RWG Meeting 17th September 2026 by Zoom

2026.09.01 Opening Worship

During our opening worship a section of the 2021 Sam Sharpe Lecture given by Amanda Khozi Mukwashi entitled "Setting the Captives Free was read".

2026.09.01 Care Plan – Questions and Answers session

The three documents Care Guidance, Proposal for Peer Support and Principles of Engagement & Care Policy were sent out to members of the RWG in July and they are attached to these minutes.

We feel that the care plan is really helpful. It is helpful for researchers, Woodbrooke, people speaking to meetings, local meetings and Quaker Recognised Bodies. This needs to be available to be downloaded.

We need to provide short introductions to the document for Friends who do not have time to read the larger document.

In particular it is important that all know how to address people experiencing the legacies of enslavement both in our community and beyond.

This document could be adopted as a policy by Trustees and sent to Area Meetings. This would start to enable Friends to think about racial justice. We ask Trustee to adopt these documents and arrange for them to be sent to all Area Meetings.

As we publish the documents we need to look at ourselves and prepare a blog explaining its development.

We need to check that we are taking care of ourselves as if not we could wear ourselves out.

Could this go under the umbrella of Safeguarding which would give it more weight in meetings..

We will explore how we might create spaces for Friends to explore these recommendations for example they could be built into the training for Quaker roles.

The 1 page paper will be sent to all local meetings.

Proposal for Peer Support

We responded to the questions:

Should this be just with faith groups or wider to for example civil society groups involved in reparation**?'**

Do we have the capacity to undertake this outside ourselves?

Should we try with ourselves first and then see what else is happening for example with racial justice networks?

We agreed that there is a real need for this within ourselves. We asked given our capacity could this be a paid position? We need to start to embed this within ourselves first but must not loose sight of this suggestion.

We do not feel it would be appropriate to put support into other organisations when we need to embed this in our own community.

We heard that there is an organisation developing peer support by building a network of people involved in racial justice. We recognise that peer support for people in similar roles in other faith organisations on this journey would be helpful.

We need to make our contacts as wide as possible to hear and learn from others and be careful with whom we align ourselves.

We need to leave it open to a peer support group to let it shape itself. We do not need to set the range yet.

We ask EP and EN to work with TH to move this forward.

2026.09.03 Funding Campaign Proposal

This document was sent as a document in advance. It suggests inviting Quaker trusts, families and financial institutions (whose involvement in enslaving or colonialism has been researched by the Historical Research Workstream) to make contributions to our Quakers in Britain Reparation Fund.
We have a paper ready to take to the Trustees to see if they have the appetite to take this forward. That document will be sent to Trustees once a Yearly Meeting decision is made about making reparation.

Concerns were expressed about approaching individuals as suggested in the paper. There are decedants of enslavers who have already set up a group to look at how they might make reparation.

The Clerks do need to contact the families and forewarn them that their history is going to be made known within our Quaker community. We will use that opportunity to make a gentle ask, an invitation to be part of the healing process we are engaging with by contributing to the

Quakers in Britain Reparation Fund. We will ask if they would be willing to be contacted at a later stage about this.

We recognise that we need to liaise with the communications and fundraising teams first. The latter hold the main relationship with the Quaker Trusts who fund BYM and have knowledge of individuals who make substantial contributions. We need to ask them ask them if they have the capacity to liaise with institutions about this invitation.

2026.09.04 Recommend a Budget for 2027

With the suggested amendment for a budget line for Peer Support the draft budget was agreed for recommendation for scrutiny and final agreement by BYM Trustees.

This budget includes a suggestion for funding for the possible Advisory Board which will be suggested to Trustees when they meet with the Co-Clerks in October.

As finance is tight we encourage RWG members to ask their Area Meetings to provide funding support to enable them to attend Yearly Meetings.

A copy if the amended budget is attached to these minutes.

2026.09.05 Clerks Updates

2026.09.05a Discussions with the Yearly Meeting Agenda Planning Committee

The Agenda Planning Committee is anticipating prepared ministry from the RWG in November 2026 and are looking to provide time for an RWG session in May 2027 Yearly Meeting. This should allow Friends and Meetings to reflect on the Yearly Meeting sessions. We hope in May 2027 we may be able to introduce an apology and that this will come back in November 2027 for agreement. Some of this may come through the BYM Trustees sessions at Yearly Meeting. There may be an opportunity for breakout spaces in July 2027 Yearly Meeting. The Agenda Planning Committee are really experimenting with how our work is presented to Yearly Meeting.

The Clerks have met with L & IH and suggested that the RWG contribution to November YM will take the form of a scripted question and answer session by five members of the RWG dealing with some of the difficult questions we have had posed to us in conversations with Area Meetings, at our Zoom Drop- in Sessions or the RWG October Conference. The following RWG Members agreed to participate: AF, EP, AM, TH, KH & HM who will be on line

Our final question to the gathering might be: **Friends are you ready to acknowledge the full history presented at the RWG's October conference 'Truth and Repair: Our Quaker Journey Towards Justice' and what else do we need to do to get to making an apology?**

We will test the plan for the November YM session to time it in a Zoom session. Date to be arranged as soon as possible.

It is anticipated that the RWG will be present at the 2027 Yearly Meetings in May, possibly July and November .

2026.09.05b Update from the Conference Planning Group

The notes of the last meeting of the group were sent as a document in advance.
We note that as of today there are 147 Friends registered for the conference 72 on line and 75 at Friends House. We would like to reach at least 200 Friends through the conference. We ask members of the RWG to circulate their Area Meetings with the information and remind Friends this is a preparation for a session on reparation at Yearly Meeting in November. We anticipate more publicity in Quake in the coming weeks.

A briefing session will be held for Friends acting as Elders and Pastoral Friends at the conference and we will trial the Care Plan with presenters.

We thank the group for their work.

2026.09.05c Update from the Historical Research Workstream

The notes of the 30th July meeting of the workstream were sent out in advance. A copy of the notes is attached to these minutes.

2026.09.05d Report from the Drop-in Sessions

These are interesting and are informing our thinking. Groups have been between 4 – 9 Friends 46 people in total. We are now making the sessions more structured. There is an importance expressed about telling local stories. Climate Justice comes up regularly. We asked what might our Quaker church look like after our work? We heard more humble, more open, taking better care of each other. It is providing a rewarding dialogue. Some Friends are interested in our work bringing local meetings questions and we are hearing of meetings who are discussing reparation and have put them in touch with each other.

2026.09.06 Closing worship

We closed in worship at 12.05.

Paper 1

Care When talking about Reparation

Purpose and Intent

This guidance is for those engaging in reparation work, particularly: those holding spaces and conversations on reparation, Quaker communities and staff engaging in this work, those navigating the emotional, spiritual, and relational impact of reparation work.

These guidelines set out how we can practice thoughtful, sustained, and collective care for all those engaged in Reparation work they come from our experience and perspectives. They are not exhaustive. Reparation work necessarily engages with histories and present realities of extreme harm, violence, racism, and dispossession. It unites the histories of perpetrators and victims previously separated. We recognise that this work carries embodied burdens for those living within the ongoing legacies of the trafficking of Africans across the Atlantic, colonialism, and systemic racism.

This guidance exists to ensure that care is shared and collective, harm is not reproduced within the work, the burden of the emotional labour is not disproportionally placed on those most affected by racism.

Care is integral aspect of reparation work. Care is decolonial.

Contents

Care When talking about Reparation ..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

Why This Guidance Is Needed? 6

1. The Emotional and Psychological Toll 6

2. Spiritual and Moral Harm 6

3. The Burden of Resistance and Justification 6

4. Emotional Exhaustion and Representation Fatigue 7

Core Principles 7

How do we practice care? 7

Before Sessions (Preparation) 8

For those holding conversations: 8

During Meetings/Sessions 8

Embedding Care in the Session 9

Making Space for Grief 9

Holding Tension and Disagreement 10

After Meetings 10
When Researching 10
Ongoing Care and Sustainability 11
Practices for sustaining care and resilience: 11
Further Resources to Support with Care [cont. and organise] 12

Why This Guidance Is Needed?

1. The Emotional and Psychological Toll

Engaging with histories of African chattel enslavement can involve repeated exposure to:

- Accounts of violence inflicted on Black and Brown bodies
- Dehumanising language and beliefs used to justify enslavement
- Forced labour systems and intergenerational trauma
- Dispossession of land; degradation culture, and identity
- Failure to live up to stated belief and spiritual values

For many, these are not distant histories. They are lived, inherited, reimagined, and ongoing. Discussing this can reopen wounds that never fully healed. This grief is an additional burden that can make reparation work for those living with the legacies of enslavement profoundly taxing.

2. Spiritual and Moral Harm

Within faith communities there can be a deep pain when confronting institutional complicity.

For example, many Quakers:

- Held and trafficked enslaved people
- Invested in companies profiting from enslaved labour
- Benefited from goods produced under violent conditions

It can be deeply distressing, particularly given Quakers' reputation for radical moral leadership. While figures such as Benjamin Lay and early Germantown Friends resisted enslavement, many were complicit in the trafficking of Africans across the Atlantic**.**

3. The Burden of Resistance and Justification

Black and Brown participants are often placed in positions where they must:

- Justify the legitimacy of reparation
- Respond to questions on whether racism "was really that bad" or "still exists"
- Explain basic realities of racism to sceptical or defensive audiences

This labour can be exhausting, undervalued, unremunerated, and unsafe. Conversations can quickly shift from history to the present, for example on the bias, inequality, and discrimination people are navigating now, making emotional distance difficult.

4. Emotional Exhaustion and Representation Fatigue

Black and Brown people may feel pressure to represent their communities' pain, needs, and demands. This "representation fatigue" is compounded by:

- Fear of backlash or being labelled "angry," "divisive," or "too sensitive"
- Being dismissed or misunderstood
- The assumption that Black and Brown people must always have answers

This creates additional emotional strain

Core Principles

- Care is collective, not individualised. It is reciprocal and for all. This is one way in which we can better care for our community.
- The burden of education or emotional labour must not sit with those who are most impacted by racism.
- Discomfort is necessary for growth, but harm is not.
- Grief, anger, and exhaustion are legitimate responses, not problems to be fixed.
- Care is a practice of justice and a decolonial act

Ubuntu philosophy reminds us: *people thrive when their humanity is centred and belonging is cultivated.*

How do we practice care?

Shared responsibility for care:

Care is not just the role of those holding the conversations, and carrying our reparative work. It is a collective responsibility.

Participants, Facilitators and Organisations are collectively responsible for :

- holding structure, boundaries, and safety
- practising self-awareness, accountability, and care for others
- providing resources and support.

We all actively:

- Interrupt harmful dynamics when they arise
- Share responsibility for holding the space
- Ensure no one person carries disproportionate emotional labour

What this looks like in practice:

- We prepare together for difficult conversations

- We do not rely on Black and Brown people or participants to educate others
- We name and interrupt harm when it occurs.
- We recognise power dynamics and respond to them. Recognising that:
    - Speaking up carries different risks depending on identity and context
    - Some voices are more easily dismissed than others
    - We all ask**:** Who is being heard, and who is not?
- We create conditions where people can engage without being retraumatised, without reinforcing power dynamics
- We are unapologetic in our rejection of all forms of hate

Before Sessions (Preparation)

For those holding conversations:

- Clearly communicate the purpose and emotional nature of the space
- Share expectations and topics in advance
- Provide optional pre-reading or grounding materials where appropriate
- Prepare for predictable resistance and emotional responses
    - Examples of helpful framing: *"I don't think you meant harm, but that landed this way…"*
- Agree co-facilitation and support roles such as Elders where possible/required
- Plan debriefs after sessions

During Meetings/Sessions

1. **Attend to Impact, not just Intent**
    - If something lands uncomfortably, do not assume harm was intended. You can still acknowledge and attend to the impact.
2. **Practise awareness of others and power dynamics**
    - What is being discussed may be distressing or difficult in different ways for individuals.
    - While well intended questions are encouraged they should be gentle and rooted in care
3. **Respect Confidentiality**
    - Share experiences rather than identifiable information.
    - What is said within the meeting is said in the spirit of trust and confidence, specific information about what individuals said need not be taken out of the group.
4. **Take shared responsibility for the space and engage with bravery and care**
    - All participants share responsibility for their own safety and the safety of others.

- We recognise that that we are all on a journey of unlearning and relearning
- We enter discussions with bravery, and hold awareness that others are being brave.
- We gently welcome and sit with the uncertainty and discomfort of healing and repair
- We recognise that our capacity to grow is a commonality we all share

Embedding Care in the Session

The following prompts may be utilised to support embedding care in sessions:

Opening prompts:

- How are you arriving today?
- What do you need from this space to support openness?

Reflective questions to offer participants:

- What am I able to offer this space?
- What am I protecting myself from?
- What am I not seeing?
- What discomfort am I able to stay with?
- What power dynamics are present?

Body awareness:

- What is happening in my body right now?
- What support do I need to stay present?

Making Space for Grief

“Grief is a catalyst that provides the space for us to say: this must change.”
— Lena Thibeh

Grief may arise, especially for those living within the legacies of enslavement. It must be allowed, and respected, not rushed or “fixed.”

Support it by:

- Pausing discussion and holding silence
- Allowing emotion, including tears, without interruption
- Offering apologies where appropriate-without expecting immediate resolution

Practices may include:

- Silence or reflection
- Acknowledgment of ancestors

Holding Tension and Disagreement

- Harm can occur even without malicious intent.
- Naming impact is essential

Those holding the conversations should:

- Acknowledge the harm
- Take breaks where needed
- Be mindful of power and whose voices are heard

We actively ensure:

- Black and Brown participants are not isolated or expected to represent others

After Meetings

We commit to:

- Debriefs and reflection spaces
- Spaces for processing emotional impact
- Peer support

These spaces help us:

- Release tension
- Reflect and learn
- Resource and sustain our engagement

When Researching

Researchers may come across upsetting language, or graphic and emotionally challenging content. These again may have different impacts for different people. Those commissioning research are asked to:

- Offer counselling / therapeutic support that is easily accessible, at no cost.
- Ensure that breaks are taken when needed, especially when engaging with difficult or distressing material.
- If needed seek support from a trusted elder or colleague to process the difficulties of what is being encountered.
- Approach this work with awareness that the content may be graphic or emotionally challenging.
    - Check in with yourself: *Am I able to hold the weight of this today?* If not, consider whether this task can be scheduled for a time when you have greater capacity.

Ongoing Care and Sustainability

Sustainable engagement with reparation and work related to racial and social injustice requires collective care embedded within organisational culture.

Key practices include:

- Peer support networks and emotional validation
- Setting boundaries and rest
- Physical movement and embodied approaches
- Access to trusted Elders and Reparation Working Group members
- Opportunities for retreat and reflection
- Reminding ourselves of incremental change and cultivating joy

Building into how we want to wind up the group/ending and laying down the work

-making space for new relationship, not grief, not 'celebration', memorialisation

Reparation work requires emotional, intellectual, embodied and spiritual engagement.

We affirm that:

- Care is shared
- Justice without care reproduces harm

Care is not separate from reparation work. It is how the work becomes possible.

Practices for sustaining care and resilience:

Below are some suggested practices for sustaining care. They can be used by those holding conversations to support participants to practice self-awareness, accountability, and care for others. They are also useful tools to ground oneself in resilience.

Arrival

- Grounding breathwork
- Prompt: *How am I arriving today?*

Regulation During Sessions

- Pause or silence
- Body check-in: *What is happening for me right now?*

Reflection

Choose 1–2 questions:

- What am I protecting myself from?
- What am I not yet seeing?
- What discomfort can I stay with?

Collective Care Practice

- Pair or group listening
- Witnessing without interruption

Resilience resourcing

Prompt: *What resource can I use to support my ability to stay in discomfort/support my ability to continue with challenging work?*

- Being with ancestors, elders, or community
- Music, Artwork, Poetry, Worship or Prayer
- Accessing nature or the elements (earth, water, fire, air)

Movement Practice

- Walking, stretching, dancing, or shaking to release tension in the body

Closing

- One-word check-out
- Gratitude or intention

Further Resources to Support with Care

To read:

- *Healing Justice Lineages: Dreaming at the Crossroads of Liberation, Collective Care, and Safety* – Cara Page and Erica Woodland
- *White Work and Reparative Genealogy: Reckoning with Ancestral Debt as a Path to Racial Reparations* – Mary Watkins
- *Recovering Racists: Dismantling White Supremacy and Reclaiming our Humanity*- Idelette McVicker
- *Resources from Holding Emotions:*

    - Holding Emotions | London Museum
    - Holding-Emotions-resource-leaflet.pdf
- Resources - The Resilience Project (related to climate anxiety but still useful.)
- *My Grandmother's Hands: Racialized Trauma and the Pathway to Mending Our Hearts and Bodies*- Resmaa Menaken
- *The Racial Healing Handbook*, Anneliese A. Singh
- *Mindful of Race: Transforming racism from the Inside Out,* Ruth King
- Doing nothing is the most important thing my Black body can do for racial justice | by Kelsey Blackwell | Age of Awareness | Medium
- The Arrow | The Movement Within the Movement

To listen:

- Ruby Savage | Deep Listening Set: Piano, Harp & Spiritual Jazz | Grounded 031 - YouTube
- Entek | Deep Listening Set: Qi Gong, Ambient | Grounded 016
- Space Afrika - Somewhere Decent To Live
- Albany State University 2014 Poetry Festival Nikki Giovanni - "Ego Tripping"
- Nina Simone - Feeling Good (Official Video)

To watch:

- The Power of Somatics for Collective Transformation, Healing Justice Ldn
- *How to Have Antiracist Conversations w/ Dr. Roxy Manning*

Esta Nyeko-Lacek

08/09/2026

Paper 2

Peer Support Groups for Historians, Researchers and Journalists

A plan from the Reparation Working Group

Purpose

The RWG's Care Plan for Researchers commits to proactive, institution-led support for the people doing the work of uncovering Quaker involvement in enslavement and colonialism — historians, archivists, genealogists, and others working in this space, whether Quaker or not. Counselling and pastoral check-ins address individual need. They do not, on their own, address something else this work produces: the experience of carrying historical and racial

material largely alone, without others who are doing the same work and understand what it costs without having it explained.

This plan sets out two peer support groups, run online, for academics, journalists, archivists and others researching or writing about enslavement, colonialism and racial history: one for people of European origin, and one for Black, Brown and Indigenous People of Colour (BBIPOC). Each is a confidential space to unburden, in the company of people who share enough of the relevant experience that nothing has to be justified or explained from the ground up.

Why Two Separate Groups

This design follows established practice for racial affinity groups (sometimes called racial caucusing), widely used across education, the non-profit sector and racial justice organising. The consistent finding across that practice is that a single mixed space cannot serve both purposes well: people of colour need room to address the impact of racism and racialised work without having to manage or educate others while doing so, and people of European origin need their own space to do the internal work of understanding their own positioning, rather than asking people of colour to provide that education, which becomes its own form of unpaid labour.

Separating the groups is therefore not a hierarchy of need. Both groups are responding to a real toll; the toll is different in kind, and each group is better able to do its own work without the other in the room.

Who the Invitation Is For

Open to anyone whose work involves researching, writing about, archiving, or reporting on enslavement, colonialism, or racial history — whether or not they are Quaker, and whether or not they have any current connection to the RWG's commissioned work. This includes, but is not limited to:

- Academic and independent historians
- Journalists and documentary researchers
- Archivists and genealogists
- Community and family historians working without institutional affiliation
- Museum, heritage and faith-body staff engaged in equivalent work

Other churches and faith bodies undertaking comparable historical reckoning may be invited to put their own researchers and historians forward to attend, on the same confidential basis as Quaker attendees. Extending the invitation this way also means the group is not so small, or so identifiable, that confidentiality becomes harder to hold.

How It Works

Format and frequency

Both groups meet online. Each group sets its own meeting frequency — between once a quarter and once every six months — according to what its own members find sustainable; there is no requirement that the two groups meet on the same schedule. Sessions begin in

summer or autumn 2026, with the exact start date set once initial sign-up for each group is confirmed.

Confidentiality

Sessions are fully confidential. Following established affinity-group practice, no minutes, recordings, or attendee-identifying notes are kept. What is shared in the room stays there. The RWG will ask facilitators only for aggregate, non-identifying information — broad themes, approximate attendance, whether the format is working — to inform how the groups continue, never anything that could be traced back to an individual or what they said.

Facilitation

Each group has its own facilitator, who is a participant or peer within that group, not someone in a position of authority over attendees' work or funding — consistent with established guidance that affinity-group facilitators should not also supervise or evaluate the people in the room. Facilitation can rotate between willing members or be held by one person on an ongoing basis, whichever the group prefers; where a facilitator takes on this role consistently, the RWG will offer a stipend in recognition of that work, in keeping with the Principles of Engagement's wider commitment to paying for labour rather than relying on goodwill.

What sessions are for

Sessions are not training, supervision, or a venue for sharing research findings. They exist to let people unburden: to talk about the toll of the work, the difficult material encountered, and what it is like to carry that without needing to first explain to the room why it is difficult. Structure is kept light — a loose agenda rather than a fixed curriculum — so the conversation can go where the group needs it to go.

How This Sits Alongside the Care Plan

These groups are a complement to, not a replacement for, the individual professional counselling and pastoral support already committed to in the Care Plan. Counselling addresses what an individual needs; peer support addresses something counselling alone cannot — the isolation of being the only person in a room who has read what you have read. The two are offered together, and attending one does not require attending the other.

Next Steps

- Identify and confirm an initial facilitator for each group –AM for European origin, MRJ for BBIPOC
- Circulate the invitation to RWG contacts, partner faith bodies, and relevant academic, archival and journalistic networks: ENL
- Confirm a start date for each group once initial interest is gathered, targeting summer or autumn 2026.
- Check in with each facilitator after the first one or two sessions to confirm the format is working, and adjust frequency or structure as needed.

Marghuerita Remi-Judah

08/09/2026

Paper 3

Principles of Engagement and Care Plan Policy

Introduction and Preamble

In recent years, universities, faith bodies, archives, museums and heritage organisations have increasingly commissioned historical research into their own institutional links to enslavement, colonialism, and systemic racism. This work matters, and it is right that it is being done. But there is something uncomfortable that institutions commissioning it have not, on the whole, faced honestly: research into historical exploitation is too often itself carried out through arrangements that echo the very inequalities it sets out to expose — unequal pay by location or credential, informal contracts that depend on a researcher already knowing how to ask for better terms, and a near-total silence about what sustained exposure to records of violence and dehumanisation actually costs the people doing the reading.

This policy exists because that gap needs closing on its own terms, not only because closing it happens to be good practice. An institution cannot credibly commission an account of how it failed to treat people with dignity in the past while failing, in the present, to pay fairly, contract clearly, and care properly for the people uncovering that history. The two parts that follow — principles of engagement covering pay, contracts and language, and a care plan addressing the psychological and professional cost of this work — are offered as one connected ethical position, not two separate concerns.

It is also true, and worth naming plainly, that getting this wrong carries practical consequences for an institution as well as a moral one. Leaving researcher wellbeing to informal goodwill rather than institutional process is a recognised gap in duty of care, not a neutral default. Who is paid, recognised, and given a voice in this work shapes whose account of the institution's history gets told, which bears directly on how credible and complete that account will be. And research into historical complicity is conducted in public view; an institution that commissions it through arrangements it would not want examined alongside the history itself is taking on a risk it does not need to take. None of this is the reason to adopt this policy. It is, however, a reason adopting institutions may find it easier to act on the ethical case once it is in front of them.

This document is offered as a living template, not a finished or final text. Institutions adopting it are encouraged to adapt its contracting language to their own legal and regional context, to implement it according to their own capacity — the language and care commitments cost nothing to adopt even where budgets are constrained — and to review its operation at the end of every project against the documented experience of the researchers it is meant to protect.

This policy does not constitute legal advice, and adopting institutions should have their own contracting templates and employment arrangements reviewed by qualified counsel in their own jurisdiction before relying on them.

Principles of Engagement and Care Plan for Historical Research

A Proposed Policy

Prepared for consideration and adoption by institutions commissioning historical research into enslavement and colonial complicity

This policy sets out principles of engagement for commissioning historical research into institutional involvement in enslavement and colonialism, and a care plan for the researchers who carry out that work. It is offered for adoption by any institution undertaking or commissioning such research — faith bodies, universities, archives, museums and heritage organisations among them — and is structured in two parts: principles governing contracts, pay and language; and a care framework addressing the documented psychological and professional costs of this work.

The policy is offered as a basis for discernment and adaptation, not as a finished or final text. Institutions adopting it are encouraged to review its operation periodically against the experience of the researchers it is meant to protect.

Part One: Principles of Engagement

Who is supported, paid and credited to research this history is not a separate question from what that history says. Those who draft history draft memory: who is in the room, and on what terms, shapes what is found, what is asked, and what is judged worth recording. This is not a marginal concern for the discipline. The Royal Historical Society's 2018 report, *Race, Ethnicity & Equality in UK History*, based on a survey of 737 UK-based historians, found that History was, by its own account, "one of the 'Whitest' subject areas in UK Higher Education" at every level: 89% White among Historical & Philosophical Studies (H&PS) students overall, against 77.3% White across all UK subjects combined, and 96.1% White among UK-national academic staff. A policy on who is paid and recognised to research enslavement and colonial complicity is therefore also a policy about whose account of that history is most likely to be produced, and whose is most likely to be treated as supplementary or unpaid — a point one survey respondent put directly:

"we need to have constructive debates about [race], on a regular basis, with BME people in the room — but BME people in discussions about race need at least to be paid and empowered; they cannot be a token or be expected to do the work of explaining for free."

This policy treats that testimony as directly applicable to the engagement of historians, not only to internal departmental discussion: the same principle — payment and empowerment rather than token, unpaid contribution — should govern who is commissioned to research this history and on what terms.

1. Pay determined by the work, not by the location or institution of the researcher

A recurring pattern in international development and humanitarian research is documented in the consultancy literature: researchers based in lower-income countries, disproportionately researchers of colour, are routinely contracted at lower day rates than researchers from the same field based in higher-income countries, with location — rather than the complexity or value of the work — setting the price. Scoping reviews of decolonising practice in research partnerships describe this as part of a wider pattern in which local and community expertise is structurally excluded from governance and design, leaving it "devalued" relative to externally credentialed expertise even where it is the knowledge a project most depends on.

Funders and research bodies that have confronted this pattern directly converge on broadly the same response. UKCDR and ESSENCE's *Four Approaches to Supporting Equitable Research Partnerships* (2022) calls on funders and institutions to shift "attitudes to what constitutes value in research partnerships" and to take "a more holistic approach to equity" when partnership and pay arrangements are negotiated. Wellcome's grant conditions go further, stating explicitly that funded partnerships should "take account of the power dynamics between higher and lower resource settings," whether the disparity is international or within a single country. The Council on Health Research for Development (COHRED) reaches a similar conclusion from the contracting side, having found through its own surveys that institutions with less developed legal capacity "often disadvantage" the less-resourced partner in negotiation — the same imbalance this policy seeks to prevent in commissioning historians.

Decolonial research scholarship sets out the underlying critique these frameworks respond to. Linda Tuhiwai Smith's *Decolonizing Methodologies* (1999) traces how Western research practice has historically extracted knowledge, labour and data from colonised and indigenous communities while reserving authorship, interpretation and credit for externally-credentialed researchers — what other scholars in the same tradition have termed "helicopter research," arriving, extracting, and leaving without return or accountability to the community studied. Communities subjected to this pattern have, in some cases, responded by setting their own binding terms. The San Code of Research Ethics (2017), developed by the South African San Institute and South African San Council, requires researchers seeking to work with San communities to submit a compensation proposal for community approval and to secure community agreement before any findings are published — placing control over both the terms of payment and the terms of publication with the community itself, rather than leaving either to the researcher's or institution's discretion. This policy does not propose replicating the San Code's formal approval process, which was designed for a specific community's relationship to its own history; it cites the Code as a model of what community control over the terms of research can look like in practice.

This policy proposes that pay be set by the nature and complexity of the task — archival depth required, sensitivity of the material, time pressure, expected output — and applied consistently regardless of the researcher's location, institutional affiliation, or employment status.

2. Equal recognition for community and academic expertise

Research into community-university history partnerships has identified a recurring hierarchy between academic and community-held knowledge, and has proposed frameworks — such as the Common Cause principles developed from research at the University of Bristol, now applied in community history partnerships including the University of Oxford's — explicitly designed "to respect and honour the knowledge, contributions and time of community historians alongside that of academics, in order to break down hierarchies and divisions within historical knowledge exchange." That such frameworks have needed to be created and explicitly stated is itself evidence that the underlying hierarchy is recognised across the sector, not particular to any one institution.

Separately, the discipline of history shows a documented pattern of racial underrepresentation and discrimination, set out in the Royal Historical Society's report quoted above: only 3.9% of UK-national academic historians are from Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) backgrounds, and 29.8% of BME survey respondents reported having directly experienced discrimination or abuse on the basis of race or ethnicity, compared with 9.5% of all respondents. The same report records BME staff being expected to perform unpaid "emotional labour" explaining race-related issues to colleagues, and survey respondents explicitly calling for this work to be paid rather than treated as a favour. This context is relevant to any policy on engaging historians: a profession in which Black and ethnic minority scholars are underrepresented, report high rates of discrimination, and report being expected to explain race-related history and experience without pay, is not a neutral backdrop against which decisions about whose expertise is paid, and whose is treated as voluntary, can be made without scrutiny.

This policy proposes that formal qualifications and institutional affiliation should not, on their own, determine pay; and that lived experience, family or community history, and informally-held archival knowledge should be recognised and remunerated as a form of expertise in their own right, on the same basis as academic credentials.

3. A single, fair contract template

This policy proposes that every historian engaged by an adopting institution be offered a written contract from a single, standard template, setting out scope, timeline, payment terms, ownership of the resulting work, and credit. Reliance on informal or verbal arrangements creates risk that protection depends on a researcher's existing familiarity with professional norms — itself unevenly distributed — rather than on institutional policy applied equally.

Most historians engaged for project-based research will hold a contract for services (as independent contractors, freelancers or consultants) rather than a contract of service (as employees), and the relevant guidance differs accordingly. ACAS's guidance on written and verbally agreed terms sets out which terms of any working relationship should be recorded in writing rather than left to informal understanding; CIPD draws the same distinction between a "contract of service," which carries statutory written-statement obligations, and a "contract for services," which does not,

but for which a clear written agreement remains good practice precisely because the statutory floor does not apply. This policy treats that absence of a statutory minimum as a reason for institutions to set their own clear standard, not as a reason to do without a written contract.

4. Consistent, humanising language

This reasoning is not unique to this policy. The Society of American Archivists' Description Section, in its guidance on inclusive archival description, recommends that archivists "make every effort to describe individuals using the terminology they use to describe themselves and their communities," explicitly naming the shift from "slave" to "enslaved" as a case in point. The US National Park Service's editorial style guide, which follows the Chicago Manual of Style, gives the underlying rationale directly: "Enslaved acknowledges the dignity of a human being; slave is a non-person, property." This policy treats that same rationale as applying with equal force to how institutions describe the people they commission to do the research, not only to the historical subjects of that research.

Where terms such as "amateur" are used to describe unpaid or informally-engaged researchers, this policy proposes that institutions name the actual employment status plainly, rather than using descriptive language that may also serve, intentionally or not, to justify unequal pay or recognition.

Part Two: Care Plan for Researchers

Fair pay and contracting terms address one dimension of risk to researchers. A second, distinct dimension concerns the psychological and professional cost of sustained engagement with archival material documenting violence, enslavement and dehumanisation. This part sets out a proposed care framework grounded in existing evidence from archival and trauma research.

1. The evidence base for researcher harm

The underlying clinical concept predates the archival-specific studies cited below and is well established. Pearlman and Saakvitne's foundational study, *Trauma and the Therapist* (1995), defines vicarious traumatization as a lasting "transformation in the inner experience" of a professional that results from sustained empathic engagement with someone else's trauma material. Figley's parallel body of work on secondary traumatic stress and compassion fatigue summarises the same finding in a single line: "there is a cost to caring." Bride, Radey and Figley's subsequent work on measuring compassion fatigue (2007) operationalised these effects for assessment in professional settings, providing the methodological basis later archival and research-specific studies have built on. This policy treats vicarious trauma not as a novel concern specific to this research, but as a long-recognised occupational risk to which engagement with enslavement-era records is a particular, and particularly intense, instance.

Vicarious and secondary trauma among professionals who engage closely with records or testimony of suffering is well documented in the more recent clinical and archival literature too, with effects described as capable of being "disruptive and

painful” and persisting “for months or years.” In the UK heritage sector specifically, the Archives and Records Association has identified vicarious trauma and emotional wellbeing as “a major risk factor for people working with archives and records” and has commissioned dedicated work on its impact on the archival workforce. A qualitative study of archivists working with traumatic records described participants as experiencing “shock, intrusive thoughts, profound senses of anger, sadness and despair, and ultimately at times disrupted functioning in personal and occupational spheres,” framing archivists as “co-witnesses” to the material they hold. Archivists who have worked directly on records connected to reparations processes — including, in Australia, government records relating to an Aboriginal trust fund repayment scheme — have written from direct professional experience about the particular weight of working with records intended for reparative use.

Wright and Laurent’s framework for “trauma-informed archival practice” (2021) makes the institutional case explicitly, arguing that organisations — not individual archivists or researchers — bear responsibility for recognising trauma risk and building safety, collaboration and empowerment into how records are accessed and described. Their subsequent international survey for the International Council on Archives found that 87% of respondents believed people can experience trauma when consulting archives, 68% had themselves been exposed to content they found distressing or traumatic, and 92% had never been taught about any of this as part of their professional training — a gap this policy’s proactive, institution-led approach to support is designed to close, rather than leaving researchers to encounter the risk for the first time once they are already exposed to it.

This evidence base supports a working assumption that the psychological cost of this research is not evenly distributed among researchers. The literature on empathic engagement suggests personal and identity-based proximity to the subject matter of records materially affects the nature of an individual’s response to them. A care policy should therefore be designed on the assumption that need will vary, rather than offering uniform provision irrespective of a researcher’s relationship to the material.

2. Proactive professional and pastoral support

This policy proposes that institutions fund access to professional counselling support for every historian engaged on this work, offered proactively at the outset of a contract rather than only on request, and continuing for a reasonable period after the contract ends. Alongside professional counselling, institutions are encouraged to provide pastoral support distinct from clinical provision — a named point of contact whose role includes welfare check-ins separate from deliverables and deadlines. The archival literature reviewed above indicates that institutional acknowledgement of risk, rather than informal or ad hoc support, is associated with better-recognised and better-managed outcomes for affected staff.

3. A shared mechanism for content and trigger warnings

This policy proposes a standing mechanism, agreed in advance of any presentation of findings, by which content involving graphic violence, sexual violence, or the

deaths of children is flagged by the researcher as part of submitting their work, and a standard form of warning is attached to the relevant material before public presentation. This shifts the responsibility for judging what warning is necessary away from the presenter alone, at the point of delivery, and onto an agreed institutional process.

A systematic review of content and trigger warnings across sectors found their effectiveness contested: some evidence indicates they support informed choice and preparedness, while other evidence suggests they may increase anxiety or reinforce trauma as central to identity, particularly in educational contexts. This policy does not present warnings as a proven mitigation of audience distress. It proposes them as an institutional courtesy and a shared responsibility, removing from the individual researcher the burden of making that judgement alone.

4. Protection against online harassment

Researchers publishing findings on race, enslavement and institutional complicity are exposed to a recognised risk of online harassment, a risk not evenly distributed across researchers. Evidence from adjacent public-facing professions makes the disparity explicit. UNESCO and the International Center for Journalists' global study of online violence against women journalists found that 81% of Black respondents had experienced online violence, against 64% of white respondents — a gap the study attributes to the way online abuse compounds along lines of race, religion and sexuality rather than affecting a uniform public figure. A peer-reviewed study of online harassment of academics similarly finds that "female scholars, sexual and racialized minorities, and precarious researchers are the most likely target of online attacks." This policy treats that disparity as a reason to assess risk individually rather than assume a single, race-neutral baseline of exposure.

This policy proposes that institutions offer practical guidance and, where appropriate, direct support on protecting a researcher's online presence before findings are published under their name — including review of publicly available personal information, guidance on account security and privacy settings, and a clear, responsive point of contact if harassment occurs. Institutions do not need to build this guidance from scratch. The American Historical Association maintains a published guide for historians contending with online harassment, recognising historians as a profession exposed to this risk and recommending, among other resources, PEN America's practical "Digital Safety Snacks" series. Amnesty International's Security Lab separately maintains a freely available Digital Security Resource Hub, developed for human rights defenders, journalists and other civil society members at heightened risk of online attack, which institutions without in-house digital security expertise may also draw on directly. This policy proposes adapting and signposting existing resources of this kind, rather than each institution developing equivalent guidance independently. Because individual circumstances and risk profiles vary, this policy proposes that institutions assess each researcher's needs individually in advance of publication, rather than relying on a single fixed protocol applied uniformly.

5. Periodic review

This policy proposes that adopting institutions review its operation at the conclusion of each commissioned piece of research, seeking feedback directly from the researcher on whether pay was fair, support was substantively available rather than merely offered, and warning mechanisms functioned as intended. This policy should be treated as subject to revision in light of that feedback, rather than as a fixed or final document.

Statistics Cited in This Policy

Finding	Figure	Source
BME representation among UK-national academic historians	3.9%	Royal Historical Society, Race, Ethnicity & Equality in UK History (2018), primary report, p.43, Fig. 2.b.1.2
White students, Historical & Philosophical Studies (H&PS), all UK student cohorts	89%	Royal Historical Society (2018), primary report, p.36, Fig. 2.a.5.1 — compared with 77.3% White across all UK subjects combined
BME historians reporting direct experience of racial discrimination or abuse	29.8%	Royal Historical Society survey (737 respondents), primary report (2018), p.50
All respondents (any background) reporting direct experience of discrimination or abuse	9.5%	Royal Historical Society (2018), primary report, p.50
UK archaeology and heritage staff identifying as white (paid staff)	97–99.2%	Aitchison & Rocks-Macqueen (2013); Zeder (1998), cited in White & Draycott (2020), Bulletin of the History of Archaeology
Heritage sector pilot workforce diversity study respondents identifying as white	90%	Historic England pilot workforce diversity study, reported in Museums + Heritage (2025)

Note: these figures are drawn from secondary reporting of named primary surveys and studies; institutions adopting this policy are encouraged to consult primary

sources directly where decisions of consequence rest on them. The heritage workforce figures above describe paid staff and pilot survey respondents; comparable, race-disaggregated data on volunteer composition specifically was not identified during this research and should not be assumed from the figures shown.

Research Sources

- ACAS, ‘Written or verbally agreed terms’, Employment contracts and the law, acas.org.uk.
- Aloudat, T. and Khan, T. (2022) ‘Decolonising humanitarianism or humanitarian aid?’, PLOS Global Public Health. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pgph.0000179.
- American Historical Association, ‘Guide for Contending with Online Harassment’, historians.org.
- Amnesty International Security Lab, ‘Digital Security Resource Hub for Civil Society’, securitylab.amnesty.org.
- Archives and Records Association (UK & Ireland), consultancy brief: ‘The impact of spontaneous collecting on the mental wellbeing of the record keeping workforce’, ARA (UK & Ireland), LinkedIn.
- Bride, B.E., Radey, M. and Figley, C.R. (2007) ‘Measuring Compassion Fatigue’, Clinical Social Work Journal, 35, pp.155–163. DOI: 10.1007/s10615-007-0091-7.
- Centre for Community History, University of Oxford, ‘Reflections on Community History’, communityhistory.ox.ac.uk — reference to Common Cause principles developed from University of Bristol research.
- Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development (CIPD), ‘Contracts of Employment’ and ‘Terms and conditions of employment’ factsheets, cipd.org.
- Council on Health Research for Development (COHRED) (2012) Where There Is No Lawyer: Guidance for Fairer Contract Negotiation in Collaborative Research Partnerships.
- Figley, C.R. (1995) Compassion Fatigue: Coping with Secondary Traumatic Stress Disorder in Those Who Treat the Traumatized. New York: Brunner/Mazel.
- Historic England pilot workforce diversity study, reported in Museums + Heritage, ‘Historic England launches survey of diversity in heritage volunteering’ (2025).
- Impact Consulting Hub, ‘Fees, fees, fees: How much can I charge as an independent consultant?’ (2022) — on local vs. international consultant day rates.
- Indigenous Archives Collective, ‘Working with Records of Trauma: A Reflection’, indigenousarchives.net (2020), on archival work connected to the NSW Aboriginal Trust Fund Repayment Scheme.

- International Center for Journalists and UNESCO, Posetti, J. et al. (2021) The Chilling: Global Trends in Online Violence Against Women Journalists, Research Discussion Paper.
- Le, T. et al. (2023) ‘Digital vulnerabilities and online harassment of academics, consequences, and coping strategies: an exploratory analysis’, Studies in Higher Education / cited via Taylor & Francis Online, DOI: 10.1080/14680777.2023.2281268.
- London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine, ‘Dismantling colonial legacies: Decolonising research and teaching at the Health in Humanitarian Crises Centre’, NCBI/PMC (PMC12286357).
- Museums Association, ‘Report shows lack of racial diversity in the heritage sector’ (Jan 2025).
- National Park Service (US), Harpers Ferry Center Editorial Style Guide, nps.gov — based on the Chicago Manual of Style.
- Pearlman, L.A. and Saakvitne, K.W. (1995) Trauma and the Therapist: Countertransference and Vicarious Traumatization in Psychotherapy with Incest Survivors. New York: W.W. Norton.
- PEN America, ‘Digital Safety Snacks’, pen.org.
- Regehr, C., Duff, W., Aton, H. and Sato, C. (2022) “‘Humans and records are entangled”: empathic engagement and emotional response in archivists’, Archival Science. DOI: 10.1007/s10502-022-09392-5.
- Rose, S. et al., systematic review of content and trigger warnings across sectors, NCBI/PMC (PMC9067675).
- Royal Historical Society, Atkinson, H., Bardgett, S., Budd, A., Finn, M., Kissane, C., Qureshi, S., Saha, J., Siblon, J. and Sivasundaram, S. (2018) Race, Ethnicity & Equality in UK History: A Report and Resource for Change. London: Royal Historical Society.
- Society of American Archivists, Description Section, ‘Inclusive Description’ resource list, www2.archivists.org.
- South African San Institute and South African San Council (2017) The San Code of Research Ethics.
- Tuhiwai Smith, L. (1999) Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples. London: Zed Books.
- UKCDR and ESSENCE on Health Research (2022) Four Approaches to Supporting Equitable Research Partnerships.
- Wellcome, ‘Equity, Diversity and Inclusion Policy’, Funding Guidance, wellcome.org.

- White, W. and Draycott, C. (2020), cited in ‘Special Issue: Inequality and Race in the Histories of Archaeology’, Bulletin of the History of Archaeology, citing Aitchison & Rocks-Macqueen (2013) and Zeder (1998).
- Williamson, E., Gregory, A., Abrahams, H., Aghtaie, N., Walker, S-J. and Hester, M. (2020) ‘Secondary Trauma: Emotional Safety in Sensitive Research’, Journal of Academic Ethics. DOI: 10.1007/s10805-019-09348-y.
- Wright, K. and Laurent, N. (2021) ‘Safety, Collaboration, and Empowerment: Trauma-Informed Archival Practice’, Archivaria, 91, pp.38–73.

Addendum: Modular Implementation Checklist

This checklist translates the policy above into practical steps for project managers, HR teams and steering committees, organised by project phase. Each step is marked with an implementation level — Foundational, Recommended, or Exemplary — reflecting the resourcing it typically requires, not a certification or compliance standard. There is no external body verifying adoption against this checklist; it is a self-assessment tool for an institution’s own use, and the levels are a guide to sequencing, not a badge to claim publicly.

Phase 1: Project Scoping and Pre-Contracting

Step 1.1 — Standardise the contract template

- [Foundational] A single, written contract template (for services or of service, as applicable) is used, rather than informal or verbal agreements.
- [Foundational] Scope of work, timeline, ownership of the resulting work, and credit are set out explicitly in the contract.

Step 1.2 — Review the pay scale for equity

- [Recommended] Pay is set by task complexity, archival depth and time pressure, not by the researcher’s location or institutional affiliation.
- [Recommended] Community historians and researchers contributing lived or family expertise are paid on the same basis as formally credentialed researchers doing comparable work.

Step 1.3 — Adopt consistent, humanising language

- [Foundational] Project briefs, press releases and internal communications use dignity-affirming language (for example, “enslaved person” rather than “slave”).
- [Foundational] Employment status is named accurately (independent contractor, freelancer, salaried researcher); “amateur” is not used as a substitute for naming someone’s actual status.

Phase 2: Active Research and Care

Step 2.1 — Offer proactive psychological and pastoral support

- [Exemplary] Funded access to professional, confidential counselling is arranged at the outset of the contract.
- [Exemplary] Support is offered proactively at the start of the contract, not only on request after distress has already arisen.
- [Foundational] A named, non-clinical point of contact carries out scheduled welfare check-ins kept separate from deliverables and deadlines.

Step 2.2 — Establish a content warning mechanism

- [Foundational] A standard, pre-agreed mechanism lets the researcher flag material involving graphic violence, sexual violence, or the deaths of children as part of submitting their findings.
- [Foundational] The institution, not the individual researcher, takes responsibility for attaching the agreed warning to public-facing material before it is presented.

Phase 3: Pre-Publication and Project Conclusion

Step 3.1 — Carry out digital security measures

- [Foundational] An individual digital risk assessment is discussed with the researcher before findings on enslavement or colonial history are published under their name.
- [Foundational] The researcher is given practical guidance on account and privacy security, drawing on existing resources such as Amnesty International's Security Lab Digital Security Resource Hub, the American Historical Association's harassment guide, or PEN America's Digital Safety Snacks, rather than the institution building equivalent guidance from scratch.
- [Exemplary] Institutional IT or communications staff actively assist with reducing the researcher's public digital footprint and act as a responsive point of contact if harassment occurs.

Step 3.2 — Carry out the periodic review

- [Foundational] A post-project conversation is scheduled with the researcher once final work is submitted.
- [Foundational] Honest feedback, without penalty, is sought on whether pay was fair, support was substantively available, and warning mechanisms worked — and is used to revise the policy for the next project.

Implementation Levels: A Guide, Not a Certification

The table below describes what each level represents. It is a guide for an institution's own planning and sequencing, not a status that can be verified by an outside body or claimed as a public certification; no such certifying body exists for this policy.

Level	What It Involves	What It Reflects
Foundational	Written contracts, humanising language, content warning mechanism, digital security guidance, post-project review.	Low- or no-cost steps an institution of any size can put in place immediately.
Recommended	Foundational steps, plus pay set strictly by task complexity rather than location or credential.	Requires institutional will to standardise pay practice; mainly a policy change rather than a budget increase.
Exemplary	Recommended steps, plus funded proactive counselling and active institutional digital security support.	Requires dedicated budget and staff time; represents the fullest version of the care this policy describes.

An institution operating at the Foundational level throughout has still met every cost-free commitment this policy describes; reaching Recommended or Exemplary levels is a matter of institutional capacity and will, not a precondition for adopting the policy in good faith.

Proposed for adoption by institutions commissioning historical research into enslavement and colonial complicity.

Marghuerita Remi-Judah
08/09/2026

Paper 6

Draft 2027 Budget

Expected Expenditure

Category	Activity / Description	Estimated Cost
Staff Expenses	Staff support for the Reparation Working Group through to the end of 2027.	**£3,750**
Yearly Meeting Attendance	Travel, accommodation and subsistence costs for Reparation	**£7,564 to £8,464**

	Working Group (RWG) representatives attending Yearly Meetings. Attendance at any of the four Yearly Meetings scheduled for 2027 may be required, subject to the agenda and any expectation that the Reparation Working Group participates in reparations-related business. *General meeting costs are estimated at £905 to £1,205 per meeting. Attendance at the residential Yearly Meeting in Hull (24 to 28 July 2027) may incur additional accommodation and subsistence costs of up to £3,120, depending on the number of RWG representatives attending and the duration of their stay.*	*These estimates are based on current assumptions regarding travel, accommodation and subsistence costs. Actual expenditure will depend on the number of representatives required to attend, attendance expectations, and final travel and accommodation arrangements.*
RWG Residential (December 2027)	Travel expenses, accommodation (where required), venue hire and meeting room costs (depending on location).	**~£2000**
Workshops and Conferences	March 2027 weekend gathering (subject to Area Meeting funding decisions) and proposed Yorkshire-based conference. Estimated at £35 to £200 per person.	**£140 to £800**
Honoraria	Honoraria for individuals invited to participate in, advise on, or otherwise contribute to the work of the Reparation Working Group.	**£8000**
Communications	Communications support, where the comms team is required to engage external support including editing of recordings, production of publications and resources, and image licensing or creation where necessary.	**£1000**
Total Expected Expenditure		**£22,454 to £24,014** **(The range reflects varying attendance and accommodation requirements for Yearly Meeting events.)**

Budget Position

- **£3,000** remains from the current budget allocation.
- A further **£19,454 to £21,014** of the proposed additional **£60,000** would be required to meet the anticipated core expenditure set out above.
- The **Total Expected Expenditure (£22,454 to £24,014)** represents anticipated core costs through to the end of 2027 and excludes items listed under **Potential Expenditure** below

.

Potential Expenditure

Category	Activity / Description	Estimated Cost
Additional Conference	Provision for a future conference following the October conference, when costs become clearer.	**TBC (~£10,000)**
Peer Support Facilitator	Engaging an external facilitator to run peer support group for those engaging in Reparation work as agreed as part of the care plan by the Reparation Working Group.	**~£5000**
Woodbrooke On-Demand Courses	Production of on-demand learning on topics including Quaker history, theology, eldership and spiritual accompaniment, care and pastoral support, and other relevant topics.	**~£5,000 per course** **~1000 plus production, editing and advertising costs**
Barbados Research	Research relating to Barbados, including review of primary source material supplied by the University of the West Indies , if progressed.	**~£10,000**
Total Potential Expenditure (excluding Woodbrooke courses)		**~ £25,000**
Total Potential Expenditure (including one Woodbrooke course)		**~ £31,000+**

Potential expenditure totals are indicative only. The final amount will depend on decisions regarding the development and number of Woodbrooke on-demand courses and any associated production, editing and promotional costs.

Additional Spending outside our budget

Shadow Advisory Board	**If the Reparation Working Group agree to proceed with engaging a Shadow Advisory Board, provision would need to be made to offer payment for their time and contribution.** **This could include payment for the following sessions:** • **A briefing session with the co-clerks.** • **A session with a Trustee representative.** • **A session for the Shadow Advisory Board to meet independently, consider its Terms of Reference, and plan future meetings. The Terms of Reference have not yet been developed or agreed with Trustees.**	**~£10,000**

Total of Expected and potential expenditure: £53,454-£55,014

Yearly Meeting Dates (2027)*

Date	Event	Location
20 February 2027	Yearly Meeting	London
1 May 2027	Yearly Meeting	London
24 to 28 July 2027	Residential Yearly Meeting (Book of Discipline focus)	Hull
20 November 2027	Yearly Meeting	London

* It is worth noting that it has not yet been determined which Yearly Meetings members of the Reparation Working Group will be expected or invited to attend.

Esta Nyeko-Lacek

16/09/2026

Paper 8

BYM Trustees' Reparation Working Group
Historical Research Workstream
Meeting held on Thursday 30 July by Zoom at 14.00
Notes

We began our meeting with worship.

2026.07.01 Updates

a. **RWG Conference Truth and Repair: Our Quaker Journey Towards Justice** 23 October at Friends House and on.
We heard that Woodbrooke are managing the registration process and all Friends involved as speakers or in any other capacity will need to register.
https://www.quaker.org.uk/events/truth-and-repair-our-quaker-journey-towards-justice
The programme is agreed and will be shared with all members of the HRW.

b. **Sweetness and Sin Combined**. This research is a compilation of the published research into the history of the Quaker chocolate companies. It includes the voices of Africans which is often missing from our research. Validating information contained in the research has been enabled by the University of Berkeley.

c. **How the gaps in our research on Barbados, Jamaica, Ghana and Kenya are being addressed**. The same AI process has been undertaken to develop drafts of early Quaker presence in Barbados and Jamaica. We are approaching Dr Sonjah Stanley Niaah Director of the University of the West Indies Centre for Reparation Research to review these documents.

We are reminded that Lucy St Smith is working on the archive at Swarthmoor Hall and there are significant connections with Barbados.

Kenyan research looking at the way British Quaker missions were established is being undertaken by Osca Malande a Kenyan Quaker doctoral graduate. He has been supported by the BYM Archivists to find information in the archive at Friends House but has not been able to look at everything as it is not yet catalogued. The result of Oscar's research will be used to help the RWG open conversations with Kenyan Friends. We thank the Archivist Team for supporting this research.

We heard that it has not yet been possible to appoint an archivist to scope the part of the BYM archive which is still in boxes.

d. **The letter in the Friend 30 July 2026 questioning the work of the RWG.** We agreed that this letter was helpful in that it helps the RWG to understand some of the concerns they will meet as their work is presented to Yearly Meeting over the next year. The Co-clerks are writing a response, a copy of which will be sent to the members of the Historical Research Workstream.

We heard that abolition is covered in both the book being produced by Bristol Friends and in that of the Lancaster research.

e. **Responding to difficult questions.**
The meeting with the Racial Justice network on difficult questions has produced a document which builds on that developed by Bristol AM for their conference.

f. **Care Plan**.
A Care plan has been developed and is being discerned by the RWG in September. This will go on the hub eventually so that it can be archived. The HRW Friends are invited to send any responses/suggestions for improvement to the plan which will be circulated to them.

It was felt that all of this indicates a need for strong eldership at the conference in October.

It was suggested that a paper should be provided explaining how the international research has been undertaken**.**

2026.07.02 History Cards.
A set of history cards covering the Lancaster research was shared in advance the set includes cards for children under 10. These AI produced cards, checked by the researcher, are intended to be used with meetings wishing further to explore the research undertaken. Local Development Workers may find these helpful when discussing reparation with meetings. Those for the children will also be part of the resources being put together by BYM staff.

It is anticipated that they will have graphics and be printed on card. Whilst the drafts do show an integrated approach to the Lancaster research concern was expressed they might be glib as things do not always connect easily.

Cards are also being produced for the Sheffield and Balby research and that of Bristol. All researchers are welcome to take up this offer.

2026.07.03 Research progress and how our area meetings are responding to the research.
Bristol. After a long Area Meeting an apology developed by the Bristol Reparation Group was accepted with minor changes. It was a difficult meeting and some local meetings had sent in amendments. The minute was partly contradictory as some Friends were discomforted by it recording our pain but not that of those whose lives were destroyed by enslaving. The minute was an accurate record of a meeting that was upsetting to those of us working on the research. We still have a long way to go and it was helpful to hear the concerns about the apology. The next steps Bristol will undertake on this journey will be led by the Reparation Group. One of the 7 Local Meeting in the Bristol AM

has not been involved at all and so the group has no idea of their opinion.

Sheffield & Balby. The Area Meeting has agreed to give 25% of all unrestricted legacies to the BYM Reparation Fund. They have already done this with one big legacy.

Norfolk and Waveney. Teresa shared her research with her new Local Meeting. This had started when she became interested in an 18th century Quaker Nicholas Lucas named in the Hertford and Hitchin Archive. Following his history revealed the founding and governing of West Jersey. The presentation was followed by a frozen silence with Friends not knowing what to say, they moved into worship.

Teresa is wanting the Area Meeting to support her work by accepting that she is acting under concern and, appointing a group of people to provide support as she continues this research.

Central England. Progress is limited by capacity.
It has been necessary to map the Warwickshire AM against the demographics of the current Area Meeting as the structure has changed so much since the 18th century.

Those researching are very conscious of gaps in the research some of which, for example banking, need a national view. The research has covered the large people but we know little of the small people.

5 Local Meetings have been spoken with about the research and 2 are taking up the work. The research is showing how in one person one can find both good and bad the example being Elizabeth Cadbury.

London. London Area Meetings may raise enough money to enable the Quaker banks to be researched. Friends were reminded that both the Lancaster and Bristol research cover the establishment of banks with the profits of enslaving.

The scope of London research is potentially huge. There is a need to look at large Quaker founded organisations. The next stage will be commissioning the research. Friends are invited to speak with Libby Adams about the time frame.

Wandsworth Local Meeting. This research is just in its early stage. The Local Meeting is helpful unofficially. The plan is to hold a meeting for Learning when there is more to report.

Scotland. We heard that Quakers in Scotland are looking to involve Edinburgh University in the research they want to undertake. This arose from a conversation with Central Edinburgh Meeting.

Kenya. Oscar told us of how he had been trying to find more information on the establishment of British Quakers in Kenya in the context of Friends involved in the colonial enterprise. He is taking a break when back in Kenya and then will start to write his report which he plans to send to the RWG in September.

2026.07.04 **November Yearly Meeting.** It was agreed that there is a need for an impactful session to test the water for an apology. The presentation at July Yearly Meeting in Manchester was powerful. The plan is to aim for an acknowledgement of our history in November and to see if YM is ready to ask the RWG to develop a draft apology.

We agreed the need to keep the African voices at the front of anything we do.

We closed in Worship

A doodle poll will be circulated for a meeting in November.

Ann Morgan