

Chatham University

Report and Recommendations  
Chatham Committee on Recognition and Memorialization

November 4, 2019

## Chatham Committee on Recognition and Memorialization

### Members

#### **Chair**

David Finegold, DPhil, President

#### **Students**

Elena Boyle '21

Alex Ferrer '20

Andrew Handley '22

Skukura Woods, MSCP '20 \*

#### **Alumni**

Ashleigh Deemer '05, Western Pennsylvania Director with PennEnvironment

Carmen Filloy, MSCP '11

#### **Community Leaders**

BJ Leber, CEO of Adagio Health

Lara Washington, CEO of Allegheny Housing Rehabilitation Corporation

#### **Chatham University Board of Trustees**

Louise Brown '67, Executive Director, Shadyside Hospital Foundation

Kathi Elliott, DNP '14, Executive Director, Gwen's Girls

#### **Faculty & Administration**

Dana Brown, Ph.D., Exec. Director of the Pennsylvania Center for Women and Politics

Tyra Good, Ed.D., Assistant Professor of Education

Lou Martin, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of History

Darlene Motley, Ph.D., Dean, School of Arts, Science and Business

#### **Staff**

Jill Ausel, Library Director

Lesli Somerset Talley, Associate Director of Career Development

\*Replaced original member Ana Towata, MSUS '19, who left CCRM following her graduation.

## I. Overview

Across the nation, communities of all kinds have been grappling with issues arising when community members question how whom their community memorialized or recognized in the past reflects upon their community and its values in the present.

Issues like these can arise when a person the community memorialized or recognized in the past left a principal legacy at odds with the values the community aspires to in the present. Monuments to Confederates or to the Confederacy are an example. Harder to weigh are memorials or monuments to people whose principal legacy includes ideologies or beliefs that were more prevalent in the past but do not reflect contemporary community values, or when the person memorialized held views that do not reflect contemporary community values but do not constitute the person's principal legacy.

These issues also arise when the people whom a community memorialized and recognized in the past do not reflect the community's diversity in the present or the diversity to which the community aspires, a not uncommon situation given that the people a community decided to memorialize in the past tended to reflect the people making those decisions then.

Although issues like these arise in communities of all kinds, college and university communities are uniquely positioned to handle them. Colleges and university communities have access to resources – *e.g.*, scholars and research – that other communities cannot as readily draw upon. Colleges and universities also have traditions of evidence-based inquiry, open-minded discourse, and respect for difference of opinion that lend themselves to grappling with difficult issues like these.

Given the resources at their disposal, higher education institutions have a responsibility, not just to their campus community but to communities of all kinds, when issues like these arise. Our responsibility is to model practices, approaches, and processes that do not forget or erase our community's past, while forging a path forward to the kind of community to which we aspire.

## II. Background

### *Chatham University: Mission & Values*

Like other colleges and universities across the nation, Chatham University has become a much more diverse campus community since its founding, and especially during the past few decades. Some of this change reflects the fact that as the nation has become more diverse, so too has the pool from which Chatham draws students, faculty and staff. But Chatham has also taken purposeful steps to attract and retain students, faculty and staff who reflect the increasing diversity of the nation.

At the same time, Chatham has taken steps to create a campus community that is welcoming to and respectful of diversity of all kinds. In 2016, for example, Chatham established the Diversity and Inclusion Council and hired a Director of Multicultural Affairs, Dr. Randi

Congleton (promoted to Assistant Dean for Diversity, Equity & Inclusion in 2019). And in 2017, as part of the University's strategic planning process, the Board of Trustees approved revising the University's Mission to state that Chatham "prepares its students to recognize and respect diversity of culture, identity, and opinion" and to include "Diversity, Inclusion, and Respect" as one of Chatham's eight core values.

These and other efforts and initiatives have had a positive impact toward achieving Chatham's goals with respect to diversity and inclusion. Nevertheless, events and issues that have arisen at Chatham and at colleges, universities and communities around the nation underscore the need for continued hard work and vigilance to achieve the campus community and campus culture we desire, while reminding us that our work in this area is far from done.

### *Naming Issues*

In 1998, a foundation in Pittsburgh gave then-Chatham College a substantial financial gift *to construct, equip and maintain a lecture hall on the College's campus, such lecture hall to be known as the "Margaret H. Sanger Lecture Hall"* [original language from gift agreement in *italics*] in honor of the founder of Planned Parenthood. A prime focus of the foundation's work was on finding ways to reduce the rate of population growth as a key element in building a more sustainable future; this focus was significantly influenced by Margaret Sanger, a close personal friend of the mother of the foundation's then-Chair. Margaret Sanger otherwise had no connection to Chatham College.

The gift agreement between the foundation and Chatham specified that Chatham must return the monetary gift to the foundation if Chatham ever removed Margaret Sanger's name from the lecture hall. This stipulation was based on the foundation's concerns that Chatham might be pressured in the future to remove her name by opponents of Planned Parenthood.

Those concerns were not unfounded. Margaret Sanger has long been a lightning rod for those who oppose women's right to make their own reproductive choices, such as birth control and contraceptives, and for those who conflate her with abortion, which she did not support. Margaret Sanger viewed contraception as a way of preventing abortions which were often deadly for women at that time, especially for women of color, poor women, and immigrants.

While there is no record of any controversy about the gift from Chatham's Board or from members of the Chatham community, either at the time of the gift or over the intervening years, longtime members of the Chatham administration report receiving occasional complaints over the years about Sanger Hall. Such complaints, relatively few and far between and usually anonymous, tended to be from outsiders objecting to the naming of Sanger Hall based on either a belief that Margaret Sanger supported abortion or because of her association with Planned Parenthood and women's reproductive rights.

In more recent years, the naming of Sanger Hall has become a source of increasing complaints, this time not from outsiders but from some Chatham students. These first complaints objected to Margaret Sanger's advocacy of eugenics (a belief, popular during

Sanger's time, in the possibility of improving the human population through controlled or selective breeding) and her alleged racism.

To give the Chatham community an opportunity to discuss these important issues in an open forum, the Black Student Union, Chatham Student Government, and Chatham University's Women's Institute hosted a symposium on Margaret Sanger in October 2016. Panelists at the symposium included: Dr. Merrian Brooks, a physician then with UPMC's Children's Hospital; Dr. Ellen Chesler, author of the seminal biography of Margaret Sanger; and Dr. Lisa Tetrault, a CMU professor and author of *Memory and the Women's Suffrage Movement*.

Afterwards, as calls emerged to rename Sanger Hall, and as controversies surrounding the naming of monuments and facilities continued to roil campuses and communities across the country, President Finegold charged Chatham University's Diversity and Inclusion Council (DIC) with establishing a set a principles to guide Chatham in deciding whether to remove or rename a historic name from a building or space on Chatham property.

The DIC modelled its proposed Procedures for Consideration of Renaming and/or Name Removal of Campus Properties (the Procedures) on procedures adopted by other higher education institutions reviewing naming issues, especially the policy adopted by Yale University in reviewing the naming of Calhoun College. Among other things, the Procedures the DIC recommended specified four principles to be considered when reviewing requests to remove a name from or rename campus property:

- **Is the principal legacy of the namesake/benefactor fundamentally at odds with the non-discrimination policy of the University?**

Chatham University - Non-Discrimination Policy

Equal opportunity and affirmative action are integral to employment and education at Chatham University because we recognize that the University's present and future strength is based primarily on people and their skills, experience, and potential to develop, no matter what their race, color, religion, gender, sexual orientation, national origin, age disability, veteran status, marital status, or any other legally protected status.

- **Is the principal legacy of the namesake/benefactor fundamentally at odds with the mission of the University?**

Chatham University - Mission Statement

Chatham University prepares women and men to be world ready: to build lives of purpose and value and fulfilling work. In addition to appropriate professional skills and liberal arts learning, Chatham believes that world readiness means being an informed and engaged citizen in one's communities; recognizing and respecting diversity of culture, identity and opinion; and living sustainably on the planet.

- **To the extent possible, was the relevant principal legacy significantly contested in the time and place in which the namesake lived?**

- **To the extent possible, was all pertinent information about the namesake/benefactor disclosed at the time of the naming request? In addition, did the University exercise due diligence regarding the namesake/benefactor prior to entering into the naming contract? Is there any evidence to attempt to conceal any relevant information that may have influenced the original decision?**

After review and approval by the President and President's Cabinet, the Board of Trustees approved the Procedures on October 12, 2017. A copy of the Procedures is included in this Report as Appendix A.

The Board of Trustees also proactively revisited and revised Chatham's Gifts Policy (Gifts Policy). The revised Gifts Policy, which the Board approved on February 15, 2019, provides, among other things, that the Board must review and approve any new naming of campus property to help ensure that the new name is in keeping with Chatham's mission and values, and that the Board reserves the right to revisit named buildings and facilities if the donor is not in line with Chatham's mission and values. A copy of the pertinent section of the Gifts Policy is included in this Report as Appendix B.

### *Establishment and Charge*

By late fall 2018, as questions about Sanger Hall persisted, but with no one availing themselves of the process for initiating a renaming request under the Procedures, President Finegold self-initiated the process as the Procedures allow Chatham's President to do.

In February 2019, President Finegold invited representatives from the Chatham University community (including graduate and undergraduate students, alumni, faculty, and staff) and leaders from the Pittsburgh community to serve on Chatham's Committee on Recognition and Memorialization (CCRM). See page 1 of this Report for a list of the CCRM's members. The Committee was charged with three tasks:

1. Review facility names, including Sanger Hall, campus memorials and other recognition for any concerns of conflict with Chatham's values and mission.
2. If conflict is found with Chatham's values and mission, make recommendations to the President and Board of Trustees on appropriate steps for Chatham to take (e.g., removal of name, renaming, use of educational context plaques).
3. Identify potential new opportunities for naming, recognition, or memorialization to more fully represent our campus community and the value our mission and campus community place on Diversity & Inclusion.

### *Process*

The CCRM met monthly from March 2019 through November 2019. An important part of the CCRM's process was providing opportunities for members of the Chatham community to share their opinions with the Committee. To that end, on April 4, 2019 President Finegold notified the campus community by email of the establishment of the

CCRM, identified its members, and shared its charges. He invited members of the campus community to share their perspective on any of the charges at the CCRM's April meeting, or, if they could not attend, submit a statement to have read and entered into the record at the Committee's meeting. In addition to the invitation extended to members of the Chatham community, the CCRM also invited subject matter experts to share their experiences and/or research with the Committee at the monthly meetings.

All told, the Committee heard from the following individuals during the course of its work:

- Dermot Curtin, a 3rd year doctoral candidate in Chatham's Psychology program who has been employed in the field of behavioral healthcare for the past decade, submitted a written statement arguing that Margaret Sanger is undeserving of being honored at Chatham because of her support of eugenics.
- Anna Butler, MFA LR Creative Writing '20, submitted a written statement in which she stated, "I do not think any positive work [Margaret Sanger] may have completed is enough to justify recognition in light of [her] violent ableist, racist, and classist affiliations."
- Tara Teets '19 (English major and co-facilitator of the Intergroup Dialogues course on Gender), who told the Committee that she has worked with the Black Student Union on the Sanger Hall issue, urged the Committee "to rename Sanger Hall and remove her bust to make the brave and compassionate move of disengaging Chatham University from the cruel rhetoric of white supremacy."
- Speaking on behalf of the Black Student Union, Elena Boyle '20 (double major on psychology and criminology, student athlete, and the vice president of Chatham's Black Student Union) asked the Committee to rename Sanger Hall and remove the bust of Margaret Sanger.
- Pam Connelly (Vice Chancellor for Diversity and Inclusion, University of Pittsburgh) shared the experiences of the committee which reviewed Dr. Thomas Parran Hall, named for a former dean of Pitt's Graduate School of Public Health who was U.S. Surgeon General during the Tuskegee and Guatemala studies.
- Dr. Jessie Ramey (Director, Chatham University Women's Institute) recapped the October 2016 symposium on Margaret Sanger that is referenced above.
- Dr. Melissa Bell (Program Director of Chatham University's Social Work Program) shared her research and studies of women's reproductive rights, including the contributions of Margaret Sanger.
- Rachel Rossi '19 (BA International Studies) submitted the results of her research project on R. Jennie Devore, President of then-Pennsylvania College for Women (PCW), Chatham University's predecessor, from 1894-1900. Ms. Rossi's research found evidence that Devore gave public speeches in the 1920s that were in favor of more restrictive immigration law and included a statement disparaging immigrants.
- Dr. Monique Moultrie (Associate Professor of Religious Studies at Georgia State University; 2019-20 Visiting Professor of Women's Studies and African American Religions, Women's Studies Research Associate at Harvard Divinity

School) spoke with the Committee about her research and teaching about Margaret Sanger.

- On September 12, 2019, President Finegold and Alex Ferrer (President of CSG) had an open dialogue with Chatham students about the CCRM's work to date at a CSG meeting to which CSG invited all students.
- On September 27, 2019, CSG convened a Town Hall for students at which nine student organizations, including CSG, endorsed Senate Bill No. 2019-03 (Alternative for Sanger Hall), included in this Report as Appendix C.

In addition, the CCRM established a Moodle site which served as a virtual research library for CCRM members to draw upon. The Moodle site included:

- Minutes/Notes from each CCRM meeting.
- Copies of all material (*e.g.*, articles, PowerPoint presentations and other documents) shared or referenced at each meeting.
  - Thus, for example, the folder for the CCRM's second meeting (April 2019) includes copies of all written statements provided by members of the campus community who spoke at the meeting or submitted written statements to the Office of the President in response to President Finegold's All-Campus email of April 4, 2019.
- Other research, articles and chapters from books on or related to Margaret Sanger.
- Reports from or articles about other universities (*e.g.*, Pitt, Duke, Yale) that have undertaken reviews of campus names and naming policies.
- Midway through the CCRM's deliberations, a matrix was created on the Moodle site. It was organized by the four Principals in the Procedures that must be considered when a modification to the naming of a campus building or facility has been requested. CCRM members could insert their findings, questions or concerns under each criteria as the CCRM's work progressed into spring, summer and fall. The Matrix proved to be a useful tool in identifying areas of broad or unanimous agreement among the Committee.

### *Observations and Recommendation re. the Process*

The Committee notes that while Charge 1 ("Review facility names, including Sanger Hall, campus memorials and other recognition for any concerns of conflict with Chatham's values and mission") suggests the Committee would review everyone for whom a building, facility or monument at Chatham is named, neither the Committee nor the University have the resources in time or personnel to undertake such a labor-intensive research study, at least not within the timeline the Committee was given to complete its work.

The Committee further notes that only two names surfaced from the CCRM or from the Chatham community following President Finegold's email of April 2019: Margaret Sanger and R. Jennie DeVore (president of Chatham University's predecessor, Pennsylvania College for Women, from 1894-1900) for whom The Jennie Devore Room in the Mellon Center is named. The Committee is comfortable addressing these two



individuals, rather than addressing every individual for whom something is named at Chatham, because it is confident that procedures and policies are in place should anyone wish to challenge a naming in the future.

The Committee devoted the lion's share of its time on Charge 1 to Margaret Sanger, reflecting the sensitivities surrounding the naming of Sanger Hall over the past three years. Another reason why the Committee devoted so much time to Margaret Sanger, one that emerged as the Committee's work progressed, is that Sanger Hall raises different, more nuanced, and arguably more difficult issues than some other institutions have considered.

This is not a case where a person's principal legacy was overseeing (Dr. Parran –Pitt), being a driving force behind (John C. Calhoun –Yale), or taking up arms in support of (Robt. E. Lee – Duke) something that an institution had not explicitly condemned in the past but deems harmful or objectionable today. This is a case where a person's principal legacy was something that aligns with the institution's mission and values, both past and present, but where other things the person said, wrote, or did in the past have been brought to light that the institution finds harmful or objectionable today.

History suggests that the latter kinds of cases will continue to surface long into the future. That is because history (past and present) is full of people who left or will leave behind significant, positive achievements, but also left or will leave behind trails of words, statements, and deeds that are far less exemplary – sometimes even harmful or objectionable.

Cases where a person left behind a positive legacy as well as evidence of harmful or objectionable words, statements and deeds are difficult to weigh. They require us to consider a person's good deeds with their bad, and to consider whether the bad so outweighs the good, or is so inextricably entwined with the good, as to diminish or even perhaps negate the good. Such cases also require us to consider the potential risk to reputation of the University and to the campus community by saying or doing nothing when a person the University once memorialized left evidence of words, statements or deeds that the community or some of its members find harmful or objectionable today.

These are difficult issues, and issues on which there were and still are respectful differences of opinion within the Committee's ranks after many months of diligent work. Should there be other challenges to a campus naming in the future, the Committee hopes that lessons learned from its work and experience may help guide future inquiries.

### Recommendation

The Committee recommends that its final Report be shared with the Chatham community when it has been approved by the Board of Trustees and that it be placed on Chatham's website for future reference. This recommendation is made in the interest of transparency and in hope that the Committee's learning process can be a learning process for others, especially if similar issues are raised in the future.

### III. *Addressing the Committee's Charges*

***Charge 1: If conflict is found with Chatham's values and mission, make recommendations to the President and Board of Trustees on appropriate steps for Chatham to take (e.g., removal of name, renaming, use of educational context plaques).***

#### *Sanger Hall*

Margaret Sanger's principal legacy was helping 20<sup>th</sup> Century women gain the right to decide when and whether to have a child – a right that had been suppressed worldwide for at least 5,000 years and one that is still threatened today. In Sanger's eyes, giving women control over their reproductive rights was a way to improve women's standard of living, employment opportunities, and self-empowerment, as well as a way of providing an alternative to abortions, which at the time disproportionately killed women of color, women from lower incomes, and immigrant women. For her many contributions to women's rights, *LIFE Magazine* in 1990 included Sanger, along with Chatham alumna Rachel Carson, on its list of 100 most important Americans of the 20<sup>th</sup> century.

Sanger's legacy also includes her work to bring reproductive health services to African American communities which many white physicians at the time would not serve. For these efforts, she received support and endorsements from prominent African American leaders of the time, including Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., W.E.B. Dubois, and Mary McLeod Bethune. Dr. King, in fact, proudly accepted Planned Parenthood's inaugural Margaret Sanger Award.

The Committee found that these and other aspects of Sanger's principal legacy are consistent with Chatham's history and legacy of empowering women, developing women leaders, and providing opportunities to underrepresented groups. Other aspects of Sanger's principal legacy are in keeping with Chatham's values of Women's Leadership & Gender Equity as well as Health and Wellness.

A formidable challenge in assessing Sanger's legacy is the amount of misinformation and disinformation about her on the Internet, much of which has been sown or

planted by individuals and groups seeking to undermine what she accomplished for women's reproductive rights, to overturn Roe v. Wade, to damage the reputation or work of Planned Parenthood, or all of the above. Getting to the truth about Margaret Sanger is hard work and takes careful and thoughtful fact-checking.

One area where this is particularly true is in the persistent claims that Margaret Sanger was racist. SisterSong's Trust Black Women project ([www.trustblackwomen.org](http://www.trustblackwomen.org)), a coalition of Black women-led organizations, has devoted considerable time and effort to studying Sanger's legacy with respect to the African American community and fact-checking many of the more frequent falsehoods on the Internet about Sanger and the African American community. Trust Black Women found no evidence that Sanger intended to coerce Black women into using birth control. The final report from Trust Black Women quotes Planned Parenthood's web site in saying, "attempts to discredit the family planning movement because its early 20<sup>th</sup> century founder was not a perfect model of early 21<sup>st</sup> century values is like disavowing the Declaration of Independence because its author, Thomas Jefferson, bought and sold slaves."

Trust Black Women's work, as well as Margaret Sanger's close relationship with and support from the leading contemporary African American advocates for civil rights, went a long way to allaying the Committee's serious concerns about the claims that started the campus discussions about Margaret Sanger – as did the fact-checking sites Politifact (<https://www.politifact.com/new-hampshire/statements/2015/oct/05/ben-carson/did-margaret-sanger-believe-african-americans-shou/>) and Snopes (<https://www.snopes.com/fact-check/margaret-sanger-kkk/>). Such is the amount of false information about Sanger on the Internet that the Committee would have found it very difficult to resolve its concerns without the excellent and thorough research and fact-checking of Trust Black Women and other organizations.

The Committee found Margaret Sanger's support of the eugenics movement to be more problematic and harder to weigh. On one hand, eugenics was a mainstream movement during her times. It was taught in leading colleges and universities and endorsed by many prominent Americans, such as Harvard President Charles Eliot. See <https://harvardmagazine.com/2016/03/harvards-eugenics-era>. Margaret Sanger was not one of the principal thought leaders or leaders of the eugenics movement. Evidence suggests she felt she had to align her more fledgling movement with the more established eugenics movement. She made clear that, unlike the eugenics movement, she saw women, not the government, as being the ones who should make reproductive choices for women. She did not believe that reproductive decisions should be made based upon a woman's race. Yet she did not disavow the eugenics movement as scholars and historians have done with the passage of time.

As several Committee members noted, however, slavery and Nazism were considered "mainstream" among certain population segments at one time in history but that should not give adherents of either ideology an excuse or a pass today. The CCRM notes that even Planned Parenthood, when celebrating Sanger's accomplishments and

contributions during its 100<sup>th</sup> anniversary, took pains to disavow and disassociate itself from Sanger's association with eugenics, as well as several other elements of her past (speaking to a meeting of a women's league of the KKK, and her endorsement of the 1927 *Buck v. Bell* decision in which the US Supreme Court upheld a Virginia statute permitting compulsory sterilization of the "unfit.") See <https://100years.plannedparenthood.org/>.

On that last note, the Committee found Sanger's beliefs and writings (as in the chapter on "The Feeble-Minded" in her book *The Pivot of Civilization*) about individuals with intellectual disabilities to be deeply troubling. While Sanger was firm that reproductive decisions should not be made on the basis of race, or by anyone but a woman acting independently, she did not believe that the same protections should be extended to individuals with intellectual disabilities. Such views, while perhaps more mainstream during her life, are repugnant to us today, constitute ableism, and are contrary to Chatham's mission, history, and values of Diversity & Inclusion.

Thus, while the Committee found that Margaret Sanger's principal legacy is in keeping with Chatham's mission and values, the Committee found that some of her other beliefs, namely her support of eugenics and her ableism, are not in keeping with Chatham's mission and values – past or present – and might be ascribed to Chatham if left unnoted and unchallenged.

#### *The Jennie DeVore Room*

R. Jennie DeVore served as President of PCW from 1894-1900. PCW recognized Ms. DeVore's service and contributions to the College by naming a room in the Mellon Center for her. The sole reference to Ms. DeVore in the room is a plaque on its door stating: The Jennie DeVore Room, President of the College, 1894-1900.

Several CCRM members brought to the Committee's attention a newspaper article from Chatham's archives describing a speech Ms. DeVore gave to the Institute of American Government in Cincinnati in 1927 –more than two decades after she had left PCW and returned to her hometown of Cincinnati to become president of her alma mater college. According to the article:

Miss DeVore advocated the enforcement of restrictive immigration laws. "It is our job," she said, "to see that the scum of the melting pot does not overflow the land. I am not satisfied to see those come in who cannot control themselves and yet want to control our government."

Research undertaken for the CCRM by a Chatham student revealed that Ms. DeVore's legacy as President of PCW included improving the College's academic and financial standing and her work to ensure that women had access to the highest quality education. The research also revealed that in the late 1920s Ms. DeVore made several speeches, exact number unknown, on the topic of "The Constitution of the

United States” to groups (Institute of American Government, Daughters of the American Revolution, League of Women Voters) in the Cincinnati area. Contemporaneous newspaper articles reported that in her speech to the Institute of American Government (1925) she “expressed her belief in the soundness of the restricted immigration law,” and in her speech to the League of Women Voters (1927) she called for extending the naturalization period to allow more time for new immigrants to gain a better appreciation of the Constitution and the United States.

The Committee agreed that application of the renaming principles to the evidence available did not support renaming The Jennie DeVore Room. However, there was not consensus on whether educational or contextualization material should be placed in the DeVore Room as the Committee recommended in the case of Sanger Hall.

On one hand, some members point to Dr. Moultrie’s concept of “flawed heroes” and to her premise that full understanding of people requires acknowledging their flaws along with the good they did. These members believe that Jennie DeVore’s derogatory statement about immigrants and her support of the restrictive immigration laws of her time are flaws that are inconsistent with Chatham’s present values of inclusion and respect for diversity, and therefore must be called out (or “called in” in Dr. Moultrie’s term). As in the case of Margaret Sanger, they would recommend that Chatham place appropriate educational or contextual material in the DeVore Room, noting Ms. DeVore’s important contributions to PCW as well as her derogatory statement about immigrants and her support of restrictive immigration law (even though they were made long after she left PCW).

On the other hand, some members observe that, apart from one derogatory reference to immigrants, the evidence consists mostly of articles reporting that Ms. DeVore, in her capacity as a scholar of the Constitution, gave several speeches supporting the restrictive federal immigration law of the time and urging that the naturalization period be extended to allow new immigrants to better appreciate the Constitution and their new country. People can agree or disagree with Ms. DeVore’s position on immigration law and policies, just as people continue to debate those issues today, but Ms. DeVore’s speeches about the Constitution and immigration were protected by the First Amendment when she made them—just as anyone who advocates for more restrictive immigration law today is protected by the First Amendment.

Unlike the situation with Margaret Sanger, these Committee members believe there is no nexus between the thing about Ms. DeVore that is clearly offensive (the derogatory slur regarding immigrants) and the things for which PCW named a room for her (her service to PCW). They believe that the considerations which led the Committee to recommend that Chatham explicitly repudiate certain elements of Margaret Sanger’s past (*i.e.*, risk to Chatham’s reputation or values if Chatham does not explicitly condemn the person’s offensive beliefs; risk that Chatham could be said to condone such beliefs, or that such beliefs could be imputed to Chatham, if Chatham does not explicitly condemn or disavow them) do not lead to the same conclusion in Jennie DeVore’s case.

These members agree with their colleagues with respect to Dr. Moultrie’s concept of “flawed heroes,” with her premise that understanding a person’s flaws as well as their positive aspects can provide fuller context about the person, and with the general principle that many if not most people (not just heroes) have flaws. But they also believe that not every flaw from a person’s past necessarily rises to a level where it must be memorialized alongside their memorial.

**Charge 2: If conflict is found with Chatham’s values and mission, make recommendations to the President and Board of Trustees on appropriate steps for Chatham to take (e.g., removal of name, renaming, use of educational context plaques).**

As the Committee’s work on Charge 1 progressed, several options began to emerge for Charge 2. In its discussions of each of the Options described below, the Committee was guided by the fact that Chatham University’s Mission promises to prepare its graduates to “respect diversity of culture, identity, and opinion.” A fundamental aspect of respecting diversity of opinion is the responsibility of each of us to respect others even when they hold different opinions than us. Thus, out of respect for our fellow Committee members, and in the event that no single Option received the unanimous support of the entire Committee, the Committee agreed to present the arguments for and against each Option, along with the votes that each Option received.

*Option 1 – Maintain the Status Quo*

The Committee unanimously agreed that keeping the name of Margaret Sanger Hall and doing nothing else was not acceptable. Doing so, all agreed, could be construed as Chatham tacitly condoning those elements of Sanger’s past which neither the Committee nor the University condone. Doing so also would miss an opportunity both to use this issue as a learning experience for the campus community and to reiterate and reaffirm the campus community’s values.

*Option 2 – Remove Margaret Sanger’s Name*

Those supporting Option 2, while acknowledging the importance of Sanger’s primary work, believe that the good work does not trump or negate the bad things she said, wrote and did with respect to eugenics and ableism, and/or believe that the bad (eugenics and ableism) are so inextricably entwined with the good (women’s reproductive rights) that the two cannot be separated. Those supporting Option 2 recognize that retaining her name will make some students uncomfortable to learn in a room named for her. If her name is removed, the recommendation would be not to rename the lecture hall, at least immediately.

Those who oppose Option 2 have concerns that removing her name:

- does not acknowledge Sanger’s principal legacy, a legacy that is in keeping with Chatham’s mission and values, and the considerable good she did in her life;
- eliminates an opportunity to use her legacy and her flaws as an educational opportunity around both reproductive rights and eugenics;
- could associate Chatham with those who seek to denigrate Sanger as part of their effort to roll back women’s reproductive rights and women’s rights in general – efforts which are anathema to Chatham’s historic commitment to women, women’s leadership, and women’s empowerment;
- would require Chatham to give back the substantial monetary gift to the original donor; and
- might dissuade future donors to give to Chatham.

*Option 3 – Retain Margaret Sanger’s Name But Treat as an Educational or Learning Opportunity*

Those supporting Option 3 believe that Sanger’s name should be retained in Sanger Hall, but the naming issue should be used as a learning opportunity for the Chatham community through (i) the placement of explanatory text or contextualization at Sanger Hall, summarizing her achievements as an advocate for women’s reproductive rights, along with an explanation of the eugenics movement, including an explicit disavowal of Sanger’s support of eugenics and ableism; and (ii) use of the Sanger Hall issue (and similar issues at other higher education institutions and communities around the country) in the Chatham curriculum and in other curricular and co-curricular settings, such as Diversity Dialogues.

Those supporting Option 3 believe that the Planned Parenthood 100<sup>th</sup> Anniversary document referenced in Section C of the CCRM’s Report should serve as a model for how Chatham might celebrate Sanger’s considerable accomplishments while recognizing and disavowing those elements of her past (eugenics, ableism) which Chatham University and the Chatham community cannot condone. It was thought that Option 3 best acknowledges Sanger’s positive principal legacy while presenting an opportunity for Chatham to acknowledge and disavow the negative elements of her past; and presents a learning opportunity for the Chatham community now and in the future.

Those supporting Option 3 would incorporate two suggestions raised by Chatham students and included in Senate Bill No. 2019-03 (Attachment C): remove and do not replace the bust of Margaret Sanger that is in the vitrine in the foyer outside the Lecture Hall, but retain the text stenciled on the wall above and below the bust (which would keep the University compliant with the terms of the original gift agreement); and, for the purposes of students’ course listings and location references for other student meetings and events, refer to Margaret Sanger Lecture Hall by its actual room number in Coolidge Hall – C-134.

### Recommendation

The Committee reached consensus on and recommends Option 3 (Retain Margaret Sanger’s Name but Treat as an Educational or Learning Opportunity) as described above.

### **Charge 3: Identify potential new opportunities for naming, recognition, or memorialization to more fully represent our campus community and the value our mission and campus community place on Diversity & Inclusion.**

As noted earlier in the Committee’s report, Chatham University has made and continues to make efforts to welcome and retain a more diverse community of students, faculty and staff. An important part of those efforts are actions that help create a campus where people from diverse backgrounds feel that they are welcome and belong. Though actions speak louder than words, visible symbols of grace – including memorials and other recognition of individuals representing the diversity to which the Chatham community aspires – can also be important ways of making students, faculty and staff of diverse backgrounds feel welcome and believe that they belong in the community. The Class of 2018 recognized this when it dedicated its Class Gift to a mural in Coolidge Hall, adjacent to Sanger Hall, depicting women representing diversity of many kinds (race, ethnicity, background, opinion, gender-identity).

New naming, recognition, or memorialization opportunities might include: naming an existing facility for someone - either an unnamed facility or one named for the original owner that was not a gift to the University (*e.g.*, some of the apartments on Fifth Ave.), raising funds to build a new facility to be named for someone, or naming a scholarship, faculty Chair, or Department in someone’s honor. Naming opportunities like these typically require that significant funds be raised to cover construction, maintenance, or salaries, but not every naming opportunity requires a daunting fundraising campaign to see it through to fruition. The placement of plaques, statues or other memorials is one example. For instance, the University might consider placing plaques or other memorials to remember important individuals or events from Chatham’s past. A CCRM member shared her memories of hearing Coretta Scott King speak at Chatham’s Chapel in 1995 as part of Black History Month. Committee members support the idea of memorializing that occasion by placing a plaque in the vestibule of the Chapel with a quote from Mrs. King’s speech. (*e.g.*, “History is about more than personalities. It is about movements and struggles. It is about the courage and the dedication and sacrifices of the unsung heroes and heroines, the everyday people who have forsaken comfort and privilege so that their children and future generations can have a better life.”)



The Committee would encourage the University, especially in this 150<sup>th</sup> anniversary year, to consider opportunities like the ones suggested above to honor and recognize individuals who “represent our campus community and the value our mission and campus community place on Diversity & Inclusion.” Priority should be given to recognizing individuals who meet these criteria and have a direct connection to Chatham (*e.g.*, Chatham alumni, faculty, Trustees, or staff and administration members), but the University should also consider individuals from outside the Chatham community who have helped further the Chatham community’s understanding of and commitment to Diversity & Inclusion through their words, deeds and example (*e.g.*, Mrs. King’s speech to the Chatham community in 1995). The Committee felt it was not in a position to identify the best candidates but suggested a more open process of nominations from stakeholders, including rationales, that the Committee or some other body could then evaluate.

Recommendation

The Committee recommends that Chatham University engage the Chatham community in identifying individuals whom Chatham might honor, recognize, or memorialize to more fully represent our campus community and the value our mission and campus community place on Diversity & Inclusion.

IV. Appendices

A – Procedures for Consideration of Renaming and/or Name Removal of Campus Properties

B – Gift Policies

C – Senate Bill No. 2019-03

## Appendix A

### **Chatham University Procedure for Consideration of Renaming and/or Name Removal of Campus Properties**

Chatham University's Diversity and Inclusion Council was charged to establish a set of principles that can guide Chatham in deciding whether to remove or rename a historic name from a building or other key structure or space on any University property.

The following principles were considered and approved by the President's Cabinet and the Board of Trustees on October 12, 2017 and adopted hereafter.

---

A renaming request must be submitted in an application that meets the following administrative requirements:

- specifies how the Principles on Renaming and/or Removal require this action, presenting a thoroughly researched and well-documented case with supporting historical and other evidence; and
- meets other administrative requirements as the Board of Trustees may from time to time establish.

The application must be submitted in writing to the Office of the President, Mellon Hall or via email to Office of the President, to the attention of the Vice President for Planning or designee(s) who will review the application and determine whether it meets the administrative requirements. If the application does not meet the administrative requirements, the applicant will be advised as to why it does not meet the criteria. The applicant can then revise the request and resubmit it. If it is still deemed not to meet requirements, the applicant can submit a final appeal to the Diversity & Inclusion Council, which will review the proposal for final consideration. If the application meets the administrative requirements as listed above, it will be forwarded to the President who will review the application with members of the University Cabinet (Vice Presidents, Deans and Athletic Director) and the Diversity and Inclusion Council.

The President with the Cabinet members and the Diversity and Inclusion Council, will decide if the application warrants further review under this procedure. Further review may be warranted only if the following two criteria are satisfied:

1. the application clearly demonstrates that the request may overcome the presumption against renaming when the Principles on Renaming and/or Removal are applied to it and,
2. the review is needed in order to address significant concerns of the University community.

The President may also determine without an application having been submitted that the historical name of a building or other campus structure or space warrants review under this process, although the President shall still decide with the University Cabinet and Diversity and Inclusion Council on whether the two criteria have been satisfied.

If a renaming or name removal question warrants further review, the President will appoint an advisor or advisors who have relevant knowledge and expertise to advise the President and the Board of Trustees on the question. The advisor(s) will consider the renaming and/or removal question by applying the Renaming and Removal Principles and may obtain expert advice and consultation, solicit appropriate input from the University community, require the applicant to present additional evidence (historical or otherwise), and conduct research and fact-finding. Upon completion of this review, the advisor or group of advisors will submit to the President a report and recommendation. Advisors may include member from the Diversity & Inclusion Council, members of the President's Cabinet, or others as deemed by the President.

The President will transmit the report and recommendation to the Board of Trustees, which will review the matter and make a final decision.

If a renaming or removal is recommended, Chatham will seek to engage the original donor and/or descendants to offer the opportunity to select another namesake prior to removal. If the naming was not tied to a direct donation (but was made in honor or memory of an individual), Chatham Advancement staff will research the background and context of the naming and recommend if any outreach to descendants of the name in question is warranted prior to removal.

After a renaming and/or name removal has been considered under this process, it will not be considered again absent a material change in known facts and circumstances.

---

#### **PRINCIPLES ON RENAMING AND/OR REMOVAL:**

The set of principles to be considered upon submitting a request for Renaming and/or Name Removal of Campus Properties include:

- **Is the principal legacy of the namesake/benefactor fundamentally at odds with the non-discrimination policy of the University?**  
Chatham University - Non-Discrimination Policy  
Equal opportunity and affirmative action are integral to employment and education at Chatham University because we recognize that the University's present and future strength is based primarily on people and their skills, experience, and potential to develop, no matter what their race, color, religion, gender, sexual orientation, national origin, age disability, veteran status, marital status, or any other legally protected status.
- **Is the principal legacy of the namesake/benefactor fundamentally at odds with the mission of the University?**  
Chatham University - Mission Statement  
Chatham University prepares women and men to be world ready: to build lives of purpose and value and fulfilling work. In addition to appropriate professional skills and liberal arts learning, Chatham believes that world readiness means being an informed and engaged citizen in one's communities; recognizing and respecting diversity of culture, identity and opinion; and living sustainably on the planet.

- **To the extent possible, was the relevant principal legacy significantly contested in the time and place in which the namesake lived?**
- **To the extent possible, was all pertinent information about the namesake/benefactor disclosed at the time of the naming request? In addition, did the University exercise due diligence regarding the namesake/benefactor prior to entering into the naming contract? Is there any evidence to attempt to conceal any relevant information that may have influenced the original decision?**

The renaming and/or name removal of a campus structure/property may be considered when one or more of the above principles supports removal or renaming. The evidence provided for each principle will be reviewed and weighed against the rationale for retaining the original naming rights. The President, University Cabinet and Diversity and Inclusion Council will oversee this process.

The removal of a historic name from a campus structure/property will be considered only in exceptional circumstances. In addition, contractual agreements may limit the institution's ability to act upon these requests.

If the University is limited in its ability to act on community concerns regarding the legacy/behavior of the namesake/benefactor due to contractual obligations, the University may consider, but is not limited to, the following:

- (1) Organizing community education sessions and dialogues regarding the contested namesake, which would include invitations to all key stakeholders (students, staff, faculty, alumni, namesake/proxy, and other outside "experts" on the namesake or historical period)
- (2) Providing an official response to the community concern by addressing the complex legacy, historical context, and commitment to maintaining open dialogue and improvements in diversity and inclusion. This official response could be through an open-forum meeting or official university email/letter.
- (3) Providing a form of commentary regarding the namesake/donor at the site of contention subject to approval. For example, a plaque/sign at the naming site that discloses the community concern, complex legacy, and creates a "full person" description of the legacy. The information contained in this commentary should be scripted in consultation with key stakeholders, subject to approval by the Board of Trustees.

## Appendix B

### G – Gifts for Buildings and Naming Spaces on Campus

Gifts for Buildings and Naming Spaces on Campus: Gifts which are designated for construction or renovation of a particular facility or space will be accepted by the University only if the construction or renovation has been approved and is regarded as a priority of the institution. In the absence of specific campaigns for building construction or renovation, all such gifts shall be referred to the [Gifts] Committee.

All spaces on the Chatham University campuses which are designated in memory or in honor of an individual/s or institution must be approved by the Board of Trustees. Chatham reserves the right to evaluate the suitability of a named space on campus to ensure that its naming is in line with Chatham's mission and values. All efforts to include the donor and/or heirs in discussing alternative names for the building or space will be made in the unlikely event that a space requires renaming.

In the case of new construction or substantial renovation typically to name a building or space requires at least 50 percent and up to 100 percent or more of the cost of the new construction or renovation. Chatham will evaluate these opportunities on a case-by-case basis and offer a set of naming opportunities for each project for which it fundraises.

Buildings, facilities and other physical spaces on the Chatham University campuses are named for the life of the building, facility or space unless specified otherwise in the gift agreement.

Renovations and facelifts of an existing building, facility or space will be accomplished in such a way that the old name may stay, if possible, with the existing building, facility or space. An endowment designated for building maintenance that will generate sufficient income each year to maintain the structure should accompany any naming gifts of this nature.

When an existing building, facility or space is demolished, moved, renovated or changed so substantially as to constitute a new building, facility or space, the original donor (or donor family) will be notified, if possible.

Any change in the name of a building, facility or space will be reviewed by the Committee and the External Affairs Committee and forwarded to the full Board of Trustees for final approval.

Every effort will be made to retain all commemorative plaques taken from destroyed, moved or substantially altered spaces and to display these plaques within the new facility for historical reference or within another space on campus.

Questions regarding the University's policy for naming spaces on campus will be referred to the [Gifts] Committee.

## SENATE BILL No. 2019-03

---

### *“ALTERNATIVE FOR SANGER HALL”*

CO-SPONSORS; Black Student Union (BSU), Chatham Student Government (CSG), Chatham Feminist Coalition (CFC), Chatham Democrats (CD), Chatham Green Team, Chatham Student Power (CSP), The Minor Bird, Beta Beta Beta Honor Society(BBB), and Love Your Melon(LYM)

---

27, SEPTEMBER 2019

---

OUTCOME: Rename Sanger Hall on All Official and Unofficial Documents and References

---

- 1.) BE IT ENACTED, this bill is a product of the hard work in advocacy by the Black Student Union (BSU) for the past two years to bring awareness around Margaret Sanger’s practice of eugenics as well as her racist and ableist views; and,
  - 2.) BE IT ENACTED, Senate Bill 2019-03 will be created with the efforts of multiple student organizations to propose alternatives to Sanger Hall; and,
  - 3.) BE IT ENACTED, the co-sponsors would like to join BSU’s efforts by coming together as a community to change the name of Sanger Hall on all course listings, references, and unofficial documents to its set name of C134; and,
  - 4.) BE IT ENACTED, the bust of Margaret Sanger should also be removed and replaced with educational pieces in addition to the class of 2018’s gift that was advocated for by BSU, in order to condemn the practice of eugenics, racism, and ableism; and,
  - 5.) BE IT ENACTED, Chatham should increase awareness focused on diversity, inclusion, and accessibility through programming and emphasis on current programs to further express Chatham’s value against Sanger’s beliefs; and,
  - 6.) BE IT FINALLY ENACTED, this bill shall be presented to the Committee for Campus Recognition and Memorialization as an alternative to the current presentation of the hall.
-