



# GAZIANTEP UNIVERSITY JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

Journal homepage: <http://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/jss>



## Araştırma Makalesi • Research Article

# Imperialism and the End of Chieftaincy in Colonial Ghana, 1925-1950

*Sömürge Altındaki Gana'da Emperyalizm ve Yerel Yönetimin Sonu, 1925-1950*

Usman ABASS<sup>a\*</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Ph.D. Candidate, Ankara Yıldırım Beyazıt University, History Department, Ankara / TÜRKİYE  
ORCID: 0000-0002-3195-7177

### MAKALE BİLGİSİ

*Makale Geçmişi:*

Başvuru tarihi: 17 Aralık 2022

Kabul tarihi: 19 Nisan 2023

*Anahtar Kelimeler:*

Gana,  
Amirler,  
Yerel otorite yönetmeliği,  
Yöneticiler.

### ÖZ

Afrika'da sömürgecilik üzerine neredeyse tüm literatür, oluşumunda Geleneksel Hükümdarların rollerinden ziyade Afrika direnişine odaklanmaktadır. Dolayısıyla bu makale bundan bir sapmadır. Bu makale, amirlerin sömürge girişimindeki konumunu ve bunun Gana'daki amirlik kurumunun çöküşüne nasıl yol açtığını tasvir etmeyi amaçlamaktadır. Bunu yaparken Avrupalıları cezbeden ve ardından Gana'da sömürgeciliğin empoze edilmesine yol açan olayları ve bu etkileşimlerin nasıl statükoyu değiştirdiğini ve böylece yeni toplumsal tabakalaşmalara ve hiyerarşik oluşumlara yol açtığını tasvir etmektedir. Avrupa emperyalizminin dürtüsünün zirvesi, çoğu Afrika devletinin oluşum aşamalarına denk geldi. Bu nedenle Afrika kıtasında büyük devletlerin gelişmesini engelledi. Çalışma, İngiliz emperyalistlerinin ve sömürgeci Gana'daki yöneticilerin, Amirler'in modus operandi ve modus vivendi'si karşısında etkisini araştırıyor. Gold Coast Kolonisi, Temmuz 1874'te kurulmuş olmasına rağmen Amirler, 1925'te bölgeyi yönetmede sömürge rejimiyle çalışmaya karar verene kadar işlerin başında kaldı. Böylece bu "hata", şüphesiz Amirler ve Amirlik Kurumu için sonun başlangıcını işaret ederken yirminci yüzyılın ortalarında eğitimli sınıf liderliğinin ortaya çıkmasına zemin hazırlamıştır. Çalışmada ikincil kaynaklarla birlikte arşiv kaynakları da kullanılmaktadır. Arşiv kaynakları Gana'daki PRAAD'dan temin edilmiştir. Bu, sömürge Gana'daki değişiklikleri başlatan yerel ve dış politikalar hakkında önemli bilgiler sağlayan amirlik, yerel yönetim sistemi ve yerel ilişkiler hakkındaki verileri içermektedir. Arşiv belgeleri, Amirlerin ülkede sömürge kuralını kurmaya ne kadar derinden dâhil olduğunu ortaya çıkaracaktır.

### ARTICLE INFO

*Article History:*

Received: December 17, 2022

Accepted: April 19, 2023

*Keywords:*

Ghana,  
Chiefs,  
Native authority ordinance,  
Administrators.

### ABSTRACT

Nearly all the literature on colonialism in Africa focuses on African resistance rather than the roles of the Traditional Rulers in its formation. Thus, this paper is a deviation from that. This paper intends to portray the position of the Chiefs in the colonial enterprise, and how it led to the decline of the chieftaincy institution in Ghana. In doing so, I trace the events that attracted Europeans and subsequently led to the imposition of colonialism in Ghana, and how those interactions modify the status quo thus leading to new social stratifications and hierarchical formations. The peak of European imperialism's drive coincided with the formative stages of most African States. So, it prevented the development of large States on the African continent. The study, thus, explores the impact of British imperialists and administrators in colonial Ghana in the face of the modus operandi and modus vivendi of the Chiefs. Although the Gold Coast Colony was established in July 1874, the Chiefs remained at the helm of affairs until they decided in 1925 to work with the colonial regime in administering the territory. Thus, as this "error" indubitably marked the beginning of the end for the Chiefs and the Chieftaincy Institution, it paved the way for the emergence of the leadership of the educated class by the middle of the twentieth century. The paper uses archival sources with secondary sources. The archival documents will explicate how deeply the Chiefs partook in establishing Colonialism in Ghana.

\* Sorumlu yazar/Corresponding author.  
e-posta: [usman\\_abass@yahoo.com](mailto:usman_abass@yahoo.com)

## Introduction

It is necessary to briefly talk about Ghana before delving into the subject matter. Ghana is a West African country and was formerly called the Gold Coast. It has a population of 30,832,019 per the 2020 census (GSS, 2021, p. 2). The territory of modern Ghana had been inhabited for thousands of years. Archaeologists have documented what became known as the Kintampo Culture, which was an early culture that developed as early as 1300 B.C. in the northern region. The evidence found at the site showed domesticated animals and early agriculture (Owusu-Ansah & McFarland, 1995, p. 132). However, massive development started in about the second century CE (Gocking, 2005, p. 11) due to advanced iron technology and improved farming and was subsequently followed by migrations of people, in particular the Mande, from the decaying Mali Empire. The latter led to population increases and the formation of States from about the thirteenth century, beginning in the north. Thus, the territory came to have many ethnic units with distinct languages, social structures, and economic activities.

Some of the larger polities from north to south, in no uncertain order, include the Wa, Gonja, Dagomba, Asante, Fante, and Ga-Adangme states. The period between the 1480s and the 1800s was when these States were formed and consolidated. From the sixteenth century onwards, Ghana became a major gold hub and thus witnessed the influx of different European countries for the region's resources and manpower. As custodians of community land, the Chiefs leased lands for building forts to the Europeans and individual firms and in turn took annual rents from them. Thus, this marked their first involvement in the colonial enterprise as they provided an environment for trade to flourish. It was such hankering that later abased the importance of the chiefs before their people and Europeans alike.

### **British Domination of the Coastal Towns since 1802**

The British were not the first to set foot in colonial Ghana. The Portuguese were the first modern European nation to set foot in colonial Ghana in 1482. By 1482, they had managed to convince Kwame Ansa (Ellis, 1893, p. 18), the Chief of Elmina, to allow European settlement on the coast. The English followed next in about 1582 under Captain Windham and Anes Pinteado (Lucas, 1894, pp. 52-53), but it was short-lived. Permanent British settlement started in the seventeenth century with a fort at Kormantine in 1682 to engage in the slave trade.

This was done through some chartered merchant companies granted by the Crown and later constituted by a Parliamentary Act to trade in slaves and form settlements in West Africa (Ellis, 1893, pp. 48-49, 51-53, 62; Johnston, 1911, pp. 216-217; Quayle-Jones, 1899, pp. 337). The Crown assumed control of the company following its dissolution in 1821. It is worth noting that all possession was acquired with the consent and approval of the Chiefs. Nonetheless, the British began to assert their authority in about 1802.

Before 1802, all affairs concerning the natives and the merchant companies were reported to the Chiefs and heard at their tribunals. However, things began to change under Archibald Dalziel, a British administrator. In 1803 he decided to imprison one of the headmen of Cape Coast for selling false gold. Furthermore, in 1805 some canoe-men of Accra who had stolen gunpowder to the value of £100 from the Commandant, were brought to trial and subsequently punished at Cape Coast Castle (Ellis, 1893, pp. 134-135), the seat of the British, instead of the Chiefs' tribunal. Later Asante's invasion of the coastal towns led to the signing of the Bond of 6<sup>th</sup> March 1844 that firmly asserted British authority along the coast and gave them the license to interfere in the affairs of the coastal natives. According to Cruickshank, the British, before asserting their authority only played mediatorial roles between the tribes to keep trade free. He said they did not aim at any

territorial jurisdiction or attempt to assume any direction in the affairs of the country beyond preventing any interruptions to trade arising out of the squabbles of the different tribes. ... Nominally masters, we yet exercised no authority, or only such as the natives did not care to dispute. They allowed us to install, and sometimes to depose their kings and head men ... (Cruikshank, 1853, pp. 30, 32).

The Asante-Fante conflicts spanned between 1805 and 1874, during which the latter tribe sought help from the British merchants trading within their sphere. The main rationale for the 1874 conflict was trade disputes with the Chief of Elmina. The British Colonel, Harley, and Governor Hennessy got the Chiefs of Anamabo, Abakrampa, and Assin to unite for action. (Claridge & Clifford, 1915, pp. 10-13). Asante enjoyed some victories. However, by 1874 it had resulted in their defeat when the British took complete control of the Fante war under Major-General Sir Garnet Wolseley, who was sent from Britain to punish Asante. This British victory thus led to the formal declaration of the Gold Coast Colony on 24<sup>th</sup> July 1874.

### **Native Administration System, 1925-1950**

The first attempt to establish British dominion over the coastal States was barely four years after the July Proclamation. In 1878 the British introduced the Native Jurisdiction Ordinance under Governor S. Freeling, but it failed to be passed because the Chiefs did not support it. Kimble said this ordinance was directed towards regulating the exercise of certain powers and jurisdiction by the Chiefs, replacing the title “King” with “Head Chiefs”, giving the governor the mandate to dismiss a chief, and towards the creation of new divisions by combining villages for easy administration (Kimble, 1963, pp. 460-469). It was revised into the Native Jurisdiction Ordinance of 1883, under Samuel Rowe, and gave more authority to chiefs than they had under customary law.

The “dismissal” clause was transferred into the 1883 ordinance. When the Chiefs realized that they teamed up with the educated natives, led by Mensah Sarbah, from 1883 to about 1910 to get the clause repealed. However, they only succeeded according to Kimble in 1910 to get the word “dismissal” changed to “deposition” (Kimble, 1963, p. 469), which conveyed the same meaning. In the meantime, Lord Lugard, in 1913, introduced the indirect rule policy in Northern Nigeria, which was eventually adopted by the British as its policy for West Africa. Lord Harlech said the policy came about “out of sheer local necessities” (Harlech, 1941, p. 5) because the British lacked personnel for administration in the area.

In Ghana, between 1925 and 1927, the Chiefs of the colony decided to work with the colonial regime of their own volition. Kimble said they took that decision because they had a dysfunctional relationship with their subjects and the government and there were growing threats of sub-Chiefs severing their alliance. Thus, this agreement was towards removing threats to their position in the form of disputes over election and destoolment (Kimble, 1963, p. 490). However, the educated natives opposed this move as they believed the chiefs were not the right group of people to negotiate with the colonial regime. The chiefs proceeded with their plan and met in Accra in 1925 to design their proposals for legislation. Thus, the outcome of this conference was the adopted Native Administration Ordinance of 1927.

This led to the formation of provincial councils for the chiefs to meet periodically to discuss matters presented by the government on native affairs. This placed the chiefs under the supervision of European provincial and district officers. It was exactly what the educated natives were against. However, the Chiefs were satisfied with that and their chairman, Nana Ofori Atta, said they decided to work with the European administrators after trying it out in practice, and jabbed that “an ounce of experience is worth a ton of theory” (Kimble, 1963, p. 495). Thus, there were three political divisions under indirect rule. They were the offices of the chief commissioner, provincial commissioner, and district commissioner. The creation of the

provincial councils of chiefs created yet another political division, but it was subordinated to the first three divisions.

The immediate consequence of this act was that chiefs came to be only recognized as chiefs with the assent of European officers, who kept a record of all enstoolments in a scheduled book called “the Gold Coast Chiefs List”. Deletion of a chief’s name from the book meant destoolment as it happened in Adansi in 1934; Bekwai in 1935 and Ejisu in 1936-7. For instance, in Bekwai, Kwame Poku was the *Omanhene* and the Native Authority in 1935. He had some issues with his people who wished to destool him, but the Chief Commissioner disagreed. Subsequently, matters were adjusted, and he was allowed to remain on the Stool. Soon came further trouble between him and his Elders and Councillors. This time, the people took the law into their own hands, rushed up to the *Ahinfie* (Palace), destooled the *Omanhene*, and appointed a new *Omanhene* (ARG 1/26/1/41, 1938, pp. 24-25). The government, although did not have any grounds for deposing him kowtowed to the wishes of the people and deleted his name from the book. Also, in Ejisu, Kobina Wusu was the *Omanhene* and the Native Authority in 1936/7. A section of the people led by the *Ohemaa*, fell out with him and trouble arose, which resulted in riots. The *Omanhene* himself was arraigned in the Court on a charge of murder and for some time the *Ohemaa*’s party thought they had got the upper hand. But the Court case failed; the *Omanhene* was acquitted and sometime after he went back to Ejisu accompanied by Government Police to maintain order. The *Ohemaa* realized she had failed in her attempt to destool him. Kobina Wusu approached a member of the Ashanti Confederacy Council to intercede for him before the Council to make peace and to swear his support to the Confederacy. He was invited by the Council to present himself in person, but he failed to turn up. The Council considered this disrespectful and proceeded to declare him destooled. However, the Government returned him to the Stool (ARG 1/26/1/41, 1938, pp. 25-26).

A further consequence of the Chiefs’ decision to work with the British was that chiefs came to be presented with a Union Jack Flag, of different sizes, and a Messenger Stick for use as insignia to their positions. It represented high marks for exceptional service to the people and government. The flags were given at the discretion of the European commissioners only upon enstoolment. When a Chief is granted a Union Jack, the first one was provided by Government, but the responsibility of replacing it in the future when soiled or worn was pinned on the Chief (ARG 1/1/114 No. 1034/E.P. Case 278/1923, 10<sup>th</sup> June 1930). For instance, in 1928, Baba Nartha the *Sarkin Zongo* of Mampong was issued a Union Jack and a Message Stick for his services to the Mampong town (ARG 1/1/114, 1928). Conversely, the *Ohene* of Effiduasia in 1930 was refused the Union Jack for disregarding Mampong Native Custom by refusing to act as *Omanhene* (ARG 1/1/114 1388/E.P. Case 278/1923, 5<sup>th</sup> Aug. 1930). Likewise, the *Ohene* of Banko was refused a flag in 1931, to which the Chief Commissioner stated there was not “any special reason for which he should be given a flag” (ARG 1/1/114 No. 499/81/28, 10<sup>th</sup> Feb. 1931). A Union Jack Flag was given to the *Omanhene* of Mampong in 1931 as soon as his enstoolment received the approval of the Governor (ARG 1/1/114, 10<sup>th</sup> Apr. 1931). Also, in 1931 the District Commissioner approved for Union Jacks to be presented to the *Ahene* of Atebubu, Ejura, and Jamase after their confirmation (ARG 1/1/114 No. 5/3/M.73, 20<sup>th</sup> May 1931). In 1931, the *Ohene* of Asokori’s request for a flag was rejected because he was issued a flag in June 1930 (ARG 1/1/114 No. 499/81/28, 10<sup>th</sup> Feb. 1931). Therefore, the responsibility of replacing it rested on him. As to how the Chiefs replaced soiled or worn flags was not clear. Perhaps the only rational explanation could be that they had to purchase them from their commissioners or other approved sources.

Up till 1929, Chiefs took tolls on roads in their towns. In 1929, the government attempted to make it illegal for tolls to be collected on what it regarded as public highways. A public highway according to the government was a highway that the public has the right to use

even though it may have been constructed by a private person and runs over privately owned land (CSO 21/4/3 C.S.M.P.1479/29, 21<sup>st</sup> Mar. 1929). For instance, the *Benkumhene* of Larteh was warned by his District Commissioner to desist from taking tolls on a road he and his people had built in their town (CSO 21/4/3 No. 639/325/1929, 9<sup>th</sup> July 1929). The *Benkumhene* in return requested for the ruling of a judge banning toll collection before he could comply with his commissioner's directives (CSO 21/4/3, 8<sup>th</sup> July 1929) and explain the same to the *Oman* of Larteh so that they may understand him and keep to the order of the commissioner (CSO 21/4/3, 3<sup>rd</sup> Aug. 1929). However, there was no such ruling or ordinance by which the commissioner issued that directive to the Chief. The Acting Commissioner for the Eastern Province then called on the Secretary for Native Affairs to come up with a definite ruling on collecting tolls on roads upon realizing that the *Benkumhene*'s request was the outcome of legal advice (CSO 21/4/3 No. 7061/1971/29, 13<sup>th</sup> Sept. 1929). The Secretary for Native Affairs put up that he did not see how the Attorney General could give more definite advice on the matter of the legality of Chiefs collecting tolls on roads that they had constructed without the government's assistance. However, he highlighted that the best seemingly way was to have the question settled by having a test case taken before the Court by the Police (CSO 21/4/3 S.N.A. Case 5/1928, 24<sup>th</sup> Sept. 1929).

In fact, at a meeting of the Central Road Board, representatives of both Elders and Swanzys Transport Cos., strongly supported Chiefs being permitted to collect tolls to meet the cost of constructing and maintenance of these roads (CSO 21/4/3 S.N.A. Case 5/1928, 24<sup>th</sup> Sept. 1929). The companies since 1929 had been giving the chiefs loans to undertake projects in their towns. For instance, in 1929, the United Africa Company Limited gave a loan of £3,000 to the Chief of Agona Duakwa<sup>1</sup> for town improvements; in 1930 the Bank of British West Africa Limited gave £500 to the *Odikro* of Ewusa for constructing a school block (CSO 21/4/16 No. 1202/31/C.P.890/29, 23<sup>rd</sup> Apr. 1931, p. 1); in 1931 the Dutch Sekondi State Council went for a loan of £2,000 from Barclays Bank to settle the Stool's debt (CSO 21/4/18 1A No. 1108/31, 11<sup>th</sup> Sept. 1931, p. 1); the *Omanhene* of Enchi took £1,000 from the General Manager of the United Africa Company, Mr McCullough, for town works (CSO 21/4/15 No. 1108/31/S.2 1931) inter alia. Repayment involved pledging Stool property in the event of default.

Thus, in 1930, the government introduced an ordinance, named "The Toll Ordinance, 1930", which the legislative council passed into law. The highlight of it was that no private person could be authorized to collect tolls, but the Stool. Private individuals were the first to be prohibited because it was feared that an unscrupulous Chief might gift land to a Contractor which it was proposed to use as a road on the understanding that the Contractor would pay to the Chief a certain percentage of tolls. Thus, since the land was controlled by the Stool, it was felt that the building of roads by private persons or companies to utilize them as commercial assets, in the form of toll collections, should only be allowed as a repayment to the Stool for communal work in construction (CSO 21/4/3 51A No. 415/S.N.A.5/1928, 10<sup>th</sup> June 1930). The three Provincial Commissioners of the Colony all agreed with the Draft Bill and expressed that tolls should be authorized on certain roads, but that permission should not be extended to private persons or companies and that such permission is limited to Stools and native authorities (CSO 21/4/3 52 No. 462/S.N.A.5/1928, 4<sup>th</sup> July 1930, p. 1). However, Hon. J. Glover-Addo prompted the government that they should insert a clause showing that the consent of the Paramount Chief of the District in which the road was to be made had also been obtained (CSO 21/4/3

---

<sup>1</sup> See for example, General Grey to the Colonial Secretary, "Financing African Chiefs for Town Improvements", 17 September 1929, M.P. No. 10333/29, pp. 1-3, enlisted in CSO 21/4/14., PRAAD, p. 1.

M.P.10614/29, 3<sup>rd</sup> Sept. 1930). Thus, with such addition, the provincial councils of chiefs accepted the terms of the ordinance without objection, first by the Effutu State, Mankessim, and then Akyem Abuakwa (CSO 21/4/3 No. 55/30/E.S.8/1927, 9<sup>th</sup> Sept. 1930; No. G.L./M.S./64/30 1930; No. 974/16/30, 13<sup>th</sup> Oct. 1930).

Thus, whilst the Native Jurisdiction Ordinance had been operational in the colony since 1927, the Native Authority Ordinance was later drafted with increased powers of the administration to assume a more direct approach than an indirect one and then passed for the territories, including Ashanti, the Northern Territories (NT), and Togoland under British Mandate, by mid-1930s. It was done with the cooperation of the chiefs. The draft Bill was presented in 1933 and it was approved first by Captain Dickenson, the District Commissioner for Mampong in the Ashanti Region. The Bill had initially concentrated most of its powers on the Governor. Dickenson believed that it would keep the Governor busy when its provisions were finally passed so he proffered that such powers should be delegated to chief commissioners, provincial commissioners, and district commissioners so they could issue orders (ARG 1/26/1/41 No.810/M.203, 29<sup>th</sup> July 1933, p. 1).

An important addition by this administrator was the need for Stool Treasuries. He put up that most of the Stools in Ashanti were bankrupt and there were very few financially sound Stools. His call was that Stools must have money to pay off their debts and they must have money for their upkeep, especially the large ones like Kumasi or Mampong (ARG 1/26/1/41 No.810/M.203, 29<sup>th</sup> July 1933, pp. 1-2). The drafted Bill did not make sufficient financial provisions at that stage. Thus, his solution to the financial challenges of the Stools was that they should be given definite legal powers to impose taxation by levy or otherwise, and if that was not feasible scientifically then the colonial regime must sanction the levy which at any rate was understood by the people. This form of taxation was to be made with the approval of the Governor or Chief or Provincial Commissioners (ARG 1/26/1/41 No.810/M.203, 29<sup>th</sup> July 1933, p. 2). It was eventually implemented as would be demonstrated later in the paper. What's more, the climax of his proposal was that Chiefs, in managing the accrued revenue of Stools, must be made to understand that Stool Funds were Trust Funds and that they were Trustees and would be punished if such funds were wasted or wrongfully dealt with. District Commissioners were to be given legal powers to ensure that all revenue and expenditure were disclosed and brought to account (ARG 1/26/1/41 No.810/M.203, 29<sup>th</sup> July 1933, p. 2).

Similarly, Major Robertson, the District Commissioner for Wenchi approved the draft bill. He shared the views of Mr Dickenson. On commissioners having powers to issue orders, he believed district commissioners should have the power to issue an order promptly because "a great deal of time is wasted more especially in outstations" if a matter had to be referred to the Chief Commissioner (ARG 1/26/1/41 No.636/W.5/33, 31<sup>st</sup> July 1933, p. 1). Also, he urged that there should be legislation to enforce Stool accountability because the Stools only accounted for fines and fees, in some cases market rents, but not revenue from the sale of produce of Stool Farms, Cocoa Tribute (ARG 1/26/1/41 No.636/W.5/33, 31<sup>st</sup> July 1933, p. 1) inter alia. Furthermore, the District Commissioner for Sunyani lauded the Bill for providing native authorities (the chiefs) with adequate powers to show their capabilities, and where the capabilities were good with a minimum of interference from the Administrative Officers (ARG 1/26/1/41 No.773/S.9/1933 1<sup>st</sup> Aug. 1933, p. 1). The initial absence of direct European power in the colony, in the views of the district commissioner, had led to "petty chieftains to become *Amanhene* and to have an exaggerated idea of their importance". Furthermore,

those *Amanhene* were either useless or obstreperous (generally both) and yet we have given ourselves no powers to control them and in instances where a Chief did live up to his title, we had not taken the powers to assist him against intrigue and passive resistance (ARG 1/26/1/41 No.773/S.9/1933 1<sup>st</sup> Aug. 1933, p. 1).

What's more, Captain Dickenson in August came out with two further recommendations before the enactment of the ordinance. First, with regards to Ashanti, a declaration of Native Customary Law which would apply to the whole of Ashanti was to be made. Secondly, all stool debts were to receive the prior approval of the District Commissioner because, according to him, the Chiefs and their elders contracted debts "in the most reckless manner without any thought of the future" (ARG 1/26/1/41 No.879/M.203, 24<sup>th</sup> Aug. 1933, pp. 1-2). Thus, whilst having a uniform declaration of native customary law would make it easier for administration, restricting stool debts would put the native States' Treasuries on a proper footing. Thence, the final draft of the Ordinance stipulated that

a native authority may, with the approval of the Governor, establish a native treasury in the area under the control of such native authority. All monies received by a native authority by way of dues, rates, fines, fees, or grants shall be paid into such treasuries. The Governor may from time to time make rules for the general management, supervision, and control of such treasuries (ARG 1/26/1/41 1935, pp. 11-12).

Not just that:

a native authority may, with the approval of the Governor, levy upon the natives living within the local limits of its jurisdiction rates, dues, and fees for such purposes as the Governor may from time to time direct (ARG 1/26/1/41 1935, p. 12).

Thus, in 1934 the Governor ordered the Colonial Secretary, G.A.S. Northcote, to forward three drafted Orders to the Chief Commissioner for Ashanti, towards establishing native authorities in Ashanti.<sup>2</sup> The first draft order mentioned the establishment of the *Asantehene* as a Native Authority, the second draft order was towards establishing the *Asantehene's* Court as a Court of Appeal in civil cases from the other Courts within the Confederacy, and the third order was towards establishing various other Native Authorities in Ashanti.<sup>3</sup> According to the then Chief Commissioner for Ashanti, F.W.F. Jackson, the *Kumasihene* actively took part in the drafting of the orders. For instance, the *Kumasihene* informed Jackson that the Constitution of the Confederacy Council should be stated in the Order (ARG 1/26/1/41 No.18/54/33 6A, 21<sup>st</sup> Apr. 1934). Also, the Paramount Chiefs made a point to Jackson that appeals from their Courts should be to the District Commissioner who should be empowered to use his discretion to hear or transfer the same to the *Asantehene's* Court (ARG 1/26/1/41 No.1267/54/33, 17<sup>th</sup> May 1934, p. 2). With such inputs, the Governor declared the establishment of a Native Authority to be called the "Ashanti Confederacy Council" in 1934. The area was divided into two: the 1<sup>st</sup> Schedule comprised the Divisions of Kumasi, Mampong, Juaben, Bekwai, Essumeja, Kokofu, Nsuta, Adansi, Kumawu, Offinsu, Ejisu, Agona, Banda, Wenchi and Mo; and the 2<sup>nd</sup> Schedule comprising of the Seven Kumasi Clans—Adonten, Akwamu, Ankobia, Gyasi, Korenti, Kyidom, and Oyoko. Thus, the restored Ashanti Confederacy Council, which was constituted as the Native Authority, was composed of the *Asantehene* as the President, Head Chiefs of those Divisions in the 1st Schedule, and the senior Chiefs of the seven Kumasi Clans in the 2<sup>nd</sup> Schedule (ARG 1/26/1/41 No.18/54/33 6B, 21<sup>st</sup> Apr. 1934). Some areas such as Banko, Sekyere, Agogo, Wioso, Juansa, Domiabra, Obogu, Beposo, Bechem, Odumasi No. 1 and 2, Mim (ARG 1/26/1/41 No.18/54/33 6C, 21<sup>st</sup> Apr. 1934,

<sup>2</sup> Ashanti, before the passage of the Native Authority Ordinance was ruled by "the Ashanti Council of Chiefs". This Council was formed in 1905 by the British following the exile of Nana Prempeh to Seychelles from about 1896 until his return in 1924. From 1924 until the passage of the Native Authority Ordinance in January 1935, Ashanti was ruled by the same Native Jurisdiction Ordinance as applied to the Colony Proper. Thus, the Ashanti Confederacy of State was suspended from 1905 with the inauguration of the Council of Chiefs, and only restored in 1935 with the passage of the Native Authority Ordinance.

<sup>3</sup> See for example, G.A.S. Northcote, Colonial Secretary, "Confidential", No. C./28/33/122. Accra, 3<sup>rd</sup> April 1934, pp. 1-2, in ARG 1/26/1/41, PRAAD.

p. 2) *inter alia*, which were non-subordinate to the two Schedules were created as native authorities by the Governor. The Ordinance came into effect on 31<sup>st</sup> January 1935.

Conversely, the NT was not conquered but acquired through a series of treaties entered with the native Chiefs. Some Africans such as George Ekem Ferguson took part in concluding treaties with the chiefs on behalf of the British from about 1890. The north was constituted in June 1902 by an Order in Council and administered by the Northern Territories Order No. 1 of 1927 until the drafting of the Native Administration Ordinance for it started in about 1931. Sections of the 1927 order were thus amended to give effect to the ordinance. This area was not like the southern States where there was a near formation of homogeneous States. It consisted of sundry tribes. Thus, within the larger States such as Gonja, and Dagbon, other districts owned by other tribes were to be created. Also, the northern section of the British Sphere of Togoland was part of this area. The Togoland portion was administered by the Togoland Order No. 9 of 1925. This area was formally a German colony but was eventually divided into two, British and French Togoland, as spoils of the First World War.

Major Jackson, the NT's Chief Commissioner, highlighted that before the introduction of the Native Administration of the north, he had toured and "interviewed practically all the Tribal Chiefs and discussed the question of the introduction of Indirect Rule" for their concurrence (CSO 21/2/5 No.211/57/1931, 17<sup>th</sup> Feb. 1932, p. 1). Nonetheless, not all the Chiefs agreed. For instance, the Chiefs of the Navrongo District, i.e., the Kasena, Nankanni, and Builsa (Kanjarga) tribes, rejected his proposal to be amalgamated under Mamprussi, whom they said had fought against them and treated them cruelly in the past. However, the three tribes agreed to form a Native Authority composed of their respective Chiefs and run their combined lands as one under a Council of Chiefs (CSO 21/2/5 No.211/57/1931, 17<sup>th</sup> Feb. 1932, p. 1). Likewise, the Issalas under Tumu also rejected to combine with the Issalas under Wa or Lawra. Furthermore, it was envisioned that the small Divisions of Dagarti and Sissala under the Chiefs of Lambussie, Ulu, Samoa, Han, and Sabuli would join the Council of Chiefs of the larger States and be represented on the Council by the Chief of Lambussie (CSO 21/2/5 No.211/57/1931, 17<sup>th</sup> Feb. 1932, p. 2). However, the Governor disregarded their rejection of the design and amalgamated them with other States under different Chiefs and in some instances created Secular Chiefs, like the Chief of Nandom (CSO 21/2/5 No.49/32 7<sup>th</sup> Mar. 1932, p. 4), who did the bidding of the colonial regime.

With regards to the Navrongo District, the Governor included them in the Mamprussi District under the *Na* of Mamprussi, because until 1913 or so that District was recognized as forming part of the Mamprussi Kingdom. The basis of this was obtained from the NT Annual Reports for 1912 and 1913, where the then Chief Commissioner for NT, Captain Cecil Armitage, at an event proclaimed the *Na* of Mamprussi and his heirs as the Paramount Chief of the Northeastern Province of the north (CSO 21/2/5 No.4/32/24 24<sup>th</sup> Mar. 1932, p. 1). Some of the European political officers disagreed with the Governor on his position on the Navrongo States. P.F. Whittall, the Commissioner for Northern Province, for instance, pointed up that the 1913 or so proclamation by Armitage was done "under misconception, due to faulty interpretation and a fear on the part of the local Chiefs and people to say other than what they thought the 'White Man' wanted to hear" (CSO 21/2/5 No.158/25/1931 6<sup>th</sup> Apr. 1932). He emphasized that the people and Chiefs of the District most emphatically did not recognize the *Na* as their overlord and had only provided presents, etc., from time to time by direct order of the White Man (CSO 21/2/5 No.158/25/1931 6<sup>th</sup> Apr. 1932). What's more, Major Jackson supported Whittall's statement that the people of Navrongo district never regarded the *Na* of Mamprussi as their overlord nor did the *Na* himself take very much interest in matters outside his immediate surroundings (CSO 21/2/5 C.S.85 No.472/57/1931 7<sup>th</sup> Apr. 1932). Yet, the Governor turned a blind eye to their objections and clung to his amalgamation policy.



That was how the various polities were amalgamated in the north. Thus, the vast NT including the Northern Portion of British Togoland was reduced to the following districts: (i) Mamprussi; (ii) Dagomba; (iii) Gonja; (iv) Wa; (v) Lawra-Tumu; and (vi) Krachi.<sup>4</sup> The ramification of such amalgamation was the eruption of ethnic-based conflicts in the north between the tribes. Also, the occupants of the Navrongo District protested from 1932 until they formed their autonomous district in 1940. Thus, in the 1940s some changes occurred and led to the separation of Lawra and Tumu as distinct administrative units. Within the same period, representative local government was experimented in the north and thence led to Bawku, Bolgatanga, and Tamale being constituted into town councils. The success of the latter led to the establishment of the NT Territorial Council in 1946 but gained statutory recognition in 1950 (Bening, 2001, pp. 26-27). Such constitutions of town councils continued into the 1950s and led to the formation of current regions.

Following the success of the colonial government's amalgamation scheme in the NT and Northern Portion of British Togoland, it was extended to the Ewe tribes occupying the Southern Portion of British Togoland. The Southern British Togoland was at first treated as part of the Colony Proper. However, in the 1940s the colonial regime divided the area into four administrative units to get about seventy-one Divisions (CSO 21/2/18) to join one or other of the Paramount Chiefs of the four States of Buem, Akpini, Asogli, or Kpandu. Fifty-six Divisions out of the total seventy-one had joined one or other of the four States. However, seven out of the remaining fifteen Divisions led by Ve, Gbi, and Anfoe refused amalgamation and beseeched the colonial regime to permit them to federate into "The Federal State" or in Ewe "Duko-Blanuwo" of Togoland under British Mandate (CSO 21/2/18 No. 002.S.F.2/12 30<sup>th</sup> Jan. 1946). In their petition to Governor Sir Alan Burns in 1945, they expressed that the amalgamation policy was in contradiction to the traditions of the people and had therefore served to betray the political fabric of the area, and many of the smaller divisions had become amalgamated as a result of outside pressures brought to bear upon them thus destroying the aim of the policy, which from the start was intended to be voluntary and without direct force (CSO 21/2/18 19<sup>th</sup> Oct. 1945, p. 1).

They had written a similar petition in 1941 to Governor Sir Arnold W. Hudson on federation, but the colonial government did not respond to it. In the 1941 petition, they made the point that amalgamation meant sacrificing their sovereign independence and territorial or Stool integrities because the policy could not be followed by a sovereign Division without "betraying the sacred trust inherited by Chief or Ruler from his ancestors" (CSO 21/2/18 14<sup>th</sup> Jan. 1941, p. 1). Despite all their efforts to remain independent, their demands were rejected by the colonial administration for fear of political repercussions since most of the Divisions had already amalgamated.

### **Quintessence of the Native Authority Ordinance, 1935**

The governor enacted the ordinance with the legislative council's advice and consent. It redefined traditional power stratification to include Europeans at the apex of the structure. In the interpretation of who wielded the highest authority, "Administrative Officers" were placed above the Chiefs. According to the ordinance, an "Administrative Officer" meant the administrative officer in charge of the district concerned and included any administrative officer acting under his direction. These officers included the Chief Commissioner, and Provincial and District Commissioners. Next in line was the Chief or Head Chief. A "Chief" was interpreted

---

<sup>4</sup> See for example, Acting Governor, "Order by the Governor", 25A/B/C, 1932, in CSO 21/2/5, PRAAD.

as a person whose election and installation followed native law and custom and was recognized by the Governor, which also included the “Head Chief” (ARG 1/26/1/41 1935, p. 1) or Paramount Chief, as the head of the Division.

A “Division”, on the other hand, was regarded as a territorial area under the supervision of a Head Chief and a Divisional Council. The latter council was the highest native authority in all matters of welfare within the Division. There is no power without the ability to adjudicate on civil and criminal matters. Thus, with the Supreme Court Ordinance of 1876, British laws and Courts were planted as superior to native customary laws and tribunals. Thence, within a district, the Magistrate Court of a District Commissioner was graded above that of the Paramount Chief, the highest native personage. Also, all persons of African descent residing in the Gold Coast who were subject to the jurisdiction of native tribunals in the communities they belonged were regarded as “natives”. Thus, the term “Native Authority” was used to refer to “any Chief or other native or other person or any native Council or group of natives” (ARG 1/26/1/41 1935, p. 2), recognized by the Governor to rule an area. This was tantamount to divesting Stools of the essence of their existence. Chiefs were defenestrated from their ancestral Stools and in their stead non-royals were throned because of the pronoun “any”.

As if that was not enough, Section 3(1-6) (ARG 1/26/1/41 1935, pp. 2-4) of the Ordinance gave the Governor the power to create native authority or authorities for any specified area of his choice and he could direct any native authority to be subordinate to another as he deemed fit; he determined the nature of power or authority exercised by such native authorities; he could also direct that such powers conferred on the native authority should not be exercised over some persons or classes of persons as he may designate; and he could at any time publish a notice in the Gazette, ordering any person recognized as a native authority or as a member of one to cease to be so recognized, and may declare any other person to assume a native authority or a member of one in his place. Under the latter provision, the Governor, if he suspected there might be a disturbance of the peace and order because of deposing a native authority, could order the person to leave the area within any specified time as he wished, and the person could not return to such area without the consent of the Governor. Defying the Governor’s directive in this instance attracted, on conviction before a Magistrate’s Court, imprisonment for a period not exceeding six months, and deportation to any part of the Gold Coast at the discretion of the Governor.

Whilst every native authority was obliged to perform his mandates satisfactorily, native subjects of each jurisdiction were required to assist their rulers in effectuating the duties imposed on them. In fact, as a subject of jurisdiction, the native was to adhere to the directives of his native authority. The latter could direct their subjects to appear before them or before a Provincial Commissioner or an administrative officer or a Native Court having jurisdiction over (ARG 1/26/1/41 1935, pp. 5-6) such subjects. Failure of a native subject to appear before such authority, officer, or court, without any reasonable explanation, resulted in the arrest of the native and then taken before such authority (ARG 1/26/1/41 1935, p. 6). Under penalties for offences, a native could be liable to several fines and punishments (ARG 1/26/1/41 1935, pp. 8-10) depending upon the offence. For instance, a fine of twenty-five pounds or to imprisonment for six months with or without hard labour, or to both such fine and imprisonment would be meted out, if: (i) he contravened or failed to obey any order or direction which by this Ordinance he was bound to obey; or (ii) he obstructed or interfered with the lawful exercise by a native authority of any powers conferred by the Ordinance. What’s more, a fine of fifty pounds or imprisonment with or without hard labour for one year or both if a native subject impersonated a Chief or assumed the powers of a native authority or exercised administrative functions without the approval of the Governor, a native authority, or a Chief. Furthermore, if any person intrigued against the powers and authority of any native authority or acted in a way

that undermined the authority of any native authority, he would be guilty of an offence and be liable on conviction to a fine not exceeding one hundred pounds or to imprisonment for one year or both and shall be liable to be deported from the Division into any part of the Gold Coast. However, the Governor had the power to grant such individual permission to return to the Division unconditionally or subject to any conditions at his discretion.

When it came to the promulgation of orders, the Chiefs who were in most instances the native authorities in their jurisdictions were given powers to issue orders. However, the orders they could issue were more related to prohibitions and restrictions of certain acts determined by the colonial regime as detrimental to people and the environment. Thus, they were more like “law enforcers”. Some of them included restricting or regulating the production and consumption of intoxicating liquors, gambling, carrying and possession of weapons, preventing the pollution and obstruction of any stream or water-course, prohibiting conducts which might cause riots or disturbance of the peace, preventing the destruction of trees, preventing the spread of infectious or contagious disease, requiring natives to report wanted individuals, requiring the report of birth or death of any native subject to the appropriate authorities (ARG 1/26/1/41 1935, pp. 6-7), etc. Despite this, the District Commissioner had the authority to either veto any order issued by a native authority which in his opinion should not have been issued or he could authorize any order that he thought was good for the people and government to be issued by a native authority, and if the native authority neglected or refused to issue the order which it was called upon to issue, the District Commissioner may issue the order himself and thereupon come into force as if it had been issued by the native authority. In effect, the Chiefs had no say but to act as they were directed by the European officers.

#### **Provincial Council in Practice: The Central Provincial Council of the Colony, 1932-1934**

It is politic before concluding the paper to delve into how the provincial councils of the chiefs functioned. The Colony Proper was divided into three main provinces, and further into sub-districts for administrative purposes. The three main divisions were the Western Province, the Eastern Province, and the Central Province. The latter is the focus of this section since they were all similar. The headquarters of the district was Cape Coast, with Elmina, Saltpond, and Winneba as sub-districts. This council had 13 Chiefs (CSO 21/2/19 No.1762/C.P.563/26, S.N.A.No.293 23<sup>rd</sup> Aug. 1934, p. 1), and their councillors, representing their respective polities. Its structure was composed of a president, vice-president, secretary, and other Chiefs as members. The presidency was rotational. Provincial Council meetings of the council were held at Saltpond in the Nkusukum State. Nonetheless, in matters of national importance, all three provinces would meet under a Joint-Provincial Council Meeting to deliberate upon such pressing matters as they arose.

As agents of the Colonial Administration, the Chiefs were paid for participating in such council meetings, which usually lasted for 6 days, to assist in the administration of the colony. The total number of meetings ordinarily did not exceed three per year. Each Chief was paid a travelling allowance of £4 per day for attending a meeting (CSO 21/2/19 No.1762/C.P.563/26, S.N.A.No.293 23<sup>rd</sup> Aug. 1934, p. 1), and transport for two lorries at 1/ a mile (CSO 21/2/19 File 26 No.1440/31 Aug. 1934, p. 1). In 1931, the Chiefs unanimously agreed to reduce their allowance by 25% from £4 to £3 and their transport allowance to assist the regime because it was in a Budget Crisis and could not balance its Budget for the period.<sup>5</sup> Thus, in 1934, the

---

<sup>5</sup> See for example, Ag. Commissioner, Central Province, “Allowance Paid to Chiefs for Attending Provincial Council Meetings”, No. 1762/C.P.563/26, S.N.A.No.293, Cape Coast, 23 August 1934, pp. 1-2, in CSO 21/2/19;

Chiefs demanded the restoration of their full allowance and demanded it to be increased to £5 since the budget crisis no longer existed. In response, the government agreed to restore the allowance to £4, not £5, and instead of transport of two lorries, they were given a transport of one lorry at 10d a mile (CSO 21/2/19 File 26 No.1440/31 Aug. 1934, p. 2). The Acting Commissioner for Central Province added that Government should only pay the original rate of £4 per day when the Head-chief attended the Council because a representative of a Head-chief to the Council did not incur the same expense as the Head-chief nor was he attended by the same number of followers (PRAAD No.1762/C.P.563/26, S.N.A.293 23 Aug. 1934, p. 2).

Sessions were formally opened by the Provincial Commissioner of the area who was normally accompanied by the district commissioner. He began by praising them for coming together to do their duty in the interest of their Country and people. Once, the Commissioner said the coming together of the Chiefs “showed how keen the Chiefs were to maintain the stability of the Council and to enhance its value” (CSO 21/2/19 24A 7-12<sup>th</sup> Sept. 1932, p. 1). Afterwards, he presented the business of the Session for the Chiefs to discuss, which also included briefing them on the affairs of the Country in general, and of the province. This usually included certain Government Bills for legislation, Judicial and political cases pending before the Council, various ordinances, agriculture-related issues, Stool disputes, individual schemes, general, etc. Thus, the decided views of the various States Councils on these subjects were further deliberated and put to vote in the council. In addition to these, matters that the native States themselves wished to bring before the Provincial Council for consideration were also discussed. In 1932, at one of such Sessions, Nana Ayeribi Acquah III, the Chief of Winneba, told the Provincial Commissioner that they, the Chiefs, were determined to carry the council on and that it was their firm intention to make the system a success so they would continue to have the support of the Government (CSO 21/2/19 24A 7-12<sup>th</sup> Sept. 1932, p. 4). Kofi Mensah (the Chief Linguist of Agona), J.W. Enchill (the Tufuhene of Mankessim), Nana Egyir Ababio (Ayan Denker), and Nana Tsibu Darku, IX (Assin Attandaso) all encouraged the other Paramount Chiefs to persist in their noble efforts to make the Council a great success for strengthening Native Administrative (CSO 21/2/19 24A 7-12<sup>th</sup> Sept. 1932, p. 9-10).

On 10<sup>th</sup> September 1932, the Chiefs unanimously passed a Motion moved by Nana Ampardu Kwamin II, and seconded by Tufuhene J.W. Enchill, Regent of Mankessim, to impress it upon the Government on the need of encouraging *Amanhin* who were attending the Provincial Councils, in the management of their State affairs (CSO 21/2/19 24A 7-12<sup>th</sup> Sept. 1932, p. 11). Since 1931, the government had wished for the Chiefs to impose Taxation in some suitable form to boost revenue, but most of the people opposed it. The government kept reminding the Chiefs to discuss taxation thoroughly within their States to educate their people including the educated community on the need for some form of taxation. In 1933, Captain V.J. Lynch, Acting Provincial Commissioner, charged that the time had come for the people of the Country to begin to cultivate the habit of Self-Help whilst they were clamouring for greater representation in the affairs of Government. He further added that they could not just sit down and wait for Providence to give their States roads, water supplies, schools, hospitals, etc., and reminded them that Providence was not going to give them those necessary things, neither could their Import Duties always be depended upon to provide them (CSO 21/2/19 24B 16-21<sup>st</sup> Jan. 1933, p. 5). On 19<sup>th</sup> January 1933, Nana J.W. Enchill, said although the establishment of a

---

Bannerman Martin, Secretary, Provincial Council of Chiefs, Central Province, “Respecting Allowance paid to Chiefs for Attending Provincial Council Meetings”, Saltpond, No.P.C./252/C.P.N.2/1927, 13<sup>th</sup> August 1934, in CSO 21/2/19, PRAAD.

---

system of Revenue collection under Native Administration was a desirable scheme, the Central Provincial Council

would not be prepared to suggest any proposals thereunder until the *Aman* Councils of the different States of the Province had thoroughly gone into and understood the proposed scheme and empowered their *Amanhene* to deal with the same at the Provincial Council (CSO 21/2/19 24B 16-21 Jan. 1933, p. 11).

In August of 1933, during the 24<sup>th</sup> Session of the Council, the Provincial Commissioner reminded the Chiefs again of the need for a tangible system of State Revenue and controlled Expenditure, without which an efficient Native Administration could never be run. Thus, Nana J.W. Enchill this time around said the time had arrived for public levies to be raised in the different States, in Stool Treasuries for the efficient upkeep of the Stools and Native Administration to effect improvements and progress (CSO 21/2/19 24C 29<sup>th</sup> Aug – 11<sup>th</sup> Sept. 1933, p. 23).

Thus, the Chiefs called for an emergency session between the 9<sup>th</sup> and 13<sup>th</sup> of July 1934, to discuss the Stool Treasury System, among other things, which they said they had allowed to remain untouched for so long. Nana Ayeribi Acquah III expressed that he could not understand how the people could expect them to work on Native Administration without some tolerable form of local taxation towards undertaking improvements for their benefit (CSO 21/2/19 25A 9-13<sup>th</sup> July 1934, p. 8). He said that in their constant desire for political and social advancement, they could do nothing without “Native Administration Revenue” or some organized system of State Treasuries (CSO 21/2/19 25A 9-13<sup>th</sup> July 1934, p. 10). The Chiefs after several hours of deliberation concluded that the time had arrived for the long-deferred establishment of Stool Treasuries to be set up and that each State needed to take the necessary steps for bringing it into existence as soon as possible. Furthermore, the form of taxation to be adopted in each State was to be arranged to suit local conditions as to the means of raising revenue and care should be taken to ensure that means of Taxation were as convenient and tolerable as circumstances in each State would permit (CSO 21/2/19 25A 9-13<sup>th</sup> July 1934, p. 11). Eventually, the Chiefs adopted a Scheme of Taxation and decided to prepare byelaws to govern the same in each State, which would be put into proper legal form to be approved by the Governor (CSO 21/2/19 25A 9-13<sup>th</sup> July 1934, p. 1).

On the issue of Paramount Chiefs attending council meetings, Nana Ayeribi Acquah III, at the 24<sup>th</sup> Session objected to fellow Chiefs sending Delegates to Council meetings instead of coming in person. He reminded them that Government believed when members of the Council personally attend meetings of the council, it added real weight and importance to their decisions in all business of the council, thus, he encouraged all of them “to pay greater attention to their state responsibilities as Members of the Provincial Council” (CSO 21/2/19 24C 29<sup>th</sup> Aug – 11<sup>th</sup> Sept. 1933, pp. 27-28). Nana Ekunfi III supported the former Chief and added that Chiefs must endeavour to be personally present at all meetings of the Council, except in the case of illness (CSO 21/2/19 24C 29<sup>th</sup> Aug – 11<sup>th</sup> Sept. 1933, p. 28). Thus, Nana Ayeribi Acquah III, and Nana Abutakyi II, moved that “in future, any Member of the Council failing to personally attend a duly summoned meeting of the Provincial Council without any satisfactory explanation should be fined £5” (CSO 21/2/19 24C 29<sup>th</sup> Aug – 11<sup>th</sup> Sept. 1933, p. 28). Besides this, the Chiefs fixed a periodical contribution of £3 per member payable immediately after the close of each regular session towards the private Funds of the Council (CSO 21/2/19 24C 29<sup>th</sup> Aug – 11<sup>th</sup> Sept. 1933, p. 28). In February 1934, in line with missing council meetings without a satisfactory explanation, Nana Nyarku Kweku IV, was fined £2:8/- for non-attendance and offering a non-satisfactory explanation. Similarly, the representative of Nana Egyir Ababio (who had obtained leave and left on an urgent matter), Chief Andorful, was fined £2:8/- for coming to the meeting alone with only a small boy who was not of age to be consulted on a given matter (CSO 21/2/19 24D 20<sup>th</sup> Feb. 1934, p. 10).

In a nutshell, the Chiefs worked tirelessly to prove to their British officers that they were the right group of people to assume the country's administration at independence. Thus, in 1934, in welcoming the new provincial commissioner, Hon. Fieldgate, to the Council Nana Ekunfi III, expressed that the Council "would always expect from him his kindly advice and assistance in its efforts to cooperate with the Government for continued successful administration", and reaffirmed "the loyalty of the Ruling Chiefs to the British Crown at all times" (CSO 21/2/19 24D 20 Feb. 1934, p. 4).

The post-1934 era was the high tide of the NAO. Its main objective was, in an attenuating manner, to regulate and set down the authority of the chiefs. However, the intelligentsia objected to such an alliance as they viewed it as a prodrome to keep the country under perpetual colonialism. Salim opined that the educated natives "considered themselves destined to the political leadership of the country and further pushed that majority of the chiefs were illiterates and incompetent" (Salim, 1975, p. 109), and so they could not serve in the best interest of the country. Thus, the period could best be described as a phase of asserting political control in the country. The NAO lasted until about 1951 when the colonial government switched to the educated class because of the failings of the Chiefs to suppress post-war tensions and because they were then effete and inefficacious to the needs of the imperial power.

### Reference

#### Archival Sources:

- ARG 1/1/114, "UNION JACKS / FLAGS FOR CHIEFS", 1923-1932.
- ARG 1/26/1/41, "The Native Authority Ordinance", PRAAD, 1935.
- ARG 1/26/1/41, J. W. de Graft Johnson, "Memorandum on the Position of the Ohene in the Native Constitution as Affected by the Native Authority Ordinance No. 1 of 1935", PRAAD, 1938, pp. 1-44.
- ARG 1/26/1/41, J.R. Dickenson, District Commissioner, Mampong-Ashanti, "Proposed Native Authorities Ordinance", No.810/M.203, PRAAD, 1933.
- ARG 1/26/1/41, District Commissioner, Wenchi, "Native Authorities Ordinance Bill", No.636/W.5/55//33, PRAAD, 1933.
- ARG 1/26/1/41, District Commissioner, Sunyani, "Proposed Native Authority Ordinance", No.773/S.9/1933, PRAAD, 1933.
- ARG 1/26/1/41, District Commissioner, Mampong, "Proposed Native Authority Ordinance", No.879/M.203, PRAAD, 1933.
- ARG 1/26/1/41, G.A.S. Northcote, Colonial Secretary, "Confidential", No. C./28/33/122, PRAAD, 1934.
- ARG 1/26/1/41, Chief Commissioner, Ashanti, "Confidential", No. 18/54/33, 6A, PRAAD, 1934.
- ARG 1/26/1/41, Chief Commissioner, Ashanti, "Confidential", No. 18/54/33, 6B, PRAAD, 1934.
- ARG 1/26/1/41, Chief Commissioner, Ashanti, "Confidential", No. 18/54/33, 6C, PRAAD, 1934.
- ARG 1/26/1/41, Chief Commissioner, Ashanti, "Confidential", No. 1267/54/33, PRAAD, 1934.
- ARG 2/1/13, The Gold Coast Chiefs List, PRAAD, 1928-29.
- CSO 21/4/3, District Commissioner, Mampong- Akwapim, No. 639/325/1929, PRAAD, 1929.
- CSO 21/4/3, Benkumhene, Akwapim, PRAAD, 8 July 1929.
- CSO 21/4/3, Benkumhene, Akwapim, PRAAD, 3 August 1929.
- CSO 21/4/3, Attorney General, "Extracted from C.S.M.P.1479/29", PRAAD, 21 March 1929.
- CSO 21/4/3, Acting Commissioner, Eastern Province, Koforidua, No. 7061/1971/29, PRAAD, 13 September 1929.

- CSO 21/4/18, Nana Bekyire Yankeh II, 1A No. 1108/31, PRAAD, 1938.
- CSO 21/4/3, Acting Secretary for Native Affairs, "Extract from S.NA. Case 5/1928", PRAAD, 24 September 1929.
- CSO 21/4/3, Commissioner, Central Province, "Regulation of Tolls on Roads", 51A No. 415/S.N.A.5/1928, PRAAD, 10 June 1930.
- CSO 21/4/3, Acting Secretary for Native Affairs, "Regulation of Tolls on Roads", 52 No.462/S.N.A.5/1928, Accra. PRAAD, 4 July 1930.
- CSO 21/4/3, Hon. J. Glover-Addo, M.P.10614/29, Accra. PRAAD. 3 September 1930.
- CSO 21/4/3, Omanhene, Effutu-Winneba, No.55/30/E.S.8/1927. PRAAD. 9 September 1930.
- CSO 21/4/3, Omanhene, Mankessim, No. G.L./M.S./64/30, Mankessim, PRAAD.
- CSO 21/4/3, Ofori Atta, Omanhene, Akyem Abuakwa, No. 974/16/30, Akyem. PRAAD. 13 October 1930.
- CSO 21/2/5, Chief Commissioner, Tamale, No. 211/57/1931, PRAAD, 1932.
- CSO 21/2/5, Colonial Secretary, Accra, No. 4/32/24, PRAAD, 1932.
- CSO 21/2/5, P.F. Whittall, Commissioner for Northern Province, "Na of Nalerigu", Navrongo, No. 158/25/1931, PRAAD, 1932.
- CSO 21/2/5, Chief Commissioner, Tamale, C.S. 85 No. 472/57/1931, PRAAD, 1932.
- CSO 21/2/5, Asst. S.N.A., 20 File 49/32, PRAAD, 1932.
- CSO 21/2/5, Acting Governor, "Order by the Governor", 25A/B/C, PRAAD, 1932.
- CSO 21/2/18, Chief Commissioner, Colony, No. 002.S.F.2/12, Cape Coast, PRAAD, 1946.
- CSO 21/2/18, "The Petition of the Head Chiefs of Anfoega, Gbi, Ve, Tsrupke, Goviefe, Likpe, and Santrokofi Divisions" to the Governor Sir Alan Burns, PRAAD, 1945.
- CSO 21/2/18, Mr V.H.K. Littlewood, "Handing Over Notes", PRAAD.
- CSO 21/2/18, "The Petition of the Head Chiefs of Gbe-Hohoe, Likpe, Ve, Santrokofi, Anfoega, Tsrupke and Goviefe Divisions" to the Governor Sir Arnold Wienhold Hudson, PRAAD, 1941.
- CSO 21/2/19, Ag. Commissioner, Central Province, "Allowance Paid to Chiefs for Attending Provincial Council Meetings", No. 1762/C.P.563/26, S.N.A.No.293, Cape Coast, PRAAD, 1934.
- CSO 21/2/19, File 26 No. 1440/31, PRAAD, 1934.
- CSO 21/2/19, Bannerman Martin, Secretary, Provincial Council of Chiefs, Central Province, "Respecting Allowance paid to Chiefs for Attending Provincial Council Meetings", Saltpond, No. P.C./252/C.P.N.2/1927, PRAAD, 1934.
- CSO 21/2/19, "Minutes of Council Meetings of the 22<sup>nd</sup> Session of the Central Provincial Council", Saltpond, 24A, PRAAD, 1932, pp. 1-13.
- CSO 21/2/19, "Minutes of Proceedings of Meetings of the 23<sup>rd</sup> Session of the Central Provincial Council", Saltpond, 24B, PRAAD, 1933, pp. 1-18.
- CSO 21/2/19, "Minutes of Proceedings of Meetings of the 24<sup>th</sup> Session of the Central Provincial Council", Saltpond, 24C, PRAAD, 1933, pp. 1-35.
- CSO 21/2/19, "Minutes of Proceedings of Meetings of the 25<sup>th</sup> Session of the Central Provincial Council", Saltpond, 24D, PRAAD, 1934, pp. 4-16.
- CSO 21/2/19, "Minutes of Proceedings of Meetings of the 27<sup>th</sup> Emergency Session of the Central Provincial Council", Saltpond, 25A, PRAAD, 1934, pp. 1-13.

### Secondary Sources:

- Claridge, W. W., & Clifford, H. (1915). *A history of the gold coast and Ashanti: From the earliest times to the commencement of the twentieth century*, Vol. II, London: John Murray.
- Cruikshank, B. (1853). *Eighteen years on the gold coast of Africa: including an account of the native tribes, and their intercourse with Europeans*. Vol. I, London: Hurst and Blackett Publishers.

- 
- Ellis, A. B. (1893). *A history of the gold coast of West Africa*. London: Chapman and Hall.
- Ghana Statistical Service, (2021). *Ghana 2021 population and housing census*. General Report, Volume 3E.
- Gocking, R. S. (2005). *The history of Ghana*. Greenwood Publishing Group.
- Harlech, L. (1941). British native policy and administration in tropical Africa. An address delivered on 6 August 1941 to the Witwatersrand Branch of the South African Institute of International Affairs, Johannesburg – South Africa, *The S.A. Institute of International Affairs, ARCHIVES*, 1-16.
- Johnston, H. H. (1911). *The opening up of Africa*. New York: Henry Holt and Co.
- Kimble, D. (1963). *A political history of Ghana: The Rise of Gold Coast Nationalism, 1850-1928*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Lucas, C. P. (1894). *A historical geography of the British colonies*. Vol. III, *West Africa*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press.
- Owusu-Ansah, D., & McFarland, D. M. (1995). *Historical dictionary of Ghana*. Second ed., Scarecrow Press.
- Quayle-Jones, W. H. Sir (1899). Our West African colonies. In *The British Empire Series: British Africa with Four Maps*, Vol. II, London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co. Ltd., 334-365.
- Salim, M. S. M. (1975). The reactions and attitudes of Africans in Southern Ghana to the British colonial policy of indirect rule, 1925-1951. Unpublished Doctorate Thesis. University of Edinburgh.
-