



University of
Strathclyde
Glasgow

University of Strathclyde
and Historical Links to Slavery



University of Strathclyde and Historical Links to Slavery

Introduction

The report is divided into three sections and each is fully referenced to show the reader where the information originated. The first section covers the background and context as this will provide a wider perspective in which to place the findings of the report. The second section deals with associations and the people involved with Anderson's Institution, Strathclyde's forerunner founded in 1796, who were known to have either engaged directly with activities involved in slavery or who inherited or benefited from legacies associated with the slave economies in the eighteenth and early-nineteenth centuries. This includes ownership of plantations or trade in produce such as tobacco, sugar and cotton which were grown and harvested by enslaved people.

In the main the focus is on those who were Trustees and Presidents of the Institution and had a role in its running and organisation. The third section deals directly with finance and money and, where it is possible to do so, the monies that have an enslavement association will be presented as a percentage of the total. One of the difficulties associated with this task is the varied and complex methods used to fund the University's activities, especially during its early years. It is further complicated by a lack of complete records.

The language and terminology used in the report are in keeping with recent academic convention that shows a greater sensitivity to those who were enslaved in the human trafficking from Africa that took place from the seventeenth to nineteenth centuries. This is also in accordance with the University's policies on dignity and respect.

As the Report is primarily concerned with any money that originated with slavery it is important to outline the methodology used in calculating what these monies would be worth today. The sums are given in the value of the times and there are three standard ways of translating them into contemporary worth; and all three have strengths and weakness.¹ The first measurement is to use inflation and simply calculate the amount taking into account average price rises from that date until the present. So in 1796 £5 would be worth £550 in 2021.

The relative value of goods and services have not all risen at an equal rate and using this measurement does not give an accurate indication as to the purchasing power of £5 in 1796. To pay someone £5 for labour in 1796 would cost the equivalent of £7,440 today if we use our second measurement, the average cost of wages. Yet, this does not take into account the fact that there was a large gap between the middle class and the working class and that a university professor would earn ten times more than a labourer, for example. The point we want to make is that the relative price of things has not remained static since the beginning of the nineteenth-century and that the cost of labour, buildings and every-day goods have all changed at different rates. Our final measurement uses value as a percentage of today's GDP (Gross Domestic Product), that is to say the value of everything in the economy, so the value of £5 in 1796 as a measure of its comparative worth in GDP is the equivalent to £46,000 in 2021.

¹ For some of the difficulties of calculating relative value and prices in the past were highlighted during the historical debate on the standard of living during the industrial revolution in which there were 'optimist' and 'pessimist' camps. See Arthur J. Taylor (ed.), *The Standard of Living Debate During the Industrial Revolution*, (London, 1975)

The problem with this figure is that economies grow over time through accumulation – think of the difference between today’s transport infrastructure compared to the late eighteenth century, it has been built up over centuries. Also, much of the economy of today is based on things like banking, insurance, stocks and bonds and other aspects of ‘invisible earnings’ that have no real comparator to the late eighteenth century. One final issue is that earnings tended to be lower and goods more expensive in Scotland compared to England, which tends to provide most of the statistical basis of UK averages.

So to sum up. Using inflation as a guide gives the smallest figure, wages is bigger and GDP is significantly larger. In the interests of transparency all three figures will be given in that order when assessing contemporary value. While such figures are important, on their own they cannot illustrate their significance to the development of the Institution. So, as far as is possible, the sums involved will also be given as a percentage of the total income of the Institution which will provide the reader with a better and wider financial context to make judgements on the significance of slavery money to the development of the Institution.

One final point, made by Stephen Mullen, which is worth reiterating, is that it is important to remember that, although the sums of money involved might not appear to be significant, that does not necessarily reflect the relative value for the time.² The website [measuringworth.com](https://www.measuringworth.com) was used to calculate contemporary values, which are given in 2021 prices.

Background and Context

In recent times, there has been a significant scholarly outpouring of works relating to the role of Scotland and Scots in the development of the slaving economies in North America and the Caribbean.³ These are especially useful in tracking and identifying individuals who were beneficiaries from slaving activities and helps set the establishment and development of the Institution in a proper historical context. Tom Devine set in train the current discussion more than a decade ago and contemporary social and political concerns regarding the legacy and impact of enslavement on racial attitudes has aroused considerable public interests as Scottish society comes to terms with its past involvement in a trade that ranks among one of the most heinous crimes against humanity.⁴ In-keeping with many Higher Education and other long-standing Institutions, this Report is part of a wider, and many would say, overdue, introspective truth-seeking examination of a painful historical legacy.⁵ The simple fact of geography transformed the fortunes of the small and picturesque town of Glasgow in the early eighteenth century as it found itself fortuitously placed to take advantage of the fact that the hub of

² Mullen, *Sugar Aristocracy*, 300.

³ In particular. Douglas Hamilton, *Scotland, the Caribbean and the Atlantic World, 1775-1820*, (Manchester, 2010); T. M. Devine (ed.), *Recovering Scotland’s Slavery Past: The Caribbean Connection*, (Edinburgh, 2015); David Alston, *Slaves and Highlanders: Silenced Histories of Scotland and the Caribbean*, (Edinburgh, 2021); Stephen Mullen, *The Glasgow Sugar Aristocracy: Scotland and Caribbean Slavery, 1775-1838*, (London, 2022) and Stephen Mullen, ‘Centring Transatlantic Slavery in Scottish Historiography’, *History Compass*, vol. 20, 1 (2022), 1-14 which provides a succinct overview of the development of historical research on the topic.

⁴ T. M. Devine, ‘Did Slavery Make Scotia Great?’, *Britain and the World*, vol. 4, 1 (2011), 40-64 and S. Mullen and E. Gibbs, ‘Scotland, Atlantic Slavery and the Scottish National Party: from colonised to coloniser in the political imagination’, *Nations and Nationalism*, early online view at <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/toc/14698129/0/0>

⁵ For example, Dundee and Glasgow universities have published reports, while, Aberdeen, Edinburgh and St. Andrews have commissioned reports. It is not just an issue for universities as the Church of Scotland has recently published a report and the Monarchy have promised an investigation to links with slavery.

the global economy shifted from the Mediterranean to the Atlantic world.⁶ We tend to think of globalisation as a recent phenomenon but the goods exported from the Americas, of tobacco, coffee and chocolate which were sweetened by sugar and formed the mainstay of consumption in the new fashionable saloons and shops in European cities, were produced by enslaved labour coerced and shipped from Africa, and the profits from the 'triangular trade' of Europe, Africa and America were used to buy luxury goods such as spices, silk and tea from the East.⁷ The movement of goods, money and people (the majority of the latter by force) was on a global scale and well underway when the idea of our university came into being.⁸ And we are all products of our time.

The growth of Atlantic trade was central to the transformation of Glasgow into the economic dynamo that would see it propelled into global significance in the nineteenth-century with the sobriquet of 'Second City of Empire'. In the age of sail, its position on the west coast looking out to the Atlantic gave it a two-week advantage in terms of crossing the Pond compared to southern ports in England. This was because the strong and variable currents and tidal flows of the Irish sea to the south meant that it was safer and more secure to take the longer route northwards via the east coast.⁹

Unlike Liverpool, Bristol and London that engaged directly in the transportation of enslaved people, Glasgow focused on tobacco and its merchants, through ruthless efficiency and business innovation, established themselves by the 1760s as the main port in the United Kingdom for the trade.¹⁰ Great fortunes were made and the legacy of tobacco can be seen in the street names of the Merchant City and, on the eve of the American War of Independence, Glasgow accounted for 40% of British trade.

The Tobacco Lords did not just profit from the labour of enslaved Africans, they actively promoted and extended the use of enslaved labour through the supply of credit and loans for plantation development. By 1775 some £1.3 million was owed to Scots by the plantation owners and a wide spectrum of Scottish society was involved in investing in the lucrative and profitable use of enslaved labour.¹¹ The contemporary value of this sum works out as £186m (inflation), £2.3b (wages) or £19.8b (GDP). The disruption of tobacco supply as a result of the American War of Independence meant that many merchants transferred their business interests to the West Indies and by 1807, when the trade in enslaved Africans was outlawed, the existence of a 'Sugar Aristocracy' demonstrated that considerable sums of money were made from business activities with the slave economies of the

⁶ See T. M. Devine, *The Tobacco Lords: a Study of the Tobacco Merchants and their Trading Activities, 1740-90*, (Edinburgh, 1990 edition), 1-17, T. M. Devine and Gordon Jackson (eds.) *Glasgow: Volume One Beginnings to 1830*, (Manchester, 1995), 139-84 and T. M. Devine and Philip Roessner, 'Scots in the Atlantic Economy, 1600-1800' in John M. Mackenzie and T. M. Devine (eds.), *Scotland and the British Empire*, (Oxford, 2011), 30-53. For the wider picture see Ralph Davie, *The Rise of the Atlantic Economies*, (London, 1988) and David Armitage and Michael J. Braddick (eds.), *The British Atlantic World, 1500-1800*, (Basingstoke, 2009).

⁷ Jan de Vries, 'The limits of globalization in the early modern world', *Economic History Review*, vol. 63, 3 (2010), 710-33; Anthony Hopkins (ed.), *Globalization in World History*, (London, 2002); Joseph E. Inikori, 'Atlantic Slavery and the Rise of the Capitalist Global Economy', *Current Anthropology*, vol. 61, 522 (2020), 159-171 and M. Duffill, 'The African Trade from Scotland, 1706-66', *Slavery and Abolition*, vol. 25, 3(2004), 101-22.

⁸ John Butt, *John Anderson's Legacy: The University of Strathclyde and its Antecedents 1796-1996*, (East Linton, 1996), 1-46 and James Muir, *John Anderson: Pioneer of Technical Education and the College he Founded*, (Glasgow, 1950).

⁹ Jacob M. Price, 'The Rise of Glasgow in the Chesapeake Tobacco Trade, 1707-1775', *William and Mary Quarterly*, vol.11, 2 (1954), 187.

¹⁰ Devine, *Tobacco Lords*, 55-81, 108 and T.M. Devine, 'Sources of Capital for the Glasgow Tobacco Trade, c. 1740-c.1780', *Business History*, xvi (1974), 113-29.

¹¹ Devine, 'Did Slavery Make Scotia Great', 47 and the 'Golden Age of Tobacco' in Devine and Jackson (eds.), *Glasgow*, 139-84.

Americas.¹² Furthermore, as the process of industrialisation started in Scotland, largely associated with the growth in textiles, it is worth remembering that the principal raw material fuelling this expansion was raw cotton, grown and picked by enslaved workers in the West Indies.¹³

The traditional view of historians was that slavery and its associations played a minor part in the transformation of the Scottish economy in the late eighteenth century. Although the importance of Atlantic trade was acknowledged, there was little explicit discussion of the centrality of enslaved populations as cultivators of tobacco and cotton and its importance as a market for Scottish linen.¹⁴ And until comparatively recently, the subject of slavery was more commonly associated in Scottish historical circles with the campaign for its abolition.¹⁵

The idea that Glasgow was simply an 'entrepot' – a place where goods came in and went out again without engendering much economic activity in the hinterland has been firmly demolished by Tom Devine who has convincingly argued that the money accrued from activities associated with slavery were a significant source of economic diversification and a factor in propelling the economy into modern industrialisation.¹⁶ The Trinidadian historian and prime minister, Eric Williams, postulated many years ago that the profits from slavery were instrumental in driving the British economy into industrialisation and that the reason behind abolition was nothing to do with humanitarianism, but rather that the modernisation associated with the development of capitalism rendered the institution redundant.¹⁷

While his thesis was largely discredited by British economic historians who argued that slavery remained profitable up until the end¹⁸, this aspect of the debate tended to distract from his argument regarding the role of profits from the trade as an important source of capital that made the industrial revolution possible.¹⁹ In regard to England, it was traditionally argued that the nation was wealthy enough to sustain the process of industrialisation irrespective of the profits from slavery. The same could not be said for Scotland and the older view of the minor role that the engagement with the slaving economies made to the transformation of the Scottish economy in the late eighteenth century would now seem to have shifted to one of not proven, if not guilty as charged.²⁰ As further historical research is undertaken, it may well turn out to be the case that the profits from the slaving economies were critical to the development of Scotland into a modern industrial powerhouse.

¹² T.M. Devine, 'An Eighteenth-Century Business Elite: Glasgow-West India Merchants, c.1750-1815', *Scottish Historical Review*, vol. 57, 163 (1978), 40-67.

¹³ Anthony Cooke, 'An Elite Revisited: Glasgow West India Merchants, 1783-1877', *Journal of Scottish Historical Studies*, vol. 32, 2 (2012), 127-165.

¹⁴ For example, S. G. Lythe and J. Butt, *An Economic History of 1100-1939*, (London, 1975),

¹⁵ See C. Duncan Rice, *The Scots Abolitionists*, (Louisiana State, 1982) and Iain Whyte, *Scotland and the Abolition of Black Slavery*, (Edinburgh, 2006)

¹⁶ Henry Hamilton, *The Industrial Revolution in Scotland*; R.H. Campbell, *Scotland Since 1707: The Rise of an Industrial Society*, (London, 1972) and Devine, 'Did Slavery Make Scotia Great?'

¹⁷ Eric Williams, *Slavery and Capitalism*, (London, 1944).

¹⁸ Seymour Drescher, *Econocide: British Slavery in the Era of Abolition*, (North Carolina, 2010 edn.).

¹⁹ David Richardson, 'The British Empire and the Atlantic Slave Trade, 1660-1807' in Peter J. Marshall (ed.), *The Oxford History of the British Empire, vol. II, The Eighteenth Century*, (Oxford, 1998), 440-465.

²⁰ The issue of the impact of slavery on the British economy has generated a huge literature and some of the key texts for the British context are Joseph E. Inikori and Stanley L. Engerman, (eds.), *The Atlantic Slave Trade*, (Duham N.C., 1992); Barbara L. Solow and Stanley L. Engerman (eds.), *British Capitalism and Caribbean Slavery: The Legacy of Eric Williams*, (Cambridge, 1987) and David Eltis and Stanley L. Engerman, 'The Importance of Slavery and the Slave Trade to Industrializing Britain', *Journal of Economic History*, 60 (2000), 123 -44. For the Scottish dimension which shows that there was a greater connection between slavery and industrial investment see Devine, 'Did Slavery Make Scotia Great?', Cooke, 'An Elite Revisited' and Mullen, *Sugar Aristocracy*.

British historians have also come round to accepting that the activities associated with slavery were much more significant than previously thought and one recent estimate has postulated that it may have accounted for as much as ten percent of GDP in the eighteenth century.²¹ For a long time, the established view was that it counted for less than one percent.²² Without suggesting a precise figure, Devine has argued that the impact of slavery on the Scottish economy was arguably of a greater scale than that in England.

Firstly, the industrial revolution in England was a long-drawn-out affair and was more of an evolution, whereas in Scotland the economic transformation was rapid and condensed to within the latter part of the eighteenth and early part of the nineteenth centuries; precisely coinciding with peak activity in the slaving economies.

Secondly, over a longer time frame, England's population grew significantly and in terms of the comparison between the domestic and slaving market, the latter declined in terms of its proportionate size. This was not the case in Scotland where the market of the West Indies, relative to the size of the Scottish population, was much larger. This is evidenced by the volume of exports from Scotland to the Americas in the late eighteenth and early-nineteenth centuries.

Finally, there is the issue of the comparative wealth of England and Scotland and if the advantage lay with the former, then in terms of significance, the profits from slavery would be greater in the latter. As more research is undertaken into the impact of slavery on the British economy, it is very likely that the historiographical trend will be one that enhances its significance.²³

Anderson's Institution was founded in a city that had and was still sucking in the profits from slavery. Indeed, it came into existence at a time when trade with the slaving economies was at its most lucrative.²⁴ While much of the historical focus on the founding of Anderson's Institution has rightly highlighted the educational dimension – Anderson's critique of existing university practice was borne out by the Royal Commission of 1826 which found that patronage, nepotism and out of date teaching was a major issue as evidenced by a professor of mathematics who was teaching using his grandfather's lecture notes.²⁵

What has received less historical attention was that the founding of Anderson's Institution was also a political statement made by the increasingly confident and prosperous middle class of Glasgow. Before 1832, only one in 125 adult males in Scotland had the vote compared to one in eight in England.²⁶ Scottish society was dominated by the aristocracy and this dominance was reinforced through the use of patronage in which government, university and church positions and posts were in the gift of the state or aristocratic landowners.²⁷ The creation of a university that was free from such

²¹ K. Rönnbäck, 'On the economic importance of the slave plantations complex to the British economy in the eighteenth century: a value added approach', *Journal of Global History*, vol. 13 (2008), 309-27 and N. Draper, 'Helping to make Britain great: the commercial legacies of slave ownership in Britain' in C. Hall and N. Draper (eds.), *Legacies of British Slave Ownership: Colonial Slavery and the Formation of Victorian Britain*, (Cambridge, 2014), 78-127 and Maxine Berg and Pat Hudson, (Cambridge, 2023).

²² P. O'Brien, 'Economic Development: The Contribution of the Periphery', *Economic History Review*, vol. 35 (1982), 1-18, R. Davies, *The Industrial Revolution and British Overseas Trade*, (Bath, 1979) and David Richardson, 'The British Empire and the Atlantic Slave Trade, 1660-1807', 461.

²³ Devine, 'Did Slavery Make Scotia Great?'

²⁴ Mullen, *Sugar Aristocracy*, 253-92.

²⁵ *Report of the Royal Commission of Inquiry into the State of Universities in Scotland*, (Parliamentary Papers 1831),

²⁶ John Stuart Shaw, *The Political History of Eighteenth Century Scotland*, (Basingstoke, 1999), 82.

²⁷ Ronald Sunter, *Patronage and Politics in Scotland, 1707-1832*, (Edinburgh, 1986).

dominance helps to explain why many middle class business leaders and other professional members of the community embraced the project and as John Butt noted, it attracted many supporters of political reform.²⁸ It was also a bold statement of their intention to act as civic leaders. An institution based in a city with extensive connections with slavery that had its main body of support drawn from the business community that had profited from that 'deplorable trade' was unlikely to escape the questionable heritage of its birth.

One further factor should also be born in mind in explaining the evolution of the Institution and its association with the legacy of slavery. The historian Jay Brown makes the point that the early to mid-nineteenth century was a period associated with growing middle-class religiosity associated with evangelical revivalism.²⁹ For many, the wickedness of the Slave Trade had to be atoned for, especially as Britain had emerged from the Napoleonic Wars victorious and this led many to conclude that Britain had a providential mission in the world because God did not punish the country for its engagement in that most sinful trade. It had a duty to lead the world by example and help spread the virtues of commerce, Christianity and civilisation.

This led to Scottish and English missionary expeditions to West Africa in an effort to make amends for the damage that had been inflicted on that part of the world as a result in the trade in captive human beings.³⁰ Furthermore, the growing public opprobrium in which slavery was held may have led many to put bad money to good uses by engaging in public works and acts of civic leadership. Also, after abolition in 1837, those who had profited from slavery were not keen to advertise the fact. Evidence for this can be found in the fact that almost all of the more popularly available biographical sources on those associated with Anderson's University who did have a connection to slavery make no reference to it.³¹

This is not to say that it was not widely known at the time. After all, membership of the Glasgow West India Association was not secret, nor was the fact its members were heavily involved in the plantation economies. Rather, it was more of an issue that was 'unspoken' and with the gentrification of the merchant class, discussion on the origins of wealth was considered 'vulgar'. For the 'gentlemanly capitalist', there was more emphasis on how money was spent, rather than how it was made.

The purchase of estates, the donations to good causes and the like form a more important part of the story than how fortunes were made, largely because spending money could demonstrate taste, breeding and gentility in a way that the nasty, brutish and ruthless qualities required to make a pile could not. The unpleasantness of slavery was quite literally 'whitewashed' out of the story and it is only through the legal records for the award of compensation after abolition that their involvement becomes apparent.³² It may be the case that Anderson's benefited from those seeking to make amends or put the money made from slavery to a good public cause. But it is also equally possible that

²⁸ Butt, *John Anderson's Legacy*, 11.

²⁹ Stewart J. Brown, *Providence and Empire, 1815-1914*, (London, 2015), 39-43, 77-79.

³⁰ The Church of Scotland Mission in Old Calabar in modern Nigeria was established in 1845 and included several missionaries who had been active in Jamaica. See Donald M. McFarlan, *Calabar: The Church of Scotland Mission, 1846-1946*, (London, 1946).

³¹ For example, see the original biographies of University Presidents of Anderson's in the Dictionary of National Biography which started in 1855 and compare them to more recent versions. Also, while enslavement and the money that was associated with it was not a bar to social mobility and social standing, the fact that neither Butt nor Muir in their respective histories makes any mention of slavery shows that knowledge of such activities was not widely circulated in the archival records.

³² The key source is the University College London 'Legacies of British Slave Ownership' data base <https://www.ucl.ac.uk/lbs/>.

involvement with the Institution was more to do with exercising civil leadership than salving troubled consciences. Anderson's fitted the bill of gentlemanly conduct perfectly because it was held to improve the lives of ordinary people by broadening their intellectual horizons:

Professor Anderson, at a time when education, all but the mere elements of reading and writing, was confined to those that had the means of going through a regular course of a college education, broke through the existing prejudices, and opened the Temple of Science to the hard-labouring mechanic and the hitherto despised artificer He made all his exhortations on behalf of science – and for the benefits of the inhabitants [of Glasgow] of which, he left the bulk of his ample fortune, that, even after his death, her citizens, particularly her mechanics and her artisans, might have the means of scientific education, without being subject to the monastic trammels in which our colleges are still invested.³³

As we shall see, this was perhaps a rather rosy and optimistic view, but the early Institution keenly promoted the role of museums as a way to educate and inform the working class and perhaps more importantly, keep them away from the demon drink.

People

The government of Anderson's was determined by 81 Trustees who selected a president, treasurer and a management team made up of nine people who were tasked with administering and developing the Institution in accordance with the terms of the Will and Legacy.³⁴ The Trustees were divided into nine categories that each had nine members and these 'classes' represented business leaders associated with the Trades House, general manufactures and entrepreneurs, lawyers, trades people and artisans, divines, medics, horticulturists, 'natural philosophers' and family members.

The leaders of civic Glasgow such as the Lord Provost, Church moderators, and the Deacon of the Trades House, were given an overview of the management of the Institution. The Trustees had a relatively high turnover with deaths, non-attendance and resignations. Of all the groups, artisans and lawyers tended to drop out and be replaced, while the merchants and manufacturers were the most consistent in attendance and administration.³⁵ The former may have found the time commitment financially onerous, while the latter would not find it as much of a strain and may have seen the opportunities of civic leadership and networking as outweighing any disadvantage. Finance was the key difficulty facing the Institution at its inception, as Anderson's ambitious legacy outstretched the rather meagre resources left in his will.³⁶

Given the omnipresent nature of the engagement with the slaving economies of the Americas in Glaswegian society in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, it goes without saying that many of the hundreds of individuals who served as Trustees of the Institution will have had some kind of casual acquaintance with, or participation in business connected to, slavery. For example, the lawyer who drew up contracts between linen merchants and plantation owners, or the rope maker whose products ended up on ships carrying sugar, or the minister who wrote a reference for an overseer on a Jamaican estate, to the surgeon who spent several years on a West Indian outpost could all be said to have profited from slavery. No doubt, it is highly likely that this was the experience of

³³ *Glasgow and Mechanics' Magazine and Annals of Philosophy*, (Glasgow, 1825) vol. III, vi.

³⁴ Strathclyde University Archives, B1/1, Minute Book of Anderson's Institute, 1796-99, 1-30.

³⁵ *Ibid.*

³⁶ Anderson left about £300 but claims against his estate were still being made several years after his death and all his furniture, his horse and household items were sold to help the balance. For context, the first professor appointed by the Institution was awarded a salary of £250. The creation of the Institution was obviously driven more by notions of civic duty and responsibility than financial reward and the Trustees, in the days before public limited liabilities, were arguably undertaking considerable financial risk in setting up the Institution.

many Trustees. To trace and track all of these individuals would be a gargantuan task and at the end of the day, one that is unlikely to be successful because of the complexities in retrieving the necessary historical data, much of which will have been lost. Furthermore, without downplaying the significance of the incidental engagement with slavery, the sums involved were not the largest and the focus of this report is set firmly on those whose fortune was made or had its origin in the engagement with the slaving economies and played a leading role in the Institution. And, crucially, if any of that money found its way into the Institution's coffers.

An obvious starting point for our discussion is John Anderson. There is not a full-length biographical study of the founder of the University and while we do have information on his role within Glasgow University (including his tempestuous relationship with colleagues and management) and his political sympathies with reform and radical causes, his views on slavery can only be conjectured until we uncover a document that reveals his thoughts on the subject.³⁷ That said, there is enough circumstantial evidence to make the case that he would probably have been in favour of the abolition of the Slave Trade by the 1790s. His religious and political views, together with his known associations with those in favour of Abolition would make it likely that he would not be a supporter of slavery.³⁸

Anderson was a member of the Glasgow Literary Society where the Foulis brothers, Francis Hutcheson and Adam Smith gave papers against slavery.³⁹ His ideas on the evolution of humanity and speculations on what in the future would become known as 'race', in which he endeavoured to account for the physical differences in human beings across the world, show that he believed in a common origin of humanity and he rejected any notion of 'polygenesis' in which humans evolved spontaneously in different parts of the world to become almost like separate species.⁴⁰

Perhaps the most compelling evidence for Anderson being in favour of Abolition comes from his library and his ownership of the anti-slavery pamphlet *An Abstract of the Evidence Delivered Before the Select Committee of the House of Commons* which was jointly published by the Edinburgh and Glasgow Abolitionist Societies in 1791.⁴¹ The pamphlet was based on documents brought by William Dickson for a tour in Scotland in 1792. The material was taken from an Inquiry by the House of Commons and included the well-known diagram laying out the way that enslaved Africans were chained together in cramped and insanitary conditions.⁴²

³⁷ Butt, *John Anderson's Legacy*, 1-25 and Ronald L. Crawford, *Professor Anderson, Dr Franklin and President Washington*, (Glasgow, 2014). The best all round discussion of Anderson as an Enlightenment figure is Paul Wood, 'Jolly Jack Phosphorous in the Venice of the North; or, Who Was John Anderson', in Andrew Hook and Richard B. Sher, *The Glasgow Enlightenment*, (East Linton, 1997), 111-133 which points out that he had a keen interest in history and philosophy.

³⁸ His keenest supporter in Glasgow University was John Millar who was anti-slavery and he met with Dr Johnson another anti-slavery stalwart. Anderson inherited his father's religious books and he was closer to the 'Popular Party' in the Church of Scotland rather than the establishment 'Moderates' and the latter tended to be more prominent in the Abolitionist cause. Anderson was a great admirer of the 16th century jurist George Buchanan and his *De Jure Regni apud Scotos* which advocated the right of resistance to tyranny. For a number of Scottish protestant evangelicals, spiritual slavery was associated with Catholicism.

³⁹ See Whyte, *Scotland and Abolition*, 50-57; Kathleen Holcomb, 'Thomas Reid and the Glasgow Literary Society' in Hook and Sher (eds.), *Glasgow Enlightenment*, 95-111 and Wood, 'Jolly Jack Phosphorous', 113.

⁴⁰ Wood, 'Jolly Jack Phosphorous', 120-23

⁴¹ Strathclyde University Archives, MS 48, 'An alphabetical catalogue of books belonging to John Anderson'. It recently was up for sale at Christies <https://www.christies.com/zh-cn/lot/lot-5327468>

⁴² Whyte, *Scotland and Abolition*, 74-78.

Anderson was also listed as a subscriber to the publication of the life of the African anti-slavery campaigner, Olaudah Equiano.⁴³ The Abolitionist cause gathered steam in the late 1780s and coincided at a time when Anderson was increasingly isolated at Glasgow University and was subject to formal sanctions until 1792 on account of his criticism of the running of the university and its finances.⁴⁴ This may help explain why Anderson was noted by his absence in the University's campaign against slavery.

With the exception of the former tobacco merchants, Alexander Oswald and Patrick Colquhoun, both of whom were by 1795 clearly identified as industrialists, the eighty-one Trustees named by Anderson in his Will and Legacy were largely free from direct association with slavery. This suggests that he did not move in social circles that had a strong connection with slavery. At this point it is worth mentioning David Dale, who was appointed as a Trustee and was also the author of an anti-slavery pamphlet.⁴⁵ That said, as a leader in the cotton-spinning industry, Dale made his fortune on a product that was dependent on raw material grown on West Indian plantations.

There is one remaining caveat regarding Anderson and his engagement with slavery that is surrounded by mystery. He was owed money by a certain Mr Humphries from Virginia and it was decided that legal action would be taken to pursue this debt.⁴⁶ It is not stated what the debt was for, nor how much money was involved, although the attempted recovery by legal means across the Atlantic means that it was a sum considered worth collecting. There is the possibility that Anderson was one of the many investors in the tobacco plantations in the era before the American War of Independence.⁴⁷ The issue of debt recovery with the newly created United States was a thorny diplomatic issue that was finally settled so that private debts could be pursued in the American courts, although more often than not, with little success. In the era before the American Revolution, investment in the slaving economy did not attract the same public opprobrium that it did in the latter part of the century.⁴⁸

The role of President of the University was a position that was elected by the nine members of the management team. The President was responsible for managing the business meetings and was in effect, the titular head of the Institution. Between its foundation and 1877, when Anderson's College was formally incorporated by an Act of Parliament, there were twenty-four presidential terms that comprised a variety of time periods lasting from one year to several, with certain individuals serving more than one term. Twenty individuals held the post in this period and of that total, eight held positions in, shares in, or associations with companies that had a clear connection with slavery and three had a very strong incidental relationship, illustrating the extensive permeation of links to slavery within Glaswegian civil society. **Four were enslavers while serving as President.** For the sake of clarity, each President and their term of office will be listed below.

⁴³ *The Interesting Narrative of the Life of Olaudah Equiano or Gustavus Vassa, the African*, (Edinburgh, 5th ed. 1792), 59. The Rev. Dr. John Gillies, John Monteith, John Pattison and David Dale were four trustees who also subscribed. We are grateful to Prof Ronald Crawford... for this information.

⁴⁴ Paul Wood, 'John Anderson, 1726-1796', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, <https://www.oxforddnb.com/display/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-481>

⁴⁵ David Dale, *Address to the Inhabitants of Glasgow, Paisley, and the neighbourhood concerning the African slave trade*, (Glasgow, 1791). One of the issues that illustrates the complexities and difficulties regarding this issue was that Dale was a cotton manufacturer who depended on enslaved grown cotton.

⁴⁶ Minute Book, 1796-99, 59-62.

⁴⁷ See Devine, 'Sources of Capital for Tobacco' which does cite the example of a university professor investing in a plantation.

⁴⁸ Article 4 of the Treaty of Paris 1783, Jonathan R. Dull, *A Diplomatic History of the American Revolution*, (Yale, 1985), 144-51.

- **1796-97:** Hugh Cross. A merchant engaged in the manufacture of goods – some may have been purchased for exchange in the trans-Atlantic trade – so at best an incidental connection. It appears that he went bankrupt in 1813.⁴⁹
- **1797-98 and 1805-06:** Alexander Oswald. Originally a tobacco merchant and then moved into sugar and cotton. He was also the nephew of the notorious Richard Oswald who was a London based Scottish slave trader. The Oswald family had an extensive network of business connections in trans-Atlantic trade. Sugar and tobacco were produced by enslaved workers and at this time most raw cotton came from the West Indies and was harvested on slave plantations. With his son, James, he moved more into the cotton industry. James campaigned for the ending of slavery in the early-nineteenth century. Clearly there is a strong connection with slavery.⁵⁰ <https://www.ucl.ac.uk/lbs/person/view/46072>
- **1798-1802:** William McNeil. West Indian Merchant with shares and investments in several companies.⁵¹ He was not on the original list of Trustees proposed by Anderson. Strong connection to slavery.
- **1802-03:** James Monteath. A surgeon with no known direct connections to slavery.
- **1803-05:** John Geddes. Owner of Verreville Glassworks, which were originally founded by Patrick Colquhoun in the mid-eighteenth century. Colquhoun was a tobacco merchant and the idea behind the glass works was to export to the American colonies. It went bust following the Revolution and Geddes was originally appointed as a manager to put the works back on its feet before he bought it over. No connection to slavery.
- **1806-07:** John Semple. An industrialist specialising in bleaching and dying in Finnieston. Died in 1810. No connections to slavery.⁵²
- **1807-09 and 1810-11:** William Anderson. Surgeon. No Connections to slavery.
- **1809-10:** Robert Austin. Horticulturalist. No connections to slavery
- **1810:** Joshua Heywood. Cotton industry and member of the Glasgow East India Association which was an organisation designed to promote free trade and end the East India Company's monopoly on Indian Trade. It also contained a lot of members from the West India Association who were connected to slavery.⁵³ Although there is no direct evidence of a personal connection to slavery, the raw cotton used at this time was grown on slave plantations in the West Indies and in keeping with best practice, his wealth and position are connected to the slaving economy.

⁴⁹ *Edinburgh Gazette*, 3rd March, 1813, 60.

⁵⁰ Devine, *Tobacco Lords*, 24-37.

⁵¹ Devine, 'Glasgow West India Merchants', 63.

⁵² George Stewart, *Curiosities of Glasgow Citizenship, as exhibited chiefly in the business career of its old commercial aristocracy*, (Glasgow, 1881) 236.

⁵³ Yukihisa Kumagai, *Provincial Manufacturers and Merchants' Campaigns for Access to the Asian Market, 1793-1833* chapter three 'Challenging the Commercial Giant: The Glasgow East India Association, 1812-1813', (Leiden, 2013), 33-73.

- **1811-1812:** James Cleland. Statistician, historian and superintendent of public works in Glasgow. No connections to slavery.
- **1812-1814:** John Hamilton. Merchant dealing in sugar and rum. Owner of several plantations in Jamaica.⁵⁴ Was Lord Provost of Glasgow and his sons became West Indian merchants. Died in 1829 age 73.⁵⁵ Clear connection with slavery. Member of Glasgow West India Association. <https://www.ucl.ac.uk/lbs/person/view/2146633009>
- **1814-1816:** John More, Glasgow agent of the Royal Bank of Scotland. No direct connections with slavery, but as Mullen points out, West Indian merchants were an important source of capital for banks in Glasgow.⁵⁶ Member of the Glasgow East India Association and part of the General Committee and given the overlap in membership between the East and West India Associations, it is safe to say that he moved in the same business circles as those advocating slavery. Went bankrupt in 1816.⁵⁷
- **1816-1819:** James Euing or Ewing of Strathleven.⁵⁸ A founder of the pro slavery Glasgow West India Association and owned plantations in Jamaica. He had a wide portfolio of interests and it would appear that his involvement with slavery led to his downfall as a Liberal MP for Glasgow. Strong connection with slavery.⁵⁹ Awarded in the region of £12,000 in compensation worth £1.16m (inflation), £10.7m (wages) and £53m (GDP) in 2021 prices. An extensive enslaver. <https://www.ucl.ac.uk/lbs/person/view/21020>
- **1820-24:** Walter Ferguson. Cotton merchant and manufacturer. Member of Glasgow East India Association. Given the connection between cotton and the slave plantations, there is a clear connection to slavery.
- **1824-30 and 1839-44:** James Andrew Anderson, Merchant and Banker. He was the nephew of John Anderson. His father was a Greenock merchant who had a plantation in Jamaica. He inherited the estate and claimed compensation when slavery was abolished. One of the executors of his fathers will was Colin Dunlop Donald, chair of the Glasgow pro-slavery society. He was awarded £1889 (£181k, £1.72m £7.93m in 2021 value). An enslaver. <https://www.ucl.ac.uk/lbs/person/view/22105/>
- **1830-39:** James Smith of Jordanhill. Merchant and rentier. There was a considerable effort to downplay Smith's connection to slavery as evidenced by his original Dictionary of National Biography that highlighted his scholarship in biblical and ancient nautical studies. He was also a significant benefactor of museums and other philanthropic endeavours. Smith was an active shareholder and participant in the plantation economy, and he was awarded a substantial

⁵⁴ <https://www.ucl.ac.uk/lbs/person/view/2146633009> and Anthony Cook, 'An Elite Revisited: Glasgow West India Merchants, 1783-1877', *Journal of Scottish Historical Studies*, 32, 2 (2013), 160-61

⁵⁵ Stewart, *Old Curiosities*, 252.

⁵⁶ Mullen, *Glasgow Sugar Aristocracy*, 271-74.

⁵⁷ *Edinburgh Gazette*, 2461, January 28th to 31st 1817, 1.

⁵⁸ Macintosh Mackay, *Memoir of James Ewing of Strathleven*, (Glasgow, 1866).

⁵⁹ Stephen Mullen, 'Ewing, James (1775-1853), West India merchant, slave owner and civic leader', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, (2016), <https://www.oxforddnb.com/display/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-53100?rskey=h0GPK0&result=16>

amount in compensation – some £13,000 (£1.25m, £11.9m, £54.6m) An enslaver.
<https://www.ucl.ac.uk/lbs/person/view/10469>

- **1844-58:** William Murray, Iron and Steel. No direct connections to slavery, although his father, Francis Murray, was an agent in West Indian trade and it would appear that this money was responsible for the founding of the Monkland Steel Company.
- **1858-65:** Walter Crum, Chemicals and Calico Printer. No direct connections to slavery although much of the textile and dyeing industries did have a bit of an overlap. He was a nephew of James Ewing and inherited a considerable sum from his uncle who was an extensive enslaver.
- **1865-68:** William Euing, Shipping Insurance broker. Given the fact that much of Glasgow's shipping was involved in the trans-Atlantic economy, there is a strong indirect connection in that Euing would have made money insuring ships transporting goods that had been harvested or produced by slaves. Indirect connection.
- **1868-77:** James Young, Shale Oil. No connections.

There are three observations that can be made regarding the Presidents of the Anderson University. Firstly, both John Butt and James Muir, in their respective studies of the historical development of the University, had a tendency to backwards project what Strathclyde would become onto its early years in terms of its close connections with industrialists. Although a number of significant figures in Scottish industrial history were Trustees, the fact of the matter is that they played little role in the management of the University. There were only a handful of industrialists who served as President and, with the exception of Walter Crum, most were relatively unknown.

The age of the industrialists only arrived with James Young in 1868 and perhaps the industrial and technological bias in self-perception of the Institution has blindsided us to the extensive role of the merchant community in the early history of the University. The widely held assumption that the development of the Scottish industrial economy was largely free from slave money was historical orthodoxy until comparatively recently and this notion is probably the reason why there was no *a priori* reason to assume that the University had connections to those involved with the slaving economies of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. The awarding of the Strathclyde University charter in 1964 has arguably obscured the point that the Institution is the eighth oldest in Britain and Ireland and was created at the high point of the British role in the Slave Trade.

This leads on to our second observation. Merchants were one part of one section of the nine classes that made up the Trustees, but account for six of the 20 Presidents: almost a third. In the first half century of the Institution's existence, merchant leadership accounts for thirty of those years. The wealthy elite had an aspiration towards civic leadership and their heavy presence in other civic forums, such as the Chamber of Commerce, the Trades House and the substantial number who became Lord Provost, is evidence of their growing dominance in the life of the City.⁶⁰ Their financial acumen, which was badly needed by a cash strapped University struggling with its first tentative footsteps in the world, would also make them a useful asset for the Institution.

Also, while there may have been some squeamishness around enslavement, there is no doubt that the wealthy elite associated with West Indies trade would provide considerable social cachet in the

⁶⁰ See Irene Maver, *Glasgow*, (Keele, 2000),

era when enslavement was legal to the newly established Institution. Furthermore, the world into which the new educational establishment emerged was a fairly precarious financial environment (two Presidents became bankrupt) and the fact that the merchants largely came from long-established businesses built over several generations gave them a profile and appearance of solidity that the newly emergent industrial sector could not yet match. In any case, the industrialists in the newly founded cotton mills, workshops and chemical factories would be heavily engaged in the day-to-day management required to get a new enterprise off the ground. The luxury of time in pursuit of the 'greater happiness of mankind' was not likely to have been a part of their business plans.

So, in many respects, the dominance of the merchant class might not be regarded as anything unusual in terms of the University leadership. What is less easy to explain is why one particular group of merchants who were members of the Glasgow West India Association exerted such a particular presence in the University in the era when the debate about the abolition of slavery in British colonies was at its height. This is the subject of our third observation.

Stephen Mullen has drawn attention recently to the lobbying activities of the Glasgow West India Association, and while not overturning the received wisdom that the anti-slavery sentiment of the citizens of Glasgow outweighed those who supported it, has shed more light on the way that the organisation operated.⁶¹ The money paid to the editor of the pro-slavery newspaper *The Glasgow Courier*, for example, shows that West Indian merchants were prepared to buy influence to further the slaving lobby interest.

Much of the strategy, which was held in common with other slaving interests across Britain, was based around the idea of 'amelioration' in which the living standards and experiences of slaves on the plantations could be improved and made better in the run up to eventual emancipation. In reality, this was designed to delay and stymie the process of abolition by claiming that premature liberation would lead to disruption, anarchy and civil disturbance in the colonies.⁶²

The Glasgow West India Association was formed in 1807 and consisted of twenty-nine institutional and sixty-three individual subscriptions, but the number involved in the run-of-the-mill business meetings was usually considerably smaller.⁶³ Yet, it was from such a small coterie that the Institution selected three of its four Presidents between 1816 and 1840 when the debate regarding amelioration and abolition was at its height. This looks suspiciously like it was part of a campaign and not a result of happenstance.

One reason why prominent figures within the West India Association might see Anderson's as an Institution worth cultivating was that it was a fairly easy target. According to the Minute Books, the number of Trustees present for the election of a new President was rarely half of the total eligible and sometimes could be as low as a quarter.⁶⁴ Given the financial pull of the merchants, it is not beyond the realms of possibility that this may have been a factor in influencing votes, especially with their extensive network of contacts. As a growing public institution with several thousand students and its connections to literary societies, it was clearly an organisation with the potential to shape opinion.

⁶¹ Stephen Mullen, 'Proslavery Collaborations Between British Outport and Metropole: The Rise of the Glasgow-West India Interest, 1775-1838', *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History*, (Jan 2023). Online version.

⁶² T. Burnard and Kit Candin, 'Sir John Gladstone and the Debate of the Amelioration of Slavery in the British West Indies in the 1820s', *Journal of British Studies*, vol. 57, 4 (2018), 760-82.

⁶³ Mullen, 'Proslavery Collaborations Between British Outport and Metropole'.

⁶⁴ Strathclyde University Archives, minute books OB1, OB5, OB3.

Also, the proletarian nature of Anderson's has been somewhat exaggerated as many of the ticket holders for the public lectures were drawn from the most solid bourgeois Glaswegian stock.⁶⁵ The ideal audience for the 'amelioration' message. Furthermore, Glasgow University was officially opposed to slavery and this view was reinforced by the professoriate which backed the Senate to sign a petition in support of Abolition.⁶⁶ That said, it was still happy to receive donations and bequests from enslavers.⁶⁷ Anderson's obsession with internal corruption left his own institution's professors pretty powerless and blindsided him to the idea that malign influences could come from the outside.

If the Glasgow West India Association was willing to use financial levers to secure newspaper support, then there would be no reason for it not to try and influence the City's other University. There is no evidence that an active policy of promoting 'amelioration' or pro-slavery sentiment was pushed by the Presidents or the university management, yet it may be that the intention was much more limited. It is worth remembering that Anderson's did not post or promote any anti-slavery petitions, which sets it at odds with many other Glaswegian institutions.

On the 14th of January 1833, a group of students, described as belonging to Glasgow University, held an anti-slavery meeting in Anderson's because a room had been denied to them at their own institution. What is worth noting is the appearance of a counter demonstration that was described as the 'sons and relations of West India planters' armed with sticks and prepared to disrupt proceedings, which they duly proceeded to do. They were led by Forbes Campbell, probably a relation of the aptly named Mungo Nutter Campbell who was a firebrand advocate of maintaining the slave system.

Anderson's janitor had his work cut out trying to keep order and although the pro-slavers were described as family of West Indian planters, this is unlikely as public brawling was not an activity that the social aspirant merchant class would engage in. A more likely explanation is that they were hired thugs. It not only disrupted the abolitionist meeting, but the constant barracking and the messages in them were duly reported in the press. So, claims that slavery was not contrary to God's Law, that Slaves were well treated and not abused, and that the Abolitionists statements were exaggerated found their way to a wider audience.⁶⁸ A more in-depth study may find further largely covert and subtle incidents of pushing the West India Association agenda, but it is beyond the scope of this study.

Finance

In the early nineteenth century there was very limited legal and financial regulation of public institutions like Anderson's. Before the advent of public limited liability, the Trustees were responsible for any infractions of the law and were liable for any debts.

Spread over 81 trustees there was reasonable security in numbers but as the nineteenth century advanced, there was creeping state regulation and the growth of law covering financial interactions, all of which led to increasing demands among the University's leaders for formal state recognition of the Institution through an act of parliament in 1877.⁶⁹ This, it was argued, would give the Institution greater legal protection which was important for endowments and donations, and it would also

⁶⁵ Letter to the *Morning Chronicle*, 7 September, 1822, Strathclyde University Archive, OB5, 1-2, Subscription Lists.

⁶⁶ Whyte, *Scotland and Abolition*.

⁶⁷ Stephen Mullen, 'British Universities and Transatlantic Slavery: the University of Glasgow Case, *History Workshop Journal*, vol. 91, 1(2021), 210-33.

⁶⁸ This report was based on the *York Herald*, 26 January 1833 showing just how far the story reached.

⁶⁹ The Anderson's College (Glasgow) Act, 1877.

provide Anderson's College, as it would be known, with a greater sense of identity and provide a clearer educational delineation with the University of Glasgow.

Central to this was a growing recognition of the importance of scientific education to the economy, much of it advocated by a former student, Lyon Playfair, who toured the European mainland following the Great Exhibition of 1851 to research his influential lectures on technical education.⁷⁰ There was also a form of mid-nineteenth century 'culture wars' in which the middle class challenged the aristocratic dominance of the roll call of national heroes by constructing their own pantheon in which 'men of science' and in particular inventors, were venerated as the embodiment of 'national virtues'. Needless to say, those values closely resembled their own with a heavy emphasis on hard work, meritocracy, talent and perseverance.⁷¹

One of the points made by Playfair and others was on the need for the state to provide funding for scientific and technical education and research through the universities and colleges. In the early and mid-nineteenth century, science or natural philosophy as it was known as at the time, was largely the preserve of the wealthy.⁷² Growing recognition of the importance of science and technology to the economic performance of the nation helped pave the way for the establishment of the Department of Science and Arts in 1853.⁷³ The increasing acceptance of the need for financial and legal frameworks in institutional government and the fundamental necessity of scientific and technical education to promote economic prosperity were two of the key factors that shaped the early development of the Institution.

The loose and unregulated world of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century meant that the financial management of the Institution was almost like an amalgam of a private members club in which the community largely regulated itself and a business in which the capitalisation of the organisation was undertaken by loans given by the trustees, but unlike a shareholder organisation, where ownership was determined by the volume of purchase and investment, the Trusteeship of the Institution meant that each member had one vote irrespective of how much they loaned or gave to the organisation.⁷⁴

Starting out with Anderson's scientific equipment, the acquisition of property and buildings meant that the Institution could build up its financial value, and as its financial value increased it meant that it had greater security available for bank loans. One of the potential attractions for investing in the University was property speculation because the value of buildings was always increasing. Alexander Oswald, who was a two-term President, was a former tobacco merchant who had a keen eye for property speculation.⁷⁵

In looking for connections with slavery we can identify three phases for our examination of the financial development of the Institution. The first phase might be described as the initial capitalisation

⁷⁰ See Jeffrey A. Auerbach, *The Great Exhibition of 1851: A Nation on Display*, (Yale, 1999) and for the wider cultural context see Ben Marsden and Crosbie Smith, *Engineering Empire: A Cultural History of Technology in Nineteenth Century Britain*, (Basingstoke, 2005).

⁷¹ See Christine MacLeod *Heroes of Invention: Technology, Liberalism and British Identity, 1750-1914*, (Cambridge, 2007) for the way in which inventors were celebrated as being vital to British economic success

⁷² The term 'scientist' only became popular in the later nineteenth century

⁷³ Thomas Weymss Reid, *Memoires and Correspondence of Lyon Playfair*, (London, 1900), 148-50 and Sir Lyon Playfair, *Glasgow Herald*, 21 Nov. 1884.

⁷⁴ Based on the notebooks held by Strathclyde University Archives. The Will left by Anderson says next to nothing on the financial management and regulation of the Institution.

⁷⁵ Butt, *John Anderson's Legacy*, 25-26.

of the Institution and was associated with getting things off the ground in the period from 1796 to 1820. In many respects, this is the most important phase because this was when the organisation was most vulnerable and it coincided with considerable economic turmoil associated with the Napoleonic Wars.⁷⁶

All future development was dependent on achieving a successful operational basis for subsequent expansion. The second phase concerns the acquisition of buildings and property required for a growing set of activities from around 1820 until about 1860. An expanding curriculum, with increasing numbers of student and the public education associated with collections displayed in the newly-built museum, demonstrated the increasing ambition and confidence of the Institution, but it was still plagued by financial uncertainty. The third phase deals with the period before 1877 and parliamentary incorporation and examines the growing maturity of Anderson's University and the evolution of a clearer educational strategy that would see a firmer steer towards a scientific and technical direction under the leadership of James Young.⁷⁷

One of the difficulties with accounting for the financial history of the early University is that the founders did not keep the records in any systematic order. After all, there was no need at that time to put them to an auditor. Proper recording of financial matters only really starts in 1832.⁷⁸ The day to day running costs, student fees, room rentals, private loans, bank loans, gifts and endowments are all interwoven into the financial fabric of the Institution and teasing these out to trace any connections with slavery is a complex process.

The safest and easiest method is to assume that any money given or loaned to the Institution that was associated with individuals who were known to have engaged with the slaving economies will be tainted. As will be discussed below, loans are especially problematic for two reasons. Firstly, they were a common financial interaction between Trustees, Managers and the Institution and there are difficulties in tracing when loans became donations and when they were consolidated into other loans for a third party such as a bank.⁷⁹ As will be discussed below, the sums involved were not that significant. Secondly, although an important part of the financial running of the Institution, loans are designed to be repaid and therefore any enslavement associated money coming in from loans would be paid out with interests and while it may leave a residue, that is not the same as an endowment or a gift in which it remains as a building block for subsequent growth and development.⁸⁰

The first significant item of expenditure was in 1798 when a building, 'the flesh market' in John's Street, was bought for £1,520 (£170k, £2.03m, £12.7m).⁸¹ This would give a physical reality to the idea of Anderson's University which had borrowed, begged and rented rooms before this. It brought to an end its transient existence. Twelve Trustees raised £2,000 (£224k, £2.87m, £16.6m) which was divided into 100 £20 shares that would pay dividends of no more than 5% per annum.

⁷⁶ On this period see David Cannadine, *Victorious Century; The United Kingdom, 1800-1906*, (London, 2018), 105-150.

⁷⁷ For Young's biography see the entry in the Dictionary of National Biography [https://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Dictionary_of_National_Biography,_1885-1900/Young,_James_\(1811-1883\)](https://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Dictionary_of_National_Biography,_1885-1900/Young,_James_(1811-1883))

⁷⁸ Strathclyde University Archive, GB 249 OB/5/1/7, Financial Statements, 1832-1880,

⁷⁹ Strathclyde University Archives, Financial Statements are fairly terse and while accounting for expenditure, income and donations in terms of amounts of money, give little supporting information.

⁸⁰ The loans are to be found in the two volumes of ledger books held at Strathclyde University Archives, GB 249 OB/5/4.

⁸¹ Minute book 198-205.

This would be calculated from the surplus that might accrue from the costs of renting out rooms to third parties and the differential between money raised from classes less salaries and professorial costs.⁸² Although the Institution made its first appointment of a professor, Thomas Garnett, at a salary of £200 per annum (£28k, £267k, £1.66m), it soon became apparent that this was beyond the Anderson's meagre means.⁸³ The method of charging professors for the use of teaching facilities which they paid out of the income collected from teaching fees became the main way to balance the budget and appoint staff. It also encouraged the professoriate to maximise numbers. From the minute book, it was clear that the shareholders owned the building and that the shares could be bought and sold provided it was to other Trustees. Should the property be sold in the future, the proceeds would go to the shareholders.

One oddity of this arrangement was that although it was stated that the building would be used for the purposes of the University, it would appear that a record of shareholders and sales would be kept by the group as their own private property without oversight from the Institute. The records do not appear to have survived and are not listed in the archives of the University of Strathclyde. In any case, the property was sold to the Institution in 1805 for £2,000 (£173k, £2.11m, £12.5m), by Alexander Oswald who was President at the time. Whether this was done in an individual capacity or as acting as head of a consortium is not clear.⁸⁴ In 1826, the building was sold for £5,000 (£477k, £4.67m, £26.2m) showing the value of property speculation.⁸⁵

We do, however, have the names of the original subscribers, which gives some indication of who the early financial backers of the Institution were. The names of William McNeil and Alexander Oswald are already familiar to us and both were Presidents and had connections to the slaving economies. McNeil was a West Indian merchant and Oswald was tobacco and sugar merchant, although he had joined forces with his son James, to move into textiles and had expressed opposition to slavery.⁸⁶ John Pattison and Robert Thomson were cotton manufacturers. Three were doctors, James Monteath, William Anderson and William Nimmo, none of whom appear to have had any connection to slavery.

John Geddes was the manager and subsequent owner of the Verreville Glass factory. William Gillespie was a Calico printer in Anderston and Alexander Allan was a shipping agent who would go on to form the first regular line between the Clyde and Montreal. John Semple was a bleacher at Finniestone and finally, there was Andrew Clarke who is described as a merchant but there is no information as to what the main source of his business activity was. So, out of the initial capitalisation, we can say that four of the twelve individuals had a connection to slavery but because the distribution of the shares was not recorded in the University archive, we cannot say with certainty what the proportion of the £2,000 was associated with Oswald, McNeil, Pattison and Thomson.

Based on the assumption that each of the twelve purchased a minimum of one share, statistically it must range from a minimum of £80 (4%) to a maximum of £1,840 (92%) with the median, in which it was dispersed equally among all the shareholders, at 33%. In the Institution's early history, this was the biggest financial outlay and although we cannot say with absolute certainty, it is unlikely that money sourced from slaving activities constituted the majority of funds. In any case, the property was not owned by the Institution until 1805 when it was bought by the Trustees. (see below)

⁸² *Ibid.*

⁸³ *Ibid.*, 170-72

⁸⁴ Minute book, 2, 154.

⁸⁵ Minute book 3, 271-81.

⁸⁶ Strathclyde University Archive, 'Subscription List', GB 249 OB 5/1/2

The Institution relied on gifts, donations and loans to cover what might be described as both start-up costs and running costs associated with keeping things going. The initial plan to pay its first professor, Thomas Garnett, an annual salary of £200 proved to be too ambitious and money soon ran out and he left in 1799. There was a need for cash flow to deal with upfront costs, especially as fee income came in dribs and drabs and the payment of room rentals was not always on time. In the financial year 1802/03, the Institution required something in the region of £250 per annum to deal with associated upfront costs and the issue of accumulated short-term loans from the Trustees. As John Butt points out, there was a high turnover of staff in the early days and this would not help with financial security.⁸⁷ The precarious nature of finances meant that there was a constant need for top-up funds. The Institution had debts and a sum of around £250 (£23.7k, £299k, £1.78m) was raised through loans and gifts to provide working capital and to consolidate the debt among the Trustees. As President, Alexander Oswald advocated a financial fresh start and provided a loan of £100 (£9.5k, £119k, £714k) and eight other managers contributed £80 (£7.6k, £99.9k, £571k). £20 (£1.9k, £23.9k, £143k) was loaned from other Trustees and donations to about £50 were gifted from right across the spectrum of the Institution's custodians.⁸⁸ Finance had an impact on educational strategy with Alexander Ure, who replaced George Birbeck as the professor of Natural Philosophy in 1804, advocating a focus on the wealthy citizens of Glasgow, rather than the artisans.⁸⁹

The selling of tickets that entitled the purchaser to attend the more prestigious lecture courses was one way to raise money. Fifty subscribers bought £1,000 (£95k, £1.19m, £7.14m) worth of tickets that were divided into 42 £20 lots that entitled the holders to attend two classes and six took out £40 which had double the entitlement. This would be used to buy the building from the original private consortium and the remaining £1,000 was raised by a bank loan that was supposed to be secured against the value of the property.

It later turned out that the loan was secured against the estate of a Miss Coulter, for whom Anderson had taken out a tontine, which was a form of investment designed to provide an income for as long as that person was alive. A tontine was usually taken out by several investors and as they all died off the remaining capital was divided amongst the survivors until none were left. The relationship with Miss Coulter to Anderson is not known and the arrangement whereby her estate could be used as security for a loan is equally opaque. There are no Coulters in the Legacy of Slavery database, although the Coulters were well-known tobacco merchants.

In addition to Alexander Oswald, there were a number of individuals who had direct and indirect connections to slavery, but this was not especially significant in the purchase of the property. Alexander's cousin, Richard bought one of the £40 tickets (not to be confused with his more infamous namesake), while McNeil purchased one for £20. Of the ticket holders that funded the £1,000 that ensured the Institution would own its own building we have the following information. Industrialists that had no connections to slavery formed the largest category and account for about half of all sales.

While there is difficulty in stating the exact percentage with precision, especially when it comes to merchants, but when the ministers and writers are eliminated, it is doubtful that more than ten per cent of ticket buyers had a connection to slavery. Also, this period appears to be before the influx of West India Association members that became prominent with the process of 'amelioration' between 1807 and 1834. The people that we identified with slavery connections in the earlier section of the report are absent at this time. Because the ticket sales constituted only half the total fund required to

⁸⁷ Butt, *John Anderson's Legacy*,

⁸⁸ Minute Book 3, 116.

⁸⁹ Butt, *John Anderson's Legacy*, 35.

purchase the building, it can be said with a fair degree of confidence that money accrued from slavery was not essential in the initial capitalisation of the Institution.

It is worth noting that the foundation coincided with a period of economic downturn in the aftermath of the Napoleonic Wars which meant that student numbers were prone to fluctuations which helps explain the somewhat haphazard nature of the Institution's finances.

The second phase of development centres around another period of building expansion between 1828 and 1831, when the rechristened 'University' took over the old grammar school in George Street. The existing building was considerably redeveloped with additional rooms and structures added on and it also included a museum for good measure. The chief movers in this development were the founder's nephew James Andrew Anderson, President 1824-30, and James Smith of Jordanhill, President, 1830-39 and, as we have already discussed, both were connected to slavery.

The old building in John Street was sold for £5,000, the grammar school was bought for £3,000, leaving a surplus of about £2,000. The cost for the extension was £4,700 and £800 for the museum. Rough and ready calculations suggest that there would be a shortfall for almost £4,000 and it was proposed that the University take out a loan of £3,500 to cover the shortfall. At the end of the day, a loan with the Bank of Scotland for £5,000 (£456k, £4.68m, £25.2m) at five percent interest per annum was taken out to cover the costs of the building expansion.⁹⁰

The museum was regarded as the focal point for the new building and Smith took an active part in its design and fitted in with the idea of doing something for the education of the public. Just as important as the building were its contents and the nature of the donations from Smith and James Ewing require further research as it is not clear whether these were gifts which then became the property of the University, or whether they were simply loaned for public display. Both Ewing and Smith are described in numerous sources as benefactors of the University and it may be the case that donations largely came in the form of materials for exhibition in the museum or bequests via trust funds held by Merchant House. In any case, most of the collections ended up with the Hunterian or at Glasgow University.

The most significant factor in the second phase of development was that with increased space and capacity there was a rise in the number of staff appointments and a corresponding increase in student numbers. A period of expanding student numbers in the 1830s and early 1840s was followed by a downturn in the economy which had an impact on numbers and income and after considerable financial turmoil, things began to improve in the mid- 1850s. Obviously this meant a rise in income and with balanced budgets. There was a period of financial stability that largely coincided with the period known as the mid-Victorian boom.

Whereas student numbers in the period up to 1830 hovered between 900 and 1,000 per session, by the mid-1850s, this had climber to around 2,500.⁹¹ Using John Butt's figures culled from the financial statements of the University in the archive, we can make a number of observations.

Between 1833 the University assets increased from £13,540 to £15,352 (£1.62m, £13.6m, £61.4m) in 1845. This was the collective value of the possessions of the Institution including buildings, museum collections, apparatus, and bequests and endowments. We have to be careful in accepting these figures because there is an inbuilt tendency to inflate assets to produce a more favourable balance sheet and a clear example of this can be seen in the claim that two fifths of the rental income of the

⁹⁰Strathclyde University Archives, B1/4 June 31-May 32.

⁹¹ But, *John Anderson's Legacy*, 51.

island of Shula was worth £1,000 which the University was given as a gift in 1844. The rental income was only £55 in 1833, so it was unlikely to make much difference to the University finances.⁹²

The liabilities were largely made up from bank loans and did not have the same accounting wriggle room as the assets because these were debts that were fixed and had to be repaid within a given time framework. Debt increased from £5,506 in 1833 to £6,822 (£726k, £6.2m, £29.1m) in 1844 and was clearly rising faster than assets and long-term this would be unsustainable. Indeed, by the 1840s, the University faced an acute financial crisis in that the Bank of Scotland was threatening to foreclose on its loan and sell off some of the Institution's property in order to redeem its money.

The University President, James Anderson, was able to use his connections in the banking world to postpone payment and eventually this led to an even bigger loan of £5,500 sourced over several banks for a period of seven years, but the interest was lower at 3% rather than the current 5%. By 1858, the debt had shrunk to £3,832, but this was largely because the Western Bank and the City of Glasgow Bank demanded payment of their loans ahead of schedule.⁹³ In terms of income generated, this increased from £287 in 1833 to £463 in 1845, while expenditure grew from £253 to £434 in the same period showing that margins were very tight with a surplus of less than £30 (£3.1k, £26.6k, £120k) to deal with unforeseen circumstances in the mid-1840s. Remember our point that small sums of money might be more important than appearance suggests.

The second phase of our financial examination coincides with the high point of slave activity in terms of individuals having a leading position in the University. It ties in with gifts and donations that had a slave provenance. William Euing gifted coins, pottery and Scottish medieval seals to the museum and would be counted among the Institution's assets for accounting purposes. The museum featured stuffed birds, fossils, minerals, historic medical equipment and other curios and had a detached existence in relation to the University's core functions, although some of its rooms were used by the medical school. The museum was open to the public and charged between two-and-a-half and one penny for admission. It also took donations.

The erratic nature of accounting means that we have to estimate the income raised by the museum which would probably work out at about £2,000 per annum in the mid-1840s (£1.2m, £18.7m, £83m). This sum is difficult to reconcile with other financial accounts cited earlier, so it may be that the museum had an independent financial existence from the University. The collections and buildings were valued at some £4,000 (£419k, £3.76m, £18.6m) in the mid-1830s and made up a considerable chunk of the University's assets. James Smith and James Anderson contributed to a fund of around £100 (£10.5k, £93.9k, £468k) to help the professors with the rental payment for their rooms and we have seen that subscriptions, private loans and ticket sales were part of the routine of fundraising.

This takes us to the crux of the issue in terms of trying to assess the significance of the impact of money associated with slavery. In terms of cash donations, we would struggle to get the figure beyond £200, the sum for private loans would be about the same and many, if not all would have been paid back, if we applied a very generous guesstimate to the gifts from Smith and Euing to the museum and say that it accounted for a tenth of its valuation in the 1830s (£400), that would bring a running total to around £800.

Also, Euing made his money as a shipping broker and the connection to slaving is incidental rather than direct. It is important to emphasise that the application of generous safety cushions to make sure

⁹² *Municipal Corporations (Scotland) Commission: Report of the City of Glasgow, Branch VII, Shuna Trust, (1835), 20-21*

⁹³ Butt, *John Butt's Legacy*, 67.

that money from slavery is not missed out, means that the calculation of £800 (£84.2k, £709k, £3.2m) for the period between the 1820s and the 1850s is a probable overestimate. As a proportion of the total value of the University assets it works out at no more than five percent and in this context, it appears fairly insignificant. When we take into account the narrow margins between income and expenditure, however, then it can be argued that these relatively small amounts were actually quite significant in terms of keeping the University going. As with most things, perspective is critical in making any kind of assessment.

Our third phase is, in many respects, the most important as the Institution moved beyond its fledgling steps into one that was both more mature and reflective of the University that we know today. A clearer sense of identity, growing student numbers and a desire to create formal legal and institutional structures that would be publicly recognised through the granting of a parliamentary charter in 1877 were all part and parcel of an ambitious strategy pushed by James 'Paraffin' Young, who was President between 1868 to 1877. Central to this vision was the aim to secure substantial endowments that would free the Institution from its hand to mouth existence and provide a stable and secure financial framework for going forward into the future. Chartered status which would confer legal recognition by the state would, it was believed, provide greater security and certainty for endowments and gifts.

This was also a period when the last of those who had made money from the slaving economies were coming to the end of their life and thoughts turned to legacy. James Ewing, President between 1816 and 1819, was a key figure in the creation of the Necropolis for the burial of the great and good of Glasgow.⁹⁴ One reason why there was not a significant amount of money donated from those associated with slavery can be explained by the idea of legacy in the sense that someone's name would live on long after their death.

Until the late 1850s, Anderson's was still a fledgling institution and had yet to put down deep roots and given that many of the wealthy presidents would know all too well the precarious nature of the Institution's finances, there was every chance that any legacy, like the University, might not survive. Whereas the amounts of money given as gifts and bequests was always dwarfed by the bank loans in the earlier period, the era of the Charter and Anderson's College would see hefty donations and endowments totalling thousands of pounds. By this time, legacies were more secure, but the number of living individuals who had made money from slaving activities were few.

Young believed that the absence of a charter was a problem for endowments because it meant that complex detailed legal instructions had to be left to ensure that the money was used as the donor intended. The hand to mouth existence of balancing the books by matching expenditure to income, while paying off bank loans was not conducive to a long-term strategy and Young was determined that the Institution needed a secure financial base upon which to build a future. This involved a two-prong plan of action.

Firstly, there was a need for endowments that would provide both stability and enable expansion. Secondly, the University needed a sharper sense of identity as to its role in the wider society and the economy. A replica of Glasgow University, which was largely Anderson's original plan, served no useful purpose in the changed circumstances of the mid-Victorian period and in any case, the steer toward a more technical and scientific institution was already happening as result of student demand; the wider economic environment; and the discussions based around establishing a University charter was one that would not antagonise the University of Glasgow.

⁹⁴ Ronnie Scott, *Death By Design: The True Story of the Glasgow Necropolis*, (Glasgow, 2005).

The charter was granted by Parliament in 1877 and the Institution changed its name to Anderson's College, removed the strait jackets on institutional management imposed by Anderson's will and provided the legal recognition of the College by parliamentary charter that would reassure potential benefactors. It was also tied into significant investment. Young had donated in excess of £10,000 (£1m, £5.18m, £18.6m) to endow the Chair of Technical Chemistry, William Euing (the shipping insurance magnate), donated £3,000 (£300k, £1.55m, £5.58m) and John Freeland (a retired merchant who lived in Nice) donated £3,500 (£351k, £1.81m, £6.51m)⁹⁵

Young had no connection to slavery and so his money was clean. As we have seen, as a shipping insurance broker during the era of the slave trade, Euing's money if not exactly pristine, had no direct connection to slavery. Freeland, who was a close associate of Young and a fervent supporter of the University and had made a number of donations over the years, is more problematic as he was described as a West Indian merchant.

John Freeland was a well-known philanthropist who made significant donations to good causes. Indeed, his charity is better remembered and recorded in the history books than his business activities.⁹⁶ He lived for quite a time in the West Indies and was a partner in Young and Freeland, which is not a particularly well known West Indian trading company and was certainly not one of the biggest ones. Also, it would appear that, even though he lived in the West Indies, he was not an enslaver as his name does not appear in the Legacies of Slavery Database. The value of his estate in Scotland was valued at just under £40,000, but the bulk of it, described as 'under £250,000' was in England.⁹⁷

All of which sort of begs the question as to why a relatively minor West Indian trader ends up with a sum of money that matches and surpasses many associated with the 'Sugar Aristocracy'. It may be the case that his money was augmented by inheritance as his father, uncle and brother were involved in textiles in the John Freeland Company. He also left considerable sums of company shares in banking and railways and it may be that he was a shrewd investor.

Finally, there is the question of timing. Most of the 'Sugar Aristocracy' had died off by the mid-century and being born in 1791, Freeland was in his early forties when slavery was abolished, meaning that he was involved at the tail-end of the phenomenon when all authorities agree that it was declining in terms of profitability. As will become apparent, the extent to which Freeland's fortune was based on slavery matters when it comes to his role in Anderson's University

Along with Young and Euing, Freeland was one of the largest benefactors of the University. He donated £2,000 for the Museum and helped out with accommodation for the Chemistry Department.⁹⁸ He gave £7,500 as a deed of trust in 1861 and in May 1873 he provided £2,000 for the Chair in Natural Philosophy. Finally, he left £5,000 in his will in 1878.⁹⁹ In 1883, the total assets of the Institution were worth £68,000 of which £20,000 were associated with Young's Chair of Chemistry.¹⁰⁰ Freeland donated a minimum of £15,000 (£1.5m, £7.77m, £27.9m) – there were other smaller handouts apart from the big donations – and this means that his income accounts for twenty two percent of the total; a significant sum by any reckoning.

⁹⁵ The text is reproduced in *Local and Personal Acts*, (HMSO, 1877), 174-83

⁹⁶ George Stewart, *Curiosities of Glasgow Citizenship: as exhibited chiefly in the business career or its old commercial aristocracy*, (Glasgow, 1881), 209-12.

⁹⁷ Cooke, 'An Elite Revisited', appendix.

⁹⁸ Minute book 4,

⁹⁹ Minute book 5, 258, 479-98.

¹⁰⁰ Butt, *John Anderson's Legacy*, 73.

Paradoxically, money from slavery was not especially significant when there were a lot of associations with those who were active in West Indian trade, but increased massively through Freeland's donations when there was little. More research needs to be done on Freeland's money to verify that it was largely made through his connections with the slaving economies of the Caribbean and as we have seen, there may be some doubts as to that. He donated £40,000 from his will to fund an extension of the Western Infirmary and although there is a mention of West Indian connections, nothing is said about slavery and he does not feature in Stephen Mullen's report for the city of Glasgow.¹⁰¹

Between 1877 and 1887, the gravitational pull to have a clearly defined educational institute dedicated to the promotion of technical and scientific studies led to the foundation of the Glasgow and West of Scotland College of Technology.

The new institution was the result of a merger of Anderson's College, the College of Science and Arts, which used to be known as the Mechanics Institute, Allan Glen's and Atkinson's institutions, both of which were charitable trusts for the education of working-class artisans founded in the mid-nineteenth century. None of these other educational organisations had any connections to money associated with slavery as they were largely working-class institutions and most were formed after slavery was abolished.

The embryonic form of the future University of Strathclyde was clearly visible and it would begin its evolution to the Royal Technical College in 1912 to the Royal College of Science and Technology in 1956 before achieving its current form in 1964. By the late nineteenth century, money from slavery had been dissipated, transformed and washed through the financial system to such an extent that it was largely untraceable. There were bequests such as the Buchanan Trust which kept a financial legacy from slavery intact. It was merged with another Trust associated with slavery set up by James Ewing to create the Merchants House (Buchanan and Ewing Bequests) in 1909 which would provide funds for educational institutions in Glasgow subject to approval of the Trustees. It had an annual budget of around £800 per annum of which Glasgow University received £250 which continued until the 1920s. Thereafter its value decreased.¹⁰²

We can assume that a similar amount went to the Glasgow and West of Scotland Technical College and if this was the case and based on the monies accrued to Glasgow University into the late twentieth century, the Ewing/Buchanan income in 2016 prices may have been £1.37m, £3.8m, £8.4m.¹⁰³ Further archival work is needed to verify these figures and there has to be an investigation into the numerous bequests and trusts which were established to help fund scholarships, prizes and provide aid to students. This will be a difficult, but worthwhile task because over time various funds and bequests have been merged and consolidated and will require forensic accounting skills to delineate the origins and development of such endowments. Although not fundamental to the financial development of the Institution, they nevertheless were a significant part of the student experience and wider university culture.

This is an important point that needs emphasised in that more often than not, it is the small sums of monies that have more of a presence in the day-to-day experience of both students and staff. After

¹⁰¹ On the Western see https://www.nhsggc.org.uk/media/232644/history_western_1874-2015.pdf and Stephen Mullen, *Glasgow, Slavery and Atlantic Commerce: An Audit of Historic Connections and Modern Legacies*, (Glasgow, 2022).

¹⁰² Stephen Mullen and Simon Newman, 'Slavery, Abolition and the University of Glasgow: Report and Recommendations of the University of Glasgow History of Slavery Steering Committee', (2018), 34-35.

¹⁰³ We are grateful to Stephen Mullen for these figures.

all, named prizes are made known to every student cohort. Although not directly comparable, to help provide some context of the wider financial picture, the Royal College building which opened in 1903 was the largest educational building complex in Europe and cost £180,000 (£20.6m, £72.8m, £217m) which was largely raised through donations and gifts, including one from Andrew Carnegie.¹⁰⁴

All institutions have a vested interest in stressing their longevity as the passage of time confers tradition, heritage and legitimacy. The test of time is the harshest evaluation that any organisation can undertake. Because of this we tend to imagine the history of an institution is like a snowball that rolls downhill and as it does, it becomes bigger as more and more material is wrapped around its foundational core. Yet, this analogy is problematic, especially in considering the relationship of Anderson's to the current University of Strathclyde. We may still see the values, ideals, and aspirations of the Scottish Enlightenment with its emphasis on rationality, improvement, cosmopolitanism, and ideals for the betterment of humanity, but it is also important to remember what has gone and, from an institutional perspective, died out.

Much of Anderson's Institution, University and College has gone and has no connection with the current university and roots die off, to be replaced by other ones. This is important in the context of money from slavery. As we have seen, the museum was the recipient of many donations and bequests, but the collections passed to other institutions and it is a branch of our history that no longer exists. The medical school constituted between a third and half of all Anderson activities.

Likewise, it has gone. The public lectures and the evening classes have largely disappeared. So, one thing to bear in mind, is that the antecedents of the University of Strathclyde do have a connection to slavery and slave money, but was that fundamental in shaping the institution of today?

Because so much of it was associated with activities that are no longer germane to the current university, the legacy of slavery to Strathclyde is largely a historic one. It nevertheless remains a regrettable one.

Acknowledgements

Research conducted by, and report authored, by Professor Richard Finlay, who holds the Chair of Scottish History, Department of Humanities, University of Strathclyde.

The author was supported by the Historical Links to Slavery Working Group chaired by Dr Stuart Fancey, University Secretary, and comprising: Professor Ian Rivers, Associate Principal and Executive Dean of the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences; Professor Churnjeet Mahn, Deputy Associate Principal; Professor Richard Findlay, Chair of Scottish History, Department of Humanities; Rachael Jones, Assistant Archivist; Yu-Chu Doong, Vice President Inclusion, Strath Union; and Stuart Forsyth, Corporate Communications Manager.

¹⁰⁴ Butt, *John Anderson's Legacy*, 103.



University of
Strathclyde
Glasgow

The University of Strathclyde is a charitable body,
registered in Scotland, with registration number SC015263