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Foreword

It has been a privilege to support City, University of London as it seeks to explore and acknowledge aspects of its history. Prompted by the reporting of a link between Sir John Cass and the slave trade by the UK media, and in the context of the Black Lives Matter movement, this work forms part of City’s response to the need to understand and address the impact of racial inequality across the institution.

This review has been necessarily brief, an opportunity to provide Council and the University with an initial view of the nature and extent of the institution’s links to the slave trade. In observing what others have done in this regard, it is clear that many, particularly US institutions, have spent months and even years examining their own histories, and making overt that which was previously hidden. For City, this is a first look. I think it represents a potential opportunity for more extensive study.

The findings of the review are twofold. First, that apart from its honouring of Sir John Cass, City has no direct, or easily identifiable, association with African slavery. Second, however, that African slavery played a significant part in making possible the land, gifts, support and patronage which underpinned City and its antecedent institutions.

In response, City has already confronted the heritage of the Cass name adopted by the Business School in 2002, and has decided to remove the name from the Business School.

What is now critical is how City makes sense of what has been learned about its history, about those connected with the institution, and how it uses this to inform the future. In the words of Professor Drayton, the importance of the review lies in how we understand and respond to ‘the ways in which slavery created a racialised inequality in wealth and life chances in Britain and elsewhere which cascades through the generations, which is reproduced through forms of structural racism.’ (Drayton p 53).

I have learnt a lot in the process, and with thanks to the Review Group members who have shared the journey and provided insight and perspective on some challenging issues.

I would like to acknowledge the work of Dr Matthew Stallard, who has diligently pursued our founders and funders through sources and archives to discover fortunes made and lost, marriages that brought inherited wealth and grants of lands to loyal servants. His report makes a fascinating and sobering read.

I would like to thank Professor Richard Drayton for his expert guidance on, and oversight of the research, his insight into the context of the findings and reflections on possible acts of repair.

Thanks also to those staff who supported the extraction of data from existing archives, and most of all to Abby Wilson, who alongside a demanding day-job, provided ongoing guidance and support to me as Chair, to the Review Group, to our researchers and advisers.

Hunada Nouss
Chair, Historic Funding Sources Review Group
1. Introduction and context

On 10th June 2020, City announced a review of its historic sources of funding to determine if there were any links with the historic transatlantic slave trade and, if so, to make appropriate and considered recommendations.

The backdrop to the review was the broader Black Lives Matter movement, itself sparked by an act of police violence against George Floyd, a Black man, in Minneapolis, USA. In the UK, the sense of injustice was augmented by the differential impact of Covid-19 on people of colour, and the campaign has manifested itself in protests against racial injustice, including action to remove statues of slave traders across the UK.

On 9th June 2020, it was reported across various media that Sir John Cass was a figure in the Atlantic slave trade, through his involvement in the Royal African Company (1660-1752). Cass Business School, so named in 2002 following a donation from the Sir John Cass Foundation, was recognised by the University as therefore having naming and donation links to the slave trade through the Sir John Cass Foundation.

The University then announced this review, which is part of City’s wider focus on advancing race equality and challenging racism, including the launch of the new EDI strategy, and its commitment to the principles of Advance HE’s Race Equality Charter, through applying for the REC Bronze Award.

2. The Review Group

The membership of the Review Group was brought together from across the University, seeking to bring diversity of experience and thought to the process.

Chair
Ms Hunada Nouss, Independent member of City’s Council

Members
Ms Judy Bisnauth, Course Officer, the Business School
Dr Lise Butler, Lecturer in Modern History
Mr Jason Clarke, Head of Sustainability
Dr Justin Davis Smith, Senior Lecturer, Business School
Mr Andrew Griffiths, Planning & Business Intelligence Officer, Strategic Planning & Performance Unit
Ms Catherine Gowers, Senior Communications Officer - Students
Miss Helen Langley, Directorate Operations Manager, Student and Academic Services
Ms Natasha Much-Vidal, Student Engagement Officer, Student and Academic Services
Professor Stanton Newman, Vice-President (International)
Ms Claire Priestley, Director of IT
Mr Saqlain Riaz, President, City Students’ Union
Dr Sionade Robinson, Associate Dean (People and Culture), the Business School
Mr Sarwan Singh, Senior Lecturer, City Law School
Mr John Stevenson, Senior Communications Officer

Secretary
Ms Abby Wilson, Head of Fundraising

3. Scope

The Historic Funding Sources Review Group was established as a task and finish group. It was asked to do the following:

(i) consider all of City’s historic sources of funding,
(ii) determine if there are any links to the historic transatlantic slave-trade,
(iii) make recommendations to the President and Council.
The intended time-period for this review was around six weeks, expecting to report in late July/early August 2020. The review has in fact taken closer to 15 weeks (from the first meeting on 23rd June 2020), requiring collation of data from across the institution, and six weeks of independent research from predominantly secondary sources.

Despite the longer than anticipated timescale, the review has necessarily been limited in scope. Initial data gathering identified over 600 names (organisations and individuals, historic and modern) that could be considered potentially in scope. The Review Group considered the optimal approach in the light of time constraints, the ease of access to sources in the Covid-19 pandemic, and data protection regulations (limiting activity in connection with living individuals). It concluded that the review should focus on the founding funders and predecessor organisations connected with the establishment of the Northampton Institute in 1894, along with a small number of donors who had been identified as being more likely to have a connection to the trade (those donors who had been in existence pre-1850). Whilst funders of research were examined as part of the initial data gathering exercise, these were ultimately not included in this project.

The Review Group oversaw the appointment of Dr Matthew Stallard, Research Assistant at UCL’s Centre for the Study of the Legacies of British Slave-Ownership, to undertake an examination of the key organisations and individuals. The aim of the research was to explore any links these organisations/individuals had with the slave trade, and the extent of their involvement, in particular active participation in the trade individually or through associated organisations.

The Review Group also appointed Professor Richard Drayton, Rhodes Professor of Imperial History at King’s College London, as External Academic Advisor to the group, providing direction to the research work, and advice on how to understand and respond to the findings.

In addition to the above, the Review Group was specifically asked to provide comment to Council on the proposal to remove the Cass name from the Business School, which was considered as part of the Council meeting on 3rd July 2020.

Whilst not strictly in scope, the Review Group considered a number of related issues, including the naming of buildings, and the framework applied to the acceptance of future donations.

4. Principal research findings

The research findings are detailed in the attached report (Appendix 2) authored by Dr Matthew Stallard.

Its conclusions can be summarised in two statements. ‘First, [that] City, apart from its honouring of Sir John Cass, has no direct, or easily identifiable, association with African slavery. Second, however, that African slavery played a significant part in making possible the land, gifts, support and patronage which underpinned City and its antecedent institutions.’ (Drayton p 52)

As Dr Stallard observes, ‘the links between City’s donors and enslavement are in many senses representative of the complex intertwining of the financial and mercantile sectors and the public and private institutions of the City of London across some three hundred years of its history, and the embeddedness of slave-trading, ownership of plantations and enslaved persons, and the trading of slave-produced goods within this system.’ (Stallard p 21)

5. Principal recommendations

We follow in the footsteps of many institutions who have done similar work. Many have undertaken lengthy and learned study, some such as City have taken a focussed first pass to take stock of their position. All who have pursued this route have sought to openly seek out the facts, and then to reflect on the meaning of this history in the context of the present.

---

1 In recognition of Sir Cecil Rhodes connection with the slave trade, it is understood that Professor Drayton’s ‘Rhodes’ Chair is to be renamed in the near future.
Whilst City’s direct links to the slave trade appear to be limited to the connection to Sir John Cass, and are being addressed, the indirect links that enabled City to flourish as a seat of learning also call out for a response. How City does so, appropriately and sufficiently, will take some careful consideration. In its deliberations on the research findings, the Review Group reflected on a legacy of harm that is keenly felt by many at City today.

In framing its recommendations, the Review Group acknowledges City’s commitment to develop an environment and culture that is diverse and inclusive, and an emerging plan to deliver this. We anticipate these recommendations will form a part of that plan. Furthermore, the Review Group considers the recommendations necessary but not sufficient drivers of change. The transformation City is seeking requires engaged leadership, honest self-reflection and manifest change to language, systems and processes that shape the conduct of business and the curriculum at City. In the challenging times ahead, when resources are tight and priorities manifold, City, and Council as its guardian, needs to sustain a genuine passion and disciplined focus on its commitment to ‘an inclusive environment to study and work free from discrimination … and to challenge any structural and institutional racism’\(^2\). In commissioning this report, the President has made a strong and visible commitment to change. The eyes of staff and students at City, and of others too, are watching.

The true legacy of this work should be seen in some of the closing words of our researcher. ‘The opportunity now arises to make decisions about the future with eyes wider open. To decide what to keep, what to change and how to work towards restitution and to continue to honour the best humanitarian aims of the Northampton Institute’s founders.’ (Stallard p44)

The specific recommendations arising from the work of the Review Group are set out below.

I. Communicate: To share our understanding of our history and promote a conversation.

II. Further research: Recognising the limited time available for research and constraints on access to primary sources due to the Covid-19 pandemic, to consider a further phase of research to support a more complete narrative of City’s ties to slavery. This might be delivered through a more focused piece of research, in the form of a postdoctoral fellowship, History PhD, or other work of scholarship.

III. Change the Business School name: To note the Review Group’s consideration of the proposal to remove the Cass name from the Business School.

IV. Reparation: To demonstrate meaningful institutional commitment to racial equality at City by taking a proactive approach to recognising and understanding the ways in which racial inequality manifests itself at City, and pursuing actions to achieve equality and ‘repair’ for the Black community at City.

Further discussion of these recommendations is provided below.

I. Communicate

We clearly have a story to tell. In some ways it is the story of many institutions that have their roots in the City of London, but it is also our history that we should acknowledge. We need to translate this legacy into the current realities and impacts for black people today and the reparative practices being put in place by City to respond to this.

We believe that this could include:

(i) Council to accept the report and provide a written response.

(ii) City to make the report available publicly, for staff and students, for alumni and stakeholders. Place the report on the City website; amend the ‘Our history’ section of the City website.

(iii) City to host one or more workshops, seminars or webinars exploring its own historic links to slavery, and the wider legacy of slavery in seeding racial attitudes and inequalities in wealth and life chances for black people today. The seminars might be organised in collaboration with the City Centre for Modern History with the institutional and financial support of the University or other stakeholders, and would be open to students, staff, alumni and interested stakeholders.

(iv) City to consider some physical representation, possibly in the form of some public art, to make visible the presence of people of colour on its history.

II. Further research

As outlined earlier, the scope of our work has been necessarily constrained by timelines of this ‘task and finish’ group, and by the limitations of access to sources over the summer months, exacerbated by the impact of Covid-19.

We have only scratched the surface, and to do justice to our findings, we believe a further period of study would provide more depth and academic rigour to this endeavour that would support, at a minimum, the production of a monograph to sit alongside City’s existing published histories, Progressing through change: The recent history of City University London, 1978-2008 by Allan P.O. Williams and The City University, A History by S. John Teague. This could for example involve extending Dr Stallard’s period of research and brief to augment the initial findings, and create a more complete account of City’s heritage in the context of wealth derived from the slave trade.

In line with Professor Drayton’s recommendation (p54), the Review Group is also suggesting that the Executive should consider the opportunity of creating an ongoing position, with the institutional and financial support of the University or other stakeholders, to examine City’s connections to the slave trade, Black British history, Black history, or imperial and postcolonial history, which could take the form of a postdoctoral fellowship, doctoral post, or more established academic post. This would build upon City’s developing strengths in history and history and politics, and contribute to strengthening and enriching City’s intellectual culture, and its efforts to decolonize and diversify its research and curriculum.

III. Change Business School name

The decision to change the Business School name has already been taken. The way in which the institution approaches the name change is regarded as a visible indicator of City’s appetite for the challenge to eliminate barriers across the institution. The perceived delay in dropping the Cass name perpetuated a sense of disappointment, if not mistrust, in City’s commitment to tackling change.

The delay is now understood to be for legal and operational reasons, and the establishment of the Naming Steering to oversee a process of broad-based consultation is welcomed. In this context, it is recommended that City’s Network for Racial Justice be recognised as a key stakeholder of, and be actively engaged with, the consultation. This is both to ensure wider understanding of the process of transition which will take longer than originally communicated, and to enable participation in the thinking around the values the institution wants to reflect in determining the new Business School name.

The Business School recognises that the necessary change goes beyond the name, and has pledged to implement changes in relation to their curriculums and pedagogy to ensure they are truly embodying the value of an equitable, diverse and inclusive institution.

IV. Reparation

At the heart of ‘Reparations’ is the idea of repair, repair of damage caused by past injustice which continues often in the form of present injustice. (Drayton p 53)
As noted previously, City has expressed a commitment to, and embarked upon a process of change. The expectation is one of a holistic approach to assess City’s structures, processes and culture that perpetuate racial inequality and urgent action to create the environment in which all staff and students can thrive. It is important that this work of analysing issues and shaping a response embraces an understanding of damage that has been caused and the need to repair.

In this context, the Review Group affirms Professor Drayton’s recommendations (2) and (3) (p 54). We propose an enquiry into the ways in which City contributes to patterns of racial inequality, in the systems and processes that sustain the conduct of business at City. Furthermore, we agree that City needs to understand how the systems surrounding the creation and imparting of knowledge work to de-value or exclude the contribution of Black communities within City. The statement ‘Decolonising City’ authored by City’s Network for Racial Justice would be a relevant starting point for this work.

The Review Group also supports the ambition of building bridges to those communities most affected by the legacy of slavery (Drayton recommendation (4) p 54). We recognise that City has strong connections with local schools, largely from ethnically diverse populations, to support educational opportunity and pathways to higher education. We should encourage contributions from historic supporters such as the Foundation formerly known as the Sir John Cass Foundation and the Livery companies in a shared endeavour of repair. Within the broader geographic context, whilst City does have a wide network of partner institutions, we would recommend an explicit enhancement of our links with the Caribbean and West Africa to support a mutually supportive engagement.

6. Further recommendations

In the course of exploring the scope of research required to fulfil the brief, the Review Group considered a number of related issues, for example, the extent of funding attached to the naming of buildings. In addition, in reflecting on the due diligence undertaken in accepting the donations from the Sir John Cass Foundation, the group considered whether the current acceptance process would flag any issues of concern. These discussions gave rise to further proposals that, whilst not directly arising out of the research findings, are relevant recommendations for Council’s consideration.

(i) Enhance City’s framework for accepting future donations: To document and seek Council approval of the guidelines and process for approving donations, including enhancements to the current process.

(ii) Enhance City’s process for the naming of buildings: To recommend that Council review the process for the naming of buildings, and other assets, to allow for a broader engagement, and better reflection of a diverse contribution to the University in particular, or academic endeavour in general.

The context of these recommendations is provided below.

(i) Enhance City’s framework for accepting future donations

In the light of the historic findings, and the more recent donations of funds from the, then named, Sir John Cass Foundation, the Review Group afforded extensive reflection on the question of how potential donations are sought and vetted, and what, if anything might need to change.

The current acceptance process is robust, and follows industry best practice. It determines a risk rating for each potential donation based on amount and source, and operates a graduated approval system based on the risk score (devised by the Director of Internal Audit, in consultation with the Development Office). There are no absolute prohibitions, though the risk weighting on sources such as fossil-fuel industries, gambling etc. operate to increase the seniority of scrutiny.
It is important to recognise that donations that enhance the institution’s ability to support its educational endeavour with current students and future students are desirable, and should be encouraged. However, protecting the reputation of the institution is also important.

It is also clear that no donations acceptance process can anticipate future shifts in sensitivity to specific issues or events. City’s current risk rating process attempts to do so by giving weight to recent negative publicity, though this is still looking through the rear-view mirror.

The Review Group considered whether the institution should accept any further donations from the Foundation formerly known as the Sir John Cass Foundation. On balance, the group noted that where the funds were to be used to combat racial inequality or by enhancing opportunities for current and future students, the group would be supportive of accepting a donation. More broadly, the group would want to ensure that, where relevant, donors have recognised and reflected on their problematic history. Were City unable to take this considered approach, it would not be able to accept donations from longstanding supporters of the University from within the civic life of the City of London which, as the research has demonstrated, is inextricably linked to the history of the slave trade.

The Review Group recommends that City should consider the establishment of a committee, drawn from senior academics, professional staff and (a) member(s) of Council that would periodically review whether the lens applied to all future donations remains consistent with the values and culture of the institution. The committee would make recommendations as to any industries and regimes that might be considered high risk, and would consider all donations above a specified financial threshold. The Review Group has become aware of an initiative within City seeking to explore alignment on values and processes which may encompass the above. It is understood that this initiative will establish a sub-committee of the University Executive Board that will have a wide remit to consider not only donations but also research grants, partnerships and any organisation or individual’s names formally associated with the University. It plans to review the due diligence processes the University uses and revise these as appropriate and also to produce a charter based on our values to guide University staff.

It is not clear whether the Donations Acceptance Policy has been reviewed and approved by Council in recent years. It is recommended that this should be done as soon as possible, reflecting the changes outlined above.

(ii) Enhance City’s process for the naming of buildings

It is evident that names used by an institution, for Schools, buildings, even rooms or lectures, reflect the culture and priorities of that institution. Given the Review Group had addressed the naming of the Business School, consideration was extended to the naming of buildings. Whilst there appears to be no connection of current named buildings to the legacy of the slave-trade, the Review Group observed that the current processes for naming were opaque and unknown to most, and in the absence of any change to these processes, were unlikely to result in a naming culture that reflected the changes City is seeking to make.

The Review Group believes there is an opportunity to bring transparency to the process of naming, and through wider engagement bring a different perspective, consistent with the ambition of reflecting the values and academic endeavour of the University. It was suggested that recognised leaders in their field (men and women of ethnically diverse backgrounds) may be more inspiring than the names of former Vice-Chancellors.

It is understood that Council may wish to retain control over naming, in particular of Schools, and in some cases, buildings, particularly in so far as naming can represent a fundraising opportunity for the institution. Nevertheless, the Review Group strongly
encourages transparency and collaboration, as now being demonstrated in respect of the renaming of the Business School.

7. Final Reflection
The final reflection of the Review Group is the deep conviction that the time for action is now.

‘The losers of the regime of post-slavery racialised inequality are not just the immediate victims, but City and all British institutions as they miss the chance to benefit from the developed gifts and energies of those who are socially excluded.’ (Drayton p 54)

End
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## Appendix One: Membership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chair</th>
<th>Reason for participating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hunada Nouss</td>
<td>I am delighted to have had the opportunity to support City as it explores and make transparent parts of its history, and tackle the legacy of racial injustice as it manifests within City today.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ms Judy Bisnauth, Course Officer, the Business School</td>
<td>Judy works in the business school and is a member of City's Network for Racial Justice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr Lise Butler, Lecturer in Modern History</td>
<td>Lise Butler is a historian of modern Britain and joined the group to contribute a historian's perspective and advice on City's essential research into its complicated history and legacy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr Jason Clarke, Head of Sustainability, Property and Facilities</td>
<td>I volunteered to sit on this group to satisfy myself that City grasped the importance of this issue, offer a real-world viewpoint and help shape recommendations which, most importantly, learn from our history.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dr Justin Davis Smith
Senior Lecturer, the Business School

As an historian of charity and an academic at the Business School, I am committed to understanding more about our past, both good and bad, so we can move forward with greater confidence and transparency with our essential agenda on social justice and inclusion.

Mr Andrew Griffiths
Planning and Business Intelligence Officer, Strategic Planning and Performance Unit

I agreed to join this group to gain greater insight into the institution’s process of receiving and managing funds, and to contribute towards how this process considers and impacts City’s stakeholders, particularly those that are at disadvantaged due to racial inequalities.

Ms Catherine Gowers
Senior Communications Officer - Students

I volunteered to be part of the Group as part of my keen interest in all matters which impact EDI. I’m currently the Chair of RECSAT Marketing and Communications Sub-Group and sit on the Student Attainment Project, and welcome this additional opportunity to input into this important conversation and reflection on City’s history and how it can move forward.

Miss Helen Langley
Directorate Operations Manager, Student and Academic Services

I volunteered to participate in the Review Group as a representative for City’s Network for Racial Justice. The historic sources of City’s funding impact the lived experience of People of Colour at City in the present day. I hope the recommendations in this report will contribute to driving change and achieving true equality for all staff and students at City.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Quote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ms Natasha Much-Vidal</td>
<td>As a young black professional service staff member at City, being part of this Review Group has enabled me to draw upon my passion for racial justice to support crucial reflection and change at this institution. I have enjoyed connecting with like-minded colleagues to have meaningful and challenging discussions to create a strong future for this institution rooted in the principles of equality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Stanton Newman</td>
<td>I think we should know and never forget our history.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Claire Priestley</td>
<td>The accuracy and transparency of matters relating to City’s historic funding review is important to our staff and students. I wanted to listen, learn and contribute where possible, to this important work and be able to speak first-hand about the actions taken and recommendations made. Working with colleagues and experts from within and outside City has been an interesting and enlightening experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Saqlain Riaz</td>
<td>I joined the review group to ensure the voice of City Students was kept at the heart of every discussion. Petitions, dialogue and calls to action were organised and executed by our wonderful Student body. I am simply a representative of their work and so all credit goes out to them and their historical actions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Dr. Sionade Robinson  
Associate Dean (People and Culture), the Business School |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As Associate Dean for People and Culture at our Business School, I believed it was vital to join colleagues in scrutinising sources of funding for our University because, quoting the author of <em>How to be an Anti-Racist</em>, Ibram Kendi, “The heartbeat of racism historically has been denial”. As we strive towards even greater inclusion and equality across City, we have to honestly admit our failings in order to understand how we must do better.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Mr. Sarwan Singh  
Senior Lecturer, City Law School |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I agreed to volunteer because I thought it was important at this moment in time to contribute to the diversity in decision-making around the issues highlighted in this report.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Mr. John Stevenson  
Senior Communications Officer |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I felt that I needed to be part of the Committee’s work as a descendant of African slaves and a member of City’s Network for Racial Justice.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Ms. Abby Wilson  
Head of Fundraising |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It has been interesting and enlightening to support the Chair and Group in this important review and I am grateful for the time and energy that members dedicated to the review.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix Two: Report of Dr Matthew Stallard

Research Parameters

Following the decision of City, University of London’s Council to remove the name of Sir John Cass from its Business School as awareness was raised of Cass’s extensive financial and administrative involvement with the Royal African Company, this report was commissioned by the President to investigate the links of donors, founding governors, and prominent figures associated with prizes or buildings to enslavement and unfree labour. In the parameters laid out in Professor Richard Drayton’s framing paper, this includes:

(i) capital derived from the pre-1833 economy based on enslaved African labour.

(ii) capital derived directly, or through reinvestment, of funds paid by the Crown after 1834 in compensation of British slave holders.

(iii) wealth derived from inheritance, or marriage into, wealth noted under (i) and (ii).

(iv) capital and wealth derived from, or enmeshed in, investments in, or trade in, or financing of the trade of, slave-produced cotton, sugar, tobacco and coffee in the United States (until 1865), and Brazil and Cuba (until the 1880s).

(v) wealth derived from trade with, supply, and credit extended to the seceded Confederacy in the United States.

(vi) wealth derived trade with, and finance involving, semi-coerced labour regimes in the nineteenth century including the cultuurstelsel in the Dutch East Indies, ‘Blackbird’ labour in Australia and the Pacific region, Indian and Chinese indentured labour in the West Indies, Mauritius, Fiji and South Africa, and in the twentieth-century from Rhodesia and apartheid-era South Africa.
Summary of Findings

Sir John Cass
Cass’s role in the Royal African Company has been a matter of broad public record in recent months. His involvement has been summarised in the report, with much of the detail kindly provided by Professor Miles Ogborn of Queen Mary, who is conducting a project on behalf of the Sir John Cass Foundation into his estate.

Campus Buildings
No direct commercial or familial linkage to enslavement between any of the other individuals after whom buildings on campus are named has been discovered in the process of research.

The Northampton Family
Although there has been no evidence uncovered of direct slave-ownership on behalf of the family, there are two instances where the Marquesses of Northampton married into families with significant financial interest in enslavement. The first occasion to the daughter and niece of prominent Caribbean slave-owners in 1787, came at a time of near-bankruptcy for the family and resulted in significant direct inheritance for the later Marquess. The second came in 1884, less than a decade before the donation of the land in Clerkenwell, when the 5th Marquess married a scion of the Barings banking (and slave-investing) dynasty.

Banking, Insurance, and Financial Institutions
A number of companies listed as donors to City have documented links to enslavement connected to their predecessor institutions and early shareholders or sources of capital, including Kleinwort Benson, Lloyd’s of London (Insurers), Royal and Sun Alliance, RBS, Rothschild & Sons, Barings, and Lloyds Bank.

Founding Governors
Two early governors, John Winburn Laurie and Emily Kinnaird have recorded familial connections to slave-ownership. A further two, Charles Barry, Jr. and Lewis Boyd Sebastian are recorded to have worked for individuals who were direct beneficiaries of slave-ownership. A number of others have links to various aspects of finance and commerce with deep linkages to the slave economy and wider colonial ventures.

The Skinners’ Company
The Skinners’ Company itself owned shares in the Virginia Company and hosted the East India Company in exchange for rent for a number of years. Of the company’s individual donors, Sir James Lancaster, Sir Thomas Smythe, Mary Weld, Abraham Dawes, Robert Bateman and Nathan Wright were all members of one or more of the Virginia, Somers Isles, and East India Companies. Bateman served as a commissioner for the Caribbee Isles in 1630 and Wright was a prominent tobacco trader. Dame Alice Smythe’s husband had been the customs master of London during the time of Sir James Hawkin’s missions. Roger Montagu’s nephew and heir was a leading Virginia and East India Company member.

The Saddlers’ Company
No links found.

Henry Smith Charity
There is no direct evidence of Smith’s connection to enslavement, but a number of his early trustees did have links to the Virginia Company.

Richard Reeve’s Charity
Reeve is recorded as possessing significant shares in the East India Company, which were liquidised and invested in property by his trustees.
Edwards Foundation
No links found.

Inns of Court School of Law
The Council for Legal Education archive is not currently accessible so the direct funders and governing committee of the school cannot be readily assessed. The legal profession as a whole, as discussed below, was, however, highly embedded in many aspects of the slavery system.

St. Bart’s Hospital
The hospital archives are also inaccessible until January 2021, preventing a deeper assessment of the hospital’s donors and bequests.
Introduction

City, University of London, created by royal charter in 1966, was founded as the Northampton Institute, a technical college established in Clerkenwell in 1894. Through merger and incorporation the University can also count as predecessor institutions the Inns of Court School of Law (previously the Council for Legal Education, founded in 1852) and the St. Bartholomew School of Nursing and Midwifery (founded in 1877).3

The foundation of the Northampton Institute was the product of the late-nineteenth century movement for improved further technical education and the widening of access to London’s working class. Membership was directed at the “poorer classes” between the ages of 16 and 25, with a registration fee of 1 shilling and regular subscriptions kept at a low price, entitling members to access to evening classes, special lectures, clubs and societies, and reduced prices for sports and swimming facilities. While manufacturing and craft skills were at the core of the taught curriculum, the reforming zeal of founding governors and donors is apparent from the wider activities programmed, with general arts, science, language, and literature taught alongside public lectures, exhibitions, and musical performances, instructions for persons intending to emigrate, and access to a library, museum, and reading rooms.4

The initial funding for the institution was £51,100, put together from a variety of public, private, and charitable sources. The London Parochial Charities contributed the lion’s share of £46,100. This body was created following a Royal Commission investigating the administration of the plethora of small parochial charitable funds in the City of London and pooled the estates of all but the five largest trusts into one conglomerate fund. £6,100 of this donation came from the Dame Alice Smythe charitable trust (transferred from the Skinners’ Company). The Skinners’ Company were to provide £1,000 per year as well as a sum of £2,000 for the building of the institute. The Saddlers’ Company provided £3,350 per annum from Robert Kitchin’s Charity, and the Marquess of Northampton donated the land in Clerkenwell upon which the Northampton Institute building was to be erected.5

The founding board of seventeen governors reflected the sources of funding, with four appointed by the Skinners’ Company, one by the Saddlers’, three by the Central Governing Body of the Parochial Charities, one by London County Council, one each by the governors of the Birkbeck Institute and City of London College, and five co-optative members. The co-opted members of the foundation included three members of the watch and clock trade, the major local industry in Clerkenwell and two local female social reformers, Hon. Emily Kinnaird and Miss Maud Wylde. The 4th Marquess of Northampton and his son, Earl Compton (later the 5th Marquess) were also members, as was architect Charles Barry Jr. who ran the public competition to select a designer for the new building.6

As well as these founding donors and governors, there were also a series of later donating institutions to the institute and City University itself, not in the least the £5 million donation of the Sir John Cass Foundation to the Business School in 2002. The list of donating institutions includes numerous prominent banks and insurance companies and the Life Offices Association (an insurance industry body) and subsequent charitable trusts such as those of Richard Reeve and Henry Smith and the Edwards Foundation. The individuals after whom buildings on campus are named have also been considered but no further close links have been discovered. Sadly, due to COVID-related restrictions, it has not been possible to access the records of either the Council for Legal Education or St Bartholomew’s hospital. The City of London and its institutions play an

---

4 Ibid.
6 For the importance of watch-making in Clerkenwell, see “Northampton Square area”. The 5th Marquess of Northampton had a particular interest in the horological trade, being appointed President of the British Watch & Clockmakers’ Guild in 1906, at its inaugural meeting, held at the Northampton Institute. See “History of the Guild” The British Watch & Clockmakers’ Guild [https://www.bwcmg.org/history]
important ceremonial and governing role within the present University and the deeply embedded links between the mayoralty, livery companies, professional institutions, and the financial sector of the City with the slavery business are discussed throughout this report.

The links between City’s donors and enslavement are in many senses highly representative of the complex intertwining of the financial and mercantile sectors and the public and private institutions of the City of London across some three hundred years and the embeddedness of slave-trading, ownership of plantations and enslaved persons, and the trading of slave-produced goods within this system. The mercantile and capital-owning classes invested heavily in the early joint-stock companies of the Elizabethan and Jacobean eras, which opened up global markets to English merchants and products, while going hand-in-hand with early colonising missions and the development of plantation economies, producing valuable staple crops such as tobacco, sugar, coffee, and indigo through the work of enslaved labourers. The febrile economic demand for more produce drove the demand for more labourers and the growth of the Atlantic slave trade, with British slave traders estimated to have been responsible for the forced transportation of 3.1 million people from Africa to the Americas. 400,000 of those people are estimated to have died, been killed, or committed suicide in the appalling conditions of the Middle Passage.7 Africa and West India merchants were the colleagues and partners of merchants and factors from every other sector. Suppliers as diverse as Midlands gun- and iron-makers, Lancashire cotton makers, Indian textile weavers, and East African shell-collectors were drawn into slave-trade networks as their produce was bought and exchanged for human cargoes in West Africa. The insurers of the City of London underwrote slaving voyages, banks mortgaged plantations and the people enslaved upon them, and capital accumulated in all of these ventures was reinvested into every sector of the economy and built environment, from banks to government debt, canals, railways, and burgeoning British industries, country houses and art and archaeological collections, as well as charitable trusts and educational institutions, such as Sir John Cass’s Foundation and the predecessor institutions of City.

City has a number of donor individuals and institutions situated at different removes from enslavement. As already identified, Sir John Cass was a stockholder and administrator of the Royal African Company, a state-backed slave-trading enterprise, as well as being an active member of non-slave-related mercantile activities and investments, the funder of educational establishments, and leaving a considerable charitable bequest. As discussed below, work remains to be done to ascertain Cass’s exact role in the slave trade and the proportion of his wealth derived directly from this involvement, however, his incontrovertible contribution to the imprisonment, enslavement, transportation, death, and torture of thousands of individuals has already led to City removing his name from campus. Cass’s links to enslavement are direct and reasonably straightforward to assess.8

In the seventeenth-century, the era of the early joint-stock companies, we are able to trace the deep intertwining of investment capital and individual financial and political interest across the City of London with early exploration, privateering, and slave-trading and the development of the East India, Virginia, and Somers Isles Companies. We can detect multiple donors to the Skinners’ Company who were direct investors in these companies, as well as those with close familial and commercial ties. Nathan Wright, in particular, stands out as a major tobacco trader as well as joint-stock investor, while the Skinners’ Company itself had financial links with both the Virginia and East India Companies. What is not possible for most of the individuals addressed during this period is to assess accurately what proportion of their individual wealth was invested in, or made from, the various slavery- and colonial-related ventures they were linked to and what proportion came from other economic activities. The overriding impression, however, is that of a City where slave-trading and colonial ventures were deeply embedded in the economic structure.

---

No evidence of direct involvement in the slave-trade or ownership of enslaved persons has yet been detected on behalf of the aristocratic Northampton family, the donors of the Clerkenwell site of the Northampton Institute and early governors. In what was a common pattern throughout the family’s history, however, the financial position of the estates and dynasty was supported, indeed rescued, by marriage to wealthy heiresses, at least two of whom inherited family fortunes built at least partly upon enslavement. While the considerable estates of the Northamptons may not have been “built on slavery”, it becomes a matter of educated historical speculation as to what extent the money linked to slavery allowed them to maintain their landed holdings in the face of financial pressures and lavish lifestyles and to what extent such generous donations of property, as well as their time and influence on the early board of governors, would have been possible without these financial matches.

Into the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, the deep interlinkage of the banking and insurance sectors with slave-dependent capital means that we can trace links for many of the financial institutions who have been donors to City to enslavement, at various levels of remove. While it is of importance to place, where possible, figures upon what amount of money from each source was derived from the slave economy it is equally important to note that so many of the influences of slave-derived wealth, whether political clout and privilege, increased governmental taxation and debt-funding, the creation of a consumer economy, general economic growth, or technological and educational advancement were all supported to such a large degree that it is impossible to separate the proceeds of enslavement from British economic development in general, or to hypothesise what the UK or the City of London would look like today without them. Tracing the family, business, and personal histories of the individual governors of the Northampton Institute also gives us a broad insight into the myriad linkages of a broad range of sectors of the British economy that slave-derived wealth filtered itself into. With the college being founded in the 1890s, it is highly unlikely that any member of the founding board would have personal connections to enslavement, but the prosopographic work on this small sample of people takes us into the realms of colonial military officers, country houses, finance and banking, trade and shipping, the Pacific fur trade, and abolitionism.

One of the main sources which has been consulted, and is referred to below, is UCL’s Legacies of British Slave-Ownership database. When slavery was finally abolished in the British Empire, Parliament only passed the 1837 bill in return for compensation to all slave-owners for the loss of their property in human beings. This resource contains biographical entries for every individual listed in government compensation records to slave-owners in the late 1830s, allowing us to trace ownership at the point of abolition. LBS also includes further information extending into the eighteenth century on ownership of the largest estates across the Caribbean. Ascertaining whether the wealth of individual donors is linked to any of the above economic activities involves a combination of research upon the individuals themselves and their personal business activities and also extensive genealogical investigation and assessment of the sources of their familial and inherited wealth and the business activities and source of familial and inherited wealth of their business partners. This report has also relied upon existing scholarship into specific individuals, institutions, plantations, and economic sectors, where relationships to slave-derived income and investment have previously been recorded as well as reliable biographical resources such as the Oxford Dictionary of National Biography and History of Parliament.9

The invention of the joint-stock company was one of the major innovations which drove the expansion of English, and later, British, mercantile activity, colonial expansion, and the spread of the institution of chattel slavery. Under Elizabeth I, royal charters were granted to various companies granting them monopolies on English trade or colonising activities with specific regions, allowing them to pool investment from many individuals. Prominent individuals, aristocrats, politicians, and the major merchants and citizens of the City of London, as well as the Crown itself, were in this way tied inextricably into the earliest colonial activities, often receiving handsome dividends which were reinvested into the City’s economy as well as the numerous joint-stock companies.

The first recorded English involvement in the transatlantic slave trade are the voyages of Sir John Hawkins during the 1560s (which included a young Francis Drake among the crew). From the point of view of this project, there is just one individual donor to the Saddlers’ Company originating before this date, Robert Kitchin, of whose career and the type of trade he engaged in little is recorded, but we do know that he passed on a number of properties to be held in charitable trust by the Saddlers’ Company on his death in 1556. There are ten Skinners’ Company donors recorded before this point, of whom only Andrew Judde is worthy of attention. Sheriff of London in 1544 and Lord Mayor in 1550-1, Judde’s charitable bequests were directed at supporting Tonbridge School. He is notable for his role as one of the earliest merchant adventurers to expand English Atlantic trading networks by travelling, among other places, to West Africa, reportedly bringing to Court gold dust from “Guinea” for the use of the Royal Mint, by request of Edward VI.10

The extant records of Hawkin’s investors are rather scant, but having addressed the scholarship that has been completed on his voyages and network, there do not seem to be any Skinners’, Saddlers’ or City donors with direct interest. The closest involvement detectable is that of Dame Alice Smythe’s bequest, which was administered by the Skinners’ Company until the 1880s and was the source of £6,100 of funds to the Northampton Institute. Her donation was drawn from the estate built by her husband, Thomas, in close commercial connection with her father, the aforementioned Andrew Judde. Whilst there is no extant record of Thomas Smythe’s involvement with Sir John Hawkins, as London’s Customs Officer, he was responsible for monitoring, recording, and charging duties on all shipping into the city during the period, a role from which he made considerable wealth.11

Another individual of note from this period is Sir John Spencer, who was one of the richest men in the country by his death in 1610. Among his many business interests and property ownerships was the manor of Clerkenwell, which he was granted by Elizabeth I, and extensive shares in the Spanish Company, the Levant Company, and the East India Company. Although at the time none of these companies are known to have had direct slave-trading activities, the Spanish Company in particular traded in a number of products linked to the Atlantic and New World possessions of the Spanish Crown and the East India Company went on to engage in slave-trading expeditions. Spencer was also moving in the same circles of investment as those individuals who would have invested in Hawkins’ voyages: as one of the City’s most prominent leaders, Spencer was both Sheriff and Lord Mayor of London at different points.12

There is no direct evidence at present of an involvement by Spencer with the Hawkins voyages, but he is worth mention as it was his land in Clerkenwell which was eventually donated by the

Joint-stock companies continued to play the leading role in funding colonial and mercantile expansion in the early seventeenth-century, notably the Virginia Company, which supported the development of a slave plantation economy on the North American coast, the Somers Isles company, which focused on slave plantations in Bermuda, and the East India Company, which engaged in trade with East Africa, India, South-East Asia, and Indian Ocean islands and ports including slave trading activities. It is in these companies that we can detect the first links between funders of City and involvement in the transatlantic slavery business. Henry Smith’s estate, consisting of properties in Kensington and surrounding parishes, was bequeathed to his eponymous charity following his death in 1628. As with Kitchin and Spencer, his business activities are difficult to ascertain from available records, partly because of his very common name, although he seemed to become more prominent in his forties as one of London’s leading moneylenders, acquiring numerous manors and estates through purchase or default and with his major creditors including the Earls of Essex and Dorset. Henry Smith would not likely have been old enough to invest in the Hawkins voyages and does not seem to have been a direct investor in the Virginia or Somers Isles companies. However, some of the first trustees of his estate, including a number of his main creditors, were linked to these companies, therefore one could assume that Smith’s network of credit enmeshed him closely with them.14

The 3rd Earl of Dorset’s links to the transatlantic economy and possible slave-ownership are recorded in his wife, Anne’s diary by the presence in their household of John Morockoe working in the kitchen and scullery and Grace Robinson working as a laundry maid, with both individuals being labelled as “a Blackamoor” in their entries in staff listings. Further information on their status or ancestry is not, however, recorded. At his death in 1624, the title and his significant debts, including to Henry Smith, was inherited by his brother Edward Sackville, a leading member and investor in the Virginia and Bermuda colonisation schemes, Governor of the Somers Isles Company in 1623 and Commissioner for planting Virginia in 1631 and 1634. Also, trustees of Smith’s estate were George Whitmore, a Master of the Haberdashers’ Company and Robert Parkhurst, of the Clothworkers’ Company and Mayor of London in 1624, both investors listed in the 2nd Charter of the Virginia Company in 1609. A further trustee, “the eldest Lady Delaware”, was, judging by the date, most likely the wife of Thomas West, Baron De La Warr, another of the leading members of the company who died at sea in 1611 on a resupply mission to the original band of colonists, having published to great public interest his Relation of the affairs of the first years of the colony.15

---


---
It is important to note that the Virginia Company did not begin operations with a deliberate plan to establish a slave plantation economy, indeed early hopes centred as much on discovering mineral wealth to match the gold and silver flowing from Latin America to Spain and establishing sustainable agriculture as trialling plantation crops. The failure to discover precious metals as well as a devastating death toll from disease and starvation, intermittent warfare with the Powhatan Confederacy, and a general unwillingness to work among the first batch of colonists led to the first arrival of enslaved Africans into English North America in 1619, when colonists purchased “20-odd” Angolan captives, seized from a Portuguese slaving ship by English privateers. The Company was dissolved in 1624 following the Jamestown Massacre and Virginia became a Royal Colony, although many original investors continued to be involved in settlement. Tobacco, especially, came to be recognised as a commercially viable staple, and plantation agriculture began to take root and became the focus of investment in the 1620s, based upon both indentured English and enslaved African labour until the later seventeenth century when enslavement became the dominant plantation labour system.16

The Somers Isles Company, meanwhile, was an offshoot of the Virginia Company, with many of the same investors, set up in 1615 to settle and exploit Bermuda, which had inadvertently become an English colony when the flagship of the first Virginia Company expedition ran aground there. Labour in Bermuda was also a mixture of indentured European and enslaved African and Native American labour for the rest of the seventeenth century, with the enslaved population rising to 3,517 out of a total of 8,266 by 1721. Unlike Virginia, the Somers Isles Company remained in ownership and administration of the colony for an extended period, not being dissolved and becoming a Crown colony until 1684.17

The third major joint-stock company which we need to consider is the East India Company, which was deeply embedded in the networks of finance and credit of the City of London. Its operations came to play a key role in both providing trade goods to exchange in West Africa for enslaved persons and later in providing a heavily-controlled export market for British manufactures, including textiles made from slave-produced cotton. It also played a direct role in slave trading, with the first documented slaving voyage of the company taking place from India to Batavia in 1622, and documented transportations of enslaved people from Madagascar to St Helena, Angola to Sumatra, and between numerous locations in the Indian Ocean, including from East Africa and India.18

According to a transcribed receipt in the company archives signed by a Richard Atkinson, the Skinners’ Company itself directly invested £66 13s in the Virginia Company, while we can detect 7 individual Skinners’ donors with personal connections to the three companies. Sir James Lancaster had been a ship’s captain during the war against the Spanish Armada and afterwards began a career in privateering, with a 1592 mission to the Malay peninsula where his ship plundered every vessel they could find followed by a 1594 voyage to the Portuguese slave colony of Brazil, from which he returned substantially richer having successfully attacked a series of ships and coastal settlements. He was a prominent figure in the fledgling East India Company, leading its first mission to establish trade links in the Indian Ocean in 1601. He left his charitable bequest in 1618.19

16 For more depth on the early years of the colony see James Horn, 1619: Jamestown and the Forging of American Democracy (New York, 2018) or Paul Musselwhite, Peter C. Mancall, and James Horn, Virginia 1619 : Slavery and Freedom in the Making of English America (Chapel Hill, NC., 2019).
17 See Michael J. Jarvis, In the Eye of All Trade: Bermuda, Bermudians, and the Maritime Atlantic World, 1680-1783 (Chapel Hill, NC., 2010).
Also leaving a donation to the Skinners' in 1618 was Roger Montagu, the King's Silkman and an elderly man by the time of his death. Although it is unclear whether he had direct involvement with any of the companies concerned, his nephew and heir Sir Henry Montagu had significant associations during Roger's lifetime as a member of the committee of the Virginia Company, assistant to the Irish Society, and member of the East India and Somers Isles Companies. Dame Mary Welde made her bequest in 1622, drawing upon the fortune of her previously deceased husband, Humphrey Weld, who during his stint as Lord Mayor of London had worked to promote the Virginia Company and encourage citizens to take out shares, purchasing three himself. Robert Bateman, Master of the Skinners in 1620-1 and City of London MP left a charitable bequest to the Skinners' Company on his death in 1639, having spent much of his adult life involved with joint-stock and colonial ventures, a member of the East India Company from 1600 and Virginia Company from 1609 onwards, appointed to the committee for planting Virginia in 1624, and serving as solicitor and treasurer to the East India from the 1620s.

The son of Dame Alice Smythe and grandson of Sir Andrew Judde, Sir Thomas Smythe, left a considerable bequest in 1625 to the Skinners' Company, supporting, like his grandfather, Tonbridge School, among other religious and educational establishments. He had been both the first governor of the East India Company and treasurer of the Virginia Company from 1609 and 1620. In his final years as treasurer Smythe pushed for the "rooting out" of the indigenous Powhatans, an end to religious conversion missions, and the expansion of tobacco planting, a major factor in the move towards a plantation agricultural model. He was removed from office following disagreements over his policies and accusations of corruption. He was also governor (resident in England) of the Somers Isles Company on its formation in 1615.

Two further Skinners' donors were not only investors in the early joint-stock companies but were also involved as time progressed in the development of further colonial ventures and the maturation of the English Atlantic plantation economy. Sir Abraham Dawes was a member of both the Virginia and Somers Isles Companies from their early days but also played a role in the colonisation of newly-acquired plantation colonies as a Commissioner for the Caribbee Islands in 1637, two years before his death and bequest to the Skinners'. Nathan Wright, a donor in 1657, was a prominent member of the East India and Levant Companies as well as being involved in trade with New England, Virginia, the Caribbean, and Africa. A reflection of his investment in the growing plantation economy of Virginia and the English Caribbean is his importing of over 11,000 lbs of tobacco in 1638 alone, whilst other records show his extensive work as a re-exporter of slave-grown tobacco from London to the Mediterranean during the 1640s and 1650s.

In 1660, following the conquest of Jamaica from Spain, the Royal African Company was set up by the English Crown, headed by the Duke of York (later James II). While there was an early plan that the company might focus upon acquiring West African gold, the growth of demand for labour in the plantation economy meant it quickly became a slave-trading corporation, eventually responsible for shipping more enslaved persons across the Atlantic than any other institution, transporting nearly


190,000 African men, women, and children into slavery between 1668 and 1731. Over 38,000 of the people taken from Africa by the RAC died before reaching the Americas.\(^{23}\)

Sir John Cass, whose bequest set up the charitable foundation in his name, had inherited a sizeable fortune from his father, who was a major building and munitions contractor to the Crown and the armed forces. In 1704 Cass purchased £1,000 of stock in the RAC, becoming an “assistant”, which meant he was actively involved in the company’s operations, before increasing his holdings to £6,000 in 1705. He sold £1,000 in 1707, keeping £5,000 until 1708, receiving a total of £172 10s in dividends. Cass’s direct involvement was as an assistant, and then later, chair of the Committee of Correspondence, which was responsible for giving detailed instructions to ship’s captains and company employees about buying, transporting, and accounting for enslaved people, with the focus of instructions being that of profit and loss. Cass was signatory to many of these letters during his time on the committee. Between 1705 and 1708, when Cass was a member of the Committee of Correspondence, the company ran fifty-five slaving voyages which embarked 14,141 enslaved Africans for the Americas. Of those taken, 11,794 are recorded as having survived the Middle Passage. The other 2,347 were killed or died en route. Uprisings occurred on five voyages in this period, although none were successful. The majority of the enslaved men, women, and children were disembarked into the sugar plantation economies of Jamaica, Barbados, and Antigua.\(^{24}\)

Cass’s investment of £6,000 is equivalent to at least £1 million today, while by comparison the provisions made for a school in Cass’s will were £1,000 in 1709, raised to £2,000 in 1718. Demonstrating the deep interlinkages of the slavery business and wider mercantile and political activity, the benefits to Cass were not solely monetary. The business, political, and social connections furnished among the City elite during this stint doubtless contributed to his election as an Alderman, Master of the Carpenters’ Company, and an MP shortly after selling his shares.

The influence of the Royal African Company was an integral and inseparable part of the City of London, with capital invested in the firm from a vast number of individuals, businesses, and institutions which then flowed back into their hands and the wider economy. Illustrating the prominence of those involved, according to Historic England between 1660 and 1690 15 Lord Mayors of London, 25 Sheriffs, and 38 Aldermen of the City were shareholders, along with many MPs and prominent figures such as Edward Colston, Samuel Pepys, John Locke, and Hans Sloane. It is important to remember also that there was a considerable overlap between shareholding in the Royal African Company and other institutions, particularly the East India Company and the Bank of England. A few illustrative examples of this include Sir John Moore, Master of the Grocers’ Company, City of London MP and Lord Mayor in 1681 and, by 1689, the second largest investor in the East India Company, having already sat on the Court of Assistants of the Royal African Company. Sir William Turner, Sheriff in 1662, Lord Mayor in 1668, and City MP, was a director of the East India Company as well as an investor in the Royal African Company as was the merchant and benefactor Sir Robert Geffrye.\(^{25}\)

As the cases above demonstrate, there was a “large cross-membership” between the livery companies and across the joint-stock companies in terms of membership as well as some physical

\(^{23}\) Totals from Trans-Atlantic Slave Trade Database [www.slavevoyages.com].

\(^{24}\) I am grateful to Prof Miles Ogborn for sharing these statistics gathered on behalf of the Sir John Cass Foundation’s investigation into Cass’s involvement with the RAC. Prof Ogborn’s references are: Information from RAC Stock Ledgers in The National Archives, T70/192-196. Information from RAC Minutes of the Court of Assistants in the National Archives, T70/87(13)-88(14). Statistics on RAC totals from Trans-Atlantic Slave Trade Database [www.slavevoyages.com].

and financial links, not least on behalf of the Skinners’ who rented their hall in the late seventeenth century to the New East India Company for their General Courts, at a rent of £300 per year. The Grocers’ Company were saved from virtual bankruptcy in the 1720s when they invested a sum of £3,000 in the East India which “proved a permanent turning point in the Company’s career”. The Mercers’ hosted both the first meeting of the Bank of England and the 1698 reception for subscribers of the newly-united East India Company, while in the 1700s the Merchant Taylors let their hall to the East India for £200 per year. Another City, University of London donor, Richard Reeve’s Foundation, trace their estate to the bequest of a Merchant Taylor who died in 1702 and left his significant wealth in a charitable trust. According to the charity, his estate “consisted mainly of large amounts of money invested in the East India Company and the Bank of England”, assets which were liquidated and invested in a large West End property portfolio.26

A final connection of the City of London which is worth highlighting is the role of the City, in particular the livery companies, in the English colonisation of Ireland. James I was keen to secure control of Ulster and fixed upon a plan to encourage investment and settlement from the wealthy trading class of merchants, citizens, and livery company members, similarly to the way in which investors had bankrolled the early joint-stock companies. There was, however, little enthusiasm from the City and eventually the twelve Great Companies were “invited” (coerced) to provide the capital to fortify Derry, which was renamed Londonderry in the company’s honour, in return for each company receiving one twelfth of the land of the county of Coleraine (also renamed Londonderry), which was expropriated from its previous owners. Each company received their share of land holding by drawing lots and the Skinners’ named theirs the Pellipar Estate (after the Latin pelliparii, meaning skinners).27

The actual management of the Pellipar Estate was done by an “Undertaker”, contracted by the company who worked as an administrator and landlord, enforcing the rights of the company to the rents from the inhabitants, as well as managing, exploiting, and developing mineral, forestry, and fishing resources. The Company owned the estate for almost three centuries, from 1617 to 1912. Company records show that the annual rents due to the Skinners in 1880 from Pellipar were £13,375, whilst in 1893 the assets of the estate were valued at £30,778 with the Irish Land Commission, £5,882 in bankers’ deposits and current accounts, as well as £700 in shares in two local railways. This money was not all syphoned directly back to the Skinners’ Company in London, however, with a large number of donations made each year to both Protestant and Catholic religious groups, educational institutions, and numerous other charitable causes in and around the area of the estate. The Saddlers’, as a much smaller company, made a smaller contribution to the initial Plantation, owning a minor share of the land allotted to the Salters, from which they received a small annual income, which was roughly £81 per annum in 1800.28


The Marquesses of Northampton

Although there is the possibility that Northampton family investments and property ownership included investment in the various joint-stock companies linked to the slave-trade and slave plantation economies or West India or Africa merchants in the City, any record of these holdings would likely be held in the family archives at Castle Ashby, currently not accessible. Similarly to the circumstances of the marriage of the Elizabethan Lord Compton to the daughter of the wealthy John Spencer, the 1787 marriage of Charles Compton and Maria Smith was the result of profligate spending, meaning that a wealthy heiress became a particularly desirable prospect. The Northampton titles, estate, and social standing likely offered an attractive match from the point of view of the untitled but upwardly-mobile Smith family. Joshua Smith, Maria’s father, was the son of a Scottish timber merchant who had settled in London in the early eighteenth century. Joshua does not seem to have owned enslaved persons himself, but in 1766 he married Sarah Gilbert, who had inherited £1,200 (£186.3k adjusted for inflation) from her father Nathaniel, who was a judge and member of the legislative council of Antigua, the lessee of Drew’s Gift plantation, which held 60 enslaved persons in 1751 and the owner of Gilbert’s Creek (which by the 1830s had 159 enslaved persons).29

Charles Compton’s father, Spencer Compton, the 8th Earl of Northampton was described as “extravagant and in debt” even before he was pushed to the edge of bankruptcy by a “most violent contest, for aristocratic pre-eminence” in 1768, during an election campaign against the Earl of Halifax, that led the Halifax estates “to be sold soon after his death for the benefit of his creditors” and for the Earl of Northampton “to live out of his native country”. Apparently, the state of family finances had not recovered by at least the mid-1790s, when the 8th Earl died in Switzerland and was succeeded by Charles Compton. It seems likely that the income from Maria Smith’s slave-lined wealth sustained the Northampton estates and financial position considerably during the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century.30

The support of the Smith fortune and the linkages to slave-derived wealth was wider than simply Maria’s inheritance, however. Her uncle, Thomas Smith, the brother of Joshua, was a very wealthy man by his death in 1825, leaving £180,000 in his will. Although it is unclear exactly what proportion of his wealth had come directly from slave-ownership and the slave economy, it was doubtless a considerable amount, as we have him listed as, at various times, the owner or funder of four estates in Jamaica. In 1775 he is listed as mortgagee (he lent the money to buy the plantation) for the Richmond estate tune the tune of £60,000. Fifteen years later, the estate and its two sugar works enslaved 243 persons. Later, Smith directly owned three plantations in St Elizabeth parish, Jamaica, including, from 1793 to 1801, Highgate Estate, from 1793 to his death, the Fonthill Estate, which enslaved 255 persons in 1826, and from 1804 until his death, the Hampstead Plantation, which enslaved 325 people in 1826. These holdings place Smith, who appears to have been an absentee owner, with his estates run by overseers and agents, in the ranks of the largest slave-owners of the time and likely reaping considerable profit in most years from the crops produced by the forced labour of the perhaps 1,000 people we can estimate he


enslaved during his lifetime, from sugar and its by-products like molasses and rum as well as coffee. 31

Thomas Smith's initial documented connection to the Northamptons springs from an £8,000 loan (£644,200 adjusted for inflation) to Charles Compton, his niece's husband, which was still outstanding by the time of his death in 1826. In his will, Smith bequeathed the same sum to his niece specifically in order to resolve or forgive the debt. Knowing that Compton's finances were still likely in a dire situation, it is quite likely that Thomas Smith's loan, and later gift, was essential in keeping the family afloat, maintaining the estates intact, and funding the lifestyle expected of a prominent member of society. The 9th Earl, who served as MP for his father's former constituency of Northampton until his succession to the earldom and elevation to the Lords, successfully lobbied Lord Liverpool for a marquessate, which he received in 1812, becoming the 1st Marquess of Northampton. Liverpool had recently succeeded the assassinated Spencer Perceval as Prime Minister, while Perceval himself was the new Marquess's cousin, having taken the Northampton MP’s seat directly following Compton’s elevation. These were the circles that the Smiths were buying into through their marriage into the Northamptons. New money worked very effectively to sustain old titles and parliamentary seats, influence, and titles were passed between family members. Building on his father's success as a City of London timber merchant, Joshua Smith had invested family money heavily in the East India Company, which by the late eighteenth century was not only trading with, but ruling, much of the Indian subcontinent and continuing to provide trade goods and capital that was funnelled back into the city and, in many cases, into the slave economy. Leveraging the City and, through his daughter, aristocratic, connections, Smith became the MP for Devizes.32

Thomas Smith's vast fortune continued to sustain the Marquesses of Northampton for at least another couple of generations. As well as forgiving the £8,000 loan, Spencer Compton, later the 2nd Marquess, was named as one of the executors as well as one of the main benefactors. Thomas Smith had no children of his own and therefore seems to have singled out his great nephew as one of his primary benefactors. Spencer and two other trustees were to manage £60,700 in Bank of England annuities, initially on behalf of Thomas Smith's widow, but later to be split between Smith's nieces and nephews and their heirs, with Spencer Compton receiving at least a third of the income. The second Marquess, funded by Smith's trust, went on to become one of the leading lights in intellectual life. For a decade he and his wife, Margaret Clephane, a writer and close friend of Walter Scott, lived in various villas and palaces throughout Italy, financing archaeological investigations, building an impressive collection of art and artefacts, patronising geologists and palaeontologists, and even editing a collection of poetry. After his wife's death in 1830, he returned to London where he served as president of the Royal Society and as a leading member of various art and scientific institutions.33


While the Smith bequest helped to sustain the family for a number of decades, the grandson of the 2nd Marquess, William Compton (5th Marquess) made another marriage, in 1884, which both significantly augmented the Northampton finances and linked the family further to slave-derived capital. His wife, the Hon. Mary Florence Baring, was the daughter and sole heir to William Bingham Baring, 2nd Baron Ashburton, scion of the Baring banking dynasty. Mary’s inheritance was £180,000 (£17.8m, adjusted for inflation). The Baring’s vast banking and financial network was described as the “Sixth Great Power” in world politics, stretched across continental Europe and the Atlantic, and had slavery-related interests as a result of a variety of early business activities, credit arrangements, mortgages, and via marriage.

It has been estimated that one-third of the Baring’s Bank total capital had been lent as credit to Wolfert Katz, the largest slave-owner in Berbice (later part of Guyana), across at least 9 large plantations, enslaving at least 1,500 persons in the 1820s and 1830s. William’s father, Alexander Baring, appears as one of the beneficiaries, as mortgagee, on 3 St. Kitts slave compensation claims, as well as an unsuccessful claimant as creditor of the owner of the Spring Garden estate in Guyana. Having been brought up in his father’s business, he subsequently became a partner of Hope & Co., an Amsterdam firm with major West Indian connections. Alexander’s wife, Anne Bingham, was the daughter of William Bingham, an American politician, and an Ann Willing, who had come into a £20,000 dowry and later inheritance from her Martinique slave-owning family. William Bingham and his son-in-law were the leading players in the negotiation of the “largest real estate deal in history”, as Barings financed the Louisiana Purchase by the United States from Napoleon’s France – a deal that led to the dramatic expansion of the slave-cotton plantation complex across the South Western states in a matter of decades.34

Alexander’s father, Sir Francis Baring, the founder of the banking dynasty had major interests in the West India trade, having served his apprenticeship with one of London’s leading Manchester and West India merchants, Samuel Touchet. According to rumour, he had made a fortune through slave trading by the age of 16 - although there is no extant evidence for this claim, he certainly was heavily involved in his early career in sugar and more general West Indian, as well as North American, trade. Having built a mercantile fortune, Baring then moved into the banking sector, lending to a large array of ventures, including funding the mortgage on the Bogue Estate in St James, Jamaica, with over 200 enslaved people held.35

The donation of the Clerkenwell land to build the Northampton Institute in 1894 must therefore be viewed in the context of the marriage seven years earlier of William Compton to Mary Baring and the subsequent implications for family finances. The 4th Marquess, father of William, was still alive at this time, and although the bequest was therefore his, rather than his son’s, undoubtedly it would have been a joint decision, as both men served on the early governing committee of the Institute and taking an interest in seeing the college’s progression. The 4th Marquess, one of the sons of Spencer Compton, named as benefactors of Thomas Smith, had followed a career in the Royal Navy, seeing service during the First Opium War to force Chinese trade and territorial concessions and was promoted to Rear Admiral in 1869, and later was named as Admiral in 1880 on the retired list. It does not seem that his marriage, to Eliza Elliot, was most concerned with wealth, more with connection: her grandfather had been a naval officer in the Napoleonic Wars, and briefly

Commander of the Cape Colony in 1837, while her father, Gilbert Elliot, was Governor-General of India and led a British invasion of Indonesian territory.\(^{36}\)

Finance, Banking, and the Legal Profession

The Barings connection to City is not only found via the Northampton family, but also through their inclusion on the list of financial and banking donors to City’s predecessor institutions. As Nick Draper has demonstrated, the British financial sector was intertwined with enslavement in a variety of ways. In some cases, the initial capital for banking firms was drawn directly or mainly from the profits of slave-trading, slave-ownership, or trade in slave-produced goods from the Caribbean or North or South America. In the case of City’s donors, there is the West India-trading fortune of Sir Frances Baring, which provided much of the starting capital for Barings bank and there is also the activities of Kleinwort Benson, which have arrived at City through the donations of CHK Charities Limited. Kleinwort “the best capitalised of all the accepting houses in 1914” had its origins in the capital built up by Alexander Friedrich Kleinwort in the slave-economy of Cuba. Arriving in Havana in 1838, he joined the major sugar exporter Drake’s in 1840, but whilst working for them also operated independently in the cigar trade. The proceeds of his export of slave-produced sugar and tobacco were the founding funds for Kleinwort’s later financial expansion.37

Another prominent way in which the banking sector (and the wider economy) assimilated slave-produced wealth was through re-investment of profits into company shares. A good example of this process in action is in the growth of joint-stock banking in London during the 1840s and 1850s, encapsulated in the career of Peter Laurie, great uncle and adoptive grandfather of John Winburn Laurie, a member of the Northampton Institute governing committee in the 1890s. Peter Laurie had moved to London from Scotland and began his career as a foreman to the King’s saddler before starting his own saddlery and later coachbuilding firms in the late eighteenth century. He made a considerable fortune when he became a leading contractor to the Indian Army, as well as through property investments in London, and rose from his humble beginnings to the post of Lord Mayor in 1832 and Master of the Saddlers’ Company in 1833. Without sons of his own, he adopted his two nephews who took over his businesses and he focused on finance, becoming the founding director and a major shareholder in the Union Bank of London from 1839, as well as investing in a number of City insurance firms. Although his initial wealth would not be considered to have been directly linked to enslavement (one might point to the synergies between colonisation in India, the Indian market for Lancashire textiles, and Caribbean and North American cotton, however) the joint stock banks pooled the capital of the stockholders to allow them to lend at highly profitable rates.38

As the major stockholders included those with slave-derived capital, the success of Laurie’s banking venture, and the increase of his existing capital was driven by the proceeds of enslavement. The major stockholders included: Andrew Spottleswoode, whose father, brother, and uncle were all Tobago shareholders, his father leaving his wealth split between his children, David Skaife, who shortly before investing in the bank had received almost £4,000 government compensation for 196 enslaved persons he had owned in Manchester, Jamaica, and Henry Edgar Glennie, son of compensation recipient, Alexander Glennie. It was through Peter Laurie’s sponsorship of John Winburn Laurie that he was able to gain the education and military commission and connections, as well as membership of the Saddlers’ company that helped propel him to his later position of responsibility at the Northampton Institute. The proceeds of enslavement were funnelled into various other parts of the economy, particularly railway shares and stocks in other colonial companies such as the Hudson’s Bay or East India. When approximately £20 million was paid in compensation to slave-owners following the 1837 Slave Compensation Act, this capital circulated throughout the economy, as well as the banking sector.39

The wider involvement of banks in the City of London in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries with enslavement was related to the complex systems of credit which were put into operation in the wider financial and mercantile sector. Bankers, such as City donors Barings and Rothschilds, would lend to slave-traders, or West India merchants (importing sugar, coffee, cotton, tobacco, and other slave-produced goods), and as demonstrated by the Barings examples above, lend credit through mortgages and loans secured against Caribbean properties, which included the estimated value of the human beings enslaved upon those estates. Nathan Mayer Rothschild’s heirs, for example, received £2,571 in return for the 168 persons enslaved on the Constitution Hill Estate in Antigua, as a result of a loan taken out by its former owner Robert Hyndman. Rothschilds most publicized role in the emancipation story has historically been as the bankers who stumped up the £20 million loan to the government to emancipate the enslaved persons of the British Empire, but through their willingness to lend money to slave-owners, we now know that they ended up as compensation recipients themselves.40

The consolidation of the banking sector over the last three centuries also means that most household-name banking companies in the UK have some historical subsidiary or predecessor institution with links to enslavement. RBS, a City donor, published a report in 2009 based upon the archives of the various banks it historically acquired, finding that numerous directors of RBS predecessors had been slave-owners themselves, as well as extending loans and other support to plantation owners. Sadly, the full report has been removed from the RBS website, but we are still able to detect eighteen directors referenced in the LBS database as compensation recipients or linked to plantation ownership. Lloyds Banking Group are another firm who have grown through acquisitions since the end of enslavement and, although there is one later director of Lloyds itself who received £74 in compensation for an estate in Trinidad, there are eight companies which Lloyds later acquired and whose capital was incorporated into the company which have claimants or beneficiaries listed in the LBS database, including John White Cater, director of the London and Brazilian bank and compensation recipient for five estates in 1837, enslaving approximately 80 men, women, and children.41

One of the most deeply embedded sections of the City of London with the slavery business was the insurance industry, the most prominent player within which was the City donor, Lloyd’s of London. Lloyd’s grew from a coffee house where the major merchants and shipping investors would meet on a daily basis to become the main marine insurance firm in the world by the 1730s. While individual directors and subscribers, such as founder Simon Fraser, who held at least 162 enslaved persons in Dominica, were themselves slave-owners, Lloyd’s and the other major marine insurers’ businesses extended beyond the insuring of the trading ships and material cargoes they transported, but also to the insuring of human cargoes. Another donating company to City, Royal & Sun Alliance, confirmed in 2002 that one of its founding companies, London Assurance, also profited from selling marine insurance policies that covered both slave trading ships and their imprisoned human cargoes. The LBS database includes details of no less than eight directors and prominent investors in London Assurance who received compensation for enslaved persons owned in 1837, along with a prominent West India merchant. Another City donor, the Life Offices Association, was founded well after the abolition of British enslavement as an industry body for the insurance industry, but its membership (and therefore funders) included a number of major insurance firms who we can trace back to some implication with the slavery business. Estimates of the importance of the insurance business of the Atlantic slave-system (including the transport of enslaved people, as well as the produce and supply of slave economies) have varied from as high

41 Jasper Jolly, “Barclays, HSBC and Lloyds among UK banks that had links to slavery”, The Guardian (18th June, 2020).
as 63% of the British marine insurance market in the 1790s, to 15% of the market but 33% of the income of insurance investments, as the premiums were higher on African and West Indian trade.\textsuperscript{42}

Considering the wider impact of the slave economy on the City of London, in the 1790s contemporaries estimated that around a third of London’s overseas trade (£3-4 million per annum) was derived from the West India trade, with the Atlantic slave economy as a whole accounting for between one quarter and one third of activity of the major financial institutions in the period around 1800. There wasn’t a single area of economic activity in the City which wouldn’t be touched either directly or indirectly by the impact of slave-derived finance. This is important to consider in respect of City, University of London’s relationship with the institutions of the City of London, such as the mayoralty, and of major founding donors such as the Skinners’ and Saddlers’ companies.\textsuperscript{43}

Likewise, the legal profession was a vital part of the City of London’s economic, as well as political and administrative life. Judges, barristers, and solicitors were often themselves members of the various livery companies as well as investors in joint-stock ventures, mercantile companies, and plantations themselves. Furthermore, contracts, wills, conveyances, trusteeships, establishment and disestablishment of business partnerships, and all manner of legal procedures and documents required a legal professional to draw up and process the relevant paperwork, meaning that lawyers had a hand (and took payment) in every aspect of financial and commercial life. Whether it was partnerships engaging in slave trading voyages to West Africa, West India merchants trading slave-produced goods, drafting deeds of ownership of plantation estates, or administering wills and trusteeships that managed the ownership of enslaved persons, lawyers were a key part of the slavery business. Particularly important is also their role acting as legal attorneys or agents on behalf of slave-owners in the administration and management of absentee-owned estates or on behalf of minors or groups of heirs who had inherited plantation estates. This extended particularly to filing claims for compensation following the abolition of enslavement on behalf of owners.

To get a representative impression of the prevalence of slave-ownership and the administrative roles of lawyers we can consult the LBS database, within which the occupation of “lawyer” (relating generally to any solicitor, barrister, or attorney) is the second-most commonly occurring occupational group (after ‘merchant’). Judges, the most senior members of the profession and the most prominent members of the Inns of Court feature as both slave-owners and beneficiaries of compensation themselves. Prominent judges such as Sir Edward East, Sir James Scarlett and Sir Anthony Hart (Chancellor of Ireland) were all born into Caribbean slave-owning families, while the Chief Justice of the Court of Common Pleas, Sir Nicholas Conygham Tindal, was awarded two-thirds of the compensation for an estate in Guyana as trustee of a slave-owner in the administration and management of absentee-owned estates or on behalf of minors or groups of heirs who had inherited plantation estates. This extended particularly to filing claims for compensation following the abolition of enslavement on behalf of owners.


\textsuperscript{43} Nicholas Draper, “The City of London and slavery: evidence from the first dock companies, 1795–1800”, \textit{Economic History Review}, Vol. 61, No. 2 (September, 2007), pp. 432-466.

More generally, a search for keywords related to the Inns of Court highlights the plethora of individuals implicated in slave-ownership and estate administration. 210 entries are listed including the term “barrister”, 150 with “Lincoln’s Inn”, 82 with “Inner Temple”, 57 with “Middle Temple”, and 48 with “Gray’s Inn”. Within this group, as with the senior judges listed above, there is a mixture of relationships to slave-ownership. While some Inn members were themselves slave-owners the manner of involvement could vary, with individuals like Samuel Pepys Cockerell, lawyer of Lincoln’s Inn and brother of architect Charles Robert Cockerell, sharing over £35,000 of compensation with banker John Biddulph for ten estates that had belonged to James Colyear Dawkins, but for which Cockerell and Biddulph had extended mortgages. Some of the sons of planters and absentee owners became lawyers themselves, such as Simon Agostini, who was called to the bar at Middle Temple in 1837 at around the same time that his father received over £2,600 for the emancipation of enslaved persons on 3 estates in Trinidad. The financial benefits of slave-ownership and compensation often lasted far beyond the end of enslavement. Forster McGeachy Alleyne of Lincoln’s Inn, for example, was executor and one of the beneficiaries of his father Charles Thomas’s estate of £30,000 in 1872. Charles Thomas Alleyne had received over £16,000 compensation for 6 Barbados estates some two and a half decades earlier which had not only afforded Forster the opportunity to gain the necessary education and advancement to become a barrister, the proceeds were subsequently passed on into the family’s next generation.45

The question of how we square this with the funding and management of the Inns of Court Law School, and the subsequent connection with City, is that the Inns themselves were funded by both the subscriptions of individual members and by generations of bequests and donations. Unfortunately, the records of the Council for Legal Education, which later became the Inns of Court Law School, currently held in the archives of the IALS, are not available for use because of COVID restrictions, so I am unable to list all of the early committee members or any potential private donors to this institution. Expanding, however, on the wider points mentioned above about the penetration of slave-related economic activity and capital into all facets of life in the City of London, it should come as no surprise that the Inns of Court, the institutions which set up, governed, and funded the Inns of Court Law School, would have members with intimate and extensive links to enslavement.46

---


46 The Council of Legal Education Archive is held at the Institute of Advanced Legal Studies: [https://ials.sas.ac.uk/library/archives/about-archives-held-institute-advanced-legal-studies-ials/records-legal-education-4].
Deep Links – Architecture, Trade, Colonial Ventures, Complex Legacies

The nature of the Northampton Institute’s foundation in the 1890s is such that the chances of a direct link to slave-ownership or slave trading for any of the connected persons and donors is quite low, coming some five decades after the end of enslavement in the British Empire. A deeper dive into the familial and commercial connections of the institute’s founding governors does, however, paint a remarkably diverse and representative picture of the myriad entanglements of slave-derived wealth with many sectors of the British economy, with individuals connected to the building of country houses, the trade and transport sectors, colonial economies, and complicated family origins which include both abolitionist campaigners and philanthropists and deep enmeshment with the transatlantic slavery system.

One of the members of the founding governing committee was the architect Charles Barry, Jr., whose role was to judge the submissions to the architectural competition to design the new Northampton Institute building in Clerkenwell, on the land donated by the Marquess of Northampton. As with any prominent architect of the period, Barry had taken a large array of commissions throughout his career, including churches and church halls in Dulwich, Burlington House, which housed a number of learned societies, Great Ormond Street, Shoreditch Town Hall, and various educational buildings. His portfolio also included two country houses whose owners had links to slave-derived wealth, stretching back over a long period. He worked for Mark Rolle on Stevenstone House, who had demolished the existing building and commissioned Barry to build a totally new house in a Franco-Italian style which was not deemed to be a success, one critic writing that the “richest man in Devon built himself the ugliest house”. Mark Rolle had inherited his titles, land, and wealth from his uncle John Rolle, who left him an estate of £300,000 in 1842, which included the proceeds of £4,333 compensation for a plantation in the Bahamas. This plantation is likely the same one the British government gave to John Rolle’s father Denys as compensation for the 76,000 acres of plantation worth £28,488 he had to give up when Florida was returned to Spain by the British in 1783. He also undertook a renovation and rebuilding work on Clumber House, Nottinghamshire on behalf of the Duke of Newcastle, who had a number of connections to enslavement over a number of generations of his family history.47

Barry not only took commissions from individuals with some slave-derived wealth, he also owed much of his position and success to his father, Sir Charles Barry, designer of the Palace of Westminster and among the most celebrated architects of the age. The senior Barry’s commissions included Harewood House, which belonged to the 3rd Baron Harewood, the benefactor of Edwin Lascelles, 1st Baron Harewood, a considerable plantation and slave-owner and who funded the initial building of the house and Kingston Lacy, the seat of the Woodley family who had also benefitted substantially from slave-derived wealth. The elder Barry had also worked on Dunrobin Castle and Cliveden House on behalf of the Duke of Sutherland, who was associated with abolitionists, not least through his wife’s passionate support for the cause, but remains controversial today and subject of recent calls for his statues to be toppled because of his leading

role in enforced Highland clearances, leading to the enforced displacement of thousands of residents. 48

Another illustrative story is that of Lewis Boyd Sebastian, barrister, one of the Skinners’ Company representatives on the governing board of the early Northampton Institute and author of a history of the company as well as a volume on trademark legislation. Sebastian had begun his career through an apprenticeship in 1873 to another Skinner, Archibald Frederick Paull, a merchant whose brother was also a barrister. Paull himself had begun in commerce by being brought into partnership in his father Archibald Paull’s West India firm, through which he had built up a substantial fortune by trading with the Caribbean slave economies, as well as through extending credit by mortgaging estates, ten of which he received compensation for from the British government, two of which he was named as a direct owner of at different points in time. The elder Paull also reinvested his slave-derived wealth into numerous bank and railway company directorships as well as being able to pass his firm onto his son. 49

The Sebastian family’s embeddedness within commercial and trading networks went back at least another generation, with Lewis Boyd Sebastian’s father (another Lewis Sebastian) working for decades as pay clerk to the St Katharine Dock Company. Sebastian senior did not exactly leave a fortune to his heirs on his death in 1900 (£998) but through his role at the docks, which traded in a wide range of commodities, particularly imported tea, shells, and feathers, and exported wool, but also including many slave-produced goods like sugar, cotton, tobacco, and indigo, he was able to provide a stable middle class lifestyle, and opportunity for education and advancement for his son. Like the other dock companies of the period, it had been built (and subsequently run) by a group of investors, the leading members of which were also company directors, the founding board including John Horsley Palmer, a merchant banker who shared compensation of £6,500 for two Grenada estates as a mortgagee, Fletcher Wilson, who received £2,800 compensation from a Grenada estate with his business partner, and Charles Pascoe Grenfell whose brother’s bank received slave compensation. Lewis Sebastian senior was born in Rio de Janeiro, although is described as a British Subject, leading one to speculate that his father may also have been involved in the mercantile business, with a focus on the slave plantation economy of Brazil, although his father’s name does not appear on his marriage certificate and his birth in Brazil means his birth certificate is not recorded in UK indexes. 50


Another founding governor with trading connections, albeit less directly tied to enslavement, is William Craighead, one of three watch and clockmakers on the Northampton Institute board. Craighead’s father David was a Dundee shipmaster who sailed far and wide according to scattered shipping references in the local press that show him travelling to Scandinavia, Turkey and the Mediterranean, and Mexico in the 1850s and 1860s. No direct evidence was uncovered in this investigation (although local archives may afford deeper insights) of David Craighead transporting slave-produced goods, although there is record of him arriving into Dundee with 753 bales of jute from London in October 1863. Dundee’s major industrial exports during the period were textiles, including linen made from Baltic flax (some of which was exported to the plantations of the U.S. South) and jute cloth and sacking which was exported worldwide and made from imported Indian raw materials. In the complex webs of national and international finance and colonial trade, the connections between any two branches of shipping and industry were multiple and Craighead’s father played his part in these. William Craighead himself seems to have participated to some extent in his father’s shipping voyages as a young man, listed on the ship Diana in the Port of Bristol in 1861 alongside his father and his mother’s brother or nephew D. Lyell. In this document he is listed as twenty years old and a watchmaker, demonstrating that he had already begun to acquire the skills that would see him establish a successful Clerkenwell business in later life and achieve the standing within the trade to be invited to join the board of founding governors.\footnote{Provo, UT, USA: Ancestry.com Operations Inc, 2004. The National Archives; Kew, London, England; Records of the Prerogative Court of Canterbury, Series PROB 11; Class: RG 9; Piece: 4498; Folio: 157; GSU roll: 543294 [Ancestry.com. 1861 England Census [database on-line]. Provo, UT, USA: Ancestry.com Operations Inc, 2005].}


As members of the Skinners’ Company, a number of the Skinners’ representatives on the governing board (although not all) were themselves successful fur and skin merchants. Although not necessarily immediately apparent, the fur and skin trade during the nineteenth century was a huge global business, with seal skins alone employing around 3,000 people in the City of London in the 1890s. It was also predicated to a great extent upon colonial expansion, with animal skins an important agricultural and hunted product. An advertisement for Institute governor Frederick Holl Morris’s company in 1914 declared them to be “Importers of Australian and Continental Leathers”, while future master of the Skinners’ Company W. C. B. Stamp spent much of his childhood and teenage years in Adelaide, Australia, before embarking on a later career in the fur trade. Stamp appears alongside Morris’s business partner, H. S. Bevington in a series of United States Congressional reports into the seal fur trade in Alaska and the Pacific, which discuss the intricacies of seal fur identification and grading as well as addressing concerns that over-hunting was leading to a dramatic collapse in seal populations, threatening the livelihoods of thousands of people in the industry. Between 100,000 and 200,000 were being imported into London alone each year and there were growing signs that the Pacific population was about to collapse, as the South Sea population already had. Both Stamp and Morris were reasonably wealthy men by the time they ascended to become Masters of the Company but it is worth considering that the building of these fortunes, though not linked to slavery, was intimately linked to a rapacious exploitation of the natural world, built upon the colonial expansion of the American, British, Canadian, and Australian states into lands and coastal waters seized from indigenous groups.53

Another web of colonial connections is related to Lieutenant General John Winburn Laurie, a member of the Saddlers’ Company as well as an MP in both the Canadian and British parliaments. As discussed above, his adoptive grandfather had bequeathed to the family a substantial fortune based upon supplying the East India Company and British Army, as well as banking ventures alongside former slave-owners. John Winburn Laurie had used his family wealth and connections to gain education at Harrow and Sandhurst, after which he served in the Crimean War. On the outbreak of rebellion in India, Laurie was sent first to Mauritius in 1857 to keep order amongst the large population of indentured Indian “coolie” labourers who authorities were fearful would also revolt against colonial forces, before being dispatched to India itself for three years on campaign against Indian forces resisting British rule, receiving promotion for distinguished service in 1861. Laurie was then sent to Nova Scotia to organise the colonial militia, where he was retained in service and decided to establish himself in local colonial society.54

Within a year of arriving in Canada he had married the daughter of the richest man in British North America, Enos Collins, and built up a successful agricultural enterprise whilst in semi-retirement from the army, no doubt helped by his father-in-law’s dominant position as the leading banker in Nova Scotia. His wife and father-in-law’s deep familial connections in North America cover a wide variety of slave-owning and slave-derived activities. Enos Collins himself had begun his career in maritime trade, including as part of the extensive Caribbean trade from Nova Scotia, shipping supplies such as cod, salmon, and lumber to the slave economies of the West Indies and transporting molasses from Cuba and sugar and coffee from Martinique into North America. He had also made a considerable amount of booty from a career as a privateer in the Atlantic and Caribbean during the Napoleonic Wars. On setting up the Halifax Banking Company in 1825 it was

54 “Laurie, John Wimburn”, A Cyclopaedia of Canadian Biography: Being Chiefly Men of the Time (Toronto, 1888),
through operations in Collin’s West Indian network of customers and contacts that the bank first established itself, before expanding business into Montréal and Toronto. It also developed formal ties with the Colonial Bank (later part of Barclays) in the Caribbean from 1837.55

Collins had made a good marriage match himself, marrying the daughter of the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia, Sir Brenton Halliburton. He was a member of a New England dynasty of Loyalists who moved to Nova Scotia following the American War of Independence, descended from the Brenton family which included Rhode Island governors, West India traders and slave-owners. His wife’s father, Bishop Charles Inglis, is also recorded to have been the owner of at least two enslaved people in New York.56

Laurie volunteered himself back into active military service in 1885 at the outbreak of the North-West Rebellion, a combination of uprisings against colonial land and trade policies by the Métis people and the Cree and Assiniboine First Nations. The largest challenge for colonial authorities was transporting troops, munitions, and supplies across the vast geographic areas and Laurie volunteered to coordinate the logistics for the campaign, as well as organising hospitals to care for wounded servicemen, roles for which he received a good deal of praise. His standing rose to such a level that he was elected to the Canadian parliament between 1887 and 1891 as member for Shelburne, before returning to the U.K. and successfully standing for the seat of Pembroke and Haverfordwest (1895-1906). A Saddlers’ member since 1857 (his father was Master of the Company), he seems to have been nominated onto the Northampton Institute governing board shortly after his arrival back in London. Laurie’s career and the financial history of his and his wife’s family span a wide range of economic activities both directly and indirectly related to enslavement, whilst his own military career, particularly his campaigns on behalf of the British Empire against rebelling colonised peoples demonstrates the way in which structures of power built upon an array of economic and political foundations, including enslavement, operated to further the project of imperialism over centuries and across the globe.57

A final case study of a Northampton Institute governor which is worthy of exploration is that of Emily Kinnaird, a narrative which throws up a series of contradictions and complexities that can help us contextualise the broader findings of this report. Emily Kinnaird had come from a


background of considerable privilege and wealth and her family history is steeped in prominent establishment figures: aristocrats, politicians, bankers, and military officers. Unsurprisingly, therefore, we are able to unearth a number of connections, direct and indirect, to slave-derived wealth and activities that supported the slave economy and the wider British colonial project. Within her background, however, we also find staunch and active abolitionist campaigners and dedicated and extensive philanthropy and social reform on the part of her parents, Emily herself, and her siblings.

Her mother Mary Jane, Lady Kinnaird was orphaned at an early age and as a young women went to live with her uncle, the incumbent of St. John’s Chapel, Bedford Row, where she essentially worked as his secretary and became deeply involved in working with the area’s poor and working class, particularly women and girls, setting up a Training School for Domestic Servants. Her marriage to banker and aristocrat Arthur Kinnaird gave her an enhanced platform for campaigning, fundraising, and reform, the two of them working together to hold weekly meetings to sponsor and discuss missionary, educational, and reforming activities with a range of their well-connected society friends. This included debating the American Civil War and a campaign against the East African slave trade, as well as numerous evangelical causes. Her foremost prominence came as founder of the YWCA. Neither Emily nor her sisters Louisa and Gertrude chose to marry, instead dedicating themselves to charitable endeavours, all three particularly active in their mother’s campaigns. Emily remained a key presence in the YWCA throughout her life as honorary secretary of the London Division for twenty-five years and honorary finance secretary for the British organization and also helped create the National Council of Women and establish 300 centres across the U.K. to care for female munition, war workers, and service personnel during the First World War.58

Emily also participated in and furthered her mother’s work on female education in India, spending much of her later life in what she described in the title of her memoir as her “Adopted Country”, taking part in frequent missionary activities and female education through the Indian Female Normal School and Instruction Society and helping to found the Indian Students’ Union and Hostel back in London in 1920. Kinnaird clearly used the position of privilege she was born in to, partly on slave-derived wealth, to advance some particularly progressive causes around women’s education and social support at a time when social, economic, and political roles for women were highly circumscribed. It is notable that she and her sisters decided to maintain their financial and personal independence by remaining unmarried. Likewise, her extensive work with girls and women and education in India indicates a global and cosmopolitan worldview. But, of course, the story is not straightforward because the impetus and focus of these colonial projects drew much from an evangelising, civilising, and Westernising zeal on the part of Kinnaird and similar reformers, which exhibited more than a little flavour of cultural superiority and imperialism in itself.59

Emily Kinnaird’s father, Arthur, 10th Lord Kinnaird was the scion of an aristocratic and banking dynasty which owned the Ransom, Bouverie, and Company bank, who have previously been documented as extending credit to slave-owners, the best example of which is a study of the Prospect Estate in Portland parish, Jamaica. Arthur Kinnaird used the premises and the business operations of the bank as a base for the philanthropic campaigns he ran in conjunction with his wife, with the bank providing collecting account services for various organisations such as funds for lifeboats in 1829, to rebuild schools and churches in Barbados in 1831, for orphaned children in 1834, and a “Home for Gentlemen” in 1856. In 1861 he became one of the directors of the new Trust and Agency Company of Australasia alongside W. F. Baring, a member of the Baring banking dynasty (see above), Thomas H. Gladstone, son of major slave compensation recipient

John Gladstone (who was the brother of Prime Minister William Gladstone), and Philip Twells, a banker who had been the trustee for two estates receiving £4,300 in compensation.\(^{60}\)

Emily Kinnaird’s mother, meanwhile, was the daughter of William Henry Hoare, another banker and descendent of an important banking family. Hoare’s remains today one of the oldest still-existent banks in the world, founded by Sir Richard Hoare in 1672, a company and family therefore possessing a long history of embeddedness within the City of London financial system, with clearly documented dealings in Royal African Company, South Sea Company (a short-lived venture famous for the famous investment bubble, which included slave-trading in its operations), and East India Company stock, who apparently counted Edward Colston among its many well-connected customers. Her maternal grandfather, Gerard Noel was the owner of Belmont Estate in St. Kitts between 1798 and 1835, which is recorded as enslaving 25 people in 1825, while her mother’s brothers William Middleton Noel and Frederick Noel received compensation for their slave-ownership following emancipation.\(^{61}\)

Even further back in the Establishment credentials of Emily Kinnaird’s family is her mother’s maternal grandfather, Admiral Charles Middleton. A cousin of gradual abolitionist Henry Dundas, Middleton entered the Navy and among his early commissions were protecting British shipping (i.e. slavers) along the West African coast and operating during the Seven Years’ War protecting the British slave plantation islands and seizing French shipping, of which he took fifty vessels and their cargoes of slave-produced goods, supplies for Caribbean plantations, and, one might speculate, maybe even enslaved Africans. He made his fortune from his cut of the prizes taken under his command as well as receiving many gifts from the British Caribbean planters he had protected, including gold and jewel-encrusted ceremonial swords. Having made his reputation and considerable wealth in this arena, however, he went on to become an advocate for abolition of the slave trade, speaking from his own experience in 1788 on the inhuman conditions of overcrowded slave ships and hosting gatherings of prominent evangelical abolitionists such as William Wilberforce and Thomas Clarkson, and closely encouraging the work of James Ramsey.\(^{62}\)

The case of Emily Kinnaird and her ancestors acts as an excellent demonstration of the deep interlinkages and, often, even deeper contradictions between the sources of familial wealth and the

---


foundations of British economic development and many of the institutions that have underpinned social reform, philanthropy, and in the case of City, education. Considering the Northampton family, from the 2nd Marquess’s extensive patronage of the arts, archaeology, and the sciences and the donation of land in 1891 to the newly-formed Institute, the centuries of charitable support to thousands of individuals and organisations afford by the Skinners’ and Saddlers’ Companies, and charities like those of Henry Smith and Richard Reeve, much social good has come from these stores of capital with numerous direct and indirect connections to enslavement. We cannot separate the origins of this wealth from the people who accumulated, invested, and distributed it. There is no simple narrative to the life of figures like Charles Middleton, or Emily Kinnaird, or the Marquesses of Northampton, in much the same way as there is no simple narrative to the wider story of British economic development, or the sources of funding of City, University of London.

There is also no intrinsic problem in “re-writing” history. That is what historians do and that is what we as a society and possessors of a collective memory do, constantly. By mapping the deep and complicated sources of capital behind our fundamental institutions of education, of galleries and museums, of government, corporations, professions, and the built environment what we do is fill in the gaps in our historical amnesia to form a more well-rounded view of the past. It is only with a fuller view of any complex system that we can make informed decisions on how we should next proceed. City, University of London has already made an important statement in removing the name of John Cass from its Business School and in commissioning this investigation into its wider links to enslavement. With this broader perspective the opportunity now arises to make decisions about the future with eyes wider open. To decide what to keep, what to change, and how to work towards restitution and to continue to honour the best humanitarian aims of the Northampton Institute’s founders.
Appendix – Names of Individuals Investigated

Links to enslavement found for those in bold

Founding Governors of the Northampton Institute

4th Marquess of Northampton
5th Marquess of Northampton
Charles James Drummond
A. Bassett Hopkins
W. J. Blake
Rev. John Henry Rose
Herbert A Wix (Skinner)
Charles Dorman (Skinner)
W. C. Blakefield Stamp (Skinner)
Frederic Holl Morris (Skinner)
Lt. Gen. John Wimburn Laurie (Saddler)
J. C. Napoleon White
J. Osbaldeston Hunt

The Hon. Emily Kinnaird
Miss Maud Wyld ***
David Buckney (Watch & Clock Maker)
Thomas Baxter (Watch & Clock Maker)
Lewis Boyd Sebastian (Skinner)
Mrs. Mackintosh ***

Charles Barry, Jnr. (Architect)
William Craighead (Watch & Clock Maker)
Mr. John J. Lambert (Skinner)

List provided by City, University of London

*** It has not been possible to ascertain which Maud Wylde or Mrs. Mackintosh found in census records is the correct individual listed here. Maud Wylde is likely the “lady visitor” and housing worker “Miss Wyld” mentioned in a letter by Octavia Hill concerning Clerkenwell, but she is not listed at the address provided in either 1891 or 1901.63

Campus Buildings

Sir John Cass
Sir James Sharp Tait
Oliver Thompson

---

Donors to the Saddlers’ Company Year of Bequest

Robert Kitchin 1556
Robert Reade 1568
John Webb 1568
Thomas Farnell/Parnell 1577
John Hobbes Reign of Elizabeth I
Dennis Milford
John Hall 1609
James Swift 1610
Robert Labourne 1627
Edward Hill 1646
John Cox 1658
William Pease 1683
Richard Banner 1698
Sarah Ewer 1767
Samuel Gunton 1768
Young George Honnor 1769
Thomas Cradock 1860
Charles Cradock 1861
Benjamin Bacon Williams 1870


Donors to the Skinners’ Company Year of bequest

Sir Andrew Judde 1558
Henry Fisher 1562
Joan Bush 1566
George Forman 1574
John Boydon 1579
Thomas Audley 1583 / 1589
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anne Gunter</td>
<td>1584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence Attwell</td>
<td>1588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alice Smythe</strong></td>
<td>1592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir Wolston Dixsey</td>
<td>1592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Lampard</td>
<td>1593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Blundell</td>
<td>1599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir William Cockayne</td>
<td>1600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Wilkinson</td>
<td>1600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Saltenstall</td>
<td>1603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Johnson</td>
<td>1611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randall Manning, Snr.</td>
<td>1611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Stoddard</td>
<td>1611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Slaney</td>
<td>1612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Fletcher</td>
<td>1616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Audley</td>
<td>1616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sir James Lancaster</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dame Barbara Champion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frances Clarke, widow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Roger Montagu</strong></td>
<td>1618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dame Mary Welde</strong></td>
<td>1622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sir Thomas Smythe</strong></td>
<td>1625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Meredith</td>
<td>1630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sir Abraham Dawes</strong></td>
<td>1639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Tichbourne</td>
<td>1641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob Peacock</td>
<td>1641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Robert Bateman</strong></td>
<td>1641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Gale</td>
<td>1655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew Bateson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nathan Wright</strong></td>
<td>1657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Lewin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis Newberry</td>
<td>1683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Spurling</td>
<td>1730</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

List compiled from *Register of Wills Making Gifts to the Company, Compiled Late 18th Century*, Worshipful Company of Skinners, Ref: CLC/L/SE/G/001/MS30951, London Metropolitan Archives and *Schedule of Charities, Compiled 19th Century*, Worshipful Company of Skinners, Ref: CLC/L/SE/G/002/MS30959, London Metropolitan Archives.
Selected References

Familial and biographical information has been fleshed out using the genealogical databases of Ancestry (subscription required) and Family Search [www.ancestry.co.uk & www.familysearch.org].

The Legacies of British Slave-Ownership database includes records of all government compensation made to slave-owners as well as ownership information of major estates stretching back into the eighteenth century, along with biographical information on slave-owners. It also includes information about specific estates and companies with links to slave-ownership [www.ucl.ac.uk/lbs].

The Trans-Atlantic Slave Trade Database includes entries for all recorded Atlantic slave trade voyages and, where extant, information on ownership, captains, and number of enslaved people transported [www.slavevoyages.org].

Peer-reviewed and well-researched biographical information on prominent figures in British public life can be found in The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography and The History of Parliament [www.oxforddnb.com & www.historyofparliament.org].

Some suggestions for further reading on the interlinkage of British economic and social life, particularly the City of London, and the slavery business:

Catherine Hall, Nicholas Draper, Keith McClelland, Katie Donington, and Rachel Lang (eds.), Legacies of British Slave-Ownership: Colonial Slavery and the Formation of Victorian Britain (Cambridge, 2014)


Madge Dresser and Andrew Hann (eds.), Slavery and the British Country House (Swindon, 2013).


The history of City, University of London is outlined in:


The Survey of London: Volume 46, South and East Clerkenwell (London, 2008) [www.british-history.ac.uk/survey-london/vol46].
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Appendix Three: Report of Professor Richard Drayton

External Academic Advisor’s report on the historic origins of the wealth underpinning City, University of London, with special reference to wealth connected with Atlantic slavery

Richard Drayton, Professor of History, King’s College London
19 September 2020

1. Context

In June 2020, in the wake of the ‘Black Lives Matter’ moment, public attention turned to the fact that Sir John Cass, whose memory was honoured in the name of City, University of London’s Business School, had derived much of his wealth from his business involvement in the enslavement of Africans. In July 3, 2020, the Council of City, University of London voted unanimously to remove his name from this institution, ‘on the basis that continued use of the Cass name was incompatible with City’s values of diversity and inclusion’.64

The President established a review chaired by Hunada Nouss to examine the historic origins of the wealth underpinning the University, and in particular to investigate its relationship to Atlantic Slavery. It aimed at a kind of retrospective due diligence about the provenance of charitable donations, to identify reputational risks, and to give attention to how the present institution engages with the legacies of racial slavery. Similar enquiries have been conducted by other universities, including Harvard, Brown and Georgetown in the United States, and most thoroughly within Britain by the University of Glasgow.65

This committee in July 2020 invited Professor Richard Drayton of King’s College London to serve as External Academic Advisor, and by a separate process recruited Dr Matthew Stallard of the Legacies of British Slave Ownership project to conduct a programme of research. Dr Stallard communicated his formal report on his research findings in September 2020.

2. Prospectus for the enquiry

In July 2020, Professor Drayton provided a prospectus for the research dimension of the enquiry. Its key points were:

(1) City, University of London is a relatively young institution, founded, unlike Glasgow, long after the abolition of chattel slavery in the British Empire. Its endowment is of a modest size, c. £100 million. Like other London universities, however, older institutions nest within it, in particular St Bartholomew’s Hospital (which dates from the 12th Century) and the Inns of Court School of Law (from 1852). It also has strong historic associations with the ancient Livery companies of the City, banking and insurance institutions, many of which had significant involvement with the businesses which were part of the Atlantic slave economy, even after British abolition. A range of private actors, the provenance of whose wealth is unknown, but many of whom may have been recipients, or heirs to recipients, of ‘slave compensation’ at the time of abolition, have donated assets to the several foundations of City and its antecedents, to buildings, prizes and chairs, or have been remembered in named parts of the University.

(2) A hierarchy of research questions arises from this:

(a) Who were the private donors of assets, both corporate and individual, to the foundation of the University and its immediate antecedent institutions, and to the endowment of buildings, academic posts, prizes and bursaries, from the Marquis of Northampton c. 1852 to the present?

---


(b) What part did unfree labour play—major, minor, negligible, or none—in the provenance of the wealth of these donors? Wealth from unfree labour being understood to include:

(i) capital derived from the pre-1833 economy based on enslaved African labour.
(ii) capital derived directly, or through reinvestment, of funds paid by the Crown after 1834 in compensation of British slave holders.
(iii) wealth derived from inheritance, or marriage into, wealth noted under (i) and (ii).
(iv) capital and wealth derived from, or enmeshed in, investments in, or trade in, or financing of the trade of, slave-produced cotton, sugar, tobacco and coffee in the United States (until 1865), and Brazil and Cuba (until the 1880s).
(v) wealth derived from trade with, supply, and credit extended to the seceded Confederacy in the United States.
(vi) wealth derived trade with, and finance involving, semi-coerced labour regimes in the nineteenth century including the cultuurstelsel in the Dutch East Indies, ‘Blackbird’ labour in Australia and the Pacific region, Indian and Chinese indentured labour in the West Indies, Mauritius, Fiji and South Africa, and in the twentieth-century from Rhodesia and apartheid-era South Africa.

(c) Are there 17th, 18th, or early 19th century gifts and benefactions connected with St Bartholomew’s which have significant visible connections to wealth derived from the Atlantic Slave Trade or from the West Indian plantation economy, or businesses involved in their inputs, products or financing?

(d) Are there any other reputational risks associated with historic or recent gifts or benefactions?

(e) Are there aspects of the institutional architecture of the University: the names of buildings, academic posts, prizes or bursaries, and in the ornamental and symbolic programme of the University which deserve attention?

(3) Research methods

Drayton noted that an exhaustive and complete study of the provenance of all wealth donated to the university in cash or kind would require a research project of a much larger scope, and would be impeded by the likely incompleteness of the record trace. It could not be pursued at this time because of the impact on library and archival access of the Coronavirus pandemic of 2020. He suggested that Stallard might work with the grain of the history of the University. Using the University’s records one might construct a list of benefactors, endowed chairs, buildings, scholarships, bursaries, prizes and societies which could then be checked, and correlated with, sources contemporary with the nineteenth-century foundation of the University and its immediate antecedent institutions. The key research tools would include the University College London Legacies of British Slave Ownership database, Nick Draper’s *The Price of Emancipation* (2010), the 2013 edited book *Legacies of British Slave Ownership*, and the *New Dictionary of National Biography*. The value of donations should be assessed and correlated with twenty-first century values using the ‘Measuring Worth’ calculator (https://www.measuringworth.com/calculators/ukcompare/).

3. Dr Stallard’s Report

During the months of July, August and early September, Dr Stallard conducted his research, under the constraints imposed by the pandemic. He presented a report of c. 20,000 words entitled, ‘Historic Links of Donors, Governors, and Prominent Figures to Enslavement’. Using a variety of digital sources, in particular the Legacies of British Slave Ownership database, Stallard focussed on the Northampton family, the City livery companies connected to City (in particular the Skinners’ and Saddlers’), and the long run financial provenance of the foundation of the University.

Its conclusions may be summarised in two statements. First, City, apart from its honouring of Sir John Cass, has no direct, easily identifiable, association with African slavery. Second, however, that African slavery played a significant part in making possible the land, gifts, support and
patronage which underpinned City and its antecedent institutions. A key section of the report summarises this elegantly:

'The links between City's donors and enslavement are in many senses highly representative of the complex intertwining of the financial and mercantile sectors and the public and private institutions of the City of London across some three hundred years and the embeddedness of slave-trading, ownership of plantations and enslaved persons, and the trading of slave-produced goods within this system.' (Stallard, p.21).

In other words, City, like other major British institutions, has been a significant indirect beneficiary of wealth derived from the Slave Trade and from plantation slavery in the Caribbean.

4. External Academic Advisor's comment on Dr Stallard's report

Dr Stallard's has conducted a rigorous investigation of Slavery's legacies to City, under the special constraints of the summer of 2020. He has engaged diligently with the problem of investigating key individuals, families and institutions linked with City, University of London. He has brought into communication several key databases, and his report deserves to be made public in a final form, as it sheds new light on parts of the impact of Slavery on Britain which were not widely known.

I consulted with Dr Stallard during his research, and I do not propose here any additions. There are only two suggestions I would make for its revision and improvement before publication:

(1) The footnotes need significant attention. In many cases they still contain the author's notes to himself. They need to be revised into a proper scholarly form, with sources explained, and URL's provided, rather than simply referenced via unexplained hyperlinks.

(2) There needs to be a full statement on sources consulted in a section at the end. At the moment, information about the sources and methods is provided en passant and in some footnotes. A scientific report requires a methodical discussion of its underpinnings and work process.

The strengths of the report are apparent, and they allow City to engage with its stakeholders and to show that it has done due diligence with respect to the history of slavery. But it should be underlined however that Stallard worked within the terms he had been set when he was appointed, and his focus was on African slavery. The research tools and methods he employed did not seek to make visible the contribution to City of other forms of unfree and semi-free and oppressed labour in colonial or quasi-colonial economies, through to the white supremacist regimes of late twentieth-century Rhodesia and South Africa. In particular I would note its focus on the context of foundation, and its retrospective address, such that the distant implications of the sixteenth- and seventeenth-century connections were more important for Stallard's research process than City's colonial engagements in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Some measure of reputational risk remains, therefore, since such engagements may become objects of public concern in the future as the legacies of the Slave Trade and plantation slavery in the Caribbean became in Britain in 2020.

5. External Advisor’s recommendations for next steps

(1) ‘Scientific’ implications

There is a case for City over the medium term to launch an initiative to examine the twentieth- and twenty-first century ‘global history’ of the University. Such a research initiative might, in one direction, address the questions about the University’s colonial connections which the 2020 enquiry did not focus upon. But, beyond this, far more positively, it might yield a portrait of City's contributions to the world, through illuminating how its alumni/ae were involved in the economic, political and cultural life of societies across the world. This might be done relatively cheaply and well with one or two funded Ph.D. studentships, or more expensively by commissioning special case studies or official histories.
(2) City's debts to slavery? The question of reparations

As Stallard's report shows, City as a quite young University had at its foundation and in its early history no direct connection whatsoever to African slavery. Its situation is thus quite different from that of All Souls College or the University of Glasgow or King's College London. But, on the other hand, wealth derived from the Slave Trade and connected to plantation slavery in the Americas, made a significant indirect contribution to the origins of the University.

What obligations arise from this? One might take a very limited view of the matter, concluding that what moral burdens arise from the contributions of enslaved people to City is a matter for older institutions, or the nation as a whole, to address. The publication of Stallard's report, with the renaming of the Business School, might in that case be the terminus of the 2020 City initiative. Or, one might seek to engage publicly with the question, by acknowledging and confronting these legacies, and finding some reasonable, economical and fruitful ways of rendering reparatory justice within the future life of the institution. There are significant benefits from considering this second path.

At the heart of the Reparations is the idea of repair, repair of damage caused by past injustice which continues often in the form of present injustice. That moral actors in the present need to render justice and equity for what happened in the past is an important current in contemporary ethical and political thought. The call for reparations for African slavery has a very long history, and has returned with a particular urgency in the twenty-first century. Reparations is often understood to be about transfers of money. Clearly, in some cases, money may play a part, but what is central to Reparations is rather the commitment to address the consequences of the past in the present towards a different future.

What are the consequences of the past of Slavery which affect City, for which it has some share of collective national responsibility for repair? These may be summarised as the ways in which slavery created a racialised inequality in wealth and life chances in Britain and elsewhere which cascades through the generations, which is reproduced through forms of structural racisms. Those racialised as 'black' in Britain are twice as likely to be unemployed, if employed to earn on average only 87% of white men, more likely to be stopped and searched by the police, more likely to be punished for any delinquency, more likely to be excluded from school, less likely to receive credit, more likely to be the object of violence. Black people are four times more likely than whites to be detained under the Mental Health Act, 25% more likely if arrested to be remanded in custody, four times more likely than their proportion of the population to be in prison, and once in custody two to three times as likely to die there. In 2014 there were 2600 Black men in prison and the number of their under 30 peers at that time in university was only slightly higher at 3000. And once in university across the UK, 30% of white students graduated in 2018 with First Class honours, vs 14% of those who identified as Black. Beyond first class honours, even fewer then go on to doctoral training; a September 2019 report, 'The broken pipeline' report notes that over three


67 Ana Lucia Araujo, Reparations for Slavery and the Slave Trade: A Transitional and Comparative History (London, 2017) is the key authority on the question.


67 Ana Lucia Araujo, Reparations for Slavery and the Slave Trade: A Transitional and Comparative History (London, 2017) is the key authority on the question.
year period only 1.2% of the 19,868 studentships awarded by all UKRI research councils went to Black or Black Mixed students, and only 30 of those were from Black Caribbean background. The losers of the regime of post-slavery racialised inequality are not just its immediate victims, but City and all British institutions as they miss the chance to benefit from the developed gifts and energies of those who are socially excluded.

Arising from this analysis, and the implications of Dr Stallard's report, I would offer the following concrete recommendations, distinct from the proposals for further research above:

(1) The one imperative duty is to make visible the massive invisible and involuntary contributions of black and brown people to the philanthropic origins of the University. The publication of Dr Stallard's report, on its own, or as part of a public-facing report on this committee's activity seems an obvious first step. I would urge the University to consider also how it might also seek to commission public works of art which would honour and make visible the presence of people of colour in its origins and history. These steps will give present and future BAME stakeholders of City a sense of their share in the ownership of the university.

(2) It is highly recommended that this be accompanied by an enquiry into the ways in City does or does not participate in the reproduction of racialised inequality. There should at some point be an audit of patterns of racialised inequality in how the university works. Are there inequalities in how academic and professional staff are hired, paid, promoted, honoured and retained, and in the structures of management? And, with respect to students, what are the patterns of racial and ethnic inequality in how students are recruited in each component unit of the university, and into whether there is an attainment gap? New policy imperatives may well arise from such an enquiry.

(3) It is also highly recommended that consideration be given to seeking out if there are any ways in which the University might, despite its best intentions, be structurally or institutionally racist. These include an assessment of the curriculum, and how the forms of knowledge and approaches it prizes might exclude or give less value to BAME people, affecting their ability to participate as full citizens of the University and the world of learning. This is what is sometimes called ‘decolonising the curriculum’. The implications of this extend to how staff are recruited, paid, promoted and retained, and the forms of expertise which the University seeks to have represented within its strengths. It is my understanding from Hunada Nouss that an initiative of this kind is already envisaged.

(4) There is a case for City to seek to build new bridges to those communities, in and outside of Britain, in which the descendants of enslaved people are strongly represented. With the help of its philanthropic partners, such as the City Livery Companies and the Cass Foundation it might seek to build new educational pathways for BAME people in Britain, possibly through direct partnerships with particular London schools. It might create a programme of scholarships for students from the Caribbean to come to City for postgraduate study. It might also build collaborative relationships with the University of the West Indies.

These initiatives will involve a significant investment of time and resources for the University. But they have the potential of making City an even more successful and prestigious institution. Approached with ambition and energy, they are certain to add to the national and international reputation of City, and to make more real the promise of its motto, 'To serve mankind'.

RD, Cambridge, 19ix20
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Dr Matthew Stallard
(from https://www.ucl.ac.uk/lbs/project/staff/)

Matthew Stallard has been working on the LBS project to transcribe and digitise the slave registers for the parish of Port Royal in Jamaica. Further details of this project are here.

Matthew gained his PhD from the University of Manchester in 2017 for a project examining labour, class, and slavery in 1820s-30s New Orleans. He has published or has forthcoming contributions on genealogy, genetics, and identity in History Workshop Journal, Journal of Family History, and New Methods and Approaches to Public History based on his work on the AHRC Double-Helix History project, as well as a forthcoming edited monograph of oral histories of migration and locality in Derby, recorded during the HLF-funded study This is Normanton. As well as having a professional data analysis background, he has worked in software design as an ESRC National Productivity Investment Fund fellow and has written for publications including The Guardian, History Today, and The Conversation.

Professor Richard Drayton
(from https://www.kcl.ac.uk/people/richard-drayton)

Biography
Richard Drayton was born in Guyana and grew up in Barbados, and was later educated at Harvard, Yale and Oxford. He has taught at the universities of Oxford, Virginia and Cambridge before coming to King's College London as Rhodes Professor of Imperial History in 2009. He has held a range of distinguished visiting appointments at Harvard, the Ecole des Hautes Etudes in Paris, the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences, City University of New York, LMU in Munich and elsewhere. He plays a significant role in Caribbean-British public life, and in 2016 he was awarded the Barbados Jubilee Honour by the Prime Minister of Barbados for service to Barbados in the United Kingdom. In 2016, he gave the 6th Distinguished Jurist's Lecture of the Judiciary of Trinidad and Tobago, published as the Whose Constitution? Law, Justice and History in the Caribbean (2016). This was central to the landmark judgment in the High Court of Trinidad and Tobago which in 2018 struck down the criminalization of same-sex sexuality. In 2020, he has persuaded the Principal of King’s to agree to an end to the association with Rhodes, and a process is in motion for the renaming of his chair.