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I. Introduction and Findings

Harvard’s motto, _Veritas_, inscribed on gates, doorways, and sculptures all over campus, demands of us truth. This report, prepared by the Presidential Committee on Harvard & the Legacy of Slavery, advances our quest for truth through scholarship about the University’s historic ties to slavery—direct, financial, and intellectual.

Through research in the Harvard University Archives and in several Harvard libraries, including the Houghton Library and the Radcliffe Institute’s Schlesinger Library on the History of Women in America, as well as in collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society, the Boston Athenaeum, the American Philosophical Society, the University of Michigan Library, and the New York Public Library Schomburg Center for Research in Black Culture, among other repositories, this report documents now incontestable truths: During the 17th and 18th centuries, the sale and trafficking of human beings—in slavery—and the industries rooted in the labor of enslaved women, men, and children were pervasive around the world, comprised a vital part of the New England economy, and powerfully shaped Harvard University. Harvard leaders, faculty, staff, and benefactors enslaved people, some of whom labored at the University; accrued wealth through the slave trade and slave labor; and defended the institution of slavery.

In documenting these truths, this report builds on the groundbreaking work of researchers at Harvard and other universities: In recent years, scholars have documented extensive relationships between American institutions of higher education and slavery. Indeed, a consortium of more than 80 institutions of higher education, called Universities Studying Slavery and based at the University of Virginia, is engaged in this work. We now officially and publicly—and with a steadfast commitment to truth, and to repair—add Harvard University to the long and growing list of American institutions of higher education, located in both the North and in the South, that are entangled with the history of slavery and its legacies.

A Community Reckoning with Slavery and Its Legacies

The findings of this committee—summarized in this introduction and detailed in the pages that follow—not only reveal a chasm between the Harvard of the past and of the present but also point toward the work we must still undertake to live up to our highest ideals. Today, Harvard University enrolls a racially diverse student body; champions race-conscious admissions policies in our courts of law; supports “inclusive excellence;” employs a faculty that includes renowned scholars of African descent and a celebrated department of African and African American studies; hosts a Native American Program that supports Native students and distinguished Native American faculty; and embraces reckoning with its past. Yet legacies of slavery persist, and our community, working together, has the opportunity to shape a better future.

Harvard’s 29th president, Lawrence S. Bacow, established the Presidential Initiative on Harvard & the Legacy of Slavery in 2019, appointed a committee representative of all the University’s schools, and charged this group with diving deep into our history and its relationship to the present. President Bacow asked the committee to “give additional dimension to our understanding of the impact of slavery” at Harvard. This work, he said, should “have a strong grounding in rigorous research and critical perspectives” that “will inform … our understanding of facts,” as well as “how we might address the ramifications of what we learn.” President Bacow also asked the committee to “concentrate on connections, impact, and contributions that are specific to our Harvard community” and “provide opportunities to convene academic events, activities, and conversations that will encourage our broader University community to think seriously and rigorously about the continuing impact and legacy of slavery in 2019 and beyond.”

This charge built on earlier work. In 2016, Drew Gilpin Faust, the University’s 28th president, publicly acknowledged that “Harvard was directly complicit in
America’s system of racial bondage from the College’s earliest days in the 17th century until slavery in Massachusetts ended in 1783, and Harvard continued to be indirectly involved through extensive financial and other ties to the slave South up to the time of emancipation.” She established a committee on the University and slavery that, with the aid of the researcher Caitlin Galante DeAngelis (PhD 2014), conducted a preliminary investigation upon which this report builds. These initial efforts included, in 2016, a public ceremony in which then-President Faust and the late civil rights leader US Congressman John Lewis unveiled a plaque affixed to Wadsworth House in Harvard Yard that acknowledges the unfree labor of four enslaved people—Titus, Venus, Juba, and Bilhah—who lived there and worked for two Harvard presidents and their families. A 2017 conference at the Radcliffe Institute for Advanced Study, organized at Faust’s suggestion with the support of then-Radcliffe Dean Lizabeth Cohen, brought together prominent thinkers about universities and slavery from around the country.

The work of excavating and confronting the truths that this committee now discloses has been, and continues to be, a community-wide endeavor. Whereas prior histories of Harvard scarcely mentioned the University’s ties to slavery, Harvard scholars and students have worked assiduously in recent years to reveal painful truths. Beginning in 2007, Laird Bell Professor of History Sven Beckert and his undergraduate students began investigating Harvard’s ties to slavery in a multiyear series of research seminars, releasing a report on their findings in 2011. At Harvard Law School in 2008, Royall Professor of Law Janet Halley explored the history of slave-owning colonial benefactor Isaac Royall Jr., sharing knowledge that helped spur student protests decrying the Law School’s shield, which featured the Royall family crest. Martha Minow, 300th Anniversary University Professor and then-dean of Harvard Law School, established a committee that recommended the retiring of the shield. In 2017, Harvard Law School dedicated a memorial on the School’s campus to the enslaved people whose labor generated Royall’s wealth. In 2020, Harvard Medical School students petitioned against the “Oliver Wendell Holmes” academic society because of namesake Oliver Wendell Holmes Sr.’s role in the expulsion of Black students in 1850 and his promotion of so-called race science. Upon the recommendation of a faculty subcommittee and with the approval of Dean George Q. Daley, the society was renamed for William Augustus Hinton (SB 1905; MD 1912), a clinical professor of bacteriology and immunology at HMS and the first Black full professor at Harvard.

Moreover, as this committee conducted its work, many Harvard alumni engaged with it, including some with family connections to slavery and others who were present on campus during the era of segregation, bearing witness to parts of the history documented in this report. With support from the Presidential Initiative, Harvard students from multiple schools and departments also aided and augmented our efforts through research and the production of poetry and dramatic art.

And as Harvard embarks on reparative efforts to address the University’s entanglements with slavery, discussed below, the committee hopes and expects that our community will continue to participate in this reckoning.

**Slavery in the North**

Context is vital to understanding the complicity of American institutions, including institutions of higher education such as Harvard, with slavery. This context reframes what many believe about slavery, and it belies a common myth.

The story most often told about American slavery focuses on large plantations in the South, forced agricultural labor, and brutal auctions where enslaved people were sold “down the river.” New England is not, in general, a part of this narrative. The Commonwealth of Massachusetts and the City of Boston are, rather, remembered as the birthplace of the American Revolution, and they are typically associated with the antislavery moment. Massachusetts is thought to have been a hotbed of opposition to slavery, and so it was at critical junctures. The Commonwealth can rightly claim noted abolitionists like William Lloyd Garrison, Frederick Douglass, David Walker, and US Senator Charles Sumner (AB 1830; LLB 1833) along with courageous soldiers who fought for the Union during the Civil War—including the famed 54th Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry Regiment, commanded by the Harvard alumnus Robert Gould Shaw (Class of 1860; posthumous AB 1873).

This conventional telling—focused on the region’s celebrated roles in the Revolutionary War, the abolitionist struggle, and the preservation of American nationhood during the Civil War—makes valor, social consciousness, and liberty the through lines in New England’s history. Resistance to tyranny in service of American democracy is an integral part of the region’s cultural identity. But history is rarely, if ever, so neat and linear; and reality complicates this incomplete, if popular, narrative.

In fact, slavery thrived in New England from its beginnings, and was a vital element of the colonial economy. Colonists
first enslaved and sold Indigenous people, and they dispossessed and massacred Native peoples through war. They also enslaved Africans and played a key role in the Atlantic slave trade, building a thriving economy based on an economic alliance with the sugar islands of the West Indies. This trade involved the provision of food, fuel, and lumber produced in New England to plantations of the Caribbean, where those goods were exchanged for tobacco, coffee, and sugar produced by enslaved Africans—or for enslaved people themselves. “This effectively made Boston a slave society,” according to a leading historian of the region, “but one where most of the enslaved toiled elsewhere, sustaining the illusion of Boston in New England as an inclusive republic devoted to the common good.” By 1700, New Englanders had made at least 19 voyages to Africa and then to the West Indies, the chief route of the slave trade, as well as many more voyages between Massachusetts Bay and the Caribbean.

The Massachusetts Bay Colony’s Body of Liberties, written in 1641, made such exchanges lawful. The first legal code governing slavery in British North America, it prohibited “bond-slavery,” “unless it be of lawfull captives, taken in just warrs, and such strangers as willingly sell themselves, or are solde to us,” leading one historian to note, “the word ‘unless’ has seldom carried more baggage.” Even as it paid homage to the Magna Carta, the Body of Liberties permitted the buying, selling, and trading of Indigenous people and Africans. Slavery would not officially end in Massachusetts until 1783.

So, too, was slavery integral to Harvard. Over nearly 150 years, from the University’s founding in 1636 until the Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court found slavery unlawful in 1783, Harvard presidents and other leaders, as well as its faculty and staff, enslaved more than 70 individuals, some of whom labored on campus. Enslaved men and women served Harvard presidents and professors and fed and cared for Harvard students. Moreover, throughout this period and well into the 19th century, the University and its donors benefited from extensive financial ties to slavery. These profitable financial relationships included, most notably, the beneficence of donors who accumulated their wealth through slavery: the labor of enslaved people on plantations in the Caribbean islands and in the American South; and from the Northern textile manufacturing industry, supplied with cotton grown by enslaved people held in bondage. The University also profited from its own financial investments, which included loans to Caribbean sugar planters, rum distillers, and plantation suppliers along with investments in cotton manufacturing. The balance of the University’s financial ties shifted over time; with the development of industrial capitalism in the late 18th and early 19th centuries, the plantation economy evolved, and cotton began to take center stage. Northern textile industrialists interacted with the institution of slavery through the cotton trade; enslaved laborers produced the cotton that was the engine of textile production and, therefore, of the region’s economy. Senator Sumner called this vital economic link between the industrial North and the slaveholding South an “unhallowed alliance between the lords of the lash and the lords of the loom.”

Harvard’s donors in this period—and their wealth—were vital to the University’s growth. They allowed the University to hire faculty, support students, develop its infrastructure, and, ultimately, begin to establish itself as a national institution. Still today, early Harvard benefactors who accumulated their wealth through slavery are memorialized throughout campus in statues, buildings, student houses, and endowed professorships—and indeed in other educational, civic, and cultural organizations across Massachusetts. These individuals’ involvement as critical players in the University’s early development, and the commemorations of their contributions still visible in the campus landscape, are an important part of the history with which we must now reckon.

**Slavery and Its Legacies before and after the Civil War**

During the antebellum era, well after the end of slavery in Massachusetts, and even after the 13th Amendment to the US Constitution conferred emancipation nationwide in 1865, vestiges—or legacies—of the system lingered. Legacies of slavery such as exclusion, segregation, and discrimination against Blacks in employment, voting, housing, healthcare, public accommodations, criminal punishment, and education, among other areas, persisted in the South as well as the North. Notwithstanding the Commonwealth’s Revolutionary War heritage as birthplace of the colonists’ struggle for liberty, its celebrated antislavery activists, and its many brave Union veterans of the Civil War, racial inequality flourished in Massachusetts—and at Harvard—as Blacks struggled for equal opportunity and full citizenship.

**Slavery and Antislavery before the Civil War**

In the years before the Civil War, the color line held at Harvard despite a false start toward Black access. In 1850, Harvard’s medical school admitted three Black students but, after a group of white students and alumni objected, the School’s dean, Oliver Wendell Holmes Sr.,
expelled them. The episode crystallized opposition to Black students on campus, which outweighed the views of a vocal contingent of white classmates who supported the admission of the three African American students. Over 100 years would pass before these more welcoming attitudes toward Blacks would prevail and open the door to significant Black enrollment.

The passage of the Fugitive Slave Act of 1850, requiring the return of enslaved people to their owners, even if slaves had escaped to free states, turned more white Northerners against slavery and its cruelties. Yet support for antislavery efforts remained anemic at Harvard, even amid the rise of abolitionist sentiment in the Commonwealth. In some cases, University leadership even attempted to suppress abolitionist sentiment.

Within the context of increasing political rancor and social division on and off campus, a small but vocal group of Harvard affiliates pressed the abolitionist cause. In addition to Charles Sumner, outspoken abolitionist voices included Wendell Phillips (AB 1831; LLB 1834), founder of the New England Anti-Slavery Society; John Gorham Palfrey (AB 1815; dean and faculty member, 1830–1839; overseer, 1828–1831, 1852–1855), the first dean of the Divinity School; and several other faculty members, among them cofounders of the Cambridge Anti-Slavery Society. Richard Henry Dana Jr. (AB 1837; LLB 1839; lecturer 1866–1868; overseer, 1865–1877) cofounded the antislavery Free Soil party and represented Anthony Burns, a fugitive slave who had been arrested in Boston. In a turn of events decried by many Northerners, a Massachusetts judge, himself a Harvard alumnus and lecturer, ordered Burns returned to slavery in Virginia. Because of such controversies, the Fugitive Slave Act became a catalyst of the Civil War, and by the time war began in 1861, the University officially supported the Union. Many Harvard men fought and died for the Union, and their sacrifices are commemorated on campus in Memorial Hall; some also fought and died for the Confederacy.

**Intellectual Leadership**

Harvard’s ties to the legacies of slavery also include, prominently, its intellectual production—its scholarly leadership and the influential output of some members of its faculty. In the 19th century, Harvard had begun to amass human anatomical specimens, including the bodies of enslaved people, that would, in the hands of the University’s prominent scientific authorities, become central to the promotion of so-called race science at Harvard and other American institutions. William Eliot—Harvard’s longest-serving president—and several prominent faculty members promoted eugenics, the concept of selective reproduction premised on innate differences in moral character, health, and intelligence among races. These were ideas of the sort that had long been deployed to justify racial segregation, and which would in the 19th and 20th centuries cement profound racial inequities in the United States and underpin Nazi Germany’s extermination of “undesirable” populations. In addition to research in the University’s extensive collections of human remains, Eliot authorized anthropometric measurements of Harvard’s own student-athletes. Many of the records and artifacts of this era remain in the University’s collections today.

**Vestiges of Slavery after the Civil War**

The decades after the Civil War, during the period of Reconstruction when debates raged about whether and how to support the Black American quest for equality, are especially germane to understanding legacies of slavery in American institutions of higher education. The US Constitution changed, reflecting the nation’s formal break with slavery and commitment to equal citizenship rights regardless of race. The 14th Amendment, conferring equal protection and due process of law, and the 15th Amendment, prohibiting discrimination against males in voting, were enacted and ratified. Within this context, reformers conceived policies and social supports to lift the formerly enslaved and their descendants. But it fell to the nation’s institutions, its leadership, and its people to safeguard—or not—citizens’ rights and implement these policies.

Around the same time, Harvard itself aspired to transform: it sought to enlarge its infrastructure, expand its student body, and recruit new faculty. Samuel Eliot Morison, a noted historian of the University, explained that during the period from 1869 into the 20th century, the University resolved “to expand with the country.” Harvard’s leaders, particularly Presidents Charles William Eliot and Abbott Lawrence Lowell, argued that Harvard should become a “true” national university that would serve as a “unifying influence.” They viewed the recruitment of students from “varied” backgrounds and a “large area” of the country as a linchpin of these ambitions.

Hence, two developments critical to understanding this moment of promise and peril occurred at once: The fate of African Americans hung in the balance. And Harvard, already well-known, sought to grow, evolve, and build a yet greater national reputation.
The University, as a prominent institution of higher education, held influence in a sphere deemed particularly critical to racial uplift. Because so many considered education “a liberating force,” legislative and philanthropic efforts to create opportunity for African Americans often emphasized schooling. Massachusetts was already a leader in this area; in addition to its many universities, the state had led the movement to establish taxpayer-supported “common schools” at the elementary and secondary levels.

Nevertheless, in Massachusetts and in every corner of the nation, African Americans encountered roadblocks to achieving social mobility through education. White opposition to racially “mixed” schools, born of racist attitudes about Black ability and character promoted by slaveholders as well as intellectuals at Harvard and elsewhere, blocked equal access to education. Segregated, under-resourced, and often inferior elementary and secondary schools became the norm for African Americans. In this, too, Massachusetts led the way.

Harvard alumni played prominent roles on both sides of the struggle over school segregation. One critically important chapter in that struggle, which would have dire nationwide consequences for Blacks into the 20th century, had occurred in Boston before the Civil War. In Roberts v. City of Boston, an 1850 decision, the Commonwealth helped normalize segregated schools. In that case—filed by Charles Sumner on behalf of a five-year-old Black girl—the Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court held that racial segregation in the city’s schools did not offend the law. Judge Lemuel Shaw (AB 1800; overseer, 1831–1853; fellow, 1834–1861) authored the opinion for the court. “The good of both classes of school will be best promoted, by maintaining the separate primary schools for colored and for white children,” he wrote. Advocacy by the local Black community with important support from Sumner led the Commonwealth to ban segregated schools in 1855, the first such law in the United States. Nevertheless, decades later, in 1896, the US Supreme Court cited Roberts as authority when it held in Plessy v. Ferguson that racially “separate but equal” facilities did not violate the 14th Amendment to the Constitution.

In higher education, Blacks also found themselves in separate and unequal schools. It was left to historically Black colleges and universities (HBCUs), supported by the federal government beginning in 1865 and often founded by Black self-help organizations and religious societies, to provide a measure of opportunity. But from the start, HBCUs were sorely underfunded, a reality that hobbled school leaders as they sought to fulfill the HBCUs’ mission of racial uplift through postsecondary school access. Predominantly white universities did not fill the breach. In keeping with prevailing racial attitudes and the relegation of African Americans to poorly resourced HBCUs of uneven quality, Harvard—like all but a few white universities—did relatively little to support the African American quest for advancement.

In the decades following the Civil War, at Harvard and other white universities, Blacks still faced discrimination, or plain indifference. Notwithstanding Harvard’s rhetorical commitment in the war’s wake to recruit a nationally representative student body that would model political collegiality, the University’s sights remained set on a white “upper crust.” Harvard prized the admission of academically able Anglo-Saxon students from elite backgrounds—including wealthy white sons of the South—and it restricted the enrollment of so-called “outsiders.” Despite access to civic organizations in major cities that could identify a pool of able Black students, the college enrolled meager numbers of African Americans. During the five decades between 1890 and 1940, approximately 160 Blacks attended Harvard College, or an average of about 3 per year, 30 per decade. In 1960, some nine Black men numbered among the 1,212 freshman matriculants to Harvard College, and that figure represented a vast improvement over the prior decades. Such small numbers made Black men feel isolated and marginalized on campus. The pattern of low enrollment of Blacks also held true at Radcliffe College, founded in 1879 as the “women’s annex” to all-male Harvard. Radcliffe did consistently enroll more Black women than its Seven Sisters peers. Yet the women educated at Radcliffe overwhelmingly were white, and Black women were denied campus housing.

Those Blacks who did manage to enter Harvard’s gates during the 19th and early-to-mid 20th century excelled academically, earning equal or better academic records than most white students, but encountered slavery’s legacies on campus. Two examples illustrate the segregation and marginalization that the few Black Harvard students faced: First, Harvard President Abbott Lawrence Lowell’s signature innovation—a residential college experience for first years that was meant to build community—excluded the handful of Black Harvard students. Lowell’s exclusionary policy was eventually overturned by the University’s governing boards following press attention and pressure from students, alumni, and activists. Second, Black Harvard athletes, whose talents sometimes earned them respect and recognition from other students on campus, encountered discrimination and exclusion in intercollegiate play, and Harvard administrators sometimes bowed to it. Yet Black students generally could and did participate in campus clubs and activities—illustrating a “half-opened door,” as
one author termed the Ivy League experience of African Americans and, for a time, Jewish and other students from disfavored white ethnic backgrounds.\(^{81}\)

The University’s history is complex, and its record of exclusion—not only along lines of race but also ethnicity, gender, and other categories—is clear and damaging. Yet this report does not explore the entirety of that difficult history; nor does it discuss at length the significance of Indigenous history to Harvard’s evolution, beyond colonial era dispossession and enslavement. This report focuses specifically on Harvard’s involvement with slavery and its legacies, from the colonial period into the 20th century, which is distinct in both degree and kind: Harvard’s very existence depended upon the expropriation of land and labor—land acquired through dispossession of Native territories and labor extracted from enslaved people, including Native Americans and Africans brought to the Americas by force. And, long after the official end of slavery, intellectual clout of influential Harvard leaders and distinguished faculty would be a powerful force justifying the continued subjugation of Black Americans.

Hence, the truth—_Veritas_—is that for hundreds of years, both before and after the Civil War, racial subjugation, exclusion, and discrimination were ordinary elements of life off and on the Harvard campus, in New England as well as in the American South. Abolitionist affiliates of the University did take a stand against human bondage, and others fought for racial reform after slavery. The willingness of these Harvard affiliates to speak out and act against racial oppression is rightly noted and celebrated.\(^{82}\) But these exceptional individuals do not reflect the full scope of the University’s history. The nation’s oldest institution of higher education—“America’s de facto national university,” as a noted historian described it—helped to perpetuate the era’s racial oppression and exploitation.\(^{83}\)

**A Legacy of African American Resistance**

This report uncovers Harvard’s complicity with slavery and its legacies, and in so doing, also recognizes as a part of the University’s history enslaved people of African and Native descent whose contributions have been overlooked. These individuals include Titus, Venus, Juba, and Bilhah, whose service in bondage to Presidents Wadsworth and Holyoke and their families supported their leadership of the University and enabled their lives as scholars.\(^{84}\) It also includes Cuba, once owned by Penelope Royall Vassall—sister of the slaveholding benefactor of Harvard Law School—as well as Darby Vassall, the son of Cuba and her husband, Anthony (Tony). Darby Vassall went on to play an important role in Boston’s free Black community, and his life and activism illustrate a critically important theme embedded in this report: Black resilience, agency, and achievement in the face of persistent discrimination.

The theme of Black resilience, agency, and achievement is especially relevant to the report’s discussion of late 19th- and 20th-century vestiges of slavery at Harvard. During the era of segregation, small numbers of African American students arrived on campus. Despite the oftentimes inhospitable learning environment, these Black Harvardians made vital contributions to the nationwide struggle against slavery’s legacies. A few examples make the point.

W. E. B. Du Bois, a graduate of Harvard College (1890) and the first African American to earn a PhD from Harvard (1895), made towering intellectual contributions even as he experienced racism on and off campus. Building on work he had first explored as a Harvard student, Du Bois, as a faculty member at HBCUs—first at Fisk University, the “Negro Harvard,” and then at Atlanta University—described and analyzed the persistent problem of the American “color line.”\(^{85}\) Moreover, Du Bois and the Black Harvard graduate William Monroe Trotter (AB 1895; AM 1896) cofounded the Niagara Movement, the precursor to the nation’s oldest civil rights organization, the NAACP.\(^{86}\)

Charles Hamilton Houston (LLB 1922; SJD 1923), the first African American editor of the _Harvard Law Review_, went on to become the vice-dean of Howard Law School\(^{87}\) and special counsel to the NAACP. A brilliant lawyer who was called “the man who killed Jim Crow,” Houston laid the legal groundwork for the reshaping of American law and society during the Civil Rights Movement.\(^{88}\)

And Eva Beatrice Dykes, the first summa cum laude graduate of Howard University, complete a master’s degree and, in 1921, earned a PhD from Radcliffe—the first African American woman to complete the requirements for a doctorate in the United States and one of three Black women in the country to complete a PhD that year. A daughter of enslaved people, Dykes went on to an illustrious career as a professor of English at historically Black colleges, first at Howard and then at Oakwood University.\(^{89}\) But when she had first sought admission to graduate studies at Radcliffe College,\(^{90}\) administrators were unimpressed by her credential earned at the historically Black Howard, and they required a do-over; Dykes, like some other HBCU graduates who enrolled at Harvard and Radcliffe, was forced to...
earn a second bachelor’s degree. She did, graduating magna cum laude and Phi Beta Kappa in 1917.91

The efforts of these African Americans, with support from white allies, including some at Harvard,92 gave rise to Brown v. Board of Education, the landmark 1954 US Supreme Court decision that outlawed state-sponsored school segregation and was “nothing short of a reconsecration of American ideals." Brown and the Civil Rights Movement prepared the way for passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965, groundbreaking legislation that barred discrimination in key American institutions and helped create the more equitable world in which we live today.93

These individuals, too, represent Harvard. They are important actors in the University’s history and in the making of a more perfect American union; and they must be made visible in this report. Through struggles against racial oppression and for human freedom, these graduates created legacies of professional leadership and civic engagement, and they made profound legal and social changes. The achievements of Black graduates of Harvard illustrate the entwining of the nation’s racial progress and access to a Harvard, and a Radcliffe, education.

Summary of the Report’s Key Findings

This account of the University’s entanglements with slavery and its legacies focuses on “connections, impact, and contributions” in the following categories: ownership of enslaved people; presence of enslaved people on campus; financial ties to slavery; intellectual leadership; and vestiges of slavery and resistance to racial oppression during the early 20th century. For purposes of this report, the activities of Harvard leadership, faculty, staff, students, and donors represent “the University.”

Our findings are as follows:

- Slavery—of Indigenous and of African people—was an integral part of life in Massachusetts and at Harvard during the colonial era.

- Between the University’s founding in 1636 and the end of slavery in the Commonwealth in 1783, Harvard faculty, staff, and leaders enslaved more than 70 individuals, whose names are listed in Appendix I.

- Some of the enslaved worked and lived on campus, where they cared for Harvard presidents and professors and fed generations of Harvard students.

- Through connections to multiple donors, the University had extensive financial ties to, and profited from, slavery during the 17th, 18th, and 19th centuries.

- These financial ties include donors who accumulated their wealth through slave trading; from the labor of enslaved people on plantations in the Caribbean islands and the American South; from the sale of supplies to such plantations and trade in goods they produced; and from the textile manufacturing industry in the North, supplied with cotton grown by enslaved people held in bondage in the American South. During the first half of the 19th century, more than a third of the money donated or promised to Harvard by private individuals came from just five men who made their fortunes from slavery and slave-produced commodities.

- These donors helped the University build a national reputation, hire faculty, support students, grow its collections, expand its physical footprint, and develop its infrastructure.

- The University today memorializes benefactors with ties to slavery across campus through statues, buildings, professorships, student houses, and the like.95

- While some Harvard affiliates fought against human bondage, on several occasions Harvard leaders, including members of the Harvard Corporation, sought to moderate or suppress antislavery politics on campus and among prominent Harvard affiliates.

- From the mid-19th century well into the 20th, Harvard presidents and several prominent professors, including Louis Agassiz, promoted “race science” and eugenics and conducted abusive “research,” including the photographing of enslaved and subjugated human beings. These theories and practices were rooted in racial hierarchies of the sort marshalled by proponents of slavery and would produce devastating consequences in the 19th and 20th centuries. Records and artifacts documenting many of these activities remain among the University’s collections.

- Research to advance eugenic theories also took place on campus: Dudley Allen Sargent, director of the Hemenway Gymnasium from 1879 until 1919, implemented a “physical education” program that involved intrusive physical examinations, anthropometric measurements, and the photographing of unclothed Harvard and Radcliffe students. Archives documenting Sargent’s activities remains among the University’s collections.
• Among Harvard’s vast museum collections are the remains of thousands of individuals. Many of these human remains are thought to belong to Indigenous people, and at least 15 are individuals of African descent who may have been enslaved, two of whom also had Indigenous ancestry. President Bacow has established a Steering Committee on Human Remains in Harvard Museum Collections to address this finding.

• Legacies of slavery persisted at Harvard, and throughout American society, after the Constitution and laws officially proscribed human bondage. Such legacies, including racial segregation, exclusion, and discrimination, were a part of campus life well into the 20th century.

• Many esteemed Black graduates of Harvard and of Radcliffe aided the nation and their communities through activism, teaching, legal advocacy, and community service devoted to the eradication of racism and to equal opportunity.

• The achievements of Black graduates of Harvard and of Radcliffe illustrate the entwining of the nation’s racial progress and access to a Harvard, and a Radcliffe, education.

These findings are discussed at greater length in the sections that follow, along with additional historical context and several individual case studies that, while not comprehensive, serve to illustrate both the nature and the extent of Harvard’s ties to slavery and its legacies. The final section of this report describes the committee’s recommendations for reparative action.
II. Slavery in New England and at Harvard

Harvard University’s early history is inseparable from that of colonial New England and, thus, from the system of slavery. Harvard was important to the region’s politics, society, and economy, and as slavery formed the basis of New England’s economic life, so it shaped Harvard. 97

Leading historians agree that the colonial economy thrived based on “an economic alliance with the sugar islands of the West Indies.” 98 This trade involved the provision of food, fuel, and lumber produced in New England to plantations of the Caribbean, where those goods were exchanged for tobacco, coffee, and sugar produced by enslaved Africans—or for enslaved people themselves. 99 “This effectively made Boston a slave society,” according to one historian, “but one where most of the enslaved toiled elsewhere, sustaining the illusion of Boston in New England as an inclusive republic devoted to the common good.” 100 Yet slavery was not absent from New England.

By 1700, New Englanders had made at least 19 voyages to Africa and then to the West Indies, the chief route of the slave trade, as well as many more voyages between Massachusetts Bay and the Caribbean. 101 The Massachusetts Bay Colony’s Body of Liberties, written in 1641, made slavery and the slave trade lawful. The first legal code governing slavery in British North America, it prohibited “bond-slavery,” “unless it be of lawfull captives, taken in just warres, and such strangers as willingly sell themselves, or are sold to us,” leading one historian to note, “the word ‘unless’ has seldom carried more baggage.” 102 Even as it paid homage to the Magna Carta, the Body of Liberties permitted the buying, selling, and trading of Indigenous people and Africans. Slavery would not officially end in Massachusetts until 1783.

Indigenous Slavery and African Slavery

Slavery in New England began when early colonists enslaved and sold Indigenous people while dispossessing these Native peoples of the land on which they had lived for generations. 103

In 1636, the year Harvard was founded, merchants at Marblehead built and rigged a ship, 120 tons and very fast, called Desire. That summer, the Desire set sail carrying 17 Pequot War prisoners who were to be sold as slaves in Bermuda on the instructions of John Winthrop. 104 A towering figure in early colonial history who served several terms as Governor and Lieutenant Governor of the Massachusetts Bay Colony, Winthrop was a member of the original “Comittee as to y’ colledg at New Toune”—that is, Harvard. 105 Winthrop himself enslaved the wife of a Pequot sachem and her two children in what he seems to have regarded as an act of Christian benevolence, reciprocity for her protection of two captured English girls during the conflict. 106

Two years later, on February 26, 1638, the Desire returned to Boston Harbor carrying cotton, tobacco, salt, and an unspecified number of enslaved Africans who had been purchased on Providence Island. The Desire was among the first American slave ships. 107 It is possible that the man known to us only as “The Moor”—who was enslaved by Harvard’s first schoolmaster, Nathaniel Eaton, and in that capacity served Harvard’s earliest students—arrived in New England aboard the Desire. 108

Not long after, in the early 1640s, a Bermuda minister named Patrick Copeland, grateful for Winthrop’s “remembrance of us in sending 12 New England Indians to us,” began recruiting the children of wealthy Caribbean plantation owners to attend Harvard. 109 As one historian has noted, “education, like the flag, follows trade”—and many sons of West Indian planters indeed followed trade to the Massachusetts Bay Colony and Harvard. 110

Harvard also benefited from land grants by the General Court (the colonial legislature) in 1653:

For the encouragement of Harvard Colledge and the society thereof, and for the more comfortable
The number of enslaved women, men, and children in Massachusetts, itself a small colony of some 33,000 inhabitants according to a 1675 census, remained relatively low until the end of the 17th century, and enslaved people formed part of a larger world of unfree labor that also included indentured white servants. In 1667, colonial administrator Edmund Randolph wrote that there were “not above 200 slaves in the colony, and those are brought from Guinea and Madagascar.” Four years later, Governor Simon Bradstreet told the Lords of the Committee for Trade and Foreign Plantations that “there are a very few blacks borne here, I think not above [five] or six at the most in a year.” Unlike white indentured servants, who eventually left their unfree status behind, these enslaved Africans faced lifetimes of uncompensated labor, both for themselves and for their descendants.

Antislavery sentiment was not, however, at the root of resistance in this period. Rather, limited opposition to slavery grew largely out of a concern about the growing presence of Black people and the effect that would have on society, fears that had gained salience in the wake of Bacon’s Rebellion in 1677. These concerns culminated in the passage in 1705 of an act “for the Better Preventing of a Spurious and Mixt Issue,” which put a prohibitive £4 tax on all slaves imported. The colonial legislature also adopted other measures designed to maintain the racial balance, such as the 1709 “Act to Encourage the Importation of White Servants,” which promised payment of forty shillings per white male servant imported into the colony and extended the 1705 import tax to include enslaved Native Americans. Despite such efforts, the number of enslaved people in the Massachusetts Bay Colony rose to 550 by 1708, and in 1720, Governor Samuel Shute wrote that “With respect to slaves either Negroes or Indians (but most Negroes) they may be computed at about Two Thousand” alongside an English population.
of 94,000. By the middle of the 18th century, enslaved Black people constituted the main source of bound labor in Massachusetts, outnumbering indentured servants, apprentices, and Indigenous workers.

**Slavery at Harvard**

On Harvard’s campus, the story was much the same. Over nearly 150 years, from the University’s founding in 1636 until the Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court found slavery unlawful, Harvard presidents and other leaders, as well as its faculty and staff, enslaved more than 70 individuals, some of whom labored on campus. Enslaved men and women served Harvard presidents and professors and fed and cared for Harvard students.

The enslaved man known as “The Moor,” who could have arrived aboard the Desire, was the first of many enslaved people who would serve Harvard students in the colonial era. Titus, Venus, Juba, and Bilhah, all enslaved people, served Harvard Presidents Benjamin Wadsworth (1725–1737) and Edward Holyoke (1737–1769). Yet more people were enslaved by Harvard’s stewards and, in this capacity, likely served Harvard’s students and maintained its campus.

The steward was a prominent role in the early years of the College, one that commanded respect and status. Stewards were responsible for feeding the scholars on campus, along with collecting student fees, overseeing staff engaged in student services, and paying many of the College’s bills. They also provided lavish feasts for the annual Commencement celebrations. From Harvard’s founding, in 1636, through the beginning of the American Revolution, only 10 men—5 from the same family—held the position. Of these 10, at least 3 owned enslaved people whose labor maintained the Harvard campus and sustained Harvard students.

Among the Harvard stewards who owned enslaved people, Andrew Bordman (II), steward from 1703 to 1747, stands out for having enslaved at least eight individuals. The documentation of his slaveholding is also characteristic of the period’s sparse records, but the picture becomes clear when the evidence is viewed as a whole: First, a deed of sale shows that Bordman paid £40 to buy a man named Cuffe and that his brother-in-law, future Harvard President Benjamin Wadsworth, witnessed the purchase. Separately, in the steward’s notebook, Bordman recorded the names of four children born to a woman named Rose: Flora, Jeffrey, Cesar, and Jane, an enslaved woman who died at the age of 22. Jane’s tombstone still stands in the Old Burying Ground near Harvard Yard, inscribed “Jane a Negro Servant of Andrew Bordman,” and it is adjacent to a similar memorial of Cicely, a black woman enslaved by the Harvard tutor, fellow, and treasurer William Brattle.

---

**ELMWOOD: A COMPLICATED HISTORY**

The residence of Harvard’s president, known as Elmwood, has a long and complicated history. Its ownership by the University, however, is relatively recent—the house was left to Harvard in 1933 by Arthur Kingsley Porter, a faculty member, and the University took possession in 1962.

Formerly the home of famous poets and diplomats and once a hospital for the Continental Army during the Revolutionary War, the building is listed on the National Register of Historic Places. It was also a site of enslavement.

The original owner of Elmwood, Thomas Oliver, was born on the Caribbean island of Antigua in 1734 to the wealthy slaveholding owners of a sugar plantation. Several years after graduating from Harvard, in 1753, Oliver married Elizabeth Vassall, daughter of a Jamaican plantation owner, and the couple built their home in Cambridge near other members of the Harvard-connected Vassall and Royall families.

In 1774, Oliver was appointed Royal Lieutenant Governor of Massachusetts—a role that carried with it the responsibility of sitting on Harvard’s Board of Overseers. It is unclear whether Oliver ever engaged with the College in this role, however, because colonists forced him to abandon his Cambridge home and move into Boston just weeks after he was sworn in. He fled the colony nearly two years later, in March 1776.

We know that Oliver enslaved 11 people at Elmwood—Buff, Cato, Jerry, Jefffy, Samuel, Mira, Jude, Sarah, Jenny, Violet, and “Young Jerry”—because he petitioned the British government in 1783 for compensation: £480 for 11 “valuable Slaves,” the 10 enslaved people he left behind plus Samuel, who made the journey with Oliver, but was “free by the Laws of England.”
We know that Rose and her other children were also enslaved because according to Massachusetts law at this time, children inherited the status of their mothers: if Jane was enslaved, then so too were her mother and siblings. If two additional people enslaved by Andrew Bordman and his widow, Elizabeth Bordman, appear in extant records: Lucy, “Indian servant of Mr. Bordman,” was baptized in 1740, Peter, “negro man servant of Mrs. Elizabeth Bordman,” married a woman enslaved in Charlestown in 1758. We cannot know whether the Bordman family owned all eight of these people at the same time. But if Andrew Bordman owned even Rose and her four children all at once, this would have made him one of the largest slaveholders in the colony; in the only surviving tax assessment for the town of Cambridge during this period, from 1749, the largest number of enslaved people recorded in a single household was four. Such was Bordman’s reliance on enslaved labor to feed Harvard’s students and fulfill his duties as steward.

Other Harvard leaders and faculty members also owned enslaved people in this period. Take, for example, Professor John Winthrop. A direct descendant of the colonial governor of the same name, Winthrop earned his AM from Harvard in 1732 and served as Hollis Professor of Mathematics and Natural Philosophy from 1738 until his death in 1779. He was also a fellow from 1765 to 1779 and served as acting president in 1769 and again from 1773 to 1774. Harvard’s Winthrop House is named for Professor John Winthrop as well as for his ancestor, the colonial governor.

On a single page of his 1759 Ames Almanack, Professor Winthrop notes the death of his enslaved “negro man George.”

13 May, a few minutes before one in y mornng [abt hi watr], our poor George died of a hectic, wh th he was thrown into by y measles; havg never been well since he had yt distemp. He was aged 24 years & one day.

Further down the same page Winthrop recorded that he procured a replacement:

had a new negro boy, wm I call Scipio. He now measures 3 feet & 11 inches, wtht shoes. By comparng his h’ wth yt of our boys, I jdg him to be 8 ½ y old.

It is unclear when Winthrop acquired this boy; not all of his notes are dated. In a subsequent note, this one dated February 6, 1761, Winthrop provides additional information about his own son’s age and height, the basis for his estimate of Scipio’s eight and a half years.

The fact of Winthrop’s slaveholding is not new; it is noted in Sibley’s Harvard Graduates, a compendium of biographical sketches of colonial-era Harvard alumni. But the story, as told in Sibley’s, is sympathetic. The passage on George’s death reads: “When [Winthrop’s] own slave boy, George, died of the measles, he was mourned as one of the family, not as an unfortunate investment.” As for Scipio, Sibley’s reports he “was watched over like the
white children of the family.” The truth, however, is that Scipio and George were undoubtedly purchased to labor for the Winthrops without compensation.

In 1773, a decade or so after Winthrop purchased Scipio and several years before the official end of slavery in the Commonwealth, human bondage captivated an audience at Harvard’s Commencement ceremony. Two candidates for the bachelor’s degree, Eliphalet Pearson and Theodore Parsons, participated in a public debate concerning the legality of slavery. Parsons, then 21 years old, took the antislavery position:

To me, I confess, it is a matter of painful astonishment... that those who are so readily disposed to urge the principles of natural equality in defence of their own Liberties should, with so little reluctance, continue to exert a power by the operation of which they are so flagrantly contradicted. For what less can be said of that exercise of power, whereby such multitudes of our fellow-men, descendants, my friend from the same common parent with you and me, and between whom and us nature has made no distinction, save what arises from the stronger influence of the sun in the climate whence they originated, are held to groan under the insupportable burden of the most abject slavery.

Defending slavery, Pearson called for the abandonment of “tender sentiment” and a calm return to “the voice of reason.” Although he conceded “[t]hat Liberty to all is sweet” he went on to argue that slavery was a benefit to Africans, who had in his view been rescued by slavers: characterizing life in Africa as “an entire subjection to the tyrannizing power of lust and passion,” Pearson implored the audience, “reflect, I say, a moment upon the condition of a creature in human shape (for in such a state of degradation one can hardly call him a man), the misery, the wretchedness... and compare it with the condition of a slave in this country.” He concluded, the slaves’ “removal [from Africa] is to be esteemed a favor.”

Slavery was not an abstraction to either man, nor to the other students and faculty at Harvard. Slavery had, by this time, long been a fact of everyday life in Massachusetts. Parsons’s impassioned argument against the institution was about more than overheard tales of abject brutality in the sugarcane fields of the Caribbean, to which New England was economically tied. His father, Reverend Moses Parsons, owned two men and a woman named Violet. Parsons’s son later recalled: “When it was generally believed that slavery was unlawful in Massachusetts, [the Reverend] summoned his slaves into his sitting-room, and there, in the presence of his children, declared to them that they were free. The men accepted the gift, or rather the declaration, for gift it was not. Yet Violet, who would have been about eight years older than Parsons, roughly as old as his eldest brother, stayed with the Parsons family until her death at the age of ninety, and is now buried in the Parsons family tomb in Byfield, Massachusetts. John Thornton Kirkland, president of Harvard University, officiated her funeral.

Theodore Parsons became a doctor. Six years after his graduation from Harvard College, at age 28, he shipped aboard the warship Bennington as its surgeon. He disappeared at sea a few days later, and his body was never found. Eliphalet Pearson became Harvard’s Hancock Professor of Hebrew and Other Oriental Languages in 1786 and served as president of the University from 1804 to 1806. He died in 1826.
III. Financial Ties: Harvard and the Slavery Economy

Slavery may have ended—at least officially—in Massachusetts by 1783, but the ties between Harvard University and slavery continued. Beginning in the colonial period and continuing well into the 19th century, the University and its donors benefited from extensive financial ties to slavery.

For roughly a century, Harvard had operated as a lender and derived a substantial portion of its income from investments that included loans to Caribbean sugar planters, rum distillers, and plantation suppliers. After 1830, the University shifted its investments into cotton manufacturing, before diversifying its portfolio to include real estate and railroad stocks—all industries that were, in this era, dependent on the labor of enslaved people and the expropriation of land.

Harvard’s financial ties to slavery also take the form of major gifts and bequests from donors who accumulated their wealth through slave trading, from the labor of enslaved people on plantations in the Caribbean islands and in the American South, and from the Northern textile manufacturing industry, supplied with cotton grown by enslaved people held in bondage.

New England and Caribbean Slavery

Harvard’s financial ties to slavery are multifaceted, and the economic links between colonial New England and the Caribbean provide critical context to understand such entanglements. Trade between New England and the West Indies proved so essential to both regions that one 17th-century observer declared Boston “the mart town of the West Indies.” As early as 1667 the governor of the English colony of Barbados acknowledged that “these colonies cannot in peace prosper, or in war subsist, without a correspondence with” the New England colonies.

While large-scale plantation slavery never took root in New England, for more than a century, Boston merchants played an essential role in sustaining the sugar plantation economy of the Caribbean; many of those same merchants were important players in Harvard’s early history. New England ships carried enslaved people and critical supplies to the Caribbean islands. They brought back slave-produced commodities like sugar and molasses, most of which was then re-exported throughout the British empire. As early as the 1630s there were already more than 20 ships plying trade between New England and the British Caribbean. As Edmund Burke observed in 1757, New Englanders became carriers for all the colonies of North America and the West-Indies, and even for some parts of Europe. They may be considered in this respect as the Dutch of America.

Here, too, we begin with Governor John Winthrop. As the historian Wendy Warren has observed, “To understand New England not only by the labor done within its colonies but even more by the commodities that came and went is to understand New England as John Winthrop did, by its place in the world.” Winthrop saw the region’s profitable trade with the West Indies, in particular, as a gift of God for the benefit both of the Massachusetts Bay Colony’s economy and its reputation:

[It pleased the Lord to open to us a trade with Barbados and other Islands in the West Indies, which as it proved gainful, so the commodities we had in exchange there for our cattle and provisions, as sugar, cotton, tobacco, and indigo, were a good help to discharge our engagements in England. And this summer there was great a drouth [drought], as their potatoes and corn, etc., were burnt up; and divers London ships which rode there were so short of provisions as, if our vessels had not supplied them, they could not have returned home; which was an observable providence, that whereas many of the London seamen were wont to despise New England as a poor, barren country, should now be relieved by our plenty.]
Timber was of particular importance to New England merchants engaged in the triangle trade. Because ships could be built and rigged in New England using only the produce of the region’s forests, shipbuilding became a significant facet of its economy. And with so much Atlantic trade focused on slave-grown commodities, Boston merchants soon became central to that industry as well. In 1700, Governor Richard Coote wrote that “more good vessels belong to Boston than to all Scotland and Ireland.”

Timber from New England was also used to build and rebuild the Caribbean’s sugar plantations, whose infrastructure required constant replacement: more than 75 hurricanes struck the region between 1700 and 1775.

Trading connections grew stronger throughout the 18th century, as Caribbean planters relied on New Englanders to provide the vital supplies required to maintain the plantation complex. New England’s fishing industries fed the West Indies sugar plantations, sending “refuse fish”—“salt burnt, spotted, rotten, and carelessly ordered”—to the “Charib-Islands, Barbadoes, Jamaica, &c. who feed their Negroes with it.”

Dried cod from New England was “the meat of all the slaves in all the West Indies.”

Importantly, these provisions imported from New England allowed West Indian planters to allocate far more land to sugar than would otherwise have been possible, enabling the system to grow. In Barbados, for example, after an unsuccessful attempt in the first decades of the 1600s to produce tobacco, planters turned to sugar as their primary crop; by the 1670s, Barbados produced 65 percent of the sugar sold in England. Initially, sugar was a scarce commodity and commanded very high prices in European markets. In 1647, at which time about half of Barbados’s arable land was used for sugar, Massachusetts Governor John Winthrop received a letter stating that planters in the island were “so intent upon planting sugar that they had rather buy foode at very deare rates than produce it by labour, soe infinite is the profit of sugar works once accomplished.” As other colonies followed Barbados into the market, however, supply increased and prices fell sharply. To remain profitable, planters were forced to devote an ever-greater percentage of land to the crop. By 1767, the share of Barbadian land producing sugar “had risen to 80 percent, which meant that virtually all land useful for agriculture of any kind was devoted to this one crop.”

As the amount of land dedicated to sugar production increased, so too did the number of enslaved laborers needed to work it. According to one estimate, the population in the mid-18th century across the Caribbean encompassed approximately 725,000 enslaved people and just over 250,000 whites. In the English colonies to which New England was most closely tied the divide was even more extreme.

In short, New England merchants provided Caribbean sugar plantations with vital supplies, which enabled planters to remain profitable and expand the brutal business of slavery far beyond anything they could have otherwise sustained. In return, New Englanders acquired capital and slave-produced goods that were essential to their trade throughout the Atlantic world. This cycle was New England’s economic bedrock. In 1783, John Adams (AB 1755) wrote: “The Commerce of the West India Islands, is a Part of the American System of Commerce. They can neither do without Us nor We without them.”

Harvard Affiliates, Slavery, and the Slave Trade in the Colonial Era

It is not possible to document here all the many gifts that Harvard received from donors whose wealth was tied up in Caribbean slavery and slave trading, both because of incomplete data and because the precise ways in which donors’ profits are connected to sugar production and Caribbean slavery are not always clear or easy to trace. Certain examples stand out, however, and these notable bequests, which proved critical to Harvard’s growth and the establishment of its reputation as a prestigious university, warrant specific mention.

Isaac Royall Jr.

Perhaps the most well-known gift to Harvard by a donor involved in slavery is the bequest of Isaac Royall Jr., whose family’s sugar plantation on the Caribbean island of Antigua furnished the wealth that endowed the Royall Professorship of Law, Harvard’s first chair in law. The plantation proceeds also allowed the Royalls to purchase their Medford, Massachusetts, estate, now a museum and historical site, where Isaac Royall Jr. enslaved at least 60 individuals.

Yet the Royall’s wealth and Harvard’s first professorship of law are not the whole story. Isaac Royall Jr.’s sister, Penelope Royall Vassall, owned—among other enslaved people—Cuba Vassall and her children. Cuba had been brought to Cambridge by Penelope and Isaac’s father, who left Cuba to Penelope when he died. Meanwhile, Penelope’s husband, Henry Vassall, had brought another enslaved man, Tony Vassall, to Cambridge from Jamaica. Cuba and Tony married, and Cuba and their children
were eventually sold to John Vassall, Henry’s nephew and a 1757 graduate of Harvard College. Among the children was Darby Vassall, who is a remarkable figure in his own right: an important player in Boston’s free Black community and an early activist for Black rights, his life and activism help to illustrate a critically important theme embedded in this report: Black resilience, agency, and achievement in the face of persistent discrimination.178

Samuel Winthrop

The Royalls were just one of many families whose slavery-begotten wealth supported Harvard, both before and long after Isaac Jr.’s bequest.179

In 1645, George Downing (AB 1642), a nephew of Governor John Winthrop and former tutor at Harvard (ca. 1643–1646), toured the British West Indies and delivered

DARBY VASSALL AND BLACK RESISTANCE

While the extraction of wealth, directly and indirectly, from the labor of enslaved people is the primary focus of this section of the report, the individual contributions of enslaved people—not only their unfree labor but also their resilience, agency, and achievement in the face of violence and discrimination—are vital to a complete understanding of our past and have for too long been overlooked.

The life of Darby Vassall—also the subject of a virtual exhibition jointly presented by the Museum of African American History in Boston and Nantucket and the Presidential Initiative on Harvard & the Legacy of Slavery—is particularly striking. Born in Cambridge in 1768 and enslaved by John Vassall (AB 1757), Darby was an advocate for equal rights and abolition of slavery throughout his life.

With the outbreak of the Revolutionary War, John Vassall, a Loyalist, left his property—today the Longfellow House National Historic Site—in the care of Darby’s parents, Tony and Cuba.2 Darby, then a small child, was living at the house when General and later President George Washington moved in and made it his headquarters, while he oversaw the American colonial forces fighting around Boston. Later in his life, Darby would tell the story of an interaction with the general himself: Washington personally offered Darby work. Darby asked how much he would be paid, and Washington retracted the offer. “General Washington,” Darby recalled, “was no gentlemen, to expect a boy to work without wages.”

After slavery was made unlawful in Massachusetts in 1783, Darby’s parents purchased property just north of Harvard’s campus. His father, Tony, operated a stable in what would become the free Black community of Lewisville in Cambridge.4

Darby eventually moved to Boston, where he owned property just blocks from the State House, and fought alongside other members of Boston’s Black community for equal rights locally and abolition nationally.5 In 1796, he was a founding member of the African Society, a mutual aid association for Black Bostonians.6 In 1812, he was one of six signers of a petition to the state legislature requesting funding for the education of Black children;7 the African School Association named in the petition was a forerunner of the Abiel Smith School, which today houses the Museum of African American History in Boston.8 Darby also actively supported the New England Anti-Slavery Society with both his time and his money;9 and he used his personal connections to benefit the Black community. He counted many prominent abolitionists of the day, including Wendell Phillips and William Cooper Nell, among his associates.10 In 1855, he visited his birthplace, bringing the self-emancipated slave, memoirist, and activist Lunsford Lane along to meet the house’s new proprietor, Henry Wadsworth Longfellow—a funder of abolitionist causes.11

At the age of 91, Darby again joined his friends and neighbors in Boston’s free Black community to petition the Massachusetts legislature, this time demanding legal protections for the Black community against slavecatchers emboldened by the Fugitive Slave Act.12

Darby died in 1861 and was buried, at his own request, with his parents’ former enslavers in the Vassall family tomb; it is located under Christ Church, near the place of his birth, and within sight of Harvard Yard.13
sermons in many of the islands’ churches. As he headed home to England, he penned a letter to his cousin John Winthrop Jr. encouraging him to migrate to the West Indies to make his fortune growing cash crops with enslaved labor:

[Colonists in Barbados] have bought this year no lesse than a thousand Negroes; and the more they buie, the better able they are to buye, for in a year and a halfe they will earne (with gods blessing) as much as they cost. 180

Downing went on to explain that “Negroes (the life of this place)” were far better than “New England servants” to work West Indian plantations, as white colonists were “noon of the fittest for those parts.” 181

John Jr. did not take Downing’s advice, but his younger brother Samuel Winthrop, the governor’s youngest son, did, dropping out of Harvard in 1645 and making his way first to Tenerife, in the Canary Islands, and, a year later, to the West Indies. Samuel became one of the first large-scale sugar producers in the British West Indies, eventually owning the rights to one quarter of the island of Barbuda as well as a sugar plantation on Antigua where dozens of enslaved people labored to produce tens of thousands of pounds of sugar a year for export to New England and Europe. 182 He also served as the deputy governor of Antigua from 1667 to 1669. 183 Winthorpes Bay on the north side of the island memorializes the prominence of Samuel and his descendants in its early colonial history. 184 Although Samuel never returned to New England, he remained deeply connected to the region, and to Harvard in particular. Before leaving Massachusetts Bay in 1645, Samuel, Downing, and two other Harvard graduates had jointly gifted land to the University—the first donation of property by alumni. The parcel, which was planted with apple trees and came to be known as the Fellows Orchard, is today the site of Widener Library. 185 In an early letter to his father, the governor, Samuel asked to be remembered to family members and to “our most esteemed President, Henry Dunster.” 186 Many years later, Samuel would send four of his sons to New England to be educated with the express purpose of eventually enrolling them at Harvard. 187 In correspondence with his brother John Jr., then the governor of Connecticut, Samuel asked for help getting his sons admitted to the College. 188

Harvard’s economic ties to the slave trade and Caribbean slavery in the colonial era were not just a matter of major benefactors; such ties were also visible on campus, including in financial transactions between individual students and the University.

Some students—often sons of wealthy New England merchants or Caribbean plantation owners—paid their tuition in plantation commodities like sugar, molasses, and cocoa. These goods, produced by enslaved labor, were luxuries of significant value. Lewis Vassall (AB 1728), for example, ostentatiously paid a portion of his tuition with a cask of sugar worth more than the entirety of many of his classmates’ dues. 1

It was advantageous for Harvard to cultivate relationships with families in these lucrative industries, and in many cases, the University would benefit from their patronage for generations. 1

In Harvard’s first century, the school capitalized on its small contingent of ultrawealthy students by making it possible to purchase special privileges and status. Modeled on a similar system in place at Oxford and Cambridge, students willing to “first pay one hundred pounds to the College Treasurer” and then “pay double tuition-money,” were granted the distinction of “fellow commoner.” 15

(Fellow commoners were also required to present a piece of silver.) Fellow commoners’ privileges included dining at the faculty table, being “excused from going on errands,” and having “the title of Masters, and... the privilege of wearing their hats as masters do.” 16 While records are incomplete, nearly all known fellow commoners at Harvard had ties to slavery. This effectively made students of slave-owning families an elite on campus.

In 1729, John and William Vassall, younger brothers of Lewis, each presented Harvard a silver tankard with their names and family arms inscribed. These tankards, received as payment for the Vassalls’ fellow commoner status, became part of the University’s collection of ceremonial silver. 17
Ultimately, he could not see these plans through: in 1667, after a French attack on Antigua ruined his plantation and decimated his enslaved labor force, Samuel wrote, “it is now all I have left besides my land & 12 working negoresses, w[ho]s hard labor I shall not be able to keep my Sonnes in New England.” Despite this setback Samuel’s finances eventually recovered, and he died one of the wealthiest men in Antigua.191

Harvard Affiliates, Slavery, and the Slave Trade into the 19th Century

Harvard continued to benefit financially from the proceeds of enslaved labor well beyond the end of slavery in Massachusetts. During the first half of the 19th century, more than a third of the money donated or promised to Harvard by private individuals came from just five men who made their fortunes from slavery and slave-produced commodities.194 Four of these men were directly involved in slavery or the slave trade, while the fifth—Peter C. Brooks—became the wealthiest man in New England by insuring New England’s merchant ships.195

James Perkins bequeathed $20,000 to Harvard for the Perkins Professorship of Astronomy and Mathematics,196 which the University created in 1842; his business, Perkins and Company, pursued a global strategy that included Caribbean slave trading, western land speculation, and opium trading in China.197 Perkins and other members of his extended family are also integral to Harvard in other ways: they played a central role in the creation of Massachusetts General Hospital (MGH), and the Perkins Room in Massachusetts Hall—the primary conference room used by Harvard’s president and other senior leaders—is named for a descendant of this family.

Benjamin Bussey, a sugar, coffee, and cotton merchant, left Harvard an estate valued at $320,000 to be divided among the Divinity School, the Law School, and a school for agriculture. Today, the Arnold Arboretum is located on Bussey’s former estate in Jamaica Plain.198 (By the time Harvard received this bequest, the net value of the trust had increased to roughly $400,000.197)

John McLean, another merchant, endowed the McLean Professorship of Ancient and Modern History in 1834 and supported Massachusetts General Hospital’s department for the care of the insane, the forerunner of McLean Hospital.198

Finally, Abbott Lawrence, who owned and operated cotton textile factories in Massachusetts along with a trading firm that marketed and distributed the products of his mills, donated $50,000 in 1847—followed by an additional $50,000 at his death in 1855. These gifts established the Lawrence Scientific School, the institutional predecessor of the Graduate School of Applied Science that would also encompass Bussey’s agriculture school. The Lawrence Scientific School’s most eminent faculty member would be Louis Agassiz, recruited on the recommendation of Lawrence, who also personally paid Agassiz’s salary for a time.199 Eventually, these institutions would evolve into today’s John A. Paulson School of Engineering and Applied Sciences.200

These donors, among other significant benefactors, are discussed in more detail in the sections that follow. While not comprehensive, these examples illustrate the multifaceted ties between Harvard’s major donors and slavery, the slave trade, and the trade in slave-produced goods.

The Perkins Brothers: James, Thomas Handasyd, and Samuel Gardner

When Thomas Nelson Perkins died at his home on October 7, 1937, his friends and colleagues commemorated his contributions as a “servant of Harvard and a leader among Harvard men.”201 Perkins, a graduate of the College (1891) and the Law School (1894), served as a fellow for 30 years (1905–1924 and 1926–1937). He was a prominent lawyer and statesman whose memory would be enshrined “at the very heart and center of the University he loved and served.”202 The Perkins Room in Massachusetts Hall, for use by the president and senior leaders of the University, was inaugurated on January 6, 1941, in his honor.203

Thomas Nelson Perkins was a scion of the wealthy Perkins family, which had, at the time of his death, supported the University for more than a century. The family’s wealth originated in the slave economy of the American South and especially the Caribbean, where Thomas Nelson’s great-grandfather, Samuel Gardner Perkins,204 and great uncles, James Perkins and Thomas Handasyd Perkins (Samuel Gardner’s brothers), began building their fortune as slave traders in St. Domingue (now Haiti).205 These three Perkins brothers—James, Thomas Handasyd, and Samuel Gardner—were each significant Harvard donors in their own right, and they bequeathed their estates to descendants who became prominent leaders at the University, among them Elizabeth Cary Agassiz—the first president of Radcliffe College.206

The Perkins brothers, active philanthropists, supported Harvard and several other important institutions.
James bequeathed $20,000 to the University in 1822 to establish the Perkins Professorship in Astronomy and Mathematics, renamed the Perkins Professorship in Mathematics in 1906, and served as a director of the effort to create the Theological School of Cambridge, now Harvard Divinity School, to which he and Thomas Handasyd both donated. James and Thomas Handasyd also led the effort to create the Massachusetts General Hospital and served in turns as chair of trustees and vice president; Thomas also served as the hospital’s second president. As trustees, they were deeply involved in the initial fundraising effort, which raised nearly $150,000, and donated $5,000 each; their brother Samuel Gardner gave a further $100. Thomas Handasyd and Samuel Gardner also supported the creation of the Massachusetts Professorship of Natural History at Harvard, now the Fisher Professorship in Natural History. Beyond Harvard, the Perkins brothers helped to establish several prominent organizations in Greater Boston. James left his mansion on Pearl Street, valued at $40,000, to the Boston Athenaeum, one of the nation’s oldest independent libraries and cultural institutions. And the Perkins School for the Blind in Watertown, Massachusetts, is named for the family, specifically Thomas Handasyd, who bequeathed his Boston mansion as a site for the school.

The Perkins brothers’ parents and a grandfather were involved in the West Indies trade, so the brothers understood well, as did other New Englanders, the wealth that could be made in the Caribbean. The French colony of St. Domingue promised the opportunity to make a fortune. In the fall of 1782, long before the brothers became active as philanthropists, a 21-year-old James boarded the merchant ship Beaver to Cap Français, modern-day Cap Haitien in the north of Haiti. The city was then a bustling metropolis and the capital of St. Domingue, the “pearl of the Antilles” in the French colonial imagination. It was built upon a rigorous racial hierarchy with a small white planter class at the top and enslaved Africans who worked the island’s sugarcane, coffee, and cotton fields at the base; at the height of its economy in this period, St. Domingue imported as many as 40,000 enslaved men, women, and children per year by one estimate, due in part to the high mortality of enslaved people on the island’s sugar plantations. Another source estimates a total of 700,000 enslaved people were imported to St. Domingue before the start of the Haitian Revolution in 1791, making it the single greatest exploiter of enslaved people in the Caribbean.

James wrote letters from St. Domingue to family in New England, as did his wife, Sarah Paine Perkins, after she traveled to join him on the island. In November 1789, Sarah Perkins described her new home to a correspondent, lingering over a description of the “the sons and daughters of slav’ry,” whom she believed:

> have their oppressions & even their wants—but their enjoyments are proportionate & I am very apt to believe that the Cup of Slavery is embittered with less gall than we are wont to imagine—for tho’ the task master may lift his whip against them, still their minds are unaffected & they appear as destitute of that smart which is keener than … (the anguish of the field) as their fellow mules. I have seen many of them who appear to be susceptible of the greatest pleasure you can imagine & who were apparently discovering an enthusiastic enjoyment from their wild disorderly gambols, but never was once witness to any thing like that grief of heart, that affliction of the mind, which is the offspring of sensibility.

James joined the firm Wall, Tardy & Co. as a commission agent for American merchants, purchasing colonial products made by enslaved people to ship to New England. When his younger brother Samuel Gardner turned 21, he, too, sailed for St. Domingue. Samuel Gardner later recalled, the flourishing state of trade and the prosperity of [St. Domingue’s] inhabitants were without a parallel perhaps in the world; for here there were no poor, I may say, either black or white,—for even among the latter those who were slaves were well taken care of, fed and clothed, and well sheltered by their masters, and those that were free were able to get a living without excess labor.

The brothers entered into a partnership with Walter Burling to form Perkins, Burling & Company; the firm traded in the products of slave labor including sugar, molasses, coffee, and cocoa, as well as enslaved people themselves. Thomas Handasyd managed the company’s business in Boston, while James and Samuel lived primarily in St. Domingue. On the island, they visited vessels in the Cap Français harbor to select enslaved women, men, and children for purchase, sometimes boarding ships to choose from among newly arrived Africans, and then selling them to slave owners on the island. They also depended on ship captains and other third parties to sell enslaved captives throughout the Caribbean, especially in Havana, Cuba, and Kingston, Jamaica. The Perkins’ business correspondence is extensive and documents commercial activities in Cuba, Guayana, Guadeloupe, Jamaica, Martinique, Puerto Rico, St. Croix, and Trinidad. Other merchants and slave
traders sought letters of introduction to the brothers to gain access to the Perkins, Burling & Company network.\textsuperscript{225}

In 1791, a rebellion began in the mountains of Cap Français that threatened the slave economy of St. Domingue and, by extension, the Perkins' wealth.\textsuperscript{226} In December of that year, a business partner wrote to James lamenting “your present situation” and informed him that “one Colonel Murray had in contemplation of sending a small vessel to assist in removing Mrs. Perkins and your family.”\textsuperscript{227} James and his wife remained in St. Domingue, however, until the burning of Cap Français in 1792 led them and many of the colony’s prominent slaveholders to flee to Havana, New Orleans, Baltimore, and New England.\textsuperscript{228} James took with him an enslaved man, Mousse,\textsuperscript{229} who allegedly helped the family escape.\textsuperscript{230} Although Perkins’s memoir states that the family freed Mousse, he remained attached to them in New England.\textsuperscript{231} Samuel Gardner stayed behind.

James continued to administer the family business, remaining in regular contact with Samuel Gardner regarding activities in St. Domingue, even as the colony was engulfed in war. In May 1792, Samuel Gardner wrote:

> the day after I purchased his Negroes there was not one for sale in the place. Indicott was obliged to wait some time & finally deposit in the hands of a Captain going with N- to Havana a sum of money considerably more than the value of 8 Slaves to get the privilege of carrying that number down in his vessel.\textsuperscript{232}

As the situation deteriorated, Samuel Gardner kept James apprised of the difficulty both of acquiring and disposing of new cargoes of slaves.\textsuperscript{233} By October 1792, he was reporting on the continued flight of the white population.\textsuperscript{234} He returned to New England in 1793, married, and became a partner in his father-in-law’s mercantile house of Higginson & Co.\textsuperscript{235} Samuel Gardner eventually entered the insurance industry and served as president of the Suffolk Insurance Company of Boston.\textsuperscript{236} He would later recall his experience in St. Domingue as an operating cause.\textsuperscript{237}

James and Thomas Handasyd redirected their primary business interest to the opium trade with China\textsuperscript{238} and sought to recast themselves as wealthy benefactors through generous gifts and bequests.\textsuperscript{239} They were successful in this regard: when Harvard President Josiah Quincy (AB 1790; overseer, 1810–1829; president, 1829–1845) wrote his 1840 history of the University, he described James as among “benefactors of Harvard College … entitled to grateful remembrance.”\textsuperscript{240} Quincy wrote of James:

> His professional career was commenced in St. Domingo, where he established a commercial house, and conducted a prosperous business until he was compelled to leave the island by the insurrection of the colored population. At the hazard of his life, and with great loss of property, he escaped from St. Domingo, and returned to the United States. Soon after this event, he formed with his brother the commercial house of James and Thomas H. Perkins, which afterwards established a professional reputation second to none in North America. By the amount and discriminating nature of their bounty for the support of learning and the relief of suffering, and by their readiness to aid in every patriotic design, they have rendered their names synonymous with public spirit and benevolence.\textsuperscript{241}

**Israel Thorndike**

In 1818, the Beverly, Massachusetts, merchant and slave trader Israel Thorndike paid $6,500 for a large collection of maps and books from the estate of Cristoph Daniel Ebeling, a professor of Greek and history. This collection, which Thorndike donated to Harvard,\textsuperscript{242} contained “one of the most complete and valuable collections of works extant on American history” available at the time,\textsuperscript{243} and came to be the core of the Harvard Map Collection—the “most valuable single collection in existence.”\textsuperscript{244}

Besides the landmark Ebeling Map Collection gift, Thorndike, together with his son Israel Thorndike Jr., donated $2,100 to Massachusetts General Hospital.\textsuperscript{245} In 1815, he served as vice president of A Society for the Promotion of Theological Education in Harvard University, which, with Thorndike’s support and that of other wealthy patrons—notably James Perkins, who also served as an officer in the society—established what is now Harvard Divinity School. Thorndike then donated $500 to that fundraising effort and a further $500 “for the purchase of theological works.”\textsuperscript{246} He also gave $500 in 1806 to support a natural history professorship and a further $100 in 1820 for a professorship of mineralogy and geology.\textsuperscript{247} Like the Perkins brothers, Thorndike's descendants were...
deeply involved at Harvard too. Augustus Thorndike was a renowned 20th century Harvard Medical School faculty member, and a professorship at the Massachusetts General Hospital bears the family name.248

Thorndike’s business interests also intersected with those of the Perkins brothers. He built his fortune primarily exporting flour and fish to the sugar plantations of the Caribbean and buying slave-produced goods like coffee, sugar, molasses, and rum to sell in US and European markets. Thorndike traded in enslaved women, men, and children as well, buying slaves in one port to sell at another.249 In a 1791 letter to the captain of one of their ships, Thorndike and his business partner250 wrote the following orders:

Purchase from Five to Fourteen good Negroes, as the price may be, & lay in such food for them as is best suited to preserve their Health & proceed to the Havanna, in the island of Cuba[,] you be very careful to keep them well secured at all times and on your arival you sell them for the most that can be obtained, & purchase as much Molasses as your Vessel will stow, leaving Room only sufficient to stow the goods you may purchase with your surplus cash, which you vest in Sugar, Cotton or Hides.251

While such transactions may have been a relatively small part of Thorndike’s overall business dealings,252 it is clear that he engaged in slave trading over the course of many years leading up to the Haitian revolution.253 Thorndike ultimately shifted—like the Perkins brothers—to the China trade, as well as to investments in New England’s textile industry.254

Trade in Slave-Produced Goods

John McLean

In his 1840 The History of Harvard University, Josiah Quincy wrote that John McLean “disposed of his large estate in a spirit of general benevolence, equally useful, exemplary, and just.”255 From an original bequest of $50,000, left in trust at the time of McLean’s death for the support of his widow, the University eventually received $25,000 to endow the McLean Professorship of Ancient and Modern History. Massachusetts General Hospital—the first teaching hospital associated with Harvard Medical School—also received nearly $120,000 from McLean’s estate.256 This gift was monumental: more than a fifth of the total amount of bequests received by the institution in the four decades following its 1811 charter,257 the gift was equivalent to eight years of the hospital’s annual operating expenses at mid-century.258 For his generosity, the division of the hospital dedicated to the treatment of mental illness was renamed in McLean’s honor. McLean Hospital, now an independent Harvard-affiliated hospital in Belmont, Massachusetts, still bears his name today.259

McLean made his fortune in the slavery-entangled trade with the West Indies that powered the Massachusetts economy from the colony’s earliest days. According to Quincy, McLean “prosecuted trade with great skill and success, chiefly with the interior of New England and the West Indies.”260 Like so many Massachusetts merchants, including his father,261 he shipped lumber from New England to Caribbean plantations. He then purchased sugar produced by enslaved people to sell in Europe and the United States. Between 1793 and 1795 alone, McLean is listed as an owner of 10 ships registered in Boston and adjacent Charlestown.262 A list of spoliation claims submitted to the federal government by US merchants seeking to recoup their losses on merchant voyages captured by the French in the 1790s notes McLean as an underwriter on eight separate voyages, including shipments of foodstuffs, dry goods, and wood products to the West Indies; cargos of slave-produced goods, including sugar, coffee, tobacco, and their derivatives, from the West Indies to the United States and Europe; and, in one case, a shipment of slave-produced goods from the American South to Europe.263

Benjamin Bussey

In his 1835 will, Benjamin Bussey explained at length his reasoning for leaving a significant portion of his wealth to Harvard University, namely his desire “to advance the prosperity and happiness of our common country.” He wrote:

In a nation whose government is held to be a government of laws, I deem it important to promote that branch of education which lies at the foundation of wise legislation and which tends to ensure a pure and uniform administration of justice and I have considered that in a country whose laws extend equal protection to all religious opinions, that education which tends to disseminate just and rational views on religious subjects is entitled to special patronage and support.264

Bussey left half of his estate to Harvard to support theological and legal education and the establishment of a school of agriculture, botany, and other natural sciences.265 The net value of his bequest, when the University received it in 1861, was just over $400,000—enough to establish Bussey Professorships at Harvard Law School and Harvard Divinity
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School as well as the Bussey Institution on the property
Bussey left to the University, now the Arnold Arboretum,
in Jamaica Plain, Boston.\textsuperscript{266} In recognition of these gifts, a
marble bust of Bussey is displayed in Annenberg Hall, the
freshman dining room in Memorial Hall.\textsuperscript{267} The Harvard
Portrait Collection also contains a likeness captured by the
famed American portraitist Gilbert Stuart.\textsuperscript{268}

In a brief handwritten memoir composed near the end
of his life, Bussey emphasized his humble origins as
the son of a poor New England farmer, his service as a
quarter master during the American Revolution, and his
work “night & day” to establish himself as a goldsmith
in Massachusetts after the war. He devoted less than
a paragraph, however, to the period during which he
amassed his fortune: he only briefly noted that he
“supplied many traders in Prov[idence], New Port, & all y’
country round”\textsuperscript{269} and did not mention that many of the
traders he supplied would have been engaged in the West
Indies trade. At this time, the slave trade in Rhode Island—
long an important center—was approaching its peak.\textsuperscript{270}

In 1790, Bussey tells us, he moved to Boston and
worked “as I’d in Dedham, day & night; did a large
bus[iness]; owned several ships; engaged in many kinds
of merc[antile] adventures” for “ab’ 15 years.”\textsuperscript{271} Other
sources detail these “adventures”: records of spoliation
claims include multiple vessels owned by Bussey and
voyages he underwrote. More than half of these voyages
originated in the United States and were bound for the
Caribbean with supplies that New England merchants had
long provided to island plantations.\textsuperscript{272}

Bussey also provisioned the plantation economy in North
America. As early as 1789, he invested in a voyage carrying
supplies to New Orleans, including flour, building materials,
farming implements, and hundreds of yards of “toe
cloth”—a rough fabric routinely used to make clothing and
bedding for enslaved people. The ship returned north with
a cargo of tobacco.\textsuperscript{273} By the early 19th century, Bussey’s
business ties spanned the American South,\textsuperscript{274} necessitating
that Bussey have representatives on the ground. In 1802,
his son-in-law traveled to Savannah on his behalf to collect
on numerous debts.\textsuperscript{275} “Messrs Chapman & Weston” were
expected to pay in tobacco,\textsuperscript{276} while Ebenezer Jenckes of
Louisville, Kentucky, was expected to remit payment in the
form of cotton.\textsuperscript{277} Such arrangements were typical, and
Bussey often shipped such goods—produced by enslaved
people in the West Indies and the American South—to
Europe, where he sold them and purchased fabrics,
dinnerware, and other goods for US markets.\textsuperscript{278}

Bussey frequently did business with other Harvard
donors, part of a tight-knit community of wealthy Boston
merchants and businessmen with ties to the University.
Among his French spoliations claims are merchant
voyages underwritten or co-owned by Thomas Handasyd
and James Perkins, Israel Thorndike, and John McLean,
each discussed above.\textsuperscript{279} Bussey also invested in the
Lawrence Manufacturing Company, owned by Abbott
Lawrence, discussed below.\textsuperscript{280} And Bussey’s attorney,
Samuel P. P. Fay (AM 1798; overseer, 1824–1852) is the
namesake of Fay House, the principal administrative
building of the former Radcliffe College—today the
Radcliffe Institute for Advanced Study.\textsuperscript{281}

During the latter decades of his life, Bussey’s focus shifted
to business interests in New England. He owned property
across the region, including extensive holdings along
Boston’s waterfront that city officials repeatedly sought to
acquire for city projects. This included land “bounding on
y’ Mill Creek... South of Ann Street and North of the Town
dock,”\textsuperscript{282} part of what is now the Quincy Market complex,
which Josiah Quincy, then mayor of Boston, purchased for
the city in 1824.\textsuperscript{283} At the time of his death in 1842, Bussey
still owned large swaths of the city, a country estate in
Roxbury (now Jamaica Plain), a woolen manufactory in
Dedham, and extensive property in what is now Maine.\textsuperscript{284}

After Bussey’s death, it fell to Quincy—now the president
of Harvard—to thank Bussey’s widow on behalf of the
Corporation.\textsuperscript{285} Like his business dealings in life, Bussey’s
final bequest illustrates not only the links between Harvard
and economies of slavery, but also the close ties that bound
the Massachusetts elite—merchants, businessmen, and
politicians—to one another and to the University.

\textbf{Edwin F. Atkins}

Examples until this point all date to the era in which
slavery was legal in the United States, if not in
Massachusetts. Yet Harvard connections to slavery
persisted even after the end of the Civil War.

In 1899, for example, the Boston-based sugar magnate
Edwin F. Atkins granted $2,500 to the Harvard
botanist Oakes Ames to begin research on the possible
development of new, better strains of sugarcane through
selection and breeding at the Atkins family’s Soledad
Plantation in Cuba.\textsuperscript{286}

Cuba had by the 1830s replaced St. Domingue (Haiti) as
the most prominent slave economy of the Caribbean,\textsuperscript{287}
and the Atkins family had been exporting sugar and
molasses from the island since 1838, some 30 years
before the beginning of Cuba’s gradual abolition of
slavery. In 1868, at the beginning of the ’Ten Years’ War,
Cuban independence leaders declared emancipation, and enslaved people who fought on either side were granted their freedom, setting in motion a slow and halting path toward the end of slavery.288 Meanwhile, during the war, American investors, including the Atkins family, extended credit to Cuban plantation owners. By the end of the 19th century, such investors had acquired most of the plantations in Cuba; Atkins, looking to expand into sugar production, acquired Soledad Plantation in 1884.289

Four years earlier, the Spanish government’s 1880 abolition law had established an eight-year period during which nominally free formerly enslaved people were labeled apprentices, or patrocinados, and compelled to continue working for their enslavers.290 This system was, in effect, slavery by another name. In fact, before Atkins purchased Soledad, the plantation’s owners sent a bill of sale to his business partners that listed 177 patrocinados as slaves, despite their new legal status. When E. Atkins & Company officially acquired the plantation, it came with at least 95 formerly enslaved patrocinados.291

Edwin Atkins’s correspondence with his plantation manager immediately after he took possession reflects a preoccupation with reducing labor costs in order to compete with other producers.292 They discuss strategies to retain control of the Black workers,293 as well as the extraction of payment for releasing workers from indentured servitude, apparently including some who were already free by law.294 By the end of the century, Atkins had expanded the estate from its initial 900 acres to 12,000 acres of land in the hills and mountains of Cienfuegos.295

A section of this plantation became a Harvard biological research station at the turn of the 20th century. In later years, scholars and students would test varieties of sugar cane on the property and develop new ways to eradicate diseases.296 To provide sustained support for this work, Atkins presented to the University initial payments on an endowment fund which, between 1919 and 1925, would come to total nearly $200 thousand.297 In 1932, Soledad officially became known as the Atkins Institution of the Arnold Arboretum, Harvard University.298 Harvard’s involvement was suspended in 1961, in the wake of the Cuban revolution, and the site is now managed by the Cuban government as the Cienfuegos Botanical Garden.299

Southern Slavery and Northern Textile Manufacturing

Harvard’s ties to the Caribbean and to wealthy planters and traders is a critical part of the story of the University’s financial involvement with slavery, but it is not the whole story. With the development of industrial capitalism in the late 18th and early 19th centuries, the plantation economy evolved, and cotton began to take center stage. By the middle of the 19th century, as the historian Sven Beckert observed, cotton manufacturers and merchants in the United Kingdom “stood at the center of a world-spanning empire,” acquiring slave-produced cotton from the Americas for their mills and selling cotton products to “the most distant corners” of the globe.291 New England and its vast textile mills followed, and Harvard affiliates’ deep connections to this lucrative industry—fed with cotton produced by enslaved people primarily in the American South—are another important part of the University’s story.

Abbott Lawrence

In his 1846–1847 annual report to the Board of Overseers, Harvard President Edward Everett shared a “plan of organization for an advanced school” to provide “systematic instruction in those branches of sciences which are more immediately connected with the great industrial interests of the country.”291 Disciplines of instruction included chemistry “in its various applications to the arts of life,” engineering, geology, and zoology. The plan was approved in February 1847, but the University lacked the funds necessary to construct new buildings and hire relevant faculty.

This uncertainty quickly resolved: in June 1847, the Boston industrialist Abbott Lawrence announced his donation of $50,000 to “defray the expenditures” necessary for the Scientific School, including “the erection of suitable buildings ... the purchase of apparatus, furniture,” as well as “comfortable support of the professors and other teachers employed.”292 The new school would train Harvard students in “the practical sciences,” to prepare “engineers, ... miners, machinists, and mechanics” for skilled employment in America’s rapidly industrializing economy.293 Everett remarked that Lawrence’s “munificent donation” was at that time “the largest sum... ever bestowed on a place of education in this country, in one gift, by a living benefactor.”294 The new scientific school was named in Lawrence’s honor and, upon his death in 1855, he bequeathed an additional $50,000 “for the further advancement of the said school.”295 Today, Lawrence’s gifts support endowed professorships in the Lawrence Scientific School’s successor, the Paulson School of Engineering and Applied Sciences.

The founder and namesake of the town of Lawrence, Massachusetts, Lawrence was co-owner of the A & A
Adams Lawrence, expanded the family business and Atlantic Cotton Mills and Pacific Mills, two major textile factories. He also served in the US Congress and as United States Minister to Great Britain. Lawrence had a personal as well as professional stake in the development of educational institutions that would teach “scientific knowledge as then applied to the practical arts,” which he viewed as critical for industry generally and for textile manufacturing specifically. He did not merely donate funds but directed how the money should be utilized.

He also personally recommended and, for several years, paid the salary of Louis Agassiz as professor of zoology and geology, as discussed below, Agassiz would play an outsized role in the University’s intellectual life and promotion of race science.

Lawrence’s descendants would continue to be deeply involved with the University. His nephew, Amos Adams Lawrence, expanded the family business and its philanthropic donations to Harvard and other institutions. Abbott Lawrence’s grandson, Abbott Lowell served as president of Harvard from 1909 to 1933 and was heir to not one but two prominent Boston families, the Lowells being another family whose considerable wealth derived from textiles, and which also counted notable abolitionists. As president, Abbott Lowell would preside over the creation of a residential college system that excluded Black students and be a leader among Harvard faculty who supported eugenics.

The wealth that Abbott Lawrence amassed through textile manufacturing and trade—like the fortunes of other Northern industrialists of the era—is inextricably tied to enslaved labor. Lawrence’s mills were staffed by free Northern workers, but they depended upon cotton produced by enslaved people laboring on southern plantations.

Transactions between Northern manufacturers like Lawrence and Southern slaveholders operated through the factorage system. Southern planters relied on factors—commercial agents—to negotiate the sale of commodities, chiefly cotton in the 19th century, produced by their enslaved laborers. Factors selected and stored the cotton bales, kept abreast of the price of cotton on the world market, and sold the commodity to various commercial houses. They then transported the raw material on freight trains and ships to the northern United States and across the Atlantic. The cotton they traded was the source of incredible wealth in the global economy. As the historian Walter Johnson has written, the Southern plantation system converted “lashes into labor into bales into dollars into pound sterling,” and it made men like Lawrence into wealthy entrepreneurs and philanthropists.

Lawrence had at least two agents in the South, one based in Richmond, Virginia, and one based in New Orleans, Louisiana. He corresponded with both on the cost of cotton on the world market and political events in Europe that could affect commodity prices. William Gray, an agent for Lawrence’s Atlantic Cotton Mills, traveled between Boston, Lawrence, and New Orleans as he handled business transactions for the mill. In the course of his work, Gray corresponded with Greenleaf & Hubbard, a firm in New Orleans that traded in cotton from Southern plantations throughout the Mississippi Valley, and which had its own Harvard links.

James Greenleaf

James Greenleaf, co-owner of Greenleaf & Hubbard, was the son of Harvard’s second Royall Professor of Law, Simon Greenleaf. He was also a philanthropist and the builder of Greenleaf House, the historic Brattle Street mansion purchased by Radcliffe College in 1905. Greenleaf House served as the residence of Radcliffe College presidents and, more recently, deans of the Radcliffe Institute for Advanced Study.

Greenleaf and his wife, Mary (Longfellow) Greenleaf, sister of Henry Wadsworth Longfellow (faculty, 1836–1854), divided their time between Cambridge and New Orleans, where Greenleaf and his business partner, Daniel Hubbard, operated from Canal Street. The violence of slavery—and the auction block—would have been in full view throughout Greenleaf’s personal and professional life. His primary business was the purchase of slave-grown cotton—generally by way of factors—and the sale of it to major Northern mills like Abbott Lawrence’s.

Due to the structure of these transactions, it is difficult to determine precisely which plantations supplied Greenleaf & Hubbard, but we do know that among them was Brierfield, owned by Jefferson Davis—the US senator from Mississippi and soon-to-be president of the Confederacy. Also the site of Davis’s personal residence, Brierfield stood on Davis Bend, a peninsula in the Mississippi Delta with “rich alluvial soil” and direct access to the cotton market via the river. Greenleaf & Hubbard worked with the firm Payne & Harrison, co-owned by Jacob U. Payne, who was not only a factor and a slave trader but also “the most intimate friend Jefferson Davis ever had” and, according his obituary in the Washington Post, “the largest cotton dealer in the world.”
IV. Intellectual Leadership: Harvard, Slavery, and Its Legacies before and after the Civil War

Context: A Nation Torn by Slavery and a Rising University

Well after slavery ended in Massachusetts in 1783, during the antebellum era and even after the 13th Amendment to the US Constitution conferred emancipation nationwide, in 1865, vestiges—or legacies—of the system lingered. Legacies of slavery such as exclusion, segregation, and discrimination against Blacks in employment, voting, housing, healthcare, public accommodations, criminal punishment, and education, among other areas, persisted in the South as well as the North well into the 20th century. And the hardening of racial categories, advanced by race scientists at Harvard and elsewhere, provided intellectual justification for continued subjugation.

Notwithstanding the Commonwealth’s Revolutionary War heritage as birthplace of the colonists’ struggle for liberty, its celebrated antislavery activists, and its many brave Union veterans of the Civil War, racial inequality flourished in Massachusetts—and at Harvard—as Blacks struggled for equal opportunity and full citizenship.

The decades after the Civil War, during the period of Reconstruction when debates raged about whether and how to support the Black American quest for equality, are especially germane to understanding legacies of slavery in American institutions of higher education. The US Constitution changed, reflecting the nation’s formal break with slavery and commitment to equal citizenship rights regardless of race. The 14th Amendment to the US Constitution, conferring equal protection and due process of law, and the 15th Amendment, prohibiting discrimination against males in voting, were enacted and ratified. Within this context, reformers conceived policies and social supports to uplift the formerly enslaved and their descendants. But it fell to the nation’s institutions, its leadership, and its people to safeguard—or not—citizens’ rights and implement these policies.

Around the same time, Harvard itself aspired to transform: it sought to enlarge its infrastructure, expand its student body, and recruit new faculty. Samuel Eliot Morison, a noted historian of the University, explained that during the period from 1869 into the 20th century, the University resolved “to expand with the country.” Harvard’s leaders, particularly Presidents Charles William Eliot and Abbott Lawrence Lowell, argued that Harvard should become a “true” national university that would serve as a “unifying influence.” They viewed the recruitment of students from “varied” backgrounds and a “large area” of the country as a linchpin of these ambitions.

Hence, two developments critical to understanding this moment of promise and peril occurred at once: The fate of African Americans hung in the balance. And Harvard, already well known, sought to grow, evolve, and build a yet greater national reputation. In the end, the University proved unwilling to participate in efforts to promote the welfare of African Americans as it pursued national prominence, whether for the sake of political expediency, because many of its leaders subscribed to the concept of inherent differences among races, or—most likely—a combination of both.

Harvard and Abolitionism

Even as the majority at Harvard accommodated or advanced the era’s racial oppression, or tried to protect and promote Harvard’s growing reputation as a national institution by keeping it out of the fray, a small but important minority of Harvard faculty, students, and alumni—before and after the Civil War—rejected prevailing social norms and were vocal and active advocates for abolition. These Harvard affiliates spoke out against slavery and racial discrimination, and this counter history of resistance is also an important element of the story of Harvard’s entanglements with slavery.

In the decades leading up to the Civil War, the social and political climate at Harvard largely reflected that of the nation. Northern abolitionists advocated for the end of...
slavery in the United States; many Southerners in the Harvard community defended slavery, and moderates tried to chart a path between the two that might preserve the union. Harvard administrators, faculty, staff, and students were vocal participants on all sides of the ongoing national debates. Yet some of the most prominent voices drowned out and sought to suppress antislavery sentiment.

Harvard Affiliates and Abolitionist Organizations in Massachusetts

Notwithstanding pressure to stay away from public abolitionist activities, a review of published lists of supporters of several Massachusetts organizations illustrates the involvement of members of the Harvard community in advocating the abolition of slavery and the protection of the rights of African Americans.

In May of 1836, for example, a group of Cambridge residents, local politicians, and Harvard faculty came together to form the Cambridge Anti-Slavery Society. In addition to Charles Follen and Henry Ware Jr., both of whom are discussed below, the original signers of the group’s constitution included two-time acting University President Henry Ware Sr. (1810 and 1828–1829; faculty, 1805–1845), the retired faculty member and former University librarian Sidney Willard (librarian, 1800–1805; faculty, 1807–1831), and seven additional alumni of the University. In all, 11 of the 23 original members—nearly half—were Harvard affiliates.344

Almost 10 years later, the Boston-based abolitionist newspaper the Liberator published a list of votes for and against two resolutions passed at that year’s New England Anti-Slavery Convention, declaring it “the great fault of the United States Constitution” that it allowed slaveholders to “control the policy and character of the nation” and calling on abolitionists to “agitate for a dissolution of the Union.”331 The diverse group of 250 men and women, both Black and white, who voted on these resolutions included the Harvard graduates and prominent abolitionists Wendell Phillips (AB 1831; LLB 1834) and Edmund Quincy (AB 1827; overseer, 1875–1877)—the latter of whom was the son of then-University President Josiah Quincy. The rolls also included the recording secretary of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society, Henry Willard Williams (MD 1849),336 who would go on to become a faculty member at the Medical School, serving as the first chair of the Department of Ophthalmology, and the benefactor and namesake of the Henry Willard Williams Professorship in Ophthalmology at Harvard Medical School.337 Perhaps most striking is the prevalence of Harvard affiliates among the active members of the Committee of Vigilance of Boston, often referred to as the Boston Vigilance Committee, which worked through legal channels and in partnership with organizations like the Underground Railroad to assist self-emancipated enslaved people to evade capture after passage of the Fugitive Slave Act in 1850. While membership of the organization was necessarily guarded, in an 1880 memoir, one-fifth of 209 members listed as active between 1850 and 1860 were Harvard graduates. This included the future Harvard faculty members Henry Ingersoll Bowditch (Jackson Professor of Clinical Medicine, 1859–1867), Richard Henry Dana Jr. (lecturer at Harvard Law School, 1866–1868; overseer, 1865–1877), and James Russell Lowell (Smith Professor of the French and Spanish Languages and Literatures and Professor of Belles Lettres, 1855–1886; emeritus, 1886–1891; overseer, 1887–1891).338

Joshua Bowen Smith: Black Abolitionist on Campus

One of the most active abolitionists in Harvard’s employ in the period before the Civil War was a free Black man, although his abolitionist work was independent of the University. Joshua Bowen Smith founded a catering business in Boston in 1849 and for 25 years served gatherings of the local elite. Smith contracted with Harvard to prepare daily meals for students as well as more lavish fare at major celebrations like Commencement;339 he provided services that had earlier fallen to the stewards and, in some cases, their enslaved workers.340 Smith invested the proceeds of his work for Harvard and other Boston-area institutions in abolitionist causes.341 He was directly involved in antislavery efforts as a member of the Underground Railroad342 and as a member of the executive committee of the Boston Vigilance Committee.341 Smith was also a cofounder of the New England Freedom Association, which provided basic necessities and legal defense to escaped enslaved people. He sometimes employed waiters and cooks connected to the association, and it is possible that some of the escapees Smith helped evade capture may have prepared food or waited tables for Harvard’s students and faculty.344

Charles Follen, Henry Ware, and Henry Wadsworth Longfellow: Abolitionist Faculty Members

Members of the Harvard faculty who worked to advance the abolitionist cause often faced particularly significant resistance from the University. In the 1830s,
two abolitionist faculty members—Charles Follen (1825–1835), a professor of German, and Henry Ware Jr. (1829–1842; overseer, 1820–1830), a member of the faculty at the Divinity School—faced pressure to curtail their involvement with the newly founded Cambridge Anti-Slavery Society. Follen believed he lost his full-time teaching role at the University because of his abolitionist activities; he resigned rather than accept a demotion to part-time instructor. Ware, according to an 1846 biography written by his brother, was warned by friends and colleagues to limit his involvement with the society, and he eventually resigned from the organization.

Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, Smith Professor of the French and Spanish Languages and Literatures and Belles Lettres (1836–1854), straddled the social and professional networks that divided abolitionists and supporters of slavery.

Throughout his life, Longfellow maintained friendships with prominent abolitionists, including Richard Henry Dana Jr., James Russell Lowell, Ralph Waldo Emerson, and Harriet Beecher Stowe. The firebrand Free Soil Party member and US Senator Charles Sumner (AB 1830; LLB 1834), whom Longfellow supported actively—if mostly in private correspondence—was among his closest friends. Yet so too was Louis Agassiz, the proponent of race science.

Longfellow’s most public stand against slavery came in 1842, when he published the volume Poems on Slavery, which described the horrors of slavery in painful detail and was popular among white audiences as well as Black. For the most part, however, he expressed his antislavery views privately—in his correspondence and his journals. Believing that slavery was “an unrighteous institution,” Longfellow donated to abolitionist causes, too: particularly after the passage of the Fugitive Slave Act, his records show numerous payments in support of escaped slaves, their families, and those who harbored them. He also supported Black schools and churches in the United States, Canada, and Haiti and gave money to purchase enslaved people’s freedom.

Longfellow wrote to Sumner that the goal of emancipation should be to place “the black man ... upon the same footing as the white.” And he did so in his home, welcoming members of the Black community as guests. In 1846, the escaped slave Josiah Henson—widely known to be the model for Harriet Beecher Stowe’s Uncle Tom—called on Longfellow in Cambridge in search of funds to support a school; Longfellow donated that day and would do so again many times over the next 30 years. At the height of the conflict over the Fugitive Slave Act, Longfellow hosted Lunsford Lane, an escaped slave and abolitionist from North Carolina, and Darby Vassall, the early advocate for free Black rights who was born in bondage at Longfellow’s very home in 1769, when it belonged to John Vassall.

John Gorham Palfrey: Abolitionist Dean

The experience of Professor and Divinity School Dean John Gorham Palfrey (faculty, 1830–1839; overseer, 1828–1831, 1852–1855) illustrates both the presence of active abolitionists in the Harvard community and some of the challenges they faced.

Palfrey grew up in Boston, attended Phillips Exeter Academy alongside future Harvard President Jared Sparks (1849–1853), and graduated with a master’s degree from Harvard Divinity School in 1818. After more than a decade as the minister of a multiracial congregation at Boston’s Brattle Street Church, he returned to Harvard in 1830 as professor of biblical literature and dean of the Divinity School. While one biographer describes the “timidity” of Palfrey’s abolitionism during these years—Palfrey joined the nascent Cambridge Anti-Slavery Society in the 1830s but quickly backed away in the face of “public opinion”—Palfrey became more vocal after 1838.

In that year, Palfrey received word from his brothers in Louisiana that his father’s health was declining, raising the prospect that Palfrey soon might inherit enslaved people from his father’s plantation. He immediately began to investigate how he might legally free any enslaved people who passed to him. At the same time, Palfrey faced pressure from Harvard President Josiah Quincy to postpone an abolitionist public debate, organized by Divinity School students, as Quincy feared a disturbance to campus life. In correspondence, Quincy urged Palfrey to reconsider the event, which Quincy deemed unsuitable for “a seminary of learning, composed of young men, from every quarter of the country; among whom are many whose prejudices, passions, and interests are deeply implicated and affected by these depulsions and who feel very naturally and strongly on the subject.”

When Palfrey opted not to postpone the debate, Quincy wrote again, objecting to the fact that students from across Harvard had been invited to the event and stating his intention to seek the “advice and action” of the Corporation. Less than two months later—although not in time to prevent the debate—the Corporation adopted a resolution that forbade anyone other than University faculty or staff members “to teach, lecture or preach, or deliver any oration or discourse in any of the schools belonging to the University, or in any Society connected...
with either of them” without permission. Palfrey resigned from Harvard shortly thereafter, in 1839, and entered politics.

In the ensuing years, Palfrey was elected as the Whig candidate and an abolitionist to the Massachusetts state legislature (1842–1843); appointed secretary of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts (1844–1847); and elected to the United States House of Representatives (1847–1849).  

Palfrey’s father died in 1843 and, true to his earlier intentions and despite the opposition of his brothers, he hired an agent in New Orleans to seek the bulk of his inheritance in human property. Palfrey then freed the older people among the enslaved he inherited and paid to transport the others—16 men, women, and children under the age of 30 who could not legally be manumitted under Louisiana’s laws—to the Northeast, where he found paid work for them in homes across Massachusetts and New York.  

In 1848 Palfrey, newly affiliated with the abolitionist Free Soil Party, ran for reelection to the US House of Representatives. He lost but remained active in Massachusetts politics, where debate over slavery heated up following the enactment of the Compromise of 1850 and a ruling of the Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court that the Fugitive Slave Act, a key element of the compromise, must be enforced in the state. These developments helped turn public opinion in the Commonwealth against slavery, and this period marks perhaps the moment of starkest disconnect between Harvard, with its national ambitions, and New England over the question of abolition.  

Around this same time, Palfrey’s activism again drew the notice of the Harvard community. In March 1850, his longtime friend, Harvard President Jared Sparks (faculty, 1838–1849; president, 1849–1853), made a personal call: Sparks, a moderate who opposed slavery but favored the removal of former slaves from the United States, told Palfrey that his activities on behalf of the Free Soil Party were harming Harvard’s reputation—this despite the fact that Palfrey had not worked at the University for more than a decade. Palfrey was outraged by Sparks’s request that he moderate his political activities.  

Sparks’s request appears to have been driven by concerns about how the abolitionist activities of Harvard affiliates like Palfrey were influencing national public opinion of the University. Later in 1850, Sparks received a letter from Caleb Cushing, a Harvard graduate and former US representative from Massachusetts, complaining that “abolitionism and political Free Soilers” were “sheltered and nurtured under the broad wings of the university.” This pushback occurred around the same time that Harvard Medical School admitted the Black students Daniel Laing Jr., Isaac H. Snowden, and Martin Robison Delany, only to rescind their admission in the face of protests from white students and families—many of them Southern. (This incident is discussed in greater detail below.) Moreover, in 1851, in response to questions from the Massachusetts legislature—which still provided funding to Harvard in this period—Sparks explained low enrollment by noting that Southerners had been hard to recruit in recent years. Concerns about the recruitment and retention of Southern students were certainly on his and other administrators’ minds.  

Following Palfrey’s failed 1851 run for Governor of Massachusetts and Sparks’s 1852 decision to step down as Harvard president and leave the University, Ephraim Peabody, a Harvard Divinity School graduate and pastor of Boston’s King’s Chapel, wrote to Palfrey to inquire whether he would be interested in being nominated for Sparks’s soon-to-be vacant professorship. Peabody, while not an officer of the University, was well connected with prominent Harvard affiliates, several of whom were active members of his parish. The offer came with a caveat: Peabody warned Palfrey that “an active part in the politics of the day beyond what is incumbent on every private citizen, would be thought by the Corporation & by the Public incompatible with an Office in the College.”  

Palfrey wrote back expressing his interest in the position, not least because he needed a means of supporting his family. He also acknowledged that the University leadership would expect him to show restraint in politics, but he did not commit to remaining on the sidelines. There is no record of any further correspondence on this subject, but Palfrey did not succeed Sparks as the McLean Professor of Ancient and Modern History.

The next year, Sparks himself sought another prominent University position for Palfrey, suggesting to members of the Corporation that Palfrey be considered for the role of treasurer upon the incumbent’s retirement. Palfrey did not receive that position either, and in this case, the reasons are on record. Fellow Charles G. Loring (AB 1812; fellow, 1838–1857) advised against nominating Palfrey because of his politics, despite Loring’s conviction that Palfrey would be an excellent treasurer:

The only doubt arises from his peculiar position as a very prominent leader of a political party, against which such inveterate lividity exists among a large portion of the influential members of society.
at the North, in the Middle States—, & which is unanimously felt at the South.— This would weigh nothing with me, if the appointment were to a private office, in which the public has no interest, nor any right to interfere. But the College is eminently public, & ought to be managed as a national institution—, & it becomes therefore a grave question, how far any office should be filled by a person, who is obnoxious to the [illegible], or ill will of a section of the nation, or any large portion of the people.377

Loring went on to imply that he was supported in this view by “the Ch. J.”—Lemuel Shaw, then chief justice of the Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court and another Harvard fellow.378 While Loring and Shaw were personally opposed to slavery, they took a moderate line in hopes of protecting Harvard as a “national” university.

The events of the 1850s eventually drove Harvard, like every other national institution, to take a stand. In the end, abolitionists were partly vindicated, while political moderates fell out of favor: In 1855, just two years after rejecting Palfrey as treasurer, the Corporation declined to grant an honorary degree to the former treasurer Samuel Atkins Eliot, who had voted for the Fugitive Slave Act while in Congress.379 In 1859, Harvard granted honorary degrees to the abolitionists Henry Wadsworth Longfellow and Charles Sumner.380 From 1861 to 1865, Harvard’s national stature and the internal divisions that came with it were reflected in the service of Harvard men in the Civil War: 1,358 Harvard men enlisted for the Union, and 136 of them died; another 304 enlisted for the Confederacy, of whom 70 lost their lives.381 Palfrey ended his career not at Harvard but in politics, appointed the postmaster of Boston in 1861 by President Abrahm Lincoln.382

Legacies of Slavery in Scholarship: Race Science

By 1850, Harvard Medical School had become a focal point of scientific theories and practices rooted in racial hierarchy, racial exclusion, and discrimination at the University. That same year, as we have seen, the passage of the Fugitive Slave Act of 1850, requiring the return of enslaved people to their owners even if slaves had escaped to free states, turned more white Northerners against slavery and its cruelties. Yet support for antislavery efforts remained anemic at Harvard, even amid the rise of abolitionist sentiment in the Commonwealth. Indeed, at Harvard Medical School, the forces of conformity with the racial status quo, aided by Harvard presidents and leading Harvard faculty members, prevailed against those who dissented.

Harvard Medical School Dean Oliver Wendell Holmes Sr. was at the helm during an 1850 controversy over the abortive admission of the Medical School’s first three Black students, and his views on race help contextualize this episode.383 They also shed light on the group of hugely influential Harvard faculty members whose work in so-called “race science”—the study of racial differences that emphasized the superiority of whites and inferiority of African peoples—would legitimize racist views among generations of scientists, medical researchers, and indeed political leaders. An alumnus of Harvard College (1829) and Harvard Medical School (1836), Holmes was a prominent anatomist and a prolific poet when he became dean in 1847.384 Among his friends and colleagues were the race science proponents Jeffries Wyman and Louis Agassiz, also hired in 1847 as the University worked to grow its ranks of prominent scientists in the 19th century.385 Holmes, like many scientists of the time, held similar views to Wyman and Agassiz. Holmes at times promoted the idea of innate differences in moral character, health, and intelligence among races.386 He also defined “the Brahmin caste of New England” to describe himself and his peers, distinguishing between “the common country-boy, whose race has been bred to bodily labor” and the “races of scholars,” like himself, who “take to [their] books as a pointer or a setter to his field-work.”387 In an Atlantic Monthly essay published in April 1875, Holmes cited, among others, Francis Galton, an English scientist known as the father of eugenics,388 asserting that “in most cases, crime can be shown to run in the blood.”389

Such ideas were perhaps related to Holmes’s engagement with anatomical racial difference.390 During the 19th century, Harvard had begun to amass human anatomical specimens, some of which were the bodies of enslaved people. Holmes was among the scientists who donated human remains to the Warren Anatomical Museum, including a skull (apparently from Africa): “The obliteration of the cranial sutures that characterize the African is finely shown,” he explained.391 Such racialized collections would, in the hands of the University’s prominent medical and scientific authorities, become central to the promotion of race science at Harvard and many American institutions, as discussed in greater detail below.

Oliver Wendell Holmes Sr. and Black Students at Harvard Medical School

On November 2, 1850, Holmes met with with Medical School faculty members to consider an inquiry about the admission of two Black students, Daniel Laing Jr. and Isaac H. Snowden, who were well qualified and had the support of members of the American Colonization
Another group of students drafted a competing resolution. The signers refused to “be identified as fellow-students, whose company we would not keep in the streets, and whose society as associates we would not tolerate in our houses.” The opposition to the Black students was not universal. The faculty voted to admit. The day before, Abraham R. Thompson and Joseph Tracy, the former a Medical School alumnus (1826) and both members of the ACS Board of Directors, had written to the Medical School faculty endorsing Laing and Snowden as “two young men of colour, pursuing medical studies ... for the purpose of practicing in the Republic of Liberia in Africa, where their services are greatly needed.” The faculty extended an offer of admission. Laing, Snowden, and Delany would, however, have a tumultuous and extremely brief tenure at the Medical School. Their reversal of fortune started when 10 white students signed a petition asking to be “informed whether colored persons [were] to be admitted as students at another course of lectures.” Other resolutions followed. On December 10, 1850, some 60 of Laing, Snowden, and Delany’s 116 white colleagues met and, by a slim majority, voted to endorse a resolution stating that the admission of Black students would degrade the quality of their degrees. The signers refused to “be identified as fellow-students, with blacks; whose company we would not keep in the streets, and whose society as associates we would not tolerate in our houses.”

The opposition to the Black students was not universal. Another group of students drafted a competing resolution on December 11, cautioning the University against rescinding admission to the three Black students: “As students of science ... they would feel it a far greater evil, if, in the present state of public feeling, a medical college in Boston could refuse to this unfortunate class any privileges of education, which it is in the power of the profession to bestow.”

Nevertheless, Holmes and the faculty determined to exclude the three Black students, deeming them irritants and distractions to the educational environment. In a letter to the sponsors of Laing and Snowden, Holmes and the faculty described this episode as a failed “experiment,” which had proved that “the intermixing of different races, on a footing of equality and personal proximity during the course of Lectures, is distasteful to a large portion of the class, and injurious to the interests of the School.”

Race Scientists: Louis Agassiz, John Collins Warren, and Jeffries Wyman

This episode took place in the context of the growth of race science at Harvard, which provided an intellectual framework to justify the exclusion and marginalization of Blacks that would endure into the 20th century. Along with Holmes, those engaging with racial difference at Harvard included John Collins Warren (AB 1797; dean, 1816–1819; faculty, 1809–1856), the son of one of the Medical School’s cofounders and himself the first dean of the faculty of medicine, and Holmes’s contemporaries Jeffries Wyman (faculty, 1838–1840 and 1847–1874) and Louis Agassiz (hon. 1848; faculty, 1847–1873). No one was as influential in this area as the renowned Swiss-born scientist Agassiz, yet each of these men—Warren, Wyman, and Agassiz—left powerful legacies on Harvard’s campus and in the wider world.

Agassiz and Wyman both joined Harvard at a time of institution-building. Agassiz at the new Lawrence Scientific School and Wyman, like Holmes, at the Medical School. Wyman succeeded Warren as a professor of anatomy, but Warren remained active in the University until his death in 1856. These three men, as colleagues and collaborators, were instrumental in the creation of major Harvard institutions.

The Warren Anatomical Museum, now housed within Harvard Medical School’s Countway Library, was established when Warren donated his and his father’s vast collections of “pathological and other specimens” to Harvard, including human skulls and “phrenological” casts. Wyman led the creation of the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, where he served as inaugural curator. And Agassiz established and served as the first curator of the Museum of Comparative Zoology.

The Agassiz name remains visible across Harvard’s campus and the City of Cambridge. Louis, who served as professor of zoology and geology from 1847 to 1873 and as curator of the Museum of Comparative Zoology from its founding in 1862 until 1873, is the most well-known member of the Agassiz family. Yet the memorials that remain are generally named for his wife, Elizabeth Cary Agassiz (for instance a professorship, a gate in Radcliffe Yard, and Elizabeth Cary Agassiz House, home of the Harvard College Admissions Visitor Center), or for his son, Alexander Agassiz (namesake of Harvard professorships).
Elizabeth is credited as coauthor of A Journey in Brazil (1868), a travelogue about their yearlong scientific expedition in the country, discussed below. She also left her own powerful mark at Harvard: in 1879, she was among a group of reformers who founded the Harvard Annex, where women could receive instruction from Harvard faculty. The Annex was soon incorporated as the Society for the Collegiate Instruction of Women, and in 1894, it was chartered as Radcliffe College. Elizabeth served as the first president of Radcliffe College and was a pioneering leader in the history of women’s education. Alexander, an engineer and investor in copper mining as well as a scholar of natural history, also worked closely with his father. He handled much of Louis’s correspondence in the final years of his life and succeeded Louis as curator of the Museum of Comparative Zoology in 1874. Alexander donated substantial sums to several organizations in the final years of his life, including more than $200,000 to the museum to support research, publications, and the professorships that still bear his name.

**Agassiz’s Early Career and the Zealy Daguerreotypes**

Louis Agassiz’s journey to Harvard began when he was invited to deliver the Lowell Institute’s Lowell Lectures, while the institute was not affiliated with Harvard, it was a forum that attracted many esteemed Harvard affiliates as lecturers and guests. Agassiz’s 1845 invitation came on the recommendation of the German naturalist Alexander von Humboldt, who was able to secure funding for Agassiz’s Atlantic crossing through his position as an advisor to the king of Prussia. Agassiz was by then a prominent naturalist, known in Europe’s scientific circles for his work on glaciation and the classification of ancient fish species. In this work, he was part of a movement toward classifying flora and fauna according to geographic origin, building upon Carl Linnaeus’s universal system of classification. Naturalists of the era were known for their splendid depictions of nature and often went on scientific expeditions in the Americas to collect specimens for their research. Their preoccupation with nature also extended to the classification of humans “into a single natural hierarchy of difference and similarity,” organized under the rubric of race.

The field of anthropology emerged in this context to study diversity among human groups as a function of visible racial difference. Medical scientists contributed to the field’s growth by investigating relationships among racial typology, geography, and disease. Phrenology, which related the shape and size of the cranium to intellectual and moral faculties, became a popular racial scientific field; craniometry, the measurement and dissection of human skulls, was its primary method. By the 19th century, race science had become a global enterprise, and Agassiz was fully immersed when he arrived in the United States in the fall of 1846.

Among the first things Agassiz did in America was to view the prominent anatomist Samuel George Morton’s skull collection in Philadelphia, an early stop on his tour of the scientific community in the United States, which warmly embraced him. Agassiz spent “four hours in contemplation” of the skulls of Native Americans and received a personal copy of Morton’s Crania Americana, inscribed by the author. In a letter to his mother, Agassiz wrote that Morton’s “collection alone merits a trip to the United States.” He also reflected on his first encounter with African Americans: “It is impossible for me to repress the feeling that they are not the same blood as us.” At this time, the United States was on the verge of establishing its own scientific institutions and schools of thought independent from those of Europe. Polygenism—which proposed not only a hierarchy of races but also separate creations of different races—was “an important agent in this transformation” because it was “of largely American origin” yet acquired authority from European scientists who had long pursued scientific theories of racial difference themselves. Agassiz understood the importance of this moment in the nation’s intellectual life and saw an opportunity. Some two years later, now a member of the Harvard faculty and building a celebrity status matched by few other scientists, he declared to the Boston Society of Natural History that American scientists “had been obliged to look up to Europe as our leader and guide in this pursuit,” but “a short period of persevering labor ... would place America in the position hitherto occupied by the Old World.”

Agassiz first formally articulated his embrace of polygenism at an 1850 meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) in Charleston, South Carolina. In an essay published soon thereafter, he set out to disprove the “prevailing opinion, which ascribes to all living beings upon earth one common centre of origin, from which it is supposed they, in the course of time, spread over wider and wider areas, till they finally came into their present distribution.” His primary objective was “to show that there is no such statement in the book of Genesis: that this doctrine ... is of very modern invention, and that it can be traced back for scarcely more than a century in the records of our science.” In another essay, he concluded that Blacks were at the bottom of a racial hierarchy ordained in nature and contended that “there has never been a regulated
society of black men developed” in Africa, suggesting a “peculiar apathy … to the advantages afforded by civilized society.”

Such views were controversial even then. The first half of the 19th century represented a period of hardening of race as a scientific concept in the United States, at the height of debate over “monogenesis” versus “polygenesis,” or the single versus separate origins of races. Monogenists, who believed in a single human creation, immediately criticized Agassiz’s arguments. Writing to her then fiancé, Elizabeth Cary noted the opposition building to his ideas: “Some of the Church people are out upon you in the papers, for your disrespect of Adam as the common father of mankind.” Congress was also, at this time, debating the Fugitive Slave Act, the passage of which would galvanize antislavery sentiment in New England. Agassiz flatly denied that his research had bearing on the fraught political question of slavery, although he asserted that it was “mock-philanthropy and mock-philosophy to assume that all races have the same abilities, enjoy the same powers, and show the same natural dispositions, and that in consequence of this equality they are entitled to the same position in human society.”

Agassiz was celebrated in the South, where he was invited to the homes of prominent slaveholders and gave iterations of his 1850 AAAS lecture. One such slaveholder, a paleontologist and physician who corresponded with Samuel Morton, welcomed Agassiz to visit plantations in Columbia, South Carolina, and examine enslaved Africans as live research specimens. Following Agassiz’s examination, Joseph T. Zealy made daguerreotype images of seven men and women for Agassiz’s further study: Delia, Jack, Renty, Drana, Jem, Alfred, and Fassena. In so doing, Zealy created what the New York Times described in 2020 as “some of history’s crudest, most contentious images—the first photographs, it is believed, of enslaved human beings.”

It was more than a century before historians retraced the identities and origins of the individuals represented in Agassiz’s daguerreotypes. We now know that Delia, Renty’s daughter, was an enslaved girl from Columbia, and that Jack was Drana’s father. Fassena, noted in the daguerreotype as a carpenter, was Mandingo, originally from modern southern Mali and Northern Guinea. They are each pictured nude or nearly so.

Agassiz returned to the South in 1851–1852 with his new wife, Elizabeth, who would become his frequent collaborator. The collection of research specimens—including human specimens—remained his focus. In an 1852 letter, he begged pardon for his delayed arrival at his next destination, explaining that he “found … an excellent opportunity of examining the negro, of which I must avail myself.”

Agassiz’s wide-ranging specimen collections were a celebrated part of life and learning at Harvard. In an 1850 report to the overseers, University President Jared Sparks highlighted Agassiz’s, Wyman’s, and the University’s collections. Some of these were on display in Holden Chapel, used by the Medical School as a lecture hall and then assigned to the new Lawrence Scientific School, including a “curious collection of casts of skulls … which was purchased and presented to the University several years ago.”

Wyman, Agassiz, and Sturmann

In September of 1860, “an extraordinary importation from South Africa” arrived in Boston—five human beings described as “a Fuigo, a Zulu, a Kaffir, a Bushman, and a Hottentot, all sons of the forests and the desert who have hitherto lived the life of savages.” These living “specimens,” had been acquired by the owners of the Boston Aquarial and Zoological Gardens for public exhibition. The announcement promised a one-of-a-kind experience, “seeing these specimens of human nature in a savage condition just as they appear in their native forests and wilds”—including “monkey tricks.” Their names were given as Machiado, Macormo, Macuolo, Quaggu, and Sturmann.

Advertisements described how the museum space was divided into two departments: the aquarial and the zoological. The Africans were to be displayed alongside an assortment of “rare and beautiful animals and birds” including seals, kangaroos, and “Serpents.” “Refined and intellectual” ticketholders were promised performances of savagery on a regular schedule:

They will appear through the day, clad in their native dresses of skins, ornamented with beads, feathers and porcupine quills, and every evening will go through the War, Love and Festive Dances,—armed with their Spears, Clubs, Shells, and other weapons of War and of the Chase,) and will also Sing the National Songs of their several tribes.

The museum’s owners created a scholarly veneer by commissioning a detailed pamphlet purporting to describe “the early life of each individual specimen of the nomadic tribes.” And Agassiz lent his scientific authority to the proceedings, addressing an inaugural gala on October 4, 1860.
Three months later, when the popular showman P. T. Barnum exhibited the Africans in New York City, public outcry over the questionable nature of their “importation” prompted him to print a statement from Agassiz in local newspapers. Agassiz “testified” that they were not enslaved but “were shipped with the knowledge and consent of the local authorities,” and that “nothing was done in securing them that would be objectionable either in a moral point of view or with reference to the laws of nations.” He did not identify these “local authorities,” nor did he address the consent of Machiado, Macormo, Macuolo, Quaggu, and Sturmann themselves.

One of the five, Sturmann, took his own life on April 28, 1861, after more than six months on display. The Boston Evening Transcript announced his death in a brief editorial:

The young Hottentot at the Aquarial Gardens, yesterday terminated his life by hanging. He was seventeen years of age and used to drive a wagon at Port Natal. For several days he was noticed to act strangely, and, just before the commission of the fatal act, conveyed from the room, where he and his four companions domesticated, nearly every moveable article, in accordance with the practice of all suicides among his people. The other Africans at the Gardens are deeply affected by the death of their companion.

Regardless of their distress, Machiado, Macormo, Macuolo, and Quaggu were “again on exhibition” on April 30.

Sturmann’s time as an object of study in the service of race science was only beginning: Wyman, who had met Sturmann while he was on display, dissected the teenager’s body at Harvard, ultimately publishing his observations in an 1865 issue of the journal the Anthropological Review. He took extensive measurements and compared them to those of a chimpanzee, a gorilla, and two Europeans. In a protracted discussion of Sturmann’s pelvis, he noted that in some respects it came “nearer to that of the anthropoids [apes] than of the Caucasians” but concluded it “belonged to the human family.”

Ultimately, Sturmann’s remains were recorded in the catalog of the Warren Anatomical Museum:

Item # 3237 cast of the head of a native Hottentot. The boy was seventeen years old, had been on exhibition for several months in this city; and finally hung himself. His skeleton is in the Museum of Comparative Zoology, at Cambridge, 1861.

The casts of Sturmann’s head remain in Harvard’s collections.

Global Collecting and the Brazil Expedition

Over nearly three decades, Agassiz also engaged colleagues across the United States and around the world, especially in the Caribbean and Latin America, to collect and classify the natural world for what would become the Museum of Comparative Zoology. He instructed his collectors—including patrons, friends, readers, and lecture audiences—to send him animals of all kinds from across New England, the United States, and the world. His aim was to endow the United States with a museum that would rival the best collections in Europe. Agassiz initially acquired and stored most of the collection at his own cost, raising funds to support the effort from private donors, including Elizabeth Cary Agassiz’s connections among the Boston elite.

The search for specimens motivated Agassiz to organize his expedition to Brazil in 1865, in the midst of the Civil War. Polygenist ideas were losing favor following the publication of Charles Darwin’s On the Origin of Species in 1859, and Agassiz identified Brazil as a prime location to continue his research and defend his claims. In April 1865, with the support of a Boston financier, Agassiz left for Brazil accompanied by Elizabeth and several Harvard students—including William James, who would become an influential Harvard psychologist. Meanwhile Alexander Agassiz, now a naturalist in his own right and directly involved in his father’s work, assumed responsibility for the museum and handled Louis’s correspondence, including discussions of the procurement of human remains from South America.

Because of the country’s racial diversity and its significant mixed-race population, Brazil had particular significance for Agassiz and other natural scientists of the 19th century. In fact, race scientists had long identified Brazil as the embodiment of the dangers of race mixture, which they argued had produced a population that doomed the nation to backwardness. Race mixture was Agassiz’s focus when he commissioned a new set of daguerreotypes of Brazilian enslaved and free people. Agassiz personally oversaw the production of these images, which were taken by a local photographer and a Harvard student assistant. The daguerreotypes likely were staged in the courtyard of the house in Brazil where Louis and Elizabeth had at one point resided with the research crew.

Louis and Elizabeth cowrote A Journey in Brazil, published in 1868, which documented the expedition and presented their findings to a general audience in the
travel narrative genre of the time. In the book’s preface, Louis specifically acknowledged the important role his wife played in the endeavor:

Partly for the entertainment of her friends, partly with the idea that I might make some use of it in knitting together the scientific reports of my journey by a thread of narrative, Mrs. Agassiz began this diary. I soon fell into the habit of giving her daily the more general results of my scientific observations, knowing that she would allow nothing to be lost which was worth preserving.\textsuperscript{464}

Elizabeth’s own correspondence confirms her deep involvement in writing and editing the manuscript.\textsuperscript{465} Given this, it is interesting to note that the book remains silent about the Brazil daguerreotypes, even as it provides detailed depictions of other episodes, including Louis’s sketch of their house maid. Elizabeth is also thought to have expunged from other publications Louis’s most flagrantly racist views.\textsuperscript{466}

It is unclear whether the omission of the daguerreotypes reflects Elizabeth’s discomfit with Louis’s production of the images, all nude or seminude, her effort to safeguard Louis’s reputation, or some other motivation. Whatever the reason, these omissions underscore Elizabeth’s active participation in the expedition and publication. It is also evident from her work on \textit{A Journey in Brazil} that she accepted prevailing racial hierarchies and stereotypes. For example, one passage in the book describes a gathering of enslaved people that Elizabeth and the crew witnessed while Louis was elsewhere:

The dance and the song had, like the amusements of the negroes in all lands, an endless monotonous repetition. Looking at their half-naked figures and unintelligent faces, the question arose, so constantly suggested when we come in contact with this race, “What will they do with this great gift of freedom?” The only corrective for the half doubt is to consider the whites side by side with them: whatever one may think of the condition of slavery for the blacks, there can be no question as to its evil effects on their masters.\textsuperscript{467}

Both Louis and Elizabeth were also interested in educational reform, so it is not surprising that they took time to observe the state of education across Brazil in the course of their travels. In one striking passage, they connect the deficits they perceive in Brazilians’ education with the close contact between enslavers and the enslaved in private homes:

Behind all defects in methods of instruction, there lies a fault of domestic education, to be lamented throughout Brazil. This is the constant association with black servants, and, worse still, with negro children. ... Whether the low and vicious habits of the negroes are the result of slavery or not, they cannot be denied; and it is singular to see persons, otherwise careful and conscientious about their children, allowing them to live in the constant companionship of their blacks. ... It shows how blind we may become, by custom, to the most palatable dangers.\textsuperscript{468}

A complicated figure in her own right, some 11 years after the publication of \textit{A Journey in Brazil}—and 6 years after her husband’s death—Elizabeth played a critically important role in promoting educational access for women through the Harvard Annex, later Radcliffe College. Notably, and notwithstanding the racial prejudices she entertained while working alongside Louis in Brazil, Radcliffe College admitted and graduated Alberta Virginia Scott, its first black alumna, as part of its first graduating class in 1898, during Elizabeth’s tenure as president (1882–1899).\textsuperscript{469}

\section*{Charles William Eliot: A Paradoxical Racial Legacy}

Charles William Eliot, Harvard’s longest-serving president, in office for the four decades from 1869 to 1909, was an influential national figure. According to one historian, “by the turn of the century ... his opinion and support were sought on every variety of public question.”\textsuperscript{470} He and his presidential administration represent a paradox: Harvard began admitting small numbers of Black students during his presidency; at the same time, Eliot himself and prominent Harvard faculty members promoted eugenics and endorsed racial segregation.

The first Black students to graduate from Harvard did so just two months after Eliot’s election to the presidency.\textsuperscript{471} The University saw its first Black graduate of the College, Richard T. Greener (AB 1870); first Black commencement orator, Robert H. Terrell (AB 1884); first Black class day speaker, Clement Morgan (AB 1890); and first Black recipient of a PhD, W. E. B. Du Bois (AB 1890; MA 1891; PhD 1895), during this period. Moreover, during Eliot’s administration, William Monroe Trotter (AB 1895; AM 1896) became the first Black member of Phi Beta Kappa and Alain Locke the first Black Rhodes Scholar (1907).\textsuperscript{472} Eliot’s tenure also saw the hiring of Harvard’s first Black faculty member, George F. Grant.\textsuperscript{473}
Perhaps the most significant development occurred soon after Eliot became president, and it revealed the paradox at the heart of limited Black advancement at Harvard during his presidency. In 1896, Harvard awarded an honorary degree to a Black man for the very first time: Eliot bestowed the honor upon Booker T. Washington, a man who had been born in slavery and who had made a mark as an author and as the principal of the Tuskegee Institute (later the Tuskegee College and today Tuskegee University). By awarding Washington an honorary degree, Harvard expressed esteem for a Black man of great ability, and that was no small thing. But that was not all the award to Washington signified: it was a politically significant choice that gave Harvard’s imprimatur to a man who achieved fame by urging Blacks to accommodate rather than fight racial exclusion, discrimination, and segregation.

Just months before Harvard honored him, Washington had gained national renown through his “Atlanta Compromise” address. In this 1895 speech, made to an audience of white Southerners during a time of rising white violence, political backlash, and legalized discrimination against descendants of slavery, Washington argued that Blacks should not agitate for racial equality or challenge segregation. “In all things that are purely social we can be as separate as the fingers, yet one as the hand in all things essential to mutual progress,” he said. Instead of pursuing the “extremest folly” of social equality, Blacks should pursue vocational education and work hard in the South, including manual labor in cotton mills. Washington’s proposal amounted to a “conservative social Darwinist proposition,” according to one biographer, and it delighted whites who were eager to leave the race question behind and let Blacks fend for themselves. Washington’s “compromise” enraged Black leaders bent on fighting racial inequality. (In 1903, the Harvard graduate W. E. B. Du Bois would famously critique Washington’s views in The Souls of Black Folk.)

It was in this context—Washington’s endorsement of Black political quiescence—that Eliot personally awarded the honorary degree to him (and 12 others) during a June 24, 1896, ceremony in Sanders Theatre. Eliot praised Washington’s remarks that evening at an alumni dinner, in which Washington—a self-described “humble representative” of the Black South—commended the “strong,” “wealthy,” and “learned” of Harvard and exhorted them to help the “ignorant” and “weak” masses rise to the “American standard.”

Alberta V. Scott, the first Black graduate of Radcliffe College, is memorialized by a marker at her family’s home on Union Street in Cambridge. In addition to this distinction, she was only the fourth Black woman to graduate from any college in Massachusetts and the first raised in Massachusetts to graduate from a college in the state.

Scott was born in 1875 in Virginia and moved with her family to Cambridge, Massachusetts, as a child. She attended the Allston School and Cambridge Latin School—both public, coeducational, unsegregated institutions—prior to enrolling at Radcliffe College in 1894. Scott was part of the first class to matriculate after Radcliffe became a degree-granting institution, and she was a member of the German Club and the Idler Club—the College’s drama club.

After her graduation, in 1898, Scott dedicated her life to education, teaching first at a predominantly Black elementary school in Indianapolis and then at Booker T. Washington’s Tuskegee Institute in Alabama. She believed “it [was] a duty for those young colored people who are so inclined to take every advantage along educational lines which they can easily obtain in New England, and then go South and teach their colored brethren.” Her life was cut tragically short by illness, and she died in 1902, at the age of 26.

Scott paved the way for the Black women who followed in her footsteps at Radcliffe, and today she is recognized across campus. The Alberta V. Scott Leadership Academy, a mentorship initiative run by the Association of Black Harvard Women, brings Boston-area high school students together with Harvard College students to foster connection and cultivate leadership skills. And the Greener Scott Scholars Mentorship Program, founded in 2018 by a group of Harvard students, brings together Black undergraduate and graduate students.

Read Scott’s profile in A Legacy of Leadership: African American Alumni at Harvard & Radcliffe
But Harvard did relatively little to help Blacks rise during Eliot’s long presidency. Instead, Eliot himself, and Harvard’s leadership more broadly, continued to advance ideas premised on biological racial difference—the same ideas deployed to support racial segregation. Eliot supported faculty who pursued eugenics, the selective breeding of human beings premised on racial hierarchy, and after his presidency would become a prominent public advocate for the field.481 His views were “well within the intellectual mainstream” at Harvard and throughout the country at the time,482 and coexisted with his enthusiasm for applied science as a means to identify new solutions for long-standing social ills. These interests were not merely academic; Eliot’s views were also bound up with his politics—including his endorsement of segregation, opposition to interracial marriage, and support for eugenic sterilization—and shaped his administration of the University.

The Bussey Institution, founded in 1871 as an undergraduate department in agriculture with the proceeds of Boston merchant Benjamin Bussey’s bequest to the University,483 was reestablished under Eliot as a graduate school of applied biology.484 Eliot supported the new school and its faculty, clearing the way for the geneticist William E. Castle’s research into “what principles underlie the improvement of breeds” and his hereditary experiments on small mammals.485 Castle and his ties to the global eugenicist movement are discussed in greater detail below.

Another beneficiary of Eliot’s support was Dudley Allen Sargent, assistant professor of physical training (1879–1889) and director of Hemenway Gymnasium (1879–1919).486 As head of Hemenway, Sargent established a system of rigorous physical exercises through which students might reform their bodies into the archetypal healthy, civilized man. He also, as described by Eliot, subjected “all students who desired to take part in athletic sports or severe physical exercises” to “thorough physical examination.”487 These intrusive physical examinations and his approach to physical education were motivated by his interest in “race improvement.”488

Student athletes subject to Sargent’s anthropometric evaluation began with a genealogical and family health form, which included parents’ and grandparents’ nationalities and parents’ occupations, as well as a question about which parent the students believed they “most resemble[d].” After completing the form, the students’ physical proportions were measured and plotted in a detailed chart that showed “relation, in size, strength, symmetry, and development, to the normal standard of your age and sex.”489 As part of these examinations, Sargent took nude photographs of many students, among them a young W. E. B. Du Bois.490 He also measured and photographed students at Radcliffe and other colleges and universities, as well as men and women at gymnasiums and community organizations, such as YMCAs and YWCAs, and at major public events, including the 1893 World’s Fair in Chicago.491

Sargent used his data to establish normative and idealized measurements for both sexes and commissioned drawings and sculptures to illustrate these findings.492 Like other prominent eugenicists of the period, he was preoccupied with the notion that the white race was deteriorating under conditions of modernity and believed that as nations became more advanced, their citizens became unfit and lax.493 He also openly endorsed racial hierarchy and held that “civilized” or “superior” races could be distinguished from “primitive” or “inferior” races based on body proportions.494

Eliot was also active in the public sphere, where he touted race science and the virtues of segregation. In the spring of 1909, before stepping down as president,495 Eliot made a tour of the American South, where he was frequently asked to comment on questions of race. While in Memphis, Eliot attempted to address “race problems” in an interview with local reporters.496 The resulting article spread like wildfire, with newspapers across the country, including in Boston, reprinting his statement that “there should be no admixture of racial stock”:

I believe for example, that the Irish should not intermarry with the Americans of English descent; that the Germans should not marry the Italians; that the Jews should not marry the French. Each race should maintain its own individuality. The experience of civilization shows that racial stocks are never mixed with profit, and that such unions do not bring forth the best and strongest children. ... In the case of the negroes and the whites, the races should be kept apart in every respect. The South has a wise policy. I believe that Booker T. Washington has the right ideals and that Dubois is injuring the progress of his race with his views.497

Other newspapers quoted from the same interview Eliot’s comparison of the South to other parts of the United States:

In the South it is the negro problem. The same or similar problems exist in all parts of the country. In protestant Massachusetts, the land of Pilgrims and Puritans, the population today is mostly Catholic.
There are Irish, Italian, and Portuguese that present the same race problem to that part of the country that the negroes do to the South. On the Pacific coast it is the same with the Japanese. 498

Following public criticism of these comments, Eliot engaged in damage control; he acknowledged the value of immigrants and attempted to clarify his views on assimilation—namely that it should be gradual rather than sudden and achieved through education, industry, and policy rather than intermarriage. But he did not deny an aversion to racial mixing. While it was common in this era to oppose marriage between races of “widely different characteristics,” 499 Eliot had gone further, drawing lines between Europeans. One political cartoon depicted a stern Professor Eliot trying to instill his “no admixture” message in his only student—a laughing cupid. 500

His statements did not go unnoticed by those few Black members of the Harvard community. A month after the interview, in April 1909, William Monroe Trotter wrote to Eliot “as an alumnus of Harvard, as a colored man, and as editor of a newspaper for colored Americans.” Trotter, who cofounded the Niagara Movement, predecessor of the NAACP, with W. E. B. Du Bois, wanted to know if what he was reading in the press was true—whether the president of his alma mater really advocated “total segregation,” approved of “the white South’s method of dealing with colored Americans,” and would concede to “admitting the colored people into the American brotherhood … only after 1000 years of ‘civilization.’” 501

Eliot’s response two days later attempted some clarification of his opinions, which, he noted, were “not newly formed.” 502 First, he explained, “The Whites and the Negroes had better live beside each other in entire amity, but separate, under equal laws.” He expressed support for Black suffrage, albeit with a poll tax for all voters, and held that “political equality seems to me to have nothing whatever to do with what is called social equality” and will not lead to “social admixture.” 503 He offered his own observations about the South, including his assessment that “it would take four or five generations more to teach the mass of the negro population that civilization is built on willingness to work hard six days in the week, and to be frugal all the time,” partly because it would be “unreasonable to expect that people who had so recently been savages and slaves should all acquire in forty years the primary virtues of civilization.” For good measure,
Eliot concluded his letter with the assertion that “as to intermarriage between Whites and Blacks, all the best evidence seems to me to show that it is inexpedient.”

When Trotter responded the next day with additional questions about the application of Eliot’s opinions to “actual conditions,” noting that “I believe I am correct in saying the Colored people are quite anxious to know your views,” he received no reply. There is likewise no recorded response to Trotter’s second prompt for a reply some five days later.

Eliot’s stature and political savvy set him up to play an active supporting role in the rising eugenics movement in his post-presidency years. He warned that “the increase of liberty for all classes of the community seems to promote the rapid breeding of the defective, irresponsible and vicious” and advocated “preventing the feeble-minded from reproducing their like.” He stopped short of other Harvard affiliates—including his secretary, Frank W. Taussig, who went on to become a faculty member and argued that, although society “[had] not reached the stage where we can proceed to chloroform them once for all,” the “feeble-minded” could at least be “segregated, shut up in refuges and asylums, and prevented from propagating their kind.”

Charles B. Davenport, William E. Castle, and the International Eugenics Movement

As the eugenics movement took hold in the early 20th century, another Harvard affiliate, Charles B. Davenport (AB 1889; AM 1890; PhD 1892), became one of its key leaders. Davenport studied biology at Harvard and stayed on as an instructor until 1899, when he joined the faculty of the University of Chicago. In 1910, Davenport and his fellow eugenics leader Harry H. Laughlin established the Eugenics Record Office in Cold Spring Harbor, New York, which became a center for the eugenics movement and produced a wide range of research and propaganda. His 1911 book, *Hereditity in Relation to Eugenics*, became the standard text for eugenics courses at colleges and universities across the country and was cited by more than a third of high-school biology textbooks of the era. Like his fellow eugenicists, Davenport believed in biological differences among races and the distinctiveness and superiority of the white race, and he virulently opposed race mixing. He advocated for racial restrictions on immigration; “selective elimination” of undesirable people; and acceptance of “the principle of the inequality of generating strains” and “eugenic ideals ... in mating,” such that “strains with new and better combinations of traits may arise and our nation take front rank in culture among the nations of ancient and modern times.”

Davenport had a significant impact on his students during his decade as an instructor at the University. Among them was a young William Ernest Castle, who would himself go on to become a major figure in eugenics at Harvard and in the United States. Castle enrolled at Harvard College in 1892, pursuing a second bachelor’s degree—he had previously graduated from Denison University—in botany and zoology. Castle worked as a laboratory assistant for Davenport and completed a PhD under the direction of E. L. Mark, the professor of zoology who had also advised Davenport. After teaching for two years at the University of Wisconsin and Knox College, Castle returned to Harvard in 1897 as an instructor and researcher in animal breeding, first at the Museum of Comparative Zoology, later at the Bussey Institution, and then the University’s center for agriculture and horticulture.

Castle was a prominent member of the American Breeders’ Association (today the American Genetic Association) and a founding member of the editorial board of the journal *Genetics*. In 1912, he was chosen as a member of the American Consultative Committee at the First International Eugenics Congress in London, where Charles William Eliot was then serving as vice president. From 1910 to 1930, Castle taught Genetics and Eugenics, one of several courses on eugenics offered across Harvard at the time. He published his lecture notes in 1916 in the textbook *Genetics and Eugenics: A Text-book for Students of Biology and a Reference Book for Animal and Plant Breeders*, which deployed his research into the breeding of animals to advance eugenicist arguments about humans in a concluding chapter titled “The Possibility and Prospects of Breeding a Better Human Race.” On race mixing, Castle argued that “from the viewpoint of a superior race there is nothing to be gained by crossing with an inferior race. ... From the viewpoint of the inferior race also the cross is undesirable if the two races live side by side, because each race will despise individuals of mixed race and this will lead to endless friction.” Moreover, to prevent the inheritance of undesirable traits, Castle concluded that “segregation” of the “feeble-minded” should be implemented in “schools and institutions under state control.” When “segregation is impracticable,” Castle argued, the “feeble-minded... should not be allowed to marry unless first sterilized.”

Such ideas, which led to compulsory sterilization practices in approximately 30 states and between 60,000 and 70,000 cases of eugenic sterilization in the United States.
States, were also a primary focus of Davenport’s Eugenics Record Office (ERO). The ERO quickly gained national and international prominence, and it sustained a dual mission to carry out research and advocate for eugenic research and eugenic policy among the public. The organization received funding from the Gladys and Roland Harriman Foundation, the Rockefeller Foundation, and the Carnegie Corporation of New York—a total of $1.2 million between 1910 and 1940—and established European connections, particularly with like-minded proponents of eugenics in interwar Germany.

Indeed, the ERO’s *Eugenical News* introduced German eugenics to an American audience, praised a Nazi sterilization law that drew on ERO research, and became “the main propagandists for the German eugenic cause.” As president of the International Federation of Eugenic Organizations, Davenport himself helped restore German eugenicists to a place of prominence in the international movement after World War I. At his alma mater, Davenport arranged for a delegation of German eugenicists to participate in Harvard’s 1936 tercentenary celebration.
V. The Long Legacies of Slavery: Segregation, Marginalization, and Resistance at Harvard

Twentieth-Century Vestiges of Slavery

In the decades after the Civil War, in Massachusetts and in every corner of the nation, African Americans encountered roadblocks to achieving social mobility, including—perhaps especially—through education. White opposition to racially “mixed” schools, born of racist attitudes about Black ability and character promoted by slaveholders, blocked equal access to education. Segregated, under-resourced, and inferior elementary and secondary schools became the norm for African Americans.

Harvard alumni played prominent roles on both sides of the struggle over school segregation. One critically important chapter in that struggle, which would have dire consequences nationwide for Blacks into the 20th century, had occurred in Boston shortly before the Civil War. In Roberts v. City of Boston, an 1850 decision, the state helped normalize segregated schools. In that case—filed by the Harvard-educated lawyer and US senator Charles Sumner on behalf of a five-year-old Black girl—the Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court held that racial segregation in the city’s schools did not offend the law. Chief Justice Lemuel Shaw—a Harvard alumnus (AB 1800), fellow, and overseer—authored the opinion for the court. But in 1855, after advocacy and a school boycott organized by Black abolitionists with important support from Sumner, Massachusetts passed legislation banning segregated schools—the first such law in the United States. Nevertheless, decades later, in 1896, the US Supreme Court cited Roberts as authority when it held that racially “separate but equal” facilities did not violate the 14th Amendment to the Constitution in Plessy v. Ferguson.

In higher education, Blacks also found themselves in separate and unequal schools. It was left to historically Black colleges and universities (HBCUs)—often founded by Black self-help organizations and religious societies, and which were offered some federal financial support beginning in 1865—to provide a measure of opportunity for Blacks. But from the start, HBCUs were sorely under-resourced, and they remain so. Inadequate funding hobbled school leaders as they sought to fulfill the HBCUs’ mission of racial uplift through postsecondary school access.

Predominantly white universities did not fill the breach. In keeping with prevailing racial attitudes and the relegation of African Americans to HBCUs with limited funding, Harvard—like all but a few white universities—did relatively little to support the African American quest for advancement.

To the contrary, Blacks still faced discrimination or plain indifference at Harvard and other white universities. Notwithstanding Harvard’s rhetorical commitment in the Civil War’s wake to recruit a nationally representative student body that would model political collegiality, the University’s sights remained set on a white “upper crust.” Harvard prized the admission of academically able Anglo-Saxon students from elite backgrounds—including wealthy white sons of the South—and it restricted the enrollment of so-called “outsiders.”

Abbott Lawrence Lowell and Discrimination in Admissions and Housing

Two major avenues for discrimination in the University setting, admissions and housing, figured prominently in the long Harvard presidency (1909–1933) of Abbott Lawrence Lowell. Lowell, who succeeded Charles William Eliot, guided Harvard through a period of significant growth—enrollment nearly doubled, and the endowment quintupled. His administration also gave rise to several highly publicized controversies related to discrimination on the basis of religion and race.

Early in Lowell’s presidency, the Faculty of Arts and Sciences voted to supplement the University’s existing exam-based admissions system with an alternative “approved secondary school course” route. In keeping with Harvard’s long-standing vision of itself as a national
institution, the express purpose of this change was to increase enrollments from outside New England as well as from public high schools, where students were less likely to receive preparation for college entrance exams. The decision attracted notice well beyond the Harvard community: in a letter to Lowell, the businessman and philanthropist Andrew Carnegie lauded the University for creating a “clear path for the poor boy from bottom to top.” In practice, however, Lowell would work to limit the new process’s effect upon the socioeconomic makeup of the student body, and to instead promote discriminatory admissions practices.

As part of Harvard’s evolving admissions policies, Lowell masterminded Harvard’s well-documented efforts to exclude Jewish students in the early 20th century. He did this in a variety of ways: first by privately tilting the admissions scale against Jewish transfer applicants and adopting a national recruitment strategy focused on regions of the country with smaller Jewish populations, and then by capping the number of Jewish students admitted and introducing new admissions criteria. These criteria, including personal interviews and the requirement that all candidates submit photographs with their application materials, were approved by the faculty in January 1926. And, at Lowell’s behest, the Committee on Admission was granted discretion to execute, in his words, a “discrimination among individuals.”

Inside and outside of the Ivy League, universities deployed many of these same policies and practices, including photo requirements, interviews, admissions tests, and recruitment from private preparatory and other urban feeder schools in ways that discriminated against or disadvantaged Black students.

But plain indifference or outright exclusion from white institutions of higher education were the more pressing problems for African Americans, as evinced by the small number of Blacks admitted to Harvard before, during, and well after the 64-year tenure of Presidents Eliot and Lowell. Despite access to civic organizations in major cities that could identify a pool of able Black students, the college enrolled meager numbers. “The official view was that African Americans who had the grades and money to come to Harvard were welcome,” wrote two historians of the institution, but no effort was made to find, recruit, or welcome those students to campus. Approximately 160 Black men matriculated to Harvard College during the 50-year period from 1890 to 1940, an average of 3 per year, 30 per decade. Such vanishingly small numbers frequently left Black men isolated and marginalized on campus.

Those Blacks who did manage to enter Harvard’s gates during the 19th and early-to-mid 20th centuries excelled academically, earning equal or better academic records than most white students, but encountered slavery’s legacies on campus.

Lowell’s perspective on questions of race—rooted in racial hierarchy and eugenics—shaped campus life. He granted Charles B. Davenport and the Eugenics Record Office (ERO) access to “the physical and intellectual records” of Harvard students for eugenics research. And in response to a request from a Harvard faculty member, Lowell lobbied a US senator to support immigration quotas, in keeping with his views “that no democracy could be successful unless it was tolerably homogeneous; and that the presence of [different] races which did not intermingle was unfortunate, as indeed it has been in the case of the negro.”

Lowell’s views resulted in a notorious example of Black marginalization on campus. In the summer of 1922, when Harvard was already under fire in the press over “the Jewish question”—the University’s anti-Jewish admissions policies—a new controversy developed: President Lowell’s signature innovation—a residential college experience for first years that was meant to build community—excluded the handful of Black Harvard students. The community Lowell sought to build included whites only.

The seeds of this so-called “dormitory crisis” had been planted the previous spring when William J. Knox Jr., a newly admitted Black freshman from New Bedford, Massachusetts—and a great-nephew of the Black abolitionist Harriet Jacobs—was barred from living in the freshman dormitories. Knox had initially been granted a room but, shortly after appearing in person for an entrance examination, he received a telegram asking that he return his registration card. One week later, Knox received a letter informing him that the freshman halls were full.

Knox traveled to Cambridge with the fellow New Bedford native and recent Harvard College graduate Edwin B. Jourdain Jr. (AB 1921), then enrolled in Harvard Business School, to inquire after the change. Jourdain had, after all, been permitted as a Black student to live in the freshman halls just a few years earlier. Dean Philip P. Chase informed Knox and Jourdain of Harvard’s policy: while Black students were allowed in voluntary residence and dining halls, they were excluded from the freshman halls because residence in those dormitories was compulsory (for whites). In Lowell’s view, “Those students whose social prejudice against the negro is strong can hardly be compelled into an association that,
Jourdain pursued the matter further, seeking a conference with President Lowell. According to Lowell, he told Jourdain “that negroes were well treated at Harvard and that it would be a mistake for them to urge admission to the Freshman Halls.” Lowell also cautioned that, if “faced by the alternative of either admitting negroes to those halls ... or of excluding negroes altogether, we might, or should, be compelled to adopt the latter, like some other colleges.” News of this exchange spread, and Lowell’s words were interpreted as a warning to those who might protest the policy, though he denied this was his intent. Lowell affirmed Harvard’s duty to provide “the best possible opportunities for education,” but doubled down on his position that Harvard did not owe Black students “inclusion in a compulsory social system with other people when it is not mutually agreeable.” Still focused on a national student body, it was, Lowell believed, “irrational to contend that on account of the two or three negroes in the freshman class, the College ought practically to drive away the large number of men from the South and West.”

The issue gained public attention in the summer of 1922, when word leaked to the New York World that a committee of seven white Harvard alumni, including one Jewish graduate, was circulating a petition among fellow alumni to send to Lowell. The petition, which gained more than 140 signatures, respectfully submit[ted]” that exclusion of Black students was a “Jim Crow policy” and argued that, while “the University owes the Southern man the best possible opportunity for education,” it does “not owe him the surrender of our Northern ideas of democracy and our Harvard ideals of justice.” If reversing the exclusionary policy meant a loss of Southerners “of intense race-consciousness,” the petitioners wrote, “the College should accept that loss rather than surrender its standards.”

The administration showed no signs of budging until January, after added pressure from prominent Black alumni pushed the controversy onto the national stage and sparked another deluge of letters. Roscoe Conkling Bruce (AB 1902), testing the policy, wrote to the registrar in December requesting a place in the freshman halls for his son. Lowell’s reply and the ensuing correspondence with Bruce were published in the New York Times. The paper also printed a statement from William Monroe Trotter, on behalf of the National Equal Rights League, decrying Harvard’s “turn from democracy and freedom to race oppression, prejudice and hypocrisy.” Another published letter, from James Weldon Johnson on behalf of the NAACP, charged that “by capitulating to anti-negro prejudice in the freshman dormitories or anywhere else, Harvard University affirms that prejudice and strengthens it, and is but putting into effect the program proclaimed by the infamous Ku Klux Klan and its apologists.”

By the end of the month, Harvard’s overseers called a special meeting to appoint a faculty committee to consider the issue. In March and April, the governing bodies amended Lowell’s policy on freshman housing; henceforth, “men of the white and colored races shall not be compelled to live and eat together, nor shall any man be excluded by reason of his color.” It was not clear what the new policy meant in practice; but it was hardly a ringing endorsement of racial mixing in campus housing.

The chilly racial climate on campus extended beyond this notorious incident. In other ways, African Americans encountered impediments to full acceptance.

During the early decades of the 20th century, for instance, the talents of Black Harvard athletes earned them respect and recognition from University leaders and from other students on campus. But these athletes also encountered discrimination and exclusion, especially in intercollegiate play. Black football and baseball players sometimes faced harassment by other teams’ fans. And universities in both the South and the North sometimes refused to play against Harvard teams that included Black players. Harvard administrators often bowed to these demands. A controversy over a 1941 lacrosse match under Lowell’s successor as president, James Bryant Conant, illustrated the problem and brought things to a head: William J. Bingham, Harvard’s athletic director, benched Lucien Victor Alexis Jr. (AB 1942; MBA 1947), an African American lacrosse player, after the United States Naval Academy objected. “We were guests of the Naval Academy,” Bingham said, “I had no choice.” After an outcry by Harvard students, the Harvard Corporation “suggested” that the athletic director make the University “principle” of non-discrimination known to other institutions.

Even as white Harvard students appreciated the Black athletes who contributed to victories on the field, many were indifferent to the overall plight of African Americans. At a time of rising racist violence against African Americans and an NAACP campaign against lynching, for example, Harvard students made light of the resurgent Ku Klux Klan. The white terrorist organization was responsible for anti-Black harassment and murder and the dispossession of Black-owned property across the country. Yet the students’ general indifference was on full display at a Class Day ceremony in 1924: the “hit of the afternoon,” according to one Boston newspaper, “was
undoubtedly the class of ’21”—the class to which Edwin B. Jourdain Jr. belonged—who came as a klavern of the Ku Klux Klan, white robes, pointed hoods with eyeholes and all. The incident apparently did not spark public outcry or a response from the administration; the Class of 1921 continued to make light of the Klan in its newsletter years later. This was not the first time Harvard students had made light of the Klan. In 1923, the Harvard Crimson published stories about Klan activities around Halloween, and the Harvard Lampoon printed an entire issue on the Klan. Such “pranks” are unlikely to have escaped the notice of the University’s few Black students. In fact, the Crimson also reported on Harvard students’ involvement in the Klan, coverage that prompted another response—a telegram to the president and Board of Overseers—from Johnson on behalf of the NAACP. Still, Black students generally could and did participate in campus clubs and activities. They wrote for undergraduate publications, debated, and won academic honors. Appreciative of the opportunities they gained at Harvard, many African Americans spoke fondly of the University. Others reacted with “ambivalence” to the reality of marginalization despite inclusion at the University. The decidedly mixed experiences of Blacks at Harvard illustrated a “half-opened door,” as one author aptly termed the Ivy League experience of African Americans during the early and middle decades of the 20th century.

Albert Bushnell Hart: A Complicated Mentor to W. E. B. Du Bois

Albert Bushnell Hart, who succeeded Lowell as Harvard’s Eaton Professor of the Science of Government and was a contemporary of many of the University’s prominent eugenicists, illustrates the ideological legacies of race science at Harvard in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, even among some of the University’s most progressive professors—of which he was one.

THE KLAN ON CAMPUS?

The Ku Klux Klan, founded in the South in 1865, gained considerable membership in the West and Midwest in the early 20th century. At its peak in 1925, the Klan claimed tens of thousands of members in every state of New England, including Massachusetts. Between February 1922 and October 1923, the student-run newspaper the Harvard Crimson reported an underground Ku Klux Klan presence on campus. Articles described isolated incidents of intimidation or recruitment, alleged student participation in area Klan chapters, and suggested the presence of an organized chapter of the Klan on campus. Such reports were published alongside Klan-related satire.

These issues received passing attention from Harvard administrators and alumni and from the national media. In 1922, for example, administrators responded to a white student’s reports that the local Klan had threatened him by dismissing the threats as “undoubtedly part of a joke.” While the Crimson’s report of Klan activity on campus in early 1922 drew little comment, similar reports in the fall of 1923 made national news in the wake of controversies over Harvard’s discriminatory housing and admissions policies. The Klan’s own newspaper eagerly recirculated and expanded on the reports; the New York Times cited Harvard Regent Matthew Luce’s assessment of their veracity; and James Weldon Johnson, secretary of the NAACP, an organization then in the midst of an anti-lynching campaign, wrote, “it would be better to close the university than to permit it to become a vehicle for disseminating the poison of race and religious hatred upon which the infamous Klan depends in recruiting its membership.” He further warned that “nation wide experience with the Klan has demonstrated that where it has not been dealt with sternly and promptly [it] has become futile to attempt to do so later.”

Most, however, continued to dismiss the reports. Student reactions ranged from flippant to annoyed. And the Harvard Alumni Bulletin lectured the Crimson, suggesting “an abatement in the firecracker brand of undergraduate journalism.” The Crimson, however, stood by its reporting “that there was a comparatively large number of Klansmen within the walls of the University.” Regardless of whether the student newspaper’s reports of Klan activity on campus were reliable or exaggerated, or fabricated as an ill-advised scheme to make light of the Klan, they would almost certainly have caused distress, particularly for Black students keenly aware of a national context of anti-Black harassment, murder, and theft of property.
A faculty member in American history beginning in 1883, Hart held the Eaton Professorship from 1910 to 1926. He was a prolific historian whose publications—including textbooks—shaped the teaching of American history at the high school and university level. He served as an early officer and president of the American Historical Association and was also president of the American Political Science Association, both during the time of the professionalization of academic disciplines in the United States.

Hart’s scholarship often focused on issues of race and class. Like many white scholars in this period, he depicted slavery as a generally benign institution that was more problematic in principle than in its execution. Presenting himself as “a son and grandson of abolitionists,” he argued that “How far slavery, as a system, was inhuman and barbarous is difficult to decide.” He reasoned that “the evidence is overwhelming that many slaves were as well fed and housed as the poor whites of the neighborhood and were unconscious of serious injustice.”

Hart routinely elided or minimized racial violence in his work, in one case noting that “none but an extraordinarily stupid or cruel master would keep his slaves down to a point where they could not do full work.” In a history textbook written for use in American secondary schools he explained:

It is not strange that slaves were sometimes cruelly treated. In those days prisoners and paupers were often ill treated. The object of a master was to make his slaves work and obey, whether they felt like it or not. If they refused, the master or overseer had to flog them or let them be idle. Sensible masters would not injure the value of a slave by too severe punishment.

Hart cast such violence as understandable, if not wholly acceptable, given that “two negro slaves might do less work in a day than one hired white laborer in the North.” The slaves’ “indolence was the despair of every slave-owner,” he wrote; their “shiftlessness, waste of their master’s property, neglect of his animals, were almost proverbial; and the looseness of the marriage-tie and immorality of even the best of the negroes were subjects of sorrow to those who felt the responsibility for them.”

Further, although vocally opposed to lynching—which he called “an opportunity for the most furious and brutal passion of which humanity is capable, under cover of moral duty, and without the slightest danger of a later accountability”—Hart asserted that:

One of the few advantages of slavery was that every slaveholder was police officer and judge and jury on his own plantation; petty offenses were punished by the overseer without further ceremony, serious crimes were easily dealt with, and the escape of the criminal was nearly impossible. Freedom … has combined with the influence of the press in popularizing crime, and perhaps with an innate African savagery, to make the black criminal a terrible scourge in the South.

Despite such views, Hart strongly supported W. E. B. Du Bois during his time as a student at Harvard. Citing his “distinct ability,” Hart recommended Du Bois for a scholarship that enabled him to continue his graduate studies. He also facilitated Du Bois’s participation in the American Historical Association’s 1891 meeting—making Du Bois the first Black scholar to present to that organization. Du Bois’s paper, “Enforcement of the Slave Trade Laws,” was published the following year in the *Annual Report of the American Historical Association*. But Hart’s support of Black students was qualified: he believed that only a racially mixed few could succeed. The achievements of Du Bois or of Booker T. Washington, he wrote in an extended discussion of race in his 1910 book *The Southern South*, “prove nothing as to the genius of the races because they are mulattoes.” He concluded that “few men of genius among the Negroes are pure blacks.”

While Hart was not an advocate for racial equality, neither was he a racist in the mold of the many eugenicists at Harvard. He certainly believed that whites were the superior race:

There are a million or two exceptions, but they do not break the force of the eight or nine million of average Negroes. … Race measured by race, the Negro is inferior, and his past history in Africa and in America leads to the belief that he will remain inferior in race stamina and race achievement.

Yet in a direct rebuke of his eugenicist colleagues, he declared “the Negro is entitled to be measured, not by brain calipers, not by two-meter rods, but by what he can do in the world.” Education was, for Hart, the consistent answer to “the vast and absorbing problem,” namely “the presence of a non-European race, formerly servile, and permanently inferior to the white race.” He argued that educating all Blacks, regardless of aptitude, was worth the effort to reach those who—like Du Bois—were exceptional: “It is a favorite Southern delusion that education and Christian teaching have no effect on the animal propensities of Negroes; there are thousands.
of examples to the contrary.”619 Hart, also a Howard University trustee, concluded that the “most hopeful thing” is the “work of institutions like Fisk, Atlanta, and Talladega.”620 “Education does not necessarily make virtue, but it is a safeguard.”621

Black Students at Harvard: A Legacy of Resistance

Just as legacies of slavery continued to shape campus life long after the Civil War and well into the 20th century, so too did Black resistance. Throughout the postbellum era and into the 20th century, Black students confronted and resisted marginalization, earning their Harvard educations and, ultimately, reshaping the nation.

W. E. B. Du Bois

W. E. B. Du Bois once recalled: “I was in Harvard, but not of it, and realized all the irony of my singing “Fair Harvard.”622 Reflecting decades later on his experience as a black student at Harvard, Du Bois declared that the University had “a galaxy of great men and fine teachers,” Albert Bushnell Hart among them. Yet, he wrote, “I went to Harvard as a Negro ... recognizing myself as a member of a segregated caste whose situation I accepted.”623 Of his social relationships, he wrote: “Following the attitudes which I had adopted in the South, I sought no friendships among my white fellow students, nor even acquaintanceships. Of course I wanted friends, but I could not seek them.”624 A lover of music and singing, he was rejected from the Glee Club: “I ought to have known that Harvard could not afford to have a Negro on its Glee Club traveling about the country.”625 Even moments of triumph were tinged: When Du Bois and his fellow Black student Clement G. Morgan were selected as Commencement speakers, Francis Greenwood Peabody—Plummer Professor of Christian Morals at Harvard Divinity School and preacher to the University—moved to consult the Harvard Corporation as to whether it was appropriate to select two Black students for this honor.626 Their answer was no; Du Bois spoke, but Morgan did not.627 In the end, Du Bois was lauded for his address “Jefferson Davis: Representative of Civilization.”628 Yet even a Harvard professor who recounted a “trustee’s” view that the paper was “masterly in every way” felt compelled to add that “Du Bois is from Great Barrington, Massachusetts, and doubtless has some white blood in his veins.”629

Du Bois arrived at Harvard having already completed his undergraduate studies at the historically black Fisk University in Nashville, Tennessee. Harvard, unwilling to accept his Fisk credential, required Du Bois to complete a second bachelor’s degree.630 Fisk, like other Black institutions, was not accredited; the Southern Association of Colleges did not grant accreditation to Fisk or any other Black college in this era.631 Du Bois enrolled in the College as a junior and graduated *cum laude* in history in 1890.632 He completed a master’s degree in 1891 and earned his PhD in 1895.

During his time at Harvard, Du Bois’s financial struggles set him even further apart from many of his white classmates. As an undergraduate, he had to rely on outside funding and charitable loans to cover tuition and living expenses.633 Unable to afford student housing, he did not live on campus; and his landlady, Mary Taylor, a Black woman from Nova Scotia, let him “owe the rent.”634 As a graduate student, Du Bois was better financially equipped: he had inherited money from his grandfather and, with the help of recommendations from Hart and another Harvard professor, James Bradley Thayer, Du Bois was awarded the Henry Bromfield Rogers Memorial Fellowship from 1890 to 1892.635

Du Bois’s experience as a Harvard alumnus mirrored, in some ways, the marginalization he faced on campus. In his autobiography, he wrote of his discomfort at visiting the Harvard Club of New York around 1950 as the guest of a white classmate and club member.636 Some eight years earlier, in 1942, Du Bois had received what appears to be a form letter recruiting new members, prompted by the club’s loss of income with so many members leaving for the warfront.637 Du Bois responded:

My dear Sir: Your letter ... rather astonished me. I have been graduated from Harvard College over fifty years and this is the first time during that period that I have been asked to join a Harvard Club. I have assumed that the reason for this reticence was that I am of Negro descent. Possibly, however, Harvard is learning something from this war for democracy and has changed her attitudes. If this is true, I shall be very glad to hear from you and to become a member.638

There are no records of a reply from the club or a membership in Du Bois’s name.639

As much as Du Bois’s experience with the Harvard community—as both student and alumnus—illuminates the racism and disenfranchisement of that era on campus, it is also a powerful story of resistance. He directly and publicly challenged ideas and ideologies advanced by Harvard professors and administrators, including Dean Nathaniel Southgate Shaler and President Charles...

Another piece from Du Bois’s graduate student years, “Harvard and the South,” not only illustrates his willingness to enter the fraught discourse on the post–Civil War South but also offers glimpses into his experience, having been privy to intellectual discussions in which he was uniquely implicated because of his race. The paper argues that the Civil War was “at core the result of a vast economic mistake” and that the solution to the South’s problems of the day “lies in the trained leadership toward correct economic ideas” and “the intellectual impetus of the broadly trained university man.” In one particularly telling passage, Du Bois notes his distance from the “Northern student of Southern affairs,” who, he writes, “wavers between calling the whites rascals, or the Negroes idiots.” The Northern student, he writes, “cannot decide whether to make out my Southern fellow student as a case of total depravity; or me as a specimen of the anthropoid ape.” Then, directly challenging his classmates’ stereotypes, he adds: “With as little personal bias as could be expected under the circumstances, I respectfully submit that he need do neither.” Du Bois subtly acknowledges the prejudice—whether scientific, social, or religious in nature—of his Harvard audience:

If the Southern people can once be brought to see that it is to their highest economic advantage to have their working classes as intelligent and ambitious and with as great political privileges as possible, I care not what they or you think as to the origin and destiny of the Negro people.

Long after earning his PhD, Du Bois remained active within the Harvard community, including attending reunions, and he continued to push Hart, with whom he stayed in regular contact, on matters of representation. For example, Du Bois responded to a letter from Hart wishing him well on his 50th birthday with the following note:

My dear Prof. Hart: I want to thank you very much for the kind letter which you sent on my birthday. I have been noticing that “The American Year Book” with which you are connected, always says surprisingly little about the Negro of America and elsewhere. Cannot something be done about this?

Du Bois also worked to hold the University accountable. In 1922 and 1923, leading up to the petition against President Abbott Lawrence Lowell’s exclusion of Black students from freshman dormitories, Du Bois consulted with the organizing alumni, sharing suggestions and contacts. He was “shocked” and enraged by the exclusion of the high-achieving Blacks admitted to Harvard. And he brought national attention to the issue by unleashing what biographer David Levering Lewis called a “double-barreled” critique of anti-Black discrimination and the use of anti-Jewish quotas by “Fair (!) Harvard” in the August 1922 issue of Crisis, the magazine of the NAACP. The dormitory exclusion distressed Du Bois because it showed that “mainstream America recognized no amount of merit, conceded not even the most minimal authority ... however rarely talented, insofar as Negro citizens were concerned.”

Du Bois’s role in cofounding the NAACP—the nation’s oldest civil rights organization—was his most profound act of resistance to the marginalization of African Americans in American society. Under the aegis of that organization and its lawyers, Black Americans struggled against discrimination in the political process, housing, public accommodations, the criminal legal system, and education. The organization’s legal strategy against segregation prevailed in Brown v. Board of Education (1954), one of the most celebrated cases in the canon of American constitutional law. Thurgood Marshall and a team that included the Harvard-educated Black lawyers Charles Hamilton Houston (LLB 1922, SJD 1923), William H. Hastie (LLB 1930; SJD 1933), and William T. Coleman Jr. (LLB 1946) played leading roles in the lawsuit that “reconsecrated American ideals.”

Ewart G. Guinier

Ewart G. Guinier, who would go on to serve as chair of Harvard’s Department of Afro-American Studies at its founding in 1969, was a student well after Du Bois had left campus. He enrolled at Harvard in 1929, during Abbott Lawrence Lowell’s presidency, and was subject to the admissions practices Lowell had put in place. After graduating with honors from Boston’s English High School, Guinier applied and was accepted to both Dartmouth College and Harvard. While Dartmouth offered a full scholarship including room and board, Harvard offered nothing. But Guinier was determined to attend the University. He turned down the full scholarship at Dartmouth and worked summers throughout the school year to pay his way at Harvard.

Despite Harvard’s new, ostensibly nondiscriminatory housing policy, Guinier was notified that he “had been granted permission to live at home”—permission he had not requested. As a freshman, Guinier would commute
to campus from Roxbury, and during his sophomore year, he stayed in Brookline. Both locations are several miles from campus.466

Guinier’s first week at Harvard was jarring.467 When he attended the freshman assembly to hear Lowell speak, he recalled:

There seemed to be a thousand people in the hall. I was the only Black. As we left the meeting I could hear conversations being started all around me,—but no one looked me in the eye, no one spoke to me. As I walked toward a group, they would move away.468

Later, Guinier was excited to encounter a familiar face—a former schoolmate—working the desk of the freshman library, but again, he was ignored. It was not until shopping for textbooks at the Harvard Coop that Guinier met another Black student, Ralph Bunche (MA 1928; PhD 1934), who welcomed him to Harvard. Bunche, who became an acclaimed diplomat, would go on to receive the Nobel Peace Prize in 1950 and play an important role in the Civil Rights Movement.469 “He was the first person who spoke to me voluntarily,” said Guinier, “and gave me some sense of community and connection with Harvard.”469 Bunche also told Guinier to look for a job at one of the private student eating clubs that catered to wealthy white students, where he could work alongside other Black students.451

Classes were not much better, and Guinier’s professors rarely called on him.462 He was “invisible to everyone around me,” treated as a “non-person,” he recalled.463 Things improved when he joined Alpha Phi Alpha and Omega Psi Phi, two Black fraternities with local chapters, but he suffered from health problems, and his family faced financial difficulties.464 Guinier was forced to transfer to City College in New York in 1931.465

Undeterred by these challenges, Guinier completed his undergraduate studies and went on to earn a master’s degree from Columbia University and a law degree from New York University. He became a prominent trade unionist, served as international secretary for the United Public Workers of America, and was the first Black candidate to be nominated by a political party—the American Labor Party—for the Manhattan borough presidency.456

In a turn of events that illustrate both Black intellectual resistance to inequality and institutional change over time, the history of the Guinier family and of Harvard remain deeply entwined. Both Guinier’s daughter, Lani Guinier (Radcliffe AB 1971), and his grandson, Nikolas Bowie (AM 2011, JD 2014, PhD 2018), followed him to Harvard first as students and later as members of the faculty. In 1998, Lani Guinier made history as the first Black woman to hold a tenured professorship at Harvard Law School.467

African American Women at Radcliffe College

The story of African Americans and Harvard during the 20th century includes the experiences of Black women at Radcliffe College. The history of Radcliffe is, itself, a tale of resistance. It was founded in 1879 as the Society for the Collegiate Instruction of Women, or the “Harvard Annex,” to create opportunities for women then excluded from the University. Elizabeth Cary Agassiz, the author and naturalist described above and a “bold” reformer “devoted to the cause of women’s higher education,” served as its first president.468 Coeducation developed at Harvard in fits and starts; although Harvard professors taught the women of Radcliffe according to the University’s standards, women did not receive Harvard degrees until 1963.449

Radcliffe stood out among its peers on the matter of access for African American women: it consistently enrolled more Black women than other Seven Sisters colleges. It was “by far the leader” among these peers.460 Nevertheless, the women educated at Radcliffe College (and the Annex) overwhelmingly were white, and they initially hailed predominantly from the Anglo-Saxon upper classes.461 Radcliffe admitted its first Jewish students in 1893, and Alberta Virginia Scott (AB 1898), the first Black woman to graduate from the College, was admitted in 1894.462 Thereafter, Radcliffe admitted a steady trickle of Black women, who invariably were “highly motivated and high achievers” according to one historian of the College.463 Another historian characterized these women as “an African American female elite.”464

While the relatively few Black women educated at Radcliffe welcomed the opportunity to be a part of a community of women scholars, they also encountered discrimination. They were denied campus housing and scholarships—significant barriers to educational access and academic success.465 Yet, many of these same women went on to play important roles in building a better and more equitable nation.

Two such women, Eva Beatrice Dykes (AB 1917; AM 1918; PhD 1921) and Caroline Bond Day (AB 1919; AM 1930), arrived at Radcliffe in the 1910s with degrees in hand from historically Black colleges—Howard and Atlanta Universities, respectively. Like W. E. B. Du Bois, the women were forced to repeat their undergraduate degrees at Radcliffe before proceeding on to graduate studies.466
They were among fewer than 15 Black students who attended Radcliffe before 1920, and neither was allowed to live on campus. Radcliffe would not permit a Black woman to live in the dormitories until 1925—two years after Harvard officially ended its discriminatory housing policy. Neither Dykes nor Day wrote much about their experiences at Radcliffe, but both seem to have viewed the College positively—at least in comparison to their baseline, the Black experience in the American South, where both women had grown up. Yet, both women also explored slavery and its legacies in their work, and they devoted considerable time in their careers to striving to right the wrongs African Americans confronted in American society.

**Eva Beatrice Dykes**

Eva Beatrice Dykes earned a bachelor’s degree, summa cum laude, from Howard University in 1914; a second bachelor’s degree, magna cum laude, from Radcliffe in 1917; and, in 1921, she became the first African American woman to complete the requirements for a PhD in the United States, one of three Black women in the country to earn a PhD that year. A distinguished scholar of English literature, in her work Dykes foregrounded white authors’ little-discussed views on race and slavery and elevated the prose, poetry, and song of Black writers.

Dykes went on to teach at several Black institutions, including Walden University in Nashville, Tennessee; Dunbar High School, her alma mater, in Washington, DC; Howard University, where she taught English from 1929 to 1944; and finally Oakwood College—today Oakwood University—in Huntsville, Alabama. At Oakwood, where she taught from 1944 until 1968, Dykes served as chair of the English department and the Division of Humanities and played a key role in securing accreditation for the institution in 1958. An accomplished musician, Dykes also founded the Aeolians of Oakwood University, now a world-renowned choir recognized as “an authoritative exponent of Negro spirituals and Work songs which express the yearnings of their forefathers to be free.”

Much of Dykes’s scholarship analyzes attitudes toward Blacks and toward slavery among canonical Western writers of the 18th and 19th centuries. In her 1942 book *The Negro in English Romantic Thought, or a Study of Sympathy for the Oppressed*, she explores the explicit attitudes of a long list of English Romantic writers toward Blacks and slavery, examining “not only poems and essays but also letters, memoirs, journals, lives, records of conversations, speeches, and anecdotes, which indicate very intimately the trend of English thought.”

She used this methodology to recover not only long-ignored arguments against slavery by celebrated white writers but also to recover the work of Black creators. Through her coedited textbook, *Readings from Negro Authors, for Schools and Colleges, with a Bibliography of Negro Literature*, Dykes introduced Black writers to American students. Elsewhere, she wrote that the examination of the lives and work of Black authors and artists powerfully illustrated:

> the variety of ways in which that cancer of American life, race prejudice, is eating the spiritual bowels of American morale and undermining the progress of the United States as a nation,—prejudice in labor, in education, in journalism, in the artistic world, in the courts of justice, in the church and in society in general.

To study Black American achievements was, for Dykes, to highlight the damages of racism and to demonstrate the need for “that racial unity which is the objective of every well-thinking person of the twentieth century.”

**Caroline Bond Day**

Caroline Bond Day, born in Montgomery, Alabama, studied under Du Bois at Atlanta University, graduating with a bachelor’s degree in 1912. She entered Radcliffe College in 1916 and began work on a second undergraduate degree, which she earned in 1919. She studied anthropology under Earnest A. Hooton, an instructor and the curator of somatology—the study of human variation and classification—at Harvard’s Peabody Museum, who was sympathetic to at least some of the eugenacists views of his era. Under Hooton’s guidance, she began research into mixed-race families that would form the core of her pathbreaking master’s work.

After completing her second bachelor’s degree, Day served as a social worker, including with the YWCA and at a settlement house in Washington, DC, and taught at several HBCUs, including Atlanta University; Howard University; North Carolina College for Negroes, now North Carolina Central University; Paul Quinn College, then in Waco, Texas, where she was the dean of women; and Prairie View State College, now Prairie View A&M, also in Texas. She also continued to pursue her research in her spare time.

Day took leave from teaching in the late 1920s to return to Radcliffe for graduate studies, supported by a grant from the Bureau of International Research (BIR) of Harvard University to her mentor Earnest Hooton. While working in Hooton’s lab, she leveraged her own social networks to recruit 2,537 individuals from 346
mixed-race families—an “inaccessible class” for white anthropologists—to participate in her research. These individuals entrusted her with sociological and genealogical information, physical measurements, family photographs, and even locks of hair. Day’s thesis, A Study of Some Negro-White Families in the United States, was published in 1932, with a foreword by Hooton, by the Peabody Museum of Harvard University as part of a Harvard African Studies series.

Day’s highly technical work pushed back against the race scientists and eugenicists at Harvard and elsewhere, arguing that race is not a fixed category and that by no measure are people of color as a group inferior to whites. This work is still hailed today as a groundbreaking demonstration, using the same tools deployed by race scientists from Louis Agassiz to Charles R. Davenport, that Black and mixed-race Americans are not systematically inferior to whites.

These and numerous other acts illustrate the counter-history of resistance embedded in Harvard’s history.

**Harvard, Radcliffe, and Racial Change**

The presence of Black students at Harvard and Radcliffe increased significantly during the late 1960s: the racial transformation resulted partly from law—in particular, the antidiscrimination mandate of the Civil Rights Act of 1964—and partly from pressure brought to bear on the University by its own students. Among them was a young Lani Guinier:

> My posse wanted to express our concern that there were very few black women being admitted to Radcliffe. We sat in in the corridor leading up to the dean’s office. We were told to be very “ladylike”; I remember well. This was our ladylike approach, but I think we got their attention. They certainly started admitting more students of color.

University leadership played a role as well. During the late 1950s and early 1960s, under the leadership of Wilbur J. Bender (AB 1927; dean, 1952–1960) and Fred Glimp (dean, 1960–1967) as deans of admissions and financial aid at Harvard, the number of Blacks and other people of color began to increase. These changes flowed from active recruitment, expanded financial aid, and explicit advocacy for student body diversity.

Efforts to recruit greater numbers of students from modest backgrounds had begun a decade earlier during the administration of President James Bryant Conant (1933–1953), but African Americans did not then benefit from them. A “dominant figure in American higher education,” Conant in the 1930s created national scholarships that broadened the University’s geographic reach and provided aid according to financial need. After World War II, Harvard under Conant enrolled large numbers of veterans subsidized under the GI Bill, with such students constituting nearly three quarters of students enrolled at the University in 1946–1947. But Conant repeatedly declined to undertake efforts to improve race relations or aid Black students, although he claimed to be “interested in the racial problem.” Nevertheless, the changes he put in place to aid veterans and students in need of financial aid helped open the University’s doors to larger numbers of Black students during the mid-to-late-sixties.

It was after the postwar boom that Bender—a former veterans’ counselor and dean of Harvard College (1947–1952) as well as a child of a working-class Mennonite family—was appointed dean of admissions and financial aid. His mandate was to find and recruit “the diverse groups needed to make a healthy student body.” Harvard College would endeavor to increase recruitment of academically able students from all corners of the nation and from relatively modest backgrounds, while continuing to admit able children of alumni and of the upper classes. With Bender at the helm, admissions began to evolve into a larger office, and one guided by formal admissions policy with an interest in composing a diverse student body, at least by some measures; in other words, an operation that would be more recognizable to those familiar with University admissions today was taking shape.

Harvard and Radcliffe student protests during the late 1960s, organized in the context of the civil rights, women’s liberation, and antiwar movements, accelerated the trend toward the recruitment and admission of students of color, including Native American and Hispanic students, as well as students in need of financial assistance. The Black presence at the two colleges tripled as a percentage of the student body between the beginning and end of the 1960s (from 2 percent in the early 1960s to 7 percent in 1969). By the end of the decade, amid increasing student protests on a wide range of pressing issues, the Association of African and Afro-American Students (referred to as AFRO) and like-minded student activists sought to reform the curriculum. They would see their demand for the creation of an Afro-American studies department begin to bear fruit in 1968–1969, when a faculty committee recommended the establishment of an Afro-American studies program but not a department. Ultimately, in April 1969, not long after Harvard President Nathan M. Pusey (1953–1971) controversially...
called in the police to disperse (predominantly white) student protesters, the faculty approved the creation of the Department of Afro-American Studies (now the Department of African and African American Studies).

Meanwhile, the upward trend in admissions of students of color continued during the 1970s. More than 400 Black students applied to join the Harvard College class of 1975, of whom 109 were admitted and 90 enrolled. The University’s long-serving dean of admissions and financial aid, William R. Fitzsimmons (AB 1967, EdM 1969, EdD 1971), first joined the admissions office in 1972. He, along with David L. Evans—a son of Arkansas sharecroppers who earned a degree from Princeton University and served for five decades in Harvard’s admissions office—became nationally known for leading the University’s efforts to recruit a diverse student body.

Harvard’s Role as a Champion of Racial Diversity in Higher Education

The 1970s also marked the point at which the University became a proponent of the consideration of race in admissions and a leader in defending such practices.

Under the leadership of then-President Derek Bok, Harvard University, along with several other leading educational institutions, expressed unequivocal support for race-conscious admissions when the US Supreme Court first considered a challenge to these efforts. Regents of the University of California v. Bakke, a 1978 case in which a rejected white applicant sued a state-supported medical school, set the terms of the legal debate over race-conscious admissions in higher education. In an amicus brief, Harvard argued that “the inclusion of qualified minority group members in a student body” was necessary for “important educational objectives.” The brief built on the scholarship of Harvard Law School Dean Erwin N. Griswold and began by, in essence, repudiating the long period during which Harvard and other predominantly white universities did little to recruit African Americans to campus. The lack of racial diversity on campuses through the 1960s, the University acknowledged, had created a “sort of white myopia,” which narrowed the perspectives of both students and professors and deprived universities of scores of future leaders.

Harvard’s admissions policy, as well as the University’s argument that the educational benefits of diverse learning environments constitute a compelling state interest, were both cited in the controlling opinion written by Justice Lewis F. Powell Jr. Powell “even appended a summary of Harvard’s policy to his opinion to provide a kind of template.” For this reason, Harvard’s admissions program has often been cited as a model for race-conscious admissions.

In every major subsequent case challenging race-conscious admissions, Harvard presidents—including Derek Bok, Neil L. Rudenstine, Lawrence H. Summers, Drew Gilpin Faust, and Lawrence S. Bacow—have remained steadfast proponents of diversity in education. In 1996, the University joined amicus briefs filed by the Association of American Law Schools and the Association of American Medical Colleges, in support of the University of Texas’s admissions program.

Harvard, along with other universities, also supported the University of Michigan through amicus filings in the Grutter v. Bollinger and Gratz v. Bollinger cases. The briefs argued that Michigan’s efforts to achieve the “educational benefits of diversity”—the accepted rationale from Bakke—were essential in higher education.

In the Grutter opinion, Justice Sandra Day O’Connor, like Justice Powell before her, cited Harvard’s practices as a model of constitutionally acceptable race-conscious admissions. She wrote that Michigan Law’s “claim of a compelling interest is furthered bolstered by its amici, who point to the educational benefits that flow from student body diversity.” Moreover, she cited The Shape of the River: Long-Term Consequences of Considering Race in College and University Admissions—a landmark study of race-conscious admissions policies and their positive long-term consequences—published by former Harvard President Derek Bok five years prior, in 1998. Bok and his coauthor, former Princeton President William G. Bowen, had also served as expert witnesses for the University of Michigan.

Harvard University, in conjunction with other schools, also filed an amicus brief when the US Supreme Court again considered the admissions policies of the University of Texas. The brief asked the court to reaffirm Grutter, arguing—just as the University had in prior briefs—that diversity is an important interest for educational institutions and that race-neutral alternative practices are inadequate. The brief emphasized that the schools did not employ “race or ethnicity as a classification in [their] admissions policies” but rather considered “myriad factors including race and ethnicity ... [as] influenced by the Harvard Plan approved by Justice Powell in Bakke and [the] Court in Grutter.” Separately, then–Harvard Law School Dean Martha Minow filed an amicus brief with the dean of Yale Law School, contending that “considering race as a part of an individualized, holistic [admissions] process is entirely consistent with the Fourteenth
Amendment” and that overturning Grutter would have “significant adverse consequences.” 718

The University continues to support race-conscious admissions, most recently in a pending case that challenges its own practices, which both the United States District Court and the United States Court of Appeals for the First Circuit have upheld as constitutional.719 Following the United States District Court ruling, President Lawrence S. Bacow sent an e-mail to Harvard affiliates reaffirming that the College’s use of race in admission “enriches the education of every student.”720 “Everyone admitted to Harvard College has something unique to offer our community,” he continued, “and today we reaffirm the importance of diversity—and everything it represents to the world.”721

Recognizing that financial barriers also limit universities’ ability to recruit diverse cohorts of students, Harvard has also been a national leader in expanding financial assistance to ensure that all admitted students can afford a Harvard education. President Lawrence Summers in 2004 announced a major increase in aid for students from families of modest means; the University would no longer require parents with incomes below $40,000 to financially contribute to the cost of their children’s Harvard College education.722 The College’s financial aid program has continued to expand, including through generous donor support.723 Today, 55 percent of Harvard students receive scholarship aid, and 20 percent pay nothing at all.724

These steps do not erase the University’s exclusion of Black students nor its anemic efforts to recruit and welcome Black students to campus into the 20th century. But they do illustrate profound and positive racial change on Harvard’s campus over time.

**The Challenge of Belonging**

While it is important to acknowledge progress in student body diversity and the University’s commitment to it, the challenges that accompanied the demographic transformation on campus, described above, must also be acknowledged. Even after their numerical presence on campus substantially increased, some African American students reported marginalization on and off campus.

A Presidential Task Force on Inclusion and Belonging, established in 2016 by President Drew Gilpin Faust (2007–2018), documented many of these challenges in its 2018 report. The Committee on Harvard & the Legacy of Slavery affirms and incorporates by reference the task force’s findings.

The task force also urged new actions to promote inclusion and ensure that all members of the Harvard community, across lines of race and ethnicity, feel welcome.725 In response, the University installed its first chief diversity and inclusion officer in August 2020, and that office, along with offices or individuals tasked with advancing diversity and inclusion in every Harvard school, is taking concrete steps to promote inclusion and equity across campus.726

In these and in other ways, the University seeks continued momentum toward the achievement of a multiracial, multiethnic community where all students can thrive.
Institutions can and do change, as the attitudes of the people inside them evolve. Over the nearly 400 years since its founding, in 1636, Harvard University has changed in many ways. It evolved from a seminary founded in a cow pasture into a university known for its excellence in numerous disciplines. It evolved from a college defined by its enrollment of white men from elite backgrounds to a university that educates students from all backgrounds, regardless of gender, race, nationality, or economic status. By the early 1970s, Harvard and Radcliffe no longer were preserves of upper crust, Anglo-Saxon white men and women.

Under the weight of sweeping changes in law and society that some of its own graduates helped to bring about, Harvard—an institution entangled with American slavery and its legacies in the many ways documented in this report—is now reckoning with this past and seeking to make amends for these wrongs.

Much remains to be done as we seek to live up to our highest ideals. But by undertaking these endeavors in good faith and with a commitment to meaningful action, the University imbues Veritas with new meaning and renews its commitment to excellence.
VII. Recommendations to the President and Fellows of Harvard College

The damage caused by Harvard’s entanglements with slavery and its legacies warrant action—efforts to remedy the persistent educational and social harms that human bondage caused to descendants, to the campus community, and to surrounding cities, the Commonwealth, and the nation. Such action cannot possibly address the many complex and damaging legacies of slavery in and beyond the United States, but nonetheless, action is vital. Harvard should take responsibility for its past, and it should leverage its strengths in the pursuit of meaningful repair.

If undertaken, the actions that the Committee recommends would be voluntary, rather than the result of legal obligation. But the absence of a legal requirement does not negate the importance of undertaking these efforts, nor does it diminish the moral case for action. Institutions often take steps that uphold their values absent any formal requirement to do so. Harvard, for example, routinely donates services and provides other benefits to communities and organizations in Greater Boston in pursuit of “a vibrant and shared future.” And in recent years, dozens of other universities, along with corporations, churches, and municipalities, have instituted remedies for complicity with slavery, all on a voluntary basis.

It is particularly appropriate for universities to take such steps: American society depends on universities to reflect and promote its highest ideals. The gap between the missions and values of universities—the pursuit of knowledge, truth seeking, integrity, and opportunity—and the reality of involvement with slavery is stark. And while a university’s participation in human bondage through direct ownership or buying and selling of people might be deemed the highest level of culpability, financial entanglements and intellectual leadership that lent universities’ prestige to theories of racial hierarchy have also resulted in lasting harm. That universities continued to exclude or discriminate against descendants of enslaved people into the middle of the 20th century deepens their complicity with this history of oppression.

Each of these forms of culpability—direct participation, financial ties, intellectual leadership, and discrimination—applies to Harvard, where the routine admission of descendants of slavery is a relatively recent phenomenon in a 385-year history. And the responsibility for involvement with slavery is shared across the institution—by presidents, fellows of the Corporation, overseers, faculty, staff, donors, students, and namesakes memorialized all over campus.

Several principles underpin the committee’s recommendations:

To be meaningful, remedies must be visible, lasting, grounded in a sustained process of engagement, and linked to the nature of the damage done. Harvard’s efforts should also be commensurate with this University’s place in the American educational landscape. We must lead in this realm, no less than in others.

Harvard must set a powerful example as it reckons with its own past. We must pursue not only truth, vital though that is, but also reconciliation. Doing so requires a range of actions—visible and continuing—that address the harms of slavery and its legacies, many of which still reverberate today, affecting descendants of slavery in the community and indeed the nation.

These actions must include monetary and nonmonetary efforts. Slavery was a system that, through violence, deprived the enslaved of the value of their own labor, creating a persistent multigenerational racial wealth gap that continues to disadvantage descendants of the enslaved. And the legacies of slavery—exclusion, segregation, marginalization, criminalization, disenfranchisement, and more—compounded its damage. The economic and social costs of categorical exclusion from and discrimination in education—not only but perhaps especially at Harvard—are profound.

Harvard is not alone in this work, nor is it first. The actions and experiences of other universities establish
informative precedent. Brown University, the first among the Ivy League to formally acknowledge its ties to slavery, under the leadership of President Ruth J. Simmons, led the way. Years ago, Brown made significant investments in support of local educational institutions, including a $10 million endowment to promote academic excellence for K–12 students in Providence, of which approximately $2 million was raised from donors, with the remaining $8 million authorized by the Brown Corporation. Brown’s actions also included loan forgiveness for graduate students who serve urban schools and students in the local area, fellowships in support of slavery studies, faculty fellowships for youth outreach, and more. More recently, the Princeton Theological Seminary pledged to create a $27.6 million reparative endowment, established scholarship funds, and hired new staff. The University of Glasgow pledged £20 million to research slavery and its legacies around the world. The University of Virginia erected a $7 million memorial, built a new dormitory named for enslaved people who labored on campus, and established scholarships and fellowships for descendants of slavery. And in 2019, Georgetown University announced a fund that would raise $400,000 annually to benefit the descendants of enslaved people that the college sold in 1838, following a nonbinding referendum passed by Georgetown students.33 In keeping with its position in higher education, Harvard should make a significant monetary commitment, and it should invest in remedies of equal or greater breadth than other universities.

We believe that Harvard’s intellectual, reputational, and financial resources should be marshaled in its efforts to remedy the harms of the University’s ties to slavery, just as past representatives of Harvard deployed these same resources and caused harm. Some of the committee’s recommendations, below, are for wholly new endeavors; many others seek to build upon important existing programs and partnerships at Harvard, which we suggest should be strengthened and expanded. All must be sustained over time, and metrics should be established to ensure accountability. Through lasting efforts institutionalized as integral parts of Harvard’s culture and curriculum, the University can create new legacies of service, innovation, equity, and leadership. We can renew our commitment to Veritas, and imbue it with deeper meaning.

We present seven broad recommendations that seek to remedy harms to descendants, to our community and the nation, and to campus life and learning.

**Recommendation 1: Engage and Support Descendant Communities by Leveraging Harvard’s Excellence in Education**

We recommend that the University leverage its scholarly excellence and expertise in education to confront systemic and enduring inequities that impact descendant communities in the United States—including in the American South, locus of the system of plantation slavery that produced cotton and fed the lucrative textile manufacturing companies of the Northeast—as well as descendant communities in the Caribbean.33 The University should address these inequities in close and genuine partnership with institutions such as schools, community colleges, tribal colleges, universities, and nonprofit organizations already engaged in this work.34

We recommend a particular focus on the creation, expansion, and dissemination of world-class learning opportunities—including curricular and pedagogical innovations, expanded access to existing resources, and outstanding teacher training—especially to support historically marginalized children and youth from birth through high school and college. Harvard’s pathbreaking work in early childhood development; in K–12 civic, moral, and social-emotional learning; in arts and STEM education; in higher education access and success; and in other fields could be leveraged to support children, educators, and parents in descendant communities locally nationally, and internationally. This could include offerings modeled on the Cambridge-Harvard Summer Academy of the Harvard Graduate School of Education or Harvard’s Crimson Summer Academy.

This pursuit might be facilitated or enhanced by taking advantage of the University’s new digital education nonprofit, established to “advance inclusion by driving innovations in learning that enrich and support people at all stages of education” through “partnerships with organizations that are doing outstanding work to identify, address, and close learning gaps.”35

In creating and implementing such programs, we urge collaboration with experts outside of Harvard. We particularly suggest partnerships with local colleges and nonprofits engaged in work with demonstrated efficacy. These institutions disproportionately serve students from disadvantaged backgrounds, many of whom likely are descendants of enslaved people.

Finally, we suggest that the University broadly share what it learns through these partnerships. Harvard should, with its partner institutions, seek to establish and model best
practices to support other historically white institutions that wish to address systemic and enduring educational inequities rooted in slavery and its legacies.

**Recommendation 2: Honor Enslaved People through Memorialization, Research, Curricula, and Knowledge Dissemination**

In pursuit of truth and reconciliation, we recommend that the University create opportunities for all members of the Harvard community, especially students, to acknowledge and engage with the history of slavery and its legacies at Harvard. Toward this end, we recommend that the University recognize and honor the enslaved people whose labor facilitated the founding, growth, and evolution of Harvard through a permanent and imposing physical memorial, convening space, or both.

Moreover, in an effort to invest in current and future generations of scholars within and outside of the University, we recommend that Harvard—already home to many scholars and programmatic endeavors related to slavery and its legacies in and beyond education—provide ongoing financial support for scholarship and curricula that seek to understand, analyze, and promote solutions to persistent racial inequities that plague descendant communities.

We further recommend that the University provide ongoing financial support for the production of knowledge and curricula about Harvard’s ties to slavery and for the dissemination of such knowledge to alumni and members of the public as well as to students, staff, and faculty across the University.

**Recommendation 3: Develop Enduring Partnerships with Black Colleges and Universities**

Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) have educated a significant share of African American professionals who have helped lead the country in creating a more equitable society, one that acknowledges that the intelligence, talents, and contributions of all groups must be recognized, nurtured, and drawn upon for the benefit of the nation. Thurgood Marshall, former associate justice of the Supreme Court; Martin Luther King Jr., minister and civil rights activist; and the Nobel Prize laureate Toni Morrison were all educated at HBCUs. The quality and importance of these institutions cannot be denied.

Yet, as a result of the nation’s history of separate and unequal systems of education, HBCUs have often been underfunded and excluded from the benefits that many other universities enjoy. In spite of this long-standing disparity in treatment, Harvard, like other major universities, has greatly benefited from the enrollment of HBCU alumni in its graduate and professional programs. These students have added immeasurably to the quality of education afforded all students at Harvard and have expanded knowledge and understanding in many disciplines.

In light of the invaluable role of HBCUs in the educational landscape and the persistent underfunding of these colleges, we believe the University should develop enduring partnerships with HBCUs. We suggest that it do so through the expansion of existing collaborations between Harvard’s schools and research-focused HBCUs.

To promote enriching and long-lasting bonds between the universities, we recommend that Harvard encourage and fund summer, semester, or yearlong visiting appointments to Harvard by interested faculty from HBCU partner institutions and similar visiting appointments by Harvard faculty to HBCU partners. We also recommend that the University encourage and subsidize summer, semester, or yearlong visits to Harvard by interested students who are juniors at HBCU partner institutions and by interested Harvard students in their junior years to HBCU partners, through a new “Du Bois Scholars Program.” These faculty and student visits would promote intellectual exchange and research collaborations between Harvard and HBCUs, particularly in STEM fields, and would also financially support HBCU partner institutions in two ways: first, by providing to Du Bois scholars who visit Harvard as juniors the generous financial aid routinely available to Harvard students, thus in many cases reducing overall college costs, and, second, by providing to faculty of HBCUs the financial support for sabbaticals routinely available to Harvard faculty.

Similarly, we recommend the University promote and fund visiting fellowships for affiliates of Harvard libraries and affiliates of HBCU partner libraries, efforts that would promote archival preservation, digitization, and other collaborations to document and safeguard African American history.

Finally, we suggest that the University broadly share what it learns through these partnerships. Harvard should, with its HBCU partners, seek to establish and model best practices to other historically white institutions that wish to address systemic and enduring educational inequities rooted in slavery and its legacies.
Recommendation 4: Identify, Engage, and Support Direct Descendants

We recommend that the University endeavor to identify the direct descendants of enslaved individuals who labored on Harvard’s campus and of those who were enslaved by Harvard leadership, faculty, or staff. The University’s acknowledgement of direct descendants’ lineage, through a Harvard & the Legacy of Slavery Remembrance Program, is a vital step in its quest for truth, reconciliation, and repair.

We further recommend that, in recognition of this lineage, the University engage with these descendants through dialogue, programming, information sharing, relationship building, and educational support. Through such efforts, these descendants can recover their histories, tell their stories, and pursue empowering knowledge.

Recommendation 5: Honor, Engage, and Support Native Communities

Indigenous history has special significance to Harvard’s founding and evolution. Slavery in New England began with the enslavement of Native Americans, and Harvard leaders and staff members enslaved and sold Indigenous people as well as people of African descent. Moreover, Harvard’s Indian College, which reflected both political and financial expediency and the broader colonial effort to Christianize, enrolled just five Native students, only one of whom received a degree in his lifetime. Legacies of Indigenous slavery and colonialism, while not discussed at length in this report, persist in Massachusetts and across the United States.

Recognizing this special significance, we recommend that the University provide financial support for research, dissemination of knowledge, recruitment of students from tribal communities, and other reparative efforts benefiting members of New England’s Native communities.

We further recommend that the University organize a landmark conference, under the auspices of the Harvard University Native American Program, to advance a national dialogue on the history and legacies of Indigenous slavery and colonialism in the United States, catalyze deep research, and establish new partnerships with Indigenous communities.

Recommendation 6: Establish an Endowed Legacy of Slavery Fund to Support the University’s Reparative Efforts

The profound harm caused by the University’s entanglements with slavery and its legacies cannot be valued in monetary terms alone. Nevertheless, the commitment of significant resources can and does signify Harvard’s acknowledgement of wrongdoing and a responsibility to undertake a sustained process of repair: financial expenditures are a necessary predicate to and foundation for redress.

Therefore, we recommend the creation of a Legacy of Slavery Fund—generously funded, preserved in an endowment, and strategically invested—to support implementation of these recommendations.

Recommendation 7: Ensure Institutional Accountability

Finally, we recommend that the University establish an accountable institutional apparatus fully empowered to lead—during an implementation phase of this Presidential Initiative—the operationalization of the Committee’s recommendations and coordination of all Harvard Schools’ participation in these efforts, in the spirit of One Harvard. This includes a commitment to ongoing engagement, dialogue, information sharing, and relationship building with community members and stakeholders in Cambridge and the greater Boston area in order to foster discussion and solicit input on the long path forward.

We further suggest annual reporting on and evaluation of the implementation process and, if necessary, the revision of these recommendations in ways consistent with their goals.

***

Harvard’s past entanglements with slavery and its legacies cannot be undone, but the present and future are ours—as a University community—to shape. The history revealed here and the committee’s recommendations for action can inspire renewed commitment to truth, institutional reform, and community engagement. Through these endeavors we can advance both the University’s commitment to the transformative power of education and our mission to develop ethical leaders who respect the “rights, differences, and dignity” of all people.737
APPENDIX I

List of Human Beings Enslaved by Prominent Harvard Affiliates

Notes About Organization and Criteria for Inclusion

This list of individuals enslaved by Harvard leadership, faculty, staff, and donors is almost certainly an undercount. Records of enslavement in the colonial era are irregular, and the list omits some individuals who are likely to have been enslaved but for whom sufficient documentation could not be located. This is an important area for future research in the spirit of the committee’s fourth recommendation to the President and Fellows of Harvard College.

The enslaved individuals listed below were identified through research in city vital records, church records, published memoirs, and personal papers, including correspondence, journals, wills, and probate records. Many were previously identified in published scholarship, although their connections to Harvard were often not highlighted. Dates appended to the names of enslaved people reflect the first and, where applicable, last date of documentation for each individual, not the duration of their enslavement.

The list includes individuals who are referred to in extant records as a Harvard affiliate’s “servant,” “man,” or “woman” and who are also identified as being of African or Indigenous descent. This reflects the fact, noted by leading historians of the era, that the term “slave” was not commonly used in colonial New England in reference to enslaved people. For example, in her authoritative work New England Bound: Slavery and Colonization in Early America, Wendy Warren explains:

> English people in the early seventeenth century only sporadically used the word “slave” to describe people of African or Indian descent in perpetual servitude, in New England or elsewhere. More often, the words “negro” and “negro servant” and, in some cases, “Indian servant” demarcated chattel status for Africans and Indians in the English Atlantic colonies. Counterintuitively, where “slave” was used in New England records during the seventeenth century, it generally referred to English captives held in North African slavery, or even as a figure of speech to connote some sort of debased state. This slowly changed over the century; more than sixty years later, an observer on Barbados would note, “These two words, Negro and Slave being by custom grown Homogeneous and Convertible; even as Negro and Christian, Englishman and Heathen, are...made Opposites.”

The list is organized by enslaver, rather than by enslaved individual, in order to support further research to identify those people who were enslaved by Harvard affiliates; source materials are, in general, similarly organized. As this work continues, however, it is critical that researchers center enslaved people in order to appropriately honor their memories and, as the committee recommends, to enable descendants to “recover their histories, tell their stories, and pursue empowering knowledge.”

Finally, unless otherwise noted, Harvard affiliations are drawn from the Quinquennial Catalogue of the Officers and Graduates of Harvard University, 1636–1915. The relationships of named Harvard affiliates to buildings and physical spaces on campus are drawn from the Harvard Property Information Resource Center’s online database.
### I. Enslaved by Presidents of Harvard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enslaver</th>
<th>Harvard Affiliation(s)</th>
<th>Enslaved Persons</th>
<th>Documentation Dates</th>
<th>Memorialization(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PRESIDENTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathaniel Eaton</td>
<td>Schoolmaster (1637–1639)(^1)</td>
<td>“The Moor”</td>
<td>1639(^1)</td>
<td>A plaque on Wadsworth Gate and brass markers nearby on Massachusetts Avenue mark the site of Eaton’s home, the first building occupied by Harvard College.(^2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1609–1674)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase Mather</td>
<td>President (1692–1701)</td>
<td>“The Spaniard”</td>
<td>ca. 1681(^4)–1719(^5)</td>
<td>Mather House(^6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1639–1723)</td>
<td>Rector (1686–1692)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acting President (1685–1686)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin Wadsworth</td>
<td>President (1725–1737)</td>
<td>Titus</td>
<td>1728–1740(^7)</td>
<td>Wadsworth House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1670–1737)</td>
<td>Fellow (1697–1707; 1712–1725)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wadsworth Gate (also known as the Class of 1857 Gate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Venus</td>
<td>1726–1740(^8)</td>
<td>A plaque installed in 2016 on the east side of Wadsworth House acknowledges Titus and Venus as enslaved persons who lived and worked there.(^9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Holyoke</td>
<td>President (1737–1769)</td>
<td>Juba</td>
<td>1744–1748(^10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1689–1769)</td>
<td>Librarian (1709–1712)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tutor (1712–1716)</td>
<td>Bilhah</td>
<td>1755–1765(^13)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fellow (1713–1716)</td>
<td>Bilhah’s newborn son</td>
<td>1762(^14)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Willard</td>
<td>President (1781–1804)</td>
<td>Dinah</td>
<td>1757–1819(^15)</td>
<td>Holyoke Street in Cambridge, south of Harvard Yard(^12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1738–1804)</td>
<td>Tutor (1766–1772)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fellow (1768–1772)</td>
<td>Cesar</td>
<td>1789(^16)</td>
<td>Willard Street in Cambridge, west of Harvard Square(^17)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## II. Enslaved by Harvard Fellows and Overseers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enslaver</th>
<th>Harvard Affiliation(s)</th>
<th>Enslaved Persons</th>
<th>Documentation Dates</th>
<th>Memorialization(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FELLOWS AND OVERSEERS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Governor John Winthrop</strong></td>
<td>Overseer (1637–1649)</td>
<td>The wife of Pequot sachem Mononotto</td>
<td>1637(^1)</td>
<td>Winthrop House is named for Governor John Winthrop and his direct descendant Professor John Winthrop (see below).(^4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Two unnamed sons of Mononotto</td>
<td>1637(^7)</td>
<td>A sculpture of Governor Winthrop is displayed in Annenberg Hall, the freshman dining hall in Memorial Hall.(^5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>At least four additional unnamed Indigenous people: two men and two women</td>
<td>1637–1639(^8)</td>
<td>A portrait of Governor Winthrop is in the Harvard University Portrait Collection.(^6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Israel Stoughton</strong></td>
<td>Overseer (1637–1644)</td>
<td>Unnamed Pequot woman</td>
<td>1637(^11)</td>
<td>Stoughton Hall is named for Israel’s son, colonial lieutenant governor and Harvard overseer and benefactor William Stoughton (AB 1650).(^2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dorcas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>John Endecott / Endicott</strong></td>
<td>Overseer (1642–1665)</td>
<td>Unnamed Pequot boy</td>
<td>1637(^15)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hugh Peter(s)</strong></td>
<td>Overseer (1637–1641)</td>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>1637–1640(^17)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Governor John Leverett</strong></td>
<td>Overseer (1673–1679)</td>
<td>As governor of the Massachusetts Bay Colony, Leverett authorized the capture, enslavement, and distribution of hundreds of Native men, women, and children taken captive in King Philip’s War</td>
<td>1675–1678(^19)</td>
<td>Leverett House is named for Governor Leverett’s grandson and namesake, Harvard President John Leverett (served 1708–1724).(^2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Governor Joseph Dudley</strong></td>
<td>Overseer (1702–1715)</td>
<td>An unnamed “Indian” girl</td>
<td>1679</td>
<td>The Dudley Community and three associated Harvard residences are named for Joseph Dudley’s father, the Massachusetts governor and Harvard overseer Thomas Dudley.(^2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enslaver</td>
<td>Harvard Affiliation(s)</td>
<td>Enslaved Persons</td>
<td>Documentation Dates</td>
<td>Memorialization(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cotton Mather (1663–1728)</strong></td>
<td>Fellow (1690–1703)</td>
<td>An unnamed “Spanish Indian,” believed to be the same individual as “The Spaniard,” above</td>
<td>ca. 1681&lt;sup&gt;25&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Mather House is named for Cotton Mather’s father, Harvard President Increase Mather (president, 1692–1701; rector, 1686–1692; acting president, 1685–1686).&lt;sup&gt;27&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overseer (1707–1724)&lt;sup&gt;31&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Onesimus</td>
<td>1706–1716&lt;sup&gt;28&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“a little boy”</td>
<td>1716&lt;sup&gt;29&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Obadiah</td>
<td>1717&lt;sup&gt;30&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>William Brattle (1662–1717)</strong></td>
<td>Tutor (1685–1697)</td>
<td>Scipio</td>
<td>1697–1705&lt;sup&gt;32&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fellow (1703–1717)</td>
<td>Cicely</td>
<td>1714&lt;sup&gt;35&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Treasurer (1713–1715)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minister of First Church, Cambridge (1696–1717)&lt;sup&gt;31&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Paul Dudley (1675–1751)</strong></td>
<td>Fellow (1697–1700)</td>
<td>Unnamed “negro boy”</td>
<td>1705&lt;sup&gt;37&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Guinea</td>
<td>1745&lt;sup&gt;39&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Nathaniel Appleton (1693–1784)</strong></td>
<td>Fellow (1717–1779)</td>
<td>Pompey</td>
<td>1729&lt;sup&gt;41&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minister of First Church, Cambridge (1717–1783)&lt;sup&gt;40&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enslaver</td>
<td>Harvard Affiliation(s)</td>
<td>Enslaved Persons</td>
<td>Documentation Dates</td>
<td>Memorialization(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **William Brattle (1706–1776)**  | Overseer (n.d.)        | Philicia         | 1731\(^{44}\)      | A portrait of William Brattle is in the Harvard University Portrait Collection.\(^{45}\)  
The William Brattle House in Harvard Square is named for this William Brattle, who built it. Brattle Street and Brattle Square are named for his family.\(^{46}\)  

|                              | Trustee of the Hopkins Foundation (n.d.)\(^{42}\) | Zillah           | 1738\(^{47}\)      |                                                                     |
| Francisc Foxcroft (1695–1768)   | Overseer (1732–1757?)\(^{48}\)                   | Flora            | 1737–1742\(^{49}\) | Foxcroft House (1822–1926) once occupied the corner of Kirkland and Oxford Streets; it was demolished to make way for the Lowell Lecture Hall.  

|                              |                                                          | Leos             | 1749\(^{50}\)      |                                                                     |
| **Lieutenant Governor Spencer Phip(p)s (1685–1757)** | Overseer (1720–1757)\(^{31}\) | Tobe             | 1714\(^{53}\)      |                                                                     |
|                              | Trustee of the Hopkins Foundation (1720–?)\(^{53}\)  | Cuffy            | 1739–1741\(^{14}\) |                                                                     |
|                              |                                                          | Zillah           | 1739\(^{55}\)      |                                                                     |
|                              |                                                          | Rose             | 1745\(^{56}\)      |                                                                     |
|                              |                                                          | James            | 1755\(^{57}\)      |                                                                     |
| **Ebenezer Storer (1730–1807)** | Treasurer (1777–1807)                                 | Unnamed “Negro servant” | 1757\(^{58}\) |                                                                     |
|                              |                                                          | London           | 1771\(^{59}\)      |                                                                     |
| **John Hancock (1736/7–1793)** | Treasurer (1773–1777)                                 | Cato             | 1764–1777\(^{60}\) |                                                                     |
|                              |                                                          | Frank            | 1768–1771\(^{61}\) |                                                                     |
|                              |                                                          | Agnes            | 1777\(^{62}\)      |                                                                     |
|                              |                                                          | Violet           | 1777\(^{63}\)      |                                                                     |
|                              |                                                          | Hannibal         | 1777\(^{64}\)      |                                                                     |
### FELLOWS AND OVERSEERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enslaver</th>
<th>Harvard Affiliation(s)</th>
<th>Enslaved Persons</th>
<th>Documentation Dates</th>
<th>Memorialization(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thomas Hubbard</strong> (1702–1773)</td>
<td>Treasurer (1752–1773) Donor of £300 and books at his death in 1773</td>
<td>Unnamed people referred to as “Negores”&lt;sup&gt;65&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1774&lt;sup&gt;66&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Buff</strong></td>
<td>1783</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Cato</strong></td>
<td>1783</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Jerry</strong></td>
<td>1783</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Jeoffry</strong></td>
<td>1783</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Samuel</strong></td>
<td>1783</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Mira</strong></td>
<td>1783</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Jude</strong></td>
<td>1783</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sarah</strong></td>
<td>1783</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Jenny</strong></td>
<td>1783</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Violet</strong></td>
<td>1783</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>“Young Jerry”</strong></td>
<td>1783&lt;sup&gt;68&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown number of enslaved people in Antigua</td>
<td>ca. 1760–ca. 1815&lt;sup&gt;69&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Oliver built Elmwood, also known as the Oliver-Gerry-Lowell House, which has been the residence of University presidents since the 1970s.
### III. Enslaved by Harvard Faculty Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enslaver</th>
<th>Harvard Affiliation(s)</th>
<th>Enslaved Persons</th>
<th>Documentation Dates</th>
<th>Memorialization(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Edward Wigglesworth</strong></td>
<td><strong>Hollis Professor of Divinity</strong> (1721–1765)</td>
<td>Hannibal</td>
<td>1736–1755</td>
<td>Wigglesworth Hall is built on the site of Edward Wigglesworth’s home and named for his father.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Fellow</strong> (1724–1765)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Henry Flynt</strong></td>
<td>Toney</td>
<td>1738</td>
<td>A portrait of Flynt is in the Harvard University Portrait Collection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Tutor</strong> (1699–1754)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Fellow</strong> (1700–1760)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Secretary of the Board of Fellows</strong> (1712–1758)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Acting President</strong> (1736–1737)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Judah Monis</strong></td>
<td><strong>Instructor in Hebrew</strong> (1722–1760)</td>
<td>Cuffy</td>
<td>1741</td>
<td>Winthrop House is named for Professor John Winthrop and his ancestor Governor John Winthrop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cicely</td>
<td>1747</td>
<td>Winthrop Street and the adjacent Winthrop Square, southwest of Harvard Yard, is named for Professor Winthrop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>John Winthrop</strong></td>
<td><strong>Hollis Professor of Mathematics and Natural Philosophy</strong> (1738–1779)</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>1759</td>
<td>There is a City of Cambridge historic marker at the site of Professor Winthrop’s home in Winthrop Square.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Fellow</strong> (1765–1779)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Acting President of Harvard</strong> (1773–1774)</td>
<td>Scipio</td>
<td>1761</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## IV. Enslaved by Harvard Staff Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enslaver</th>
<th>Harvard Affiliation(s)</th>
<th>Enslaved Persons</th>
<th>Documentation Dates</th>
<th>Memorialization(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>STAFF</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thomas Danforth (1623–1699)</strong></td>
<td>Treasurer (1650–1668)  Steward (1668–1682)  Overseer (1679–1686; 1689–1692)</td>
<td>Philip Ffeild</td>
<td>1700¹</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Andrew Bordman (II) (1671–1747)** | Steward and Cook (1703–1747)² | Cuffe            | 1716/17³           | The Bordman home, where enslaved people lived and worked, was purchased by Harvard in 1794 and used as the College House. The land where that building stood, at the corner of Massachusetts Avenue and Dunster Street, is now part of the site of the Smith Student Center.¹⁴  
|              |                              | Rose             | 1718–1730⁴          |                                                                                     |
|              |                              | Jane “of Rose”   | 1718–1740⁷          |                                                                                     |
|              |                              | Flora “of Rose”  | 1723⁸              |                                                                                     |
|              |                              | Jeffrey “of Rose”| 1731–1739⁹         |                                                                                     |
|              |                              | Cesar “of Rose”  | 1733¹⁰             |                                                                                     |
|              |                              | Lucy             | 1740¹¹             | Jane’s tombstone stands in the Old Burying Ground in Harvard Square.¹⁴             |
|              |                              | Peter            | 1758¹²             |                                                                                     |
| **Jonathan Hastings (1709–1783)** | Steward (1750–1779) | Cato             | 1761¹³             | A stone tablet next to the Littauer Center marks the site of Hastings’s home, north of Harvard Yard.¹⁶ |
|              |                              | Anne             | 1771¹⁴             |                                                                                     |
|              |                              | Rose “of Anne”   | 1771¹⁴             |                                                                                     |
|              |                              | Cato “of Anne”   | 1774¹⁷             |                                                                                     |
V. Enslaved by Major Donors to Harvard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enslaver</th>
<th>Harvard Affiliation(s)</th>
<th>Enslaved Persons</th>
<th>Documentation Dates</th>
<th>Memorialization(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Edward Hopkins (1600–1657)</strong></td>
<td>Funded the Hopkins Foundation, established in 1710s with Harvard as a primary beneficiary</td>
<td>Unnamed person referred to as “the Negar”</td>
<td>1658</td>
<td>Hopkins is the namesake of the town of Hopkinton, Massachusetts, which was created in the 1715 and administered to generate revenue for the University through 1832.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>John Hull (1624–1683)</strong></td>
<td>Donated £100 in 1683</td>
<td>As treasurer of the Massachusetts Bay Colony, Hull managed the sale of dozens of Native men, women, and children taken captive in King Philip's War</td>
<td>1675–1676</td>
<td>Hull’s name is included in the Upper Frieze at the Boston Latin School, which honors the most “historically significant alumni” of the oldest public school in the United States.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Violet</td>
<td>176712</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Violet’s unnamed mother</td>
<td>176713</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>John Cuming / Cummings (1728–1788)</strong></td>
<td>Benefactor of Harvard Medical School</td>
<td>Brister Freeman</td>
<td>1753–1822</td>
<td>Hancock Professorship of Hebrew and Other Oriental Languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jem</td>
<td>1755–1788</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thomas Hancock (1703–1764)</strong></td>
<td>Funded a professorship</td>
<td>Unnamed people referred to as “Negroes”</td>
<td>176317</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cato</td>
<td>176318</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enslaver</td>
<td>Harvard Affiliation(s)</td>
<td>Enslaved Persons</td>
<td>Documentation Dates</td>
<td>Memorialization(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Isaac Royall Jr.**     | Funded the first professorship in law at Harvard, forerunner of the Harvard Law School | With his father, owned more than 60 enslaved individuals in Massachusetts | 1732–1783                | Royall Professorship of Law  
Harvard Law School owns a portrait of Isaac Royall Jr. and his family          |
|                          |                                                                                         | Unknown number of enslaved people in Antigua                | 1732–1783              | Royall House and Slave Quarters, in Medford, Massachusetts                        |
| **James Perkins**        | Funded a professorship  
Donor to and officer of the Massachusetts General Hospital, the first HMS teaching hospital, at its founding  
Director of the effort to create the Theological School of Cambridge, now Harvard Divinity School | Mousse/Deyaha    | 1790s–1831          | Perkins Professorship of Astronomy and Mathematics                               |
<p>|                         |                                                                                         | An unknown number of enslaved people traded in St. Domingue (Haiti) | 1789–1793              |                                                                                  |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enslaver</th>
<th>Harvard Affiliation(s)</th>
<th>Enslaved Persons</th>
<th>Documentation Dates</th>
<th>Memorialization(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Handasyd Perkins (1764–1854)</td>
<td>Donor to and officer of Massachusetts General Hospital at its founding(^{28})</td>
<td>An unknown number of enslaved people traded in St. Domingue (Haiti)</td>
<td>1789–1793(^{29})</td>
<td>Perkins School for the Blind, in Watertown, Massachusetts(^{10})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel Gardner Perkins (1767–1847)</td>
<td>Donor to Massachusetts General Hospital at its founding(^{31}) Donor to the Massachusetts Professorship of Natural History at Harvard(^{32})</td>
<td>An unknown number of enslaved traded in St. Domingue (Haiti)</td>
<td>1789–1793(^{31})</td>
<td>The Perkins Room in Massachusetts Hall is named for a descendant of Samuel Gardner Perkins.(^{34})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel Thorndike (1755–1832)</td>
<td>Donated the Ebeling Map Collection to the Harvard Library(^{15}) Vice president of “A Society for the Promotion of Theological Education in Harvard University,” member of the Committee for Procuring Subscriptions, and donor at the founding of Harvard Divinity School(^{16}) Donor to Massachusetts General Hospital(^{17})</td>
<td>An unknown number of enslaved people traded in the Caribbean</td>
<td>1791–1793(^{18})</td>
<td>A professorship in orthopedic surgery at Harvard Medical School is named for a descendant of Israel Thorndike.(^{39})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moses Brown (1748–1820)</td>
<td>Donor to Harvard Divinity School(^{10})</td>
<td>An unknown number of enslaved people traded in the West Indies</td>
<td>1791–1793(^{11})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enslaver</td>
<td>Harvard Affiliation(s)</td>
<td>Enslaved Persons</td>
<td>Documentation Dates</td>
<td>Memorialization(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edwin F. Atkins</td>
<td>Donated property in Cuba and over $100,000&lt;sup&gt;42&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>95 Cuban patrocinados, formerly enslaved people who were required by law to pay in order to leave the plantation properties to which they were legally bound</td>
<td>1884&lt;sup&gt;43&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>The Atkins Institution in Cuba (botanical gardens was operated by Harvard until the Cuban Revolution in 1961)&lt;sup&gt;44&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix II

A Note on Process

The release of this report is at once the beginning of Harvard’s commitment to a meaningful and sustained process of repair and the culmination of an initiative that comprised deep research and the active participation of a wide range of stakeholders. Process matters greatly in work of this kind, and the initiative’s efforts to engage a wide range of key experts and share its work with a broad audience are described below. The committee is grateful to all those who supported this undertaking.

As noted in section I of this report, Harvard’s 29th president, Lawrence S. Bacow, established the Presidential Initiative on Harvard & the Legacy of Slavery in 2019. He appointed a committee representative of all the University’s schools and charged this group with diving deep into our history and its relationship to the present. President Bacow asked the committee to “give additional dimension to our understanding of the impact of slavery” at Harvard. This work, he said, should “have a strong grounding in rigorous research and critical perspectives” that “will inform … our understanding of facts” and “how we might address the ramifications of what we learn.” President Bacow also asked the committee to “concentrate on connections, impact, and contributions that are specific to our Harvard community” and “provide opportunities to convene academic events, activities, and conversations that will encourage our broader University community to think seriously and rigorously about the continuing impact and legacy of slavery in 2019 and beyond.”

This charge built on earlier work. In 2016, Drew Gilpin Faust, the University’s 28th president, publicly acknowledged that “Harvard was directly complicit in America’s system of racial bondage from the College’s earliest days in the 17th century until slavery in Massachusetts ended in 1783, and Harvard continued to be indirectly involved through extensive financial and other ties to the slave South up to the time of emancipation.” She established a committee on the University and slavery that, with the aid of the researcher Caitlin Galante DeAngelis (PhD 2014), conducted a preliminary investigation upon which this report builds. These initial efforts included, in 2016, a public ceremony in which then-President Faust and the late civil rights leader US Congressman John Lewis unveiled a plaque affixed to Wadsworth House in Harvard Yard that acknowledges the unfree labor of four enslaved people—Titus, Venus, Juba, and Bilhah—who lived there and worked for two Harvard presidents and their families. A 2017 conference at the Radcliffe Institute for Advanced Study, organized at Faust’s suggestion with the support of then–Radcliffe Dean Elizabeth Cohen, brought together prominent thinkers about universities and slavery from around the country.

The work of excavating and confronting the truths that this committee now discloses has been, and continues to be, a community-wide endeavor. Whereas prior histories of Harvard scarcely mentioned the University’s ties to slavery, Harvard scholars and students have worked assiduously in recent years to reveal painful truths. Beginning in 2007, Laird Bell Professor of History Sven Beckert and his undergraduate students began investigating Harvard’s ties to slavery in a multiyear series of research seminars, releasing a report on their findings in 2011. At Harvard Law School in 2008, Royall Professor of Law Janet Halley explored the history of the slave-owning colonial benefactor Isaac Royall Jr. sharing knowledge that helped spur student protests decrying the Law School’s shield, which featured the Royall family crest. Martha Minow, 300th Anniversary University Professor and then-dean of Harvard Law School, established a committee that recommended the retiring of the shield. Upon the recommendation of a faculty subcommittee and with the approval of Dean George Q. Daley, the society was renamed for William Augustus Hinton (SB 1905; MD
Moreover, as this committee conducted its work, it engaged many Harvard alumni engaged with it, including some with family connections to slavery and others who were present on campus during the era of segregation, bearing witness to parts of the history documented in this report. It welcomed broad audiences through more than a dozen events, all of which were free and open to the public. And, with support from the presidential initiative, Harvard students from multiple schools and departments also aided and augmented our efforts through research and the production of poetry and dramatic art.14

Consultative Process

In preparing this report and recommendations, the committee consulted a wide range of experts and organizations that provided invaluable input. In particular, committee members met with King Boston and Höweler + Yoon to explore approaches to memorialization; with leaders of the Royall House and Slave Quarters and the Museum of African American History in Boston and Nantucket on questions of public history and partnership; with major library and HBCU leaders on archival collaborations; with University of California system leaders on innovations in education access; and with leaders of the Boston Foundation, the University of Massachusetts Boston, Bunker Hill Community College, Roxbury Community College, and other educational and service organizations that support descendant communities in Massachusetts. Committee members and staff also participated in the City of Cambridge Committee on City Art, Monuments, and Markers and engaged with the Cambridge Historical Commission, History Cambridge (formerly Cambridge Historical Society) and the new Slave Legacy History Coalition, led by Dennis Lloyd, a descendant of Darby Vassall, whose story is discussed in Sections I and III of this report.

Harvard is one of many institutions reckoning with historical ties to slavery, and the committee also benefited from partnership with the Universities Studying Slavery consortium as well as generous advice from faculty members, administrators, and advocates involved with similar efforts at other universities. The committee chair is particularly grateful to Prairie View A&M President Ruth Simmons, who convened the Brown University Steering Committee on Slavery and Justice as president of that university in 2003, and to James Campbell, the Edgar E. Robinson Professor in United States History at Stanford University (formerly of Brown University); David Blight, Sterling Professor of History, of African American Studies, and of American Studies at Yale; David Collins, associate professor and Haub Director of Catholic Studies at Georgetown University; Kirt von Daacke, assistant dean and associate professor of history at the University of Virginia; and Martha A. Sandweiss, professor of history at Princeton.

Within Harvard, the committee consulted with the Steering Committee on Human Remains in Harvard Museum Collections, chaired by the historian of science and medicine Evelynn M. Hammonds, who also served on the legacy of slavery committee; with the Committee to Articulate Principles on Renaming, chaired by Harvard President Emerita Drew Gilpin Faust; and with the Faculty of Arts and Sciences Task Force on Visual Culture and Signage, chaired by Robin Kelsey, dean of arts and humanities. Leaders and staff of the Harvard Museum of Comparative Zoology, the Harvard Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, and the Warren Anatomical Museum also provided support. The committee also benefited from consultation and partnership with the University’s Office of Equity, Diversity, Inclusion, and Belonging; the Hutchins Center for African and African American Research and its director, Henry Louis Gates Jr.; the Charles Warren Center for Studies in American History; the Harvard Office for the Arts; the Department of Music; the American Repertory Theater; and several students involved with the Harvard Generational African American Students Association.

We received particular support from the Harvard University Archives, Houghton Library, and the Schlesinger Library on the History of Women in America at Harvard Radcliffe Institute, all of which granted our researchers safe physical access during the COVID-19 pandemic and digitized parts of their collections for us. Many other Harvard libraries and departments digitized materials and provided additional support, including:

- Arnold Arboretum Horticultural Library and Archives
- Baker Library, Harvard Business School
- Countway Library, Harvard Medical School, Harvard School of Dental Medicine, and Harvard T. H. Chan School of Public Health
- Department of African and African American Studies, Harvard Faculty of Arts and Sciences
- Ernst Mayr Library of the Museum of Comparative Zoology
- Frances Loeb Library, Harvard Graduate School of Design
- Harvard Fine Arts Library
- Harvard Law School Library
We also engaged with numerous libraries and special collections in eastern Massachusetts and across the United States. In particular, the leadership and staff at the Massachusetts Historical Society and the Boston Athenaeum provided us with invaluable guidance and access to their collections. Colleagues at the William L. Clements Library at the University of Michigan and the Moorland-Spingarn Research Center at Howard University digitized items in their collections for our use, and staff at the Schomburg Center for Research in Black Culture at the New York Public Library and the Robert S. Cox Special Collections and University Archives Research Center at the University of Massachusetts Amherst assisted us in accessing important materials. We also consulted the collections of the American Philosophical Society Library, the Boston Public Library, the Milton (Massachusetts) Historical Society, and the Williams Research Center at the Historic New Orleans Collections.

Research and Creative Projects

Harvard faculty and students engaged in a wide range of research and creative projects with support from the Presidential Initiative on Harvard & the Legacy of Slavery. You can learn more about their work online.

Student Research and Creative Project Grant Recipients

- Aabid Allibhai (GSAS; HLS)
- Clara Amenyio (GSD)
- Busola Banjoh (Harvard College)
- Daniel Barcia (HBS; HLS; Harvard College)
- Phoebe Braithwaite (GSAS)
- Gianna Cacciatore (HDS; GSE; Harvard College)
- Darien Carr (GSD; Harvard College)
- Alexandre Chaumette (Harvard College)
- Bettie Closs (Harvard College)
- Isabel Cole (Harvard College)
- Bennett Comerford (GSAS)
- Jarrett Drake (GSAS)
- Stacey Fabo (Harvard College)
- Winona Guo (Harvard College)
- Catherine Huang (GSE)
- Shandra Jones (GSE)
- Heidi Lai (Harvard College)
- Sarah Mallory (GSAS)
- Kyra March (Harvard College)
- Orlee Marini-Rapoport (Harvard College)
- Mary McNeil (GSAS)
- Garry Mitchell (GSE)
- Elifmina Mizrahi (GSD)
- Thandi Nyambose (GSD)
- Eve O’Connor (GSAS)
- Ogechukwu Ogbo (Harvard College)
- Suzannah Omonuk (HDS)
- Nicole Piepenbrink (GSD)
- Cresa Pugh (GSAS)
- Kiana Rawji (Harvard College)
- Avi Robinson (GSD)
- Malachi Robinson (Harvard College)
- Divya Saraf (GSD)
- Jack “Alex” White III (Harvard College)
- Cecilia Zhou (Harvard College)

Abbreviations:

GSAS: Harvard Graduate School of Arts and Sciences
GSD: Harvard Graduate School of Design
GSE: Harvard Graduate School of Education
HBS: Harvard Business School
HDS: Harvard Divinity School
HLS: Harvard Law School

Faculty-led Research Projects

When Campus Is Closed: Privilege, Poverty, and Pandemic Life at Harvard University

Researcher: Anthony Abraham Jack, assistant professor of education, Harvard Graduate School of Education, and Shutzer Assistant Professor, Harvard Radcliffe Institute

This study examines the impact of the convergence of a reckoning over long-standing racial inequalities, a global pandemic, and—for many—an economic crisis. Jack and his research team have interviewed 120 Black, white, Latinx, Asian and Native undergraduates, with particular emphasis on understanding the experiences of generational African American students at Harvard. This research informed the recommendations presented in section VII of this report.

Mapping Post-Mortem Segregation: A Survey of the Old Burying Ground in Cambridge

Researchers: Aja Lans, 2021–2023 postdoctoral fellow, Inequality in America Initiative; Jason Ur, Stephen Phillips Professor of Archaeology and Ethnology; and Andrew Bair, PhD candidate, Harvard Department of Archaeology
Compared to the white colonial settler population, Black residents of colonial Cambridge are currently nearly invisible in death, with only two headstones known to mark gravesites of “negro servants” in the Old Burying Ground in Harvard Square. Yet the documentary record shows that there were many more enslaved persons living and working in Cambridge and at Harvard. What became of them in death? Can we find them and give them the same visibility afforded to white colonists? To answer these questions, this project brings the tools of historical archaeology, spatial analysis, and archeological remote sensing to the Old Burying Ground in an effort to locate the graves of marginalized members of the colonial Cambridge community.

Student Researchers and Creative Partners

Many undergraduate and graduate students, as well as recent graduates and postdoctoral fellows, played critical roles in the work of the initiative, including as researchers working on the report and on supported projects, as participants in the film that accompanies this report, and as voice actors for a virtual walking tour that provides an introduction to the landscape of enslavement—and of resistance—in and around Harvard Yard.

• Busola Banjoh (Harvard College)
• Becca Spindel Bassett (HRI; GSE)
• D’Wayne Bell (GSE)
• Lucian Bessmer (GSE)
• Vincent Bish (HKS; GSE)
• Robert Clinton (HLS)
• Mycah Conner (GSAS)
• Galadriel A. Coury (Harvard College)
• Theodore Delwiche (Harvard College)
• Emily Farnsworth (HDS)
• Noah Gold (Harvard College)
• Ethan Goodnight (GSAS)
• Laura Greenberg (GSD)
• Lindsey Hightower (Harvard College)
• Hiram Jackson (HDS)
• Chelsea Jno Baptiste (GSD)
• Orelia Jonathan (GSE)
• Shandra Jones (GSE)
• Aja Lans (GSAS)
• Sydney Lewis (Harvard College)
• Kyra March (Harvard College)
• Suzannah Omonuk (HDS)
• Samantha O’Sullivan (Harvard College)
• Phyllis Pawa (HDS)
• Franco Paz (GSAS)
• James Ramsey (HDS; HLS; Harvard College)

Abbreviations:

GSAS: Harvard Graduate School of Arts and Sciences
GSD: Harvard Graduate School of Design
GSE: Harvard Graduate School of Education
HBS: Harvard Business School
HDS: Harvard Divinity School
HLS: Harvard Law School
HRI: Harvard Radcliffe Institute

Public Programming

The Presidential Initiative on Harvard & the Legacy of Slavery (H&LS) is a University-wide effort anchored at Harvard Radcliffe Institute (HRI). The following public lectures and discussions were organized by HRI in partnership with, and with funding from, the presidential initiative. Recordings of these events are available online.

2019–2020

Naming Racism, June 2020

As part of a series on health inequity in the age of COVID-19, Camara Phyllis Jones and the H&LS committee member David R. Williams explored how we might overcome, “the somnolence of racism denial,” dismantle the system of racism, and put in its place a system in which all people can thrive.

American Policing and Protest, June 2020

Monica C. Bell and Laurence Ralph, with Brandon Terry as moderator, discussed contemporary police violence against people of color along with ethical issues that we must consider as we attempt to envision how our nation might be transformed.
2020–2021

**Perfecters of This Democracy: A Conversation with Nikole Hannah-Jones**, September 2020

Nikole Hannah-Jones and the H&LS committee chair, Tomiko Brown-Nagin, engaged in conversation about pressing issues of race, civil rights, injustice, desegregation, and resegregation.

**The Enduring Legacy of Slavery and Racism in the North**, October 2020

Kyera Singleton, Manisha Sinha, and John Stauffer, with the moderator and H&LS committee member Tiya Miles, examined the role and impact of slavery in the North, the influence of scientific racism, and the response of Black abolitionists.

*This event was presented in collaboration with the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology and the Harvard Museums of Science and Culture.*

**Obesity, COVID-19, and Systemic Racism**, October 2020

Sara Bleich and Sabrina Strings explored how uneven distribution of social support drives obesity; how framing affects policy; and how lack of research fuels speculation and reinforces racist stereotypes.


Eddie R. Cole, the H&LS-funded researcher Anthony Abraham Jack, and Jennifer Morton, with the moderator Kemeyawi Wahpepah, discussed how higher education can and should rise to the challenges of 2020 and beyond.

**Harvard & the Legacy of Slavery: Reckoning with the Past to Understand the Present**, March 2021

The H&LS committee chair, Tomiko Brown-Nagin, and the committee members Tiya Miles and Martha Minow explored the charge of the initiative and the work then under way to explore Harvard’s historical entanglements with slavery and its legacies, along with the initiative’s efforts to support student and community engagement.

2021–2022

**The Intentional Museum**, March 2021

Christy Coleman, Makeda Best, and the H&LS committee member Sven Beckert, with the moderator and H&LS committee chair Tomiko Brown-Nagin, discussed the power that museums have to genuinely engage with communities around what matters most to them.

*This event was presented in collaboration with the Harvard Museums of Science & Culture and the Harvard Art Museums.*

**Racial Inequity and Housing Instability in Boston: Past, Present, and Future**, April 2021

Tatiana Cruz and Lydia Edwards, with Chris Herbert as moderator, discussed how millions of Americans have long struggled to pay for housing, with communities of color additionally burdened by housing discrimination and historical race-based policies, such as legalized segregation, redlining, and mortgage discrimination, with a specific focus on Greater Boston.

*This event was presented in collaboration with the Royall House and Slave Quarters, in Medford, Massachusetts.*

**Medical Racism from 1619 to the Present: History Matters**, May 2021

Jim Downs and Susan M. Reverby, with the moderator and H&LS committee member Evelynn M. Hammonds, examined the roots in slavery of contemporary African American mistrust of the healthcare system, the lack of trust in medical providers fostered by experiences of everyday racism, and the African American community’s long dependence, born of necessity, on care from within the community.

*This event was presented in collaboration with the Project on Race & Gender in Science & Medicine at the Hutchins Center for African & African American Research at Harvard University.*

**Book Talk with Clint Smith**, July 2021


*This event was presented in collaboration with the Royall House and Slave Quarters, in Medford, Massachusetts.*
Book Talk with Tiya Miles, July 2021

Second in a two-part series, featuring the H&LS committee member Tiya Miles, author of All That She Carried: The Journey of Ashley's Sack, a Black Family Keepsake (Random House, 2021), the 2021 National Book Award Winner for Nonfiction.

Opening Discussion for Brown II, September 2021


This event was presented in collaboration with the Royall House and Slave Quarters, in Medford, Massachusetts.

Feeding the Nation: Michael W. Twitty on American Foodways and the History of Enslavement, March 2022

Michael W. Twitty shared insights about the role of enslaved people in shaping American foodways, as well as the critical importance of including stories of the enslaved prominently in public history and historical interpretation, followed by a conversation with the H&LS committee chair, Tomiko Brown-Nagin.

This event was presented in collaboration with the Royall House and Slave Quarters, in Medford, Massachusetts.

Lift Ev’ry Voice: Celebrating the Music of Black Americans, April 2022

A discussion and concert by the Aeolians of Oakwood University, Kuumba Singers of Harvard College, and Harvard Choruses. The Aeolians was founded in 1946 by Eva Beatrice Dykes, a professor of English at Oakwood who in 1921 had become the first Black woman to earn a doctoral degree from Radcliffe College (the women’s college affiliated with Harvard).

This event was part of the Eileen Southern Initiative, housed in the Harvard University Department of Music.

Inclusions: Envisioning Justice on Harvard’s Campus, April 2022

Inclusions—a participatory, student-generated art installation—served as the inspiration for this conversation about the intersection of art, visual culture, and representation at Harvard. Tracy Smith joined the student creators Kiana Rawji ’23 and Cecilia Zhou ’23 in a discussion focusing on how we can use art to envision justice, moderated by the H&LS committee member Stephen Gray.

This event was presented in partnership with Harvard College student artists, the Office for the Arts at Harvard (OFA), the Harvard John A. Paulson School of Engineering and Applied Sciences, the OFA Ceramics Program, and The Monument Project.

Who Is Policing the Police? April 2022

An exploration of what real police accountability looks like, including perspectives of current and former law enforcement officers, activists, and academics.

This event was presented in partnership with the Harvard Generational African American Students Association.

See next page for upcoming events.
Upcoming

“Telling the Truth about All This”:
Reckoning with Slavery and Its Legacies
at Harvard and Beyond, April 29, 2022

“Nations reel and stagger on their way; they make
hideous mistakes; they commit frightful wrongs;
they do great and beautiful things. And shall we
not best guide humanity by telling the truth about
all this, so far as the truth is ascertainable?”

—W.E.B. Du Bois, Black Reconstruction
in America, 1860–1880 (1935)

Over the past two decades, universities around the
world have begun to engage with their legacies related
to slavery. Many have issued reports detailing some of
their historical ties to slavery, the substantial financial
benefits the institutions and their affiliates extracted
from slave economies, and universities’ intellectual
contributions to racist ideologies and practices. At the
same time, this research has uncovered a long history of
African American resistance, and we are just beginning
to address the impact of legacies of slavery on Black
students at these institutions into the 21st century.

With this history uncovered, we must now ask: What
must institutions of higher education do? What
types of repair work can and should we undertake?
We will explore these questions in our conference
through discussions about a range of topics, including
engagement with descendant communities, legacies
of slavery in libraries and museums, and novel
public engagement and educational opportunities.
Notes


2 See Section II of this report; Appendix I lists individuals enslaved by Harvard leadership, faculty, staff, and donors. This list is not comprehensive, as records of enslavement in the colonial era are irregular and the list omits individuals who are likely to have been enslaved but for whom sufficient documentation could not be located. This is an important area for future research.


5 See “Universities Studying Slavery,” President’s Commission on Slavery and the University, University of Virginia, accessed February 7, 2022, https://slavery.virginia.edu/universities-studying-slavery/. See also Wilder, Ebony & Ivy and Harris et al., eds., Slavery and the University.


7 The admitted class of 2025 at Harvard College was historically diverse. According to the College Admissions website, the class was 15.9% African American, 25.9% Asian American, 12.5% Hispanic/Latino, 1.1% Native American, and 0.5% Native Hawaiian. “Admissions Statistics,” Harvard College Admissions & Financial Aid, accessed October 12, 2021, https://college.harvard.edu/admissions/admissions-statistics.

Note that in reporting such statistics and quoting historical sources throughout this report, for the sake of clarity we generally use the terminology of the source document.

8 See Section V of this report. As early as 1977, under the leadership of President Derek Bok, the University advocated for the use of race-conscious admissions policies to increase diversity at colleges and universities across the country. The University filed an amicus brief in Regents of the University of California v. Bakke, arguing before the Supreme Court that maintaining a racially diverse student body achieves important educational goals. Brief for Columbia University et al. as Amici Curiae Supporting Petitioner, Regents of the University of California v. Bakke, 483 U.S. 265 (1987) (No. 76–811). The University continues to defend race conscious admissions: As President Lawrence S. Bacow noted in a recent statement, “Considering race as one factor among many in admissions decisions produces a more diverse student body which strengthens the learning environment for all.” “SCOTUS Statement from President Bacow,” Harvard Admissions Lawsuit, Harvard University, accessed February 7, 2022, https://www.harvard.edu/admissionscase/2022/01/24/scotus-statement/.

9 See “Presidential Task Force on Inclusion and Belonging,” Harvard University, accessed February 7, 2022, https://inclusionandbelongingtaskforce.harvard.edu/. Established by Harvard President Emerita Drew Gilpin Faust, the members of the Task Force were Danielle Allen (co-chair); Archon Fung (co-chair); Meredith Weenick (co-chair); Katrina Armstrong; Ali Asani; Anita Berrizbeitia; Iris Bohnet; Mohan Boodram; Pat Byrne; Elson Callejas;


The members of the committee were: Sven Beckert (co-chair); Evelyn Brooks Higginbotham (co-chair); Alejandro de la Fuente; Annette Gordon-Reed; Evelyne M. Hammonds; and John Stauffer.


Note that all pre-1752 dates have been updated to the New Style system following the Gregorian calendar, in which the calendar year runs from January 1 to December 31. See “The 1752 Calendar Change,” Colonial Records & Topics, Connecticut State Library, accessed February 17, 2022, https://libguides.ctstatelibrary.org/hg/colonialresearch/calendar.


Beckert et al., Harvard and Slavery.


See “Royall Must Fall: The Shield is Retired,” Exhibit Addenda, Harvard Law School, accessed February 9, 2022, https://exhibits.law.harvard.edu/royall-must-fall-shield-retired. Isaac Royall, Jr. (1719–1781) lived just over three miles from Harvard Yard. The Royall House and Slave Quarters, where the Royalls enslaved more than sixty people and lived off the wealth generated by yet more enslaved people who labored on the family’s sugar plantation in Antigua, has been a historic site for over a century. Since 2005, the Royall House and Slave Quarters has reoriented its programming to focus on educating the public about the lives of the people enslaved there and, more broadly, the history of slavery in New England. See The Royall House & Slave Quarters, accessed October 12, 2021, https://royallhouse.org/.

The members of Harvard Law School’s 2016 shield committee were: Bruce H. Mann (chair); Mawuse Oliver Barker-Vormawor; James E. Bowers; Tomiko Brown-Nagin; Annette Gordon-Reed; Janet Halley; René

HARVARD & THE LEGACY OF SLAVERY | 2022
The members of the sub-committee were: Nawal Nour See, for example, Colleen Walsh, “Initiative on Legacy historians have produced almost as many books about Anthony D’Amico; Marcela del Carmen; Emily Gustainis; Artwork and Cultural Representations,” Harvard Medical and Fellows of Harvard College on the Shield Approved for See, for example, Margaret Ellen Newell, Brigit Katz, “Harvard Law School Marks Ties to complexity of the English immigrants’ rich religious and Harvard Gazette, March 2016, https://today.law.harvard. Law School, accessed February 17, 2022, https:// hls.harvard.edu/about/the-harvard-law-school-shield/. See Section IV of this report.

The members of the sub-committee were: Nawal Nour (co-chair); Fidencio Saldaña (co-chair); M. William Lensch (organizer and member); Jalen Benson; Terésa Carter; Anthony D’Amico; Marcela del Carmen; Emily Gustainis; Dominic Hall; Beth MacGillivray; Stephen Maiorisi; Alisha Nanji; Jane Neill; LaShyra Nolen; Scott Podolsky; Joan Reede; Tania Rodriguez; Raquel Sofia Sandoval; Joanna Swift; and Alana Van Dervort. See M.R.F. Buckley, “Winds of Change: Holmes Academic Society Renamed in Honor of Physician-Scientist William Augustus Hinton,” Harvard Gazette, September 23, 2020, https://news.harvard.edu/gazette/story/2020/09/harvard-medical-schools-holmes-academic-society-renamed/. See also “Guiding Principles for Artwork and Cultural Representations,” Harvard Medical School, accessed February 17, 2022, https://hms.harvard.edu/about-hms/campus-culture/diversity-inclusion/guiding-principles-artwork-cultural-representations.


See, for example, Margaret Ellen Newell, Brethren by Nature: New England Indians, Colonists, and the Origins of American Slavery (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2015), 4: “historians have produced almost as many books about New England as there were English colonial residents, as Edmund Morgan famously joked. They have reconstructed the compelling narrative of the Puritan migration, the complexity of the English immigrants’ rich religious and intellectual life, and the intricacies of the society and innovative thinking they helped create. Many of these works stressed the uniqueness of New England culture and sought there the origins of American exceptionalism. With a few notable exceptions, though, the history of slavery in general and of Indian slavery in particular remains stubbornly absent from these narratives.”


Warren, New England Bound, 35; see also Thomas G. Barnes, The book of the general laws and liberties concerning the inhabitants of the Massachusets: Reproduced in facsimile from the unique 1648 edition in the Huntington Library (San Marino, CA: Huntington Library, 1975). Newell argues that the regulation of slavery in the Body of Liberties was meant largely to define the legal status of Native people captured during the Pequot War in the late 1630s. She further notes that, when Native peoples were granted certain rights of citizenship after their defeat in King Philip’s war, colonial courts used laws such as the Body of Liberties to enslave them through “the sentencing of Indians to terms of servitude and even slavery as punishment for crime and debt.” See Brethren by Nature, 6, 11, 53–58, and “To be sold ‘in any part of ye kings Dominionys’: Judicial Enslavement of New England Indians,” chap. 9.

See Section II of this report and Appendix I. See also Beckert et al., Harvard and Slavery, 8–9.

Newell acknowledges that “[n]umerous historians have argued that slavery was more of an ornamental or status institution in the North rather than an economic investment, but others have marshaled persuasive evidence to the contrary,” Brethren by Nature, see 171–172, quote on

35 See Section III of this report.


37 For sources discussing Harvard’s accumulation of wealth vis-a-vis slavery, see Beckert et al., Harvard and Slavery, 11–12.


42 Wilkinson, “1850 Harvard Medical School,” 14, 16.


44 Bosco, “Fugitive Slave Act,” 229–230, 239. See Section IV of this report.


46 The names of Harvard men who died in service to the Union are displayed in Memorial Hall. See Morison, Three Centuries of Harvard, 302–303.

47 See Section IV of this report.


50 See Section V of this report.

51 Because of universities’ unique role as sites of research and education, the idea of intellectual leadership as a category of entanglement and a form of culpability with slavery is particularly important. Yet it is also a complicated matter: Many universities rightly prize
intellectual freedom, and therefore strive not to prescribe or circumscribe the intellectual output of their faculty. Harvard is no exception in this regard, and the discussion of past wrongs is not a departure from this core institutional value. It affirms academic freedom: As this report documents, rather than upholding the principle of academic freedom and the pursuit of Veritas, the University, on several occasions, sought to moderate or suppress anti-slavery views within the community.

Moreover, the committee does not propose a retrospective evaluation of all the ideas that have emerged from Harvard and may have caused harm. Rather, this report describes specific actions and ideas advanced by Harvard faculty and leaders with the University’s institutional backing—actions and ideas that caused enduring harm, and which we, as a University community, must no longer honor.


52 On the white vigilante violence that followed formerly enslaved Blacks when they tried to exercise their newly found freedom, see Foner, Reconstruction 119–123, 425–430. W.E. Du Bois, Black Reconstruction in America: An Essay Toward a History of the Part Which Black Folk Played in the Attempt to Reconstruct Democracy in America, 1860–1880 (New York, NY: Russell & Russell, 1935), 221–230, describes, for example, the insufficient resources given to the Freedmen’s Bureau, a federal agency design to aid the formerly enslaved in the South, as the result of political pushback from Southern whites.

53 Morison, Three Centuries of Harvard, 323.

54 This language is drawn from an address by Charles William Elliot, president of Harvard from 1869–1909, quoted in Morison, Three Centuries of Harvard, 322.

55 Morison, Three Centuries of Harvard, 322. On the Overseers' aspirations for Harvard during this period, see also ibid., 324–331.


59 Roberts v. City of Boston, 59 Mass. 198, 5 Cush. 198 (1849). See David Herbert Donald, Charles Sumner and the Coming of the Civil War (Naperville, IL: Sourcebooks, Inc., 2009), 151. Sumner asserted: “The separation of the schools, so far from being for the benefit of both races, is an injury to both.” See also Roberts, 59 Mass. at 204.


63 For a discussion on racial segregation in elementary and secondary education, see Urban and Wagoner, Jr., American Education, 165–168; for HBCUs, see generally Lovett, Black Colleges and Universities.


65 There was little support for mixed schools anywhere in the North. See Urban and Wagoner, Jr., American Education, 165; Sollors et al., eds., Blacks at Harvard, 1–4; West, “Harvard and the Black Man.”
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(Boston, MA: Printed by John Boyle, for Thomas Levert, 1773), 4–5. For the original manuscript, see Forensic dispute between Theodore Parsons & Eliphalet Pearson: manuscript, 1773, MS Am 1423, Houghton Library, Harvard University, https://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:FHCL.HOUGH:37045020.


See Forensic dispute on legality of enslaving the Africans, 26–27.

Theophilus Parsons, Memoir of Theophilus Parsons, Chief Justice of the Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts with Notices of Some of His Contemporaries (Boston, MA: Ticknor and Fields, 1859), 17, https://books.google.com/books?id=9CkrAQAAIAAJ.

Parsons, Memoir, 19.


Wright and Hanson, Sibley’s Harvard Graduates, 288–304.


Foster, Smalle Beginnings, 157–158.


Edmund Burke, An account of the European settlements in America: In six parts. I. A short history of the discovery of that part of the world. II. The manners and customs of the original inhabitants. III. Of the Spanish settlements. IV. Of the Portuguese. V. Of the French, Dutch, and Danish. VI. Of the English. Each part contains an accurate description of the settlements in their extent, climate, productions, trade, genius and disposition of their inhabitants: the interests of the several powers of Europe with respect to those settlements; and their political and commercial views with regard to each other, 2 vols. (London, UK: Printed for R. and J. Dodsley in Pall-Mall, 1760), 2:173, https://books.google.com/books?id=6Wg6AAACAAJ.


Hosmer, Winthrop’s Journal, 2:328.

Sir Charles Whitworth, State of the Trade of Great Britain in its Imports and Exports Progressively from the Year 1697 also of the Trade to each particular Country, during the above Period, distinguishing each year, in two parts with a Preface and Introduction Setting forth the Articles whereof each Trade consists, (London, UK: Printed for G. Robinson, etc., 1776), xlvii–xlviii.


John Josselyn, An Account of Two Voyages to New-England: made during the years 1638, 1663 (1674; reprint, Boston: William Vezzie, 1865), 210–211. Peterson, City-State of Boston, 113, notes that Massachusetts fishermen sent “refuse fish”—mackerel, which was considered low-grade compared to cod—to the West Indies at low prices to be fed to enslaved people. Warren, New England Bound, SS, argues that “New England merchants were by midcentury racializing food: products understood to be beneath English standards were deemed sufficient for enslaved peoples in the West Indies. Rotting fish, however unappetizing to European stomachs, was a relative bargain for the feeding of slaves, for it cost so much less. Colonists could pocket the difference.”
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In fact, no obligation to remedy harms of slavery exists in American law; recent litigation seeking such remedies has been unsuccessful. See, for example, In re African-American Slave Descendants Litigation, 304 F. Supp. 2d. 1027 (N.D. Ill. 2004) holding that Plaintiffs’ attempt to bring remedial claims based on slavery more than a century after the end of the Civil War and the formal abolition of slavery failed, “consistent with the position taken by numerous courts which have considered the issue over the last century. In the content most pertinent here—higher education—the U.S. Supreme Court has upheld race-conscious admissions policies meant to increase access for “underrepresented minorities,” including people of African origin who may be descended from enslaved people; but the rationale the Court recognized for such policies was a compelling interest in “diversity,” rather than remedying vestiges of past discrimination or slavery. See Bakke for upholding race as one factor among many in admissions to promote an interest in educational benefits of diversity. Justice Marshall argued in a separate opinion that the lingering effects of slavery justified race-conscious admissions in higher education; no other justice joined his opinion, see Bakke, 438 U.S. at 387–402 (Marshall, J.); Grutter v. Bollinger, 539 U.S. 306 (2003). Many scholars have criticized the non-compensatory, diversity-based justification for affirmative action. See Tomiko Brown-Nagin, “Elites, Social Movements, and the Law: The Case of Affirmative Action,” Columbia Law Review 105, no. 5 (June 2005): 1436, 1453–1463; see also ibid., n. 69, noting that Columbia University President Lee Bollinger questioned whether Bakke’s diversity rationale was a “powerful enough” argument in support of affirmative action and believed Brown v. Board of Education and the harms of state-mandated segregation should instead be the starting point for public debate.
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Like Bilhah, Dinah is never identified as being of African or Indigenous descent. Also like Bilhah, Dinah is a biblical name frequently assigned to enslaved women. See Newbell Niles Puckett, Black Names in America: Origins and Usage, edited by Murray Heller (Boston, MA: G. K. Hall, 1975), and Insoce, “Carolina Slave Names: An Index to Acculturation.”

The scant records leave Dinah’s life open to interpretation. One scholar has posited, given Dinah’s age when she first appears in the diaries, that she may have been Bilhah’s daughter. Another has speculated that the trip she left with Molly Landman in 1762 may have been a permanent departure, thus rendering the Dinah in later family diaries another individual. See Jane Kamensky, “The View from 1764,” in The Philosophy Chamber: Art and Science in Harvard’s Teaching Cabinets, 1766–1820, ed. Ethan W. Lasser (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2017), 6, and Christina J. Hodge, “A Sharp White Background: Enslavement and Privilege at Eighteenth-Century Harvard College,” Historical Archaeology 55, no. 4 (2021): 470.


Table II. Enslaved by Harvard Fellows and Overseers

1 Throughout the colonial era and well into the 19th century, the University did not control the appointment of Overseers. The colonial and later the state legislature determined membership. Generally, all Governors, Deputy Governors, and Lieutenant Governors were automatically Harvard Overseers by virtue of their positions, along with magistrates and ministers from Cambridge and the surrounding towns. After 1780, the list also included various members of the state legislature. Harvard and the Legacy of Slavery researchers have not reviewed the full list of Overseers in the 17th and 18th centuries to identify all of those who were slaveholders; this is an important area for future research. For a full description of the permutations of the Board of Overseers in the 17th, 18th, and 19th centuries, see Harvard University, *Quinquennial Catalogue*, 1636–1915, 13–17.


3 Newell, *Brethren by Nature*, 40–41, 79, describes this woman’s enslavement and later escape from Winthrop’s household. See also C. S. Manegold, *Ten Hills Farm: The Forgotten History of Slavery in the North* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2010), 42. As Governor of the Massachusetts Bay Colony during the Pequot War, Winthrop also decided what to do with the estimated hundreds of Indigenous people taken prisoner by soldiers of the Massachusetts Bay colony during the war. He oversaw the distribution of women and children as slaves to English colonists, as well as the shipment of captives to the West Indies for sale to the sugar planters there. See Manegold, *Ten Hill Farm*, 41–43; for a more detailed account, see Newell, “‘David’s warre’: The Pequot War and the Origins of Slavery in New England,” chap. 1, “I do not see how wee can thrive untill wee get into a stock of slaves’: Slavery in the Puritan Atlantic World,” chap. 2, and Indians we have received into our houses”: Pequot War Captives in New England Households, *Brethren by Nature*.


8 Newell, *Brethren by Nature*, 66, documents at least three women and two men entering Winthrop’s household after the Pequot War; this number presumably includes the wife of Mononotto, leaving an additional two women as well as the two men. She further describes Winthrop’s 1639 will in which he left his property on Governor’s Island and the enslaved Indigenous people who labored there to his son Adam. See also Francis J. Bremer, *John Winthrop: America’s Forgotten Founding Father* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003), 318.


11 Newell, *Brethren by Nature*, 33–35, 93. Israel Stoughton played a prominent role in the Pequot War, commanding soldiers from the Massachusetts Bay Colony in the slaughter or capture and enslavement of hundreds of members of the Pequot tribe in what is now southern New England. Pequot women and children who survived the war were divided among Indigenous tribes allied with the English colonists and among English settlers in New England, while adult men were shipped to the West Indies and traded to English planters in exchange for cotton, tobacco, and African slaves. See also James Savage, Richard S. Dunn, and Laetitia Yeandle, eds., *The Journal of John Winthrop*, 1630–1649 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1996), 225–228, 246.


13 Newell, *Brethren by Nature*, 93–94, asserts that Dorcas is the “Blackamore maid” held up as a sign of the colonists’ success in Christianizing their servants in *New Englands first fruits: in respect, first of the conversion of some, conviction of divers, preparation of sundry of the Indians, 2. of the progress of learning, in the colledge at Cambridge in Massachusetts Bay. With divers other speciall matters concerning that country* (London, UK: R. O. and G. D. for Henry Overton, 1643), 10–11. On April 13, 1641, John Winthrop recorded in his journal that, “A negro maid, servant to Mr. Stoughton of Dorchester [...] was received into the church and baptized.” *Journal of John Winthrop*, 347. “Dorcas ye Blackmore” is


Leverett would have been an Overseer of the College by virtue of his role as Governor of the colony from 1673 to 1679. John Leverett Papers, Massachusetts Historical Society, accessed March 14, 2022, https://www.masshist.org/features/saltonstall/john-leverett.

Leverett was directly and extensively involved in the mass enslavement of Indigenous people during King Philip’s War. He recruited mercenaries to fight on behalf of the Massachusetts Bay Colony in King Philip’s War with promises of “captives and plunder.” In September 1676, Leverett issued a certificate declaring New England’s Indigenous peoples—including noncombatant women and children—enslavable. By the end of the war, there were roughly 2,000 captive Natives in New England households—a number that does not include those sold to plantations in the West Indies or in markets on the other side of the Atlantic. Governor Leverett’s Certificate, September 12, 1676, Photostats, Massachusetts Historical Society, Boston, cited in Newell, *Brethren by Nature*, 141, 150–151, 159.

Archives, digitized images provided by FamilySearch.org, cited in Wayne Tucker, “Joseph Dudley.”

Mather would have been appointed an Overseer by virtue of his position as the Minister of the North Church in Boston, after the composition of the Overseers reverted in 1707 to the original 1642 rules: “The Governor and Deputy Governor for the time being, and all the magistrates of this jurisdiction, together with the teaching elders of the six next adjoining towns, viz. Cambridge, Watertown, Charlestown, Boston, Roxbury, and Dorchester....” See Harvard University, Quinquennial Catalogue, 13. See also John Langdon Sibley, Biographical Sketches of Graduates of Harvard University in Cambridge, Massachusetts, Volume III, 1678–1689 (Cambridge, MA: Charles William Sever, University Bookstore, 1885), 20, 21.


See McDonald and Aspelund, Increase: What’s in a Name?.

After 10 years of servitude, Mather permitted Onesimus to purchase a “Negro-lad” to replace himself in Mather’s household. Thereafter, Mather wrote, Onesimus was permitted to “Enjoy and Employ his whole Time for his own purposes”—except for a variety of services that he was still required to perform for Mather’s family, including bringing in firewood every night, shoveling at the Mather home after “great snows,” and generally being on call when the family deemed his services necessary to them. See Diary of Cotton Mather, 1681–1708, 363; Diary of Cotton Mather, 1709–1724, Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society, 7th ser., vol. 8 (Boston, MA: Massachusetts Historical Society, 1912), 363.

Diary of Cotton Mather, 1709–1724, 384.

Diary of Cotton Mather, 1709–1724, 477, 562.


First Church in Cambridge functioned as the official church for the University until 1814, when the Corporation and Overseers voted to create and maintain a “Society for religious instruction, worship and ordinances on the Lord’s day” within Harvard. See Church of Christ in Cambridge, 394–395; Morison, Three Centuries of Harvard, 201–202.

Harvard “held a partial right of ownership” in the second, third, and fourth meetinghouses built for the use by the Church of Christ (today’s First Church) from the Second Meetinghouse constructed in 1651 until the Fourth, to which it contributed one-seventh of the cost of construction in the mid-18th century. Each of these meetinghouses stood near the site occupied since 1925 by Lehman Hall in Harvard Yard. See Maycock and Sullivan, Building Old Cambridge, 615–616.

Church of Christ at Cambridge, 59, 183, 184.


William Thaddeus Harris, Epitaphs from the Old Burying-ground in Cambridge, with Notes (Cambridge, MA: John Owen, 1845), 48, https://books.google.com/books?id=wrXW6t1MeKUC.

Harris, Epitaphs, 48.


“History,” Dudley Community; Dudley, Genealogy of the Dudley Family, 8.


Church of Christ at Cambridge, 124; “First Church Timeline.”

Church of Christ at Cambridge, 108.

This William Brattle (AM 1722) was the son of the Reverend William Brattle (AM 1680) described above.

The Hopkins Trust was established in the 1710s with a bequest from benefactor Edward Hopkins (listed below) and administered primarily for the benefit of Harvard College. See Charles Pickering Bowditch, *An Account of the Trust Administered by the Trustees of the Charity of Edward Hopkins* (1889), https://books.google.com/books?id=jAcAAAAVAAJ.

44 Church of Christ at Cambridge, 97.


47 Church of Christ at Cambridge, 109.


49 Church of Christ at Cambridge, 109, 110.

50 Church of Christ at Cambridge, 109.


54 Church of Christ at Cambridge, 109, 111.

55 Church of Christ at Cambridge, 111.

56 Church of Christ at Cambridge, 109.

57 Church of Christ at Cambridge, 171.


Cato also appeared in Lydia Hancock’s 1777 will in which she stipulates that he should receive 6 pounds, 13 shillings, and 4 pence from her estate “at the time he shall become free by my late husband’s will.” Will of Mrs. Lydia Hancock, *Suffolk County, MA: Probate File Papers*, AmericanAncestors.org, New England Historic Genealogical Society, 2017–2019, (from records supplied by the Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court Archives, digitized images provided by FamilySearch.org), accessed April 2, 2021. As John and Lydia Hancock shared a home, Cato and the other enslaved people named in Lydia Hancock’s will lived in John Hancock’s house up to the time of her death. See William M. Fowler, *The Baron of Beacon Hill* (Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1980), 77.


62 Will of Mrs. Lydia Hancock, AmericanAncestors.org.
Table III. Enslaved by Harvard Faculty Members

1 Hannibal had three children who were baptized at First Church. We have not included them here because research to date has not uncovered their mother’s identity, whether she was enslaved, or by whom, nor has it uncovered whether and by whom the children were enslaved.

2 Church of Christ at Cambridge, 109, 145; Vital Records of Cambridge, 2:442.


4 John Greenwood, Henry Flynt (1675–1760), c. 1749–1750, oil on canvas, 87 cm x 77.2 cm x 5.7 cm (framed), Harvard Art Museums, https://hvrd.art/o/304644.

5 Church of Christ at Cambridge, 109.

6 Vital Records of Cambridge, 2:441.


9 John Singleton Copley, John Winthrop (1714–1779), 1773, oil on canvas, 155.6 cm x 121.3 cm x 11.4 cm (framed), Harvard Art Museums, https://hvrd.art/o/299882.

10 Hastings, “The Streets of Cambridge,” 68. The square is across Mt. Auburn Street from the former site of Professor Winthrop’s house on the corner of Mt. Auburn and what is now John F. Kennedy St. See Maycock and Sullivan, Building Old Cambridge, 138, figure 3.35.


12 Winthrop, Annotated almanac, Harvard University Archives.

Table IV. Enslaved by Harvard Staff Members

1 Historian Wendy Warren identifies Thomas Danforth as an enslaver in New England Bound (154), citing An Historic Guide to Cambridge, which notes that, in his will, Danforth declared “that the negro man Philip ffeild [Ed. note: Ffeild in table] should serve Mr. Foxcroft four years, and then be a free man.” See An Historic Guide to Cambridge, compiled by members of the Hannah Winthrop Chapter of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution (Cambridge, MA: self pub., 1907), https://books.google.com/books?id=ckIVAAAAIAAJ.

2 This Andrew Bordman was the fourth member of his family to serve as a steward. He was also brother-in-law to University President Benjamin Wadsworth. After his death, his son became the fifth and final Bordman to serve in the role. See Clifford K. Shipton, Sibley’s Harvard Graduates, vol. 4, Biographical Sketches of Those Who Attended Harvard University, 1690–1700 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1933), 19, 84; Harvard University, Quinquennial Catalogue of the Officers and Graduates of Harvard University, 1636–1890 (Cambridge, MA: John Wilson and Son, 1890), 56, https://books.google.com/books?id=zh9OAAAAMAAJ.


4 Maycock and Sullivan, Building Old Cambridge, 123, 759, 765.
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V. Enslaved by Major Donors to Harvard

1. See Bowditch, *Charity of Edward Hopkins*.


11. *Edmund Trowbridge*, ca. 1730–1740, oil on canvas, 113.8 cm x 87.1 cm, National Portrait Gallery, https://npg.si.edu/object/npg_H-AAA___194_....


17 Will of Thomas Hancock, AmericanAncestors.org.

18 Will of Thomas Hancock, AmericanAncestors.org.


23 The Perkins brothers (James, Thomas Handasyd, and Samuel Gardner) bought and sold enslaved human beings to turn a profit. In the 1780s and 1790s, they ran a mercantile house in St. Domingue that brought foodstuffs and timber from New England to the Caribbean for sale; purchased enslaved people directly off of ships and in the markets in St. Domingue for sale on other Caribbean islands; and purchased sugar, coffee, and other products produced by enslaved people in the Caribbean for sale in the U.S. and Europe. All three brothers spent time in St. Domingue, although Thomas quickly returned to New England for his health. See “Scope and Content,” Perkins Family Papers, Boston Athenaeum, Massachusetts June 1, 2021, https://cdm.bostonathenaeum.org/digital/collection/p15482coll1/id/874/; Carl Seaburg and Stanley Paterson, Merchant Prince of Boston: Colonel T. H. Perkins, 1764–1854 (1971; repr., Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2014), esp. 38–42.


25 Bowditch, Massachusetts General Hospital, esp. 417, 428.


27 Perkins Family Papers, 1780–1882, MSS. L816. Boston Athenaeum, Massachusetts, accessed October 28, 2021, https://cdm.bostonathenaeum.org/digital/collection/p15482coll1/id/874/. The relevant material in this collection, including correspondence to and from Thomas, James, and Samuel Gardner Perkins, dates to the period when the brothers ran a mercantile business based in St. Domingue (Haiti). Many of the letters are explicit in their descriptions of the purchase and sale of enslaved people, including reports from ship captains on the profits and losses associated with such sales.

28 Bowditch, Massachusetts General Hospital, esp. 417, 428.

29 See note 23 above.


31 Bowditch, Massachusetts General Hospital, 428.


33 See also Samuel A. Eliot, A Sketch of the History of Harvard College and of its Present State (Boston, MA: Charles C. Little and James Brown, 1848). Between them, the three Perkins brothers also supported the Astronomical Observatory (637), the libraries (488), a fundraising effort to build an exhibition space (401, 592–593), and students (182).


Neither Perkins Hall nor the Perkins Laboratory Building on the Harvard University campus are named for direct


37 Bowditch, Massachusetts General Hospital, 430.


41 See note 38 above.
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3 The members of the committee were: Sven Beckert (cochair); Evelyn Brooks Higginbotham (cochair); Alejandro de la Fuente; Annette Gordon-Reed; Evelyln M. Hammonds; and John Stauffer.

4 Titus and Venus were enslaved by Benjamin Wadsworth, President of Harvard University from 1725 to 1737. Juba and Bilhah were enslaved by Edward Holyoke, President of Harvard from 1737 to 1769. See Christina Pazzanese, “To Titus, Venus, Bilhah, and Juba,” Harvard Gazette, April 6, 2016, https://news.harvard.edu/gazette/story/2016/04/to-titus-venus-bilhah-and-juba/. Titus, Venus, Juba, and Bilhah, along with many of the individuals discussed here, were brought to light in Beckert et al., Harvard and Slavery, and by Caitlin Galante DeAngelis Hopkins, Harvard and Slavery Research Associate, 2017–2019.

Note that all pre-1752 dates have been updated to the New Style system following the Gregorian calendar, in which the calendar year runs from January 1 to December 31. See “The 1752 Calendar Change,” Colonial Records & Topics, Connecticut State Library, accessed February 17, 2022, https://libguides.ctstatelibrary.org/hg/colonialresearch/calendar.


Beckert et al., Harvard and Slavery.


See “Royall Must Fall: The Shield is Retired,” Exhibit Addenda, Harvard Law School, accessed February 9, 2022, https://exhibits.law.harvard.edu/royall-must-fall-shield-retired. Isaac Royall Jr. (1719–1781) lived just over three miles from Harvard Yard. The Royall House and Slave Quarters, where the Royalls enslaved more than sixty people and lived off of the wealth generated by yet more enslaved people who labored on the family’s sugar plantation in Antigua, has been a historic site for over a century. Since 2005, the Royall House and Slave Quarters has reoriented its programming to focus on educating the public about the lives of the people enslaved there and, more broadly, the history of slavery in New England. See Royall House & Slave Quarters, accessed October 12, 2021, https://royallhouse.org/.


The members of the subcommittee were: Nawal Nour (cochair); Fidencio Saldaña (cochair); M. William Lensch (organizer and member); Jalen Benson; Teresa Carter; Anthony D’Amico; Marcela del Carmen; Emily Gustains; Dominic Hall; Beth MacGillivray; Stephen Maiorisi; Alisha Nanji; Jane Neill; LaShyra Nolen; Scott Podolsky; Joan Reede; Tania Rodriguez; Raquel Sofia Sandoval; Joanna Swift; and Alana Van Dervort. See M.R.F. Buckley, “Winds of Change: Holmes Academic Society Renamed in Honor of Physician-Scientist William Augustus Hinton,” Harvard Gazette, September 23, 2020, https://news.harvard.edu/gazette/story/2020/09/harvard-medical-schools-holmes-academic-society-renamed/. See also “Guiding Principles for Artwork and Cultural Representations,” Harvard Medical School, accessed February 17, 2022, https://hms.harvard.edu/about-hms/campus-culture/diversity-inclusion/guiding-principles-artwork-cultural-representations.
