“When I see the big ship,” Josiah Yamsey remembered in 1820, “I see none but white men.” He was sure that he would be eaten. Instead, he was locked below decks, behind an iron grille. Another captive man told him that whites “did not eat the people, but made them work.” Soon, a Royal Navy vessel gave chase, and brought the captured slave ship back to Freetown, the capital of Sierra Leone, Britain’s small colony on the West African coast. Yamsey and his shipmates went ashore, to the ramshackle barracks of the colonial Liberated African Department. A few months later, Yamsey was sent to Regent, a village in the mountains five miles inland. In Regent, Yamsey met W.A.B. Johnson, a German-born missionary, and eventually converted to Christianity. “God bring me out from my Country people,” Yamsey concluded, “God did all these things to save me from Hell, by Jesus Christ.”

Josiah Yamsey’s recollections are preserved in the archives of the Church Missionary Society (CMS). His testimony is heavily mediated. Johnson transcribed it, and shaped it according to the generic conventions of missionary writing and the expectations of his audience, the CMS’s leaders, based in London. We can only guess at the contents of Yamsey’s mind, at
his fears, at the succor he took from Christianity. His life is archived more durably than his faith. Under the terms of the 1807 Slave Trade Act, which abolished the British slave trade, the Governor of Sierra Leone had the right to “dispose” of people released from slave ships. The Liberated African Department (LAD) was built up to manage and refine this process. To the LAD, Yamsey was a data point in a system of settlement and labor. To the CMS, Yamsey was a character conjured from missionary correspondence for the edification of donors. The institutions that archived Josiah Yamsey had a common ambition: that, after emancipation, former slaves could be ‘civilized.’

Before 1807, British activists argued that the slave trade was an obstacle to ‘civilization’ in Africa; the “chain which bound Africa to the dust, and rendered abortive every effort to raise her.” What was a rhetorical flourish in London was a practical problem in Sierra Leone. What kind of society would Britain build in West Africa to replace the slave trade? And how would British officials know when former slaves living in a post-slavery society had been ‘civilized’? To the LAD, ‘civilization’ was a package of British folkways that could be observed and measured: taking wages, wearing European clothes, owning land, attending church. To the CMS, it was a more ineffable transformation, but one that was still detectable in narratives of personal transformation judged to be ‘authentic’ by white missionaries. Josiah Yamsey lived between these two versions of ‘civilization.’ He was relatively privileged: the power of missionaries like Johnson rested on the assent and assistance of converts like Yamsey. And yet, the whole system

---


presumed his and his fellow former slaves’ incapacity and grateful obedience. In Sierra Leone, imperial anti-slavery laws were the charter for a system of economic exploitation founded on a shifting foundation of paternalism, coercion and codependence. In 1820, when Josiah Yamsey bore witness to his fellows converts about his captivity and conversion, he was also bearing witness to the rebirth of British anti-slavery as colonialism.

Building ‘civilization’ out of anti-slavery in Sierra Leone was a different, although related, project from the emancipation of slaves in British colonies. In the slave colonies, emancipation presented officials with what Thomas Holt, writing about Jamaica, called ‘the problem of freedom,’ of how “thoroughly [to reform] … ex-slaves’ culture so as to make them receptive to the discipline of free labor.” In Sierra Leone, officials felt that they faced a more foundational problem. A majority of enslaved people in the West Indies spoke some English, many were practicing Christians, and most participated, to some extent, in a cash economy. In Jamaica, the roots of ‘civilization’ were shallow but visible; the ‘problem of freedom’ was the problem of protecting and nurturing those roots after emancipation. In contrast, most people arriving in Freetown from slave ships spoke no English, had never worked in heavily capitalized agricultural industries, and had never bought anything with a British shilling. Anti-slavery activists in London assumed that the West African societies involved in the slave trade had been
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7 For example, one leading West Indian planter estimated that in 1774, that enslaved people held at least 20% of all the circulating specie in Jamaica. See Vincent Brown, _The Reaper’s Garden: Death and Power in the World of Atlantic Slavery_ (Cambridge, Mass., 2008), 114.
so debased by it that they had virtually no ‘civilization’ to speak of, and that the people they sold had even less. Moreover, former slaves repatriated in Sierra Leone came from all around West Africa; British officials did not need to finesse the end of slavery and the traditions of a conquered society. The British colony at Sierra Leone was something new, and something made by anti-slavery. In consequence, colonial officials claimed a mandate not just to reform former slaves’ culture, but to create a culture for them, and then to impose it. As two Parliamentary representatives commented in 1827, the “manner of life” of former slaves living in villages like Regent was “altogether artificial.” In Sierra Leone, the ‘problem of freedom’ intertwined with what might be called the ‘emerging problem of imperial trusteeship.’ as British efforts to teach the discipline of capitalism to former slaves grew in symbiosis with British ambitions to rule West Africa for the sake of the ‘natives.’

**********

In the nineteenth century, at least 81,745 people like Josiah Yamsey were repatriated in Sierra Leone, including nearly 13,000 people between 1814 and 1824. However, before 1815, colonial officials took more interest in captured slave ships than in the people imprisoned aboard them. The 1807 Act passed during the Napoleonic wars, and was designed to adapt the interdiction of slave ships to the routines of maritime warfare. The Act permitted a new Court of Vice-Admiralty in Freetown to award military personnel a portion of the auction value of the
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9 For a good summary of the problem of British colonial officials attempting to abolish slavery while maintaining ‘traditional’ institutions in colonized society, see the discussion of the Gold Coast Colony in Dylan C. Penningroth, The Claims of Kinfolk: African American Property and Community in the Nineteenth-Century South (Chapel Hill, NC, 2003), 13–44.
10 James Rowan and Henry Wellington, “(312) Sierra Leone. Report of the Commissioners of Inquiry into the State of the Colony of Sierra Leone. First Part,” House of Commons Papers; Reports of Commissioners, 1826, 92.
slave ships they had helped to capture as ‘prize money’ – the same incentive offered for the capture of enemy warships and merchant shipping.\textsuperscript{12} However, this focus on the value of slave ships meant that former captives were an afterthought. In Sierra Leone, some were indentured as ‘apprentices,’ others were enlisted in the armed forces, but many were sent to informal settlements outside Freetown, where they effectively disappeared from the scrutiny of colonial officials.\textsuperscript{13}

By 1815, prize money was essential to the colonial economy. Consequently, in Sierra Leone the end of the Napoleonic wars was a crisis, not a relief. After Waterloo, former captives kept arriving, putting pressure on wages, while the rewards of capturing slave ships decreased. The 1815 Treaty of Paris did not mandate the abolition of other European slave trades. Instead, the rules governing the seizure of foreign slave ships became stricter, and British officers shared the proceeds of captured non-British ships under new bilateral agreements with other European states. For Charles MacCarthy, who served as Governor of Sierra Leone from 1814 until his death in the first Anglo-Asante War in 1824, ‘civilization’ was a way to shore up the fortunes of a fading colony; colonialism was an emergent property of economic necessity.


Between 1816 and 1823, MacCarthy founded an archipelago of villages to settle former captives. The villages, in the hinterland of Freetown, included Regent, Kissy, Gloucester, Waterloo, Wilberforce, Leopold, Charlotte, Bathurst, Wellington, York, Kent and Hastings, as well as villages on the Banana Islands off the coast south of Freetown, and another on the Isles-de-Los, a chain of islands near present-day Conakry, Guinea. By 1822, nearly 8,000 people lived in the villages, compared with about 5,600 in Freetown itself. The village system was overseen by the Chief Superintendent of the LAD, and each village was managed by a missionary superintendent, recruited by the CMS. The missionaries were administrators as well as preachers: organizing agriculture, operating schools, and maintaining village registers.

Some historians of Sierra Leone portray the village system, particularly in the 1830s and 1840s, as an incubator for future generations of leaders. However, the village system began as a pragmatic attempt to dull an economic shock. Because ‘civilization’ was valuable, the records of the village system are relatively robust in comparison with the records of other colonial departments. Regent’s records are especially dense. In his time, no missionary in West Africa was as celebrated as Regent’s superintendent, W.A.B. Johnson. An historian of British
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14 The Royal Gazette and Sierra Leone Advertiser [Freetown], August 10, 1822; see also Kopytoff, A Preface to Modern Nigeria, 25.
16 For example, I have found no extant records of the Ordnance or Public Works Departments, and few remaining records from the law courts.
17 See, for example, Stephen H. Tyng, ed., A Memoir of the Rev. W.A.B. Johnson ... (New York, 1853); The Gospel in Africa: An Account of the Labors and Success of the Rev. W.A.B. Johnson, Missionary of the Church Missionary Society in Regent’s Town, Sierra Leone, Africa (New York, 1858); Arthur Pierson, Seven Years in Sierra Leone: The Story of the Work of William A.B. Johnson, Missionary of the Church Missionary Society, from 1816 to 1823 in Regent’s Town, Sierra Leone, Africa (New York, 1897); Maria Louisa Charlesworth, Africa’s Mountain Valley; Or, The Church in Regent’s Town, West Africa (London, 1874). Johnson also plays a prominent role in missionary histories published in the mid-nineteenth century. See Samuel Abraham Walker, Missions in Western Africa, Among the Soosoos, Bulloms, &c: Being the First Undertaken by the Church Missionary Society for Africa and the East
missionary work wrote that Regent represented, “All that we have wished [for]…from missionary efforts.” Missionary accounts of the ‘civilization’ of former slaves also attracted the attention of the American Colonization Society, who saw in the villages a proof-of-concept that, “under the political government of a few white men,” a colony could safely be established in Africa to hive off free African-Americans. In response to the shock of peace in Europe, the village system transformed a legal instrument that had made ending the slave trade profitable into a colonial bureaucracy that removed the legal status of ‘slave’ from former captives, and elaborated a set of norms for the behavior and everyday life of ‘free’ people.

********

Recently, the history of the British empire has been revitalized by studies of individual people and places, foregrounding and thickly describing connections within an empire that was heterogeneous, “a mass of loose ends, contradictions and unfinished projects.” Concomitantly, recent work on the transatlantic slave trade has reinterpreted the core subject of Atlantic history with close readings of individual places, and individual lives. The village system in Sierra

---

Leone was relatively small, and relatively isolated, but its connections with the wider British empire give it outsize importance. In a field structured by Eric Williams’ thesis that the abolition of British slavery was caused by the declining value of the West Indies to British industry, and by David Brion Davis and Christopher Leslie Brown’s careful intellectual histories, the origins of British abolitionism preponderate. In part, this is because the 1807 Slave Trade Act was designed to weaken the slave-holding regime of the British West Indies from the supply side, eventually leading to emancipation. In contrast, although historians of the 1833 Slavery Abolition Act emphasize the practical challenges of emancipation, most treat the law as a nearly inevitable sequel to 1807. Between these milestones, celebrated by British reformers the nineteenth century and reified by historians, colonial Sierra Leone was built of the scaffolding of imperial laws against slave-trading.

Sierra Leone was an abolitionist colony insofar as it represented a colonial incarnation of British anti-slavery ideology. However, British ‘abolitionism’ was very different from its American counterpart. In the United States, abolitionists were committed to ending slavery and to securing equal citizenship for African-Americans. In a country where slavery was a visible part of everyday life, this iteration of abolitionism was revolutionary and introspective. In Britain,
slavery was a colonial institution, concentrated in the West Indies. Most leading activists against British slavery and the British slave trade rarely encountered enslaved people. For them, as for most Britons, the effects of the end of colonial slavery were largely economic: layoffs in Liverpool, fluctuations in the price of sugar. In consequence, British anti-slavery was less radical, more expansive and more *imperial* than American abolitionism. The successes of British anti-slavery underwrote schemes for domestic moral reform, for global missionary work and for the ‘protection’ of the indigenous peoples living in the British settler empire.25

The leaders of the British movement against the slave trade and against slavery were also fundamentally conservative in their assumptions about the pace of emancipation; most assumed that former slaves would learn the economic, cultural and cognitive habits of freedom over generations. Among historians of abolitionism in the United States, ‘gradual emancipation’ is a fault line between historians who posit a stark difference between early advocates of gradual emancipation and later advocates of immediate emancipation, and historians who see the two periods of abolitionism as continuous and interconnected.26 In the British empire, gradualism
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was generally accepted at home and widely implemented in the empire. In Sierra Leone, emancipation blurred into ‘civilization.’ The assumption that former slaves ought to learn the discipline of free labor blended smoothly with the expectation that they ought gratefully to accept British control over their lives.

Anti-slavery was expansive and imperial. Some recent histories of the British campaign against the slave trade posit a facile continuity between late Georgian and early-Victorian activists and the bureaucrats of the high Victorian Foreign Office, and single-mindedly interpret any action taken against slave traders by the British government in the later nineteenth century as evidence of a deeply ‘moral’ British foreign policy. And yet, it is certainly true that leading British anti-slavery activists were insiders, not street fighters, and that anti-slavery was promiscuous, its ambitions reaching far beyond slavery as such. As one of critic of the ‘Saints’ put it: “They step into their carriages…they are the Sierra Leone Company; and again… the Society for Missions… another transformation makes them the Society for the Suppression of Vice; a fifth carries them to the India House; and sixth lands them at the House of Commons.” After 1808, although it was became a Crown Colony, mostly by military officers, Sierra Leone remained deeply connected to the ambitions of British anti-slavery.

**********

British Sierra Leone began as an attempt to prove that commerce in Africa could be more profitable without the slave trade. In 1787, the colony began as the short-lived ‘Province of
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28 This critique was part of an attempt by T.P. Thompson, the first Crown Governor of Sierra Leone, to use his position to expose the ‘hypocrisy’ of the London-based abolitionist elite. See Decision of the Court of Vice-Admiralty, November 6, 1809, Records of the Colonial Office, The National Archives, Kew (CO) 267/27.
Freedom,’ with settlers drawn from among the ‘Black Poor,’ indigent soldiers and sailors living in London after the American Revolutionary War.\(^{29}\) In 1792, the Sierra Leone Company re-launched the colony with a new settlement, Freetown. The Company’s directors included William Wilberforce and other prominent leaders of Parliamentary antislavery. Freetown was first settled by nearly 1,500 ‘Black Loyalists,’ African-Americans who joined the British side in the Revolutionary War, and had been resettled in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, joined in 1800 by roughly 500 exiled Trelawny Maroons from Jamaica. The Company hoped the settlers would take wages to grow crops like sugar and cotton, and prove the efficiency of free labor over slave labor. The Company’s plans faltered, and in 1808, the Company dissolved and Sierra Leone became a Crown Colony.

However, the elite London abolitionists maintained strong connections with the Governors of Sierra Leone. Correspondence on West African affairs sent to the Colonial Office was routinely copied to Wilberforce and the leading abolitionist jurist James Stephen. Zachary Macaulay, who had governed Sierra Leone under the Company, served on the board of the CMS, built a trading empire out of his firm’s branch office in Freetown and represented the business interests of many colonial officials, including Charles MacCarthy.\(^{30}\) After the Company folded, eight of the fourteen directors of the Sierra Leone Company joined the steering committee of the new ‘African Institution.’ The Institution, whose subscribers also included noblemen, merchants and pious bankers, was founded expressly to influence British policy in West Africa.\(^{31}\) The relationships between London activists and colonial officials could be intimate as well as


\(^{30}\) See Scanlan, “The Rewards of Their Exertions.”

professional. When MacCarthy was on leave in London in 1821, he asked Zachary Macaulay to help him find a wife, “to fill the throne at Sierra Leone,” as Macaulay put it.32

After 1807, the African Institution lobbied for the founding of a Vice-Admiralty Court in Sierra Leone to process captured slave ships, and promoted the court to British officers.33 Freetown became the judicial and military capital of slave-ship interdiction in the British empire. Prize money provided ready cash and cheap goods to merchants and military officers.34 While prize money boomed, former slaves appeared only intermittently in colonial records. Tellingly, when Governor Edward Columbine, a Royal Navy officer, ordered a colonial census in 1811, the census-takers counted the 1,917 people in Freetown, but not the nearly 1,000 people who had already been emancipated under the 1807 Act but who had been sent to live outside the capital.35

After the 1815 Treaty of Paris formally ended the Napoleonic wars, Royal Navy cruisers continued to capture slave ships, but under a more closely-regulated prize system. Regular sittings of the Vice-Admiralty Court were suspended; the Court, which had operated unilaterally, and with few regulations, was replaced by bilateral Courts of Mixed Commissions. In the Mixed Commissions, British judges shared the bench with representatives of other European governments, and prize money was divided out between British officers and foreign judges.36

Sierra Leone, as prize money became scarcer, more than 2,500 people arrived in Freetown from slave ships. “Unless some more enlarged plans are adopted,” wrote Charles MacCarthy, “the increase we daily receive of these individuals will rather retard than promote our advance toward Civilization.” The growing number of cheap workers put pressure on the children of the first generation of settlers. Many left the colony to work as sailors on merchant vessels. MacCarthy faced a complicated economic problem: less prize money and fewer associated goods and services, a shortage of skilled labor and a surplus of unskilled labor. The village system was MacCarthy’s ‘enlarged plan’ to manage this economic crisis.

MacCarthy, a career soldier, was not a pious man. He had little interest in Anglican theology or orthodoxy; instead, he valued the rituals of social inclusion associated with the Church of England – the church-going, the festivals, the parish-level collection of vital statistics. From these premises, MacCarthy reasoned that missionaries could do double duty as administrators. He reached out to the Church Missionary Society in 1815 and 1816. In 1816, a
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46 On the price of labor in Freetown, see *Royal Gazette and Sierra Leone Advertiser* [Freetown], April 4, 1818; on settlers leaving the colony, see Paul Cuffe to Nathan Lord, April 9, 1815, Wiggins, *Paul Cuffe’s Logs*, 342.
47 On MacCarthy’s career, see S. T. McCarthy, “The Clann Carthaigh,” *Kerry Archaeological Magazine* 2, no. 12 (March 1, 1914): 181–202. See also Letters and Documents Connected with Sir Charles McCarthy and the McCarthy Family, 1695-1824, National Army Museum, London (NAM), NAM 6612/10/3; Edward O’Shill to Colonel Robert Brownrigg, 22 September, 1798, NAM 6612/10/8/1; John Haig to Army Medical Department, 12 January 1799, NAM 6612/10/8/5.
CMS representative, Edward Bickersteth, traveled to West Africa to take stock of the Society’s operations. Bickersteth was soon convinced to move the missionary headquarters to Sierra Leone. “In the absence of supernatural inspiration,” he wrote, “such circumstances may be considered as the call, ‘Come over and help us.’” MacCarthy proposed to “divide the Peninsula in Parishes, settling a Clergyman in each.” The most promising young men would be taken on by the colonial government as apprentices in skilled trades. The rest would be distributed out to the villages. MacCarthy promised to double the salary of any missionary recruited by the Society, from £125 to £250 a year, wagering part of the colonial budget against the hope that better organization would make up the difference. In celebration of the deal, MacCarthy gave an informal settlement in the colony, a village called Hog Brook, a patriotic new name: Regent’s Town.

********

During the wars, the Vice-Admiralty Court was an economic dynamo, and the ‘civilization’ of former slaves was a lower priority for colonial officials than maintaining the momentum of wartime commerce. However, the legal designation ‘captured Negro,’ which the Vice-Admiralty Court applied to former slaves, proved useful to the Liberated African Department in peacetime. ‘Captured Negroes’ were ‘captured’ in the same sense as the ships they had been imprisoned
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43 MacCarthy to Bathurst, May 31, 1816, CO 267/42.

44 Ibid.
aboard were ‘captured’: chattels seized as contraband by Britain. The Crown symbolically refused to take ‘possession’ of its ‘property,’ but still claimed the right to indenture, to enlist or to resettle former slaves. By the early 1820s, MacCarthy’s administration used the term ‘Liberated African’ in preference to ‘captured Negro,’ but the legal disabilities associated with the category did not change. MacCarthy had simply renamed the kind of authority that flowed directly from imperial laws against the slave trade.

Bureaucratic instruments express the ideologies of the institutions that make and use them. The Liberated African Department’s most famous record, the Register of Liberated Africans, is a collection of names, physical descriptions, and occasional notes about the ‘nation’ of more than ten thousand people released from the Middle Passage and resettled in the colony. Although some historians read the Registers against the grain to understand the African diaspora in Sierra Leone, the Registers were used by the LAD as tool for surveillance.
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45 The concept of ‘contraband’ goods has an unsettling history in the legal archives of slave societies; ‘contraband’ slaves could, in a sense, ‘steal themselves.’ For a rich discussions of this idea and its repercussions, see, for example Kate Masur, “‘A Rare Phenomenon of Philological Vegetation’: The Word ‘Contraband’ and the Meanings of Emancipation in the United States,” *The Journal of American History* 93, no. 4 (March 1, 2007): 1050–1084.

46 As late as 1822, in a dispatch to Earl Bathurst, MacCarthy asked for “articles for the service of sick Liberated Africans” and for “clothing for the service of the Captured Negroes.” Charles MacCarthy to Earl Bathurst, January 12, 1822, Governor Despatches 1818-1822, Sierra Leone Public Archives, Fourah Bay College, University of Sierra Leone, Freetown (SLPA).


also produced a second ledger, the ‘Statement of Disposals,’ of which the volume for 1821-1833 survives in the Sierra Leone Public Archives in Freetown. The Statement is a record of the total number of individuals in each slave ship broken down by where they were sent to clear forests, row boats, repair buildings, cut roads, or bear children.\(^{49}\) Although the LAD’s registers survive, other internal records are very rare; secrecy was a feature of the system: Charles MacCarthy preferred to give instructions to the Chief Superintendent in person, not in writing.\(^{50}\) In turn, the Chief Superintendent informally instructed the missionary superintendents, riding circuit to the villages, “to observe that the system is acted up to.”\(^{51}\) Consequently, the Liberated African Department was flexible, and adaptable. Its records were spreadsheets for making and measuring ‘civilization.’

‘Civilization’ was a vague and promiscuous concept; the LAD used the labor of the Liberated Africans, and the infrastructure of the village system to advance a number of colonial projects. First, the villages announced a regime of surveillance. Until the 1880s, ‘Sierra Leone’ was confined to Freetown and its immediate backcountry, a rugged peninsula of roughly three hundred square miles. And yet, even within this relatively restricted territory, some Liberated Africans slipped out of the LAD’s control. Most spoke little or no English, and few have left any trace in the archive other than notes that they had absconded from their villages. Their motivations are not preserved in the archives, but they had many reasons to slip away: hope that they might find lost families, anger at the authority of missionary superintendents, fear of an alien situation or of re-enslavement. Many ‘runaways’ did not go far, and settled in unofficial villages in the colony, or in Mende, Temne and Bullom villages near the colonial border. Some

\(^{49}\) Liberated African Department, Statement of Disposals 1821-1833, SLPA.
\(^{50}\) Evidence of Joseph Refell [Former Chief Superintendent, Liberated African Department], Appendix 10B, CO 267/92. See also Evidence of Mr. Cole [Chief Superintendent, Liberated African Department], Appendices 9B & 10B, CO 267/92.
\(^{51}\) Evidence of Mr. Cole, Appendices 9B & 10B, CO 267/92.
made their homes in a village called Bambara Town, a half-mile east of Freetown, “an African hamlet in the centre of a British colony.”52 The discharged black soldiers from the 4th West India Regiment lived in another informal settlement, Soldier Town, unofficially called ‘the Camp,’ and known as a market for stolen goods.53 The village system did not stop this process, but it did declare the colonial government’s claims over the movement of people within the colony.

The villages also helped to solidify colonial borders. The Department established villages in locations that would compel villagers to clear land of rocks and bush in order to build homes and gardens. From 1816 to 1819, most of the villages were built in the mountains, so that the Liberated Africans would, as the long-serving Chief Superintendent Joseph Reffell put it, “clear the Forest in the rear.”54 The next villages, settled after 1819, were built in the swampy coastal lowlands, when the mountain farms proved relatively unproductive.55 By claiming land internal to the borders of the colony, the villages cemented the claim of Britain over the whole Freetown Peninsula, and excluded local Mende, Temne and Bullom chiefs and headmen. To consolidate the colony’s external borders, MacCarthy purchased a tract of land in 1819 from the Temne chiefs on the banks of a river (probably the Ribi), south of Freetown. With the new land claimed under the treaty added to the land claimed by the villages, MacCarthy boasted that Sierra Leone had grown into its ‘natural’ geographic borders: rivers to the north and south, mountains to the east, and the Atlantic to the west.56

But the village system was most important as a mechanism for economic stimulus, as a conduit for money and goods. Its opaque financial records were probably the result of a deliberate effort. Financial records circulated primarily in the colony itself, concealed from

52 Fitzgerald to Pratt, May 3, 1821, Mission Book, 22nd Year, CMS C/A/1/M1/44.
53 Ibid.
54 Evidence of Joseph Reffell, 10B, CO 267/92. See also West-African Sketches, 174.
55 Evidence of Mr. Cole, Appendices 9B & 10B, CO 267/92.
56 MacCarthy to Henry Goulburn, April 22, 1819, CO 267/49.
auditors in London. Visitors reported that the Department’s Cash Account contained all of the expenses and revenues of the LAD, and that invoices were paid with bills drawn on the Treasury by the Governor himself, in his role as public accountant.57 These records do not survive in London or Freetown in either colonial or missionary records, although some data were copied down and published in 1827.58 When MacCarthy died in 1824, the Acting Governor who replaced him complained that he could not consult several key financial records, because MacCarthy carried all the copies with him.59

Still, there is enough evidence to show that the villages made it possible to pay for expenses that might not otherwise have been countenanced by the British Treasury. One of MacCarthy’s successors complained about the salaries of two French Catholic nuns employed as nurses. “Why the whole of this sum was paid by the Liberated African Department,” he wrote, “I can form no idea.”60 On at least fifty-five different occasions between 1817 and 1820, MacCarthy drew bills on the Treasury, without an itemized advice slip, ‘on account of the expenses of Captured Negroes,’ for amounts ranging from £100 to £1,000. The Treasury was reluctant to pay, and wrote to the War and Colonial Office for authorization. Each time, MacCarthy’s expenses were approved, perhaps because the Governor was likely to have spent the money long before the bill made it to London. The extant bills charged in this way amount to £32,379, 16s 14d. Adjusted for inflation, that is roughly £2,560,000 in 2015 currency— not an astronomical sum, but significant, especially as it was granted with virtually no oversight.61

58 Evidence of Mr. Cole, Appendices 9B & 10B, CO 267/92.
59 D.M. Hamilton to William Sutherland, April 28, 1824, Local Letters: D.M. Hamilton’s Letter Book, April 1824 to February 1825, SLPA. See also Fyfe, History of Sierra Leone, 155.
60 D.M. Hamilton to Captain Findlay, Commandant, Bathurst, Saint Mary, River Gambia, June 28, 1824, Local Letters: D.M. Hamilton’s Letter Book, April 1824 to February 1825, SLPA.
61 These seventy-one inquiries are spread across three boxes of files in the National Archives, Kew. They include memoranda sent from the Office of the Treasury to the Office of the Secretary of State for War and the Colonies on January 15, February 16, April 1, April 8, April 21, May 8, May 22, June 8, June 11, July 23, July 27, August 1 and
In Britain, the early 1820s were marked by skepticism toward the acquisition of new colonies, and by austerity in colonial budgets. But ‘civilization’ proved valuable. The missionary press swelled with reports from Sierra Leone, and MacCarthy attached LAD ledgers to his dispatches, with the names of villagers freed from slavery by the British and living under British protection. In response, even as grants for the basic expenses of colonial administration fell, the Liberated African Department received independent grants from Parliament: £29,000 in 1815, £41,000 in 1816, and £39,000 in 1823. At the same time, MacCarthy seems to have poured more and more money into the villages, as the expenses of the Department rose from £10,849 in 1815 to £59,629 in 1822.\textsuperscript{62}

From these numbers (bearing in mind that the data are probably inaccurate and certainly incomplete), it seems the Department ran a significant deficit. That probably did not trouble MacCarthy: He was not a merchant, and the Department did not need to turn a profit to benefit the colony. The villages could run a deficit because they were a mechanism for economic stimulus, a way to send money generated by concern for ‘civilization’ toward sectors of economic life threatened by the erosion of the prize-money economy, particularly local trade and skilled work. For example, from 1818 to 1825, more than £132,327 of the money granted to the Liberated African Department was spent on building and repairing colonial buildings.\textsuperscript{63} Since villagers were expected to maintain their huts at their own expense, with limited material support from the government, and considering that there were relatively few Europeans and African-American settlers in the colony compared to the population of Liberated Africans, those funds must have been a boon to skilled laborers in the colony, a steady source of contracts for

\textsuperscript{62} Peterson, \textit{Province of Freedom}, 83.

carpenters, masons, and the like. Similarly, although villagers were expected to farm, there was never enough rice, the colony’s basic staple, to satisfy demand.\textsuperscript{64} Demand for rice and palm oil was met by offering tenders paid by the LAD. The amount of rice imported to Sierra Leone rose from 422 tons in 1818 to 1,091 tons in 1823, and the amount of palm oil imported from 13,788 gallons in 1820 to 31,546 gallons in 1823.\textsuperscript{65} Colonial merchants suffered in 1815 as their customer base declined, and as the customers who remained had less money to spend. The village system offered merchants a new market to supply.

The Liberated African Department also allowed for the distribution of labor in the colony. In one sense, it did this by allowing merchants easy access to Liberated Africans as apprentices, by training some in skilled trades, and by sending others to be farmers in rural areas. The villages also supplied unskilled labor for colonial projects. While in ‘the King’s service,’ former captives lived in temporary huts built out of mud, or in makeshift sheds at the Colonial Forge Yard and Forge House.\textsuperscript{66} The LAD loaned out groups of workers to various colonial departments as needed. When loaned to the Ordnance Department, Liberated Africans were not paid wages.\textsuperscript{67} In 1825, the Public Works Department employed 440 workers for wages, and 300 more without wages. Apparently the unpaid workers were “employed in carrying Bricks and lime, being a lighter work and one more easily apportioned to the strength of the individual.”\textsuperscript{68}

For Charles MacCarthy, the village system was a powerful instrument. The system claimed territory, shored up trade, and managed labor. Its tidy registers also proved to be useful magnets for Parliamentary funding. The system compelled Liberated Africans to work and live according to the economic logic of ‘civilization,’ and its records neatly recorded the colony’s

\textsuperscript{64} Ibid., 75–76. See also Evidence of Mr. Cole, Appendices 9B & 10B, CO 267/92.
\textsuperscript{65} Table of Rice Contracts and Tender, Appendix 15A, CO 267/91.
\textsuperscript{66} Evidence of Mr. Cole, Appendices 9B & 10B, CO 267/91.
\textsuperscript{67} Evidence of Mr. Myrton, [Clerk of Works, Ordnance Department], Appendix 16B, CO 267/92.
\textsuperscript{68} Evidence of Mr. Myrton, Appendix 16B, CO 267/92.
progress toward that ‘civilization’ in spreadsheets and ledgers. The reorientation of the political economy of Sierra Leone around controlling the lives of Liberated Africans announced the expanded colonial ambitions of British anti-slavery. But in the villages themselves, the straight lines and clear figures recorded in the offices of the Liberated African Department did not always add up.

*********

Charles MacCarthy was proud of the villages. He visited some as often as three times a week, often bringing guests with him.\(^69\) The colonial newspaper reported on an occasion when the Governor and his guests observed the former slaves at work and prayer, and concluded their visit with an “elegant dinner in humble Style.”\(^70\) And yet, the everyday life of the villages was obscure, even to the Governor. As one missionary wrote, “there is not an European in the Colony who knows a fourth part of what is going on here, excepting those who reside on the spot.”\(^71\) From Freetown, in the ledgers of the Liberated African Department, ‘civilization’ was transparent and visible. In Regent, which was, by the reckoning of the LAD, the most ‘civilized’ and successful village, the white missionary superintendent managed the lives of former slaves while sharing power by choice and by necessity with African converts. The village system was built on anti-slavery, and motivated by economic need – but in its everyday life it invested the goods and money delivered by the LAD with ambiguous, transformative power.

Most missionaries in Sierra Leone understood that Charles MacCarthy was more interested in what religion could do for his government than in religion itself. As one colonial


\(^{70}\) *Royal Gazette and Sierra Leone Advertiser* [Freetown], January 1, 1820. See also Evidence of Joseph Reffell, Appendix 10B, CO 267/92.

\(^{71}\) James Norman to Pratt, n.d., Mission Book, 22nd Year, CMS C/A/1/M1/88.
chaplain complained, “He has two faces towards us.”  

W.A.B. Johnson, superintendent of Regent from 1816 until his death in 1823, also experienced the Governor’s indifference. While in Freetown, Johnson preached to an audience including MacCarthy and a clique of military officers. The officers laughed and talked throughout the service. After the service, a humiliated Johnson hiked from Freetown to Regent. “I felt,” he wrote, “as if I had come into another world.” He entered a community of nearly two thousand people, living in wattle houses with grass roofs, built around a stone church (which still stands), where Christian communion defined village life, both for privileged converts, and non-Christian villagers.

In the later nineteenth century, Freetown was a hub of Christian missions led by Krio preachers, and the home of the Church of England’s first African bishop. But in the 1820s, the lives of Liberated Africans were just beyond the edge of the archive: most people freed from the Middle Passage were illiterate, and those who knew English left few records. As such, the vast CMS archives are deceptively rich, full of detailed accounts of village life that were intended, eventually, for British consumers. As the CMS implored W.A.B. Johnson, “Send us particular narratives of what takes place that you think will interest our friends.”

Johnson’s journals – hundreds of pages of archival documents – focus almost exclusively on a minority of villagers.

---

72 William Garnon to Pratt, June 27, 1817, CMS C/A/1/E6/58.
73 Pratt to Bathurst, August 31, 1816, CO 267/44; for another description, see Bacon, Abstract of a Journal, 60–67.
76 Pratt to Johnson, October 8, 1817, CMS C/A/1/E6/73.
the elite ‘communicant’ members of the church. Still, the communicants were, in the view of both the LAD and the CMS, the most ‘civilized’ of the Liberated Africans. Consequently, although the records of the CMS obscure the lives of most former captives, the lives of the communicants who thrived under the colonialism emerging from imperial anti-slavery help further to define what British elite abolitionists and colonial personnel meant when they argued that anti-slavery would ‘civilize’ Africa.

W.A.B. Johnson was a working-class immigrant to London from Hanover, zealous but innocent of theological training.78 When he arrived in Regent in 1816, Johnson found the village registers in chaos.79 Once he brought the registers up to date, Johnson distributed regular rations, delivered by the LAD. Food, together with free instruction in English, the language of trade in Freetown, seems to have convinced Liberated Africans assigned to Regent to stay, and the village grew quickly. Villagers attended church services, but Johnson was distressed. When he finished his sermons, parishioners “would come & ask me for clothing &c. which gave me reason to think that they only came for that purpose.”80 However, in October 1816, a shingle-maker named Joe Thomson became Johnson’s first convert.81 By January 1817, 41 of the villagers had been baptized and invited to become full communicant members of the church.82

Johnson, as village superintendent, received significant material resources from the LAD. Goods were sent from London by the ton to support a worthy cause: slate, lead, bells, clocks, and weathervanes arrived free or at cost, to build churches.83 School supplies like slates, notebooks

78 See Johnson, journal entries from March, 1816 to June, 1819, CMS C/A/1/E7A/66.
79 Johnson, journal entry for June 18, 1816, C/A/1/E7A/66. Johnson found distributing food a “very disagreeable task.” He preferred organizing and teaching the village schools. Johnson, journal entry for June 20, 1816, C/A/1/E7A/66.
81 Ibid.
82 Ibid.
and ink were also delivered in bulk. In one typical order, placed in 1818, Joseph Reffell requested thousands of shirts and pairs of pants, bars of soap and blankets, as well as 26 tons of iron in different shapes and lengths, an industrial lathe, and a screw chuck. In another order, placed in 1822, he requested almost nineteen miles of cloth. Johnson distributed Regent’s share of this bounty.

Turning enslaved people into ‘Liberated Africans’ was a simple bureaucratic procedure, done at the slave trade courts and recorded at the Liberated African Department. Converting Liberated Africans to Christianity, however, was much more complicated. Conversion is confounding for historians, both ephemeral and profoundly material. For converts in Regent, it was a spiritual experience invisible in the archive, but also an invitation to join a privileged political and economic community with dense records. Johnson was an adept preacher, but he also controlled access to colonial resources. Johnson was charged by MacCarthy with keeping “the uncivilized in due order” and rewarding “the industry of the well behaved,” and he took this mandate seriously. After services, when people lined up for clothing or food, Johnson “told them that I would come and see them at their respective farms, and give… according to their

84 “[List of Articles] Required for the Service of Captured Negroes in this colony of Sierra Leone,” January 11, 1822, Governor Despatches 1818-1822, SLPA.
85 “Request for Service of Captured Negroes &c. in the colony of Sierra Leone, Sierra Leone,” May 19, 1818, CO 267/47; “[List of articles] Required for serving of Captured Negroes in the colony of Sierra Leone and for furnishing the Churches and Build Stores and Superintendents’ Houses,” CO 267/47.
86 Reffell received 3,000 yards of cloth for jackets, another 30,000 yards of fabric for trousers and shirts, 2,000 duck flocks, “[List of articles] Required for the Service of Captured Negroes in this colony of Sierra Leone,” January 11, 1822, Governor Despatches 1818-1822, SLPA.
88 MacCarthy to Pratt and Bickersteth, November 20, 1819, CMS C/A/1/E8/74; see also Johnson, journal entry for July 15, 1816, C/A/1/E7A/66; Peterson, *Province of Freedom*, 116–117.
industry.” Children in the missionary school received army surplus clothing; Johnson referred to his favorite schoolboys as “my little Red Jackets.” Conversion offered access to more of the resources of the village system. Soon, the material advantages of conversion were not exclusively Johnson’s to distribute. The communicants established a mutual aid society, and disciplined ‘backsliders’ by revoking their privileges. Although the relentlessly positive tone of missionary journals presents the village as nearly conflict-free, there are hints in the archive of Johnson’s power to coerce by refusing rations, and of rising hostility toward the communicants. As a group of schoolgirls hoping to join the church complained to Johnson, “Them other girls make too much noise, and some of them would do us bad, but they fear you.”

In a village where beating rice was part of the rhythm of everyday life, Johnson explained election in cereal terms. As villagers beat rice stalks, the grains remained and the husks blew away; communicants, Johnson explained, were the grains, chosen for eternal life. Johnson was convinced that “the Christian negroes shew a strong attachment to the simplest views of religion.” However, Johnson’s lack of formal theological training may have given communicants the space to understand Christianity on their own terms. In the accounts of their lives preserved in Johnson’s diaries, communicants remembered the ‘miracle’ of their rescue from the Middle Passage, and their fear of damnation. “I thank God he bring me to this country,” one man proclaimed.”

89 Johnson, journal entry for July 15, 1816, C/A/1/E7A/66.
90 Johnson, journal entry for February 21, 1820, Mission Book, 21st Year. CMS C/A/1/M1/21/9; see also Sir George Collier to Pratt, February 11, 1819, C/A/1/E7/63.
91 In one six-month period, the communicants collected £6, 14s, 1d and spent £6, 11d, 5d. Johnson, journal entry for July 11, 1818, CMS C/A/1/E7/47; see also Johnson, journal entry for May 18, 1822, Mission Book, 23rd Year (1821-1822), CMS C/A/1/M1/14.
92 Johnson, journal entry for August 5, 1820, Mission Book, 21st Year, CMS C/A/1/M1/94.
93 Charlesworth, Africa’s Mountain Valley, 160.
94 Walker, Church of England Mission in Sierra Leone, 104.
95 Ibid., 134–135. For other examples, see Johnson, journal entry for September 12, 1818, C/A/1/E7/47; David Noah and William Davies to Pratt and Bickersteth, received October 30, 1818, CMS C/A/1/E7/38.
to be Christian, and had not been authentically converted. 96 Ironically, Johnson was sometimes annoyed by the communicants’ preoccupation with their sins. He wrote, “They seem to have all the old usual disorders, complaining & mourning over the depravity of their heart.” 97

The communicants impressed MacCarthy. Although he and his fellow officers joked through sermons, they always attended church. MacCarthy found the discipline of church attendance reassuring, a symbol of public acceptance of his government. He was delighted to learn that some communicants in Regent attended worship as many as six times on Sundays. 98 Moreover, when communicants married one another, they wore European clothes, “The brides…dressed in white gowns, black beaver hats, ribbons…the men in blue coats, light waistcoats, frilled shirts, white neck-handkerchiefs, light trousers, white stockings, shoes, and fine hats.” 99 On a visit in 1821, MacCarthy wept when he saw the communicant villagers lined up along the road from Freetown, led by twelve girls in white. 100 To MacCarthy, church attendance and regular work went hand-in-hand, and the Governor was as satisfied with Regent’s work as with its public piety. Schoolboys cleared land for farms that grew more cocoa and cassava than any other village, as well as subsistence crops like yams, plantains and bananas and a few cash crops like coffee. 101 In 1818 and 1819, laborers from Regent built a new road to Freetown. 102 A year later, the villagers cut another road from Regent to York, a fishing village south of Freetown. “The poor people have worked almost beyond their strength,” Johnson wrote, “The rocks are immense.” 103

96 Johnson, journal entry for April 23, 1818, C/A/1/E7/47.
97 Johnson, journal entry for July 13, 1818 C/A/1/E7/47.
98 Johnson, journal entry for July 27, 1820, Mission Book, 21st Year, CMS C/A/1/M1/21/94.
99 Johnson, journal entry for September 3, 1820, Mission Book, 21st Year, CMS C/A/1/M1/21/94.
100 Johnson to Pratt and Bickersteth, December 29, 1821, Mission Book, 23rd Year, C/A/1/M1/2.
102 Charlesworth, Africa’s Mountain Valley, 101.
103 Ibid., 234–235.
The success of the Regent communicants provoked tension between the bureaucratic and religious models of ‘civilization.’ To MacCarthy, the communicants seemed to be well along the path to ‘civilization.’ So why, he wondered, weren’t there more of them? Johnson allowed relatively few people to be baptized, and even fewer to join the full communion. In Regent, in 1823, out of a population of roughly 2,000, there were only 410 communicants. MacCarthy expected Johnson to baptize every Liberated African, and to treat conversion as a patriotic ritual. Johnson claimed the ability to distinguish true from false conversions, and insisted that since only a fraction of humanity had been elected to salvation, only a minority of the villagers could be communicants. The Governor did not have much leverage; he could not relocate too many of the villagers without putting the overall integrity of the system at risk. Moreover, Johnson was successful where many other missionaries in the colony were unimpressive, and a few scandalously brutal – William Randle, superintendent of Kent, beat his servant to death in front of a group of horrified villagers. Still, MacCarthy complained that “a good moral conduct, a Christian appearance, and an assurance of an anxious wish to become Christians” ought to have been enough to merit baptism for Liberated Africans.

As church membership became more desirable, Johnson became nervous that “the Devil is about to sow tares amongst the wheat.” Johnson’s reticence was both practical and theological: if baptism were scarce, village resources would remain concentrated in the hands of the worthy, and salvation would be appropriately uncommon. Consequently, there were high barriers to entry into the communion, policed by Johnson and the communicants (including

---

105 Johnson, journal entry for December 19, 1818, CMS C/A/1/E7A/66.
106 Bickersteth to Johnson, May 25, 1821, CMS C/A/1/L1/167; see also Johnson to Pratt, February 6, 1821, Mission Book, 21st Year, CMS C/A/1/M1/131.
107 MacCarthy to Pratt, June 8, 1819, CMS C/A/1/E7A/72.
108 Johnson, journal entry for September 18, 1818, CMS C/A/1/E7/47.
109 Johnson, journal entry for April 11, 1820, Mission Book, 21st Year, CMS C/A/1/M1/45.
Josiah Yamsey). In 1818, Johnson convened a council of six communicants to evaluate candidates for baptism.\footnote{Johnson, journal entry for February 23, 1818, CMS C/A/1/E7/47.} By 1820, the council included Johnson, two white missionary assistants, and seven communicants. Candidates were invited to “relate the dealings of the Lord.” They were questioned, and “such were allowed who had manifested a change in their conduct, convinced of sin & had a view of the Saviour to save them.”\footnote{Johnson, journal entry for August 5, 1818, CMS C/A/1/E7/47. See also Johnson, journal entry for August 13, 1820, Mission Book, 21\textsuperscript{st} Year, CMS C/A/1/M1/94.} Johnson made a weekly announcement of the names and “places of abode” of candidates for baptism. The communicants would watch them, “and if they should observe any improper conduct… inform me of the same.” This week of surveillance was repeated after three months of candidacy, and again just before baptism.\footnote{Johnson, journal entry for April 21, 1821, Mission Book, 22\textsuperscript{nd} Year, CMS C/A/1/M1/34.}

The inner circle of communicants on the committee had a few traits in common: all were men, all were polyglot, and all were skilled laborers.\footnote{For example, William Tamba was a butcher, William Davis a master shingle-maker, Peter Hughes a master mason, David Noah a clerk – see Johnson, journal entry for April 11, 1820, Mission Book, 21\textsuperscript{st} Year, CMS C/A/1/M1/45.} Other missionaries sometimes believed that their converts aimed to bamboozle them, feigning conversion in order to receive the material benefits of the Christian communion. One wrote, for example, that the “first thing the [African] mother inculcates into her child is deceit.”\footnote{G.S. Bull’s Report on the Seminary Students, June 30, 1820, Mission Book, 21\textsuperscript{st} Year, CMS C/A/1/M1/48.} Johnson, in contrast, delegated so much authority that the European missionaries became jealous and vindictive. When Johnson was on leave in England, David Noah, one of the council, had his modest salary of £80 a year stripped from him. “David Noah,” Johnson fumed on his return, “is more useful than some Schoolmasters and Missionaries who enjoy a Salary of £200 & £250.”\footnote{Johnson to Pratt and Bickersteth, July 12, 1820, Mission Book, 21\textsuperscript{st} Year, C/A/1/M1/63.} Noah, Johnson wrote,

Conducts entirely the day and evening schools… issues rations for about 1,200 people; keeps the provision-lists and returns, and
P.X. Scanlan, ‘Colonial Rebirth of British Anti-Slavery,’ 29

school-lists; measures out all the lots, and sees that the houses and fences are regularly built; receives the stores every Thursday in Freetown; enters marriages, baptisms, &c.; does the duty of a parish clerk; prays with the sick; in short, he is everything at Regent's Town!¹¹⁶

This list shows the kind of bureaucratic work that Charles MacCarthy prized. But it also hints at the counterpoint to MacCarthy’s statistics and to the frictionless just-so stories of the missionary press. Regent prospered partly because of Johnson’s charisma and administrative acumen, but also because he allowed a group of elite Liberated Africans access to administrative power, and concentrated resources in their hands.

In Regent, the communicants were a powerful social group, the privileged adopters of ‘civilized’ economic life who helped the village to flourish and both supported and challenged the authority of its white missionary. The village system – founded on anti-slavery law – was shaped by the complex, coercive and transformative power dynamics of an emerging colonialism. But part of the project of ‘civilization’ in Sierra Leone was a campaign to publicize the achievements of the system to the London-based backers of anti-slavery, and to a substantial Anglo-American audience for missionary literature. ‘Civilization’ in Sierra Leone was messy, but it was represented to the Colonial Office in the matter-of-fact prose of official dispatches, and the rectilinear clarity of spreadsheets. In the missionary press, the familiar fall-and-rise of conversion narratives and the trope of a paternal white missionary among grateful black converts represented the tangled faith and material culture of Regent as a simple, seductive parable of white supremacy.

*******

In the missionary press, the villagers of Regent appeared rapidly to be ascending the ladder of ‘civilization’ through grateful acceptance of Johnson’s tuition. This hallucination was peculiarly

¹¹⁶ Johnson to Pratt and Bickersteth, October 18, 1822, Mission Book, 23rd Year, CMS C/A/1/M2/51.
British, informed by the early fantasies of the elite London abolitionists, who hoped to use the momentum of earlier anti-slavery successes to push on for the conversion and reformation of the whole empire, and by the conventions of missionary writing. But this vision of Regent also seduced the American Colonization Society, who saw in Regent a model of a peculiarly American version of white supremacy, triumphant in Africa.

In part because of the profound differences between the British abolitionist movement and the American Colonization Society, historians rarely place colonial Sierra Leone and Liberia in the same frame.\textsuperscript{117} The colonizationists promoted what Nicholas Guyatt calls “an idea of double emancipation,” in which “blacks would be freed from slavery, [and] then whites would be freed from blacks.”\textsuperscript{118} Many African-American communities, especially in the 1790s, endorsed the idea of a West African colony. In 1795, one congregation in Newport, Rhode Island even sent a delegation to Freetown.\textsuperscript{119} And yet, as early as 1802, Thomas Jefferson had also proposed sending free blacks from Virginia to Africa.\textsuperscript{120} African-Americans resisted the ACS for decades, and proposals for emigration were a constant counterpoint and rebuke to schemes for

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{120} Thomas Jefferson to John Lynd, January 21, 1811, published in American Colonization Society, \textit{First Annual Report}, 14.
\end{itemize}
colonization. However, the movement for white-led colonization commanded far greater resources than the movement for black-led emigration. In Regent, a plan devised by African-Americans was seized upon by white colonizationists and retrofitted with the ideology of colonization, reinforced with American impressions of the success of the village system. The imperial ideology and colonial practices of British anti-slavery were not identical to the ambitions of the ACS, but these distinctions eluded the first generation of colonizationists.

Paul Cuffe, a prosperous African-American Quaker merchant captain, was an early proponent of bringing free black settlers from the United States to Sierra Leone, in order to found a transatlantic partnership between African-American merchants in New England and West Africa. Tellingly, Cuffe had little contact with Liberated Africans when he visited Freetown in 1811. Cuffe founded a ‘Friendly Society’ in Freetown to encourage trade, whose members included a man named John Kizell, from whom Cuffe bought tropical lumber. Kizell had been born in the Sherbro’ and sold into slavery in Charleston. He joined the British ranks in the Revolutionary War, and returned to Africa from Nova Scotia in 1792. In West Africa, Kizell worked as a commercial agent for the Sierra Leone Company from 1802. In 1809, he sold all his property in Freetown in order to satisfy his creditors, and moved to the Sherbro’ as a merchant and unofficial colonial envoy.

---

122 There is a rich literature on Paul Cuffe, see especially Sheldon H. Harris, Paul Cuffe: Black America and the African Return (New York, 1972); Lamont D. Thomas, Rise to Be a People: A Biography of Paul Cuffe (Urbana, IL, 1986).
123 When he needed short-term laborers, he recruited from among migrant Kru living in Freetown, and not from among the ‘captured Negroes.’ See Cuffe’s remarks, March 6, 1811, Paul Cuffe’s Logs, 107.
124 Cuffe’s remarks, December 23, 1811, Ibid., 176.
125 For a history of Kizell’s life see Lowther, The African American Odyssey of John Kizell.
The Friendly Society was disrupted by the War of 1812. In February 1816, Cuffe returned to Sierra Leone, with cargo and just under forty settlers recruited from African-American communities in the mid-Atlantic. The settlers were welcomed, but Cuffe was not allowed to land most of his trade goods. “The expenses of the Voyage,” he wrote, “will fall very heavy on me.”

Cuffe died in 1817, but not before corresponding about his plans with Robert Finley, a preacher from New Jersey, and Samuel Mills, a young missionary from Massachusetts. In 1817, Finley co-founded the ACS, and in 1818, Mills arrived in Sierra Leone as its agent.

In his letters to Mills, Cuffe recommended that the American colony be founded on the Sherbro’, where “a citizen of Sierra Leone,” could assist. In Sierra Leone, Mills met with the Friendly Society, of which Kizell (the ‘citizen’ whom Cuffe had mentioned) was now president. Mills was delighted with Kizell, who, in his view, was “a second Paul Cuffe.” After Cuffe’s death, his correspondents in the ACS seized on the rough outline of his plans – a colony of African-Americans in the Sherbro’, near to and associated with Sierra Leone – and recast a plan for black solidarity in the image of white supremacy. The Society praised Sierra Leone for controlling “the fugitive slaves of the southern states…a useless and pernicious, if not

---


130 Journal entry, March 27, 1818, Gardiner Spring, ed., *Memoirs of the Rev. Samuel J. Mills: Late Missionary to the South Western Section of the United States and Agent of the American Colonization Society Deputed to Explore the Coast of Africa* (New York, 1820), 165–166.

131 Ibid., 182–183.
a dangerous” population. Those ‘fugitive slaves’ were the Freetown settlers, precisely the people with whom Cuffe had proposed to trade.

In 1818, when Samuel Mills and Ebenezer Burgess arrived in Sierra Leone, Mills was awestruck by “a spectacle of grateful admiration” in Regent. The colonizationists projected their own understanding of slavery and colonization in the United States onto the village. They did not grasp that Sierra Leone was, for Britain, an imperial foothold in West Africa. While it was unquestionably founded on a principle of white supremacy – on British claims to control Africans ‘for their own good’ – it was not a scheme for liquidating free people of African descent from the empire, but rather a way of making former slaves an imperial asset. MacCarthy was privately furious at the idea of an American colony so close to Freetown. To the Governor’s horror, the ACS sent the Elizabeth, with settlers aboard, in 1820. Campelar, Kizell’s village on Sherbro’ Island, was designated as the staging area for an American colony on the mainland. However, a deal Kizell had promised to make with local chiefs collapsed, stranding the settlers. Nearly two dozen died of fever, along with two ACS agents.

Two more agents, Ephraim Bacon and Joseph Andrus, arrived to evacuate Campelar. On their way to Sherbro’, they too visited Regent. Andrus told Johnson “he never had seen a Church in America filled with more attentive hearers.” Johnson, who knew that William Tamba and William Davis hoped to preach outside the colony, suggested that they accompany the

---

134 MacCarthy to Bathurst, May 9, 1818, CO 267/47. See also Royal Gazette and Sierra Leone Advertiser [Freetown], April 25, 1818; MacCarthy to Bathurst, January 2, 1818, CO 267/47; Mouser, American Colony on the Rio Pongo, 83.
135 Bacon, Abstract of a Journal, 37.
Americans as interpreters and negotiators. On April 22, 1822, at the edge of a makeshift cemetery dug too close to the waterline, Atlantic worlds, people and ideologies collided, as Bacon and Andrus, two white Americans, argued with Kizell, the former slave who had lived in the Carolinas. Tamba and Davis, two men rescued from the Middle Passage who had risen to positions of power in Regent, looked on. After the evacuation, Andrus and Bacon began to search for a new site for the colony. Davis, and several other leading communicants were from the Grand Bassa region of present-day Liberia, and Johnson advised the American agents to choose the region (about sixty miles along the coast from Cape Mesurado, where the Americans eventually settled) as a site for their next attempt at forming a colony. Davis and Tamba even negotiated with a local king in Grand Bassa on behalf of the ACS. The bargain struck between the ACS and the king included a provision for the education of the king’s son, at the missionary school in Regent (where the prince died about a year later).

In 1821, after the negotiations in Grand Bassa, Eli Ayers arrived to take the surviving colonists, who had been living near Freetown, to the new colony. He took the now-routine tour of Regent and was also enthralled with the sight of young men, “proceeding Indian file, with their Bibles under their arms.” And yet, when Johnson offered Davis’s services a second time, the Americans set sail without him. Perhaps the colonizationists were unsettled by an African translator with his missionary agenda. Ayers abandoned also the ACS’ plans in Grand Bassa, and

137 Johnson to the Secretaries, March 20, 1821, CMS C/A/1/M1/22nd Year/3
139 Johnson to Pratt and Bickersteth, March 20, 1821, Mission Book, 22nd Year, CMS C/A/1M1/3.
141 Entry for April 10, 1821, Ibid., 27. See also Johnson, journal entry for April 28, 1821, Mission Book, 22nd Year, C/A/1/M1/34. On the Bassa prince’s death, see Johnson, journal entry for March 15, 1822, Mission Book, 23rd Year, C/A/1/M1/14.
made a deal for land at Cape Mesurado instead. When the Bassa prince died, the Americans did not visit the king or pay respects, and Johnson mourned the low morale of his communicants, particularly Davis and Noah.\textsuperscript{143} The missionary resolved to cut ties with the colonizationists. “They are so whimsical,” he wrote, “I think it most prudent to keep at a distance.”\textsuperscript{144} The ACS’ flirtation with the village system and with Sierra Leone was abortive, but it is illuminating. It shows the differences between early American colonizationism and the new British colonialism built on anti-slavery in Sierra Leone. Both ideologies presumed white supremacy. But where the ACS imagined their colony as a way to transform the United States and remove the ‘problem’ of black freedom to Africa, a different version of Anglo-American ‘freedom,’ shaped by the expectations of colonialism and justified by the self-righteousness of British anti-slavery, was building in Sierra Leone.

**********

In 1823, Johnson died of yellow fever. In 1824, MacCarthy died in the Anglo-Asante War. Without MacCarthy’s energy and advocacy, the Liberated African Department’s budget fell from more than £41,133 in 1823 to £18,201 in 1825.\textsuperscript{145} Regent remained – and so did the communicants, the fathers and mothers of the Krio, as the descendants of Liberated Africans came to be known. However, without a charismatic white missionary to cast in the starring role, the villages all but disappeared from the missionary press. Even in the 1850s, writers returned to Johnson’s diaries for material, and to Regent, the “lovely dwelling-place of freedom.”\textsuperscript{146} But what was that freedom?

\textsuperscript{143} Johnson, journal entry for March 1822, CMS C/A/1/M1/23/14.
\textsuperscript{144} Johnson to the Secretaries December 29, 1821, CMS C/A/1/M1/23\textsuperscript{rd} Year/2
\textsuperscript{146} Charlesworth,\textit{ Africa’s Mountain Valley}, 12.
In the village system, ‘freedom’ was acquiescence to ‘civilization.’ Before a Liberated African could be ‘free,’ he or she would be recorded as a datum of labor and demography by the Liberated African Department, and then set to work, and ideally to prayer, by a CMS missionary superintendent in a Liberated African village. In the 1810s and early 1820s, the voices and everyday lives of individual Liberated Africans – the stuff that might actually have constituted their freedom – are obscured or distorted by the record-keeping of the institutions that archived them. Anti-slavery became colonialism in Sierra Leone. A cohort of people whose previous cultural lives were presumed to have been functionally (if not literally) erased by the experience of enslavement in Africa were recruited as workers and settlers, and expected to adopt a new set of norms of conduct based on British folkways. The most ‘civilized’ were those who seemed most to have accepted those new norms. At the same time, a familiar problem of labor in a post-emancipation society was complicated by the nascent imperial ambitions of Britain in West Africa.

The meaning of the villages shifted according to the view of the observer. To MacCarthy and the LAD, they were a tool for governance; to the CMS, a source of missionary anecdotes; to Johnson and the communicants, a spiritual home and a material culture; to the ACS, a fantasy of black subordination. In Britain, anti-slavery activists sometimes called the end of colonial slavery ‘the Great Experiment.’\(^1\)\(^4\)\(^7\) Emancipation, in this view, was a test of the economic superiority of wage labor, and of the ability of emancipated people to live up to British expectations for their ‘civilization,’ labor and gratitude to Britain. The ‘experiment’ found an early laboratory in Sierra Leone, when former slaves were put at the ‘disposal’ of the colonial Governor under the terms of the abolition of the slave trade. The village system was made in

---

\(^1\)\(^4\)\(^7\) For discussions of the consequences of this characterization, see Drescher, *Mighty Experiment*; Catherine Hall, “‘From Greenland’s Icy Mountains … to Afric’s Golden Sand’: Ethnicity, Race and Nation in Mid-Nineteenth-Century England,” *Gender & History* 5, no. 2 (June 1, 1993): 212–230; Hall, *Civilising Subjects*. 

---
response to an economic crisis, but was not only a colonial bricolage. It turned out, in practice, that British abolitionist ideology was not tarnished or distorted when applied to the quotidian business of colonial government – it was made for it.