

PROJECT REPORTS

9.

THE ASHANTI RESEARCH PROJECT

List of Stool Histories (continued from Research Review Vol.1. No.2.)

IAS	81	Nsenie Stool History
IAS	82	Ofoase Stool History
IAS	83	Sami Stool History
IAS	84	Ayebiakyere Stool History
IAS	85	Fumesua Stool History
IAS	86	Ofiri and Manso Stool History
IAS	87	Sewuah Stool History
IAS	88	Adwaase Stool History
IAS	89	Adanse Paramount Stool History
IAS	90	Obuokrom Stool History
IAS	91	Baamu Stool History
IAS	92	Danpomu Stool History
IAS	93	Nkaniasehene Stool History
IAS	94	Essienimpong Stool History
IAS	95	Adonten Stool History
IAS	96	Abenase Stool History
IAS	97	Hiawu Stool History
IAS	98	Amoaman Stool History
IAS	99	Anwomase Stool History
IAS	100	Kronko Stool History
IAS	101	Gyenyaaase Stool History
IAS	102	Nkawie-Kuma Stool History
IAS	103	Nfensi Stool History
IAS	104	Mmagyegyefuo Stool History
IAS	105	Besiase Stool History
IAS	106	Akyempim Stool History
IAS	107	Nyinahin Stool History
IAS	108	Nkarawa Stool History

List of Stool Histories continued:-

IAS	109	Suma Stool History
IAS	110	Kenyase Stool History
IAS	111	Adwumakaasi Stool History
IAS	112	History of the Kumasi Zongo Community
IAS	113	Kyeneyekyenfuoo Stool History
IAS	114	Stool History of the Asantehene's Prempeh Drum
IAS	115	Sekyedomase Stool History
IAS	116	Kumasi Wangara Stool History
IAS	117	Duase Stool History
IAS	118	Kotei Stool History
IAS	119	Pekyi No.1 Stool History
IAS	120	Pekyi No.2 Stool History

SUMMARIES OF ASANTEHENE'S COURT RECORDS

Continued from Review Vol. 1. No.2.

<u>Serial No.</u>	<u>Year of Case</u>	
IAS 21	1944	Judgment for the defendant in a case in which both plaintiff and defendant alleged that their origin and status had been degraded by the imputation of slave connections.*
IAS 22	1944	A case of withheld allegiance and right to a stool: the Secretary of State for Native Affairs rules that allegiance depends on residence and that strangers ought to pay tribute to the chief of their new domicile.
IAS 23	1944	A share in the payment of the debts of a stool validates both social and political status: a denial of a right to a person so entitled implies a doubt as to his origins and is subject to damages. The plaintiff is awarded damages against the defendant in this case.

* Summaries of the Records in this and subsequent issues will illustrate the principles of Ashanti Law where they appear in the proceedings and decisions -

Summaries of Asantehene's Court Records continued.

<u>Serial No.</u>	<u>Year of Case</u>	
IAS 24	1945	Segments of a lineage may sever their kinship bonds "twa kahyire mu"; such a severance may be expressed by non-participation in funeral celebrations involving one party and even a public feast during such celebrations. The plaintiff in this Great Oath case successfully claims the right to bury her own brother as against the defendant, the head of her matrilineage, on the ground that her predecessors and his had "atwa kahyire mu" at the <u>Asantehene's</u> court.
IAS 25	1948	The elders of Peki No.1 secure the destoolment of their chief on the grounds that he had been convicted as a criminal, and that in the course of his day as a prison convict, he had defiled his person and stool in that his sandals had been removed, he had also removed and carried faeces and urine pans from the cell, and that he had subsequently failed to slaughter sheep to cleanse his person and stool. These activities were held to be 'repugnant' to custom.
IAS 26	1936	Arbitrators in an enquiry decide that neither by Ashanti nor Muslim law can a person claim rights to the property of a deceased son of a father's brother.

Summaries of Asantehene's Court Records continued.

<u>Serial No.</u>	<u>Year of Case</u>	
IAS 27	1935	Defendants plead, and are found, guilty for "putting" the Agogohene "into fetish" i.e. cursing him. The <u>Agogohemaa</u> or queenmother of Agogo, one of the defendants, is destooled on that ground.
IAS 28	1935	The plaintiff discovers in court that her supposed co-wife, and not herself, is the real wife: the court, for this reason, rejects her claims from the co-wife and defendant, on the ground that the latter had deprived her of her 'matrimonial rights'.
IAS 29	1937	The court decides after hearings on destoolment charges that the Odikro of Fawohoyeden cannot be destooled because only three of the charges were proven; these were: failure to take proper care of a national shrine under his charge; failure to increase stool farms; making improper use of money intended for sacrifices to the land and 'fetish'. The court decides that they can not, in any case, destool the chief because the leader of the opposition is himself a 'Royal of the Stool' and should not have led the destoolment move: 'Only the Elders of a town or a village, are in accordance with Native Law and Custom, entitled to depose elect or instal a Chief or Odikro'.

Summaries of Asantehene's Court Records continued.

<u>Serial No.</u>	<u>Year of Case</u>	
IAS 30	1936	Defendant is convicted and jailed for 'cheating' and stealing'. The case is interesting for the relentless efforts of the defendant to get the case transferred from the Asantehene's court and his subsequent appeals through the higher courts.
IAS 31	1946	'A royal is one whose ancestor had established or founded a village' and the clearest proof of such an establishment is the existence of a stool 'blackened' in memory of the founder. The plaintiff in this case successfully claims the Sekyedumasi stool by clearly establishing his genealogical relationship in the maternal line with the first chief of Sekyedumasi whose stool was 'blackened'.
IAS 32	1946-47	Upon the request of his Elders, the Chief of Ofoase is destooled by the Kumasi Divisional Council for 'unlawfully' insulting his elders, for 'cruelty' towards his subjects, for a neglect of his political duty in failing to report a Great Oath Case to the Asantehene, - in sum, for his lack of 'political sagacity'.

PROJECT REPORTS

15.

Summaries of Asantehene's Court Records continued.

<u>Serial No.</u>	<u>Year of Case</u>	
IAS 33	1946	A stool created by an Asantehene would 'naturally' have an <u>Obaapanyin</u> or a queenmother's stool attached to it; arguing from this principle of Ashanti law, the Ashanti Confederacy Council sustains the claim of the Anamakohene that his stool had had an Obaapanyin since its creation by Nana Osei Bonsu Panyin (c. 1800-1824).
IAS 34	1937	The Gonjas in Kumasi petition the Asantehene to recognize for them a headman who would sit on the restored Ashanti Confederacy Council.
IAS 35	1937	The Kumasi State Council quash a move to depose the Agogohene, holding that 'it is not constitutional or customary to depose an occupant of a stool because some of the (attached) black stools are missing'.
IAS 36	1948	The Kumasi Divisional Council sustains a complaint by the Chief of Odumase No.2 (superior) against the <u>Odikro</u> (chief) of Sunyani (subordinate) that the latter erred in threatening the former with violence if he dared visit Sunyani: the Council states that it is against both 'native custom and British justice' to attempt to stop such a visit.
IAS 37	1952	The State Council exonerates the Bantamahene from a charge of 'liar'.

Summaries of Asantehene's Court Records continued.

<u>Serial No.</u>	<u>Year of Case</u>	
IAS 38	1952	The Barihene obtains an assurance from the Odikro of Akrodie that the latter would account for the tribute, <u>nto</u> , collected from Akrodie lands and pass on the shares of the Barihene and the Asantehene; he would also not 'alienate' lands for farming without the permission of the Barihene.
IAS 39	1954	The right to bury a person, in doubtful cases, establishes kinship with the person and also ownership of a slave or a pawn. In this Great Oath Case, the Kumasi State Council upholds the exclusive right of the plaintiff to bury a deceased person and correlatively his right in <u>persona</u> over her matri-kin and descendants as against the defendant.
IAS 40	1955	A male stool creates the corresponding female stool; an <u>obaapanyin</u> or queenmother cannot summon the <u>male elders</u> of her political unit without the concurrence of her male counterpart. In this case, the complaint of the <u>obaapanyin</u> of the Akwaboa stool against the <u>Akwaboahene</u> is dismissed by the Kumasi State Council which rejects her claim that her stool had been brought independently from Denkyera and also asserts that she had acted 'unconstitutionally' when she attempted to summon <u>Akwaboa</u> elders in a dispute with the <u>Akwaboahene</u> without the latter's knowledge and consent.