



# UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON NAMING HONORS

REPORT TO THE PRESIDENT

---

MAY 8, 2021



EMORY UNIVERSITY

<b>INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>3</b>
A. Preamble.....	3
B. Charge .....	3
C. Process.....	5
<b>II. Existing Names.....</b>	<b>8</b>
A. Atticus Greene Haygood.....	8
B. Lucius Quintus Cincinnatus Lamar.....	13
C. Augustus Baldwin Longstreet .....	16
D. George Foster Pierce.....	18
E. Robert Yerkes .....	21
<b>III. New Names.....</b>	<b>26</b>
A. Horace Johnson.....	26
B. Additional Considerations.....	28
<b>APPENDIX.....</b>	<b>30</b>

## INTRODUCTION

### A. Preamble

This is a report about the present. It is about the University's current mission, vision, and values. It is an appraisal of whether the existing names and legacies we exalt and honor are consistent with those values. The question before our Committee is not what legacies we should remember. Nor is the question what legacies we should punish. As the name suggests, the task of the Naming Honors Committee has been to assess whether the University is living its values through what we honor.

This report is about the future. We offer this report mindful that the honors we endorse have implications for what messages are expressed to future members of our community about their status as equals; about whether this environment welcomes them with a spirit of inclusion; and about what it means to engage in academically rigorous, fair-minded debates about difficult issues. We also reach our conclusions mindful that today's actions are tomorrow's precedents. The degree of deference we give to past decisions, the amount of respect we show to past community members, will help inform the degree of respect that our decisions are entitled in the future.

And this report is about the past. Our work is informed by a prior Emory University committee's admonition that "circumspection is called for in judging historical eras through the moral lens of our own day" and that "named buildings and other honors become part of the institution's history." We are contemporaneously guided by the awareness that some past contributions have historically been unrecognized because of systemic racism, sexism, and other forms of identity-based discrimination, exploitation, and dehumanization. Failing to seek out and lift up the contributions of those who have been historically subjugated, while celebrating the legacies of those who contributed to their subjugation, is a form of complicity in past horrors. In remembering the past, showing respect of past victims of horror requires prudence about the legacies we celebrate.

### B. Charge

This Committee's work builds on the work of prior committees, and prior administrations. In 2017, President Claire E. Sterk appointed the Task Force on Legacies, which drafted University guidelines for contested honorific names across Emory's campuses, including names on buildings, spaces, programs, and scholarships. That Task Force created a set of guiding principles. Next, in 2019, the Offices of the President and Provost created the University Committee on Naming Honors, which reviewed contested names and developed recommendations for leadership's consideration. In August 2020, President Gregory L. Fenves and interim Provost Jan Love reappointed the Committee, selecting the following diverse range of community members:

Fred Smith Jr., Committee Chair and Associate Professor of Law, Emory School of Law  
Gabrielle Buchbinder 21B  
Adaora Ede 21N  
Dabney P. Evans 98PH Associate Professor of Global Health, Rollins School of Public Health; Director, Center for Humanitarian Emergencies

Alison Collis Greene, Associate Professor of American Religious History and Director  
 of the Master of Theological Studies Program, Candler School of Theology  
 Jill Hamilton, Associate Professor, Nell Hodgson Woodruff School of Nursing  
 Laura J. Hardman, Trustee Emerita  
 Daniel LaChance, Winship Distinguished Professor in History, 2020–2023, Emory  
 College of Arts and Sciences  
 Samantha Lanjewar 24G Genetics and Molecular Biology PhD Student  
 Carlton Mackey 05T, Director, Ethics & the Arts and Associate Director, Ethics and  
 Servant Leadership, Center for Ethics; Adjunct Faculty, Department of Film and  
 Media, Emory College of Arts and Sciences  
 Carolyn Meltzer, Executive Associate Dean, Faculty Advancement, Leadership, and  
 Inclusion; Chair, Department of Radiology and Imaging Sciences; William  
 Patterson Timmie Endowed Professorship, Emory School of Medicine  
 Giacomo Negro, Professor of Organization and Management; Goizueta Term Chair,  
 Organization and Management, Goizueta Business School; Professor of  
 Sociology (by courtesy), Emory College of Arts and Sciences  
 Joshua Newton, Senior Vice President of Advancement and Alumni Engagement  
 Ronald Poole II 23C Student  
 Salmon Shomade, Associate Professor of Political Science, Oxford College  
 Philip Wainwright 85G Vice Provost, Global Strategy and Initiatives

We are also aided by the incomparable work of Anjulet Tucker 00C 09PhD, the Office of  
 the President, Director of Presidential Initiatives and Special Projects, and Liaison to Office of  
 the President. Moreover, we received extraordinary support from Darlene Berry, Executive  
 Administrative Assistant, Office of the Provost; and Melissa Daly, Assistant Vice Provost and  
 Chief of Staff in the Office of the Provost.

The Committee was charged with: “examining new historic names for and reviewing  
 contested historic names on buildings, spaces, programs, scholarships, and other celebratory  
 titles that honor individuals. It serves in an advisory capacity to the president.” The Committee  
 was asked to “[b]uild on work done by previous committees that focused on naming and honors  
 at Emory” and to use the 2017 ‘Proposed Principles for Bestowing Naming Honors at Emory  
 University,’ developed by the Task Force on Legacies in 2017, as a guide.” The Committee was  
 asked to:

- “1. Review historic names on buildings, spaces, programs, scholarships, and other  
 honors, which have become contested. It may conduct historical research on names  
 submitted for review and evaluate the appropriateness of the reviewed names of  
 buildings, locations, named professorships, and other honorific titles based on an analysis  
 of the historical research;
2. Review and conduct due diligence research on potential new historic names submitted  
 for evaluation.”

### C. Process

The current Committee convened on December 1, 2020. President Fenves and Provost Love welcomed Committee members and outlined the Committee's charge. In the months that followed, the Committee: (1) solicited names and feedback from the broader Emory University community; (2) reviewed and adapted principles from prior committees; (3) read prior reports, student demands, and recent school newspaper articles about contested names;<sup>1</sup> (4) hired two graduate research assistants; (5) consulted other external and internal experts; and (6) engaged in deliberations to apply adapted principles to well-documented contested names. Each of these steps is described in more detail here.

(1) Solicitation of names from community: With the aid of the Office of the President, the Committee approved an online form through which persons could submit names for review. A snapshot of the interface can be found in Appendix B. Additionally, Susan Carini (Executive Director of Communications and Public Affairs) authored an article that updated the University community about these efforts. These methods yielded multiple names for our review: Augustus Longstreet, George Pierce, and Robert Yerkes. Longstreet and Pierce were also among the names that students have requested the University to review in recent years. For Yerkes, the nomination was submitted by a member of the Yerkes family who serves on Emory's Board of Visitors.

Moreover, this system yielded three potential new names for our consideration: Ira Adams-Chapman, Horace Johnson, and Frances Smith-Foster. We focused primarily on the Johnson name, in part because the name was nominated early in our process, and in part because the name was accompanied with substantial decanal support from across campus. Moreover, the nomination was not connected with a proposed philanthropic gift. In our view, a standing committee on naming honors should be created to review additional names, a committee akin to the Committee on Honorary Degrees. We nonetheless also include information in this report about the remarkable work of Drs. Adams-Chapman and Smith-Foster.

(2) Review of other indicia of contestation: Our initial charge explained that, "In recent years, members of the Emory community have raised important questions about the names and honorific designations recognized on Emory's Atlanta and Oxford campuses." To this end, beyond our formal submission system, the Committee also took into account other evidence that names have been a source of contestation in recent years among Emory community members. We considered names that were submitted to previous committees. We also read related student demands and articles in Emory's student-run newspaper.

Consideration of these additional sources, along with a realistic appraisal of which names we could engage in careful, well-documented research, yielded the following additional names: Atticus Haygood and L.Q.C. Lamar.

---

<sup>1</sup> In a [letter to the Emory community on June 16](#), the Coalition of Black Organizations and Clubs submitted a list of requests to the Emory administration that included the following demand: "We demand that Emory University be a willing ear and undedicate residential spaces and other University properties to Confederate slave holders, acknowledging their notorious and well-documented histories of deriving wealth from the enslavement, abuse, forced labour, and general subjugation of African American peoples." See also [Kamryn Olds, Rename Longstreet-Means. It's Time, Emory Wheel, Jul 14, 2020](#); [Martin Shane Li and Sophia Ling, Our Buildings Bear Confederate Names. This Cannot Stand, Feb 6, 2021](#).

(3) Review and adaptation of prior principles: The Committee reviewed the principles that were adopted in 2017 and adapted them for our use. The 2017 report can be found in Appendix A, and the substantially similar principles that we used can be found in Appendix C. For clarity, below is language from the 2017 report, with our modifications noted:

1. *All naming honors bestowed by Emory University, should recognize those who have made positive contributions to areas such as education, the arts, the sciences, health care, peace-building, religion, social justice, community or public service, philanthropy, or other areas consistent with Emory’s mission, values and vision to “create, preserve, teach, and apply knowledge in the service of humanity.” **Further, Emory University welcomes a diversity of ethnic, cultural, socioeconomic, religious, national, and international backgrounds, believing that the intellectual and social energy that results from such diversity is critical to advancing knowledge and excellence.** In keeping with established University policy and procedures, naming opportunities should bear the names of only those individuals or entities that reflect the values of Emory University **and are reflective of a community characterized by respectful and mutually supportive interaction among faculty, students, staff, and the wider world.***
2. *All buildings on Emory’s campuses contribute to the University’s mission and thus contribute to the University’s reputation. No distinction should be made between buildings because of their primary purposes, whether residential, social, athletic, academic, scientific, or administrative. **Conscious efforts should be made to honor persons whose contributions have historically been unrecognized because of systemic racism, sexism, and other forms of identity-based discrimination, exploitation, and dehumanization.***
3. *Because circumspection is called for in judging historical eras through the moral lens of our own day, and because named buildings and other honors become part of the institution’s history, a presumption against renaming them should exist, absent **compelling** circumstances.*
4. *In the instance when a name is contested, the following criteria should be considered:<sup>2</sup>*
  - a. *whether association with the name brings dishonor or infamy to the University;*
  - b. *whether the named person or entity behaved contrary to the mission, **vision, or values** of the University;*
  - c. *whether the person or entity promoted slavery, genocide, or discrimination on the basis of race, gender, religion, national origin, ~~or sexual identity~~, sexual orientation, or other identity-based status;*

---

<sup>2</sup> Note: The 2017 principles also included, “whether the named person or entity engaged in criminal activity.” The 2021 Committee concluded, however, that legality and morality are not synonymous. Because American law has sometimes endorsed and condoned horrific acts, the Committee concluded that legality is an inaccurate and inadequate barometer of egalitarian values.

*d. whether the person or entity later took redemptive action, such as public repudiation of an objectionable position, work to overcome injustice, or other activity reflecting the University's mission and values and counter to the activity that has called the name into question; and*

*e. whether the named building, space, or program has generated a positive legacy. ~~that transcends the history of the named person or entity.~~*

(4) Research Assistance: With generous resources from the Office of the President, the Committee hired two graduate research assistants, both of whom are candidates for PhDs: Daniel Ballon, in the Graduate Division of Religion, and Kimberly Neal, in the Department of History. The students were recommended by Professor Alison Greene, and she served as the most direct supervisor for their work. The research assistants attended Committee meetings, produced reports about all five existing names that the Committee carefully reviewed, and answered the Committee's questions about how to contextualize relevant information about the contested names. The Carlos Foundation provided funding for the research assistants.

(5) Consultation with Internal and External Experts: The Committee consulted a number of internal and external experts, including:

Yolanda Cooper, Dean and University Librarian  
John Bence, University Archivist  
Dr. Joseph Crespino, Jimmy Carter Professor of History  
Dr. Gary Hauk, University Historian Emeritus  
Dr. Mallory Millender, University Historian Emeritus, Paine College  
Dr. Paul Root Wolpe, Raymond F. Schinazi Distinguished Research Chair in Jewish Bioethics, director of the Center for Ethics  
Dr. Michelle Maria Wright, Longstreet Professor of English

(6) Deliberations: The full Committee met approximately two times each month to facilitate our progress. In addition, subcommittees (of seven persons) were created to refine our guiding principles and to deliberate about specific cases. During the second and third weeks of April, subcommittees met to deliberate about the names on our docket and made recommendations about those names. The subcommittees consulted the research reports about these names, as well as other primary and secondary sources. At each of these meetings, at least one faculty historian and one graduate research assistant was present to answer committee members' questions. For existing names, members of the subcommittees collectively asked, and ultimately reached consensus about, the following questions, each of which was derived from the aforementioned framework and revised principles:

1. Does the name reflect Emory's mission, vision, and current values?
2. Does the name confer dishonor or infamy?
3. Is the name associated with behavior contrary to the University's mission, vision, and values?
4. Did the named person take later redemptive action?
5. Has the named program/building/space generated a positive legacy?
6. Was the name selected for reasons that are inconsistent with the University's mission or values?

7. Does this subcommittee recommend that this name be removed?

On April 29, the full Committee met to discuss the subcommittees' recommendations. After those deliberations, on April 30-May 2, via an online ballot, the Committee voted. The Committee endorsed each of the subcommittees' recommendations with no dissents.

## II. Existing Names

The Committee recommends that Emory University discontinue the conferral of naming honors for: Atticus Greene Haygood, L.Q.C. Lamar, George Foster Pierce, Augustus Baldwin Longstreet, and Robert Yerkes. We reiterate that these recommendations are not, in our view, a form of punitive judgment. Further, it is important that their legacies—positive and negative—be remembered. It is also our view, however, that there are compelling reasons to cease in honoring them through the naming of spaces, professorships, and programs. Although some of the individuals below had significant positive contributions, in each instance, they also had central roles in promoting policies that significantly contributed to slavery, genocide, or other forms of identity-based subordination. They promoted policies that perpetuated the view that some human beings were inherently inferior, subhuman, or incapable of being full members of American Democracy.

To continue celebrating the legacies of individuals who perpetuated such policies would be incompatible with Emory University's vision and values. According to our University's formal Vision Statement, "The university welcomes a diversity of ethnic, cultural, socioeconomic, religious, national, and international backgrounds, believing that the intellectual and social energy that results from such diversity is critical to advancing knowledge." Moreover, "Emory strives to create a community characterized by respectful and mutually supportive interaction among faculty, students, staff, and the wider world." Further, according to Emory University's Institutional Statement on Diversity, "Equity is the guarantee of fair treatment, access, opportunity and advancement for all students, faculty, and staff, while at the same time striving to identify and eliminate barriers that have prevented the full participation of some groups." What we choose to honor communicates implicit messages about whether all persons enter into our community with equal dignity. Replacing the following names will facilitate progress toward creating a respectful, mutually supportive, and equitable institution.

### A. Atticus Greene Haygood

Atticus Greene Haygood, a Methodist bishop and educator, was born November 19, 1839, in Watkinsville, Georgia, the son of Greene Berry Haygood, a lawyer, and Martha Askew Haygood. He died January 19, 1896, in Oxford, Georgia.<sup>3</sup> Ordained in 1858, Haygood served as a chaplain for the Confederate army during the Civil War; was appointed editor of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South's Sunday school publications (1870); and served as president of Emory College (1875-1884), where he introduced the teaching of modern languages, law, and business courses. He edited the Wesleyan Christian Advocate (1878-1884); was appointed the first agent for the John F. Slater Fund for Negro Education in the South (1882); was elected bishop (1890);

---

<sup>3</sup> For this paragraph, the Committee relies on Stuart A. Rose Manuscript, Archives, and Rare Book Library's [Collection Description of Haygood's Papers](#).

served the Los Angeles Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South; wrote more than 13 books (1872-1895); and was a chief spokesman for the “New South” doctrine.

A freshman dormitory bears Haygood’s name, as does the gate at Emory’s most prominent point of entry. As with all candidates, the Haygood subcommittee reflected upon seven questions during its deliberation, and it reached consensus as to whether they Strongly Agreed, Agreed, Disagreed, Strongly Disagreed or were neutral to each of those questions. They also provided a statement of reasons to the Chair and the larger committee. Each of the questions the subcommittee answered and the role the answers played in the ultimate subcommittee’s recommendation are described below.

### 1. Does the name reflect Emory’s mission, vision, and current values?

The subcommittee dedicated to the Haygood case observed that this was a difficult question in light of Haygood’s decidedly mixed legacy. But ultimately, the subcommittee disagreed with the view that the name reflects Emory’s mission, vision, and current values.

On the one hand, Haygood’s legacy is often associated with his considerable positive contributions. During his time as Emory’s president, he increased the school’s regional profile, built up its library collection, and created opportunities for financial aid for students who worked across campus.<sup>4</sup> He also attracted resources from Northern philanthropists, helping to eliminate Emory’s debts.

Nationally, Haygood is most known for his role in cultivating Georgia’s reputation as a leader of “The New South,” both through his words and his deeds. For example, on November 25, 1880, Haygood delivered a Thanksgiving sermon titled “The New South: Gratitude, Amendment, Hope—A Thanksgiving Sermon” at the Oxford Methodist Church in which Haygood “declared that slavery had been an evil thing, and that with its abolition the South with a clear conscience faced a more prosperous future, if only she would exercise the virtues of industry and economy.”<sup>5</sup> He also authored three books that elaborated in this theme, including *Our Brother in Black: His Freedom and His Future* (1881). According to one historian, Haygood’s writings helped attract Northern philanthropy toward a “future-oriented” vision of the South.<sup>6</sup>

Relatedly, Haygood is known for his role in attracting philanthropy toward higher education for Black students. In 1882, Haygood helped to found what is now Paine College, a private, historically Black college in Augusta, Georgia.<sup>7</sup> In addition, in 1882, he became the executive director of the John F. Slater Fund for the Education of the Freedmen, a fund created through a million-dollar donation from Northern philanthropist John Fox Slater. That fund disbursed financial aid to support schools and colleges for African Americans in the South.<sup>8</sup> In 1884, Haygood resigned the presidency at Emory to work in his role at the Slater Fund full time,<sup>9</sup> and in 1890, he was elected as a bishop in the Methodist Episcopal Church (MEC), South, a position in which he served (primarily engaged in mission work in California) until 1893.

---

<sup>4</sup> Henry Morton Bullock, *A History of Emory University* (Nashville, TN: Parthenon Press, 1936), 168-69.

<sup>5</sup> Thomas H. English, *Emory University, 1915-1965: A Semicentennial History* (Atlanta, GA: Higgins-McArthur Co., 1966), 6.

<sup>6</sup> Gary S. Hauk, *Emory As Place: Meaning in a University Landscape* (Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 2019), 21.

<sup>7</sup> Hauk, *A Legacy of Heart and Mind*, 35.

<sup>8</sup> Ibid.

<sup>9</sup> Ibid.

On the other hand, the subcommittee ultimately concluded that alongside the laudable aspects of his legacy, Haygood also had a central role in promoting policies that contributed significantly to the subjugation of African Americans in the South. This is especially true of his policy positions during and after Reconstruction. In one 1887 op-ed, for example, while condemning a state law that criminalized integrated schools in Georgia, Haygood *also* wrote that parents of interracial children should be convicted and placed on the chain gang.<sup>10</sup> He wrote:

It seems to me, as I have often heretofore tried to teach, that the best interests of both races require them to keep their blood pure. There is no hope for either in miscegenation. There is a Georgia law against inter-marriage—a law more violated, ten to one, if not the letter, in reality and spirit of it, than the law against mixed schools. If now the Legislature will give us a law placing the parents of mulatto children in the chain-gang, that would be worth while.

He also publicly stated, on multiple occasions, that African American men across the South should not have been given the right to vote immediately after the Civil War, arguing in 1895 that “in the days of ‘Reconstruction’—in many respects more harmful to business, social, civil, and religious order and life, than the war itself—the ballot was ‘dumped’ upon the emancipated people—utterly unfit for the responsibilities of citizenship.”<sup>11</sup> Consistent with that assertion, Haygood opposed the Federal Elections Bill, proposed in Congress at a time when Southern states began to codify voting restrictions such as grandfather clauses, poll taxes, and literacy tests.<sup>12</sup> He reasoned, “As I see these things, no more worse blow could be aimed at the negro than a blow which he would inevitably understand as intended to put him in control of government in the South.”<sup>13</sup> Simultaneously, while he condemned lynching,<sup>14</sup> he nonetheless often minimized the brutality of the institution of slavery, as well as the terroristic violence that was taking place when federal troops left the South.<sup>15</sup>

The subcommittee focused less on his role as a chaplain in the Confederate army. To be sure, the subcommittee was aware that in 1861, Haygood volunteered to serve in the Confederate army as a chaplain of the Fifteenth Regiment of Georgia Infantry.<sup>16</sup> The subcommittee was also aware that in 1863, Haygood was appointed by the MEC, South to serve as a missionary chaplain to Confederate troops in northwest Georgia.<sup>17</sup> While concerning, the subcommittee observed that Haygood engaged in post-war deeds and words that disavowed the institution of slavery and celebrated its demise. The nature of his Civil War involvement and Haygood’s later actions serve as mitigating factors with regard to his role in the Civil War.

---

<sup>10</sup> Atticus Greene Haygood, “Chain Gang for the Wrong Reason,” ACHFP, bound volume 3.

<sup>11</sup> Atticus Greene Haygood, “The Negro Problem: God Takes Time—Man Must,” *The Methodist Review*, September-October 1895, 7, AGHFP, box 1, folder 3. *See also* Atticus Greene Haygood, “A Nation’s Work and Duty: If Universal Suffrage, Then Universal Education,” Delivered Before the National Sunday-School Assembly, Chautauqua, TN, August 20, 1883, AGHFP, bound volume 9 (condemning the “constant menace” of “the ignorant vote”).

<sup>12</sup> Haygood, *Alabama Christian Advocate*, August 14, 1890.

<sup>13</sup> *Id.*

<sup>14</sup> Haygood, “The Duty of the South,” AGHFP, bound volume 9.

<sup>15</sup> Atticus Greene Haygood, “A Meditation,” ACHFP, bound volume 4.

<sup>16</sup> Mann, Atticus Greene Haygood, 37-40.

<sup>17</sup> *Id.*, at 44-45.

Instead, the subcommittee was most troubled by his post-war positions. From Haygood's pedestal of trust as an emissary of the New South, he advocated for pernicious policies. The subcommittee that focused on the Haygood case put it this way: "The practices that Haygood advocated for—the withholding of the franchise, the punishment of interracial relationships—and those that he actively minimized—lynching, slavery—were unambiguously and foreseeably linked to the re-subjugation of people of African descent after a brief period of radical possibility."

2. Does the name confer dishonor or infamy?

The subcommittee reached consensus that it was "Neutral" on this question. On the one hand, Haygood engaged in efforts to support the education of former slaves. On the other hand, as stated above, these efforts are tainted by segregation and his support of policies that are the antecedents of systematic racism that persists today. He advocated punishment for having mixed children through the chain gang; minimized the issue of lynching; and advanced the idea that Black men were not ready to participate in governance, specifically voting. The subcommittee recognized that historically, Haygood's public legacy has been presented in a positive light. But the subcommittee could not ignore Haygood's numerous public statements supporting practices and ideas that maintained the subjugation of African Americans.

3. Is the name associated with behavior contrary to the University's mission, vision, and values?

The subcommittee reached consensus that it was "Neutral" on this question as well, for many of the reasons that have been stated. His legacy, the subcommittee explained, is mixed. Although he served and assisted Confederate troops during the Civil War, the fact that this was in his capacity as a chaplain was a mitigating factor. Moreover, his reputation is often associated with his positive contributions as a racial moderate who advocated for African American education. Indeed, the administration building at Paine College bears his name, as does an African American seminary in Arkansas.

And yet, in the very same documents in which Haygood advocated for progress, he supported policies that propagated a racial caste system that America is still working to untie itself from today. An Emory student or member of the public who decides to read Haygood's writings would encounter this advocacy, as well as his minimalization of slavery and terroristic mob violence.

4. Did the named person take later redemptive action?

The subcommittee reached consensus that it "Agree[d]" with this statement. The subcommittee acknowledged that there are varying definitions of the word "redemption," with some definitions taking on religious significance. It understood this question to inquire as to whether Haygood engaged in actions that undermined white supremacist policies. In the words of the subcommittee: "Haygood was a strong advocate for education, through his actions and achievements as the President of Emory, in his extensive writings, and in his support of educational opportunities for former slaves. He is widely recognized for his positive work in this area." They reiterated, however, that he supported "specific policies...that were racist and

discriminatory.” As such, “[t]he subcommittee feels strongly that his support for racist and discriminatory positions and minimization of the violence of slavery and racism cannot be overlooked and that this part of his legacy sits in contradiction to and undermines other actions that might be seen as redemptive.”

5. Has the named program/building/space generated a positive legacy?

The subcommittee agreed with this question, though one subcommittee member was neutral. The subcommittee was aware of three cases of honorific naming for Haygood: Haygood Hall at the Oxford campus, the Haygood-Hopkins Gate, and Haygood Drive. The subcommittee noted that “Haygood-Hopkins Gate is one of the most widely recognized symbols of Emory, heightening the need to confront the negative aspects of Haygood’s legacy.” Haygood Hall is one of Oxford’s principal student residence halls. The subcommittee noted that while it is difficult to “measure feelings and the way they are associated with the names or the structure or spaces,” these structures and spaces “definitely have positive associations.” The subcommittee noted the continued recognition of Haygood’s name in other institutions, including a seminary in Arkansas and the administrative building at Paine College.

6. Was the name selected for reasons that are inconsistent with the university’s mission or values?

The subcommittee is not aware of any problematic aspects in the naming of the features bearing Haygood’s name.

7. Does this subcommittee recommend that this name be removed?

The subcommittee reached consensus that the name should be removed. It explained this decision as follows:

In spite of his earnest attempts to find a better path forward, his racist positions on policies and his racist statements are impossible to ignore. Support for racist policies is clear and, in the assessment of the subcommittee, negates other good things he did. Retaining his name on buildings and other features on campus in the face of his complex and mixed legacy is contrary to the current values of Emory as expressed in the Emory mission and vision statements and specifically Emory’s commitment to create an inclusive campus.

As we deliberated, we were mindful of our obligation to use circumspection “in judging historical eras through the moral lens of our own day.” We were also mindful that “because named buildings and other honors become part of the institution’s history, a presumption against renaming them should exist, absent compelling circumstances.”

From one standpoint, circumspection may be understood to require a kind of deference to the norms and values of an era, even if they directly contradict the University’s current mission and values. The Committee adopted a different

understanding of what circumspection requires. We saw circumspection as an imperative to keep at the forefront of our deliberations the historical context in which Haygood lived, spoke, and acted. We acknowledged that it was improbable that he—or similarly situated men—would recognize his white paternalism as pernicious. And yet we weighed such acknowledgement against the effects such paternalism had in his time. The practices that Haygood advocated for—the withholding of the franchise, the punishment of interracial relationships—and those that he actively minimized—lynching, slavery—were unambiguously and foreseeably linked to the re-subjugation of people of African descent after a brief period of radical possibility.

The subcommittee feels that the positive aspects of Haygood’s legacy are outweighed by his support of racist policies and positions that are contrary to elements of Emory’s current mission, vision and values and undermine Emory’s commitment to an inclusive environment. This mixed legacy makes it inappropriate for him to be celebrated by honorific naming, and we therefore recommend that Haygood’s name be removed.

**The Full Committee’s Recommendation: The Full Committee endorses this recommendation of removal with no dissents.**

**B. Lucius Quintus Cincinnatus Lamar**

L.Q.C. Lamar was an American lawyer, judge, executive official, and politician.<sup>18</sup> He was born in Putnam County, Georgia, in 1825<sup>19</sup> and died in 1893.<sup>20</sup> He graduated from Emory College in 1845.<sup>21</sup> Lamar served in the United States House of Representatives from Mississippi from 1856 to 1861, resigning to become a member of the Mississippi Secession Convention.<sup>22</sup> At that convention, he authored Mississippi’s Ordinance of Secession.<sup>23</sup> He then served as a Lt. Colonel on behalf of the Confederate States of America during the Civil War. After the war, he was again elected to office in Mississippi, serving as a state representative, a member of the United States House, and a United States Senator. From 1885 to 1888, Lamar served as the Secretary of the Interior. From 1888 to 1893, he served as Associate Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court.

For several decades in the previous century, Emory Law School bore his name. Today, three professorships at the law school bear his name. The Committee recommends that Emory discontinue the use of this name. Below are the subcommittee’s answers to each of the posed questions and its accompanying reasons.

---

<sup>18</sup> “Lamar, Lucius Quintus Cincinnatus,” U.S. House of Representatives: History, Art & Archives, accessed April 19, 2021, [https://history.house.gov/People/Listing/L/LAMAR,-Lucius-Quintus-Cincinnatus-\(L000030\)/](https://history.house.gov/People/Listing/L/LAMAR,-Lucius-Quintus-Cincinnatus-(L000030)/).

<sup>19</sup> James B. Murphy, “Lamar, Lucius Quintus Cincinnatus,” *American National Biography* (Oxford University Press, 2000), <https://www-anb-org.proxy.library.emory.edu/view/10.1093/anb/9780198606697.001.0001/anb-9780198606697-e-1101030>.

<sup>20</sup> *Id.*

<sup>21</sup> *Catalogue of Emory College, 1907-1908* (Foote and Davis Co., 1908), 54.

<sup>22</sup> Murphy, *supra*.

<sup>23</sup> *Id.*

1. Does the name reflect Emory's mission, vision, and current values?

The subcommittee strongly disagreed with this statement. From his positions of power, Lamar defended slavery and supported the South's ability to legalize enslavement. Lamar wrote Mississippi's Articles of Secession, in which he disparaged the abolitionist view of "negro equality." Lamar's stance and active role in perpetuating slavery—and later, obstructing Reconstruction—goes against Emory's mission, vision, values, and commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion.

2. Does the name confer dishonor or infamy?

The subcommittee strongly agreed. The subcommittee concluded that Lamar's legacy brings both dishonor and infamy. The committee focused in particular on Lamar's work in writing the Articles of Secession, which at the time was regarded as treason by the federal government. Lamar actively engaged in pro-slavery activities and attempted to block federal interventions into Southern states' affairs. Additionally, Lamar played an active role in trying to obstruct Reconstruction by blocking the counting of electoral votes in the presidential election of 1876.<sup>24</sup>

3. Is the name associated with behavior contrary to the university's mission, vision, and values?

The subcommittee again strongly agreed, identifying a number of instances of behavior at odds with Emory's current mission, vision, and values. As observed, Lamar promoted enslavement and played an active role in secession via his Secession Articles. Particular excerpts from Lamar's Articles of Secession highlight his pro-slavery, anti-Reconstruction viewpoint: "Our position is thoroughly identified with the institution of slavery—the greatest material interest of the world. Its labor supplies the product which constitutes by far the largest and most important portions of commerce of the earth."<sup>25</sup> He added: "These products are peculiar to the climate verging on the tropical regions, and by an imperious law of nature, none but the black race can bear exposure to the tropical sun. These products have become necessities of the world, and a blow at slavery is a blow at commerce and civilization."<sup>26</sup>

4. Did the named person take later redemptive action?

The subcommittee strongly disagreed. The subcommittee noted that Lamar famously expressed rhetoric for national reconciliation, rhetoric for which he has received public praise. Still, Lamar continued to denounce the need for Reconstruction. Consider, for example, his

---

<sup>24</sup> James B. Murphy, "Lamar, Lucius Quintus Cincinnatus," *American National Biography* (Oxford University Press, 2000), <https://www-anb-org.proxy.library.emory.edu/view/10.1093/anb/9780198606697.001.0001/anb-9780198606697-e-1101030>.

<sup>25</sup> "Confederate States of America - Mississippi Secession A Declaration of the Immediate Causes which Induce and Justify the Secession of the State of Mississippi from the Federal Union," *The Avalon Project, Documents in Law, History, and Diplomacy*, [https://avalon.law.yale.edu/19th\\_century/csa\\_missec.asp](https://avalon.law.yale.edu/19th_century/csa_missec.asp)

<sup>26</sup> Id.

famous eulogy of Northern Republican Senator Charles Sumner, which is sometimes cited as evidence of his belief in reconciliation.<sup>27</sup> In that speech and in other public statements, there was no disavowal of his previous positions on (and activity perpetuating) racial subjugation. Moreover, even after that famed speech, he attempted to obstruct the presidential election of 1876 as a means of ending Reconstruction.<sup>28</sup>

Years after the end of Reconstruction, Lamar continued to promote policy positions that perpetuated racial subordination. In an 1881 letter to the editor of the *Brookhaven Ledge*, Lamar lamented the potential looming “domination of the negro vote” and expressed his belief that “life will be unbearable in Mississippi if it succeeds.”<sup>29</sup> He added, “The negroes are far different now from what they were. They have become more estranged from, and more antagonistic to, and less assimilated with, our political of habitudes and aims than they were when under the lingering influence of old relations of dependence and protection.”<sup>30</sup> In a contemporary private letter, he explained the aims of these kinds of statements: “The object is with me to arouse the white people and to impress them with the necessity of union against negro government. I argue at some length to show that an election carried by a negro vote will be a negro government[.]”<sup>31</sup> These are not words of redemption.

##### 5. Has the named program/building/space generated a positive legacy?

The subcommittee strongly disagreed. The subcommittee looked to whether the use of the name in question in Emory honors has generated a positive legacy. In addition to the above discussion, the subcommittee also took into account that the University decided to discontinue the use of Lamar as the name of the Emory University Law School decades ago.<sup>32</sup> Further, earlier this year, The Lamar Inn of Court, which affiliated with Emory University Law School, changed its name to the Judge Clarence Cooper Inn of Court. (Cooper 67L is a trailblazing Black federal judge.)<sup>33</sup> According to an article in the *Fulton County Daily Report*, “The Inn decided last fall to retire the Lamar appellation, because the namesake, Lucius Quintus Cincinnatus Lamar, was a slaveholder who advocated for ‘Southern rights’ and white supremacy in the post-Reconstruction South.”<sup>34</sup>

---

<sup>27</sup> President John F. Kennedy cited the speech in Part III, Chapter 7 of his Pulitzer Prize winning *Profiles in Courage*.

<sup>28</sup> James B. Murphy, “Lamar, Lucius Quintus Cincinnatus.” *American National Biography: Oxford University Press* (February 2000), <https://doi-org.proxy.library.emory.edu/10.1093/anb/9780198606697.article.1101030> (“When the commission moved to recommend that the electoral votes go to Hayes, however, Lamar joined other Democrats in preventing the count completion. Then he used the threat of obstruction to pressure Republicans into further guarantees of an end to Reconstruction in the south. With assurance gained, Lamar abandoned the Democratic filibuster and joined again with those favoring completion of the vote count.”)

<sup>29</sup> Edward Mayes, *Lucius Q.C. Lamar, His Life, Times and Speeches* (Publishing House of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, 1896), 435.

<sup>30</sup> *Id.*

<sup>31</sup> *Id.*, at 438.

<sup>32</sup> Gary Hauk, “Emory and the Confederacy, Part Two: The case of Justice Lamar,” *Emory Historian's Blog*, <https://emoryhistorian.org/2018/12/18/emory-and-the-confederacy-part-two-the-case-of-justice-lamar/amp/>

<sup>33</sup> Meredith Hobbs, “Emory Law's Inn of Court Renames Itself After Judge Clarence Cooper,” *Fulton County Daily Report*, Jan. 27, 2021.

<sup>34</sup> *Id.*

6. Was the name selected for reasons that are inconsistent with the University's mission or values?

The subcommittee reached a consensus that there was insufficient information to answer this question. Subcommittee members did observe that 1916, the year in which the Law School was created and named after Lamar, was one year after the film "Birth of a Nation" was released and during the time when Confederate monuments and statues were being erected throughout the South. But there is less evidence about the circumstances in which the professorships were named after him. One chairholder informed the committee that at least one of the three L.Q.C. Lamar Chairs was created in 1992.

7. Does this subcommittee recommend that this name be removed?

The subcommittee recommended removing this name, emphasizing here the distinction between memory and honor. The name Lamar does not support the values the institution honors at present. We recommend renaming any buildings, programs, and spaces with the name Lamar, including the L.Q.C. Lamar Chair in Law.

**The Full Committee's Recommendation: The Full Committee endorses this recommendation of removal with no dissents.**

#### C. Augustus Baldwin Longstreet

Augustus Baldwin Longstreet,<sup>35</sup> lawyer, author, and college president, was born September 22, 1790, in Augusta, Georgia, and died July 9, 1870, in Oxford, Mississippi. His sketches of late eighteenth century Georgia life, "Georgia Scenes," appeared in Georgia newspapers (1833-1836), but later writings were more political or religious. He was ordained a Methodist minister (1838) and became president of four Southern colleges: Emory College (1839-1848), Centenary College in Jackson, La. (1849), the University of Mississippi (1849-1856), and South Carolina College (1858-1861; now the University of South Carolina). Longstreet served as President of Emory College from 1840 to 1848. A dormitory at Emory (Longstreet-Means Hall) bears his name. Having considered the guiding principles, the Committee recommends that the name be removed. The subcommittee that focused on Longstreet answered the guiding questions as follows:

1. Does the name reflect Emory's mission, vision, and current values?

Subcommittee members first engaged with Emory's mission, vision, and values statements and then discerned that Longstreet's legacy is at odds with them. The subcommittee focused on many of the aspects of Emory's mission, vision, and values that have been cited throughout this report. The subcommittee also observed that according to Emory's Diversity Statement, "Inclusion in action is about creating an environment in which faculty, staff, and students can thrive, where they feel appreciated and can see themselves in the images, traditions, and culture of the campus community."

---

<sup>35</sup> For this paragraph, the Committee relies on Stuart A. Rose Manuscript, Archives, and Rare Book Library's [Collection Description of Longstreet's Papers](#).

Longstreet has been celebrated because he brought national attention to Emory and to the South, and he financially supported the institution during the Civil War. Indeed, Longstreet served as president of multiple institutions of higher education in the South. And yet, in every case, he used those platforms to promote a theological defense of enslavement, to advocate for secession, and to attack “the hot and fetid breath of Abolitionism.”<sup>36</sup> Longstreet authored proslavery pamphlets while he was President of Emory.<sup>37</sup> His first biographer observed that his views influenced his students, writing that “[h]is intense State rights views helped to disciple and solidify the educated intellect of his section.”<sup>38</sup>

In short, Longstreet’s educational contributions compromised the institutions to which he made them, particularly Emory University and the Methodist Episcopal Church, where he wielded his authority to sow division and offer an intellectual and theological defense for proslavery and secessionist positions.

2. Does the name confer dishonor or infamy?

The subcommittee strongly agreed with this statement. The subcommittee focused in particular on Longstreet’s work to write proslavery pamphlets while at Emory. Furthermore, as our report indicates, when proslavery and antislavery Methodists divided in 1844, Longstreet spoke up vocally for Bishop James O. Andrew, the enslaving bishop at the center of the split.<sup>39</sup> In *The Accidental Slaveowner*, historian Mark Auslander has examined Longstreet’s central role in Andrew’s defense and provided evidence to suggest that Longstreet himself was involved in the transfer of an enslaved woman named Kitty to Bishop Andrew.<sup>40</sup>

3. Is the name associated with behavior contrary to the university’s mission, vision, and values?

The subcommittee strongly agreed with this statement. Longstreet vigorously promoted enslavement and secession from every major platform that he held; provided its intellectual and theological justification; and promoted secession at a time when many southerners opposed it. In a proslavery speech at South Carolina College, Longstreet denounced antislavery positions in defense of an “abject race of negroes, who never knew freedom and never can maintain it.”<sup>41</sup> Promotion of slavery and discrimination were fundamental components of his life’s work.

4. Did the named person take later redemptive action?

The subcommittee strongly disagreed with this statement, finding no evidence that Longstreet took redemptive action and instead noted that he held fast to his earlier positions.

---

<sup>36</sup> Augustus Longstreet, “Baccalaureate Address Delivered at the University of South Carolina to the Graduating Class of 1859,” as cited in Oscar Penn Fitzgerald, *Judge Longstreet: A Life Sketch* (Nashville: Methodist Episcopal Church Publishing House, 1891), 98.

<sup>37</sup> Fitzgerald, 71.

<sup>38</sup> Id.

<sup>39</sup> Mark Auslander, *The Accidental Slaveowner: Revisiting a Myth of Race and Finding an American Family*, (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2011), 87-91.

<sup>40</sup> Id., at Appendix 3, 319-335.

<sup>41</sup> Fitzgerald, 97-98.

5. Has the named program/building/space generated a positive legacy?

The subcommittee disagreed. The subcommittee recognized that Longstreet-Means Hall is a beloved space but concluded that the name compromises that space's legacy. The subcommittee concluded that the retention of the Longstreet name going forward would further impede and compromise the legacy of the building. Longstreet was among the names that a group of Emory students advocated for removing from Emory's honorary naming list in the summer of 2020. Indeed, the Longstreet name has been a source of repeated conflict within the Emory community. Students and faculty members have called for a name change many times, including in an Emory Wheel opinion piece in July 2020<sup>42</sup> and another Emory Wheel opinion piece in February 2021.<sup>43</sup> A Change.org petition called "Rename Longstreet-Means Residence Hall at Emory University" has over 900 signatures.<sup>44</sup>

6. Was the name selected for reasons that are inconsistent with the University's mission or values?

The committee has no records that indicate deliberations around the original selection of the Longstreet name, either for the residence hall or the chair in his name. On this question, the committee vote was "not enough information."

As for the 2010 decision to again make use of the Longstreet name on a new dormitory hall, the subcommittee voted "no." According to the Committee's discussion with former University historian Gary Hauk, when Longstreet-Means Hall was rebuilt and renamed in 2010, the name was selected again in celebration of Longstreet's role as Emory's president, and with a sense of nostalgia for the former Longstreet Hall. The subcommittee did not have evidence that conversations about Longstreet's proslavery, inflammatory positions emerged in that renaming process. It would aid in the work of future committees if heretofore the University kept documentation of its naming decisions.

7. Does this subcommittee recommend that this name be removed?

The subcommittee emphasized here the distinction between memory and honor. The name Longstreet does not support the values the institution honors at present. It therefore recommended renaming of Longstreet-Means Hall and the Augustus Baldwin Longstreet Chair in English.

**The Full Committee's Recommendation: The Full Committee endorses this recommendation of removal with no dissents.**

D. George Foster Pierce

---

<sup>42</sup> Kamryn Olds, "Rename Longstreet-Means. It's Time," *Emory Wheel*, July 14, 2020.

<sup>43</sup> Martin Shane Li and Sophia Ling, "Our Buildings Bear Confederate Names. This Cannot Stand," *Emory Wheel*, Feb. 6, 2021.

<sup>44</sup> "Rename Longstreet-Means Residence Hall at Emory University," <https://www.change.org/p/emory-university-administration-rename-lsm-s-name-at-emory-university>.

George Foster Pierce, a Methodist bishop and president of Emory College, was born February 3, 1811, in Greene County, Georgia, and died September 4, 1884, in Sparta, Georgia.<sup>45</sup> Pierce was a son of Lovick Pierce (1785-1879), a Methodist clergyman and physician. He was admitted to the Georgia Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church (1831); became president of Emory College (1848); and was elected bishop in the Methodist Episcopal Church, South (1854). As bishop, Pierce spent the first half of each year on his plantation, Sunshine, near Sparta, Georgia, and the latter half on Episcopal visitations.

Pierce currently has the following naming honors at Emory: Pierce Drive at Emory's Atlanta campus; Pierce Street at the Oxford campus; the Pierce Program of Religion; and The Dr. Lovick Pierce and Bishop George F. Pierce Professor of Religion, Chair of Religion. The Committee recommends that these names change. The respective subcommittee answered the guiding questions as follows:

1. Does the name reflect Emory's mission, vision, and current values?

The subcommittee voted "Strongly Disagree." The subcommittee members first engaged with Emory's mission, vision, and values statements. They focused largely on this excerpt from Emory's mission statement: "Emory strives to create a community characterized by respectful and mutually supportive interaction among faculty, students, staff, and the wider world. In keeping with the demand that teaching, learning, research, and service be measured by high standards of integrity and excellence, and believing that each person and every level of scholarly activity should be valued on its own merits, the university aims to imbue scholarship at Emory with a commitment to humane teaching and mentorship and a respectful interaction among faculty, students, and staff; open disciplinary boundaries that encourage integrative teaching and scholarship; a commitment to use knowledge to improve human well-being; and a global perspective on the human condition." The subcommittee also focused on the broad summary of Emory's current vision statement: "Emory is a university internationally recognized as an inquiry-driven, ethically engaged, and diverse community, whose members embrace respect and employ creativity, critique, and collaboration in providing courageous leadership for positive transformation in the world through teaching, research, scholarship, health care, and social action."

The subcommittee recognized that Emory's mission, vision, and values were different when Pierce was president of the institution. The subcommittee nonetheless concluded that Pierce's actions were in strong discord with Emory's current mission, vision, and values. Specifically, committee members pointed to Pierce's central role in putting forth a biblical justification for and theological defense of human enslavement and to his determination to preserve the institution of slavery at any cost—including both the schism in the Methodist Episcopal Church (which he helped to precipitate) and Civil War.<sup>46</sup> Committee members further noted Pierce's personal conduct: his sexual relationship to an enslaved woman and the children he did not acknowledge.<sup>47</sup>

Pierce also made significant educational contributions, particularly to the education of women in Georgia. For that, Pierce has gained significant lasting acknowledgement both at

---

<sup>45</sup> For this paragraph, the Committee relies on Stuart A. Rose Manuscript, Archives, and Rare Book Library's [Collection Description of Pierce's Papers](#).

<sup>46</sup> Auslander, *The Accidental Slaveowner*, 24.

<sup>47</sup> Hauk, *Emory As Place*, 36; Auslander, *The Accidental Slaveowner*, 288.

Emory and elsewhere. Yet the subcommittee weighed his advocacy of human enslavement and in the balance finds Pierce's life work far more at odds than in concord with Emory's mission, vision, and values.

2. Does the name confer dishonor or infamy?

The subcommittee agreed that "infamy" is an appropriate characterization of Pierce's legacy. Subcommittee members again pointed out that Pierce played an instrumental role in orchestrating the MEC split, which presaged Southern secession and the Civil War. Historian Mark Auslander observes of the MEC split: "It would be hard to overstate the national impact of the New York General Conference of 1844 and the subsequent schism of the MEC. Methodism was at the time the largest religious movement in the United States, deeply interwoven into the nation's political, cultural, and civic life.... Numerous proponents of southern states' rights and nullification would cite the northern censuring of Bishop Andrew as a grave insult against southern honor and an indicator of the ultimate northern intention of eradicating slavery by force. Many white southerners to this day cite the case of Bishop Andrew as a preeminent example of northern intolerance toward their southern brethren."<sup>48</sup>

3. Is the name associated with behavior contrary to the University's mission, vision, and values?

The subcommittee voted "Strongly Agree." Members pointed to a number of instances of behavior at odds with Emory's current mission, vision, and values, but focused on one that is most definitive. As our graduate research assistant observed in a report that guided our work: "At the time he served as president of Emory College, Pierce held at least ten enslaved men and women. Despite a popular narrative in at least some circles that Pierce was a kind and gentle master, the Transforming Community Project at Emory in 2011 uncovered that Pierce had a sexual relationship with at least one of the women he enslaved, as evidenced by the lineage of African American descendants bearing his name who participated in Emory's Slavery and University conference." Pierce unequivocally practiced and promoted—celebrated, even—human slavery and discrimination based on race.

4. Did the named person take later redemptive action?

The subcommittee recognized some significant contributions Pierce made to women's education but found no evidence that Pierce took redemptive action and instead noted that he doubled down on his earlier positions, drawing on this excerpt of the graduate researcher's report: "Indeed, shortly before his death in 1884, the Atlanta Constitution published an interview with Pierce in which Pierce continued to defend slavery as an institution 'full of domestic affection' between master and enslaved and praised the 'subordination and quiet of the colored population during the war,' which he credited to Southern Methodist evangelizing efforts and the supposed subduing effects of Christianity."<sup>49</sup>

---

<sup>48</sup> Auslander, *The Accidental Slaveowner*, 24.

<sup>49</sup> Internal quotations in the passage reference "In the Life of Bishop Pierce," *The Atlanta Constitution*, February 3, 1884, 1.

5. Has the named program/building/space generated a positive legacy?

Committee members struggled with this question, as the legacy of the name and the legacies of the programs/buildings/spaces are distinct. Ultimately, the subcommittee voted “Disagree” to this question. Notably, and persuasively, the faculty member who holds the Pierce Chair of Religion on the Oxford campus of Emory (not a member of the Committee) nominated the name and made it clear that the name itself is a liability to the legacy and to his work. The subcommittee concluded that the retention of the Pierce name going forward would impede the legacy of both the space and the chair. In addition, Pierce was among the names that a group of Emory students advocated for removing from Emory’s honorary naming list in the summer of 2020. An Emory Wheel opinion piece in February 2021 likewise called for removal of the Pierce name from Emory’s property.

The subcommittee knows of no evidence of attachment to the name in itself at Emory. At the same time, we recognize that Wesleyan College, which Pierce helped to found, has recently renamed its rebuilt chapel in his honor and in appreciation for his work in founding that college.

6. Was the name selected for reasons that are inconsistent with the University’s mission or values?

The subcommittee concluded that there was insufficient information to answer this question. The committee has no records that indicate deliberations around the selection of the Pierce name, either for the street or the chair in his name.

7. Does this subcommittee recommend that this name be removed?

The subcommittee recommended removing this name. Like other subcommittees, members emphasized here the distinction between memory and honor. We should find ways to remember Pierce’s actions. But because the subcommittee does not believe we should honor those actions, we recommend the renaming of Pierce Drive, Pierce Street, the Pierce Program of Religion, and Pierce Chair in Religion.

**The Full Committee’s Recommendation: The Full Committee endorses this recommendation of removal with no dissents.**

E. Robert Yerkes

Robert Yerkes was a comparative psychologist and eugenicist. He was born in Pennsylvania in 1876,<sup>50</sup> attended Ursinus College from 1892 to 1897, and earned his PhD from Harvard in 1902.<sup>51</sup> He then became a professor, teaching psychology at Harvard College and

---

<sup>50</sup> James W. Reed, “Yerkes, Robert Means (1876-1956) comparative psychologist,” *American National Biography: Oxford University Press* (February 2000).

<sup>51</sup>Id.

Radcliffe College.<sup>52</sup> He later served as President of the American Psychological Association. During World War I, he served as chairman of the Committee on the Psychological Examination of Recruits, where he developed the Alpha and Beta Intelligence Tests.<sup>53</sup> He also served as “Expert Eugenic Agent” to the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.<sup>54</sup> In addition, Yerkes served as the Chairman of the Committee on Inheritance of Mental Traits, a committee of an institute called the Eugenics Record Office.<sup>55</sup>

Yerkes founded the Yale University Laboratories of Primate Biology.<sup>56</sup> After his death, the lab was moved to Emory University in Atlanta, Georgia, and is now called the Yerkes National Primate Research Center. The Committee recommends that the Yerkes name be removed. As with the other names, the subcommittee that deliberated about his case considered the following questions:

1. Does the name reflect Emory’s mission, vision, and current values?

The subcommittee voted “Strongly Disagree” on this question. The subcommittee members consulted the same aspects of the mission, vision, and values statements that guided other subcommittees. Yerkes defended eugenics (the study of how to arrange reproduction within humans to increase the occurrence of heritable characteristics regarded as desirable and reduce the occurrence of heritable characteristics regarded as undesirable). In 1914, he worked with Harry H. Laughlin and the Committee to Study and to Report on the Best Practical Means of Cutting Off the Defective Germ-Plasm in the American Population.<sup>57</sup> That group supported institutionalization and sterilization as “most feasible and effective in cutting off from the population the supply of defectives.”<sup>58</sup>

During World War I (1914-1918), Yerkes and other psychologists were charged with determining the mental “fitness” of draft recruits. Under the direction of Yerkes, these psychologists developed the Army Alpha (written) and Army Beta (image based) tests for draftees.<sup>59</sup> According to Yerkes and his findings, a disproportionate number of recruits that were considered “feeble-minded” were Black or immigrant men.<sup>60</sup> Beyond simply determining aptitude or potential placement within the military, these tests also had implications for civilian life by sparking increased intelligence testing across the country, increasing sentiments of nativism and demands for restricted immigration, and solidifying assumptions of degeneracy and/or criminality in African Americans.<sup>61</sup> During the World War II era, Yerkes continued to support eugenicist theories.<sup>62</sup>

---

<sup>52</sup> Id.

<sup>53</sup> Id.

<sup>54</sup> Id.

<sup>55</sup> George Shepherd, “When Should A Person's Name Be Removed from A Monument? A Proposed Standard and Its Application to the Yerkes National Primate Research Center”, 51 U. TOL. L. REV. 249, 263 (2020)

<sup>56</sup> Donald A. Dewsbury, *Monkey Farm A History of the Yerkes Laboratories of Primate Biology, Orange Park, Florida, 1930-1965* (Bucknell University Press, 2006), 28.

<sup>57</sup> Leon J. Kamin, *The Science and Politics of I.Q.* (Routledge, 1974), 25-26.

<sup>58</sup> Harry H. Laughlin, Report of the Committee to Study and to Report on the Best Practical Means of Cutting Off the Defective Germ-Plasm in the American Population: The Scope of the Committee 's Work (1914), <https://readingroom.law.gsu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1009&context=buckvbell>.

<sup>59</sup> Stephen Jay Gould, *The Mismeasure of Man* (W. W. Norton & Company, 1996), 194-95.

<sup>60</sup> Id.; Shepherd, 259.

<sup>61</sup> Shepherd, 274, 277.

<sup>62</sup> Shepherd, 273.

These actions do not reflect Emory's mission, vision, and values of welcoming diversity and inclusion. "Emory University's mission is to create, preserve, teach, and apply knowledge in the service of humanity." In contrast, Yerkes used his talents in ways that facilitated crimes against humanity.

2. Does the name confer dishonor or infamy?

The subcommittee voted, "Strongly Agree." Yerkes propagated support for eugenics and segregation/institutionalization and sterilization of people seen as unfit for society (the poor, the disabled, the mentally ill, and people of color). These theories were ostensibly about improving genetic quality but are associated with the goal of preserving the position of the dominant groups in the population.

The Army Alpha (written) and Army Beta (image based) tests for draftees and the continued support for eugenicist theories throughout the WWII period as psychologists in general were called upon to justify the racial hierarchies in the United States amid international conflict are examples of actions that confer dishonor.

To be sure, Yerkes' name has also become associated with research on primates. But his main contribution was to eugenics. And the subcommittee observed that other institutions have removed the names of other supporters of eugenics. In 2020, the University of Southern California removed the name of Rufus von KleinSmid, a eugenics leader and former president of the university, from a prominent building.<sup>63</sup> In 2021, Caltech announced that it would remove the name of its founding president and first Nobel laureate, Robert A. Millikan, from campus buildings because he supported eugenics.<sup>64</sup>

3. Is the name associated with behavior contrary to the university's mission, vision, and values?

There was a vote for "Strongly Agree." Yerkes' work had a significant impact upon the immigration debate, then a major political issue in America. Congressional debates leading to passage of the Immigration Restriction Act of 1924 frequently invoked his data.<sup>65</sup> Eugenacists lobbied for limits to immigration and for imposing quotas against nations based on their purported inherent inferiority. The knowledge that Yerkes produced was used to exclude groups from society. He defended eugenicist theories for decades. These actions do not reflect Emory's mission, vision, and values of welcoming diversity and inclusion.

4. Did the named person take later redemptive action?

The subcommittee voted "Disagree." Ideas from the U.S. eugenics movement that Yerkes supported were used by the Nazis in Germany to determine who was considered to have genetic disorders for elimination from the chain of heredity. The Nazis organized a eugenics program

---

<sup>63</sup> Teresa Watanabe, "USC removes name of Rufus von KleinSmid, a eugenics leader, from prominent building," *Los Angeles Times*, June 11, 2020, <https://www.latimes.com/california/story/2020-06-11/usc-removes-name-of-former-president-rufus-von-kleinsmid-a-supporter-of-eugenics-from-prominent-building>.

<sup>64</sup> "Caltech to Remove the Names of Robert A. Millikan and Five Other Eugenics Proponents from Buildings, Honors, and Assets," January 15, 2021, <https://www.caltech.edu/about/news/caltech-to-remove-the-names-of-robert-a-millikan-and-five-other-eugenics-proponents>.

<sup>65</sup> Shepherd, at 268.

that allowed the compulsory sterilization of any citizen who according to the opinion of a “Genetic Health Court” suffered from alleged genetic disorders.<sup>66</sup> Throughout the period in which these events took place, Yerkes did not repudiate his eugenics views. Indeed, in 1941, he wrote:

If called before a court of my peers to defend the social practice here suggested, I should say simply that we of this country and culture have destroyed or impaired the effectiveness of most of the naturally operative factors and agencies for the elimination of the biologically unfit; that we have lacked the courage, wisdom, and resourcefulness to devise and put into effective operation socially controlled substitute procedures to safeguard human quality; and that in consequence of these social neglects we are steadily becoming less fit for survival and, incidentally, through the institutionalizing of those who are physically or mentally defective, insane, criminalistic, or for other reasons wholly incompetent and dependent, we have accumulated a degree of social responsibility and an economic burden which drastically limit opportunity for constructive endeavor. It is reasonable to maintain that our resources might be much more wisely used in the enhancement of normal life than in protecting and prolonging individual helplessness and misery. So far as I have been able to discover, our unwisdom in this matter is attributable entirely to sentimentality and a false conception of humaneness.<sup>67</sup>

5. Has the named program/building/space generated a positive legacy?

The subcommittee discussed the meaning of this question and interpreted it to reflect whether use of the name in question, Yerkes, when associated with this building, has generated a positive legacy. As with other subcommittees, this question was a challenging one. The use of non-human primates for scientific research of the kind conducted at the Yerkes National Primate Research Center continues to be vital to understand and improve human health in a multitude of ways. The association of the building and the name Yerkes can therefore be positive. Ultimately, however, the committee unanimously voted “Neutral.” The theories that Robert Yerkes contributed to supported segregation and sterilization of people viewed as unfit, and dominance of people viewed as fit in society. This association between the primate research center and Robert Yerkes produces a negative legacy.

6. Was the name selected for reasons that are inconsistent with the University’s mission or values?

The subcommittee voted “Not Enough Information.” The subcommittee discussed the lack of information to determine whether the name was selected for reasons inconsistent with Emory’s mission, vision, and values. The Yerkes Laboratory was operated from 1930 to 1956 by Yale University in Florida. The website of the Yerkes center reports that after Robert Yerkes’

---

<sup>66</sup> Robert N. Proctor, *Racial Hygiene Medicine Under the Nazis* (Harvard University Press, 1988), 108.

<sup>67</sup> Robert M. Yerkes, “Psychology and Defense,” 84 Proc. of The Am. Phil. Soc’y 527, 540 (1941), as cited in Shepherd, 274.

death in 1956, Yale officials decided that the distance between the university's main location and Florida was not beneficial. Emory University agreed to assume ownership of the Yerkes Laboratory. "The transfer occurred at a time of increasing scientific interest in the study of NHPs [non-human primates], in part a result of the development of the polio vaccine through primate research."<sup>68</sup> It is possible that the name Yerkes was retained to mark these achievements or interest. But the committee could not find information supporting this or other interpretations.

7. Does this subcommittee recommend that this name be removed?

There was a vote to recommend the Yerkes name be removed. The subcommittee also emphasized the difference between remembering a legacy and honoring it.

**The Full Committee's Recommendation: The Full Committee endorses this recommendation of removal with no dissents.**

F. Additional Considerations

Additional Names: There are names that, with the benefit of more time, we would have investigated further: Alexander Means, Luther Smith, Ignatius Alphonso Few, James Thomas, and Isaac Stiles Hopkins. One complicating factor is that in two of these instances, the names are connected to spaces that also bear the names of individuals we recommend removing: The Hopkins-Haygood Gate and Longstreet-Means Hall. Prudence is warranted with respect to how to address this complicating factor.

Affected Community Members: Before any final decisions are made with respect to these recommendations, we highly recommend engaging in dialogue with student and alumni organizations, as well as community members who are associated with the names in questions. We note that with respect to the Longstreet Chair of English and the Pierce Chair of Religion, the professors who hold those chairs asked that they be recommended for removal. The three L.Q.C. Lamar chairholders have been consulted as well.

The Importance of Remembering: As has been stated throughout this report, we urge the University to take active steps to ensure that members of our community have accessible opportunities to remember our school's history, even as we exercise discretion about which names we celebrate. Explanatory plaques, symposiums, and classes are among examples. We recommend engaging in a robust collaborative process with stakeholders when constructing these opportunities. Indeed, the construction of such forums is, in and of itself, an opportunity to encourage active learning about those who, as the aphorism goes, dug the wells from which we drink.

This observation is consistent with the findings of the 2017 Task Force that: "Other strategies besides removal of a name should be considered when appropriate. On a building, for example, retaining a name and adding a name or names may create opportunities for engaging students and others in discussion of controversy associated with the original name. In some cases, a plaque or other display may be appropriate to put the name in context and provide opportunities to engage historical issues." Moreover, that report found that, "Emory must take

---

<sup>68</sup> <http://www.yerkes.emory.edu/about/history.html>.

care that either in placing or removing a name, the University will find ways to tell its history (and the stories behind its spaces) as clearly and fully as possible. Both the placement and removal of a name are ways of determining how history will be told.” We only add that there are some circumstances in which removal *and* the use of public history to educate are important.

### III. New Names

The Committee recommends naming a building on the Oxford campus after Hon. Horace Johnson, a revered judge and alumnus who passed away last year. The Committee observes that the nomination of this name came with deep institutional support, including from the Dean of Oxford College. We note that we also received two nominations for other names: Dr. Ira Adams-Chapman and Dr. Frances Smith-Foster. Because the Adams-Chapman proposal was connected to a potential philanthropic gift, it has been referred to Advancement and Alumni Relations, which has contacted the nominator. Because the Smith-Foster nomination was received on April 21, the Committee had insufficient time to dedicate research to that effort. Our absence of a recommendation about them does not reflect the merits of their cases. We believe that a dedicated standing committee, focused on vetting and recommending new names in a transparent manner, should be created.

#### A. Horace Johnson

The Committee recommends that Horace Johnson be considered by the Board of Trustees for a significant naming honor. The subcommittee that reviewed this nomination consulted the following considerations, derived from our guiding principles:

1. The name reflects Emory’s current mission, vision, and values.

The subcommittee strongly agreed that Horace Johnson made significant contributions to Emory University and the Greater Atlanta Community through decades of public service and service to humanity, areas that reflect Emory’s current mission, vision, and values to “create, preserve, teach, and apply knowledge in the service of humanity.” Judge Johnson had a distinguished and celebrated legal career in Georgia, first in private practice for 20 years and then, beginning in 2002, as a Superior Court Judge of the state’s Alcovy Judicial Circuit. Among those examples of Horace Johnson’s record of public service and service to humanity were his many successes that include launching a system of accountability in the courts for veterans and for parents behind in child-support payments. The incorporation of alternatives to traditional punishments for these infractions resulted in reduced costs to the criminal justice system and affected communities. For his decades of commitment and dedication to public service, Mr. Johnson received numerous community and professional awards that include the prestigious R.O. Arnold Award in 2016, the State Bar of Georgia’s Lifetime Achievement Award in 2017, the Frederick B. Kerr Service Award in 2018, and the Georgia Legal Distinguished Leader Award in 2019. These awards reflect the respect from Mr. Johnson’s peers for his exceptional leadership skills to achieve positive transformation in the world through social action.

Further, this subcommittee strongly agreed that Horace Johnson captured the values of Emory University that exemplify respect, compassion, innovation, and the highest levels of

service. On the Emory Oxford campus, Horace Johnson was recognized as a pioneering and prominent African American alumnus who for many years was a sought-after and generous mentor to our diverse students of color and all backgrounds. Mr. Johnson's compassion and caring acts of service to the students and faculty were recognized through his invitation to be the 2020 Oxford commencement speaker, which unfortunately was postponed due to the pandemic. Finally, Mr. Johnson's decades of leadership in the judicial system is apparent not only in the many awards and accolades he received but particularly from his outstanding achievements as an African American lawyer and judge. He was the first Black Superior Court judge in the circuit, and at the time of his death was the only Black person to have served as a Superior Court judge in the circuit covering Newton and Walton counties in the State of Georgia.

2. In what ways, if any, is the name associated with behavior contrary to the University's mission, vision, and values?

In the analysis of this case, the subcommittee did not identify any behavior contrary to Emory's mission, vision, and values or note any dishonor or infamy at this time.

3. In what ways did the individual under review demonstrate selflessness, inspire others, break barriers, or create opportunities for individuals or disenfranchised populations?

The subcommittee agreed that Mr. Johnson lived a life that was an exemplar of selflessness, inspiration to others, and one that broke barriers and created opportunities for individuals of color and other disenfranchised populations. Mr. Johnson was recognized among his peers as a pathbreaker throughout his life. As a young man, he courageously integrated his elementary school, an act that required the protection of marshals as he entered the building. In the years to follow, he became a star pupil and leader among his peers, later enrolling in Oxford College and continuing on to Emory's Business School, where he received degrees from both Emory schools. On the Oxford campus and in Atlanta, Mr. Johnson has been described as having had a bright mind and as being an engaged student. Mr. Johnson was a leader in growing the Black Student Alliance at Oxford and in Atlanta he helped found Emory's chapter of Alpha Phi Alpha, one of the most prominent African American fraternities.

4. The individual under review has primarily generated a positive legacy.

The subcommittee strongly agreed. Judge Johnson's legacy of remembrance and his outstanding contributions as a trailblazer who was admired by his peers, community, and city are but a few of the characteristics that have generated a positive legacy. His many firsts in education, the judicial system, and social justice actions paved the way for many individuals of color and disenfranchised populations. As early as his elementary school years, Judge Johnson's life was an exemplar of courage, commitment to service, and an ethic of hard work that is a model for future generations.

5. Does this subcommittee recommend that this name be recommended for an honorific naming?

The subcommittee voted "yes" to recommend Horace Johnson for honorific naming.

**The Full Committee's Recommendation: The Full Committee endorses this recommendation with no dissents.**

## B. Additional Considerations

Dr. Ira Adams-Chapman: We received a nomination from Jordan Chapman, the daughter of Dr. Ira Adams-Chapman. The nomination provided the following well-considered points and context about this highly dedicated member of our community:

*Dr. Adams-Chapman was a faculty member in the school of Neonatology and at Children's Healthcare of Atlanta, in addition to being a graduate of the College and Rollins. I would like to have her considered for the naming of one of the buildings or any of the rooms on campus for the following reasons.*

*1. There are barely any rooms named after women on campus, let alone women of color and/or Black women. My mother created a lasted legacy across Emory's campus, which can be noted by her CHOA colleagues, but also by those she met as a student, such as Dean Moon of Oxford College who was her Resident Director while she was an RA on campus or the AKA's who she served with as a member of their chapter.*

*2. My mother's dedication to the Emory community did not end with her graduation. She encouraged me to attend and despite battling breast cancer, not once, but twice, she created a presence on campus and helped lead the next generation of neonatologists worldwide. Having her name on a building or space would encourage other young Black women who come to campus to aspire to similar greatness.*

*3. At this moment, Emory University is having to reckon with the naming of buildings like Longstreet-Means and others on campus. At this moment, I believe it would be best to highlight members of the Emory community who have accolades with the university that don't just highlight how much money they've donated, but also showing how dedicated they've been to the university and its students. She did just that and would be an amazing representative for any space.*

*4. As a doctor, she gave her life to Emory University, so much so that it was where she passed away, just under 4 years after her husband in the same hospital on campus. Despite the serious amount of pain she was in at the end of her life, she constantly hosted webinars, trainings, mentorships, wrote articles, edited books, and more all in the name of Emory University. While I could list the accolades from her nearly 30-page CV, I won't at this moment. As an associate professor of pediatrics and the Jennings Watkins Scholar in Neurosciences at Emory University School of Medicine, Dr. Adams-Chapman was a member of the Division of Neonatology at Emory and Children's Healthcare of Atlanta since 1998. A majority of her career has revolved around Emory and I believe she should be honored, and I am confident that her colleagues, acquaintances, and patients agree with me.*

Because this nomination is connected to a proposed philanthropic gift, we have referred the nomination to the Advancement and Alumni Relations Office.

Dr. Frances Smith-Foster: On April 21, we received a poignant, well-documented nomination for Frances Smith-Foster to replace the name of Augustus Longstreet on the respective Chair in the English Department. The nomination came from the individual who holds the professorship and comes with the support of the English Department. According to the nomination, Smith-Foster is:

an internationally renowned scholar in African American and Black Diaspora Studies. We find Smith an especially poignant choice due to her pioneering work with slave narratives and arguing that we must accord them greater attention and a greater place in both African American and U.S. literature as a whole. Given Augustus Longstreet's infamous apologia for slavery and dismissal of enslaved Black voices, choosing to rename the chair after Smith provides Emory with an eloquent and unbowed response to the worldwide call for the demotion of centuries of anti-Black thought, discourse and action.

Because the nomination was received after all subcommittees had deliberated, we could not approach this moving nomination with care. In addition, we observe that Dr. Smith-Foster is still alive.

Standing Committee: We believe that a Standing Committee on New Names should be created, akin to the Honorary Degrees Committee, to consider other names. We have collected naming procedures from other schools, some of which are in Appendix E, that could help guide the work of such a standing committee. In our view, any such committee should also consult the 2021 report produced by the Task Force on Untold Stories and Disenfranchised Populations. That report suggested, for example, naming a scholarship in memory of enslaved persons who are a part of the University's history, such as Catherine Boyd or Augustus Wright. Such names should be considered for additional naming honors as well.

## **APPENDIX**

Appendix A: Charge and 2017 Principles

Appendix B: Website Interface

Appendix C: Adapted 2021 Principles

Appendix D: Emory Mission and Vision

Appendix E: New Naming Procedures from Selected Schools

## **APPENDIX**

Appendix A: Charge and 2017 Principles

Appendix B: Website Interface

Appendix C: Adapted 2021 Principles

Appendix D: Emory Mission and Vision

Appendix E: New Naming Procedures from Selected Schools

## **APPENDIX A**

## **University Committee on Naming Honors Charge**

In recent years, members of the Emory community have raised important questions about the names and honorific designations recognized on Emory's Atlanta and Oxford campuses. Convened in 2017, the Task Force on Legacies was appointed by President Claire E. Sterk to draft guidelines for the university for reviewing contested names on buildings, spaces, programs, scholarships and other honors bestowed by Emory. The Task Force on Legacies developed principles to guide university policies and practices that honor and reflect its mission and values.

The University Committee on Naming Honors was charged in 2019 by the Offices of the President and Provost with reviewing contested names and developing recommendations for leadership's consideration. It delivered its final report to the president and provost in April 2020.

In a letter to the Emory community on August 13, 2020, President Gregory L. Fenves announced plans to reappoint this committee to expand its scope and its membership to represent a broader range of campus voices.

### **Charge**

The University Committee on Naming Honors is charged with examining new historic names for and reviewing contested historic names on buildings, spaces, programs, scholarships, and other celebratory titles that honor individuals. It serves in an advisory capacity to the president.

Building on work done by previous committees that focused on naming and honors at Emory and using the "Proposed Principles for Bestowing Naming Honors at Emory University," developed by the Task Force on Legacies in 2017, as a guide, the committee is authorized to:

1. Review historic names on buildings, spaces, programs, scholarships, and other honors, which have become contested. It may conduct historical research on names submitted for review and evaluate the appropriateness of the reviewed names of buildings, locations, named professorships, and other honorific titles based on an analysis of the historical research;
2. Review and conduct due diligence research on potential new historic names submitted for evaluation.

### **Process for Determining Contested Names**

1. To determine contested names, the committee may consult with Emory leaders who worked on naming issues in previous years to gain an understanding of names of building, spaces, programs, scholarship or other honors that they understand to have been contested prior to the work of this committee. It may also review the recommendations of the report of the University Committee on Naming Honors from April 15, 2020, which was received but not implemented.
2. The committee may consider input from the community (inclusive of faculty, staff, students, and alumni) regarding names for the committee's review, historical research related to a name under the committee's review, and potential names for renamed spaces. They may enlist the support of the

Offices of the President and the Provost and existing governance organizations (including, but not limited to, the University Senate, Faculty Council, Employee Council, Student Government Association, and Graduate Student Government Association) to gather an inventory of names for initial review and to facilitate community input.

## **Timeline**

The committee will submit a report with a summary of findings on each name reviewed, including recommendations for name changes, to President Fennes by April 1, 2021. Periodic progress reports may be requested throughout the academic year.

## **Resources**

Administrative and project management work of the committee will be facilitated by staff from the Office of the Provost and the Office of the President. The committee will have access to graduate student research assistants for research support as needed.

## **Principles for Considering Naming Honors at Emory University** *Developed by the 2017 Task Force on Legacies<sup>1</sup>*

1. All naming honors bestowed by Emory, should recognize those who have made positive contributions to such areas as education, the arts, the sciences, health care, peace-building, religion, social justice,

---

<sup>1</sup> Created in 2017, the *Task Force on Legacies* was a presidentially appointed group charged with developing principles for review of contested names. Membership on the Task Force included representation from faculty, students, staff, alumni and trustees.

community or public service, philanthropy, or other areas consistent with Emory's values and mission to "create, preserve, teach, and apply knowledge in the service of humanity." In keeping with established University policy and procedures, naming opportunities should bear the names of only those individuals or entities that reflect the values of Emory University.

2. All buildings on Emory's campuses contribute to the University's mission and thus weigh in the scales of the University's reputation. No distinction should be made between buildings because of their primary purposes, whether residential, social, athletic, academic, scientific, or administrative.
  3. Because circumspection is called for in judging historical eras through the moral lens of our own day, and because named buildings and other honors become part of the institution's history, a presumption against renaming them should exist, absent exceptional circumstances.
  4. In the exceptional instance when a name is contested, the following criteria should be considered:
    - a. whether association with the name brings dishonor or infamy to the University;
    - b. whether the named person or entity behaved contrary to the mission of the University;
    - c. whether the named person or entity engaged in criminal activity;
    - d. whether the person or entity promoted slavery, genocide, or discrimination on the basis of race, gender, religion, national origin, or sexual identity;
    - e. whether the person or entity later took redemptive action, such as public repudiation of an objectionable position, work to overcome injustice, or other activity reflecting the University's mission and values and counter to the activity that has called the name into question; and
    - f. whether the named building, space, or program has generated a positive legacy that transcends the history of the named person or entity.
  5. Other strategies besides removal of a name should be considered when appropriate. On a building, for example, retaining a name and adding a name or names may create opportunities for engaging the community in discussion about the controversies associated with the original name. In some cases, a plaque or other display may be appropriate to put the name in context and provide opportunities to engage with historical issues.
- 
6. In placing or removing a name, it is important that the history associated with the name be communicated to the Emory community fully and clearly. Both the placement and removal of names are ways of determining how history will be told at Emory.

## **APPENDIX B**

# Community Feedback

**YOUR EMAIL\***

**YOUR EMORY AFFILIATION\***

- ☐ Alumni
- ☐ Faculty
- ☐ Staff
- ☐ Student
- ☐ Other

Please check all that apply.

**THIS SUBMISSION IS A:\***

- ☐ Request for inspection of an existing name.
- ☐ Suggestion of a new name for the committee to consider.
- ☐ General comment

Please check one or both.

**SEND YOUR FEEDBACK TO THE COMMITTEE ON NAMING HONORS** 

Your engagement is deeply appreciated. Given the expected volume of response, the committee regrets that it cannot respond to each submission. Be assured that all submissions will receive review.

## **APPENDIX C**

## **Adapted Principles for Considering Naming Honors at Emory University**

1. All naming honors bestowed by Emory should recognize those who have made positive contributions to such areas as education, the arts, the sciences, health care, peace-building, religion, social justice, community or public service, philanthropy, or other areas consistent with Emory's mission, values and vision to "create, preserve, teach, and apply knowledge in the service of humanity." Further, Emory University welcomes a diversity of ethnic, cultural, socioeconomic, religious, national, and international backgrounds, believing that the intellectual and social energy that results from such diversity is critical to advancing knowledge. In keeping with established University policy and procedures, naming opportunities should bear the names of only those individuals or entities that reflect the values of Emory University and is reflective of a community characterized by respectful and mutually supportive interaction among faculty, students, staff, and the wider world.
2. All buildings on Emory's campuses contribute to the University's mission and thus weigh in the scales of the University's reputation. No distinction should be made between buildings because of their primary purposes, whether residential, social, athletic, academic, scientific, or administrative. Conscious efforts should be made to honor persons whose contributions have historically been unrecognized because of systemic racism, sexism, and other forms of identity-based discrimination, exploitation, and dehumanization.
3. Because circumspection is called for in judging historical eras through the moral lens of our own day, and because named buildings and other honors becomes part of the institution's history, a presumption against renaming them should exist, absent compelling circumstances.
4. In the instance when a name is contested, the following criteria should be considered:
  - a. whether association with the name brings dishonor or infamy to the University;
  - b. whether the named person or entity behaved contrary to the mission, values, and vision of the University;
  - c. whether the person or entity promoted slavery, genocide, or discrimination on the basis of race, gender, religion, national origin, or sexual identity;
  - d. whether the person or entity later took redemptive action, such as public repudiation of an objectionable position, work to overcome injustice, or other activity reflecting the University's mission and values and counter to the activity that has called the name into question;
  - e. whether the named building, space, or program has generated a positive legacy; and
  - f. whether the name selected is inconsistent with the University's mission, values, and vision.
5. Other strategies besides removal of a name should be considered when appropriate. On a building, for example, retaining a name and adding a name or names may create opportunities for engaging the community in discussion about the controversies associated with the original name. In some cases, a plaque or other display may be appropriate to put the name in context and provide opportunities to engage with historical issues.
6. In placing or removing a name, it is important that the history associated with the name be communicated to the Emory community fully and clearly. Both the placement and removal of names are ways of determining how history will be told at Emory.

## **APPENDIX D**

## **Mission**

Emory University's mission is to create, preserve, teach, and apply knowledge in the service of humanity.

To fulfill this mission, the University supports teaching from the undergraduate to the advanced graduate and professional levels, and scholarship from basic research to its application in public service. As a comprehensive research university, Emory's academic programs span a great range from arts and sciences to business, law, theology, and the health professions. These different fields of study are knit together by robust interdisciplinary programs and a core devotion to liberal learning.

The Emory community is open to all who meet its high standards of academic excellence and integrity. The University welcomes a diversity of ethnic, cultural, socioeconomic, religious, national, and international backgrounds, believing that the intellectual and social energy that results from such diversity is critical to advancing knowledge.

Emory is committed to opening disciplinary boundaries and supporting interdisciplinary research and teaching from a global perspective. Along with this, Emory strives to create a community characterized by respectful and mutually supportive interaction among faculty, students, staff, and the wider world.

In keeping with the demand that teaching, learning, research, and service be measured by high standards of integrity and excellence, and believing that each person and every level of scholarly activity should be valued on its own merits, the University aims to imbue scholarship at Emory with a commitment to humane teaching and mentorship and a respectful interaction among faculty, students, and staff; open disciplinary boundaries that encourage integrative teaching, research, and scholarship; a commitment to use knowledge to improve human well-being; and a global perspective on the human condition.

## **Vision**

Emory is a university internationally recognized as an inquiry-driven, ethically engaged, and diverse community, whose members embrace respect and employ creativity, critique, and collaboration in providing courageous leadership for positive transformation in the world through teaching, research, scholarship, health care, and social action.

## **APPENDIX E**

# Naming or Renaming University Buildings Spaces, Programs and Positions

POLICY NO.	EFFECTIVE DATE	LAST REVIEWED
01.15.02	October 26, 2019	October 26, 2019

## 1.0 Policy Purpose

The purpose of this policy is to define how Brown University manages and approves proposals for the naming or renaming of a University building, space, program, or position in honor of a donor, individual, organization or entity.

## 2.0 To Whom the Policy Applies

This policy applies to the Corporation of Brown University (the Corporation), the President, the Senior Vice President for University Advancement, and to any member of the Brown University community who engages in management or approval of proposals for the naming or renaming of University buildings, exterior and interior spaces, programs, and positions.

## 3.0 Policy Statement

The University may acknowledge gifts and/or honor an individual or organization by naming a building, space, program, or position. Naming is one of the ways in which the University acknowledges the generosity of donors and honors those whose service to or affiliation with Brown enhances the University. It is the responsibility of the President and the Corporation of Brown University to nurture, preserve, and protect that legacy.

In considering proposals to name a building, space, program or position, the President and the Corporation shall exercise judgment with regard to the individual or entity the proposal is intended to honor. In general, the President and the Corporation, or those to whom authority to approve naming proposals is delegated, will not approve proposals for naming where, in their judgment, doing so: is not aligned with Brown's mission of education, research and scholarship; compromises the academic freedom of the university community; and/or being associated with the proposed name could inflict damage on the University's reputation, standing or integrity or be contrary to University values.

## 3.1 Naming a University Building or Space

Proposals for the naming of a University building or space associated with a gift must be submitted to the Office of the Senior Vice President for University Advancement.

The proposal must include a description of the building or space to be named, its current use and any relevant information regarding the history of the facility, together with a description of the name proposed and its significance to Brown, including the amount of the gift and the identity of the donor(s).

If the Senior Vice President supports the proposal and it requires approval by the Corporation, it shall be forwarded to the Office of the Corporation for review by the President and, if approved by the President, inclusion on the agenda of the next scheduled meeting of the Corporation or the Advisory and Executive Committee.

Approval by the President and the Corporation is required for naming of:

- All buildings, additions to buildings, and exterior campus spaces such as fields, terraces, greens, and courtyards.

Approval by the Senior Vice President for University Advancement is required for:

- All interior spaces, such as lobbies, auditoria, dining and function rooms, classrooms, offices and seminar rooms.

In the naming of buildings and spaces, a distinction should generally be made between the name of the facility and the name of the program housed in the facility. Since programs, centers, institutes and departments may from time-to-time change, grow, move, merge or dissolve, the University will generally distinguish between the name of the facility and the name of the program or programs it houses.

### **3.2 Naming a University Program or Position**

Proposals for the naming of a University program (center, department, institute, school) or position (endowed professorship, endowed coaching position, senior academic or administrative officer position, etc.) associated with a gift must be submitted to the Office of the Senior Vice President for University Advancement. The proposal must include a description of the program or position to be named together with a description of the name proposed and its significance to Brown, including the amount of the gift and the identity of the donor(s).

If the Senior Vice President supports the proposal it shall be forwarded to the Office of the Corporation for review by the President and, if approved by the President, inclusion on the agenda of the next scheduled meeting of the Corporation or the

Advisory and Executive Committee. The naming of any University program or position requires approval by the President and the Corporation.

### **3.3 Naming a Scholarship, Fellowship or Lecture**

Any proposal to name a scholarship, fellowship or lecture (endowed or current-use) requires approval by the Senior Vice President for University Advancement.

### **3.4 Duration of Naming**

Naming for an honoree or a donor is generally granted for the useful life of the entity. The University may deem the naming period concluded in certain circumstances, including but not limited to:

- If the purpose for which the named entity is or needs to be significantly altered, is no longer needed/ceases to exist.
- If a physical entity is replaced, significantly renovated or no longer habitable.
- The period of time of the naming specified in the gift agreement has expired.

The appropriate University representative will make all reasonable efforts to inform in advance the original donors or honorees when the naming period is deemed concluded. The University may provide alternate recognition as may be appropriate in honor of the original gift.

### **3.5 Renaming a University Building, Space, Program or Position**

Under extraordinary circumstances, a proposal to rename a University building, space, program or position may be submitted to the President, and by the President for approval to the Corporation. Such a proposal must include information about the name of the entity proposed to be renamed and the rationale for changing that name, as well as a recommendation for the preservation and display of the original name on campus, where appropriate.

The renaming of any University building, space, program or position requires approval by the Corporation. In considering such proposals, the President and the Corporation shall exercise judgment with regard to the individual or entity the original naming was intended to honor and apply the same general principles in section 3.0 above.

### 3.6 Removal of Naming

The University reserves the right, on reasonable grounds, to revoke and terminate its obligations regarding a naming if, including, but not limited to:

- The University determines its association with the donor or the honoree could cause damage to the University reputation, standing or integrity or be contrary to University values. This determination will be guided by Brown's mission of education, research and scholarship.
- In the case of a naming associated with a gift the donor fails to fulfill the terms of the gift that is recognized by a naming.

The appropriate University representative will make all reasonable efforts to inform in advance the original donors or honorees when the naming period is deemed concluded. The University may provide alternate recognition as appropriate in honor of the original gift.

### 3.7 Other Considerations

Any gift valued at \$1 million or more in support of a building, space, program, position, scholarship, fellowship or lecture must be accepted by the Corporation (see Gift Acceptance Policy).

A proposal to name a building, space, program or position associated with a gift shall not be implemented – e.g., building signage not installed or a program or position name not utilized in materials and publications – until and unless the University has received an executed gift agreement and 50% of pledge payments towards the gift commitment have been received.

With regard to naming proposals associated with a gift, any special circumstances or request for exceptions to this policy must be referred to the Senior Vice President of University Advancement who will determine the course of action, which may include consultation with the President and/or the Corporation.

The University will generally not name a building, space, program or position in honor of a current faculty or staff member. Proposals for such a naming may be approved to take effect upon the retirement of the individual faculty or staff member.

### 3.8 Honorific Namings

From time to time the University may consider proposals to name a building, space, program or position in honor of an individual not associated with a gift. Such proposals shall be considered and approved under this policy subject to the principles in Section 3.0 and the processes described in Sections 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3 except that the Office of the Provost shall be substituted for the Office of the Senior Vice President for University Advancement.

#### **4.0 Definitions**

For the purpose of this policy, the term below has the following definition:

**Gift:**

A voluntary, non-reciprocal charitable donation of value in exchange for which nothing in return is promised, expected, implied or forthcoming to the donor.

#### **5.0 Responsibilities**

All individuals to whom this policy applies are responsible for becoming familiar with and following this policy. University supervisors are responsible for promoting the understanding of this policy and for taking appropriate steps to help ensure compliance. Senior officers are responsible for the development of appropriate practices and protocols to ensure compliance.

#### **6.0 Consequences for Violating this Policy**

Failure to comply with this and related policies is subject to disciplinary action, up to and including suspension without pay, or termination of employment or association with the University, in accordance with applicable disciplinary procedures or for non-employees may result in the suspension or revocation of the individual's relationship with Brown University.

#### **7.0 Related Information**

Brown University is a community in which employees are encouraged to share workplace concerns with University leadership. Additionally, Brown's Ethics and Compliance Reporting System allows anonymous and confidential reporting on matters of concern through the EthicsPoint platform.

The following information complements and supplements this document. The information is intended to help explain this policy and is not an all-inclusive list of policies, procedures, laws and requirements.

**DUKE UNIVERSITY**  
**STATEMENT OF POLICY**  
**NAMINGS**

**I. Naming of New Buildings and Spaces to Recognize Contributions:**

A. Contribution for Construction. Buildings or spaces (both interior and exterior including roads) approved for inclusion in the capital budget may be named for a donor if the donor's gift provides at least one-half of the estimated total cost of the new building or space. In addition to one-half of the total cost of the new building or space, every attempt should be made to obtain a gift from the naming donor to fund a permanent endowment in an amount sufficient to pay the annual estimated ongoing cost of maintenance and operation of the new building or space.

B. Contribution for Program Support. When construction financing for a building is provided by sources that do not carry naming obligations, a building may be named for a donor if a substantial gift is made by the donor and that gift is restricted to the support of programs to be carried on within the new building. A "substantial gift" for these purposes is a gift in an amount that is equal to at least one-half estimated total cost of the new building; provided, however, the nature of the programs planned for the new building or space may, in the discretion of the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees, require that this naming gift level be increased or decreased.

C. Naming of Spaces. When construction financing for a new space is provided by sources that do not carry naming obligations, the space may be named for the donor if a substantial gift is made by the donor and that gift is restricted to the support of programs and activities to be carried on within the space, or restricted to pay the annual estimated ongoing maintenance and operation of the new space. A "substantial gift" for these purposes is a gift in an amount that approximates at least one-half of the total cost of the new space, or a gift in an amount sufficient to fund a permanent endowment that will pay the annual estimated ongoing cost of maintenance and operation of the new space; provided, however, the nature of the programs and activities planned for the new space may, in the discretion of the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees, require that this naming gift level be increased or decreased.

D. Plan for Maintenance and Operation. In the case of a proposed new public outdoor space, the sponsoring department, school, or unit must include in the naming request a plan for the maintenance and operation of that space, including the funding of the estimated cost of such maintenance and operation.

**II. Naming of Existing Buildings and Spaces to Recognize Contributions:**

A. Contribution for Construction. If major renovations to an existing building or space are required, the building or space may be named for a donor provided that the donor's gift covers at least one-half of the cost of the major renovation. A "major renovation" for these purposes is a renovation (including planned additions) that is estimated to cost at least one-half of the estimated replacement cost of that building or space (including planned additions). For example, if the

estimated replacement cost of a building is \$40 million (including planned additions), and the renovations of that building (including planned additions) are estimated to cost \$20 million, then a gift of \$10 million would be sufficient to support a naming opportunity. As in the case of new building construction, every attempt should be made to obtain a gift from the naming donor to fund a permanent endowment in an amount sufficient to pay for the annual estimated ongoing cost of maintenance and operation of the renovated building or space.

B. Contribution for Program Support. An existing unnamed building may be named for a donor if a substantial gift is made by the donor and that gift is restricted to the support of programs to be carried on within the building. A "substantial gift" for these purposes is a gift in an amount that is equal to at least one-half of the estimated replacement cost of that building; provided, however, the nature of the programs carried on in the renovated building may, in the discretion of the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees, require that this naming gift level be increased or decreased.

C. Naming of Spaces. When construction financing for the renovation of an existing space is provided by sources that do not carry naming obligations, the space may be named for the donor if a substantial gift is made by the donor and that gift is restricted to the support of programs and activities to be carried on within the space, or restricted to pay the annual estimated ongoing maintenance and operation of the space. A "substantial gift" for these purposes is a gift in an amount that is equal to at least one-half of the total cost of the space renovation, or a gift in an amount sufficient to fund a permanent endowment that would pay the annual estimated ongoing cost of maintenance and operation of the space; provided, however, the nature of the programs and activities planned for the space may, in the discretion of the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees, require that this naming gift level be increased or decreased.

D. Recognition of Original Naming. When a building or space undergoes a major renovation (as defined above) the name of the building or space will be retained unless otherwise approved by the Board of Trustees. If a building or space ceases to exist, the existing name is not required to be retained; however, that name will be honored as a part of the University's history by appropriate recognition of the original naming by the Board of Trustees.

### III. Naming of Programs and Professorships:

Programs and professorships may be named in recognition of a gift at a level determined by the Board of Trustees.

### IV. Namings to Honor University Faculty and Administrators:

A. Buildings, spaces (including roads), programs, and professorships, may be named in recognition of a former member of the faculty or administration.

B. In naming buildings, spaces (including roads), programs, and professorships, in accordance with IV.A. above, the Board of Trustees will usually approve such namings only after the faculty or administrator has retired from Duke or is deceased.

C. All naming to honor faculty and administrators shall be for the life of the building or space

being named.

V. Policy Administration for Namings in I. – IV. above:

A. The Board of Trustees or the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees shall approve the naming of buildings, spaces, programs and professorships described in I. – IV. above after appropriate consideration by the Facilities and Environment Committee and the Institutional Advancement Committee in accordance with the Bylaws of the University and the charters of those committees, as follows:

1. Facilities and Environment Committee: All proposals to name, 1) buildings and exterior spaces, such as gardens or plazas (and including roads), 2) interior spaces that are not linked to a donation to the University, and 3) when appropriate, proposals to name buildings, spaces (including roads), programs, and professorships to honor University faculty and administrators in accordance with IV. above, shall be brought before the Facilities and Environment Committee for review and recommendation to the Board of Trustees for approval;

2. Institutional Advancement Committee: All proposals to name, 1) interior spaces in response to donations to the University, 2) programs and professorships in accordance with III. above, and 3) when appropriate, proposals to name buildings, spaces (including roads), programs, and professorships to honor University faculty and administrators in accordance with IV. above, shall be brought before the Institutional Advancement Committee for review and recommendation to the Board of Trustees for approval.

B. The Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees is authorized to negotiate variances in this policy with a prospective donor when the best interests of the University are served by an alternative arrangement.

VI. Naming of Schools:

A. While there is some history at Duke of naming schools for donors, there is a preference against naming any currently unnamed school in the belief that these schools benefit more by being associated exclusively with "Duke University."

B. In the event, however, that an extraordinary situation presents itself that deserves consideration, only the University President may initiate discussions with donors and such discussions may take place only after the University President has consulted with the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees.

C. A school may only be named by the Board of Trustees upon the recommendation of the President.

Adopted by the Board of Trustees and effective on the Thirteenth day of June, 2014.

## **Indiana University Naming Policy**

### Scope

- A. This policy applies to the naming of all permanent physical facilities and permanently established organizations of Indiana University for the purpose of commemorating persons, for administrative description, and for temporary or working use.
- B. This policy does not apply to (i) the designation or announcement of the availability of organizations or facilities for naming (that is, naming opportunities); (ii) organizations or facilities that are intended to be temporary; (iii) forms of individual recognition, such as faculty chairs, professorships, scholarships, fellowships, awards, and other individual honors; or (iv) sponsorship agreements governed by the Licensing and Trademarks policy ([FIN-LT-01](#)).

[Back to top](#)

### Policy Statement

- A. Authority for Naming
  - 1. Authority for the naming of organizations and facilities within Indiana University rests with the Trustees of Indiana University upon the recommendation of the President of Indiana University, except for the areas specifically delegated to the President or other university officers for final approval.
  - 2. Final approval authority for the initial naming, change of names, or removal of names of organizations and facilities shall be assigned as follows:

Objects of Naming / Types of Names	Facility – Major	Facility – Minor	Organization – Major	Organization – Minor
------------------------------------	------------------	------------------	----------------------	----------------------

Working	VPCPF	Dean (or administrative head)	President	Provost/Chancellor or EVP Clinical Affairs (specific to naming related to IU School of Medicine)
---------	-------	-------------------------------	-----------	--

Administrative	President	Dean (or administrative head)	Trustees	Provost/Chancellor or EVP Clinical Affairs (specific to naming related to IU School of Medicine)
----------------	-----------	-------------------------------	----------	--

Commemorative – Memorial	Trustees	President	Trustees	President
--------------------------	----------	-----------	----------	-----------

Commemorative – Benefactor	Trustees	President	Trustees	President
----------------------------	----------	-----------	----------	-----------

3. The President may reassign the responsibilities of university officers in the event of a reorganization.
4. The Vice President for Capital Planning and Facilities shall annually provide to the Facilities Committee of the Board of Trustees a list of all complete naming proposals received during the preceding year, the classification of each proposal (as major, administrative, etc.), and the current status of each proposal in the approval process.

#### B. Criteria for Names and Types of Names

1. The criteria for naming in this policy constitute minimum standards; i.e., the criteria are necessary but not sufficient for approval. The Naming Committee, President, designated university officers, and Board of

Trustees retain full discretion to decline to recommend or adopt a naming proposal that otherwise appears to meet the criteria.

## 2. Working Names

- a. Working names are temporary and will be replaced either upon the formal dedication of a facility or organization, or if there is no formal dedication, upon commencement of the operations of an organization or completion of a building.
- b. Working names should be unique, short, and descriptive of the facility or organization being named.
- c. The use of multiple working names for a single facility or organization is strictly to be avoided.

## 3. Administrative Names

- a. Administrative names are intended to be permanent. They must be unique on the campus on which the facility or organization is located and, where possible, they should be unique within the university. They should describe the use or purpose of an organization, facility, or exterior space (e.g., Botany Greenhouse, Department of English); indicate a location (e.g., North Street Garage); or adopt some other neutral designation, such as the name of a tree, flower, animal, or geographic or geologic feature (e.g., Meadow Lodge).
- b. Administrative names should be dignified, appropriate for permanent use, suitable for the facility or organization and, where possible, have some obvious relevance to the facility or organization.

## 4. Commemorative Names

- a. The commemorative naming of organizations and facilities recognizes those who have made significant contributions in service to, support of, or honor of Indiana University. Such naming seeks to recognize the best Hoosier values and traditions, with a special emphasis on those who have been strong advocates of the pursuit of knowledge and the enhancement of higher education.
- b. Major academic facilities and major academic organizations should be permanently named for individuals and not for corporate entities.
- c. There are two categories of commemorative names:
  - i. Memorial Recognition
    - Memorial naming recognizes individuals who have made extraordinary contributions to Indiana University, the state of Indiana, the nation, or the world, and whose lives and personal qualities deserve to be remembered and emulated. The individual or

the individual's contribution should usually have a relationship to the facility or organization being named.

- To maintain the significance of the honor, the memorial naming of any facility or organization shall remain a rare method of honoring individuals. Other prestigious university honors should be considered before a memorial naming is proposed. Ordinarily, a memorial honoree would have previously received (including posthumously) such an honor, and there would be a compelling reason that the further recognition of a memorial naming is appropriate.
- For memorial naming of major facilities and major organizations, a five-year waiting period shall be observed after the death of the individual before consideration for such distinction, unless specifically approved by the Board of Trustees.

## ii. Benefactor Recognition

- Benefactor naming recognizes substantial financial contributions by donors to the university in accordance with applicable university and IU Foundation policies on the value of gifts. In determining the appropriateness of naming as benefactor recognition, the following factors may be considered, in addition to the personal qualities described above: the net present value of any and all gifts to Indiana University or the IU Foundation from the donor to be honored, and, in particular, of the gift (if any) that motivates the naming; the appropriateness of associating the donor's name with Indiana University; and the donor's other contributions to the university, including volunteer activities, awards, and assistance with other projects.
- In no case will a benefactor naming be approved by the Trustees before the execution of a legally enforceable gift agreement.
- A benefactor may ask the university to name a facility or organization for an individual other than the benefactor, or the benefactor's immediate family, provided that the proposed individual exhibits the personal qualities described above, the individual's permission is obtained as required by paragraph (d) of this section, and the individual is not otherwise

disqualified from naming based on paragraph (e) of this section.

- d. A dossier (typically prepared by the proponent of the naming in the originating unit) which contains the information required by this section, appropriately verified, shall accompany all proposals for commemorative naming. The dossier shall also include the written permission of the individual to be named (or an appropriate representative, in the case of memorial naming) to use the name as proposed.
- e. Major facilities and major organizations may not be named for public officials while they continue in office.

### C. University Naming Committee

1. The University Naming Committee, appointed by the President, will advise the President concerning all names to which this policy applies. A university vice president will be appointed by the President to chair the committee, and the committee's membership shall include the Vice President for Capital Planning and Facilities, the Executive Vice President for University Academic Affairs, the President of the IU Foundation, and others selected from among senior officers of the university with responsibility for legal, public affairs, facilities, financial, and academic affairs. The President may appoint additional members of the committee as needed to perform its duties.
2. The offices of the Vice President for Capital Planning and Facilities and the Executive Vice President for University Academic Affairs shall jointly staff the committee and coordinate all aspects of the naming process.
3. All naming proposals that require approval by the President or the Board of Trustees must be presented first to the Vice President for Capital Planning and Facilities (for facilities) or the Executive Vice President for University Academic Affairs (for organizations). If the appropriate vice president finds that the proposal and dossier are complete and appear to meet the relevant criteria, that vice president may refer the proposal to the University Naming Committee. The appropriate vice president may also seek additional information from the proponent of the naming or consult with the President or the chair of the University Naming Committee in determining whether to refer a proposal to the committee. The President, provost, a chancellor, or a vice president may refer other naming proposals to the committee through this procedure.
4. The committee will be responsible for assuring that naming proposals include a thorough factual investigation of the proposed honoree and that the proposal otherwise meets the stated criteria, making recommendations to the President on naming proposals, and advising on naming policy and procedures, as needed. The committee may establish

such subcommittees as it deems appropriate to carry out its duties and responsibilities. The committee will meet at the call of the chair.

#### D. Changes to or Removal of Names

1. The removal of or change in the name of a facility or organization may be initiated only by the provost, a chancellor, a vice president, the president of the IU Foundation, the president of the university, or a trustee.
2. In the absence of an express delegation by the President to a special committee appointed and charged by the President, the same process for naming a facility or organization in the first instance shall be implemented for changing or removing the name of a facility or organization, and the Naming Committee shall retain the authority for administration of this process.
3. When a facility or organization ceases to exist, the university will make every effort to continue to commemorate memorial or benefactor recognition in an appropriate way; however, the university will not usually transfer a name to another facility or organization.
4. In the case of a benefactor naming, the university may remove a name upon the failure of a financial commitment to be satisfied.
5. The university reserves the right to remove a name from a facility or organization under extraordinary circumstances when the continued use of the honoree's name would compromise the public trust and reflect adversely upon the university and its reputation. The removal of an honoree's name from a facility or organization must not be undertaken lightly, and it must be approached with respect for the considered judgments of the past, especially when exercised by the contemporaries of the honoree, and with an awareness of the fallibility of our own judgments. The decision-making process must include, at a minimum, the following:
  - a.
    - i. An articulation of specific behavior(s) or course(s) of conduct on the part of the honoree on which the request for the removal of the honoree's name is based;
    - ii. A fact-finding investigation of the specific behavior(s) or course(s) of conduct, including an examination of contemporaneous records related to the consideration of the naming, and the historical, personal, and (if relevant) academic context, of the behavior(s) or course(s) of behavior;
    - iii. Thoughtful consideration of the impact on the university and the university community of both retention and the removal of the honoree's name from the facility or the organization, including but not limited to the following:

- The nature of the specific behavior(s) and course(s) of conduct;
- The centrality of those behavior(s) and course(s) of conduct to the honoree's life as a whole;
- The prominence or role of named facility or organization in the daily life of the university;
- The relationship of the honoree to the university's history;
- The degree to which retaining the name will interfere with the ability of the university community to teach, work, learn, and live in the community;
- Whether retention of the honoree's name compromises the university's mission or conflicts with the university's fundamental values.

The university may also consult with immediate relatives and heirs of the honoree, as well as individuals involved in the initial naming decision, before making a recommendation.

6. Upon the removal of a name under this section, the name of the facility or organization will revert to name immediately previous. If there is no previous permanent name, an administrative name will be adopted. The process for an initial naming will be utilized if the facility or organization is subsequently renamed.

[Back to top](#)

## Reason for Policy

- A. This policy is established to provide for an orderly, coordinated, and informed practice of naming Indiana University facilities and organizations in such a manner as to ensure the appropriate recognition of the traditions of the institution, including the opportunity to honor and recognize its distinguished alumni, benefactors, and friends.
- B. Careful consideration must be given to associating any name with the excellence and reputation of Indiana University. Therefore, this policy is designed to ensure the proper vetting and consultation before making such decisions.

[Back to top](#)

## Procedures

- A. Approval to Proceed for Commemorative Names

1. For the commemorative naming of major facilities and major organizations, all initial approaches to, or serious discussions with, a benefactor or representative of an individual to be memorialized must have the prior approval of the chief development officer of the university; the responsible provost, chancellor, or vice president; and the President.
2. The purpose of preliminary approval is to ensure that the contemplated naming is likely to be consistent with university and campus goals and priorities, with university and campus development plans, and with the terms of this policy. The approval to proceed permits the approach or discussions to begin and a proposal and dossier to be prepared; approval to proceed does not assure approval of the completed proposal and dossier.
3. Requests for the President's approval to proceed shall be routed through the Vice President for Capital Planning and Facilities (for facilities) or the Executive Vice President for University Academic Affairs (for organizations). The request should contain sufficient information to reflect the approvals in paragraph (a) and address the purposes of paragraph (b) of this section.

B. Approval Process for Names Requiring Presidential or Trustee Approval

1. The University Naming Committee will only accept naming proposals from the provost, a chancellor, a vice president, the president of the IU Foundation, or the President of the university.
2. Proposals for benefactor naming will only be accepted from the chief development officer of the university.
3. A complete proposal includes a dossier that addresses and verifies all of the applicable criteria in this policy, including:
  - A precise description of the facility or organization to be named
  - The exact name to be adopted
  - The basis or reason for the naming; for commemorative names, why the proposed name is appropriate to the facility or organization
  - For memorial naming, whether the five-year rule is applicable
  - For commemorative names, whether the individual is currently a public official
  - For benefactor names, analysis and approval by the IU Foundation. The Foundation's analysis should usually include consideration of the net present value of the gift, other contributions and activities of the donor, consistency with announced gift opportunity amounts, consistency with other university gift amount policies, and other naming opportunities
  - Approvals by the relevant department, school, and campus leadership (as appropriate)

- If the naming is for someone other than a donor, formal permission of that individual or authorized representative.
4. In considering a naming proposal, the University Naming Committee may seek additional information, refer the proposal to the Naming Advisory Council, or recommend approval or disapproval to the President.
  5. After receiving the recommendation of the University Naming Committee, the President may seek additional information, refer the proposal to the Naming Advisory Council, disapprove the recommendation, or approve the recommendation and, when appropriate, forward the recommendation to the Board of Trustees. The Board will consider proposals according to its normal operating procedures.
  6. In order to ensure adherence to consistent naming conventions, and to avoid confusion due to duplication, the Naming Committee must be notified of working and administrative namings of minor facilities or organizations which that are covered by this policy but do not require action by the University Naming Committee, President, or Trustees.
  7. A dean, provost, chancellor, or vice president may seek the informal advice of the Vice President for Capital Planning and Facilities (for facilities) or the Executive Vice President for University Academic Affairs (for organizations) on any question concerning a proposed name to which this policy applies or may potentially apply. Either may choose to refer such questions to the University Naming Committee.

[Back to top](#)

## Definitions

### A. Objects of naming:

Facilities: All permanent physical structures, in whole or in part, including interior spaces of structures and exterior spaces, whether or not connected with a particular structure.

Organizations: All permanent units of organization, including schools, colleges, academic and non-academic departments, centers, institutes, offices, academic programs, and administrative and auxiliary units.

### B. Types of facilities and organizations:

Major Facility: Any large or prominent facility. Examples include large or well-known structures, academic buildings, facilities that receive frequent visits by the general public; prominent interior spaces, such as a main atrium or entrance, auditorium, library, the floor of a building, a playing surface; and prominent exterior spaces, such as a street, plaza, park, quadrangle, or open atrium. In case of doubt, a facility should be considered major.

Minor Facility: A facility to which this policy applies and which is not major. Examples include small structures; facilities designed for service or incidental purposes or that are rarely visited by the general public; most interior spaces, including classrooms, offices, lounges, laboratories' physical space, and work spaces.

Major Organization: Any formally established, prominent academic unit of the university, including schools and colleges. Any organizational unit that must be approved by the Board of Trustees or by the Indiana Commission for Higher Education is a major organization. In case of doubt, an organization should be considered major.

Minor Organization: A permanently established organization to which this policy applies and which is not major. Examples include most departments, centers, institutes, clinics, laboratories (as organizations), divisions, and administrative and auxiliary units.

#### C. Types of names:

Working Name: A temporary name which will be replaced by a permanent administrative or commemorative name. Working names are typically used in the planning, development, and construction phases of a facility or organization.

Administrative Name: A permanent name for a facility or organization, which is primarily descriptive or decorative. The name of an individual or corporate entity may not be considered an administrative name.

Commemorative Name: The name of an individual person or persons which is assigned as a permanent name for a facility or organization.

Memorial Name: A commemorative name for a facility or organization that recognizes an individual (or individuals) who has made extraordinary contributions to Indiana University, the state, the nation, or the world.

Benefactor Name: A commemorative name for a facility or organization that recognizes substantial financial contributions by a donor or donors to the university.

#### D. Temporal references:

Permanent: Expected to continue in existence for at least ten years or indefinitely. An administrative name is considered permanent even if it is hoped or expected that it will be replaced by a commemorative name.

**1. Title**

Naming Policy

**2. Rules and Regulation**

Sec. 1 General. Before proceeding with honorific or gift-related namings, institutions must carefully consider all circumstances surrounding the naming, including the overall benefit to the institution and whether displaying the name is and will continue to be a positive reflection on the institution.

1.1 Review. Any naming of Facilities and Programs must undergo a high level of consideration and due diligence to ensure that the name comports with the purpose and mission of the U. T. System and the U. T. System institutions. No naming shall be permitted for any corporation or individual whose public image, products, or services may conflict with such purpose and mission.

1.2 Time Limitation for Approval. Naming approvals granted under this Rule are valid for a period not to exceed 365 days from the date of approval. After approval of a naming, the negotiated gift agreement must be executed within 365 days of that approval. If that does not occur, the naming must be resubmitted for approval by the Board of Regents through the Vice Chancellor for External Relations, Communications and Advancement Services unless the Chancellor approves a one-time, 90-day extension of the naming approval, consistent with the requirements of Section 2 below.

Sec. 2 Naming of Prominent Facilities and Prominent Programs.

2.1 Each naming for a Prominent Facility or Prominent Program must be approved by the Board of Regents. Recommendations for namings of any university building or athletic facility, college, school, and academic department or clinical division shall be forwarded to the Board of Regents with recommendations of the Chancellor, the Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic or Health Affairs, the Vice Chancellor for External

Relations, Communications and Advancement Services, and the president of the institution, according to procedures established by the Office of External Relations, Communications and Advancement Services.

- 2.2 Naming of Other Prominent Facilities and Programs. Each naming for Other Prominent Facilities and Other Prominent Programs may be approved by the Chancellor with recommendations of the Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic or Health Affairs, the Vice Chancellor for External Relations, Communications and Advancement Services, and the president of the institution, according to procedures established by the Office of External Relations, Communications and Advancement Services. Other Prominent Facilities and Programs may include wings and other major components of academic, medical, athletics, and arts facilities, large auditoria, concert halls, atria, prominent outdoor spaces, and clinics and academic and health programs, centers, institutes, and organized research units. The Vice Chancellor for External Relations, Communications and Advancement Services, in consultation with the appropriate Executive Vice Chancellor, will make final determinations concerning what types of Facilities and Programs will be considered Other Prominent.

- Sec. 3 Naming of Less Prominent Facilities and Less Prominent Programs. The Board of Regents has delegated naming authority for Less Prominent Facilities and Less Prominent Programs to each president based on a set of general guidelines that are reviewed and approved by the Chancellor, except that any Corporate Naming requires approval by the Chancellor and compliance with the procedures set forth below in Section 7, including the requirement for advance consultation. The Vice Chancellor for External Relations, Communications and Advancement Services, through consultation with the appropriate Executive Vice Chancellor and the U. T. System institutions, will make final determinations concerning what types of Facilities and Programs may be considered Less Prominent.

- Sec. 4 Naming of Streets. The naming of all streets located on campus must be approved by the Board of Regents. Recommendations for any street names shall be forwarded to the Board of Regents

with recommendations of the Chancellor, the Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic or Health Affairs, the Vice Chancellor for External Relations, Communications and Advancement Services, and the president of the institution.

Sec. 5     Honorific Naming. As a matter of general practice, namings will recognize significant philanthropic gifts. Under special circumstances, honorific namings may be considered. Honorific namings are exceptional in nature and shall be granted for individuals or organizations that have made extraordinary contributions to a U. T. institution, the state or nation. Recommendations for honorific namings may be proposed by an institution president to the Chancellor, who will determine on a case-by-case basis whether to advance the request to the Board of Regents for consideration.

5.1     Namings Criteria. All requests for honorific namings should identify how the honoree meets one or more of the following criteria:

- (a) Reflects the mission of the university through remarkable service and leadership of lasting value to the university or society
- (b) Reflects the mission of the university through pinnacle achievements in discovery, scholarly work and citizenship
- (c) Reflects the mission of the university through a longstanding relationship of engagement and support that has contributed to qualitative and transformational university advancements
- (d) Represents the highest degree of historical significance

5.2     Restrictions on Honorific Namings.

- (a) Any naming in honor of U. T. System administrative officials, faculty, or staff members or for elected or appointed public officials shall normally occur at least five years after the individual's retirement from university or public office or death.

- (b) Namings that bring into question the reputation of the university are subject to rejection or termination after approval.
- (c) The honorific naming will likely serve for the useful life of the facility or program. If the asset is later modified or replaced, the University reserves the right to rename it or offer an alternative honorific naming as close to the spirit as possible of the original naming.

5.3 Prominent Facilities and Programs/Other Prominent Facilities and Programs. Honorific namings of Prominent Facilities and Programs or Other Prominent Facilities and Programs must be approved by the Board of Regents following the recommendation of the Chancellor.

5.4 Less Prominent Facilities and Programs. Under appropriate circumstances, honorific namings of Less Prominent Facilities and Programs may be granted by the president of the institution, with approval of the Chancellor. Such naming for a U. T. System or institution administrative official, faculty, or staff member or for an elected or appointed public official shall be approved by the Board of Regents following the recommendation of the Chancellor.

Sec. 6 Gift-Related Naming. Facilities and Programs may be named under the terms of a negotiated gift agreement to memorialize or otherwise recognize substantial gifts and significant donors or individuals designated by donors. Each institution shall develop guidelines for what constitutes substantial and significant donations to warrant a gift-related naming. Institutional donor guidelines must be approved by the Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs or Health Affairs, the Vice Chancellor for External Relations, Communications and Advancement Services, and the Vice Chancellor and General Counsel for inclusion in the institutional *Handbook of Operating Procedures*.

Sec. 7 Corporate Naming. Each Corporate Naming for Prominent Facilities or Programs must be approved by the Board of Regents. Each Corporate Naming for Other Prominent Facilities and Programs or Less Prominent Facilities or Programs must be approved by the Chancellor.

7.1 Special Considerations. The Office of External Relations, Communications and Advancement Services must

complete a detailed due diligence review, in accordance with policies and procedures established by that office, of the corporation prior to any Corporate Naming. Each Corporate Naming must be analyzed by the Office of External Relations, Communications and Advancement Services, the Office of the Board of Regents, the Office of General Counsel, and the Office of Business Affairs to ensure that there are no impermissible conflicts or legal issues. Certain restrictions may also apply to any proposed naming of a Facility financed with the proceeds of tax-exempt bonds.

Corporate namings for academic and health buildings, colleges and schools, and academic departments shall not occur, with the exception of rare and special circumstances.

Corporate namings for athletics facilities, arts facilities, and museums, conference centers, and non-academic and non-health facilities may receive consideration with preference given to term limits for corporate namings.

- 7.2 Procedures for Corporate Naming. Before negotiating a possible Corporate Naming, the president shall send a written request, in compliance with procedures established by the Office of External Relations, Communications and Advancement Services, to the Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic or Health Affairs. Except in the case of Less Prominent Facilities or Programs, the institution shall negotiate an agreement with the corporation, using the Standard Corporate Naming Gift/Licensing Agreement prepared by the Office of General Counsel. Any substantive variations to the standard agreement must be approved by the Office of General Counsel. The Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic or Health Affairs shall have authority to sign such agreements after appropriate review and approval.

- Sec. 8 Changes to Approved or Existing Names of Prominent Facilities, Programs, and Streets and Nonhonorific Redesignation. Minor changes to approved or existing names of Prominent Facilities, Programs, and Streets as determined by the Vice Chancellor for External Relations, Communications and Advancement Services and the General Counsel to the Board may be approved by the Chancellor after review by the Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic or Health Affairs, and the president of

the institution. Nonhonorific renaming and redesignation of projects in the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) shall be reviewed and approved by the Assistant Vice Chancellor for Capital Projects. Such approved redesignations will be included in the amended CIP.

Sec. 9 Namings Approvals Chart. The below chart summarizes the approving authority for namings. Please reference the text of the rule for relevant procedural requirements.

	Corporate	Non-Corporate (Individual)	Honorific
Namings for Prominent Facilities and Programs	Board of Regents	Board of Regents	Board of Regents
Namings for Other Prominent Facilities and Programs	Chancellor	Chancellor	Board of Regents
Less Prominent Facilities and Programs	Chancellor	Institutional President	Board of Regents for namings for U. T.-affiliated individual or public official  Institutional President, with approval by Chancellor, for all others.

Sec. 10 Announcements. No institution shall announce the naming of any Facility or Program prior to the final approval required by this Rule.

### **3. Definitions**

Facilities - all physical facilities and buildings.

Prominent Facilities - all buildings; athletic facilities.

Other Prominent Facilities - areas such as wings and other major components of academic, medical, athletics, and arts facilities, large auditoria, concert halls, atria, prominent outdoor spaces, and clinics.

Less Prominent Facilities - facilities such as laboratories, classrooms, seminar or meeting rooms, and patient rooms that the Vice Chancellor for External Relations, Communications and Advancement Service, in consultation with the Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic or Health Affairs and the appropriate U. T. System institution, determines are less prominent and therefore not within the category of Prominent Facilities.

Programs - all non-physical entities.

Prominent Programs - major entities, such as colleges, schools, academic departments, and clinical divisions.

Other Prominent Programs - academic and health centers, programs, institutes, and organized research units.

Less Prominent Programs - academic centers, programs, and institutes that the Vice Chancellor for External Relations, Communications and Advancement Services, in consultation with the Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic or Health Affairs, determines are less prominent and therefore not within the category of Prominent Programs.

Corporate Naming - the naming of any Facility or Program after a corporate or other business-oriented entity.

Prominent Naming - the naming of Prominent Facilities or Prominent Programs.

#### **4. Relevant Federal and State Statutes**

*Texas Education Code* [Section 51.923](#) – Qualifications of Certain Business Entities to Enter Into Contracts With an Institution of Higher Education

#### **5. Relevant System Policies, Procedures, and Forms**

Regents' *Rules and Regulations*, [Rule 60301](#) – Development Board of an Institution

**6. Who Should Know**

Administrators  
Development Officers

**7. System Administration Office(s) Responsible for Rule**

Office of External Relations, Communications and Advancement Services

**8. Dates Approved or Amended**

Editorial amendments to Sections 1 and 9 made May 28, 2020  
February 27, 2020  
Editorial amendments made May 21, 2019  
Editorial amendments made to Sections 2.1, 2.2, 4, 5.1, 7, 8, and 9 made  
September 25, 2018  
Editorial amendment to Definitions made February 23, 2017  
February 11, 2016  
Editorial amendments made to Sections 2, 4, 7, 9, and 10 made July 13,  
2015  
August 25, 2011  
Section 9 (Nonhonorific Redesignation) was added back in as an editorial  
amendment on March 5, 2010; this section (formerly Sec. 6) was deleted in  
May 2006. Sections 9-10 were renumbered as Sections 10-11.  
February 5, 2010  
August 23, 2007  
May 11, 2006  
December 10, 2004

**9. Contact Information**

Questions or comments regarding this Rule should be directed to:

- [bor@utsystem.edu](mailto:bor@utsystem.edu)