



Nottingham Trent
University

Dr Lewis Darwen,
Dr Andrew Gritt, Head of History, Heritage and Global Cultures

Nottingham Trent University and Links to Historical Slavery

Version: 1
Date: July 2023

Version: 01
Date: 07/23

Details:

Introduction

This report supplements the extensive report written by Dr James Dawkins, *Nottingham's Universities and Historical Slavery*. Dr Dawkins' report was principally focussed on the progenitor institutions of the University of Nottingham and although this includes institutions that are also part of NTU's history, it omits the Nottingham Government School of Design (NGSD), established in 1843, and the institution that was the foundation of NTU.

This report, therefore, complements Dawkin's report by focusing predominantly on the Nottingham Government School of Design's main benefactors from its inception in 1843 through to the construction of the Waverley Building (which became the school's main site) in 1865. Drawing mainly on reports and other information from Nottingham's newspapers, trade directories, and the UCL Slavery Database, the report considers the early history of the school and its principal sources of funding. Donor lists can be found at the end of the report.

Findings

During the period under analysis the Nottingham Government School of Design and its successor institution the School of Art were financed by a combination of annual government grants, annual public subscriptions, and student fees. The institution also relied from time to time on donations from local benefactors for specific purposes. This is entirely typical of the period with many educational and other institutions being dependent upon the philanthropy of industrialists, bankers, and other professionals and tradespeople. In the case of NGSD, many of the annual subscribers and donors were prominent individuals and businesses involved in Nottingham's banking, textiles and legal sectors. The majority were lace manufacturers, but the largest individual donations were from the banking sector.

The pattern of donations appears to represent a contrast with later donations to University College Nottingham. For the NGSD, the vast majority of donations were under £20 (equivalent to around £2,500 at 2021 prices) with a large number of small donations from lace manufacturers forming the majority of the donations. What we cannot research is the provenance, value or ultimate destination of works of art that were donated. These are referred to in contemporary reports, but details are very sparse and their survival is uncertain.

A significant proportion of the subscriber base came from the lace manufacturing interest. The research conducted has not revealed any of these donors to have directly invested in slavery: none appear to have had a financial interest in slave plantations and none appear to have owned slaves. However, it is undeniable that there was an indirect financial benefit as slavery reduced the labour costs associated with cotton production. Although the archival base does not allow detailed analysis of the source of cotton used in the Nottingham textiles trades given the aggregation processes at British ports and markets prior to internal marketing and transport, it is worth noting that the majority of cotton imported into the UK up to 1865 came from countries that made extensive use of enslaved Africans, most notably the USA and Brazil, which

countries made extensive use of enslaved Africans until 1865 and 1888 respectfully.¹ Although alternative sources of raw cotton were sought during the nineteenth century, particularly in India/south Asia and Egypt and the middle East, it was widely regarded that cotton from these regions was of inferior quality and trade here was dwarfed by the Atlantic trade routes.

Perhaps more significantly, the School of Design/Art benefitted on two occasions from large individual donations (totalling £120) from the major banking firm S. Smith and Co. The London branch of this banking firm, under the name Smith, Payne and Smith, owned slave plantations in Jamaica in the late eighteenth century and lent money to slaveowners. Several people involved with Smith and Co in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries appear in the UCL Slavery database.²

However, it is worth noting that Nottingham also had an Anti Slavery Association in the early decades of the nineteenth century that was part of the national abolitionist movement. Again, the archival base for the Nottingham Anti Slavery Association is very limited and it is not clear how active it was. Searches of a variety of indexes and catalogues as well as digitised newspapers and Parliamentary Papers have revealed very little regarding the activities of this organisation. However, one of the key individuals of this Association locally was Samuel Fox, 1781-1868. Samuel was a Quaker, a philanthropist, an abolitionist and a long-term supporter of education. Fox was active nationally and attended a meeting at Exeter Hall in London in 1833 at a time of intense debate about slavery in the British empire. Following this meeting he became one of the signatories to a memorial requesting a national group of abolitionists be permitted to meet with the Whig Colonial Minister.

In addition to this Anti-Slavery work he was also a supporter of local philanthropic and educational initiatives in Nottingham for over 50 years. He helped found the first free school for adults in Britain in 1798.³ In 1850, he donated £10 (equivalent real cost in 2023 £1,394) to the NGSD.⁴ In 1852, when he was pledging money to support the Nottingham Artizans' [sic] Library, it was reported that he had a "kindly disposition to encourage all societies of a useful and educational character".⁵ In 1853 he donated land for the planned Midland Institution for the Blind and it was reported that he was "well known for the generous and munificent support he gives to every true charitable and philanthropic object".⁶

Historical background to the founding of the NGSD

Concerns about the standard of art and design in British textile manufacturing prompted the government, following a Select Committee report in 1836, to establish

¹ It is possible that scientific analysis of the samples in the Nottingham Lace Archive could reveal the geographical origin of the cotton and thus help fill a gap in the archival record.

² Further details on S. Smith and Co. can be found in a discrete section below.

³ J. W. Rowntree, H. B. Binns, *A History of the Adult School Movement*, 1903.

⁴ Real cost is based on the comparing the donation to a cost index of all output in the economy based on GDP. See "Five Ways to Compute the Relative Value of a UK Pound Amount, 1270 to Present," MeasuringWorth, 2023.

⁵ "Nottingham Artizan's Library, *Nottingham Guardian*, 17 June 1852.

⁶ "Midland Institution for the Blind", *Nottingham Guardian*, 12 August 1852.

schools of design in London and selected industrial towns and cities of England and Scotland.⁷ Due largely to the importance of its staple industry, lace, Nottingham was one of the successful applicants. Thus, the Nottingham Government School of Design (NGSD) was opened in 1843.⁸ The NGSD was funded by three sources: an annual government grant, initially guaranteed for 3 years, of £150 per annum (c. £19,380 at 2021 prices); public subscriptions; and student fees. Nottingham's application to be one of the chosen sites included a pledge to raise £150 through public subscriptions annually, matching the government grant. An initial subscription of £90 was raised at a meeting of interested parties in Nottingham in October 1842.⁹ In December 1842 the school's first committee was formed, and the following month its members selected a building on Beck Lane as a temporary location for the school.¹⁰ The NGSD opened its doors to students in March 1843. In 1845, the Committee decided to purchase and extend the Beck Lane building in order to increase the intake of students and place the institution on a more stable, permanent footing.¹¹ The building was purchased on security for £1,900 at an interest rate of 4.5 per cent (c. £239,600 at 2021 prices), with the proviso that at the end of five years they could give up the building and have the money returned. The Committee also spent £600 enlarging the building, £350 of which was covered by public donations (c. £75,000/£44,000 at 2021 prices).

In *A History of Nottingham School of Design*, Jones writes that:

The lists of the early supporters, sponsors and subscribers to the School feature many well-known names from Nottingham's industrial and civic history: Birkin, Jacoby, Morley, Wakefield, Mundella, Adams, Steegman and Heymann are but a sample. They gave generously to the School in its early days, digging deep into their purses, and donating gifts of works of art and much needed volumes for the non-existent library. In some cases, support for the School passed down through generations of the same family, such was the interest in the School's survival.¹²

While all this is true, throughout its early history the NGSD struggled to raise adequate subscriptions, and rarely got near meeting the £150 promised in 1842 (Table 1). The annual meetings of subscribers and friends of the school were usually poorly attended, and the apparent absence of interest in the school among many of Nottingham's textile manufacturers was frequently commented on. Based on trade directory lists, only a very small fraction of Nottingham's extensive lace manufacturing interest ever donated to the school. As such, the school was in a poor financial condition during the 1840s and early 1850s, its survival never assured. The purchase of the Beck Lane building in 1845 had left the NGSD Committee with a debt of £250 (2021 equivalent c. £31,500), and the institution's precarious financial situation prompted concerted efforts

⁷ BPP, *Report from the Select Committee on arts and their connection with manufacturers; with the minutes of evidence*, vol.9, 568 (1836), pp.iii-xi.

⁸ Nottingham was chosen as one of the successful bidders in mid-1842. The first NGSD committee was formed in December 1842: *Nottingham Review*, 9th December 1842. The other schools included Somerset House (London), 1837; Manchester, 1838; York, 1842; Sheffield, 1843; Birmingham, 1843; Coventry, 1843; Glasgow, 1845; Norwich, 1845.

⁹ *Nottingham and Newark Mercury*, 28th October, 1842. Unfortunately, the report on the meeting does not show who provided subscriptions. It is likely that most, if not all, of the 52 attendees did. They included prominent lace manufacturers, bankers, clergymen and legal professionals.

¹⁰ *Nottingham and Newark Mercury*, 2nd December, 1842.

¹¹ *Nottingham Review*, 12th April 1844.

¹² C. Jones, *A History of Nottingham School of Design* (1993), p.14.

by Committee members to gain new subscribers in 1850. Subscriptions increased over the next few years but still failed to reach £150, and declined again in the early 1850s after an initial boost. In 1850, the five-year security period on the Beck Lane building ended, and the Committee decided to take the building on a low-interest mortgage. They also managed to raise almost £500 (c. £70,000 at 2021 prices) in donations to clear the existing debt and towards other costs (a full list of the 1850 donors is featured in table 3).

Table 1: Nottingham Government School of Design subscription income, 1844-53

Year	Subscriptions (£)	2021 Real cost (£)
1844	149	19,020
1845	97	12,230
1846	91	11,620
1847	85	10,120
1848	84	10,850
1849	74	9,679
1850	120	16,730
1853	104	13,440

Source: Nottingham and Newark Mercury, 22nd February 1850; Nottinghamshire Guardian, 20th October 1853. "Five Ways to Compute the Relative Value of a UK Pound Amount, 1270 to Present," MeasuringWorth, 2023

The school's main source of income was the government grant, which was increased to £450 (c. £55,000 at 2021 prices) in the early 1850s (Table 2). However, the grant was only to cover the salaries of the teachers and the supplying of casts and other technical equipment. It was not to cover the general expenses. Moreover, the government grant was reduced back to £150 in 1854, which only covered the cost of the headmaster's salary and one pupil teacher. The Committee could not afford to employ more teachers, nor did they have the funds to purchase equipment and other necessary resources for the students. Public donations of books and works of art meant the school managed to get by. The school's sustainability was also aided by its relocation to Plumtre House in 1852, which had been offered for use free of charge by the local textile manufacturer Fisher and Co. The use of Plumtre House allowed the school to accrue income from the lease of the Beck Lane site. According to Francis Braithwaite, a member of the NGSD Committee, the school's funds were so limited in the early 1850s that had it not been for Fisher and Co offering the building 'they would have been very hardly placed to find a sufficient rental – in fact they could not have done it for a building commodious enough.'¹³

Table 2: Nottingham School of Design Accounts, year ending March 1853

	Income/expenditure £	2021 Real cost £
Student fees	143	18,480
Subscribers	104	13,440

¹³ Nottingham Journal, 23rd November, 1855.

Parliamentary grant	450	58,140
Rent of property	34	4,393
Total income	732	94,580
Expenditure	717	92,640

Source: *Nottinghamshire Guardian*, 20th October 1853

Plumtre House was only a temporary location, and the Committee members resolved in 1854 to purchase or construct a building of their own. The Nottingham Council agreed to sell three roods of land near Waverley Street to the School of Art for £100 'for the purpose of erecting a building thereon to be used for such school'.¹⁴ This would, ultimately, lead to the construction of the Waverley Building. However, for financial and other reasons it was not until the early 1860s that construction of the building began. In the meantime, the school (now known as the School of Art) relocated temporarily to a nearby warehouse in Commerce Square in 1858 (Plumtre House was demolished in 1860 to make space for warehouses).¹⁵ A major factor in the decision to go ahead with the construction of Waverley Building was the Committee of Council of Education agreeing to contribute 25 per cent to the costs. In 1860, Committee members of the School of Art requested public donations towards the building's estimated cost of £4,000 (£504,400 real cost at 2021 prices). Many prominent Nottinghamshire businesses provided very considerable contributions, including a donation of £100 from the banking firm S. Smith and Co (a full list of donors in 1860 can be found in Table 4). Construction on the Waverley building began in 1863 and was completed in 1865.

Donor lists

A full list of the School of Design's annual subscribers and donors during the period under analysis has not been discovered during the research. This incomplete archival record is not unusual although it is possible that such lists might appear in the school's minute books and other unpublished records, held by Nottinghamshire Archives.¹⁶ A partial list from 1850 shows that most subscribers provided relatively small sums of just over £1, and this was probably true of the subscriber base more broadly (Table 5). Of greater importance to the development of the school were the large sums donated for specific purposes by major Nottinghamshire firms, particularly in relation to the construction of the Waverly building which was partially funded by public donations of over £1,400 (£176,600 at 2021 prices). Donor lists from 1850 and 1860 provide the basis for some analysis of the source of funding for the Nottingham School or Art.

It has not been possible for reasons of time to explore the potential links to slavery of all the donors. However, cross checking with the UCL Slavery Database reveals no

¹⁴ There were some objections to this among the councillors, as the land was thought to be worth much more than its sale price. One councillor suggested that they could have sold the land for over £1,000.

¹⁵ The government schools of design were renamed schools of 'art' in the early 1850s.

¹⁶ DD/SA/1/1, Administrative and financial records; DD/SA/1/1/2, Committee minutes; DD/SA/1/1/5, Cash book. It is not clear if all these records cover the early years of the institution, but the file as a whole covers 1843-1888.

significant direct links between the benefactors of the NGSD and Transatlantic slavery other than the Smith and Co bank. A short biography of the banking firm S. Smith and Co. (below) demonstrates that the business had undeniable historic links to transatlantic slavery. This is potentially significant, as the bank provided cumulative donations of £120 to the school between 1850 and 1860 (c. £14,000 at 2021 prices). Many of the other donors were prominent lace manufacturers, some of whom provided donations of between £20 and £50 (c. £2,400 to £6,000 at 2021 prices). These businesses, by working with material imported from areas where slaves worked on cotton plantations, were indirect beneficiaries of enslaved labour.

The Duke of Newcastle (known as the Earl of Lincoln up to 1851) was the President of the school, and had some influence on Nottingham being one of the towns selected by the government in 1843.¹⁷ It's is not clear if he donated financially to the school (he does not appear in any of the donor lists), but he remained an important figurehead of the institution and laid the foundation stone of the Waverley building in 1863.¹⁸ The Duke of Newcastle was a member of the Canterbury Association, a group of MPs, peers and Anglican church leaders whose aim was to establish a Colony on New Zealand. Following this role he was appointed Secretary of State for the Colonies from 1852-4 . According to Dawkins' draft report, the Duke of Newcastle had ties to the transatlantic slave economy (p.67), although it is not clearly how far those connections went.

Biography of S. Smith and Co.

Business: Banking

Donations: £20 in 1850 / £100 in 1860.

S. Smith and Co. was a major Nottinghamshire banking firm which unequivocally had historic links to transatlantic slavery. The firm traces its origins to Thomas Smith (1631-91), who founded a small independent bank in Nottingham in the 1660s. Little is known about the early years of the operation, but it appears to have remained a local bank until its expansion by Abel Smith (1717-88), Thomas' grandson, in the second half of the eighteenth century. Abel founded the London bank of Smith and Payne in 1758, and banks at Lincoln (1775) and Hull (1784). The Nottingham and London banks were managed by the same partnership. In 1807 the Nottingham bank became known as Samuel Smith and Co. The bank lent money to slave owners in the eighteenth century, and more significantly the London branch of Smith, Payne & Smith came to own several Jamaican estates in the late eighteenth century and retained them until the abolition of slavery in the British West Indies in 1833. Several of the Nottingham Smith's, some of whom served as MPs for Nottingham, are listed on the Legacies of British Slavery website.¹⁹ The following notes are provided by the website:

¹⁷ *Nottingham Review*, 30th September, 1842.

¹⁸ *Nottinghamshire Guardian*, 23rd October, 1863.

¹⁹ This link directs to the London branch of Smith, Payne and Smith: [Details of Firm | Legacies of British Slavery \(ucl.ac.uk\)](#). Robert Mellor's book, *Men of Nottingham and Nottinghamshire* (1924) had further details on this family (beginning on p.79).

A major lender to Manning & Anderdon and through the latter's failure a very prominent firm in the compensation process. The bank had also been entangled earlier in lending to slave-owners, and owned The Farm in Jamaica at least between 1789 and 1791 and probably until 1798; lent against the estates and enslaved people on Holland, Fish River and Petersville plantations in Jamaica in 1824, buying additional enslaved people with co-mortgagees for Holland in 1830; and were mortgagees on Friends estate in British Guiana.

From RBS's own research: "In 1824, six partners of Smith, Payne & Smiths, established 1758, provided a loan of £5,000 (later increased to £15,000) as part of a consortium which lent £40,000 on a mortgage of the Holland, Fish River and Petersville sugar plantations, Jamaica, in 1824. They provided a further £3,750 as part of a consortium which lent £10,000 on a mortgage of the Holland plantation in 1829. As a result of an 'amicable' Jamaican High Court of Chancery case, the bank became part-owners (by purchase in 1836) with the other mortgagees of the Holland estate in order to realise the monies owed to them, at the same time relinquishing their interest in the Fish River and Petersville plantations. Additionally, in 1830, in order to maximise the income of the plantation to help repay part of the debt owed to them they part-financed (in partnership with the other lenders) the purchase of additional slaves to work on the plantation. In 1836, under the Act for the Abolition of Slavery 1833, the bank received its share (3/8) of the compensation for the 406 slaves on the Holland plantation."

For reference, £5,000 in 1824 is worth around £514,000 at 2021 prices.

Lists of donors and subscribers in 1850 and 1860

The following lists feature individuals known to have donated to the school up to 1865. Table 3 features those who donated to help the school purchase the Beck Lane building in 1850. Table 4 features those who provided donations towards the construction of the Waverley Building in 1860. Table 5 is a partial list of subscribers in 1850. Trade directories have been used to determine the professions of those in the lists. There are many gaps where it has not been possible to find out an individual's profession. This is usually because several people in the directories had the same name.

Table 3a: Donors for the school, 1850

Name	Profession	£	s	D
I and I C Wright and Co	Banking	20	0	0
S. Smith and Co	Banking	20	0	0
Ball, Duncliffe and Co	Lace manufacturer	10	0	0
Richard Birkin (Mayor)	Lace manufacturer	10	10	0
Bradley and Son	Lace manufacturer	10	0	0
C. H. Clarke	Solicitor	10	0	0
William Cripps	Lace merchant	10	0	0
William Enfield	Solicitor	10	0	0

Thomas Fisher	Unknown	10	0	0
Samuel Fox	Unknown	10	0	0
F. B. Gill and Co.	Silk Merchant	10	0	0
Gill and Wright	Silk throwsters	10	0	0
Thomas F. Gimson	Lace manufacturer	10	0	0
Groucock, Copestake & Moore	Lace manufacturer	10	0	0
William Hannay	Solicitor	10	0	0
John Hadden	Lace manufacturer	10	0	0
John Heard	Unknown	10	0	0
Lewis Heymann	Lace manufacturer	10	0	0
Thomas Herbert	Lace manufacturer	10	0	0
William Hurst	Unknown	10	0	0
Arthur Morley	Hosiery manufacturer	10	0	0
Thomas Moore	Unknown	10	0	0
Charles Paget MP	Member of Parliament	10	0	0
George Rawson	Unknown	10	0	0
Fred Robinson	Lace manufacturer	10	0	0
John Thackeray	Lace manufacturer	10	0	0
R G Walker and S	Unknown	10	0	0
John Wild	Lace manufacturer	10	0	0
Henry Youle	Unknown	10	0	0
Ed Steegmann	Lace manufacturer	5	0	0
James Fothergill	Unknown	5	0	0
John Birkhead	Unknown	5	0	0
J and C Thornton	Lace manufacturer	5	0	0
Baillon Brothers	Lace manufacturer	5	0	0
Carver and Son	Unknown	5	0	0
William Cartledge	Merchant	5	0	0
G B Yates	Lace manufacturer	5	0	0
John Hardy	Lace manufacturer	5	5	0
James Hardy	Lace manufacturer	5	5	0
Richard Hardy	Lace manufacturer	5	0	0
Adams, Page and Cullen	Lace manufacturer	5	0	0
Bacon and Lewin	Lace manufacturer	5	0	0
Hill and Swanwick	Unknown	5	0	0
Thomas Close	Unknown	5	0	0
Hudson and Bottom	Lace manufacturer	5	0	0
Henry Mallett	Lace manufacturer	5	0	0
Manlove and Alliott	Lace manufacturer	5	0	0
T Keeley and Son	Unknown	5	0	0
John Cropper	Lace manufacturer	5	0	0
Percy and Smith	Unknown	5	0	0
Thomas Oliver	Lace manufacturer	5	0	0
Jon Reckless	Lace manufacturer	5	0	0
William Brooker	Unknown	5	0	0

James Roe	Unknown	5	0	0
Thomas Windley	Lace manufacturer	5	0	0
Mr Smith (Hounds Gate)	Unknown	5	0	0
Thomas Hopkins	Unknown	3	0	0
Page and Wright	Unknown	3	0	0
Felkin and Vickers	Unknown	3	0	0
Liberty and Tomlinson	Lace manufacturer	2	2	0
Adolphus Marx	Unknown	2	2	0
S. W. Moore	Lace manufacturer	2	2	0
Thomas Bishop	Unknown	2	2	0
T. Roberts and Son	Lace manufacturer	2	2	0
George Berrey jun	Lace manufacturer	2	0	0
William Galloway	Unknown	2	2	0
Mr Swann	Unknown	2	0	0
Francis Hart	Unknown	2	2	0
William Hill	Unknown	2	0	0
Hovey and King	Unknown	2	2	0
Jacoby and Co	Lace manufacturer	2	0	0
Richard Kendall	Lace manufacturer	1	0	0
William Patterson	Unknown	1	0	0
James Jerram	Unknown	1	0	0
T Peet	Lace manufacturer	1	1	0
Robert Cooke	Unknown	1	0	0
Timothy Chouler	Unknown	1	0	0
William Shaw	Unknown	1	0	0
Joseph Smith	Unknown	1	0	0
Barnett and Matlby	Lace manufacturer	1	1	0
J and G Trueman	Lace manufacturer	1	0	0
Francis Wellford	Unknown	1	0	0
Hy Cartwright	Unknown	0	10	0
H Cheetham	Lace manufacturer	0	10	0
Mr Bircumshaw	Lace manufacturer	0	10	0
Thomas Finn	Unknown	0	10	6
John Black	Unknown	0	10	0
Jalland	Unknown	0	10	6
		489	98	12

Source: *Nottinghamshire Guardian*, 4th April, 1850.

Table 3b: distribution of donations by amount, frequency and value, 1850

<i>Amount</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>Proportion of Total Value</i>
Less than			
£5	32	£47.95	9.7%
£5	27	£135	27.4%
£10	27	£270	54.8%

£20	2	£40	8.1%
Total	88	£492.95	

Table 3c: Note on values.

1850 value (£)	2021 value (£)
20	2,788
10	1,394
5	697
1	139

See appendix for notes on values

Table 4a: Donors for the construction of the Waverley building (1860)

Name	Profession	£	S	P
S. Smith and Co.	Banking	100	0	0
I and I C Wright	Banking	50	0	0
Heymann and Alexander	Lace manufacturer	50	0	0
Cope and Ward	Lace manufacturer	50	0	0
Benjamin Walker	Lace manufacturer	50	0	0
Charles Paget MP	Member of Parliament	50	0	0
John Walter MP	MP and newspaper publisher	50	0	0
J and H Hadden	Lace manufacturer	30	0	0
John Bradley	Thread manufacturer	30	0	0
T. Herbert	Lace manufacturer	30	0	0
Fred Robinson	Lace manufacturer	30	0	0
George Simons	Paper manufacturer	25	0	0
Wild and Bradbury	Lace manufacturer	25	0	0
T Adams and Co	Lace manufacturer	25	0	0
Boden and Co	Lace manufacturer	25	0	0
J Burton (deceased)	Lace manufacturer	25	0	0
Copestake, Moore and Co	Lace manufacturer	25	0	0
F[rancis] B[utcher] Gill	Silk merchant	21	0	0
Barnett and Maltby	Lace manufacturer	20	0	0
Reckless and Hickling	Lace manufacturer	20	0	0
Stegmann and Co	Lace manufacturer	20	0	0
Jacoby and Berenhart	Lace manufacturer	20	0	0
J and C Thornton	Lace manufacturer	20	0	0
J and W Lambert	Lace dressers	20	0	0
F Braithwaite	Hosiery manufacturer	20	0	0
W Hanney	Gentleman	20	0	0
William Enfield	Solicitor	20	0	0
Richard Hardy	Lace manufacturer	20	0	0
M Marx (deceased)	Lace manufacturer	20	0	0
R Birkin	Lace manufacturer	20	0	0

W Wright	[Surgeon?]	20	0	0
T F Gimson	Lace manufacturer	20	0	0
Edmund Hart	Lace manufacturer	20	0	0
J F Bottom	Lace dresser	20	0	0
W Cartledge (deceased)	Merchant	20	0	0
T Ball	Lace manufacturer	20	0	0
J L Thackeray	Lace manufacturer	20	0	0
H Mallett	Lace manufacturer	20	0	0
E Patchitt	Solicitor	10	10	0
W Hollins	Silk manufacturer	10	10	0
Thomas Riste	[Bricklayer?]	10	10	0
A Morley (deceased)	Hosiery manufacturer	10	10	0
George Berrey	Lace manufacturer	10	10	0
James Hardy	Lace manufacturer	10	10	0
George Liberty	Lace manufacturer	10	10	0
James Hartshorn	Lace manufacturer	10	10	0
John Hardy	Lace manufacturer	10	10	0
Ashwell and Wallis	Hosiery manufacturer	10	10	0
Maillot and Oldknow	Lace manufacturer	10	10	0
R and T Birkin	Lace manufacturer	10	10	0
Kulp and Son	Lace manufacturer	10	0	0
Lottimer and Co	Merchants	10	0	0
Hamell and Lockwood	Lace manufacturer	10	0	0
Simon, May and Co	Lace manufacturer	10	0	0
T Ellis	Unknown	10	0	0
A Wells	Solicitor	10	0	0
John Webster	Lace dresser	10	0	0
W Hill	Lace manufacturer	10	0	0
W Gregory	Unknown	10	0	0
S Adams	Lace manufacturer	10	0	0
W Vickers, jun	Lace manufacturer	10	0	0
J and G Trueman	Lace manufacturer	10	0	0
T Simpson	Unknown	10	0	0
W Williamson	Unknown	6	0	0
W Page	Unknown	5	5	0
Francis Bush	Unknown	5	5	0
W Parsons	Unknown	5	5	0
James Roe	Unknown	5	5	0
C Redfern	Unknown	5	5	0
E R Dunn	Unknown	5	5	0
Shaw and Sons	Unknown	5	5	0
Pratt Hurst and Minnitt	Unknown	5	5	0
Copeland and Chapman	Unknown	5	5	0
T Roe and Son	Unknown	5	5	0
Hopcroft and Co	Unknown	5	5	0
J Dobson and Son	Unknown	5	0	0

T Shaw	Unknown	5	0	0
R Biddle	Unknown	5	0	0
W Hill	Unknown	2	2	0
J Fletcher	Unknown	2	2	0
G Duclose	Unknown	2	2	0
		£1,423	181	

Source: *Nottingham Journal*, 20th March, 1860.

Table 4b: Distribution of 1860 donations by amount, frequency, and value

<i>Amount</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>Proportion of Total Value</i>
Less than £10	18	£82	5.5%
£10-£19	25	£256	17.1%
£20-£24	21	£471	31.4%
More than £25	17	£690	46.0%
Total	81	£1499	100%

Table 4c: Note on values.

1860 value (£)	2021 value (£)
100	12,610
50	6,305
20	2,523
10	1,261

See appendix for notes on values

Table 5: Partial annual subscription list, 1850

Name	Profession	£	S	d
Thomas Adams	Lace manufacturer	1	1	0
S. Adam and Sons	Lace manufacturer	1	1	0
Barnett and Maltby	Lace manufacturer	1	1	0
T Barton Basford	Unknown	1	1	0
Ball, Dunningcliff and Co	Unknown	2	0	0
G. Berry jun	Unknown	1	1	0
Titus Beecroft	Unknown	1	1	0
Mr Bittleston	Unknown	1	1	0
John Cropper	Lace manufacturer	1	1	0
William Cope	Unknown	2	2	0
Thomas Close	Unknown	1	1	0
William Galloway	Unknown	1	1	0
John Hardy	Lace manufacturer	1	1	0
James Hardy	Lace manufacturer	1	1	0
S Hollins	Unknown	1	1	0
Hovey and King	Unknown	1	1	0
Hudson and Bottom	Lace manufacturer	1	1	0
Jacoby and Co	Lace manufacturer	2	2	0
Leipman, Kohn and Co	Unknown	1	1	0
Large and Lottimer	Merchants	1	1	0
S. and I. Morley	Hosiery manufacturer	1	1	0
Thomas Moore	Unknown	1	1	0
S. W. Moore	Lace manufacturer	1	1	0
Thomas Page	Unknown	1	1	0
T Roberts jun	Unknown	1	1	0
T Roberts and Son	Lace manufacturer	1	1	0

Fredrick Robinson	Lace manufacturer	1	1	0
T Robinson Basford	Unknown	1	1	0
R and G Seals	Unknown	1	1	0
Shaw and Sons	Unknown	1	1	0
Charles Thornton	Lace manufacturer	1	1	0
I and G Trueman	Lace manufacturer	1	1	0
Thomas Woodhouse	Unknown	1	1	0
I Wheatley	Unknown	1	1	0
William Wright	Unknown	1	1	0
W Wright and Co	Unknown	1	1	0
Wyeth, Rogers and Co	Unknown	1	1	0
		40	38	0

Conclusion

Although the NGSD was partially funded by local benefactors, funding that was essential to the survival of the institution and the construction of Waverley Building, the direct connections to Transatlantic slavery appear to be minimal, and as far as this research has revealed, confined to a single bank. Smith and Co. were the largest single donors, but only provided a fraction of the finance that was raised in this period. There are a larger group of lace manufacturers who made financial contributions, and they benefited indirectly from Transatlantic slavery due to the reduced labour costs of producing raw cotton. However, a combination of the scale of slavery, the dominance of cotton from the Americas in international trade, the methods of transportation, warehousing and sale of raw cotton in the ports, that it would have been exceptionally difficult to avoid using cotton that had been produced using enslaved labour prior to 1865.

It also has to be said that one of the donors has been identified as a prominent abolitionist. One abolitionist does not negate the involvement of Smith & Co in slavery, and the financial contributions of Samuel Fox don't match those of the bank. However, this complexity does help to highlight that nineteenth century Nottingham was a place where different political, social and moral perspectives could thrive. It would be ahistorical and unhelpful to speculate on the views on slavery held by other donors, and the archival base would not be strong enough to warrant detailed investigation.

Appendix

Note on values of money

Throughout this report modern monetary equivalences are provided based on calculations provided by the MeasuringWorth website.²⁰ This website provides multiple methods of calculating changes in the value of money over time based on indexes of household expenditure, GDP, average wages and per capita GDP. As these indexes do not necessarily change in proportion to each other, and as the archival basis on which each index is created varies in quality and completeness, calculations regarding the *value* of money over time vary according to the index used as the basis of calculations.

Within this report, the index used is the *Real Cost* which is calculated by comparing the initial cost to the cost index of all output in the economy. This is designed to be used for capital expenditure and public expenditure. However, this results in a relatively low comparison for the value of an investment over time. For instance, the £489 donated locally to the NGSD in 1850 is worth £68,000 at 2021 using the real cost calculator. The same investment is worth £434,000 if calculated according to the *Labour Cost Index* (based on a multiple of average wages) and £2,000,000 if measured using the *Economic Cost Index* (which is based on the index of GDP and the share of GDP represented by the initial sum). Therefore, the calculations used here are conservative estimates and the true value could be considerably higher.

²⁰ <https://www.measuringworth.com/>