Cities built on slavery: Liverpool and Manchester

The major slaving port in Britain in the early 18th century was London, the home of the Royal African Company (RAC), which in 1672 replaced the Royal Adventurers Trading in Africa. The Adventurers had been formed in 1663 to supply British sugar-growing colonies with enslaved Africans. Bristol merchants entered the trade in the 1690s, when the government annulled the RAC’s monopoly. But by the 1740s Liverpool had overtaken both Bristol and London.¹

By 1795 about a quarter of Liverpool’s ships were engaged in the trade in enslaved women, men and children. It has been calculated that Liverpool vessels carried 40% of the entire European slave trade and controlled 60% of British trade. Between 1795 and 1804, 1,099 slaving vessels sailed from Liverpool; London and Bristol sent 184. For example, in the years 1805, 1806 and 1807, for example, 70,294 enslaved Africans were carried to the Americas in four hundred and two slaving voyages from Liverpool.²

Liverpool imported such quantities slave-grown sugar from the British colonies in the West Indies that its first sugar refinery was built in 1668. Slave-grown tobacco from the British plantations in Virginia on the American mainland was also imported by Liverpool’s merchants. By 1711 tobacco imports reached 1,600 tons. As among seventy-two members of the Liverpool Company of Merchants Trading to Africa there is a ‘William Woodville, Havanna’, it is likely that these imports included slave-grown tobacco from Cuba.³

The trade in slaves and with the plantations greatly aided local manufacturing and provided employment for thousands in and around Liverpool. For example, slaving vessels had to be built and manned; the goods exchanged for the enslaved, and the fetters, manacles and chains used on the coast, on the vessels and on the plantations in the Americas had to be manufactured. Food and food and water containers were also required, as well as tools for plantation use. The enslaved labourer also required a minimum of clothing while the plantation owners and supervisors demanded all the fineries they would have enjoyed in Britain. Thus manufacturing and trade in Liverpool and its hinterland increased vastly. As the local merchants explained to Parliament in 1726:

The manufacture of cotton, woollen, copper, pewter, etc., spread particularly all over the County of Lancashire, so much influenced by this trade, are now put into the most flourishing circumstances.

A book on Liverpool published in 1796 noted that the export of Manchester cloth ‘brought out the great burst of prosperity in both Liverpool and Manchester’.⁴ There have been no approximations of the numbers of people, from sail-makers to gun-powder workers, from sugar refiners to carters, from seamen to shipwrights, who therefore made their living from the trade in, and the labour of, enslaved Africans.
The merchants’ profits were generally vast: ‘Dicky Sam’, the chronicler of the Liverpool slave trade, calculated that the profits on the 303,737 slaves carried by Liverpool vessels between 1783 and 1793 was, on the average, £214,677 (c. £13 million in 2005) per annum. I have been unable to find any estimates of the profits of the importers or the manufacturers, the shipbuilders, the insurers or the bankers. The Government also reaped profits: it collected £640,684 (c. £39 million in 2005) in Duties from the port of Liverpool in 1784 alone. The proportion of this collected from vessels employed in the slave trade and slavery is not known.

Such involvement with Africa and Africans naturally resulted in an ever-growing population of Africans in the area. As recounted by Liverpool historian Ray Costello, African students were educated in Britain…during the 1780s…it was thought that there were generally from fifty to seventy African children at school in Liverpool… During the last quarter of the eighteenth century, black settlers, either as slaves, servants, students of noble descent or the dual heritage children of white plantation owners…were both visiting or settling all over Liverpool and the surrounding district.

Manchester must also have had a large Black population: in 1787 when asked to preach in the city’s Collegiate Church, abolitionist Thomas Clarkson found that ‘the church was packed and some fifty black people were clustered around the pulpit’.

**Liverpool after 1807**

Contrary to the expectations of some, Liverpool continued to expand after the abolition of the slave trade by Parliament. Its population grew from about 80,000 in 1807 to 286,487 in 1841. In 1845, Liverpool was the second most busy port in the UK after London. How did Liverpool accomplish this? Can the trade in slave-grown produce account for this growth? Did perhaps Liverpool also continue to reap profits from the trade in enslaved Africans?

Given how long it had taken for the Abolition Bill to be passed, Liverpool’s experienced merchants and shipowners had ample time to ensure not only their survival but their prosperity by diversifying their trade, should the abolitionists succeed in Parliament. As indicated above, by the nineteenth century Liverpool was entrenched not only in the trade in slaves, but also in the Americas, from where slave-produced raw materials were imported and to where manufactures were exported. By the 19th century Liverpool traders had their own ‘factors’ (ie, agents), on the mainland and on the islands to facilitate and expedite their trade. Of eighty-three slaving vessels surveyed by historian David Williams, by 1811 twenty-three had been redeployed to the West Indies, 17 to South America, 20 to North America, 11 to the Canaries and Azores and 10 remained in the African trade. On the African coast the (ex?)-slave-traders’ intimate knowledge of trade and traders ensured participation in ‘legitimate’-and other - trade.

The revenue of the Mersey docks rose from £102,403 in 1822 (c. £5,727,400 in 2005) to £175, 506 (c.£8,041,695) in 1841 and £667,567 (£29,506,460) in 1861. One has therefore to ask: how much of the income required for Liverpool’s development as a city was derived from slave-grown produce?
- *trade in the products of slave labour*

Prior to 1807, slaving vessels, on the final ‘leg’ of the triangular trade, that is from the Americas back to Britain, arrived loaded with slave-grown produce. Now that British ships could no longer carry enslaved Africans to the Americas, the slaving vessels were refurbished for direct cargo voyages to the Americas. The Caribbean territories captured from the French during the Napoleonic Wars provided new sources of trade, which required more vessels. This provided even more work for the shipwrights, seamen and sugar refiners of Liverpool. By 1810 sugar imports amounted to 46,000 tons and tobacco to 8,400 tons; in 1830 Liverpool’s share of raw cotton imports into Britain had risen to 90% of the total imported.

Trade with Brazil and other South American slave-worked colonies also increased. By 1812 Brazil supplied about 20% of the raw cotton unloaded in Liverpool’s docks. Brazil had little shipping of its own: building ships for the Brazil trade provided more work and profits for Liverpool’s merchants, shipbuilders, et al. In a pamphlet entitled *Some remarks and observations on a Petition to Parliament from the merchants and shipowners of Liverpool praying for the admission…of the products of Brazil, by a member of the Brazilian Association of Liverpool*, the unnamed author notes that ‘the petitioners carry on extensive commerce with Brazil in the produce and manufactures of the United Kingdom… export value is Three million Sterling’. The imports listed are sugar, coffee, cocoa and rum. In 1864 about 13 million pounds of raw cotton was imported from Brazil.

There is almost no information available on the Brazilian Association, though its office holders are listed in local directories. The 1842 directory also lists a resident Brazilian consul, which indicates the importance of this trade. A cursory glance through the Liverpool Customs Bills of Entry and *Lloyd’s Lists*, available at the Liverpool Maritime Museum Archives, shows regular sailings to Havanah (Cuba), Bahia and Rio de Janeiro (Brazil). For example, during the first week of March 1844, two ships left for Rio, and one each for Bahia, Pernambuco (Brazil) and Havanah. These were augmented by the establishment of the Pacific Steam Navigation Co., which moved from London to Liverpool in 1846; and then the founding of the Liverpool, Brazil and River Plate Steamship Co. in 1865, whose principal shareholders were the Liverpool firm of Lamport & Holt. This company took over the carriage of mail from the UK to Brazil from the Pacific Steam Navigation Co. That there was a need for a subsidised official carrier of mail of course also indicates the importance of trade with Brazil. *That is, trade in slave-grown produce.*

The largest proportion of the cotton passing through Liverpool was from the USA – and also slave-grown. That even abolitionists overlooked the provenance of cotton and other slave-grown produce is demonstrated, for example, by the importation of such cotton by the abolitionist William Rathbone.

By the 1850s, two-thirds of British textile exports were cottons. As textiles were 60% of Britain’s total exports, this slave-grown produce was responsible for a large proportion of Britain’s merchant wealth.

- *‘legitimate’ trade with Africa*

British, including ‘foreign and colonial’ goods exported to Africa in 1805 amounted to only 3% of all exports from Britain while the official value of goods imported from Africa was only £106,839 (c. £4 million in 2005). Twenty years later the 44 ships which sailed to West Africa from Liverpool only brought back £154,755 (c. £6 million in 2005) worth of goods. Palm oil was the major product imported, followed by timber and ‘gum senegal’. Most of the
vessels used in the early years of this trade had been slavers and were owned by merchants previously connected with slaving.\textsuperscript{xvi}

What were the goods exported to Africa? While some were sent in response to demands by traders in ‘legitimate goods’ on the Coast, ‘Liverpool entrepreneurs’, according to historian Barry Drake, ‘also supplied trade goods to factors in West Africa that were eventually used in the purchase of slaves’. This was admitted in Parliament in May 1848:

\begin{quote}
\indent goods which are employed for the payment of slaves either to go Brazil and are thence conveyed to the coast of Africa, or in some cases are sent direct to Africa, not to the persons who exchange them for slaves, but are consigned to persons who act for other individuals in other countries, who are concerned in the slave trade.\textsuperscript{xvii}
\end{quote}

When questioned, the Liverpool merchants naturally claimed that who their agents sold their goods to was none of their business. Though many merchants only remained in the African ‘legitimate’ trade briefly, the firm of I.O. Bold was involved for 26 years; John and Thomas Tobin, who also traded with the West Indies and India, for 25 years; and Horsfall & Tobin, also trading with East and West Indies and North America, were involved for over 20 years. One of the large Tobin clan, Thomas, owned gunpowder works in Ireland and supplied the huge demand for this in Africa.

Merchandise exported to the West coast of Africa included textiles, which gravely affected local weaving industries; by 1850 17 million yards were exported. Similarly, the export of salt from Cheshire ruined African salt manufacturing. Then, as now, arms/ammunition were the most popular of exports: in 1840 Liverpool ships carried 81\% of the over 3 million pounds of gunpowder shipped to Africa, as well as an unknown proportion of the 89,653 guns. In the 1860s it has been estimated that over 100,000 guns, ‘made from iron unfit to make firearems and horribly dangerous’, were shipped to Africa. Liverpool vessels also transported 55\% of the 2.8 million lbs of iron bars. (Iron had also been manufactured in West Africa prior to the import of the cheaper European bars, which ruined the local manufacturers.) Among the other items listed in the Customs Bills of Entry are (probably slave-grown) tobacco, cocoa, glassware, hats, wine, stone jars, and rum.\textsuperscript{xviii}

The main item imported from Africa was palm oil, used in the manufacture of soap, and to lubricate machinery and on the railways. The volume imported rose from 249,796 lbs in 1807 to over 10,000 tons in 1830 and 50,000 tons in 1860. Palm oil was hugely profitable as the ‘mark-up between the Liverpool price and the African price was 100\% in the 19\textsuperscript{th} century’.\textsuperscript{xix} That much of the palm oil was grown by slaves and transported to the coast on the heads of slaves, some of whom were sold once they had delivered the oil on the coast, was ignored by the traders. About half the oil imported into the UK was in the hands of Liverpool traders, who thus profited, yet again, from slavery. Of these traders, the most successful – the Tobins, Horsfalls, Aspinalls - had been traders in slaves.

\textit{- ongoing participation in the trade in enslaved Africans}

Historian Hugh Thomas admits that

Continuing English involvement in the trade is more difficult to analyse. A few dealers established in West Africa...continued to play a part. Some English captains sailed under United States flags, and later under Swedish, Danish, and even French ones. More important, probably, several prominent firms
participated in the trade after 1807 by investing in or even owning theoretically Spanish- or Portuguese-owned ships. Many English firms still supplied the ‘trade goods’ for slave voyages…

Some examples of these ongoing involvements and methods taken to escape the strictures of the Abolition Act were:

Very soon after the passage of the Act Thomas Clarkson reported that while he was in Liverpool in August 1809, three ships, the **Flying Fish**, the **Susan** and the **Neptune**, left Liverpool, ‘going as tenders to collect slaves’: He had also been told by two seamen who had just returned on the **Neptune** that her captain had bought 13 slaves and took 2 ‘pawns’ while picking up wood and produce on the River Gaboon, and had ‘sold them to a Portuguese vessel’. A fourth vessel, the **Ferrula**, renamed **Perula**, had been ‘fitted out for the slave trade and a cargo of muskets and gunpowder…fetters…’ The **Perula** had picked up slaves from Old Calabar. Another Liverpool vessel, the **George**, was suspected of having carried out some of the goods exchanged for slaves on the coast by the **Perula**. Abolitionist campaigner Zachary Macaulay could not ‘see on what grounds the officers of the Customs should hesitate to detain and prosecute the vessel’. Could the influence of the ‘retired’ slave traders on the Liverpool Common Council perhaps have had some influence with the Customs?

That ten ex-slaving vessels should have been redeployed to a new and seemingly flourishing trade with the Azores and the Canaries is somewhat suspicious. Could they have been in the business of carrying ‘coast goods’ to these islands for slavers to pick up from there?

Zachary Macaulay’s preserved correspondence with Liverpool abolitionist William Roscoe begins with a letter of March 1809, asking Roscoe to become a member of the Committee of the African Institute’s Directors appointed to ‘watch over the execution of the Abolition laws’. Subsequently he asked Roscoe to send reports on suspect vessels in Liverpool. Between December 1809 and February 1812, fourteen vessels are mentioned in this correspondence as having sailed on slaving voyages from Liverpool. According to the E. Chambré Archive, in 1809 Macaulay ‘listed thirty-six vessels which were suspected of having sailed from Liverpool on a slaving voyage since 1807’.

Thomas Clarkson explained some of the other methods of evasion:

Not only two or three English vessels have left Liverpool for the slave trade, but others have gone and are going, under Portuguese Papers and Colours…[S]ome are English with a mixture of English and Portuguese officers, others really Portuguese…now and then with an English agent on board. Thus for example, the **George**, Capt. R.P. Jackson and the **Venus**…both sailed for Africa the first week in May with Portuguese Papers and with a mixture of Portuguese and English officers… Thus the **Perula** (sic), Capt. Miguel de Salva, a real Portuguese ship now fitting out in Liverpool for Africa and the Brazils…By the Act it is seizable if provable that it is actually going to Africa for slaves. To get this proof is very difficult. All we can do is send information to the cruisers.

Many of the vessels had traded under a variety of names. ‘Sham sales’ were conducted in Spanish, Brazilian and other ports, where Spanish-named captains were put on board, while the real English ‘master’ continued on the voyage as the ‘supercargo’. For example, William Roscoe reported that the **Maria Dolous** carried ‘three persons on board – an American, a Spaniard and an Englishman, ‘who are probably captains alternately’. The volumes of **Lloyd’s**
Register list some, but not all sales: for example, the Liverpool-registered Hercules, changed owners seven times between 1809 and 1813. Could there have been reasons for this other than the desire to avoid traceability and the possibility of indictment for slave trading?

Occasionally vessels emanating from Liverpool were capture by the Anti-Slave Trade Squadron and sent for trial in Sierra Leone. The Liverpool Mercury reported one such case on 18 September 1840. It had received a communication from a gentleman long resident in Sierra Leone, but recently returned. Several vessels condemned...the English brig Guyana, belonging to Mr Logan, a merchant, of Liverpool, was condemned on 12 August for aiding and abetting in the slave trade. It appears this vessel sailed from Liverpool on 18 October 1839, with a general cargo to Bahia (Brazil), to Edwards & Co, and was there chartered through the agency of the same house with the sanction of the British Consul (Mr Wheatley) to carry a cargo of merchandise to the coast of Africa, touching at various places for the purpose of trading. That on the 26 March...HM schooner Viper...brought her to by firing a shot. After overhauling her a prize crew were put on board...to Sierra Leone where she lay 102 days before she was condemned. The cargo is not yet disposed of (and much is ruined). The merchants complain very much of the frequent sales of the slave cargoes brought into Sierra Leone, ruining their business.

This, of course, confirms that the traders were selling ‘coast goods’ to the traders in enslaved people.

The British Consul at Cape Verde reported another method of participation: On 16th October 1839 ...the Taraensa, a steam vessel arrived, bound for Brazil. It is the sixth vessel of the kind that has called here from Liverpool for the supply of coals, belonging to the same company. From reports, I am lead to understand that they assist the landing of slaves from vessels coming to the coast of Brazil from the coast of Africa.

Yet another manoeuvre is reported in the files of the Treasury. Thomas Crowther, a Liverpool merchant had written regarding the unauthorised sale by the captain of his vessel, the Lady Combermere. The vessel had been sold on the African coast to a Brazilian slave trader for $6,000. The case was taken to court, but the Treasury Solicitors decided that ‘no prosecution can be maintained against him (the ship’s officer) under the Slave Trade Prohibition Act’. One can be sure that the ‘message’ contained in this decision was well noted by shipowners in Liverpool. As were all the other non-prosecutions and non-interventions by the government.

The ‘message’ that the British government and the its agents in Liverpool were not very concerned about enforcing laws regarding the port’s ongoing participation in the trade is exemplified by the case of the Nightingale. This American vessel was caught trading in enslaved Africans off the Angolan coast in 1860. It had been outfitted for the voyage in Liverpool. That the ship had been outfitted for the illegal trade was well known in the city, as was the outfitting of the Harbinger, the Propontus and a steamer, the City of Norwich, in 1864. If these, how many others? Lord Russell had promised ‘the closest investigations [of the Nightingale]...and all the powers of the law shall be put in motion with a view to prosecute to conviction the perpetrators of this odious crime...’ But I can find no evidence of such action, then or at any other time.
Two years after the passing of the Abolition Act, Thomas Clarkson recognised the inadequacies of the law and its implementation. He believed that there was a need for a ‘new Act regarding the evasion’. For example, he advocated that it should be made a ‘misdemeanour for English subjects to be found knowingly in English or Foreign ships, trading for slaves’. The following year he told William Roscoe that he was planning on ‘bringing in a Bill next session regarding all the known Evasions…[T]o prevent effectually not only the Evasions of Englishmen but of Foreigners’. In 1811 Macaulay believed that Roscoe needed professional – that is, legal – assistance in Liverpool to investigate Customs documents. He and Lord Brougham, another very active member of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, were going to see the Attorney General regarding the various limitations in the Abolition Act. However, Roscoe felt that ‘penalties and punishments’ would be useless while the British slave traders ‘sent out Agents, capital and goods to fit out vessels in foreign ports’. When Brougham presented a bill in Parliament to proscribe investment in the trade in slaves, the resistance was led by A. Baring MP, a member of the Baring clan who feature in many of the chapters of this book.

The ‘tricks of the trade’ were well publicised by abolitionists, including captains of many of the Anti-Slave Trade Squadron ships. So why did the government not take firm action? Would the government have enforced more stringent Acts if Parliament could have been persuaded to pass them? How could Liverpool Customs turn the proverbial ‘blind eye’ to vessels fitting out for slaving voyages in Liverpool? Why did central government do so little to enforce the laws? Was British prosperity so dependent on the trade in slaves and on slave produce, (which in turn depended on the trade), that it was inconceivable to pass meaningful Acts?

[An interesting light is thrown on Liverpool and slave traders by the actions taken by William Roscoe to free the imprisoned ‘Negro’ crew of the Monte de Casino. The vessel’s captain, José A. Cardozo had the men arrested and jailed, on the ground that he had lent them money which they had not repaid. Thomas Clarkson, then in town, heard of this, contacted a lawyer and obtained discharge papers for the men. But the crew refused to leave the jail. The jailer then notified Roscoe, who obtained bail for the men. A magistrate freed them. Roscoe arranged for eight of them to enter the Royal Navy. The ninth, had ‘an infirmity’, so Roscoe had a friend give him a job on one of his vessels. In his deposition Ioze, one of the freed men, explained that they had all been slaves of Cardozo.]

Regrettably, there is no compilation of British vessels captured by the Anti-Slave Trade cruisers and taken to the Mixed Commission or the Vice-Admiralty courts. An analysis of these would clarify ongoing British involvement as well as perhaps the politics behind the frequent decisions not to indict these vessels. The carriage of multiple flags and non-registration of vessels could also, of course, lead to greater understanding of the mechanisms of the illegal trade.

- slave and legitimate traders’ influence

Many of the wealthiest slave traders became prominent and influential citizens of Liverpool. As described by one historian, ‘Liverpool was dominated by a strong, almost hereditary caste of merchants and shipowners’. Their experience and attitudes became not only unquestioned but respected – and widespread. Some have already been listed in Chapter 1. Some other members of this caste were:
Jonas Bold was a member of the Africa Committee. Besides trading in slaves he also owned privateers. He served on Liverpool’s Common Council and was Bailiff in 1796; Mayor in 1802. Isaac Oldham, his son, continued trading with Africa, served on the Town Council and was Bailiff in 1827.\textsuperscript{xxiv}

Edgar Corrie was a member of the Company of Merchants Trading to Africa – that is, he must have been a trader in enslaved Africans.\textsuperscript{xxxv} In the 1780s he was a partner of John Gladstone. Another Gladstone, T. Stewart, formed a new partnership with William Corrie in the early 19th century. In 1841 Corrie & Co. were among the founder members of the Cotton Brokers Association of Liverpool. Corrie is noted as having ‘liked to take his flight in West Indian cotton and other commodities’.\textsuperscript{xxxvi}

John Gladstone, already mentioned in Chapter 1, was probably the most influential of the Liverpool traders at the national level. He had began his long career as a supplier of goods to West Indian planters; by the 1820s he had acquired a number of sugar and coffee plantations – and 2,183 slaves - in Demerara and Jamaica. He also traded with India and China and imported from Brazil. The Liverpool West India Association passed resolutions against slave emancipation at his behest and he was among those who deliberated on the tactics to be used in the compensation debates. Gladstone was honoured with the ‘freedom’ of Liverpool in 1811; the city presented him with £1,400 and ‘a service plate in token of their sympathy and goodwill’ in 1824 when the cruelty with which he had put down a revolt by the slaves on one of his Demerara plantations was debated. With support from the Duke of Marlborough, he served as MP for Woodstock and Lancaster for nine years. He was created a baronet in 1846, despite having been unseated form Parliament for bribery in 1827. His son Robertson continued the business on his father’s death in 1851; he served on Liverpool Council for many years and was elected Mayor in 1852.\textsuperscript{xxxvii}

The Heywood clan, whose fortunes were founded by Arthur, ‘had experience of the African trade, dabbled in privateering – had Letters of Marque’, and set up a bank in 1773, which by 1788 operated in both Liverpool and Manchester. It existed until 1883. Benjamin Heywood was elected to the Liverpool Chamber of Commerce in the 1770s.\textsuperscript{xxxviii}

Charles Horsfall was an alderman on the town’s Common Council, and mayor in 1832. He owned a plantation in Jamaica; after 1807 his trade with the Americas increased. The partnership of Horsfall & Tobin was the largest in the palm oil trade while Bateson & Horsfall were prominent members of the Liverpool Cotton Brokers Association. T.B. Horsfall was MP for Liverpool 1861 - 1865.

Thomas Leyland (1752-1827) privateer, slave trader, merchant, member of the Chamber of Commerce, Town Council and Bailiff, also served as Liverpool’s mayor three times, in 1798, 1814 and 1820. In 1807, having dissolved previous banking partnerships, he set up Leyland & Bullin, which existed till 1901. Until 1835 Liverpool Corporation banked with L & B; it then transferred to Heywood’s bank. Leyland left an estate of £600,000 (c. £28 million in 2005).\textsuperscript{xxxix}

The Tarletons – Edward, John and Clayton were mayors in 1712, 1764 and 1792 respectively. John as MP for Liverpool led the city’s delegation to Prime Minister Pitt’s Slave Trade Committee in 1788, naturally opposing abolition, as did his son Banastre, MP from
1790, in the debates in 1806. In the 1799 list their slaving vessels are named as the *Swift*, the *Abigait* and the *Resource*.

**Sir John Tobin**, who was knighted in 1820, served as an alderman on the Liverpool Common Council and then as mayor in 1819. He and his brother Thomas had both started in the slavery business by working on slaving vessels. In 1799 his *Young William* is listed as sailing on a slaving voyage from Liverpool. The *May*, another Tobin vessel, was exempted from paying dock and town dues. Tobin’s daughter and son John married into the Aspinall family – another successful slave trader. Patrick, another son, owned plantations in the West Indies; nephew James Aspinall Tobin served as Mayor in 1854.\(^{x1}\)

How many of these merchants were involved in supplying slave traders on the African coast or in the Americas, and how many traded in slave-grown produce and supplied goods to slave-owners, has not been researched.
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