

DUKE UNIVERSITY
COMMISSION ON MEMORY AND HISTORY

Table of Contents

- I. Executive Summary**
- II. Report**
 - A. Background**
 - B. Charge to the Commission**
 - C. Members of the Commission**
 - D. The Work of the Commission**
 - 1. Outreach**
 - 2. Principles**
 - 3. Options for the vacant space**
 - 4. Procedures**
- III. Afterword**

Appendix A: The History of a Controversial Statue

Appendix B: Removal of the Robert E. Lee Statue

Appendix C: Formation of the Commission on Memory and History

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Commission on Memory and History was appointed by President Price on September 1, 2017, following the removal of the statue of Robert E. Lee from the portal of Duke Chapel. The charge to the commission was three-fold:

1. Propose principles to guide the president and the Board of Trustees when an issue arises related to the appropriateness of a memorial or the naming of a facility on campus. These principles should reflect the deep values of the university and serve the university over many years rather than focus on a specific issue;
2. Having established these principles, apply them in recommending options to the president regarding the now vacant space in the front of Duke Chapel; and
3. Provide input to the president and the secretary of the Board of Trustees as they develop procedures for applying the principles to any future issue.

Sixteen members of the Duke and local communities were named to the commission, including students, faculty, trustees, alumni, administrators, and local residents. The commission reviewed reports by other colleges and universities, reviewed the process by which Duke came to have a statue of Robert E. Lee on the portal of Duke Chapel, and conducted extensive outreach to gather views from a broad representation of the Duke and Durham communities.

The following principles were developed to guide the university going forward:

1. **The educational mission is central. Therefore, the goal should be to engage with history and never to erase it.** Duke's guiding principle when thinking about its history must be its commitment to teaching, learning, and scholarship. Histories lend themselves to reinterpretation, and monuments and debates over them provide learning opportunities—especially at a university. The goal should be to gather and assess everything that can be learned about the origins of the name or the monument and the person's life and legacy.
2. **Both past intent and present effect of the representation matter and should be given weight.** With the acknowledgment that human beings are complex and flawed, is the principal legacy of the person who is memorialized or honored aligned with or in opposition to the university's enduring values as we understand them today?
3. **The meaning of campus symbols should align in totality with Duke's highest aspirations.** Is the current symbolism or understanding of this figure or name consistent with the fundamental values of the university as we now

express them, including a commitment to foster an inclusive campus community? Is the name or monument a source of institutional pride?

4. **The process of changing an historic structure must be thoughtful and deliberate.** History and tradition are important to Duke, and removing or renaming historic structures should be an uncommon event, undertaken only in extraordinary circumstances that clearly warrant a change. Nothing should be destroyed or erased; if a decision is made to move a memorial, it must be retained and preserved for study, so that it can become the focus of education in the future.

Recommending options for the vacant space

Duke Chapel has a special significance at Duke—a grand cathedral at the heart of a modern, secular, research university. The commission recommends to the president and Board of Trustees two options for the vacant niche on the portal of Duke Chapel, in order of our commission’s preference:

1. **Leave the space vacant for a period of time, perhaps a year, and engage in a process of education and community engagement. A plaque could be installed in the space to educate our community about the history and the significance of the empty space and about our need to examine the past.** The space would be a visual pause as the university dedicates itself to exploration and learning about our history.
2. **Name a person to fill the space.** There was substantial support on the commission and within the broader Duke community for two individuals: The Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., and the Rev. Dr. Anna Pauline “Pauli” Murray. Both Dr. King and Dr. Murray fit the intersection of religion, community, and education that seem most appropriate for the Chapel space.

The commission also gave input into the administrative procedures that were developed as a means of implementing the principles.

The commission recommends that the university take this opportunity to explore Duke’s history in a conscious and intentional manner, making a significant commitment to understanding and educating our community about Duke’s history and to appraising Duke’s physical space and how it reflects our community.

COMMISSION ON MEMORY AND HISTORY

REPORT

November 17, 2017

The Commission on Memory and History was appointed by President Price on September 1, 2017, following the removal of the statue of Robert E. Lee from the portal of Duke Chapel. In a message announcing the formation of the commission to the Duke community, President Price wrote:

The commission will be charged with developing principles to apply when issues arise related to the names of university facilities and monuments on campus, recommending next steps for the entrance of Duke Chapel, and providing guidance to me, and to the Board of Trustees, as we engage in a broader campus conversation about history and inclusion. I have asked that the commission complete its work this fall.

Background

The commission was appointed during a tumultuous time in the United States, particularly in the South. Charlottesville, Virginia, had been the site of horrific, racially motivated violence that began when a coalition of white supremacist and neo-Nazi groups held a torchlit march on the campus of the University of Virginia on Friday night, August 11, 2017. The stated goal was to oppose the planned removal of a statue of Robert E. Lee from a public park in the town. The next day, an individual linked to white supremacist groups drove a car into a crowd of counter-protesters, killing one person and injuring 19. Americans responded in outrage and grief, which also served to ignite an urgent national debate on the meaning and relevance of Confederate statues and monuments in our communities today. By Monday evening, the movement had come to Durham: a group of protestors pulled down the statue of a Confederate soldier that had stood on a pedestal outside the old Durham County Courthouse.

Now the focus turned to Duke, and to a statue that had stood in the portal of Duke Chapel for eighty years, unnoticed or unremarked by many: a carved limestone statue of Robert E. Lee, general of the Confederate Army. Although police presence at the Chapel had been increased, the statue was vandalized on Wednesday night—literally defaced with a hammer—prompting an outcry over this destructive act committed against the sacred building of Duke Chapel. By Friday, rumors of a KKK march and rally forced government offices to close in downtown Durham, as city officials feared a clash with counter-protesters.

It was in this atmosphere that on Saturday morning, August 19, President Price wrote to the Duke community to announce that he had authorized the removal of the

statue of Robert E. Lee “to ensure the vital safety of students and community members who worship there, and above all to express the deep and abiding values of our university.” Explaining that the statue would be preserved, President Price also announced his intention to appoint a commission to study the issue of memory and history on campus, and he signaled that the university would “use the next year to explore various aspects of Duke's history and ambitions through teaching and scholarship, ... [including] an exhibition in the Library; a campus conversation about controversy and injustice in Duke’s history; and a forum to explore academic freedom, freedom of speech, and freedom of assembly in the university.”

The president formally announced the formation of the Commission on Memory and History on September 1.

Charge to the Commission

The charge of the Commission on Memory and History is three-fold:

1. Propose principles to guide the president and the Board of Trustees when an issue arises related to the appropriateness of a memorial or the naming of a facility on campus. These principles should reflect the deep values of the university and serve the university over many years rather than focus on a specific issue;
2. Having established these principles, apply them in recommending options to the president regarding the now vacant space in the front of Duke Chapel; and
3. Provide input to the president and the secretary of the Board of Trustees as they develop procedures for applying the principles to any future issue related to the appropriateness of a memorial or the naming of a facility on campus.

The commission will review the work of other universities who have engaged in similar efforts and consult broadly with the many constituencies in the Duke community, ensuring that the process is open and inclusive.

The commission is to complete its work and report to the president by November 17, 2017.

Sixteen members of the Duke and local communities were named to the Commission on Memory and History. President Price wrote in his message: “The members of the commission are students, faculty, trustees, alumni, administrators and local residents who reflect a range of perspectives and the rich diversity of our university. I am deeply grateful to the 16 distinguished and thoughtful members of our community who have agreed to serve.”

Members of the Commission:

Frank E. Emory, Jr. '79, Chair, Partner, Hunton and Williams, and Duke University Trustee Emeritus

Gráinne Fitzsimons, Vice Chair, Professor, Fuqua School of Business, and Psychology and Neuroscience

William R. Ferris, Joel R. Williamson Eminent Professor of History and Senior Associate Director, Center for the Study of the American South, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (also former Chairman of the National Endowment for the Humanities)

W. Barker French '63, Durham civic leader and former President of the Duke Alumni Association

Michael Ivory, Jr. '18, Duke University Undergraduate Student

Elizabeth Kiss, President of Agnes Scott College and Duke University Trustee (also former director, Kenan Institute for Ethics at Duke)

Adriane D. Lentz-Smith, Associate Professor of History, Duke University

David F. Levi, Dean, Duke University School of Law

Robert R. Penn '74, President, Penn Resources, Inc., and Duke University Trustee

Thomas Pfau, Alice Mary Baldwin Professor of English at Duke University, with secondary appointments in Germanic Languages & Literature and in the Duke Divinity School

The Rev. Dr. Luke A. Powery, Dean of Duke Chapel and Associate Professor of Homiletics, Duke Divinity School

Wilhelmina M. Reuben-Cooke, '67, Professor, David A. Clarke School of Law, University of the District of Columbia, and Duke University Trustee Emerita

Sally D. Robinson '55, Duke University Trustee Emerita

Jacqueline Robinson-Hamm, Ph.D. Candidate in Biomedical Engineering, Duke University

Michael J. Schoenfeld '84, Vice President for Public Affairs and Government Relations

The Rev. Dr. Charles M. Smith '62, Divinity '65, Duke University Trustee Emeritus

Staff: Carolyn C. Gerber '90, Special Assistant to the Vice President for Public Affairs and Government Relations

Work of the Commission

The commission met three times in the fall of 2017. During its first meeting, President Price met with the commission to issue his charge in person and discuss his expectations. Over the course of its meetings, the commission developed the work plan, reviewed the feedback received, drafted the principles, and discussed options for the vacant space. In addition, much substantive work was accomplished outside of these meetings, including initiating outreach, conducting research, reviewing materials, gathering information, and writing and revising drafts.

To educate themselves about the work done previously in this space, members of the commission reviewed reports by other colleges and universities, including Brown, Columbia, Yale, Princeton, and Georgetown Universities; Harvard Law School; Bryn Mawr College; and the Universities of Michigan and Oregon. While each school has faced unique issues related to the particularities of its history, many common themes emerged from these thoughtful reports, and it was instructive to see how each institution has grappled with the best way to commemorate and come to terms with its own complex history for a diverse community.

Other advance reading materials included extensive national news coverage of the issue of how communities commemorate their history, including editorials from many perspectives. The commission reviewed relevant information relating to Duke's own institutional history, Duke's policy on naming, and events such as Duke's decision in 2014 to remove the name from Aycock Residence Hall on East Campus.

The commission also reviewed the process by which Duke came to have a statue of Robert E. Lee on the portal of Duke Chapel:

In his design for Duke Chapel, Julian F. Abele, the African-American architect employed by Trumbauer, had paid tribute to the Gothic cathedrals of Europe, which often featured statues at the entrance depicting saints or figures from the Bible.

[The stone carver] John Donnelly wrote that while he knew of this tradition, he also knew that James B. Duke had been a Methodist, so saints would be "out of place" on Duke Chapel. Donnelly appealed to the architectural firm for guidance about the subjects of the statues; Trumbauer apparently dismissed the concerns and left the sculptor to solve the problem on his own. There is no information in the University Archives about whether anyone at Duke was consulted on this question. Donnelly finally contacted a professor at Vanderbilt University, who suggested subjects "of seeming appropriateness" for Donnelly to carve.

So the new cathedral at the new university came to be flanked with statues of 10 historical figures drawn from the Protestant and Methodist traditions and from the history of the American South.

--From the DukeToday story on August 16, 2017

Outreach

The commission was committed to gathering views from a broad range of community members so that its work could be informed by diverse voices and perspectives. To fulfill that mandate, the commission engaged in a campaign to solicit input from a wide representation of the Duke and Durham communities. The work of the commission and the invitation to submit thoughts and comments have been promoted through the DukeToday website and social media channels. A dedicated website (<https://memoryhistory.duke.edu>) and email address (memoryhistory@duke.edu) were set up to receive input.

- Faculty: Dr. Fitzsimons spoke at a meeting of the Academic Council and invited faculty to submit comments.
- Students: The student members of the commission spoke at meetings of the Duke Student Government and the Graduate and Professional Student Council. Emails inviting comments were sent to all registered student organizations (more than 400 undergraduate organizations and more than 100 graduate and professional student organizations).
- Bass Connections team: Faculty director Robin Kirk and two undergraduate students presented research from their 2016-17 project, "The Construction of Memory at Duke and in Durham: Using Memory Studies."
- Employees: Employees were reached through the "Working@Duke" website and email, as well as the weekly email to managers, which is forwarded to employees.
- University Archives: The University Archivist was invited to submit a statement.
- Alumni: The Duke Alumni Association was invited to submit comments. The DAA Board of Directors conducted a survey of its members and discussed the issue at its October meeting.
- Duke Chapel: Dean Powery invited comments from the Chapel Advisory Board and the Council of the Congregation at Duke Chapel.
- Durham community: Emails were sent to two dozen civic and community organizations, as well as a dozen faith-based organizations; these groups were suggested by the Office of Durham and Regional Affairs.
- Special constituents: Members of the commission reached out to faculty, staff, and Durham community members they thought should be consulted. These included current and former deans of the Duke Divinity School, two former deans of Duke Chapel, the former university archivist, Counseling and Psychological Services, Duke's Office for Institutional Equity, and faculty from the

Departments of History; Classical Studies; Art, Art History, and Visual Studies; and the Divinity School. They also included staff from a variety of roles at Duke, including staff who work closely with varied student populations, and community members knowledgeable about the Duke-Durham relationship, as well as civic and religious groups in Durham.

More than 200 comments and statements were received either to the website or by email—from faculty, staff, students, alumni, and members of the Durham community. The views expressed spanned a wide range of perspectives and opinions. Many individuals and groups submitted lengthy and thoughtful statements reflecting deep beliefs or distinguished expertise in the topic. The commission read and carefully considered all of the submitted material; this material will also be provided to the President and Board of Trustees so they may learn from our community.

The following principles were developed to guide the university going forward:

Principles

Duke University is built on a foundation of enduring values, embodied in the university’s mission statement and consistent with the ambitions expressed in the 1924 Indenture by James B. Duke. Duke University is committed to expanding the frontiers of knowledge; crafting an education that stimulates students’ growth as intellectuals, leaders, and citizens; training the next generation of professionals; fostering scholarship through a commitment to academic freedom; and engaging with and serving our community and our wider world. Diversity deepens these values, and the university gains much when it includes a wide array of voices in its teaching, learning, operations, and governance. As Duke’s mission statement proclaims, “By pursuing these objectives with vision and integrity, Duke University seeks to engage the mind, elevate the spirit, and stimulate the best effort of all who are associated with the University; to contribute in diverse ways to the local community, the state, the nation and the world; and to attain and maintain a place of real leadership in all that we do.”

Duke is not a static entity but a dynamic community. Founded as a one-room schoolhouse in rural North Carolina in the 1830s, Duke came of age at the same time as a nation struggling with vital questions about citizenship and community. Duke’s history is intertwined with and shaped by the racial history of the American South—from a time of slavery, through Jim Crow segregation and discrimination, through the Civil Rights era, to today. As Duke has grown into a global research university, it has evolved in tandem with these struggles and alongside changing social mores. Over the course of its history, the university has committed to achieving a full vision of inclusion, and we are resolved to continue to work together toward this shared goal.

Guided by values that transcend any particular moment, yet continually shaped by the evolving values of its time, Duke functions as a complex organization in the present. From time to time, tensions will arise between these values and understandings of the past and present. Because memorials are ratifications of community values, tension or conflict may focus on the name on a building or a monument that may no longer align with the university's values, aspirations, or present-day understanding of itself.

When these situations arise, we recommend an approach predicated, as befitting a research university, on a commitment to scholarship, rigorous analysis, and civic discourse. The goal should not be to conceal, erase, or sanitize the past but to take advantage of the opportunity to ask questions, understand the history that produced the name or monument, and learn as a community. It is important to remember that institutional history and traditions can be meaningful ways to participate in a university community across time. We also understand that symbols can have effects on the members of our community, defining them as outsiders and impeding their sense of inclusion, which can in turn affect the learning environment. As new analyses and interpretations come to the fore, we must make statements about who we are, rather than who we were. We have some of the nation's great experts on these questions; we can leverage them so that Duke leads these conversations.

When there is significant concern as to the monument or the name on a building, in a spirit of open inquiry and humility, and a determination to live up to our highest standards as an intellectual community, we suggest the following principles:

1. **The educational mission is central. Therefore, the goal should be to engage with history and never to erase it.** Duke's guiding principle when thinking about its history must be its commitment to teaching, learning, and scholarship. Just as communities are never static, neither is history or memory. Histories lend themselves to reinterpretation, and monuments and debates over them provide learning opportunities—especially at a university. The dynamism of historical understandings and community memories should be foregrounded, and Duke should call upon its own intellectual resources to engage with such questions through research and scholarship in order to approach the ensuing discussion pedagogically. The goal should be to gather and assess everything that can be learned about the origins of the name or the monument, the person's life and legacy, and how the naming occurred—including arguments in support of and in opposition to it in the past—as well the person's relationship with Duke University. Using the same research-based approach, careful consideration should be given to the stated reasons for removing the name or the monument.

2. **Both past intent and present effect of the representation matter and should be given weight.** When the individual was memorialized, what was the process undertaken, what was the primary reason given at that time, and what message was it intended to convey? What is the current understanding of the memorial, and is it different from the original intention? What is its impact on members of the Duke and Durham communities today? With the acknowledgment that human beings are complex and flawed, is the principal legacy of the person who is memorialized or honored aligned with or in opposition to the university's enduring values as we understand them today?
3. **The meaning of campus symbols should align in totality with Duke's highest aspirations.** When Duke elects to use a specific name or a representation of a specific person, the individual should have served a significant role in the advancement of the university or represent the ideals to which it aspires. What does the active choice to retain a name or structure say about our present identity and our future aspirations? Is the current symbolism or understanding of this figure or name consistent with the fundamental values of the university as we now express them, including a commitment to foster an inclusive campus community? Is the name or monument a source of institutional pride? Breadth and balance are also important: any single memorial should be understood in the context of memorializations on the entire landscape of the campus; the totality is more significant than any individual, and Duke should aspire for that totality to represent a full history of the university and the people who contributed toward its growth in many ways.
4. **The process of changing an historic structure must be thoughtful and deliberate.** History and tradition are important to Duke, and removing or renaming historic structures should be an uncommon event, undertaken only in extraordinary circumstances that clearly warrant a change, and consideration must be given to the historic and aesthetic value of the building or item in question. In circumstances where a legal or other commitment to a donor limits the university's course of action, it may be more appropriate to provide additional context for the name or the monument. Offering background information on a plaque may fulfill a pedagogical imperative and enable the community to learn a fuller account of the person and of their legacy and relationship with Duke. Nothing should be destroyed or erased; if a decision is made to move a memorial, it must be retained and preserved for study, so that it can become the focus of education in the future. Similarly, if a name is removed, a plaque should be placed explaining the name and the reasons for its removal. The process must be transparent and shared with the public, and must include and reflect the community's diverse voices.

Options for the vacant space

Duke Chapel has a special significance at Duke—a grand cathedral at the heart of a modern, secular, research university. The Chapel is part of the founding of the university—the “great towering church” that James B. Duke intended—and continues to play a vibrant role in the life of the university today. A Christian church of interdenominational character and purpose, Duke Chapel reaches out to people of all faiths through its tradition of inspiring preaching, worship, and music. The Chapel is also a solemn space of the university, hosting some of the most significant ceremonies of the academic year, including Convocation, Founders’ Day, the Martin Luther King, Jr. Commemoration, and Baccalaureate. An icon of the university that receives more than 200,000 visits each year, Duke Chapel bridges faith (*religio*) and learning (*eruditio*), through worship, student ministry, community connection, interfaith engagement, and the arts.

Architecturally, the portal is part of the Chapel building, serving as the main point of entry to its sacred space. At the same time, some of the statues face outward, toward the public square of the university and the larger community.

The commission recommends to the president and Board of Trustees two options for the vacant niche on the portal of Duke Chapel, in order of our commission’s preference:

- 1. Leave the space vacant for a period of time, perhaps a year, and engage in a process of education and community engagement. A plaque could be installed in the space to educate our community about the history and the significance of the empty space and about our need to examine the past.** The space would be a visual pause as the university dedicates itself to exploration and learning about our history. In the Sunday morning worship service in Duke Chapel that followed the removal of the Lee statue, Dean Luke Powery suggested that the empty space might represent “a hole that is in the heart of the United States of America, and perhaps in our own human hearts—that hole that is from the sin of racism and hatred of any kind.” He also noted that the empty space may also represent “an openness toward the possibility of healing, even in our day.” The empty space can signal an opening toward a fruitful, constructive, teaching moment and toward deep communal work, and make any ultimate decision about the person to fill the space more thoughtful, deliberative and meaningful.
- 2. Name a person to fill the space.** Numerous compelling candidates have been suggested as possible replacements for the statue of Robert E. Lee, many of whom can be thought of as representing the principles and the values of the university. There is a strong sense among commission members that if there is to be a replacement, it should provide us with an opportunity to address the lack of women and people of color in the iconography of Duke Chapel. There was

substantial support on the commission and within the broader Duke community for two individuals: The Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., and the Rev. Dr. Anna Pauline “Pauli” Murray.

The Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. (1929–1964) was a towering figure of the Civil Rights Movement, whose “Letter from a Birmingham Jail” was a manifesto of civil disobedience, drawing on Christian principles and the strategies of Gandhi. A pastor, a national leader, and an international inspiration, he directed the peaceful march on Washington, D.C., of 250,000 people, where he called for an end to racism and discrimination in his famous “I Have a Dream” speech. At the age of 35, he became the youngest man to have received the Nobel Peace Prize. He was assassinated on April 4, 1968.

The Rev. Dr. Anna Pauline “Pauli” Murray (1910–1985) was a nationally and internationally known advocate for human rights and social justice who grew up in Durham with her aunt and grandparents. An attorney, writer, feminist, LGBTQ pioneer, poet, and educator, she challenged the Civil Rights Movement to recognize the leadership of women. In 1977 at age 66, she was the first African American woman to be ordained an Episcopal priest, and she was named a saint by the Episcopal Church in 2012.

Both Dr. King and Dr. Murray fit the intersection of religion, community, and education that seem most appropriate for the Chapel space.

By preferring to leave the space open for a year before taking further action, we respectfully suggest that the president and Board of Trustees take this opportunity to explore Duke’s history in a conscious and intentional manner, making a significant commitment to understanding and educating our community about Duke’s history and to appraising Duke’s physical space and how it reflects our community. This process should create educational opportunities for students, research and celebrate previously unrecognized members of our community, and allow the entire community to take pride in the significant contributions of former staff, students, and faculty—which may take many forms that go beyond those traditionally recognized by Duke. The process should also include an effort to come to terms with the less positive aspects of Duke’s history in order to allow our community to learn from our past. We hope that Duke will reach out to the broader Duke and Durham communities to engage them in conversation about what Duke has been and aims to be.

Procedures

As the third part of its charge, the commission was asked to review and provide input for the administrative procedures that were developed by the Office of the President and the University Secretary for implementing the principles. After reviewing the procedures and offering comments, the commission is confident that the following process reflects the spirit of the principles and will provide a thoughtful approach that will serve the university well if such issues should arise in the future.

Procedures for Reconsideration of Namings and Memorialization

1. Any member of the Duke community (faculty, students, alumni, and staff) may make a proposal to reconsider the naming of a building or other act of memorialization of an individual on the Duke campus.
2. The proposal is to be submitted to the Office of the Secretary of the Board of Trustees. It should consist of the following:
 - A rationale for any proposed change in naming or memorialization; and
 - An explanation, supported by appropriate research, regarding how the principles established by the Board of Trustees on naming and memorialization support the proposed change.
3. Upon receipt of a proposal, the secretary will do the following:
 - Ensure that the proposal thoughtfully engages with the principles related to naming and memorialization set forth by the Board of Trustees and makes a case on that basis for a proposed change. If the secretary is not persuaded that the proposal has done so, the secretary will return the proposal to the member of the Duke community who submitted it for further revision.
 - Once the secretary has decided that the proposal has complied with the requirements above, the secretary will consult with the senior leadership of administration and the Executive Committee of the Academic Council to conduct an initial assessment of the merits of the proposal.
 - If after this consultation, the secretary decides that the request warrants the attention of the president, the secretary will forward the proposal to the president.
4. Upon receipt of a proposal from the secretary, the president will convene an ad hoc committee to consider the proposal and make a recommendation to the president regarding any change in naming or memorialization. In constituting the committee, the president will draw upon expertise within the Duke community and from external sources, and will include representatives from the faculty, students, staff, alumni, the executive vice president, the vice president for public affairs and government relations, and the chair of the Facilities and Environment Committee of the Board of Trustees.
5. Once the committee has delivered its report to the president, the president may accept, reject, or modify the committee's recommendation before bringing the proposal forward to the Board of Trustees for final action.

Afterword

The report of the Commission on Memory and History answers the charge issued. In addition, we offer the following suggestions, which, we readily acknowledge, extend beyond the charge.

It would be valuable for Duke's deliberative process to extend consideration to replacing more of the statues that currently stand in the portal. The six individuals were suggested to the stone carver in the early 1930s and were rendered without any guidance from the Duke community. The five remaining statues include depictions of some individuals who may not be aligned with the mission and highest values of this university. We are mindful that no one flawed human being can represent all the ideals to which a university aspires, and choosing one person necessarily excludes many other people. Simply putting up one statue that was selected according to our principles, while leaving in place five others that were not, is a missed opportunity for Duke and leaves many among the commission with concerns. A longer term, deliberative, inclusive process may lead us to see this moment as an opportunity to select a group of individuals for the Chapel portal who truly reflect this university and to honor those as yet unrecognized who have had an impact on making Duke what it is today. Alternately, the niches could be filled with an array of carved timeless symbols of education—for example, scales as an emblem of the study of law—or with generic figures holding these symbols.

We also encourage the consideration of memorials, beyond the portal of the Chapel, that would begin to give formal recognition to the farmers, sharecroppers, and factory workers—men and women, black and white—whose labor was the foundation of the wealth that created Duke University. Laura Edwards, Peabody Family Professor of History at Duke, shared these words with the Commission:

Right now, Duke's campus memorializes just one part of the University's past. The other part—all the other contributions, economic, political, and cultural—made by a wide range of North Carolinians, even Duke's financial benefactors, is far less evident. We need to catch up to our own history: we need to own it, honoring the humanity of those who came before us as well as the challenges that defined their lives and that continue to define our own.

It is our hope that these suggestions will inform the thinking of the president and the Board of Trustees as they consider how to fill the vacant space in the Chapel.

Appendix A: The History of a Controversial Statue

Duke Today
August 16, 2017

By Carolyn Gerber

As towns and campuses across the country engage in urgent public debate regarding their statues and monuments, new attention is turning to a statue on the portal of Duke Chapel that bears the likeness of a Confederate general. Documents from the Duke University Archives shed light on the history of the statue that's been considered to be the image of Robert E. Lee.

In the late 1920s and early 30s, the job of carving the limestone details of West Campus -- the gargoyles, shields and other decorations -- had been given to the prominent stone carver John Donnelly. The John Donnelly, Inc. firm had also carved the exterior on Grand Central Terminal in New York and would go on to carve the exterior of the Supreme Court Building in Washington, D.C. John Donnelly would later write in a short memoir that Horace Trumbauer, whose Philadelphia architectural firm designed Duke's West Campus, "had become so confident of the Donnellys that he practically gave them carte blanche over all his commissions."

In his design for Duke Chapel, Julian F. Abele, the African-American architect employed by Trumbauer, had paid tribute to the Gothic cathedrals of Europe, which often featured statues at the entrance depicting saints or figures from the Bible.

John Donnelly wrote that while he knew of this tradition, he also knew that James B. Duke had been a Methodist, so saints would be "out of place" on Duke Chapel. Donnelly appealed to the architectural firm for guidance about the subjects of the statues; Trumbauer apparently dismissed the concerns and left the sculptor to solve the problem on his own. There is no information in the University Archives about whether anyone at Duke was consulted on this question. Donnelly finally contacted a professor at Vanderbilt University, who suggested subjects "of seeming appropriateness" for Donnelly to carve.

So the new cathedral at the new university came to be flanked with statues of 10 historical figures drawn from the Protestant and Methodist traditions and from the history of the American South.

Over the doors are statues representing leaders who brought Methodism to the United States -- Thomas Coke, Francis Asbury and George Whitefield -- and over the inner arch, a statue depicting John Wesley, the founder of Methodism.

The three statues on the left depict Girolamo Savonarola, a 15th-century Dominican friar and firebrand preacher who was excommunicated and executed; Martin Luther, a leader in the Protestant Reformation; and John Wycliffe, the English theologian and reformer who translated the Bible into English. On the right are three historical figures from the American South: Thomas Jefferson, the third president and founder of the University of Virginia; Robert E. Lee, the Confederate general; and Sidney Lanier, a Southern poet and musician who died in North Carolina. None of the statues are labeled, and the names of the individuals depicted are not listed anywhere in the Chapel.

The statue of Lee in particular was not well received. Objections were made that the statue did not resemble Lee, and that the belt buckle had been wrongly carved with the initials "U.S." (There was an attempt made to scratch the letters out, but they are still visible.) On April 26, 1932, the building committee of The Duke Endowment, which at the time made significant decisions for the university, discussed their dissatisfaction; the minutes report that "the statue of a soldier was intended to represent a wellknown Southern general but that there was no likeness in the statue to the popular conception of this person." The minutes indicate that a letter was read from Donnelly to Trumbauer, asserting the "symbolical" nature of the representation. It was then moved and seconded that "these statues should be decorative symbolic figures, and not as representing or to be known as representing any specified person."

In September 1932, Duke President William Preston Few and Duke Endowment trustee William R. Perkins exchanged letters about their "disappointment" over the statue. Perkins wrote on September 13, 1932, "I do not believe anybody will ever take it to be Lee."

Appendix B: Removal of the Robert E. Lee Statue

The following email from Duke University President Vincent E. Price was sent on Saturday morning, August 19, 2017, to all Duke students, faculty, staff and alumni:

After hearing from and consulting with a number of students, faculty, staff, and alumni, and with the strong support of the Board of Trustees, I authorized the removal of the statue of Robert E. Lee from the entrance of Duke Chapel early this morning.

I took this course of action to protect Duke Chapel, to ensure the vital safety of students and community members who worship there, and above all to express the deep and abiding values of our university.

The removal also presents an opportunity for us to learn and heal. The statue will be preserved so that students can study Duke's complex past and take part in a more inclusive future.

Wednesday night's act of vandalism made clear that the turmoil and turbulence of recent months do not stop at Duke's gates. We have a responsibility to come together as a community to determine how we can respond to this unrest in a way that demonstrates our firm commitment to justice, not discrimination; to civil protest, not violence; to authentic dialogue, not rhetoric; and to empathy, not hatred.

As part of this effort, I am creating a commission, to include faculty, students, staff, alumni, trustees and members of the Durham community, to advise on next steps and to assist us in navigating the role of memory and history at Duke. The commission will look at how we memorialize individuals on the Duke campus in buildings and sculpture and recommend principles drawn from Duke's core values to guide us when questions arise. I will ask this commission to work expeditiously.

In addition, and in concert with Provost Sally Kornbluth, we will use the next year to explore various aspects of Duke's history and ambitions through teaching and scholarship. This will include an exhibition in the Library; a campus conversation about controversy and injustice in Duke's history; and a forum to explore academic freedom, freedom of speech, and freedom of assembly in the university. Further information about these programs will be forthcoming.

As this process moves forward, I welcome your thoughts about how Duke can best address the troubling events of the past few months, learn from a careful and unvarnished understanding of our national and institutional history, and build a stronger, more inclusive future as a university community.

Vincent E. Price
President, Duke University

Appendix C: Formation of the Commission on Memory and History

Duke President Vincent Price sent the following message out Friday, September 1, 2017, to members of the Duke community concerning formation of a new Commission on Memory and History:

To the Duke Community:

I am very pleased to announce the formation of the Commission on Memory and History at Duke University.

The members of the commission are students, faculty, trustees, alumni, administrators and local residents who reflect a range of perspectives and the rich diversity of our university. I am deeply grateful to the 16 distinguished and thoughtful members of our community who have agreed to serve.

The commission will be charged with developing principles to apply when issues arise related to the names of university facilities and monuments on campus, recommending next steps for the entrance of Duke Chapel, and providing guidance to me, and to the Board of Trustees, as we engage in a broader campus conversation about history and inclusion. I have asked that the commission complete its work this fall.

Every member of the Duke community deserves a voice in this vitally important conversation, and the students, alumni, faculty and staff with whom I have spoken in the past few days hold a diversity of views about the best way forward for the university. At Duke, we have the courage and integrity to engage productively around our disagreements without resorting to incivility or vandalism, instead finding collective strength in open-minded participation and mutual respect.

I hope you will offer your input to the commission, which among other means can be done directly through its website <https://memoryhistory.duke.edu>. I am confident that the Duke community will emerge from this important deliberative work with our shared values affirmed and our commitment to the university's bright future renewed.

Sincerely,
Vincent Price
President, Duke University