

History Dialogue Facilitated Small Group Discussions Report
David Woodger and Colette Ferns
Bluefern Consultancy

Introduction

This report summarises the key themes and points that were shared from nine consultation groups between 3 November and 8 December 2021. There were 63 participants including 8 students, 16 alumni and 39 staff members.

There was a general consensus throughout the consultation groups of the relevance and importance of this review by the History Group within Imperial and this process of reflection and consultation as a valued opportunity to review and align Imperial in becoming an equitable and inclusive organisation. The dialogical process of exploring the recommendations of the History group report drew out of the participants differing personal, professional, political views and beliefs that were often uncomfortable, challenging and rooted in deep experience of injustice and discrimination that offered a reflection for all participants.

There was a desire that these positive dialogues would not be a ‘one off’ exercise as it was seen as an evolving process of examining inequality and racism that needed to be continued. This was felt to be a very positive start of this process. No-one involved in the consultation groups sought to rewrite or change history, they were open to learn and share their thoughts often based on the dialogue within the groups on the best way to respond.

Our approach to writing the report

Recommendations and suggestions included in this report are those specifically emerging from participants within the outlined themes. The authors do not provide any recommendations of their own.

For transparency we have read all the transcriptions and we have summarised the discussions under the following sections and key themes;

Section 1: Principles and Processes

- A. The History Group Report (Page 2)

Section 2: How the College currently recognises and reflects specific individuals/activity

- B. Removal, renaming and developing a museum (Page 5)
- C. Thomas Huxley (Page 13)
- D. Addressing racism and inequality (Page 17)

Section 3: Ideas put forward

- E. Decolonising the curriculum (Page 22)
- F. A Centre for the History of Science Technology and Medicine (Page 24)

Section 4: Wider reflections and suggestions

- G. Reflection on the College name Imperial (Page 26)
- H. Review present partnerships and donors (Page 31)

We have identified key points within these themes. We have not undertaken a proportionate analysis of the participants reflecting majority/minority views, we have sought to reflect each and as many of the participant perspectives as possible. In order to centre and reflect the views of the participants we have included their own words as much as possible.

Section 1: Principles and Processes

A. The History Group Report

The diversity of views, understandings and opinions regarding the History group report recommendations, and suggestions evoked differing responses across the groups. Some welcomed the report and thought its structure, pitch, rigour and recommendations were very useful, whilst others were highly critical of it and were expecting to have an open debate with the authors, more rigorous academic analysis of history and made suggestions of voting across the Imperial community. The outlier voices expressed cynicism and concern with regard the report's recommendations being a 'fait accompli' and raised concerns on the impact this consultation process will have.

There were a range of positive comments related to the report and the process of consultation and dialogue being created across the campus community.

'First of all, I would commend you and the team for the clarity and the structuring of the report. I found it an unusually and refreshingly easy read for this kind of thing, I think it got to the point and it laid the context out very nicely, and broadly I'm comfortable with the recommendations, the logic of them and how they were explained and what they are'.

'I think having this report produced and sharing it with staff and students and having these consultation groups are exactly right. I think personally it's not hiding away because it's out in the open, this report's been well researched, there are these groups where everyone can have their say and it's facilitated by an external person. I think this is part of what needs to happen and it's kind of a question of how to continue this beyond this short little consultation period and beyond what does happen? Some of the recommendations I think are basically great in terms of who has been recognised so far in the institution, it's the people who had the power, and predominantly that's white men, and then the recommendations about the people that haven't been recognised is great because that should really be put to the forefront'.

'I'm here today because I think dialogue is the only way that we can begin to start to reach some sort of conclusion, because there will be a conclusion as far as this is concerned and I sense that whatever that conclusion is nobody's going to be particularly happy, but there will be a conclusion. The hope that I have is that we as a college entity will start to get more comfortable with dialogue, the uncomfortableness around certain types of dialogue, because I think that embedded into Imperial is this real uncomfortableness about being uncomfortable, intellectually a powerhouse, there's no two ways about it, but emotionally this whole thing is about being uncomfortable, hearing somebody else's opposing view, that doesn't sit well and I think it's to the detriment of whatever successes we have at Imperial'.

'I was really impressed with what the History Group are doing, mainly because I think it's a very proactive start. A lot of these movements are often very reactionary, if we look at the Rhodes Must Fall movement in Oxford it's very reactionary, and then you get knee jerk reactions, so seeing that Imperial and a group were coming forward and taking action to try and proactively assess Imperial's legacy and the names of buildings, all the science and Imperial's face when we enter it, I thought that was really encouraging.'

There was certainly a deep feeling of the need to not '*just sweep concerns under the carpet*', to challenge the denial that manifested in various ways.

*'I remember watching this programme. It was a few years ago, on BBC about slavery in the UK and I was completely astonished because it is not taught; you hear a lot about the slave trade in the States and in America, but with the UK it's like, 'No, nothing happened.' Then all the things that have come out about Churchill and how terribly racist he was. Then I read a book *Inglorious Empire* and what the Brits did in India, and that is like a horror story, and it's just all swept under the carpet and there is a nice gloss, it's glossed over. I think one side is that these people are still in denial that the things they did, committed all those years ago, were really bad; they were murdering and thieving, stealing left, right and centre, leaving those countries really poor, and so this is what I would call the 'Imperial State of Mind,' that somehow people think that they are entitled to basically exploit others because they are white, because they are aristocracy, or they have more money, but basically they see some justification in exploiting minorities, maybe people who are not as strong, not as rich, and somehow, they give themselves this moral right to do it, which is completely wrong.'*

The suggested recommendations generated across all the groups a diversity of opinions and a range of emotions and feeling. Participants felt the report could have presented a more in-depth historical analysis of Huxley, given he was one of the founders of Imperial College. This lack of detail and depth drew out deep emotions of frustration anger and criticality. Other references within the report equally drew out anger and concern such as the reference to De La Beche having enlightened views on slavery.

'I'm actually really disappointed when I look at this History Report because the overwhelming impression that I get from it is one which is incredibly superficial and isn't engaging with the very difficult questions in the history of the college. I'm very happy to believe that there was a deeper discussion that went on in the background, but it doesn't come out in the report. Bits of the entries on individuals are cut and pasted from Wikipedia, there are appendices which are hagiographies of people, dwelling only on the best bits without any discussion of do these new people that we want to name things after have problematic aspects about them? What is it about these people? What do they say about the ethos of college? Are these individuals that were deeply associated with Imperial or is this Imperial just trying to appropriate the success of these individuals to try and make the college look good?'

'Another thing that struck me is the methodology with which the report was created. I believe there are plenty of people that have not been considered in it that could have got a sort of recognition and which had a very important role in the college and were not recognised, for example I believe the philosopher Alfred North Whitehead does not have any scholarship or anything named after him at Imperial College, and I didn't understand why such an important philosopher who also collaborated with Bertrand Russell did not enter any recognition.'

'The reference to Henry De La Beche says, "His family wealth came from slavery and De La Beche inherited and ran his father's slave plantation in Jamaica ending in 1830, he held enlightened views as to slavery on the family plantations, abolished whipping and prepared slaves for eventual freedom." I find this kind of shocking because if you own slaves you don't have enlightened views about slavery, you literally own people, and the only people who had enlightened views about slavery were the people who dedicated themselves to fighting it, including enslaved people who fought for their freedom.'

The History Group Report raised a number of questions that it was felt by some participants that were not included; how decisions were made? What criteria was applied? What was the hypothesis being proposed? Was it that to ensure history is not a barrier to building an equitable and inclusive university? If so, can we identify evidence to see if the history of Imperial has presented a barrier? Questions were also raised on definitions and meanings of the terms' equity and inclusivity. This led to queries on what is the population that Imperial is trying to reflect in the goal of inclusivity. Equity of opportunity or equity of outcome. These points were felt to be important to define before testing the hypothesis that the history is a barrier to developing an equitable and inclusive university.

Discussion included whether the rules and standards set out are fixed or changeable, if for example the person identified with a building or statue is no longer worthy of the association with the college and as cultural trends change or new people emerge worthy of association can be included in recognition. Will the process be a static or dynamic process and survive the test of time? This discussion concluded with a proposal for a commission that reviews annually or bi-annually as it was felt it should be a dynamic process.

Who has been involved in this process both the writing of the History group report and those have had time to attend the consultation groups was brought into focus by this participant.

'The emphasis in the report is very much on the scientists and academics and reminding ourselves that we're Imperial College, we're not representing a scientific field, we're representing Imperial College, so that would also include professional staff and PTO or support services because statistically there are just more BAME and women in those jobs as well. I'll be very interested to see how they are making up and how much they have contributed before today, and I think that should be included as well. You can maybe debate there are just more white men because they have these XY opportunities and X, Y and Z at that time and that place, but then I am very curious how the support staff would look at that time'.

This short exchange reflected the differing feelings across the age range of participants;

'You must have seen the number of articles in the newspapers about how absurd Imperial College looks by having a go at Huxley, and amongst my colleagues, they think we look ridiculous. It's not great publicity'.

'I think it looks better to my generation than it does to yours probably'.

The History group report was welcomed in its broad proposals to acknowledge people from marginalised groups, as this reflects the global community Imperial is part of.

'Imperial is very much advertised as an international university, so it isn't just that because you're not from the UK your voice isn't important, international students and staff are important to Imperial and we really laud that as it's an international space, so our history and how it's viewed by international people is also very important, to hear everybody's voice. I was pleasantly surprised by just seeing the lists of names of people from marginalised groups that have done big things in the science and medicine area for the college, and so it was nice to see all those names, but then not surprised by the fact that all of these people are unknown figures and have not been acknowledged and celebrated, so it's nice with those recommendations to bring more people to light, but under the traditional sense of how Imperial celebrate people and recognise people, making sure that all the people that have contributed to Imperial are going to be celebrated and recognised.'

Section 2: How the College currently recognises and reflects specific individuals/activity

A. Removal / Renaming and developing a museum

The overall consensus from the participants within the groups, regarding the recommendations from the History group report was to use the process of reviewing Imperial relationship with the past as a learning educational experience and create changes that reflect contemporary understandings of equality and diversity. The underlying shared point the participants were unified on, was not the rewriting or erasing of History or of the contributions of eminent figures had made but upon a recognition, contextualisation and linkage to the wider experience of Empire and Imperialism

Participants also welcomed this opportunity to express and voice the deeper impact of Imperials historical relationship to Empire and how they relate and engage with this legacy on a daily basis as they travel and participate within and around the college. The views regarding the report's outcome suggestions such as the removal of statutes, bust, and historical artefacts was mixed, the point of consensus was around this consultation process within the College and an opening up of wider participation within decision making.

'Personally, I think that the review is an immensely positive undertaking. It's absolutely right and proper that as a college we all understand our past and we understand the figures that have led to our present. None of them were perfect and we need to understand why they were not perfect, but we also need to remember why they were very good and had for example names of buildings put on them.'

'I think the solution offers a very positive opportunity for education to understand our past, both politically and scientifically, and to use that for the present and to shape the future. I really do strongly believe the answer is not to remove people into what would become some sort of chamber of horrors if one had some special room where we put unwanted busts; we need to explain them, and I think more needs to be done in the whole college to promote scientific history, the history and philosophy of science and the political context in which scientific endeavour took place, and I think that way we will all be better off, and we can use these figures, imperfect as often they were, to improve ourselves.'

The fluidity of the dialogue within the groups gravitated towards exploring the notion of creating value out of the past and opening up an honest reflection upon links with slavery, exploitation, and wealth gained form the subjugation of people and countries.

'My view is that if you remove the evidence, you remove the deed, therefore slavery related objects such as statues and buildings should carry plaques which tell the truth of the links with slavery. In this regard the next statue that should be removed should be that of racism. Teaching this history properly in schools and giving it proper attention in our high institutions of education should help reduce slavery-related racism.' Quote used source Geoffrey Palmer (Chancellor Heriot-Watt University) was used by participant to express their view.

'When we talk about history, we should learn from history, we should never repeat history's mistakes, what we've seen with Beit, what we've seen with Huxley, to name a few, are lessons that we should be teaching ourselves and everybody that's coming through our institution, 'Look, this is what's happened, when you go out into the world with your degree and your career, try and make a difference and make a positive difference. That should be the message.'

'Imperial's relationship with Empire reverberates through my lived daily lived experience and why I am living in the UK. I'm in this country because Britain carved up India and caused a lot of bloodshed, my own grandma remembers the British chopping people's hands off. My family have been directly impacted by racism, by the British Empire. I feel like I'm definitely... I'm really proud of my culture and stuff, but at the end of the day it's impacted my family materially, psychologically, physically. Looking at the broad impact, it's not just a theoretical thing that we can have the debate and be like, 'Oh, we can just separate race and we can separate science,' these things are all interlinked. I agree there are a lot of figures in history that if you judge them by today's standards, we can say they had really, really backwards thoughts, but at the end of the day a lot of their actions are resulting in today's racism, gender inequality and inequality.'

'I think with race, the reason why it's so prominent is it's still a living issue to a lot of people who are racialised. I don't want to be considered South Asian, I'm racialised as South Asian by being called 'Paki' on the street, and other things. That's where I think the conversation needs to go beyond just... It is really complex, but talking about these things and having it out in the open is what needs to happen.'

The groups also explored redefining and creating a future legacy for Imperial and many felt this opportunity offered a crossroad, to open up and explore a fresh new way to engage with history and celebrate new people who have and currently contributing to science.

'Regarding the naming of buildings, I think this is really interesting because historically buildings have been named after royalty, they've been named after essentially elites, even though Huxley, interesting to hear that he wasn't a traditional elite so that goes to show there are some exceptions, but normally it's someone who is elite. It's a question: do we even want buildings and things to be named after people? Do we want to do that in the future? It's just a question about do we want to put people on pedestals even if nowadays they are not the elites, is it still something we want to do? It's just a question about things can change and history is not just something that's fixed, it's something that people are contributing to in the present and things can change. I think just removing a statue without having a debate and without having a democratic process is wrong, but if there's a democratic process and it's removed, it's not ignoring history, it's acknowledging history and then the decision has been made to remove it because they don't represent Imperial's current values'.

'I do disagree with you about the naming of buildings because I think that we should celebrate significant achievements by humans, and I think it's particularly appropriate in a scientific university like Imperial that we remember the people that established the basis on which everybody works.'

The History report recommendations to celebrate the achievements of new contemporary scholars was widely welcomed within the discussion held in the groups. The steps to widen the field in relation to the diversity of race and gender stimulated response from some participants who suggested that these steps were only being done to redress the imbalance in context of the historical domination of white men with links to Imperialism.

This view was challenged and drew out a critique for example regarding Huxley, one participant suggested that dialogues around him were on the whole defensive with people reasserting the good about his abolitionist actions and downplaying his contributions to eugenics.

'What I'm trying to say is we need to repopulate that history with more figures, with more people. There might be other people who have significant scientific history and contributions, but we know that the scientific community has been built upon the knowledge and contributions of global and indigenous peoples, and this process of filtering this knowledge is still going on. Now we live in a globalised world so there are some things that being recognised and some things that aren't.'

'This is the same approach, like how history and science has come to be. When we think for example of Enlightenment, who exactly is the Enlightenment for? It's only for white man because the women were not enlightened at all in the Victorian times. We need to rename it exactly as it is, and I'm not saying we should just censor it, we should cancel it, but can we actually also discuss this person was also human and has flaws? I think we don't talk enough about these flaws and how it can impact in today's society.'

'I get a sense that you're making connections with the institutional systemic and the political, so science is not a neutral independent entity, it's linked to a systemic political, in the broadest sense, system where some people gained, and other people didn't, and I get a sense that you're saying that this system is still alive now, in current times.'

Participants that felt statues and names of buildings that do not reflect the values of the University should be removed. There were different perspectives as to the way they should be acknowledged with some agreement in some groups with the development of a museum that explained the contributions and problematic aspects of the figures within their historical context of their work. In some groups' participants supported the idea of keeping them in situ with plaques and others wanted new figures identified to replace them. There were those who felt it was best to identify the buildings based on their specific subject or function without names. The point was also made by several groups that the process of naming and recognition should be reviewed regularly and a dynamic process of change reflecting science and the world as it is.

'We need to understand, I'm not saying that we should hide and not acknowledge these things, these things have to be acknowledged, they have to be looked at and in a deeper way so people understand what exactly is the problem or the issue with these people or what they stand for, it's important that we know that the college is standing for something better now than it did in the past, and maybe it thought it was standing for something better then but it's just not the case. It wasn't the case then even though they thought it was, and it's not the case now'.

'We just need to be able to put this out in the open because history, and when I studied history at school I didn't know anything about empire, it wasn't taught, it's still not being taught, not into any extent. I studied up until my master's African History and I had to study African History at university because nobody talks about these things. This is the problem, we're just not being educated from a school age so that people can really understand other people's culture and to respect other people's way of living. I don't think the college is, the History Report doesn't bring anything like this out, it doesn't even consider these things, it's just talking about, 'Let's just change names,' as I said before, 'Let's just change this,' but it's just on the surface and it's not going deeper, and that's what we need to do really'.

There were suggestions to rename buildings, scholarships by explaining exactly what they are- Chemistry building or 'award for excellent early careers research'. The college can demonstrate the excellence through other ways rather than just naming things.

'We need to have a pro and con list of whether it's beneficial to have these names on things, or they cause more trouble than they're worth. I think if you look at it objectively, hanging onto some of these names is not really helpful, the cons outweigh the pros. It's not saying you're erasing history; it's just recognising history and how do we use that to move forward in the way that we want to move forward? I think we have to be pragmatic about it.'

'It's not about eradicating history and people from our history, that's not what it's about; it's just about understanding. If we keep saying, they were the people of their time and that's what it was like, people had that kind of ideology,' then we're not going to get anywhere, we're just going to keep repeating, history is just going to keep repeating itself as it does with the same people making the same kinds of mistakes. Everybody, I think, wants to understand history, we don't want to hide from our history, we don't want to eradicate anyone, we just want to understand and learn and to start to appreciate who we are and appreciate people'.

'You are making a statement about who you can see there has made extraordinary contributions? Who represents your ideology? Who do you think should be glorified up there? Like it says in the report, history keeps on moving, there is very dirty history within biology with eugenics, the same with anthropology, it was incredibly racist. It's what it was, it was a reflection of the ideology, that doesn't mean we need to continue having that statue over there, because anthropology, because human biology has moved on beyond that path in theory, so therefore we should reflect that'.

'I'm completely comfortable with that statue being moved to a museum because I feel like it is history and if you want to learn about it you can go there, but if you're walking past the bust every day and it says Huxley, we are by definition putting these people who are being identified on a literal pedestal, and in kind of walking past that person we're saying, 'This is the best we've got,' and the QR code next to it that says, 'Yes, they were pretty good but actually not so good,' how many people are looking at that, and is that really the best we've got? It can be dynamic, we could introduce new portraits / busts/ names.'

It was felt that Imperial college could take the lead by creating new opportunities and links with the Natural History Museum the V&A, to develop an exhibition with regard to the Imperialistic history which could have far reaching impact. The city of Liverpool's Slave Museum was mentioned as an example.

'I like some of the recommendations that were made, and I do agree with others who think that we shouldn't hide the history, but I don't like the idea of it being celebrated in naming rooms and buildings after it. I like the idea that they're going to get staff involved, if they decide they're going to rename a building that the community is going to be involved in that and we look into the history prior to them naming the building, and also the idea of a QR code so people can actually read that themselves. They mentioned something about having a room, I don't know if it's like a history room with all the statues and stuff that they've got around the building and having the context behind these people and their contribution to Imperial. That I like, so I think that we shouldn't be hiding the history, but we should share that, and not just for people at the college, but even Exhibition Road there's the National History Museum, have it open to the public so it's not just people who work or study at Imperial know about it but it's available to the public'.

'Another point there which I thought was quite interesting was creating this community with The V&A, so the context of where Imperial is, and then creating the community around the response'.

'We get a lot of people from all over the world who come to see all the museums there, and we could be a part of that, so it's not just the local community knowing about the history but it's a lot wider From what I know, I think the Liverpool is the only place that has a slave museum, they're quite open about their involvement in the slave trade, and I don't know of any other place in the UK that does that'.

'I've been at the college for about five years and a lot of the names and the people that are in this report I didn't know about their background. There was one, I can't remember his name, but he owned a slave plantation in Jamaica, and it's in a small town where my parents come from, and then I'm starting to think there's a connection there; if I looked into my history, would my ancestors have been on that plantation? Even that in itself was uncomfortable to know that we are naming buildings after people like this'.

Some participants didn't see the value in naming buildings after eminent people who have contributed to the field of Science, Technology and Medicine there are other ways to name buildings, that in the future will be less open to scrutiny.

'I think this is an opportunity find other ways to celebrate people. I don't know about other people's views, but when I was reading through it that's came to my mind, that we are a college of science and medicine, there are so many possibilities, we can name things after elements or maybe botanical names, plants, bacteria. There are so many neutral, I would say... maybe not bacteria or viruses, but this is what I started thinking about'.

Participants welcomed this process of consultation, being involved in the decision making of renaming and reviewing and welcomed some of the recommendations in particular the QR codes and contextualisation the Imperials past history. The process opened up space and opportunity for black and racial minoritised participants to express, discuss, have their voices heard regarding transgenerational racism and its traumatising effects upon daily lived experience. It also highlighted the pervading historical ideology of racism, its deep embedment and embodiment within systems of institutional power that normalises the positioning of black peoples as inferior and white superior. This power dynamic denies, dismisses and diminishes the nature and extent of racism.

'I've been going back and forth about the renaming buildings and statues and things like that and think I am still 50/50 on the statues as to removing them or the QR code to explain the history, I'm definitely all for making sure that the whole of the history is taught and not just the shiny bit over here, ignoring that there was also some very serious stuff going on over there. But the more I have been thinking, especially with building names, it's like when something wrong or bad has happened and it's been shown to happen in someone's history, if it was to do with fraud or money, so you talk about the Tanaka Building, there wasn't really a big uproar about renaming the Business School from The Tanaka Business School when it was shown that he was guilty of fraud and whatever other misconduct. Then I use a random example that one of my [redacted] spoke about as well, Jimmy Savile, he raised a hell a lot of money for charity, the money that he raised for charity was phenomenal to really help a lot of people, but when it came out about his history and the disgusting things that he'd done,

people are not still saying we should keep his statues up, but when it comes to issues around race, and things where people have been severely wronged and it's very bad history, whether you say, 'It was different in the old days, everyone had a slave,' it was wrong and there were people that were affected badly back then and are still affected now. Hearing our colleague's example of the transgenerational impact of racism in their current lived daily experience. It's very seriously still affecting people, but for some reason when it's race it's something that we need to get over and let's move on, it was a long time ago; everything else is always never forget and it's important to remember, and you have to make actions from that. I don't know why race and racism never seem to get that same priority'.

'When we all found out that we'd all been paying off the reparations to the slave owners because the people in the tax office didn't realise that that might be an issue for people, they were like, 'Today we finish paying off our loan, our debts from paying off all the people that used to own slaves and we had to give them compensation for losing their slaves.' It's that kind of history that people don't even realise the seriousness of it, so we're not given that information in the first place, but then even when the information is released by accident because they didn't realise it was such a bad thing, so flippantly, 'Oh yes, by the way you've all been paying to pay off the slave owners from your taxes.' It's this kind of thing, so the acknowledgement is very important but then also where serious, I don't know how to describe them, misdemeanours or whatever it is, there needs to be actions that show that it is not acceptable now and that's not how we want to be as an institute going forward'

Some participants felt that this consultation process provided Imperial college an opportunity to re-examine its history within the context of institutional racism by opening up and exploring all aspects of its Imperial legacy. The challenge participants felt was not to fall short of this.

'La Beche, he was the one that had the plantations in Jamaica, like I said, in the area where my parents came from, and I've been through the Royal School of Mines, I saw the statue but I was always rushing somewhere else so I never really had time to actually see who he was, and I don't think there was any explanation about him anyway. Would I have actually gone into his history, because there's quite a lot of buildings with different names? But when I did find out, and in my family, we're looking at our family tree so we're going back, and I was thinking, 'Do I want to know that? Do I want to know that my ancestors were on his plantation and he was in a building that I've been working in for the last five years?' It might not trigger anything for anybody else, but for me it's having that connection, and do I want to have that statue still in the building? I'm not saying get rid of it but, like I said, if there is some sort of history room and the story and the context is there, then fair enough, but I wouldn't want to be on South Ken and know that I've got to pass this area all the time, because it's something that will trigger that memory for me just by knowing it was there'.

'I would say though, as a person of colour I found it incredibly positive, and to make people feel welcome, I'm someone of South African heritage as well, so recognising some of these people with very different views to what we have today, it's not simply a case of morals changing, some of the things like slavery, using people down in the mines like they did in South Africa, it's something that will hopefully be abhorrent for the rest of our future. So, I think some of these just have to be changed.'

'It's important to represent, to try and... History has a lot of opinions, and a lot of people say it's not a fact, but one of the facts in the matter is that throughout history there are a lot of people who have contributed to science. There's a very well-known case of women who didn't quite get recognised for what they were doing, and their husbands were actually published as

authors, I think this actually happened in the case of Nobel Prize winners, this happened in the case of Indian scientists who couldn't actually get their journals and their work published in European journals until somebody contacted Albert Einstein and he actually facilitated this. So, I think to accurately represent history it's really important for Imperial to bring forward other people and put them forward to be named, and I think the report did that, it identified a few people who were involved in Imperial's history and said, 'These people should be recognised more,' so I thought that was really encouraging, it wasn't just a negative.'

'I don't have an answer for the statue issues, and I understand the sentiment about removing and such. I don't agree with just removing them, that doesn't solve the issues, I completely agree with that, but I think how do you then actively create this dialogue or understanding? Obviously, if you're saying, 'Okay, you remove the statues and you're erasing the history,' but there are people already been erased, for example the people that worked in the mines, the black workers that were oppressed by these people, they contributed to the mine, the work, so actually they contributed to the fortunes that were contributing to the money they made and paid for all these things for the college, so their hard work and history, their heartbreak, that's been erased, that's not being acknowledged, and how do you address that?'

'It does have an effect, you do notice when you go into the building and you see who it's named after. Perhaps that it's just to me, who tends to Google things but I'm curious to see who these people are, and I go, 'Okay, yes, cool, someone who's definitely benefited from something that has I suppose negatively benefited people that might look like me in the past.' It's disheartening, and it does sometimes add to a feeling of not belonging, which is hurtful.'

'One thing I think that is important is that people from underrepresented backgrounds do get to see people who look like them being celebrated and being commemorated, and the History Report does talk about that.... I don't know enough about the people referred to in the report, even though I've read it. But I think that's a great idea and we would be helping to show people who do not necessarily get represented in society.'

'I think having these scholarships named after names that sound different is fantastic. I think that does create a welcoming atmosphere and it would just be great for one day for that not to be seen as a welcoming atmosphere but just something as it's completely normal.'

'I have absolutely no problem, indeed I really welcome us not naming buildings after people who approved of the slave trade. I agree that that was a time when many people approved of the slave trade whereas now few people would say that they did, but having said that, not everyone did at that time and it was a, 'Why should we be naming buildings after people who are so clearly not treating other people... so clearly involved with abuse of other people.'

This process of reviewing History and Imperial College's move to become an inclusive learning institution has opened up and given a platform for black minoritised staff and students to express the impact of institution racism and share their lived experience.

'For the past 18 months every time I'm out and about I'm looking at different areas to the parts that my ancestors have played in them possibly. This is what I am saying, it's just understanding that history better, because to go back and think that racism is institutional, despite what anybody wants to say about it, it is institutional, and I know you're fighting the establishment, everybody, to actually have any recognition that it exists, because they're going to tell us it doesn't exist, you're making it up. So yes, it's acknowledgement, and whether or not you acknowledge as part of their history to say... And I'm going between

them and us, because this is what it is, then if you find an easier way to do it, then do it, but it does exist and that's... Yes'.

'What I've found, looking back, it was very confusing as a child because I'd have the history that was taught in school, very much the history of the British Empire and everything else and how great everything was, and I also get the history taught to me by my mum and my family. The two histories would run parallel and there'd be common themes, but then very different explanations as to the reasons why all the outcomes and how happy the people were. It's kind of that, and now that's ingrained in me so that I'm just used to running parallel histories, knowing the official history but also thinking underneath, 'Okay, there's also, that parallel history that's running onto the people that things have happened too that maybe weren't so happy about it.' So, there's a bit more of the world waking up and being woke now about it. You get Thanksgiving that's just happened, and in the past all you have is Thanksgiving and it's great and the celebration, and now you get a lot more people going, 'But you're celebrating the complete destruction of the indigenous population of a place,' and things like that, so both sides of history are starting to come out a bit more, which I appreciate, and I think that needs to be pushed a bit further.'

'I think that's one of the reasons as well why the voices from part of the population, members of Imperial as one type population, maybe haven't come forward as much because we have lived our whole lives with this parallel history, so we're not surprised when things are 'uncovered,' because it wasn't covered up for us, we've always known about it. I think it's people that didn't realise that there were two sides to the history that's been going on and are now very shocked and angry about people suggesting to take away people's names because they were great people. I think it's that education of people that didn't realise that history has lots more sides to it than just the victor gets to write the story and print the story off. I've always, everywhere I've gone, I remember going through the City of London but then being told it was literally built by slaves, and a lot of people I think don't realise that. Then probably I think Albertropolis, either the money or the literalness of it, the work of people that look like me that their blood, sweat and tears have gone into that are not acknowledged. That's where I am'.

B. Thomas Huxley

We have created a separate section within this report to look at the participants thoughts and reflections upon Thomas Huxley as a wide range of feelings, passions and reactions engendered lively debate. Participants who were critical of the History group report felt the document did not fully contextualise and give credit to his contributions to the field of science and to the founding of Imperial College London. One thematic thread running through the consultation groups was the notion that people were a product of their time in history and to judge them from our current contemporary values and morals is unfair.

'Huxley is a towering figure, the first professional scientist and pivotal in the foundation of Imperial College and organising science in South Kensington, he put science in the school curriculum, and established primary school education across London. He was a massive figure, and the idea that he was a racist, applying modern term to a 19 Century figure is just inappropriate. He was passionately opposed to slavery, and that essay written in 1865 in celebration of the 13 Amendment, in celebration of the fact that slavery had been abolished, and to say this is a morally flawed character is an outrage'.

'I think that the suggestion to rename his building, to move his bust is the least correct one from the report. It has been said that Huxley contributed, if we can say that, to the colonialist spirit of the British Empire or these kinds of similar endeavours, but what I can see is instead the opposite. He has to be thought of in the context of the British Empire, so he lived in the second half, especially worked in the second half of the 19th century, and in that period there were of course many ideas, theories, that today are not acceptable anymore and are of course false. He was of his time and he basically tried to prove his beliefs, which of course now we know are false. But what is outlined in particular in the report is that, I quote, "He expressly opposed any notion that racial ranking could justify or slavery. So, yes, put these theories in the context of the time and knowing also the fact that he abhorred any sort of violence against black people or non-European people, then I don't understand why there is a need to erase his name'.

'I recognise that not everyone is perfect, everyone is a person of their time and place at that time and it reflects the thinking at that time, but what I found really interesting is that there are some debates that it's completely acceptable to, for example it's completely acceptable to be honest and admit that, but then when we do in other areas such as race and ethnicity I found there is some more resistance to for me Huxley is an inspirational character, so I find it very disappointing the college, from my perspective wants to remove the name and hide it all away. I'm much more in favour of making an asset of Huxley. Huxley. Somebody did suggest, 'Well what about the support staff at the beginning of the university?' Well, Huxley was at the beginning of the university and he was an idealist and he spent a lot of time teaching working class people in the Royal School of Mines in the evenings. Also, he was one of the proponents that introduced primary school education throughout England, so as well as being Britain's... Somebody also mentioned at the beginning that he worked his way up from the bottom, he wasn't a gentleman scientist as was the type then, he educated himself, worked his way up through the east end of London and eventually became Britain's first paid scientist, so he was the first professional person.'

'Huxley also contributed to founding Nature, the scientific journal, so for us as a science university, for me, independent of the negative connotations about the race thing he's an inspirational figure. I'm sure he would be a very liberal person today, he was a very

advanced Victorian, he was a pioneer in so many ways, so I find the report's suggestion to take away the name and hide away the bust, I just profoundly... I'm a very avantgarde type of person but I profoundly find that disappointing that we would lose the name Huxley from the university and hide it away. I'm really agreeing with the two people that suggested we make a virtue of Huxley, and they could do so much more, they could explain the history together with the statue. I feel that it's an own goal for the university one of our founders. But in general, of course, I just wanted to finish by saying many of the recommendations I think are perfectly fine, I would be just deeply disappointed if the college, but respecting its democracy, it would be disappointing for me if we lost and repressed the heritage of Huxley.'

'To my understanding he was a giant really and a force for good, overwhelming force for good in his support of Darwin, as a sort of exemplar of somebody who came up from relatively humble beginnings, made his way, he was an autodidact and there's a lot to be said for that, I think. He was just so productive and important a figure. That is set against, clearly, some of his work which led him to... The other thing to say is that from what you've written there and the little I've read; he's seen as and seemed to be a pretty decent human being all round. I think what he seemed to do is move into an area of scientific investigation, and these things tend to get a life of their own, and he ended up in a pretty bad place and not one any of us would support, but I just wonder if that's enough. What I would do, personally, on the recommendation is not go taking the bust away and sticking it in the quiet place, but actually putting the story out there, because in a way any of us could walk into that situation, is my feeling, any of us could end up in that place without having pernicious intent or any sinister leanings. I have to say, this is based on my sketchy understanding of his life and what he did.'

'I very much liked the appendix in the History Report, I believe it was from a biographer of Huxley, was it Adrian Desmond, I apologise if that's wrong, and that basically took a rather nuanced and subtle view of saying, 'Yes, you really have to look at people by comparison with their own time, with the widespread beliefs of their own time, and also look at their personal development over their life,' and that biographer's view was that Huxley was definitely overall a force for good.'

Some participants expressed ambivalence in relation to Huxley and would rather focus upon the current time and moving forward and would like the college to focus upon ethical investing, human rights and support to poor students.

A participant who worked in the Huxley building said....

'The person behind the name of the 'Huxley building I don't think most people really know who he is and so changing the name of the building or removing the bust is not going to make much difference to people now or in the future. The problem with a click on information device is that most people will not read the full essay and it's open to cherry picking a sentence like he is a scientific racist and so on and so forth but considering the time and the global reality that white men were on top is not unreasonable. Huxley was a protagonist of emancipation of women and egalitarian.'

The strong views supporting Huxley and contextualising him in terms of the great value he created overlooked for some participants his connections to the Slave trade and Eugenics and rationalised away these points in the context of being a product of his time in history.

'I'm not against change, but if for instance the Huxley Building were to be renamed there ought to be a plaque with Thomas Huxley saying frankly he was a big advocate of eugenics but he also did an awful lot for the abolition of slavery. I don't think we're in the business of cancelling people.'

A number of participants said they felt unwelcomed and rejected by the Imperial reminders of Empire around the University and signalled feelings of marginalisation. The current History reports' reflection and challenge in relation to Huxley building was appreciated.

'... If we're talking about the Imperial values then it has something to do with that in a sense of what were these people associated with? It doesn't matter at that time, Huxley's work contributed a lot to race, scientific racism, and we have to acknowledge that. It's not just about, 'Oh, he was a great man, he did great work,' yes, sure he did, but his work impacted lots of lives, and the perspective, the way that people saw people at that time, and it went very well with the imperialistic drive during the late 1800s of conquest and trying to justify conquest of Africa and other parts of the world. So, it's not just a case of dirty money, it's about what was the impact of all those things.'

'I get a sense of Huxley trying to apply his scientific knowledge to what seems like a good problem of classifying people and in later years it all went horribly, horribly wrong. There should be something about the discussion around Huxley that makes us deeply uncomfortable about what our ethos is and what it includes and what it doesn't, and that serves as a marker of a historic moment of transition that really shaped what Imperial is and what our view of science is today, and that gives us a focus to ask all of these hard questions about what the future looks like. That's the kind of conversation I would love if this document provided the foundation with, if this conversation provided the foundation with, that it didn't become, 'This person is a good person, this is a bad person,' but, 'How did this person live their lives and are we comfortable with that and what it says about us today, how we judge people from the past and how we judge people from other cultures today?' Which I worry about because that's a big part of the education that we do'.

'I'm not against change, but if for instance the Huxley Building were to be renamed there ought to be a plaque with Thomas Huxley saying frankly he was a big advocate of eugenics but he also did an awful lot for the abolition of slavery. I don't think we're in the business of cancelling people.'

The discussion around the recommendations for Huxley stimulated and enabled a deeper dialogue and reflection around Imperials' ethos and values, moving forward in a globalised world and the journey it needs to take in becoming a fully inclusive organisation. Some participants recognised that this consultation process could be a moment of transition that would shape Imperial's future and view of science moving forward. An example within Imperial was used as an exemplar.

'What I wanted to underline is the point, as it has been also pointed out, is that the report misses the point: we should not be looking at renaming things, but more at educating people about their origins. For example, I know that the Centre for Language, Culture and Communication at Imperial has been expanding, if I am not mistaken, and I hope that they can bring more education also under these terms for what regards the history of the college. For example, during my undergraduate degree I took this course in History of Technology and it also focused on how British colonisers and Dutch colonisers in southern Africa basically stole the technological ideas of the local populations and made them look like their own. This is, I think, something that should be outlined, something that should be widely publicised, not changing of these names.'

'I'm uncomfortable with the Huxley outcome really. I think it is better to not defend him but to explain him and put it all out there on the table. Whoever, wrote the report does suggest that, and I think this is a case in point really, a great man with flaws is what I would say. A man who worked within the imperialistic structures therefore, the implicit assumptions is, this view would have been shared by virtually everybody at that time. This view formulated the fabric of our organisations and structures of society. Surely this should be the focus'.

This particular comment was then challenged by another participant making the point that there were people who challenged the status quo of slavery, not least the slaves themselves. One participant raised a very powerful point which encouraged the group they were part of to reflect upon how people in positions of power and privilege connect to and listen to alternative views, diverse experiences, and the voices of marginalised peoples. It raised the point around what principles and ethics inform naming buildings, scholarships and having statues and preserving historic relics.

'On Huxley what is the point of naming a building or a scholarship, whatever, after a person if it's not to honour them? Do we honour someone who said people have blind spots without recognising his own? There were enough people at the time maybe Huxley's contemporaries who did not believe in the whole scientific racism line of thought that Huxley was following, that scientific racist ideology that there are differences between black/Asian/white people. There was an alternative viewpoint, so it wasn't as if it was unheard of, it was there; it wasn't a popular one, but it was present. Again, do we want to memorialise, do we want to honour someone who did stand for that, because what is that saying about us?'

'Surely there's a better way to showcase Huxley's beliefs? Is it in a historical document, in a book about Imperial's history, or is it on a building named after him? Do we have a plaque then that says, 'We realise that these are some problematic views about Huxley, but we think his name should stay because of XYZ, but we want to highlight ABC which is an issue by today's standards?' I don't know. I personally think that if there are people who have come through Imperial, who have helped Imperial but have less of a problematic history, then maybe perhaps their name should be memorised as well and perhaps Huxley should be put to a history book?'

'There's no way that we could allow young people into the building, young people from different nationalities and not acknowledge these things. I just think that it's not right to not acknowledge. If we're saying, 'No, it's too strong to remove his name from the building,' then we need to think about how... I preferably would like the name removed, that's where I stand, I would like the name removed, but if it's not going to be removed then I think that there should definitely be something to let people know, because often we don't think about the names, we're expecting people to go and find out, we're expecting people to, 'Do your research,' or, 'How come you don't know?' then we should have some acknowledgement as to why he should be honoured in that way.'

'.... the Huxley Building. I guess biologists see him as a great figure in science but again he had some views that we find objectionable now. I think in the case of naming anything, it's not a permanent structure, and the act of naming is a way of recognising someone, so now in the 21st century we find some of their views objectionable, I think we do need to reassess whether it's appropriate to name a building after them and whether it projects the values that we want to project to the world.'

D. Addressing Racism and Racial Inequality

The dialogues within some groups have grappled with the deeper dynamics and nuances of institutional racism, these dialogues have explored the rationalisation of racism and how it embeds racial hierarchies within its operational cultural, norms and standards. Formulating racial power dynamics between white and black racial minoritised relationships and positions. The groups explored how this power dynamic maintains the status quo and obscures its systemic nature. The dialogues within some groups have grappled with this power dynamic exploring its impact of disadvantage and discrimination. They reflected upon and examined the recent attempts to dismantle it, being frustrated with the slow-moving responses. They welcomed this process of re-examination of Imperial's Colonial past as opportunity for the future to make sustainable meaningful changes.

'This report clearly comes out of a time when there was a lot of desire for really important discussion about minority involvement in universities and trying to promote the presence of people that historically have been marginalised, but it doesn't feel like the right way to do that is to just say, 'We're going to strike a few names off some buildings, we're going to add some names to some scholarships, job done,' which is the impression that I take away from this report. I'd really like to be persuaded otherwise, that there's a much deeper wellspring of engagement going on here.'

'I think what we need is more open transparency. When we're talking about Britain and the Slave trade, we're good at hiding it, we're good at covering it up. People talk a lot about America but, like we said, it was just as big here and it's never talked about or acknowledged. Like I said, the only place I know is Liverpool that actually openly have got a museum and explains their involvement.'

'It's coming out of the woodwork now, they're still trying to sweep some of it back under the carpet, but it's out there now. Acknowledgement is key, everybody would have heard, 'Oh, that was then, move on from that,' but it's not. It's still with us in the current day, and that is the point that I just wanted to put across. it's still with us.'

One participant shared the legacy of Imperialism upon their current lived experience.

'The way I think about the issue, and just like last week I'm very keenly interested in history and how it impacts the present, and I'm going to speak very subjectively coming from an African perspective. I grew up in Nigeria and it really did take me some time to understand the historical impact of the British Empire within that region, it's almost like an awakening of sorts where you begin to realise just how much your entire culture is shaped by events that transpired several decades ago. Interestingly, I speak very fluent English and struggle with my own traditional language, and of course I'm sure a lot of former colonies have these kinds of issues. However, what my experience has been is, coming to terms with the impact of historical events I have realised that it creates kind of a bifurcation, particularly within how Africans and former colonies view the British Empire, and there typically tends to be those who hold a certain layer of resentment that lays at the bottom of their chest every day where they go, when they go about their work etc. You do have to see things like your cultural heritage, elements of your cultural heritage in museums and things like that, and that does leave a very unpleasant taste in your mouth as you go about your daily life, so it's really meaningful to have these kinds of historical examinations, how the perspective from which history is viewed by the conquerors versus the conquered. I think that's essentially the objective of this entire exercise, and then seeing how Imperial College fits into all of that.'

'I don't want us to necessarily consider these things to be sacrosanct, ultimately, we want to keep in very clear view what the current impact of the status quo is having on various groups of people. Notwithstanding, I think we want to, as much as possible, minimise the negative sentiment that exists by virtue of the status quo. It's useful to say, 'How does this impact this particular group of people?' and this has been an experience with the Business School and I've given the feedback at different points in time to say, 'Hey look, there are certain things that exist which you wouldn't be aware if people didn't speak about it,' and then you want to listen to those voices who say, 'Hey, this makes me uncomfortable, I feel isolated by virtue of this, it's going to impact me in certain ways,' and gauge how much of that should be considered in the overall objective of what you're trying to do, which is to create a more inclusive environment'.

'I've been born and bred in the UK and brought up with mixed heritage, and to be quite honest I've just got on with life, and what will be will be, because that's how it's been for us growing up in the UK. But of late I've got very into my cultural background, and with college having international students and even more people of colour coming to the college etc, I don't think it's a good sign to have students come into that or look at the background now, now it's been brought to light. Why can't they just have a Hall of Fame or something in the college if they want to remember these people? There don't have to be buildings or statues or whatever it might be. From my perspective, I don't think it's a very good light on the college to keep these buildings and names at the forefront of the college, being one of the biggest universities, and, like I say, with a lot more international students. Probably years ago there it was more upper class in the university; now, I'm not saying people aren't upper class in the university but now, with student loans and things like that there are more people that are able to come to the college, and I don't think it's a good advertisement for Imperial College.'

'I have a wider concern as well; I recognise the importance of symbolism and of the impact that history has on us, but I do strongly agree with the views that have been aired that it's more about now, in the present, and arguing over the slave trade and Britain's involvement in a worldwide phenomenon of slavery in many ways detracts from the reality of present day discrimination, and its present-day discrimination that we should be focusing on, not history. I know the two are connected, but if we get into long ramblings about whether a statue in Bristol should stand up or not, I think the danger is that energy gets put into that rather than doing anything really material about the intolerance that exists in current society, and I think that is more important than naval gazing over 19th Century history.'

The proposal for changing names on buildings and names of awards was felt not to be substantial enough.

'In terms of the buildings and having this conversation myself, I feel although we shouldn't focus on the past, for those that are currently living in a system where they are oppressed, whether it's consciously or unconsciously, having these iconographies that we can talk actually, removes the personal element away from it and allows us to talk about systems of oppression and privilege in a way that's not, 'You are an oppressed person that needs to tell the majority how you are oppressed,' but if you can talk about something that's separate from you but linked in some way, I think there is power to having conversations about history and historical figures, because they do provide a vehicle for those whose voices have been marginalised to talk about something that we might view as objective, if that makes sense, because a building is objective.'

'I think there needs to be a bit more discussion on the implication of the history of the college and how we can discuss it further in a more meaningful way, so that we can actually see things happening, because if we're just going to change names, that's not going to have much of an impact really for people, just changing the names of buildings, changing the names of awards, we need something much more substantial than that.'

Some were concerned with the lack of action on representation despite a lot of discussion on the subject and others concerned that a sense of belonging was needed for international students with visual representation of themselves in the college.

'Being at the college for 11 years now, I don't see myself (black staff member) in the college as much as I would like, people like me in the college in senior roles, that's always been a problem or issue, but that hasn't been addressed as far as I'm concerned. We are all aware of the issues already, but just trying to do something, that's where we lack the action. We talk a lot, we talk, talk, oh yes, we talk about this, we talk about that, but I don't see much happening in all this discussion that we always like to talk about, but we're not doing anything. I don't want to sound negative, sorry, but that's what it seems to me. I just wish we wouldn't talk so much, and if we're going to talk, let's do something about it really.'

'I think this question of belonging is a huge question for us with international students that come from all over, and certainly when I teach physics one of the problems that we have is that it feels like a very abstract inhuman sort of a subject, and so being able to humanise it by reference to past physicists that come from all backgrounds is a really powerful way of, as I think was alluded to earlier, seeing yourself in disciplines. That seems totally invisible in the names of buildings, but it is the sort of thing that can be quite powerful if you're walking down a corridor and you have these pictures of past people and it's not just the grey-haired black and white male physicists of the past. And so, rather than naming buildings with numbers and things like that, I think if we could get this right, fostering that sense of belonging, and especially because so much of the trouble that we have in the sciences is not about getting people in, but there's an even bigger problem of keeping people once they come in and making them feel like they belong and making them feel like they have a place.'

'There should be an effort to build a more inclusive and respectful environment at Imperial, and I believe that very much now the focus of the university should try to include people which have been so far excluded, whether that is through, as I said before, giving more awareness through history or these kinds of things across college or more concrete economical efforts by the university through scholarships or similar'.

'If I just look around at the PhD students at [REDACTED] Department for example, wondering how many people are from Britain, how many Asian British people are there? And I say that even though I'm Irish, but who have carried on to do their PhDs, and how many are from India, from the Middle East, from Pakistan? I've always noticed that they are from other countries more than they are over here, and I think that's a shame because I don't think those numbers are low at undergraduate level. And I think the same goes across to black students as well, that they aren't transgressing past undergrad at Imperial and there must be a reason why.'

Being isolated and no sense of belonging was raised as a dynamic of racism which impacted substantially on the lived experience within the college.

'There's quite a mix, but the terms young people find very challenging is in their groups, in their conversations, in those classes that they have, that's when they start to feel very isolated and that's where they find that there are very few people like them. That's where the struggle is. We have fought really hard to support the students that have been on our programmes and are now undergraduates at Imperial from feeling that isolation, from feeling alone, not being able to talk to someone, not being able to socially fit in...we have young people that struggle with their identity because they think that they can't wear certain things or they can't do certain things, so in a sense they can't be themselves. That's a real struggle and I think that's why, you probably got a lot of young people, undergraduates saying, 'I don't feel welcome,' or 'I don't feel a sense of belonging.' It's simply because when you strip back the university and you're there in your group, with your department, and you have a lot of different challenges that maybe other students may not be aware of that it's a struggle for many.'

'We get that a lot when talking to young people about that kind of feeling isolated, feeling like they're not welcome because they don't see many reflections of themselves, they don't see these things, and so it's very hard for them in that sense. I think what we try to do when we talk to young people who do come in for the day, they might be with us for a week on a summer school programme, they love the university, they're all excited, 'This is my first choice, I'm coming to Imperial.' They love it, they come and they love it, but once, if they do get in, they do join the cohort, and I'm talking specifically about minority students, we see that there is a big challenge for them. There is a challenge, and how we deal with that, and I think the support they need, which is starting to kick in, we are starting to put our own welcome, we're doing things to keep tabs on those students, to have discussion groups with them, to help them with certain things, to find out what their needs are etc. but that's the challenge that we're finding, that isolation.'

'I've been here for over a decade, but I didn't know much at all about the college, so a lot of it was new to me. When I find people of colour who, like they had an Asian scientist, I was just like, 'Whoa, this is great, that makes me feel good.' It's a bit like Oxbridge, Imperial, the image is a bit white, and I know that's trying to change but that's what I see.'

'I think another idea that would be good, is having these people quite visually around departments, like that Asian scientist, is there a picture of him? Is there information about him? I've worked in two academic departments, and it's just felt very white on the academic side. Professional staff it's a different demographic, but it would be good if visually when students walk around they can see that, 'Oh, there was this scientist from this background, this scientist from this background,' because I feel it's quite white, the image.'

Clarity was sought as to the scale and nature of the scholarships. Concern was expressed as to the financial commitment. Was this just one or two scholarships or was this a substantial shift in approach on this?

'I did notice that in the report a lot of the actionable things were not necessarily financial commitments and I think I'd just like to see more from Imperial as to providing more financial commitments, to making and setting up those scholarships and things like that that they were mentioning, because those are things that we know do improve representation.'

Funding barriers were identified and acknowledged for disadvantaged students who disproportionately come from Black and racial minoritised backgrounds and scholarships were generally considered to be a positive way forward. One participant shared;

'That to me seems like a most logical solution for the diversity problem, to actually enable people that otherwise wouldn't be able to fund to actually come. The statues, we said that we really don't even know who these people in the statues are, so therefore changing them, I don't think that's going to encourage more people to come. By giving them the economic means to actually do it, I think that will, living in London is really expensive and fees are expensive-these are major obstacles to actually com- I also think Imperial could do more in terms of supporting those international students who are coming from less privileged backgrounds.'

There were contributions from participants on access and representation from Black and Racial minoritised students;

'In terms of black student numbers, locally within our department we know that the numbers are not reflective of UK statistics, and especially if you look at our local population, we fail very badly in recruiting anyone from within London and especially in our department that is still the case. If we have one black student in a year or the whole course that person faces challenges of being the sole representative of a whole background and community in a largely white environment. For some students that's fine and they get on with and they speak to their peers and they challenge their peers, and others it's very difficult.'

'I know in my medical course it's one or two black students in total every year, it's very under represented from BRM students'.

Discussion on Imperial's role in supporting and enabling access to students from disadvantaged backgrounds resulted in participants desiring to see more ambitious actions and resource allocated to this including examining barriers into the job market.

Section 3: Ideas put forward

E. Decolonising the Curriculum

There was widespread understanding and recognition that within STEM disciplines, certain groups and in particular Black and racial minoritised groups have not been represented for their contributions. This was not just specific to Imperial but to the evolution of these disciplines as a whole. Recognition was made that substantial research and development of specific disciplines' fields of study and resources were as a result of the Empire and Imperialism. Imperial and those associated with it have contributed to the way that science and all of its disciplines have developed, and this has informed views that are now deemed to be objectionable, recognising time and context.

Based on this, consultation groups participants shared in different ways that the most significant approach the college can make in relation to its history is to incorporate this within the teaching curricula both for undergraduate and postgraduate studies, to enable reflection on the historical context of specific figures who have contributed to its development and be open about their actions and ideas which have affected Black and racial minoritised Communities across the world. This is it was felt could then allow Imperial to express the values it holds, recognise the changing context and world and share positively new thinking and actions. As one participant said, '*because if we say that this is such an important piece of our values then why wouldn't we be teaching about it?*'

These are some of the contributions to this discussion;

'I think looking at the way in which scientific disciplines have developed and how those have been taught and researched at college, that feels to me important potentially as part of the wider decolonising conversations to be had'.

'I think the way that science has been used and is being used, and an examination of perhaps some of the names or all of the names that are introduced in the History Report, how are they talked about within college departments as well and with students, and cited and so on? That feels to me as a potential next step, so looking critically at those figures, the ones that we should be celebrating more and the ones that we should be more critically examining and contextualising. But then how actually are they represented in what we're teaching and the benefit of research?'

'I think on the curriculum, so thinking it ties more back into how STEM or science has been constructed or why certain populations are being underrepresented, not been well represented in certain fields, particularly their contribution, not just Imperial but just the whole nature of the evolution of the science. If you go to the Science Museum next door then they're all white men, that's why this whole thing is happening, and as a result of that's what we're having now with certain people are not being well represented in these certain disciplines and such and all their work not being acknowledged. I think it should be something more embedded in the curriculum in particular fields especially, whether it's computing or biology or whatever it is that the college is teaching.'

These discussions contributed to the call for greater attention and exploration within disciplines to decolonising the curriculum agenda, embedding historical context to teaching, learning and research which references differing perspectives and identifies contributions that have been marginalised.

'I don't think by removing the statues you are trying to swipe it away or anything; if you want people to actually learn about that, then put on a module for the history of biology or the history of anthropology or so on within courses, which I never had for example. That's a much better way to teach people but when you have a statue, it's not teaching, you are making a point that you glorify that person.'

Individuals that have been cited in the History group report need to be critically examined and contextualised alongside further research and acknowledgement of those individuals yet to be celebrated for their contributions, being incorporated and cited within programmes of study. Points were made in this discussion that there are many contributors to the development of western science and that there needs to be a wider acknowledgement and recognition that they are only one part of a larger context.

F. Centre for the History of Science, Technology and Medicine.

The discussions on decolonising the curriculum lead to an exploration and identified need for a Centre for the History of Science, Technology and Medicine. (Imperial previously had such a centre at the college)

This was premised on the value for STEM disciplines to be informed from a historical, social and humanities perspectives. This was informed by discussions on the potential inertia that STEM study could find itself without considering other ways of seeing and examining phenomena in the wider world, differential impacts in society and its inter-relationship with other disciplines. The history group report was felt to be a positive catalyst to considering STEM within a greater and larger whole than it presently is, as a socio-historical understanding would give an opportunity for new and thoughtful approaches and understandings to be developed which otherwise might not previously be considered.

'The emphasis in STEM disciplines are about fact and objectivity and it was recognised that was not always the case, there are other perspectives and the way in which facts have been viewed change and continue to change. 'The communication of science and who has been considered the voice of authority feels to me like part of that history.'

From the research perspective participants felt the college had made developments in interdisciplinary research which matched funders expectations, though the value of academic expertise and perspective from the identified disciplines above established within the college was felt would enhance, deepen and broaden understanding of these and other related issues the college is now facing. The following contributions share some of these thoughts and perspectives.

'One of the things that Imperial College doesn't have is a department of history or humanities departments and so I think it's a bit more difficult to have these discussions around the social historical context that science happens in. I think that was why I wanted to come along today to participate in this, because I think it's a very important discussion to have and it's important that we bring in the historical and social perspective.'

'This is the positive thing about the report, the college is saying, 'Actually history does matter.' It feels to me that if potentially we still had the centre for History, some of the things that I was just talking about could be picked up by people in that centre and made more central. An example, the Centre for Higher Educational Research and Scholarship which is just recently set up is very positive in the college recognising that education and educational research is really important to what the college does, and it feels like there's starting to become a wider acknowledgement that social sciences and humanities actually do have a role to play in what the college does.'

'I think the general point is that it does mean we are lacking that perspective in college. I think the college began to recognise the importance of interdisciplinary research and that's very much the way things are going, it's understood that a lot of progress is made at the intersection between disciplines, the UKRI, our main funding body is moving in that direction. I think it is a disappointing and slightly retrograde step that we don't have that kind of expertise and that kind of perspective within the college, and I think that does make these kinds of discussions more difficult, or it's more difficult to have them because we don't have the academic disciplines that can bring that perspective, and that would broaden and deepen our understanding of these issues'.

'There are certain academics who are up for discussing all this, but some I think perhaps are not, that's the vibe I get from working in departments, like, 'We do the science, this talking

about all these issues, that's for another department within the college, that doesn't affect us. That's for that group, this is for us.'

'I think given that most of our academics do come from the hard sciences, and I think until recently there has been a very strong sense of a hierarchy of disciplines, so the hard sciences are seen to be better more rigorous science than say the social sciences, they're certainly higher on the hierarchy than humanities and history. I do think that's beginning to change a bit, and I think that's one of the things that needs to change in order to address the whole question of how you decolonise the curriculum and how you recognise people who have been neglected by history but have made important contribution to science.'

'...about decolonising, and also some of the maybe humanities-oriented work. Increasingly, more work's been done by colleagues from the CHER - Centre of Higher Education, sorry I've forgotten the acronyms, but yes, I guess it's looking across more the educational experiences, or I guess you coming from a more social science point of view of studying STEM or of experience of studying at Imperial.'

Section 4: Wider reflections and suggestions

G. Reflection on the College name Imperial

This theme emerged in numerous consultation groups. It centred on why the name of the college was not reflected on more rigorously within the report as an important context to the History group discussions and written report. Participants felt the report focussed on the origin of the name 'Imperial' rather than consider whether the name is relevant today and if it should be retained. The consultation groups shared an appreciation of the complexity of 'Imperial's' global position, working within development and the significance of Imperial as a global brand.

A number of points were made;

'From what I read in the report the name Imperial, it looks like it's non-negotiable, I don't think we are going to change that. They've gone into the reasons why it was Imperial or why they think it is, but that's been left to one side and it's not included anywhere else, other than we are stuck with the name.'

'It strikes me as interesting that Imperial College is literally named after the British Empire. It occurred to me, has there been any discussion about the fact that Imperial College is named after the British Empire?'

'It seems weird that the Imperial has formed this History Group which is looking into various aspects of history of the college, which is great, but they're leaving out of their terms of reference the fact that Imperial College is called Imperial College, and whether the name of the college should be part of the discussions going on.... it seems like the elephant in the room for you to do this big historical review and not address the fact that the university is called Imperial College.'

Participants expressed concern with the name in developing relationships from an international perspective, including the diversity of leadership within the College.

"I do a lot of work with colleagues in low-income countries, because my research is to do with water and sanitation, and I'm also on some advisory boards for the UK government funding associated with overseas research, and it's always a bit awkward because the UK government is trying to encourage equitable partnerships with colleagues in low-income countries. A lot of my colleagues are really happy to have those discussions with me, but it's always a bit awkward for someone from a place called Imperial College to be talking about having equitable partnerships with someone in Tanzania or somewhere like that.'

'I think as a global organisation that universities should be forward thinking and leading the world in everything that they do, it's important they do this correctly and well and allied to how other people can follow. It's important for young people to look at organisations, much like they do with the movies and things, people need to see their face, the mirrors of themselves in people in leadership roles, and that includes the universities, so I think the more a university can encourage, highlight people from all backgrounds being successful, the more we can encourage young people to join those organisations and feel welcome, so I think the name is important.'

'It's very strange if you are from an African country and you are receiving assistance from Imperial College, it just sits very awkwardly to receive this assistance, whether it's the research or technical assistance. So, I think If they want to continue engaging on an equal footing with people in the Commonwealth and more broadly developing countries, I think they must at least focus on the bigger name of Science and Technology rather than just Imperial. Some people even just say Imperial, "I go to Imperial.'

A number of participants expressed how they felt this was a great opportunity to project a positive image to the world that Imperial stands for clear values of opportunity and equality. The actions of the college from this endeavour on examining inequality and inclusivity could demonstrate a new era to address the attractiveness to groups of people disadvantaged systemically from the process of Empire. In this process consideration of the name of the college needed to be included in that thinking about the future.

Participants felt the explanation was inadequate and simplified and felt that the college had removed the motto, so why was not further consideration given to the name of the college and a new motto considered. There were a number of points shared on this.

'.. that's well and good just changing the names of awards and changing the names of buildings, but really is that all that it is?' Because they made a reference to the fact that Imperial wasn't named after imperialism or to do with empire, but it just didn't seem good enough to just simplify it as just that.'

'I also agree with the fact in general that the question of the name has not been addressed, and this is in complete contrast with the decision instead to look at single people and activities as it is expressly detailed in the report, as most of the activities which are contested have actually to do with the Empire and so are related in some sense with the Imperial name. I found especially striking the fact that last year, if I am not wrong, the motto of Imperial, 'imperi ducus et tutamen', was taken away from the coat of arms of the college. The name Imperial in that case, they wanted to take that out, while in this report they try to avoid looking at it. That's one great contradiction.'

'Part of that (changing the motto) was to put a bit of the history behind, to again just sweep it under the carpet a bit, because the old branding was very much imperialistic, because there were a lot of conversations about the motto which the last bit of the translation is, 'Safeguarding the Empire;' safeguarding from who, is the question. There are a lot of people that were asking about the motto and should this be acknowledged, and something done about it, and there were discussions among the bosses but ultimately it was like, 'It's a lot of paperwork and we'll have to go through a lot of stuff and we won't bother yet.' And then George Floyd and then they removed it, although removed in principle but not in... I think it's still there, I think it's still officially the motto, we just don't show it any more'.

'My question is, if the motto is gone but it's not gone officially, then why we are even having this conversation? Shouldn't the first step be to get a new motto or say we really distance ourselves from this motto? Even Princeton University changed their motto and they removed Woodrow Wilson; they had a Woodrow Wilson School of International Affairs and people were like, 'Oh no, you can't...' Woodrow Wilson was a complicated figure, they used these words 'complicated,' 'nuanced,' 'Let the past be the past,' but then when George Floyd happened they had no choice, they really had no choice, so he's gone, he's no longer there, and the motto is now changed'.

'I think officially getting a new motto should be a good way because ultimately, I agree with what the students are saying but you are never going to be able to steer policy in the right direction all the time, and especially if they have vested interests. If they have vested interests what are you going to do? You can't force someone who is on the board to sign up for complete sustainability, that's not possible because she's sitting on the board, she is not going to do that. We know that's not going to happen. I would say they must revise the motto, and if it's not removed officially that's really bad, that shows you are not willing, as

you said, all of you, not willing to make the formal step. It's like coming out of the closet but you are not really out, you are just like, 'I will just take one step out.' No, you really need to do it and say the Empire was terrible, we don't want this name, but we are keeping it because we are scientists, scientists don't change their names when they move in the environment, they just keep their names. I can understand that, but to not update your

Centred around discussions on the name also included points raised on the statue of Queen Victoria;

'...I don't think the Statue of Queen Victoria was mentioned in the reception (in the report) ... she is the figurehead of British Empire. So, I think again, like the name of Imperial, on this particular report it's been something that's not really been discussed. I don't think of course that we should knock that down or hide it in a cupboard somewhere, but I think particularly having a way of conveying information that it's not just about we laud Queen Victoria with absolutely no reservations, is my view on it'.

'We've got a statue of Queen Victoria quite prominently at Imperial, and I don't think this was touched upon in the report. I'm not an expert in Queen Victoria but she oversaw the British Empire during its biggest colonial expansion and... It's quite controversial, and I guess that takes us onto the point of Imperial's name in itself. I'm not suggesting any kind of drastic changes with regards to these things, but Imperial is a very charged word. I've talked to several other people around me and a lot of people of colour from foreign students as well, they find it a very... It's a very charged word, so I think in the future these two things the History Group could maybe just discuss from all angles.'

'I was just going to add on top of the whole Imperial name and not being touched, in one of our meetings that we had someone came and was very surprised by the fact that as soon as you come into the Imperial main office you have a statue of Queen Victoria there as well and all of her presiding over Empire and everything, and how come that's not been brought up in any of the history dialogue to date? Because again, with international students, people coming from the Commonwealth and her presiding over what's happened to their countries and their people, there doesn't seem to be any kind of acknowledgement of that anywhere either'.

'I totally support the debate about the name of the college, Imperial, and the connotations, and I have been at the college a few years now. I also remember when the statue of Queen Victoria was put in the Business School, there was no debate, it was just one day I came into college and it was there. Obviously, the thing that triggers in my head is Queen Victoria, Empress of India, and I have kind of like a nervous twitch every time I walk past it because it's almost a reminder of subjugation. I feel that these are the big issues that the college has to address, and it's disappointing that it hasn't addressed. I've less of a problem with Huxley, to be honest with you.'

Participants did not have a strong view either way in terms of recommending whether the name is changed or not, only that a fuller discussion needed to be reflected within the report and the review. One felt if the name was changed but not the actions of the college then this could be described as 'hypocritical'.

The name Imperial evoked much discussion and reflection within the groups.

'This is the simplest thing for me, you can have these discussions about the history and the figures, but it starts from the top; if your name is still Imperial College, my goodness, what change are you actually going to bring about? I think this is really fundamental, it's very similar, if I think about the Covid situation with the masks, people should wear masks but if the top doesn't wear masks, the Prime Minister is not wearing a mask, what difference does it make? For me as an outsider it's of course they are moving towards acknowledging and putting the black faces there, and I hope they are not just faces and that it's an actual real revision of the contributions of diverse people, but if the name is still there, fundamentally what are we celebrating? Yes, we are celebrating empire. That's all I've got to say'.

Points were made in respect to redefining the name, discussion on the brand of Imperial and whether and what the college stands for in addressing its imperialist relationships.

'Is maybe a point of this process redefining the name 'Imperial'? Because it is a brand, and the brand is what brings the students in and the world class status and everything. A few of the students who've been part of this focus group are quite radical in terms of what they want to see for the future; they recognise the past, and they want changes, so we can redress the past, but to transform the past into the future they want to see a lot more consideration to relationships with mining companies, with arms, so the mining, the engineering, the environmental expertise that Imperial has on the world stage, what are the maybe standards of engagement with enterprise that Imperial takes, so reduces this continual Imperial relationship with Africa, India and Palestine and Israel came up as an area'.

'I feel that if you are truly going to do it in deed then your name eventually must evolve. So, I understand there is a brand called Imperial, but then why is it that they don't expand the full name? Because if I understand, isn't the full name Imperial College of Science and Technology? I remember reading that somewhere, but you never see that name pop once, I even thought, 'Oh, is this the real name?' So, why do they not focus on making it a new name or expanding upon the name? Maybe they want to keep the name Imperial College, but I also feel you cannot just say you are going to do things in deed, because it becomes very, very strange and awkward if you are the champion of sustainability, you are the champion of addressing inequities in the world and you're reducing poverty, but you have Imperial College'.

'There was a massive, massive rebranding 10-15 years ago now, now I can't even remember what they were, Imperial College of Science, Medicine and Technology, and then they rebranded Imperial College London, no comma, so it's Imperial College London, and then the official thing is you can then refer to it as Imperial or the College, capital C like God. And it was very much so that you're not even meant to call it Imperial College, it should never have just been Imperial College just like that, so Imperial or the College. So, they can do big rebranding when they want to and really push that out and make it clear.'

There were concerns raised that losing the name would affect peoples' careers and that the name carried weight.

'I think the name Imperial, it's so powerful now around the world, especially with COVID, and we've been leading on it in so many ways that I can't see them ever changing it. I know black people who have worked at Imperial, and Asian people, and just having Imperial on their CV is attractive to employers, so if we changed it to something like Kensington College, who is going to know who it is, and it doesn't carry the same weight. I think there is a downside to changing the name because so many people have relied on it in their careers, if you see Imperial on their CV, it gets them that interview'.

The discussions around the name Imperial raised reflections and links regarding present day racism and the repetition of History and a lack of challenge within the college. Participants were keen not to repeat history and they saw the History Group report as an opportunity to transform the Imperial past.

'In terms of removing names and trying to whitewash people out, I think that's wrong because then you don't have the opportunity to learn from history, and we know that if we don't learn from history we repeat it, although often we repeat it anyway. I was very disappointed when I read the report that they really airbrushed over the whole concept of the college name, Imperial, says it all, and the argument for that was they were interested in things and people. I would argue that the concept of empire is not just a concept, it is a very real thing, it is about one group of people exploiting the resources, the lands and individuals of another place. We know that's something that the British Empire was very good at'.

H. Review present partnerships and donors

There were some vociferous questions around Imperial present relationships with partners and whether they are any different from the past? The point was made that history is also being created now in the present.

'I think renaming buildings and so on is a good idea, but if it remains as just that and you only look at the past and not what's happening right now, then what's the point? It just comes off more as trying to clean your image rather than actually doing the things that would be meaningful, that would have a material impact right here and today.'

A number of student participants were concerned that the report did not address present relationships only those from the past. Those that might be related to the present were under category B and are considered for further research and analysis. They together shared the following synopsis.

'I think this was very disappointing, and this is what I was initially looking for when I initially read this report. It's been reported by Felix, Imperial is not great with their investments and their partnerships. ... Why are we talking about clean technology when we're putting money into fossil fuels? It makes zero sense.....you have all these companies mining the third world for oil, gas and so on that are actually not only involved in human rights abuses but they are polluting the entire environment for that.'

'Also, imperialism when it comes to the arms industry. ... We're participating with BAE Systems, we get money from them, we invest in them and we have partnerships; BAE Systems is selling arms to Saudi Arabia that is known to commit crimes against humanity specifically against Palestinians in Gaza, they supplied 35 bombers for Israel. So, this is what is not mentioned in the report but it's history because it's happening at the moment, it's ongoing history, and it's completely ignored. I just find it so outrageous.'

A participant in response to this shared that the college receive money for projects that is not shared as they are in defence.

'We receive quite a lot of money from Shell, BP, all in green technologies, and when we talk about it we say, 'This is to develop green technologies, BP are great because we're doing this,' but we're participating in essentially greenwashing of these companies, and that is modern history.'

The question of ownership featured in these discussions with this participant expressing this point.

'What annoys me most, and it's still valid today, that other countries have the right to explore into a different country and exploit their mines, and this is for me particularly now exceedingly wrong. All the mines should belong to the countries where they are based, and they should not be exploited just due to monetary issues. This is one of the things where probably many coloured people feel very, very strongly against anyone who comes into contact and are putting them onto pedestals basically, because that is the wrong thing to do. I think this movement, this changing of our minds into a different, that is going to happen anyway, and it's needed.'

Participants also connected the discussions on past actions with the present actions of the college which may not be deemed acceptable now or in the near future.

'There are a lot of sponsorships in the college, college scholarships and whatnot from industries which tomorrow probably won't be acceptable. The oil industry caused global warming and the whole planet's burning up... and we've been taking money from... I won't name any names, there are lots of them, or equally defence industries. It's a thin end of a very big wedge, I think it's something that if we are going to acknowledge the errors of the past, we're still making them in different ways.'

One participant who had some awareness of the due diligence within the college shared there was process in place and queried '*whether that was enough would be another question*'. They shared;

'Obviously, there are some industries that we would never dream of touching money from, the most obvious one now is tobacco, but whether one could argue that taking money from fossil fuel companies now will be seen in 10 years' time as equivalent to taking money from tobacco companies I think is an interesting question'.

Another point that was made about gifts and legacy gifts and relationships with the Ministry of Defence.

'I'm worried about the current donations and endowments that the college receives now, today. There's evidence that we've received donations from the Mosley Foundation and things like that; what our relationship is like with the Communist Party in China. I'm more concerned about those kinds of current issues that we also have to address'.

'Zaharoff, the guy involved in arms, there's a lot of things I know that have been researched at the college, since I've been here I know that which make me uncomfortable, but I have probably not thought about them, like our connections with the Ministry of Defence and so on.'

They went on to share;

'I think what's as important is ensuring that those funders don't get to dictate what we do, and that's something that the college is much hotter on. The due diligence is one thing, and you could perhaps argue that it's not as rigorous as it needs to be and doesn't take a moral judgment, but the college is extremely serious about its academic autonomy and making sure these companies don't get to dictate those kinds of terms or have a veto on what we do.'

These points were contrasted with these viewpoints.

'I think the risk of stopping any funding of future projects for students etc. from some of these organisations is shooting ourselves in the foot in the sense that a lot of the oil companies today are investing a lot of money in the future of green energy. I understand they themselves for example have a terrible history of exploiting the natural resources of multiple countries, but they're also leading the way for the future green net zero transition that all economies need to transition into in the next 10-20-30 years, so I'm hoping the college has a proper due diligence process in place that ensures funding continues to come from these organisations. I'm not suggesting that we greenwash their funding, I'm not suggesting we should maintain some of the names which we've discussed on this call given the history of them, but again I think the college needs to be cognisant that the reason it's here today is because funding came from these sources, and they need to continue to come if it intends to be a leading university in the future. That's the only point I wanted to raise'.

'I do think there's a slight danger of cutting off our nose to spite our face, as the saying has it. We do need fundraising of all types, we do need frankly, to put it crudely, the money, and looking back at the Beit brothers they may well be highly objectionable even by their own standards I suspect, and very much objectionable by modern day standards, but they made their money and then they donated it to the college so that we could use it for good purposes. So, I think there is a very interesting question of what sort of philanthropy do we want as a college?'

The welfare of international students also emerged in the discussions on present understandings and attitudes towards the concerns on inequalities with this contribution;

'Just to bring in a slightly different aspect of modern imperialism, we are always very proud of our international links, our international students, we have a very large number of students from China and the Far East.....but when the pandemic hit, a lot of the internal concern was money, and that strikes me as also quite imperialistic, so we are willing to accept these students because they're paying large amounts of money to support us, as soon as something bad happens we're worried about the money, not necessarily the students.'

Strong feelings emerged that the college should be thinking more about ethics of funding, investments and in education, one participant raised the point that the college should consider investing in the future, putting money into ethical funds, looking at improved spending that will outlive oil for example, one participant felt oil had maybe 50 years left. Investments that were deemed unethical that are against the academic and university mission should be reconsidered and adjusted.

Reviewing and evaluating research funding and projects was questioned and emphasised as an area to be examined.

'I absolutely agree with the point that the students have been raising (about existing college relationships) and I think when talking about for example decolonising the curriculum, that shouldn't let research off the hook and the reasons why research has been done. I'm acknowledging that there is a lot of change recently around particular areas of research, or certainly funding, but yes, I think examining how research topics/areas have been chosen in the past and the reasons, and where the funding came from is equally important, and agreeing a way of funding the research and the topics that are selected, in the way that it sounds like the students have been talking about. I think that would be really important.'

Another participant shared that more should be done to promote the ethics of engineering, he mentioned that he had taken an ethics course, however this was not taken seriously, and he felt that given Imperial is involved in industries that can be considered as modern-day imperialists it was important to equip students with this understanding.

Concern was expressed as to why these issues had not featured more strongly in the history group report, with some feeling this was something the college did not want to address as the consequences were not going to look good for the college and it would reveal some ‘big questions.’

One such ‘big question’ was raised questioning the role Imperial has being on a board of a company that contributes to high levels of pollution.

‘I am not saying that all of Imperial is corrupted, but there are pockets where it feels like it hasn’t moved, like the fact for example that, for me personally it’s not race-related but I think it’s related to integrity and honesty of the leaders of Imperial College. When we have a President who sits on the Chevron’s Board, and she is also supposed to be leading the college’s sustainability strategy, what are we really talking about? Why did Imperial, those people who were going through the recruitment process never... It was never a red flag for them. We can’t have a President who is sitting on Chevron’s Board, one of the companies which is considered one of the eight major polluters, and companies that are contributing hugely to the climate crisis. It doesn’t compute’.

The discussion on present relationships going forward was summarised by one participant as follows;

‘I think it’s an interesting point that a lot of us have mentioned that history is made in the present.... and that the decisions that we make now that will be looked back not so fondly in some time, and so let’s correct those sooner rather than later.’

Overall there was a desire for some clear guidelines, a set of standards and criteria that judgements can be made on what financial contributions are accepted and this would need to be transparent. Donors it was felt needed to be subject to relevant and appropriate scrutiny.