



Moody, J. (2016). Liverpool's local tints: drowning memory and "maritimizing" slavery in a seaport city. In K. Donington, R. Hanley, & J. Moody (Eds.), *Britain's History and Memory of Transatlantic Slavery: Local Nuances of a 'National Sin'* (pp. 164-185). (Liverpool Studies in International Slavery). Liverpool University Press. <https://www.liverpooluniversitypress.co.uk/books/id/38454/>

Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication record in Explore Bristol Research](#)
PDF-document

This is the author accepted manuscript (AAM). The final published version (version of record) is available online via Liverpool University Press at <https://www.liverpooluniversitypress.co.uk/books/id/38454/>. Please refer to any applicable terms of use of the publisher.

University of Bristol - Explore Bristol Research

General rights

This document is made available in accordance with publisher policies. Please cite only the published version using the reference above. Full terms of use are available: <http://www.bristol.ac.uk/red/research-policy/pure/user-guides/ebr-terms/>

Chapter 7

Liverpool's Local Tints: Drowning Memory and "Maritimizing" Slavery in a Seaport City

Liverpool says much that is unrepeatable...(it) stands as a warning to anyone wishing to paint a national picture by enlarging local tints.

*Michael Bentley*¹

This was a port, a great port, and ominously nothing but a port.

*Lady Margaret Simey*²

Introduction

The national public memory of Britain's involvement in transatlantic slavery has been framed by a maritime-themed lens; confined to the activities and movements of ships across the Atlantic Ocean, having broken memorial ties with more land-based operations and consequences. John Beech has argued that this 'maritimization' of slavery, as he terms it, has placed a commemorative focus on the transatlantic slave *trade*, as opposed to enslavement itself, obscuring broader histories of the slavery business, and indeed of its wider economic, social and cultural impacts and legacies on British soil.³ Much of the weight of Beech's 'maritimization' argument rests on the location of public exhibitions and museums addressing slavery – which, prior to 2007 at least, were largely to be found in port cities; London, Bristol, Hull and

Liverpool.⁴ Crucially, this is a pattern which can also be discerned across other former European slave-trading states, where memory work surrounding the history slavery has also been confined to coastal locations and port cities. In France, the *Memorial to the Abolition of Slavery* opened in 2012 in Nantes, eighteenth century France's largest slave trading port city, and the country's secondary historic slave-trading port, Bordeaux, opened a permanent exhibition in *Musee d'Aquitaine*, "Bordeaux in the 18th Century – Trans-Atlantic Trading and Slavery" in 2009.⁵ Similar orchestrated efforts to maritimize national European histories of transatlantic slavery (and subsequently reduce 'slavery' to the 'slave trade' in this manner) through a port city focus can be seen within the location of memory work in The Netherlands (the *National Monument to Commemorate the History of Dutch Slavery* in Oosterpark, in the port city of Amsterdam). Similar maritimization is achieved through a focus on ships, where in Denmark and Norway, the most sustained memory-work has thus far centred on the slave ship *Fredensborg*, both where it sank in 1768 and the display of remains uncovered in 1975.

Whilst it can be argued that the history of transatlantic slavery has been maritized on 'national' scales across Britain and Europe, through the geographical restriction of memory work to coasts and ports - how does this 'maritimization' argument work in relation to the isolated study of one such port city? How does the criticism that there has been a 'maritimizing' of the memory of slavery nationally, play out 'locally' in somewhere like Liverpool, a place frequently defined by its maritime connections, as a 'seaport' or 'port city' within historic discourse? A place defined by its maritime past (and present) on the global heritage stage; having been inscribed a 'Maritime Mercantile City' on the UNESCO world heritage list in 2004?⁶ A place, moreover, where much of its general historic story has necessarily been

‘maritimized’, connected intimately as it is, to the activities and workings of its river, its port and the seas? Whilst Liverpool’s ‘local’ collective memory of slavery, as Beech argues in relation to national memory, has certainly been ‘maritimized’, a closer look at the ‘local tints’ of this particular port city reveal some important contradictions, complications, and departures from the national story.

The ‘maritimization’ of slavery in Liverpool is ultimately a process embroiled within, and complicated by, the city’s own historic story and constructed sense of collective identity. The public face of the history of Liverpool and slavery across time is here the evolving product of the interdependent relationship between memory and identity. As John Gillis suggests:

The parallel lives of these two terms alert us to the fact that the notion of identity depends on the idea of memory, and vice versa. The core meaning of any individual or group identity, namely, a sense of sameness over time and space, is sustained by remembering; and what is remembered is defined by the assumed identity.⁷

The unique local context of Liverpool’s involvement in the slave trade, namely its dominance towards the end of the eighteenth century alongside rapid population growth (see Longmore, this volume), coincides with an important historiographical timing. Liverpool ships were responsible for the transportation of over 1.1 million enslaved African people to the Americas between 1750 and 1807, more than any other British port.⁸ Written histories of the town begin to appear in the midst of Liverpool’s rise to prominence in the ‘African trade’, at the end of the eighteenth century. Liverpool reached its slave-trading apogee during the decade of legal

abolition at the very beginning of the nineteenth century, when the town owned close to 80 per cent of Britain's total slave trade.⁹ Liverpool's eighteenth and early nineteenth century historians foreground the transatlantic slave trade as a distinctly *maritime* activity in which Liverpool (contemporarily) excels. Seymour Drescher has suggested that James Wallace's *General and Descriptive History of Liverpool*, published in 1795 sought to inspire pride in the city's livelihood, its shipping and trade which meant presenting the sheer scale of Liverpool's slave trade as evidence of its '*raison detre*'.¹⁰ This is illustrated through Wallace's emphasis of this dominance using fractions of maritime-themed trade.¹¹ The emphasis of the centrality of the slave trade to Liverpool's commercial livelihood within written historic discourse at this point in time and indeed into the nineteenth century, maintains residues of the pro-slavery debates Liverpool's civic authorities so actively supported.¹² However, as we move past moments of abolition and, moreover, emancipation in the early nineteenth century, slavery is far from rendered an inescapable and significant segment of Liverpool's overall *maritime* story. Instead, processes of maritimization act as further displacement motifs. They flood Liverpool's identity narratives with nautical romanticism, obscure historic phenomena through 'sea themed' generalization, and dislodge narratives of slavery by shifting focus to other maritime activities, or to more comforting subjects. However, a closer look at the maritimization of slavery in this local context reveals that counter memories of slavery – and of the enslaved – emerge from the water's edge. Processes of 'maritimizing' slavery in Liverpool may displace, but they also disturb, returning embodied memories as if on incoming tides.

Maritimization in Context

This maritimization of slavery from the eighteenth to the twentieth centuries nonetheless aligns with broader national patterns, which discursively construct British collective identities, framed by contexts of empire and colonialism. Geoff Quilley has argued that the image of the sea in eighteenth century art was integral to the ‘imagining’ of Britain, in which the ‘island nation’ idea was represented and reinforced through a visual construction of an ‘affinity with the sea’, metaphorically combining ‘commerce and patriotism’.¹³ Ken Lunn and Ann Day have similarly argued that ‘maritimity’ has long been a significant component of British national identity construction, comparable, perhaps, to romantic images of landscape and the rural idyll, and at points emerging combined, where the British nation is represented as being both maritime *and* rural. They further argue that, although a form of ‘maritimity’ is perceptible in the ‘new navalism’ of the 1880s and 1890s, narratives of maritime achievement and the ‘control of the seas’ motif became increasingly central to British national identity constructions in the early twentieth century.¹⁴ Promotional texts produced in Liverpool at this time embarked on this process whole-heartedly, drawing on a national romanticism of a maritime past and adding their own unique dose of ‘Merseypride’ to the mix.¹⁵ In a 1902 guidebook, the first to be produced by the city authorities and at a high point of Edwardian imperial pride for the city, maritime accomplishment is presented as something Liverpool did first and most extensively:

It is not without reason that Liverpool, the great Mersey seaport, is generally looked upon as one of the first – if not the first – maritime ports of the world.

Her ships sail on every sea, and the produce of every land under the sun finds its way to her Docks.¹⁶

This is the image presented to visitors and tourists. Liverpool, second city of Empire, is imagined through a cosmopolitan and highly romanticised (if hyperbolic) language, of ships sailing *every* sea, the agency expressed in relation to the produce of ‘every land under the sun’, arriving as if of its own volition, that it, like the visitor, ‘finds its way to her Dock’. The physical infrastructure of maritime activity and the port’s built environment are also drawn into this maritime pride discourse, that by 1753, the town ‘could boast proudly of its docks’.¹⁷ Crucially, Liverpool’s immense involvement in the transatlantic slave trade does not receive any mention here, or in the rest of the text. In 1907, a new version of the first official guide to Liverpool was produced by the city authorities in line with the public celebrations of the city’s 700th anniversary of its 1207 charter from King John, referred to within local public discourse as ‘Liverpool’s 700th Birthday’.¹⁸ The newly inserted history chapter gives ‘Shipping’ as the primary reason for Liverpool’s historic wealth. Within the one line in which slavery is mentioned, the ‘successful’ competition against Bristol is the main point of emphasis. ‘By far the larger number of the ships were employed in the West Indian trade which had grown to importance’ the guide claims, immediately stating that, ‘out of this trade sprang the slave trade which was wrested from Bristol’.¹⁹ The official guides to Liverpool in the twentieth century maintain this precedent, and the line concerning the ‘springing’ of the slave trade and its ‘wresting’ from Bristol, remains word for word in tact into the 1970s.²⁰

These lines of mercantile enterprise and competitive tones in Liverpool’s civic identity narratives are frequently presented alongside a distinctly romanticized

maritime past. Writing in the local press in 1957, Liverpool's 750th 'birthday', the aptly named Derek Whale described how '[o]ceans of water have flowed down the Mersey since the mighty Port of Liverpool was but a sleepy little village', the quaint rural idyll of traditional British identity narratives here invoked through the scene of a 'sleepy village', yet set against more mid-twentieth century industrializing imagery, of 'might', and of the curiously industrial notion of a river capable of holding the flow of oceans.²¹ The author also imagines the 'bygone seafaring age' to be 'a romantic age of trading pioneers under sail' who bring back '[t]ales of strange customs and people of foreign lands, where lay the white man's treasures in silks, cotton, ivory, oil, wine and spices', and presumably also in the bodies of African people, not included in this list of foreign 'treasures'.²²

Whilst Beech focused his maritimization of slavery argument primarily on museums as repositories of national memory, and Lunn and Day similarly argued that museums have been responsible for much of the romanticization of British maritime heritage, certainly up to the turn of the millennium,²³ as the above shows, there is a much broader discursive context such processes sit within. Museum-based maritimization takes place both inside and outside the walls of the museum, and in Liverpool this started taking shape within embryonic moments of an imagined maritime museum.

Maritime romanticism and Liverpool's museums

The Merseyside Maritime Museum, rightly criticised for sidelining slavery in panel texts, played its own significant role in romanticising Liverpool's maritime heritage

and displacing slavery, long before it opened its doors. The museum opened in the early 1980s after decades of discussion and debate around the importance of Liverpool (of all places) having a 'Museum of the Sea'. Thomas Hume (1917-1992), Director of Liverpool Museums, stated in 1963 that '[e]very museum must in some way reflect the life of its area'.²⁴ It was therefore surprising, he claimed, that the museums held little in the way of maritime material until the collection started by Dr Douglas Allan (1896-1967) in the 1920s, which included a substantial collection of model ships.²⁵ The Maritime Museum had, therefore, long existed in the discursive psyche of the city; an idea or symbol to be raised and debated around points of civic significance and collective commemoration, its absence poignantly noted and lamented. During the 1931 'Shipping Week' organised by The Liverpool Organisation (a group of businessmen who spearheaded other such 'civic weeks' during the 1920s), a number of maritime-specific events were hosted including a shipping exhibition in St George's Hall.²⁶ This exhibition sought to promote a memory of maritime heroism and foreground a long nautical history, which would naturalise Liverpool's position and legitimacy as a port against fears of 'forgetting' this fateful relationship in the present.²⁷ The local press claimed the exhibition would not 'hide' anything, and the organisers intended to 'include documents and models referring to the slave trade, as well as things more creditable to us'. However, detail on items relating to Liverpool and slavery remained conspicuously absent from press coverage after the opening of the exhibition, and within official literature.²⁸ Of over 650 items exhibited, only five related to slavery.²⁹ Interestingly, although a lending note claimed that a diagram of the Liverpool Slave Ship *Brooks* (sometimes spelt *Brookes*), now a staple component in museum representations of slavery and a key

aspect of the visual maritimization of the subject, had been provided for the exhibition, this is not listed within the guide.³⁰

It was from this large, popular and predominantly celebratory exhibition of Liverpoolian maritime pride, that historian Robert Gladstone, great-nephew of Prime Minister William Gladstone, hoped a permanent shipping exhibition would emerge. However, up until his death in 1940, this dream was not realised, and he died leaving £20,000 in a bequest fund to the cause.³¹ In 1946, Cecil Northcote Parkinson, maritime historian and former assistant at the National Maritime Museum Greenwich, declared that a completely separate building would be required to house such a museum, a claim echoed again during the national spectacle of the Festival of Britain in 1951, and prompted by an exhibition in the Walker Art Gallery in Liverpool.³² ‘Such a Museum,’ argued the *Official Guide* of that year, ‘properly developed, would be unique in this country, representing the maritime commerce of the nation and the growth of Liverpool as its centre, as the National Maritime Museum at Greenwich represents the country’s naval history.’³³ Further maritime-focused exhibitions were staged in 1957, Liverpool’s 750th ‘birthday’, during which familiar lines concerning successful competition against other port cities were raised alongside brief mentions of transatlantic slavery.³⁴ These celebrations once again raised renewed calls for ‘building the long-wished-for Maritime Museum’.³⁵

The Merseyside Maritime Museum finally opened in 1980 in Liverpool’s Albert Dock, arising alongside regeneration initiatives centred on tourism, where it was hoped the museum would ‘act as a catalyst for the investment of private money’.³⁶ In discourse surrounding the museum’s opening, the particular maritime past presented omits any specific reference to transatlantic slavery, though freely references maritime romanticism and individual memory, suggesting that those

interested in the museum will include ‘many who have memories of a working life on the docks or at sea, and those which have childhood memories of the romance of Britain’s second seaport.’³⁷

The maritimizing of Liverpool’s historic story, emphasized and made tangible through the development of the Merseyside Maritime Museum, obscured slavery from official narratives of the city’s development. Commentators instead listed other port-related activities or blurred potential references amongst sea-themed generalization. ‘Liverpool, once the second port of the British Empire,’ one article written around the museum’s opening suggests, ‘owes its existence to the sea’, here omitting any reference to the transatlantic slave trade.³⁸ Although brief discussion of Liverpool’s involvement in the slave trade was present within this museum, the text was described as a ‘lawyers plea for mitigation’ by the 1989 Gifford Report into race relations in the city conducted following the 1981 Toxteth riots, and ominously titled *Loosen the Shackles*.³⁹ This interpretation was based on the justifying and defensive tones used within panel text, and on the content of the following panel, which, the report argued, merely foregrounded celebrations of white British abolitionists.⁴⁰

It was within this context, and against this criticism, that the Transatlantic Slavery Gallery was developed, opening in October 1994, though as a gallery in the basement of a larger ‘Maritime Museum’, maritized through its architectural geography.⁴¹ Even the International Slavery Museum, which opened as a museum in its own right in 2007, exists as a floor of the main Maritime Museum complex. However, its development as an independent museum, at least in name, prompted some negative reactions around the time of its opening, that ‘[s]lavery should be covered as part of the Maritime Museum (as it was), not as a free-standing museum’, reflecting the dominant influence of the long-standing local and national

‘maritimization’ of slavery.⁴² The International Slavery Museum’s position within the Maritime Museum building was also used within public discourse as a device to downplay the specific significance of slavery to Liverpool, that it is ‘quite suitable that the museum is integrated into the wider Maritime Museums complex. If ever there was a statement that slavery was not the only thing that made the city rich it is that.’⁴³ Local historian Peter Aughton similarly framed the popularity of the Transatlantic Slavery Gallery and the International Slavery Museum, as being down to intense interest in the subject, ‘(and, indeed, in the immensely important theme of Liverpool’s maritime history in all its many and varied dimensions)’.⁴⁴ This acts to place the slave trade firmly within a much larger, generalized, and crucially *maritime* context.

‘Slaves in Liverpool’

However, alternative reactions to a sea-themed past act to connect histories of Liverpool and slavery through mythologies embedded within the urban landscape. Here, embodied memories of ‘slaves in Liverpool’ emerge through maritized connections, and yet are subsequently challenged through the use of maritime ‘displacement’ narratives.

In 1946, Edmund Vale, writing in the British Local Information Sheets, described Liverpool as a ‘most romantic town’, using ‘the subterranean sandstone chambers in which the pitiful “stock” of the slave trade used to be kept while awaiting shipments to America’ as an example of this ‘romanticism’.⁴⁵ In response, Arthur C Wardle, Honorary Secretary of the Nautical History Society in Liverpool, himself

apparently tired of ‘continually trying to dispel the legend of the Liverpool “slave cellars”’, suggests that Edmund Vale should, ‘stick to factual history, for he will find more romance in the authentic history of the local press gangs, privateers and the general trade than by following the sordid story of slaving or the silly legend of the slave-cellars.’⁴⁶

Histories of press gangs, privateers and the ‘general trade’ are here used to displace not just apparently erroneous ‘legends’ of slaves in Liverpool, but the overall ‘sordid’ history of transatlantic slavery itself. Such ‘legends’ are also countered through a displacement narrative shaped by triangles, via the ‘triangular trade’.⁴⁷ The use of the triangular device to describe the Atlantic routes of the slave trade, familiar to representations of this history nationally, keep human connections between Liverpool and slavery at bay, having ships leave and return with inanimate goods only, confining talk of slave bodies to the ‘middle passage’.⁴⁸ The familiarity of the triangular motif is also drawn upon within statements downplaying the significance of the slave trade within Liverpool’s historic story. Within a map caption in his *People’s History of Liverpool*, Peter Aughton states that the depiction of the Salthouse Dock should act as ‘an important reminder of the most important “triangular” trade in Liverpool’s economy – not slavery, but salt.’⁴⁹ However, the historic distancing of the human realities of the trade is critically highlighted within a letter to the editor in 1939. Here it is suggested that the wealthy merchants of the town were ‘fortunate, owing to the triangular voyages, in arriving back in the Mersey or the Bristol Channel with little evidence of the cruelty and horror of the middle passage – and with clean papers.’⁵⁰ The most common deployment of the triangular motif, however, focuses on discrediting stories of slave sales within the city.⁵¹ Following the announcement of the planned Transatlantic Slavery Gallery in 1991 an article in the local press states that

stories of slaves being sold in Liverpool itself ‘is also a myth, according to some historians, who say that slaves never came to the city, but were taken straight to America and the Caribbean in the infamous triangular trade which made the port rich.’⁵²

The prospect of a historic slave presence in the city is one of the most hotly contested points of Liverpool’s slavery memory discourse, and one which is discursively tied to its physical urban terrain. Liverpool’s architectural history, however, is a subject in which transatlantic slavery is not welcome. In online reaction to content within the International Slavery Museum relating to connections between transatlantic slavery and the built environment, one commenter is incensed that ‘[o]ne of the city's finest (collective) assets, i.e. its architecture, must have this mis-placed guilt bollocks sprayed all over it.’⁵³ Similarly, on a RIBA architectural tour of the city (and despite all volunteer tour guides being offered a full day’s training in the history of Liverpool and slavery, with suggestions on the ways in which this can be talked about through the built environment), no mention was made of slavery. In relation to the development of the city, the guide stated a number of times that ‘Liverpool made its money from the sea’, an image that acts to flood the subject of Liverpool’s maritime past, in vague, romanticized statements.⁵⁴

Goree: a site of memory

Despite such omissions, debates surrounding the otherwise obscured human embodiment of this difficult history are never far from the discursive surface, appearing as ghosts in the city’s urban terrain, at points along the memory of the river

Mersey's edge. Toni Morrison once said that when the Mississippi river floods, it returns to the route it took before it was artificially straightened out, and that this flooding is an act of 'remembering', that water has a perfect memory.⁵⁵ If the river Mersey ever flooded enough to remember its eighteenth century course, before it was pushed back by later dock constructions on reclaimed land, it would touch sites of memory that place slaves on Liverpool soil, creating presence in the face of absence. Stories of slave sales in the city focus on sites located along the original dock line, around the Old Dock and on the steps of the Custom House,⁵⁶ and, in particular, around the historic site of Goree. Goree Warehouses (Image 7.1), bear the name of an island off the coast of Senegal, and were named 'in commemoration of the African trade, then so prosperous in Liverpool'.⁵⁷ Stories of slaves in Liverpool are here 'hooked' onto place through semiotic associations – to sites named in celebration of Liverpool's 'lucrative trade', which become a backdrop for a debates echoed in architectural change.

[IMAGE 7.1 - Goree Warehouses, engraving 1862]

Ramsay Muir, Professor of History at the University of Liverpool in the early twentieth century, stated in his 1907 *History of Liverpool*, that 'the legend which pictures rows of negroes chained to staples in the Goree Piazzas, exposed for sale, is a curious instance of popular superstition.'⁵⁸ More elusively, Louis Lacey, author of a 'commemorative' history of Liverpool, and writing in the same year as Muir, states that the Goree Piazza, 'suggests old slaving days'. After this mysterious, if vague, association by name, Lacey includes further reference to slave sales in the immediate vicinity of the Goree warehouses, to 'a public house, where slaves were regularly

bought and sold, stood, not more than half a century ago, adjacent to the Churchyard.’⁵⁹ In Liverpool’s historic public discourse, the name of Goree alone conjures up associations with slavery – a connection that lingers long after the physical demolition of the structures in 1958. From this point forward, ‘Goree’ becomes the intangible site of memory where ‘legend asserts that slaves were sold,’⁶⁰ a focal point for stories of slavery to gather, causing a layering of narrative and memory across time and place.

In the case of Goree, architectural change has mirrored structures of discourse in an effort to displace myths of slavery with myths of abolition, overlaid with distinctly maritimized and romanticized identity narratives. One of the most prominent critical points made about Britain’s national memory of slavery is the commemorative platform given to white British abolitionists. John Oldfield has encapsulated this criticism, identifying what he terms a ‘culture of abolitionism’, arguing that Britain’s memory of slavery has long been dominated by narratives of heroic (predominantly white) British abolitionists as opposed to the less heroic, though much longer story of British involvement in transatlantic slavery.⁶¹ John Beech criticizes this tendency, suggesting that celebrating abolition is much like ‘celebrating that you’ve stopped beating your wife’ – both contradictory and hypocritical.⁶² Marcus Wood has also argued that the imagery of slavery, abolition and emancipation created by Europe and America represents, not slavery itself, but a ‘white mythology’, which ‘works hard to deny the possibility of gaining knowledge of the disaster of the Atlantic slave trade.’⁶³

Efforts to displace local ‘maritimized’ memories of slavery draw on these national narratives of abolition. Following the demolition of Goree warehouses in the late 1950s, a large office block was constructed parallel to the site where Goree

Piazzas would have stood. The closest building to their original location, this 1960s tower block was named 'Wilberforce House' after renowned abolitionist William Wilberforce, whose bicentenary of birth had been marked nationally in 1959. Designed and built by Gotch and Partners in 1965-67,⁶⁴ Wilberforce House was named to celebrate a national hero, one who had recently received much public celebration and whose commemoration in name few would take issue with. The local press ran articles about Wilberforce in his bicentenary year, outlining how 'Liverpool gave him many supporters'.⁶⁵ More 'local' heroes of abolition were noted in response within letters to the editor, calling attention to prominent worthies such as William Rathbone, Dr Jonathan Binns, James Cropper, and 'the Roscoes, the Rushtons and others.'⁶⁶

The discursive displacement of one 'myth' for another, of narratives of slave sales for narratives of white heroism, was also reproduced within discussion of this particular site of memory in Howard Channon's 1972 *Portrait of Liverpool*. Channon replicates the same process of discursive displacement seen within the architectural developments around Goree, drawing on discourses which foreground white philanthropic action as justification for historic wrongs:

Where the Piazzas called Goree (after an African island) stood on the quayside of George's Dock, from which many of the slave ships sailed, there is now Wilberforce House, an office block built in the 1960s and bearing the name of the arch-apostle of abolition; and at least the port has made some practical recompense to Africa for the agonies that hundreds of thousands, taken in bondage from that continent, endured in the holds of Mersey vessels.⁶⁷

This ‘practical recompense’, Channon argues, included the work of the Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine, ‘an act of pure altruism which has made – and continues to make’ contributions to ‘social progress’ in Africa’s ‘new nations.’ Medical altruism is complimented by the employment of African people in maritime roles, ‘young Nigerian cadets’, and the education of Africans in Liverpool establishments - all seen as ways in which Liverpool is ‘helping’ Africa in the 1970s. Expressed in a tone of ‘post’-imperialistic paternalism, this is an awkward attempt to find some good from so much ‘anguish’ during a decade of increasing racial tensions in the city itself. It is significant, therefore, that the people benefitting from these activities are ‘from Africa’, specifically Nigerian, with no mention made of Liverpool’s own longstanding black community, concurrently forming new political and educational organisations (e.g. Charles Wootton College, 1974; Liverpool Black Organisation, 1976).⁶⁸ Just as the construction and naming of new buildings had been an attempt to displace old memories of slavery, so Channon’s passage seeks out similar processes of discursive displacement.

However, some architectural features of Liverpool’s urban landscape have created more ‘nuanced’ expressions of Liverpool’s memory of slavery, forging spaces of interaction where maritimization produces land-based connections to slavery. On the city side of Wilberforce House, in a courtyard off of Drury Lane, the road running parallel with ‘Back Goree’, a water sculpture was constructed called ‘Piazza Waterfall’. The sculpture commemorates Goree Piazzas in a manner that both reveals and obscures Liverpool’s memory of slavery through ‘maritized’ artistic intervention. The sculpture was commissioned during a period of great urban development in the city, following the establishment of a permanent City Planning

Department (1962).⁶⁹ In reports issued by Graeme Shankland and Walter Bor, architect-planners from London County Council, the use of public art was advocated in urban spaces ear-marked for redevelopment. In particular they suggested that ‘Water and Fountains will have a great role to play’ in redevelopment plans.⁷⁰ Merseyside Civic Society also supported public art and street decoration, and it was this group of architects and other interested parties who commissioned the design of the sculpture.⁷¹ Initially, a location outside the city was chosen, but the sculpture was promptly re-imagined as a way to mark the beginning of post-war inner city redevelopment.

Director of the Walker Art Gallery, Hugh Scrutton, put the project forward to the Arts Council, who donated £750 towards costs.⁷² However, it was long-standing Liverpool shipbuilding company Cammell Laird & Co who ultimately put their name behind the sculpture’s construction. The Denbighshire-born sculptor on the project, Richard Huws, was a shipbuilding apprentice at Cammell Laird’s Birkenhead Yard and would later become an Engineering Lecturer at Liverpool School of Architecture. Huws is best known for designing the Festival of Britain water sculpture at the South Bank Exhibition, London, in 1951.⁷³ The involvement of Cammell Laird, an old Liverpool shipping company, significant to the city’s contemporary economy and historical maritime development, is noteworthy. Furthermore, their association with a place in which there has been a layering of abolition discourse over memories of slavery is significant; where Wilberforce stands over Goree, here Cammell Laird, a company with its history in MacGregor Laird, construct a maritime-themed water sculpture. MacGregor Laird (1808-1861) was celebrated in Liverpool as an abolitionist figure of sorts for his work in promoting nineteenth century trade with Africa, in interests beyond human cargo. A thanksgiving service was held in 1932 to

mark the centenary of his expedition to West Africa, and to commemorate the man ‘who won Liverpool from the slave trade to legitimate commerce’.⁷⁴

Cammell Laird provided a plaque to mark the new Piazza’s completion in 1967. It was placed next to the sculpture and is, poignantly, modelled in the shape an ‘African shield’ (Image 7.2). The text commemorates the original warehouses and notes their association with Africa through name, if not through trade.

“GOREE-PIAZZA”, ORIGINALLY TWO ARCADED / WAREHOUSES IN
THE MIDDLE OF THE OLD / DOCK ROAD, WAS NAMED AFTER THE
ISLAND / “GOREE” OFF THE WEST COAST OF AFRICA

Connections are made without being made, visual and textual references to Goree and Africa appear whilst leaving the nature of Liverpool’s trading relationship with the island, and indeed the significance of this site of memory, muddled in the water.

[IMAGE 7.2: Piazza Sculpture plaque. Image: Author]

Explicit connections between the sculpture and slavery memory may not be made on tangible public surfaces, etched into metal, but they are made within later discourse, in guidebooks to the city. When Ron Jones leads his readers to New Goree Piazza, Brunswick Street, he states that the site’s:

[...] intriguing Piazza Waterfall takes its name from the Goree Piazzas which were two arcaded warehouses named after ‘Goree’, a slave exporting island off the west coast of Africa. The warehouses were situated opposite here in the

centre of the main dock road, i.e. between the Strand and the Goree, and were demolished after the last war.⁷⁵

Jones recounts the Russian doll of memory naming at this site, directing his readers to notice a sculpture, named after a warehouse, named after an African Island - following the mnemonic links back to Liverpool and slavery. David Lewis, in his guidebook to the city, directs his readers to walk over a covered bridge (demolished a few years after publication) from the waterfront side of Goree, across the road, over Back Goree and through to Wilberforce House courtyard and the location of the Piazza Waterfall. The sculpture, he suggests, is known to locals as 'the Contraption', and is 'lively and exciting, noisy and unpredictable'.⁷⁶ However, Lewis's connection between the sculpture and slavery is more delayed. After mentioning the name Goree a number of times within the text, Lewis approaches Liverpool's involvement with transatlantic slavery as if through footnotes, through 'little history', describing the view from Wilberforce House:

The dock road below us is divided by a central reservation. The road heading north is called the Goree, and the road going south, along the old shoreline is called the Strand; but it was once called Back Goree and the old roads ran either side of a warehouse complex called the Goree Piazzas. This was built in the late 18th century to hold goods for George's Dock. Sometimes even Liverpool's little history is stained with the slave trade; the piazza was named after an island off Senegal used as a holding camp for slaves, which is now a World Heritage Site.⁷⁷

The ‘stain’ of history, as Lewis puts it, connects these two UNESCO World Heritage sites; the island of Gorée and Liverpool’s waterfront, through names left on Liverpool’s urban terrain - where the name of one road, one warehouse, one sculpture, carry memories of slavery across centuries.

[IMAGE 7.3 - Piazza Waterfall Sculpture with Wilberforce House in background.

Image: Author]

The water-sculpture marks the old site of ‘Goree’, a site of memory along Liverpool’s original historic shoreline, where land would have met the river Mersey, and slave ships would load and unload in George’s Docks. When it was operational, the structure had a series of buckets on poles, which tipped out water into a pool below. This was intermittent and unpredictable, the motion ‘said to resemble the sound of waves breaking on shore’.⁷⁸ Richard Huws suggested that this design created a continual flow of action, and a sound that, unlike more conventional fountains, was ‘no longer that of the monotonous ever burbling river, but that of the restless temperamental sea.’⁷⁹ The water sculpture commemorates the historic place of the water’s edge, where the river Mersey would have once met the dockside, and like the motion of the tide itself, the site of Goree acts to both reveal and obscure Liverpool’s memory of slavery; through romanticized maritime narratives which celebrate the sea, drowning memory through generalization, or displacement narratives which foreground white abolition. Yet stories of slaves in Liverpool ‘crystallize’ around Goree and other sites in the city, anchoring an otherwise maritized history to Liverpool’s tangible surfaces, and revealing human connections historically discursively confined to foreign lands or the bellies of ships.

Conclusion

The maritimization of the memory of slavery in this former slaving capital has been forged through the crucible of local historic context, circumstance and identity narratives which both foreground local nuances of the history of transatlantic slavery, and contend with national narratives of abolition. However, ‘maritimization’ in this context is not wholly about displacement or distancing as Beech suggests, nor is it completely a picture of ‘forgetting’. Memory, like the waves the Goree sculpture commemorates, has a ‘partial, allusive, fragmentary, transient nature’ as Kerwin Lee Klein argues – it is an elusive and at points unpredictable phenomena.⁸⁰ In Liverpool, more land-based connections to slavery are raised from amnesia’s murky ‘maritized’ depths through stories of the enslaved themselves, and the memory of the water’s edge. Crucially, this is the complex, nuanced and long historic discursive context that museums of the later twentieth and early twenty-first centuries sit within. Criticisms that focus on interior museological displays alone, whilst rightly highlighting omissions, biases, and cliché, miss much of the larger picture. The *longue durée* of Liverpool’s slavery-memory-discourse, demonstrates the perils of assuming consistency across interior and exterior museological contexts, and indeed the inaccuracies of painting broader pictures by enlarging ‘local tints’. The authoritative narratives of Liverpool and slavery, promoted by civic institutions, official histories, and much public discourse, are challenged and contested by other ‘mythologies’; those pertaining to the movements and experiences of enslaved African people themselves. Here, stories of a slave presence in Liverpool root the

human reality of an otherwise ocean-bound, de-humanized and ‘neutrally’ economically termed *trade* in ‘slaves’ to the city’s urban terrain. Myths meet at contested *lieux de memoire*,⁸¹ at sites of slavery memory, and clash like so many angry waves, lingering around specific places, and layering over time, re-emerging when the urban landscape shifts, at points of architectural change, and raised through the same ‘maritimized’ lens which sought to drown connections in generalisation, romanticism and displacement.

Notes

¹ Michael Bentley, *The Climax of Liberal Politics : British Liberalism in Theory and Practice, 1868-1918* (London: Edward Arnold, 1987) p. 30

² Margaret B. Simey. *The Disinherited Society: a personal view of social responsibility in Liverpool during the twentieth century* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1996) p. 17

³ John G. Beech. ‘The Marketing of Slavery Heritage in the United Kingdom.’ in *Slavery, Contested Heritage, and Thanatourism*, ed. G.M. Dann and A.V. Seaton, (New York: Haworth Hospitality Press, 2001)

⁴ Despite a flurry of national commemorative activity during the Bicentenary of the Abolition of the British Slave Trade Act in 2007, and despite major exhibition redesigns in Liverpool and Bristol, in 2008 Beech argued that there was still little evaluation of the broader impacts of slavery on Britain and that slavery was still being ‘maritimized’ within representations. See John Beech, ‘A Step Forwards or a Step Sideways?: Some Personal Reflections of How the Presentation of Slavery Has (and Hasn't) Changed in the Last Few Years,’ *1807 Commemorated* website, accessed

August 21, 2013

<http://www.history.ac.uk/1807commemorated/exhibitions/museums/step.html>

⁵ See Renaud Hourcade, “Commemorating a Guilty Past: The Politics of Memory in the French Former Slave Trade Cities” in *Politics of Memory: Making Slavery Visible in the Public Space*, ed. Ana Lucia Araujo (New York: Routledge, 2012)

⁶ UNESCO, ‘Liverpool – Maritime Mercantile City,’ accessed Oct 2, 2014

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1150/>

⁷ John R. Gillis, ‘Introduction - Memory and Identity: The History of a Relationship,’ in *Commemorations: The Politics of National Identity*, ed. John R. Gillis (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994), 3.

⁸ Kenneth Morgan, ‘Liverpool’s dominance in the British slave trade, 1740-1807,’ in *Liverpool and Transatlantic Slavery*, ed. David Richardson, Anthony Tibbles, and Suzanne Schwarz (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2007), p. 15

⁹ Morgan, ‘Liverpool’s dominance in the British slave trade, 1740-1807,’ p. 15

¹⁰ Seymour Drescher, ‘The Slaving Capital of the World: Liverpool and National Opinion in the Age of Abolition,’ *Slavery & Abolition* 9, no. 2 (1988).

¹¹ ‘First. That one-fourth of the ships belonging to the port of Liverpool are employed in the African trade Second. That it has five-eighths of the African trade of Great Britain Third. That it has three-sevenths of the African trade of all Europe. Fourth. That it navigates one-twelfth part of all the shipping of Great Britain. Fifth. That it has one-fourth part in all foreign trade of Great Britain. Sixth. That it has one-half the trade of the city of London. Seventh. That it has one-sixth part of the general commerce of Great Britain. Eighth. That 584 ships belong to the port, whose burthen is 92098 registered tons.’ James Wallace, *A General and Descriptive History of the*

Ancient and Present State of the Town of Liverpool (Liverpool: R. Phillips, 1795), pp. 238-39.

¹² In 1789, Liverpool sent twelve petitions against the abolition of the slave trade. Single petitions were sent by other slave-trading ports; Lancaster, Bristol and Glasgow. Jane Longmore, ‘“Cemented by the Blood of a Negro?” The Impact of the Slave Trade on Eighteenth-Century Liverpool,’ in *Liverpool and Transatlantic Slavery*, ed. David Richardson, Anthony Tibbles, and Suzanne Schwarz (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2007), p. 243. Further, James Walvin has suggested that Liverpool’s MPs, mercantile elite, and commercial and political interests, provided more detailed evidence against abolition than those from any other slave port between 1787 and 1807. See James Walvin, *Black Ivory: A History of British Slavery*, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 2001), p. 260.

¹³ Geoff Quilley, ‘“All Ocean Is Her Own”: The Image of the Sea and the Identity of the Maritime Nation in Eighteenth-Century British Art,’ in *Imagining Nations*, ed. Geoffrey Cubitt (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1998), p.135.

¹⁴ Ken Lunn and Ann Day, ‘Britain as Island: National Identity and the Sea,’ in *History, Nationhood, and the Question of Britain*, ed. Helen Brocklehurst and Robert Phillips (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004), pp. 125-26.

¹⁵ John Belchem has identified a ‘Merseypride’ discourse in Liverpool histories at the turn of the twentieth century, where Liverpool’s ‘exceptional’, yet temporally recent, growth and prosperity is articulated as something in which to take an ‘inverse pride’. See John Belchem, ‘Liverpool’s Story Is the World’s Glory,’ in *Merseypride: Essays in Liverpool Exceptionalism*, ed. John Belchem (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2000), p. 6.

¹⁶ *A New Guide to Liverpool* (Liverpool: Littlebury Brothers, 1902), p. 133. Prior to this publication, guidebooks in Liverpool were published privately, by individuals and societies not directly associated with the Corporation. See John Davies, 'Liverpool Guides, 1795-1914,' *Transactions of the Historic Society of Lancashire and Cheshire* 153 (2004): p. 82.

¹⁷ *A New Guide to Liverpool*, 3.

¹⁸ 'Liverpool's 700th Birthday - Preparations for the Celebration,' *Liverpool Post & Mercury*, March 16, 1907; 'Liverpool's 700th Birthday - the Celebrations - Channel Fleet to Be Invited - Important Meeting,' *Liverpool Daily Post and Mercury*, February 22, 1907; 'Liverpool's 700th Birthday Pageant,' *Liverpool Courier*, August 5, 1907.

¹⁹ Liverpool Corporation, *City of Liverpool Official Handbook (Published under the Authority of the Corporation)* (Liverpool: Littlebury Brothers, 1907), p. 82.

²⁰ This line is included in the following guides: Liverpool Corporation, *Official Handbook (1950)*, pp. 31-2; Liverpool Corporation, *Liverpool Official Handbook (published under the authority of the Corporation)* (Liverpool: Littlebury Brothers, 1957), p. 19; Liverpool Corporation, *Liverpool Official Guide (published under the authority of the Corporation)* (Liverpool: Littlebury Brothers, 1967), p. 19; Liverpool Corporation, *Liverpool Official Guide (published under the authority of the Corporation)* (Liverpool: Steel House Publications, 1971), p. 14.

²¹ Derek Whale, 'Fishing Village to a Great Seaport,' in *City of Liverpool Charter Celebrations 1207-1957: Evening Express Charter Supplement* (Liverpool: Liverpool Evening Express, June 17, 1957).

²² Whale, 'Fishing Village to a Great Seaport.'

²³ See Ann Day and Ken Lunn, 'British Maritime Heritage: Carried Along by the Currents?,' *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 9, no. 4 (2003).

²⁴ T.A. Hume, 'History of the Port Lives On,' in *The Port of Liverpool: The Vital Link between British Industry and the World (Supplement)* (Liverpool: Liverpool Daily Post, December 30, 1957).

²⁵ This collection, which grew over the next decade, was largely destroyed when the William Brown Street buildings were hit in the May 1941 Blitz, leading to the loss of 90 ship models. Hume 'History of the Port Lives On'. Prior to this, only a small amount of maritime material was held by Liverpool Museums. The Liverpool Museum had '[a] small fleet of ships' amongst its collection in 1815, and the Mayer Museum received a ship model as a gift from the Mersey Docks and Harbour Board in 1862. See Elizabeth Mumford, *An Explanatory and Interesting Companion to the Liverpool Museum* (Liverpool: Johnson, 1815).

²⁶ John Belchem, 'Introduction: Celebrating Liverpool,' in *Liverpool 800 : Culture, Character and History*, ed. John. Belchem (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2006), p. 30; 'Growth of a Great Port - Liverpool Shipping Week Features,' *Liverpool Post & Mercury*, August 6, 1931; 'Liverpool Launches Its Shipping Week,' *Liverpool Daily Post & Mercury*, August 31, 1931.

²⁷ 'In spite of constant reminders, it is too often forgotten even by Merseyside, that Liverpool's destiny is on the sea. Her place and wealth as a port have been built up over the centuries, and this exhibition, which opens on August 29th, will, it is hoped educate as well as interest'. 'Ships Down the Ages,' *Liverpool Daily Post & Mercury*, August 18, 1931.

²⁸ The section of the official guide concerning the history of the port outlines its physical developments and states that Liverpool traded with 'the British Colonies in

America, West Africa’, and that ‘towards the end of the eighteenth century Liverpool had fairly outstripped Bristol’ without detailing such lines of trade. L.A.P. Warner, ‘How the Port of Liverpool Was Evolved,’ in *Liverpool Shipping Week Official Book and Programme* (Liverpool: Liverpool Organization Limited, 1931).

²⁹ The only item that received sustained discussion in the local press was a bronze bell given to the African ‘Grandy Robin John’ in Old Calabar in 1770 by Thomas Jones, who was, significantly, a Bristol slave merchant, not a Liverpool trader. Four further items are listed within the catalogue published as part of the exhibition’s official programme; a ‘Slave Emancipation Letter’ for an Elizabeth Bennet Croft from 1826 signed by the Mayor of Liverpool, a related ‘Original Account’ for Croft from 1813 to the amount of £150, a Bill of Lading of slaves from 1803 and a ‘Debit Note Sale of Slaves’ from 1782. ‘A Slave Trade Bell,’ *Liverpool Daily Post & Mercury*, August 25, 1931; *Liverpool Shipping Week Official Book and Programme*, (Liverpool: Liverpool Organization Limited, 1931).

³⁰ LRO, Liverpool, Liverpool Shipping Week 29 August - 5 September 1931, *Correspondence in Connection with the Organisation etc*, 387.2 LIV, List of Items Lent to Liverpool Shipping Week Exhibition. For a critique of the use of the *Brookes* in 2007, see Marcus Wood, *The Horrible Gift of Freedom: Atlantic Slavery and the Representation of Emancipation* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2010). Chapter six.

³¹ ‘Liverpool Launches Its Shipping Week.’

³² C Northcote Parkinson, ‘The Idea of a Maritime Museum,’ *Nautical Research Society Transactions* 3 (1946).

³³ Liverpool Corporation, *City of Liverpool Official Handbook*

³⁴ In literature produced to accompany the Maritime Exhibition at The Littlewoods Central Clubroom, the beginning of the eighteenth century is discussed as the time when Liverpool ‘entered the African trade and the profitable traffic in slaves in competition with London and Bristol, from which she emerged supreme’. E.W. Paget-Tomlinson, *Maritime Exhibition Catalogue and Guide* (Liverpool: Littlewoods, 1957) pp. 5-6.

³⁵ ‘Famous Ship Models to Be Seen Again,’ *Liverpool Daily Echo*, June 13, 1957; ‘Liverpool Pride as City Celebrates Its 750th Birthday,’ *Liverpool Echo*, June 17, 1957.

³⁶ ‘After 100 Years - a Museum of the Sea,’ *Sea Breezes* 54 (1980).

³⁷ Peter Rockliff, ‘Special...The Launching of the Maritime Museum,’ *Trident 2*, Nov/Dec (1980).

³⁸ ‘After 100 Years - a Museum of the Sea,’ pp. 393-96.

³⁹ Lord Gifford QC (Chair), Wally Brown, and Ruth Bunday, *Loosen the Shackles: First Report of the Liverpool 8 Inquiry into Race Relations in Liverpool*, (London: Karia Press, 1989), p. 26.

⁴⁰ The panel text read as follows: ‘The slave trade did make a significant contribution to Liverpool’s prosperity. However, Liverpool’s trading wealth was firmly established before it began to dominate the slave trade from the 1760s. Between 1783 and 1793, 878 Liverpool ships carried 303,737 slaves. Sailings to Africa represented only 10% of outward bound tonnage from Liverpool. On the other hand slaves produced the sugar and tobacco which were Liverpool’s most important imports.’ Quoted in Gifford, Brown and Bunday, *Loosen the Shakes*, p. 26.

⁴¹ Marcus Wood has argued that the gallery’s basement location acted to ‘compartmentalize’ slavery, and remove it from ‘the overall narrative of Liverpool’s

development.’ See Marcus Wood, *Blind Memory: Visual Representations of Slavery in England and America, 1780-1865* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000), p. 297.

⁴² Liverpolitan, September 16, 2007, (6:30 p.m.), comment on, *Skyscraper City Forum* ‘International Museum of Slavery’, accessed July 6, 2008, <http://www.skyscrapercity.com/showthread.php?s=f3172977c66555ae6da093ef09ab3c20&t=524570>

⁴³ Buggedboy, September 18, 2007, (11:52 a.m.) comment on *Skyscraper City Forum*

⁴⁴ Peter Aughton, *Liverpool: A People's History, 2nd Edition* (Preston: Carnegie, 2003), pp. 307-08.

⁴⁵ Edmund Vale, quoted in ‘“All Round” in the London Letter,’ *Liverpool Daily Post*, April 8, 1946.

⁴⁶ Arthur C. Wardle, ‘Letter: The Slave Cellars,’ *Liverpool Daily Post*, April 23, 1946.

⁴⁷ ‘The southern produce imported to the Mersey was largely raised by negro slaves bought in Africa by Liverpool traders, and sold to Americans on stage two of that damnable **triangular trip**’ Sydney Jeffery, ‘Liverpool Links with America,’ *Liverpool Daily Post*, October 15, 1956. ‘By 1760 there were 69 Liverpool ships on this **triangular trade**’ Liverpool City Council, *City of Liverpool Official Guide* (Liverpool: British Publishing Company Ltd, 1988), 14. ‘[...]the ships made a **triangular trip**, going out to the African coast with a cargo, loading their slaves there for the Atlantic crossing, and selling them direct on the other side. The home cargo was American and Colonial produce.’ ‘A Persistent Fable,’ *Liverpool Post and Mercury*, November 6, 1934.

⁴⁸ ‘The slaves were then shipped on the **terrible Middle Passage** to the West Indies, where, after they had been sold, the ship loaded rum, sugar, and other native produce, and returned to Liverpool.’ ‘Letter: In Reference to Your Note...’, *Liverpool Daily Post & Mercury*, April 28, 1931.

⁴⁹ Aughton, *Liverpool: A People's History, 2nd Edition*, p. 80.

⁵⁰ Herbert Feilden, ‘Letter: Liverpool and the Slave Trade - the Triangular Voyages,’ *Liverpool Daily Post*, August 22, 1939.

⁵¹ ‘Slaves were not, of course, brought to Liverpool in large numbers, as the Liverpool slave trade was only part of a triangular commercial operation.’ George Chandler, *Liverpool* (London: B. T. Batsford, 1957), p. 305.

⁵² Steve Brauner, ‘Slavery Haunts the Old Docks,’ *Liverpool Daily Post*, December 13, 1991.

⁵³ Blabber II, September 17, 2007, (12.19 p.m.), comment on, *Skyscraper City Forum*.

⁵⁴ RIBA Architectural Tour of Liverpool taken by author, July 24, 2011

⁵⁵ Toni Morrison, ‘The Site of Memory’ in *Inventing the Truth: The Art and Craft of Memoir* 2nd ed. ed. William Zinsser (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1995) p. 99

⁵⁶ Wood, *Blind Memory*, 16; Gomer Williams, *History of the Liverpool Privateers and Letters of Marque: With an Account of the Liverpool Slave Trade, 1744-1812* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1897, reprinted 2004), p. 474.

⁵⁷ James Allanson Picton, *Memorials of Liverpool, Historical and Topographical*, Vol 1, 2nd Edition, (London: Longman, Greens & Co., 1875), p. 557

⁵⁸ Ramsay Muir, *History of Liverpool* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1907), p. 202.

⁵⁹ Louis Lacey, *The History of Liverpool from 1207 to 1907. Some Notes. 700th Anniversary Souvenir* (Liverpool: Lyceum Press, 1907), p. 75.

⁶⁰ Quentin Hughes, *Seaport* (London: Percy Lund, Humphries & Co, 1964), p. 11.

⁶¹ John. R. Oldfield, *'Chords of Freedom': Commemoration, Ritual and British Transatlantic Slavery* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007).

⁶² Beech, 'A step forwards or a step sideways?' This comment refers to a well-known example of a loaded question or logical fallacy in which being asked 'have you stopped beating your wife' carries with it an implication of guilt and is impossible to answer 'yes' or 'no' to without admitting that guilt.

⁶³ Wood, *Blind Memory*. p. 8

⁶⁴ Terry Cavanagh, *Public Sculpture of Liverpool* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1997), p. 46.

⁶⁵ 'ONE of the more remarkable men of the eighteenth century whose bicentenaries are being celebrated this year was William Wilberforce. He certainly changed the course of history for his deeds affect the lives of millions now living in the twentieth century free from the bonds of slavery and Liverpool gave him many supporters.' Dr. J Thomas, 'He Freed the Slaves: Wilberforce and His Liverpool Supporters,' *Liverpool Daily Post*, August 24, 1959.

⁶⁶ Ivor E. Davies, 'Letter: Fighters against Slavery, *Liverpool Daily Post*, August 29, 1959.

⁶⁷ Howard Channon, *Portrait of Liverpool* (London: Robert Hale & Company, 1972), p. 73. Ron Jones also includes a section on the poignant naming of the building after a section on Goree, though layers American connections, 'Wilberforce House, the modern building looking out onto the Piazza, is named after William Wilberforce the great anti-slavery reformer [...]'. Ron Jones, *The American Connection: The Story of Liverpool's Links with America from Christopher Columbus to the Beatles* (Moreton: Ron Jones, 1986), p. 25.

⁶⁸ See Ray Costello, *Black Liverpool: The Early History of Britain's Oldest Black Community, 1730-1918* (Liverpool: Picton Press, 2001).

⁶⁹ John Willet, *Art in a City* (London: The Shenval Press, 1967), p. 15.

⁷⁰ Willet, *Art in a City*, 104; Graeme Shankland, *City and County Borough of Liverpool Planning Consultants Report No 10. Draft City Centre Map* (Liverpool: City and County Borough of Liverpool, 1963), p. 54; Graeme Shankland and Walter Bor, *Liverpool City Centre Plan* (Liverpool: City and County Borough of Liverpool, 1965), p. 89.

⁷¹ Merseyside Civic Society, *Report for the Year Ended 30th September, 1966* (1966), p. 3.

⁷² 'The Merseyside Civic Society,' *Liverpool Illustrated News*, January 1967, 'Liverpool Fountain Will Be Shipyard Built,' *Liverpool Journal of Commerce*, May 19, 1966.

⁷³ Willet, *Art in a City*, 108.

⁷⁴ 'To Free the World of Slavery - Appeal of the Churches,' *Liverpool Post and Mercury*, July 29, 1932.

⁷⁵ Jones, *The American Connection*, p. 23.

⁷⁶ David Lewis, *Walks through History: Liverpool* (Liverpool: Breedon Books Publishing, 2004), p. 152.

⁷⁷ Lewis, *Walks through History*, p. 152

⁷⁸ 'Liverpool Fountain Will Be Shipyard Built.'

⁷⁹ Richard Huws, quoted in Quentin Hughes, *Liverpool: City of Architecture*, 2nd ed. (Liverpool: Bluecoat Press, 1999), p. 167.

⁸⁰ Kerwin Lee Klein, 'On the Emergence of Memory in Historical Discourse,' *Representations* 69 (2000) p. 138.

⁸¹ Pierre Nora, 'Between Memory and History, Les Lieux De Memoire,'
Representations, no. 26 (1989).