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INTRODUCTION

Washington and Lee University President Will Dudley formed the Commission on Institutional History and Community in the aftermath of events that occurred in August 2017 in Charlottesville, Virginia. In February 2017, the Charlottesville City Council had voted to remove a statue of Robert E. Lee from a public park, and Unite the Right members demonstrated against that decision on August 12. Counter-demonstrators marched through Charlottesville in opposition to the beliefs of Unite the Right. One participant was accused of driving a car into a crowd and killing 32-year-old Heather Heyer. The country was horrified. A national discussion on the use of Confederate symbols and monuments was already in progress after Dylann Roof murdered nine black church members at Emanuel African Methodist Episcopal (AME) Church in Charleston, South Carolina, on June 17, 2015. Photos of Roof posing with the Confederate flag were spread across the internet. Discussion of these events, including the origins of Confederate objects and images and their appropriation by groups today, was a backdrop for President Dudley’s appointment of the commission on Aug. 31, 2017.

President Dudley charged the commission “to lead us in an examination of how our history — and the ways that we teach, discuss, and represent it — shapes our community.” He directed the commission to examine “how we can best present our physical campus to take full advantage of its educational potential in a manner that is consistent with our core values.” He instructed the commission to “create various opportunities to engage in conversation with all corners of the community,” and to “meet with existing groups whose ongoing work relates to some of these issues, including the Working Group on the History of African-Americans at W&L, the University Committee on Inclusiveness and Campus Climate, and the University Collections of Art and History Advisory Committee.” The president had confidence that the university would “set a national example by demonstrating how the divisive issues confronting us can be addressed thoughtfully and effectively. That is what a university should do, and it is especially what Washington and Lee should do.”

The president appointed 12 members, all drawn from faculty, staff, students and alumni:

Chair: Brian C. Murchison, Charles S. Rowe Professor of Law

Faculty: Ted DeLaney ’85, Associate Professor of History;
Melissa R. Kerin, Associate Professor of Art History;
Thomas Camden ’76, Associate Professor, Head of Special Collections and Archives, University Library.
Students: Elizabeth Mugo ’19, Irmo, South Carolina, Executive Committee Vice President (elected Executive Committee President, April 2018);
Heeth Varnedoe ’19, Thomasville, Georgia, Junior Class Representative to the Executive Committee;
Daniele San Román ’19L, Port Jefferson Station, New York, Law Strategic Planning Task Force.

Staff: Mary Main, Executive Director of Human Resources;
Trenya Mason ’05L, Assistant Dean for Law Student Affairs.

Alumni: Cynthia Cheatham ’07, Washington, D.C., Alumni Board Member;
Mike McGarry ’87, Charlotte, North Carolina, Alumni Board President;
Phil Norwood ’69, Charlotte, North Carolina, Rector Emeritus.

Nine members of the commission are alumni: Ted DeLaney and Tom Camden from the faculty; Trenya Mason from the staff; Elizabeth Mugo, Heeth Varnedoe and Daniele San Román from the student body (one year as a student qualifies a person to be an alumna/alumnus); and the three alumni representatives, Cynthia Cheatham, Mike McGarry and Phil Norwood. For the biographies of all members, see Appendix A.

From September 2017 through May 1, 2018, the commission worked in response to the president’s charge. This report is that response. The report is divided into three principal parts, and it includes several appendices. The report’s subject matter is necessarily difficult, involving close attention to problematic aspects of the university’s history and physical campus. The president asked the commission to think openly and honestly about a range of such issues, and the process has been challenging. The report does not seek to diminish the many features that make W&L unique and well-loved by those who have worked and studied here, but it does seek to offer constructive proposals to make the university an even better, stronger institution.

Part I describes the methodology used by the commission to canvass the views of university constituencies. It offers a broad summary of views that were expressed, although it is important to acknowledge that not every view can be captured in a short summary. Appendix B therefore contains a more detailed inventory of the views that the commission received. Part I demonstrates that the commission engaged a wide number of individuals who are connected to the university and learned much about their views and suggestions for a sound response to the president’s charge.
Part II — and its extension in Appendix C — addresses the history of the university. The purpose of this part is to begin gathering facts for a full and accurate understanding of the school’s history, including information that is not always included in the telling of the W&L story. Part II does not purport to be a definitive historical account but is a first step in clearing away myths, liberties and exaggerations that, in the commission’s view, should be corrected by the university as it charts its future path. The account is necessarily incomplete; as Lee himself wrote, “It is only the ignorant who suppose themselves omniscient.” Much room remains for research and discussion carried out with intellectual honesty and humility.

The story of W&L is not simply the 19th-century background of the Civil War and the presidency of Robert E. Lee. The story includes the school’s 20th- and 21st-century history, particularly its commitment to the liberal arts, its gradual shaping of a more inclusive mission and environment, and its eventual recognition as a premier American institution of higher learning. Part II makes a number of recommendations to further an accurate understanding of the school’s full history.

In Part III, the report turns to the university’s visual culture — both physical and virtual. The commission documented the dominant imagery used and displayed in highly visible areas of the campus, and analyzed the messages of the visual vocabularies and display practices. Based on this information, the commission makes a number of recommendations to change the physical and virtual environments of the campus. The goals are to create a more dynamic and inclusive atmosphere to align the school’s visual culture more closely with its educational mission.

Finally, in its conclusion, the report reflects further on the president’s charge, the work completed this academic year, and the steps that it recommends for the immediate future. Although the commission’s recommendations are distributed by subject matter throughout the report, Appendix D brings them together in one list.
PART I: METHODOLOGY: OUTREACH AND RESPONSE

I. Outreach

The commission considered the importance of gathering input from a broad range of community members. The commission created four sub-groups to host formal outreach sessions. Student members of the commission led conversations with student groups and organizations. Faculty members of the commission led conversations with groups of faculty members who attended and participated. Staff members of the commission led conversations with a wide array of staff members, including administrators, administrative support staff, library staff, dining and facilities employees, and others. Alumni members of the commission led structured telephone sessions. These conversations influenced how the commission examined and prioritized a myriad of concerns related to W&L’s history and community.

From October through March, the commission hosted the meetings and phone calls. There were eight sessions for W&L law and undergraduate faculty; 16 sessions for university staff members; four telephone sessions for alumni totaling more than 400 alumni listening in or speaking; and one telephone session with the Black Alumni Working Group. There were also nine sessions with current students, including members of the Executive Committee, the Student Bar Association, the Black Law Student Association, the College Democrats, the Panhellenic Council, the College Republicans, the Student Judicial Council, the Student Association for Black Unity, and the Interfraternity Council. In addition, the student sub-group attended student organization meetings and held weekly office hours through the end of March.

The commission also met with faculty members of the Women’s, Gender, and Sexuality Studies Program, the University Committee on Inclusiveness and Campus Climate, the vice president for University Advancement, the vice president for Student Affairs and dean of students, the provost, the associate dean for Administration and Student Affairs at W&L Law, the vice president for Admissions and Financial Aid, and additional groups (see Appendix B).

Across all outreach meetings and call-in sessions, the commission asked similar questions:

1. What are our core values? What elements of our campus reinforce or are in conflict with these values? How could our campus better reflect these values?
2. How do our curriculum, programs and initiatives reflect our core values?
3. What story or stories does our physical campus tell? Are those stories accurate? What images and motifs create discomfort?
4. What specific aspects of the culture of W&L affected your decision to work/study here, and what specific aspects directly affect your experience here? How does it affect your current engagement as an alumnus or alumna?
5. In what ways do you feel that our culture and history affect the experiences of our diverse students, staff and faculty? How might we increase diversity within the student body?
6. What traditions are important to maintain as part of the W&L experience?

II. Response

Consistent themes emerged across the sessions:

- Core values are honor, integrity, civility and rigorous scholarship.
- Existing programs on campus reflect the core values, such as the Johnson Program, the Shepherd Program for the Interdisciplinary Study of Poverty and Human Capability, Spring Term, and the Roger Mudd Center for Ethics.
- W&L does not tell the complete story of university history and of those who helped to shape it.
- Robert E. Lee needs more critical examination and a more nuanced interpretation. Who was Lee? What does being linked to Lee mean?
- There is a tension between preserving history and providing an educational experience that fosters success for all members of the campus community.
- W&L needs greater diversity and more inclusiveness; student experiences are unequal.
- Lee Chapel is not a comfortable place for many.
- Other campus spaces need to be available in order to create new campus traditions.
- W&L has failed to adequately tell the complete story of its ownership of enslaved people.
- The university has a history apart from Lee, and that story should be told prominently.

For a detailed summary of comments received in the outreach sessions, emails and form submissions, please see Appendix B.

Some of the specific comments received from faculty and staff:

- Leadership needs to be bold, clear and intentional in addressing issues of our history and in diversifying the faculty and student body.
- Many institutions tell the story of their history, but W&L seems to tell the story of one man, and that story is not critical. The university tells stories
of Lee that are favorable and limited to one period of his life, and even those stories are not completely accurate.

- Lee served the university ably as president, raising funds and rethinking the curriculum.
- Lee Chapel is a problematic site for many members of the community; it should be reconfigured or turned into a museum.
- The marker on the Colonnade is inadequate in telling the story of enslaved people and their history and contributions to W&L.
- The university needs to do more to create a welcoming atmosphere for diverse employees and students and a stronger infrastructure to retain them.
- The exclusivity and cost of the Greek system need to be examined.
- History cannot be erased, so it needs to be told accurately.
- Use arts as one way of telling the university story and including diverse voices.
- Honor is a core value, but we do not stitch its various meanings into a cohesive message.

Some of the specific comments received from students:

- A more accurate telling of the life of Lee is necessary.
- Lee should not be portrayed in Confederate uniform on campus.
- Confederate flags should not be allowed in dorms and fraternity houses.
- Holding events in the chapel is difficult for members of the community.
- W&L is "not unmindful of the future" but is stuck in the past. The emphasis on tradition impedes progress.
- While many students support the Greek system, there is an interest in more interaction between groups on campus. Social events, the cost, and the limited racial and ethnic diversity within most fraternities and sororities can make this a challenging environment for some students.
- The student body should make an effort to cultivate an environment that attracts diverse students.
- The university curriculum, professors, and commitment to liberal arts are important.
- Programs on campus give students opportunities to learn and face tough issues and give back to the community.
- There is a strong sense of community reflected by student self-governance.

Some of the specific comments received from alumni:
• Expand first-year and faculty orientation to include a balanced history of the university. Examine history fully and tell it truthfully on and off campus. Utilize resources such as Special Collections more in teaching the university’s history.
• The university needs to provide resources and spaces that are welcoming to diverse students and additional resources to support diversity of faculty and staff.
• There were specific concerns from some about making sure that racial and ethnic diversity were not the focus of student recruitment, and that there are other characteristics that make a person diverse.
• W&L needs to do a better job of enrolling students across socioeconomic and racial and ethnic groups.
• Important traditions are the Honor System, the Speaking Tradition, civility, and recognizing the contributions of George Washington and R.E. Lee.
• Make images of underrepresented groups more visible on campus.
• Fraternities and sororities can be exclusionary institutions.
• The representation of Lee on campus was mixed. Some thought the “Recumbent Lee” statue in the chapel is problematic, while others thought the recognition of Lee throughout campus should remain unchanged.
• Increase financial aid/make admissions need-blind.

In President Dudley’s message announcing the membership of the Commission on Institutional History and Community, he called for the commission to:

1. Examine how our history — and the ways that we teach, discuss and represent it — shapes our community.
2. Create various opportunities to engage in conversation with all corners of the community.
3. Set a national example by demonstrating how the divisive issues can be addressed thoughtfully and effectively.

With this charge as the benchmark for the report, the commission has engaged with students, staff, faculty and alumni. The university community has asked for transparency in the examination of its history and recommendations for change.

**Recommendation No. 1: Release the commission’s report in full to the university community and post on the website.**
PART II: REFLECTING ON THE LEGACY OF THE PAST

President Dudley charged the commission to explore how Washington and Lee University’s history shapes its community. The first question necessarily is, what is our history? It is an institution founded in the early 18th century with a long record of associations with public persons and events, so one would expect the university to have a well-documented, easily accessible, and widely known history. In fact, it does not. Much of its 19th-century experience, including its links to slavery, the Civil War and Robert E. Lee, is known only in bits and pieces. In addition, its 20th- and 21st-century history, including its gradual development as a top liberal arts institution with a dynamic curriculum and an ethos of personalized education, is often taken for granted.

From its contacts with the various constituencies during the outreach phase, the Commission on Institutional History and Community learned that faculty, students, staff and alumni recognize the value of truthfully telling and learning from all aspects of the school’s history. The demand for more awareness was most often heard from current students. Many said that they were not prepared to account for the university’s ownership of slaves; to explain why the university is named for a Confederate general; or to trace the eventual emergence of a more racially and economically diverse student body of men and women. They noted too that the lack of historical instruction allows for groups outside of the W&L community to impose their own narratives on the university and its key spaces, such as Lee Chapel and Museum. Students felt strongly that they should not graduate from one of the oldest institutions in the country without ever having seriously engaged its history and the lessons that can be drawn from it. Furthermore, the lack of formal historical instruction makes it difficult for students to distinguish fact from fiction in the telling of the W&L story.

Recommendation No. 2: Incorporate the university’s history into its orientation program and its curriculum as a tool for examining society’s challenges and better preparing graduates to face those challenges. There must be a focus on the university’s 18th- and 19th-century history, including the facts about George Washington’s and Robert E. Lee’s involvements with the university. The university’s 20th- and 21st-century history must also be part of the canon, especially its evolution as a premier liberal arts institution and its mission to prepare students for “engaged citizenship in a global and diverse society.”

Possible mechanisms for delivering the university’s history to the student population:

1 https://www.wlu.edu/about-wandl/non-incautus-futuri/mission-statement
A. Compile a packet that contains a historical overview. The Office of Admissions will send it to students when they decide to attend W&L or will provide it to students once they arrive on campus. The packet will contain key elements of the university’s historical narrative and copies of important primary-source documents. Small-group discussions about the contents of the packet could take place throughout the first-year experience. During Orientation Week, include programming that introduces W&L’s history and makes use of information from Special Collections.

B. Require each undergraduate student to take a seminar that explores W&L history, including the involvement of the namesakes, the contribution of enslaved persons, the role of W&L in the creation and dissemination of the Lost Cause narrative, the training of soldiers on campus, and the impact of our graduates on the institution and the world. The goal would be neither to mask nor to bash the university’s history, but rather to tell the full story, confident that the university’s positive contributions to society far outweigh its shortcomings. Alternatively, encourage faculty to offer more courses about W&L history, such as race and slavery in Rockbridge County, perhaps modeled on Professor Theodore DeLaney’s current course. In the School of Law, offer a one-credit course focused on W&L and its connection to the history of civil rights and racial justice; the course would not be required, but would be open to second- and third-year law students as well as undergraduate students in the Legal Studies Program.

C. During Spring Term, foster campus unity by selecting a topic or issue that the entire community explores and discusses, whether in multiple class offerings that address the topic from different angles; a speaker series that highlights different aspects of the issue; a reading club that examines the issue; or a staged public debate related to the topic.

D. Digital Humanities Project: Build an active, developing database for articles, bibliographies and archival sources related to the history of the university and the people who played a role in its development.

E. Create an additional, required, extended orientation meeting for first-year law students to introduce the entering class to the history of the university and its impact on the campus community. Following the format of the Virginia State Bar Law School Professionalism Program, provide a lecture for the whole class and then break out into discussion groups.
F. Celebrate the first month of the new Supreme Court term (October) at the School of Law by offering a four-week series of events and speakers in Lewis Hall on aspects of university history.

Recommendation No. 3: Create opportunities for alumni to learn the full history of W&L through programs at chapter events, and produce video of selected footage. Knowledgeable speakers would cover a range of topics, and items from Special Collections would help tell the story. Educating W&L graduates is important. About 70 percent of incoming students have contact with graduates before or during the applications process; these alumni are well positioned to pass along accurate information about the school’s background and trajectory. Educational opportunities, devised by the Alumni Office and Special Collections, could be evening programs with several speakers, each covering a time period or facet of W&L history.

Appendix C provides the beginnings of an effort to gather facts about various topics in the university’s history. As noted in the introduction, the text is only a start; it does not claim to be definitive. It delves into parts of the W&L story that are not often told, yet need to be included in a full story of the university. Among topics that could be part of the orientation packet mentioned above are several from the 18th and 19th centuries (the early years of Augusta Academy/Liberty Hall; trustee John Robinson’s bequest of enslaved persons to the university; and Robert E. Lee’s contributions to the university as president), and several from the 20th century (the evolution of the university’s efforts to diversify the faculty and student body, the decision to adopt co-education, and the development of a dynamic liberal-arts curriculum). The following pages summarize facts to be considered as the university assembles a more complete rendering of its story.

I. Founding and Early History

The iconic Liberty Hall ruins, overlooking the playing fields of the back campus, speak to the 18th-century history of the school, a history that is not widely known. This part of the university’s story sheds light on the ambitions of the true founders and the complex social context in which the school was born.

The institution that became Washington and Lee began in 1749 as a small, classical grammar school known as Augusta Academy. Its founder was Robert Alexander, a citizen of Ulster who arrived in America in 1737 as part of the “great migration of the Scotch-Irish to America.”2 With the goal of preparing boys for college and the Presbyterian ministry, Alexander headed the school until the early 1760s.3 In

---

3 Ibid., 5.
1776, the school’s trustees, members of the Presbytery of Hanover, appointed 28-year-old William Graham as rector. Graham was born in Pennsylvania of Scots-Irish parents and educated at the College of New Jersey, which would become Princeton University. Graham’s classmates at the College of New Jersey included Henry “Light-Horse Harry” Lee (the father of Robert E. Lee), and his teachers included Dr. John Witherspoon, exponent of the Scottish Enlightenment and signer of the Declaration of Independence. Witherspoon influenced the political philosophy of the country’s founding generation, strongly articulating “his anti-tyrannical and anti-English roots in defense of American freedom.” During his tenure as president of the College of New Jersey, Witherspoon tutored free black men to prepare them for the ministry. He was also a slaveholder. In Witherspoon, then, we see the “contradictions between a revolution dedicated to liberty and an economic system based on forced labor.” In the South, Witherspoon’s family and descendants did much to advance education by building great institutions of higher learning. But scholars have highlighted the fact that they “built their lives and wealth on a foundation of slavery.”

Under Graham’s leadership, the grammar school in Virginia was renamed Liberty Hall, perhaps due to the intense “revolutionary sympathies” of Graham, the school’s trustees, and the Witherspoon legacy. In 1785, the school began to offer college-level degrees, and its course of study included Latin, Greek, classical literature, English literature, moral philosophy, mathematics, geography and natural science. Graham, an ardent anti-Federalist, spoke out against ratification of the proposed U.S. Constitution, seeing the plan as an effort to eclipse powers of the state. Like Patrick Henry, he urged Virginia not to ratify, but the pro-ratification forces, led by James Madison, prevailed.

Among the students at Liberty Hall towards the end of Graham’s tenure was John Chavis, the first African-American to receive a collegiate education in the United

---

6 Wilder, 111.
9 Crenshaw, 11.
10 Robert Goggin-Gillespie, “Reverend William Graham, Presbyterian Minister and Rector of Liberty Hall Academy,” University of Richmond Scholarship Repository (Unpublished Master’s Thesis, 1970), 31; see also Crenshaw, 14, 22.
11 Crenshaw, 15.
Chavis was born in 1763 in Granville County, North Carolina, to free black North Carolinians. He was raised near Mecklenburg, Virginia. At age 29, Chavis began studying for the ministry under Witherspoon at the College of New Jersey. On Witherspoon’s death in 1795, Chavis moved to Virginia and enrolled at Liberty Hall Academy. He completed his studies in 1799. Finding him to be “of unquestionably good character and a communicant in the Presbyterian Church,” the Lexington Presbytery licensed him to minister in the church. Neither an abolitionist nor a radical, Chavis enjoyed a successful career as minister and teacher in North Carolina. In Raleigh, he established the John Chavis School, which educated black students as well as whites, although in separate classes taught at different times of the day. Prominent whites saw the value of entrusting the education of their children to Chavis; among his students was a future U.S. senator, Willie P. Mangum. Chavis died in 1838.

Liberty Hall’s finances during this period were precarious at best, but the generosity of an unlikely benefactor made a crucial difference. In 1796, George Washington, in his second term as president of the United States, gave the school its first major endowment — $20,000 of James River Canal stock. For years, Washington had been interested in developing a river route linking the Atlantic to regions of Ohio and Kentucky. The Virginia legislature chartered the James River Co. in 1785 to make surveys and gave Washington 100 shares of the stock “as a means of winning public confidence in the James River project.” Unwilling on ethical grounds to accept the stock as a personal gift, Washington sought a public purpose for the stock and settled on higher education as a worthy recipient.

In Washington’s view, supporting higher education was of prime importance in the new republic. As Washington put it, “The time is … come, when a plan of universal education ought to be adopted in the United States. Not only do the exigencies of public and private life demand it, but, if it should ever be apprehended that prejudice would be entertained in one part of the Union against another, an efficacious remedy will be to assemble the youth of every part under such circumstances as will, by the freedom of intercourse and collision of sentiment, give to their minds the direction of truth, philanthropy, and mutual conciliation.” When he selected Liberty Hall to receive the

---

13 Ibid.; Crenshaw, 22-23.
14 Crenshaw, 26.
17 Horn, 228-29.
18 George Washington quoted in Horn, 228-29.
gift in 1796, the trustees renamed the school Washington Academy. In 1813, they changed the name to Washington College.\textsuperscript{19}

Washington’s vision of education as a universal right, a bulwark against sectionalism, and a search for truth was complemented by Graham’s own practical approach to education as preparation for life. “The aim of education,” Graham wrote, “is to furnish the mind with the knowledge of truth and to open the first principles of science, so that the student may be capable to pursue any business in life he shall afterwards think proper. The knowledge of truth is therefore the principal end of education, and the most proper means of acquiring this knowledge is diligent application.”\textsuperscript{20}

While these men were uncommonly forward-looking in defining and supporting the school’s mission, it is notable that, in other areas, they did not go against the grain. Washington was a slave owner for 54 years.\textsuperscript{21} At the time of his death in 1799, he owned 123 of the 317 enslaved persons living at Mount Vernon, and his will provided for emancipation of those 123 people on the death of his wife. On her instruction, they were emancipated effective January 1801. The will also directed that slaves who were old or in ill health “shall be comfortably clothed and fed by my heirs while they live,” and that young slaves upon freedom should be taught reading and writing and “some useful occupation.”\textsuperscript{22} Washington’s views on slavery will continue to be parsed and debated. One commentator credits Washington at least for seeing that African-Americans were capable of, in Washington’s words, “a destiny different from that in which they were born.”\textsuperscript{23} But though he acknowledged slavery’s evil, he chose to tolerate it throughout his life.

As for Graham, it is unknown whether he was a slave owner. At Liberty Hall, he taught a course, Human Nature, in which he defended slavery on the ground that free blacks would threaten the white population.\textsuperscript{24} Both Washington and Graham could have used their position and influence to undermine slavery in their lifetimes; others did in the same historical period. Ironically, the ideas about universal education and citizenship espoused by both men would eventually be used against the institution of

\begin{itemize}
\item 19 https://www.wlu.edu/about-wandl/history-and-traditions/our-namesakes
\item 20 William Graham quoted in Gillespie, 31.
\item 21 Chernow, \textit{Washington}, 10. According to Chernow, Washington inherited his first 10 slaves at age 11.
\item 22 Ellis, at 263; Chernow, 801. According to Chernow, “By freeing his slaves, Washington accomplished something more glorious than any battlefield victory as a general or legislative act as president. He did what no other founding father dared to do,” 801.
\item 24 Robson, at 647-48.
\end{itemize}
slavery and lead to its demise, but it would take another hundred years — and loss of life on a colossal scale — for slavery to end in America.

Recommendation No. 4: Establish the fall Convocation as University Day. This will celebrate the opening of the academic year; explore the past, present and future of the university; and reflect on the university’s core values and ideals. University Day would replace Founders Day in January, which is currently tied to the university’s namesakes rather than the full history of the university. The Omicron Delta Kappa Convocation would remain in January.

Recommendation No. 5: Use existing and future research generated from course work, exhibitions and lectures to update university web pages and further reflect university history. Pages that would benefit from updates include History & Traditions FAQ for the First-Year Experience; History and Traditions web pages under About W&L; and History of Washington and Lee’s Presidents.

II. The Robinson Bequest

In 2015, President Kenneth Ruscio oversaw the placement, between Robinson and Tucker halls, of a historical marker entitled “A Difficult, Yet Undeniable History.” The marker recognizes the enslaved men and women owned by Washington College in the 19th century. A full rendition of W&L’s history should acknowledge that in 1826, “Jockey” John Robinson left his estate to the college, consisting of 73 enslaved women, children and men, as well as a large farm on the James River.25 The will stated that the slaves and property could not be sold for 50 years, although it also provided that the college could sell “such others as may render themselves by crimes or mutinous habits, unsafe or injurious in their connection with their fellows.” Robinson also wrote, “In any disposition which may be made of these slaves and also in their treatment, it is my earnest desire that the strictest regard be paid to their comfort and happiness as well as to the interests of the estate.”26

Robinson’s bequests helped the financially suffering college. In 1825, the college had a mere 65 students and a “diminished bank account.”27 Proceeds from the sale of the Robinson livestock, whiskey, distillery equipment and furniture amounted to $4,500. The college also earned money from hiring out some of the enslaved workers. Robinson’s will had consented to such arrangements: “This right is to be exercised upon a sound discretion and in such manner as to give the negroes who are allotted for hire the alternative of being sold to masters of their own choice.”28 In 1836, the college sold

26 Ibid.
27 Ibid.
28 Ibid.
most of the enslaved people to Hugh Garland, of Lynchburg, Virginia, for $20,674.91. Garland took them to work in the Mississippi cotton fields. The sale of slaves to Garland allowed the college to build Robinson Hall on the Colonnade. Additional sales of enslaved persons took place over the ensuing two decades, probably to local residents, and there is documentation that the college still owned three elderly, incapacitated individuals in 1857. “We wonder,” said President Kenneth Ruscio in 2015, “how the men who led this institution at the time not only tolerated slavery but used these enslaved men and women to help maintain and fund a college.”

Recommendation No. 6: Rename Robinson Hall, as further explained in Part II, Section V of the report.

Recommendation No. 7: Improve and expand recognition of the contributions to the university of enslaved persons, including those in the Robinson bequest. Improve the space that commemorates those in the Robinson bequest and erect a more prominent monument than the existing marker.

Recommendation No. 8: Invest in continued research to explore contributions of enslaved persons to the university. Hire a genealogist to complete the research on descendants of the Robinson enslaved persons. In addition, hire a two-year post-doctoral fellow to complete additional research, including the history of enslaved persons who were not part of the Robinson bequest and the 20th-century black experience at W&L.

Recommendation No. 9: Take action when the genealogist identifies descendants of enslaved persons owned by Washington College. It is premature to be prescriptive or comprehensive on what follows this research, but options for future consideration include: Establishing an education fund to support a descendant’s secondary or collegiate education, payable to a school to be attended by the descendant; creating an annual community project in the region settled by the descendants, similar to the Lexington programs now assisted by the university’s Community Grants Program; hosting a gathering on campus that provides an opportunity for descendants to meet and learn more about the results of the genealogist’s and post-doctoral fellow’s research; and sponsoring a series of lectures and activities on reconciliation and memorialization, with topics including the trans-Atlantic slave trade, enslavement, the Civil War, Reconstruction, the civil rights era, and the connection to a contemporary and intersectional analysis of race, gender, sexuality, economic inequality and equity.

III. Mid-1800s at Washington College.

From 1836 to 1848, the president of the college was an alumnus, Henry Ruffner, a licensed Presbyterian minister, member of the faculty, and two-time acting president of the school. For Ruffner, “the central purpose of education” was the formation of character. Religion must be the chief element of higher education, he declared at his inaugural, but Washington College would not favor a particular denomination. The college “was designed for the education of youth of all Christian denominations” and would offer “the same opportunities to all moral, qualified young men.” As Ruffner put it, if students “are to be drenched with the bitter waters of sectarian bigotry, they must go somewhere else; we eschew the task.”

Ruffner also espoused the end of slavery in western Virginia. A slaveholder himself, Ruffner favored gradual emancipation and removal of blacks from Virginia. He was a member of the Rockbridge Colonization Society, a branch of the American Colonization Society. While the society initially “enjoyed a reputation as a practical alternative to perpetual slavery,” its reputation fell “when it became clear that some of its followers actually hoped to reinforce the system of slavery by ridding the nation of ‘the great public evil’ of blacks not under direct white control, and removing the disturbing influence of freedmen from the vicinity of their slaves.” In 1847, he expressed his antislavery views at a meeting of Lexington’s Franklin Society, a men’s debate club, and he later published the speech in pamphlet form. His argument was that slavery was economically harmful — in fact, “pernicious to the welfare of states.” Religion and union, not slavery, would bring prosperity. Ruffner noted that investment in slavery caused “Virginians [to] neglect manufacturing and transportation,” and that the use of slave labor in agriculture led to the white population’s geographic dispersal, which negatively affected public education. Ruffner’s concern was that extremists on both sides of the slavery argument — fervent abolitionists and extreme pro-slavery advocates — would lead to destruction.

Presbyterian George Junkin succeeded Ruffner. Junkin possessed substantial academic credentials: He had founded Lafayette College, in Easton, Pennsylvania, and served as its first president, and later served as president of Miami University, in
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Oxford, Ohio. He had promoted public education in Pennsylvania and had started a school for teachers in that state. Like Ruffner, Junkin was strongly pro-Union, but unlike Ruffner, he was pro-slavery, and his early advocacy had caught the attention even of John C. Calhoun during Junkin’s tenure at Miami University. Junkin’s argument was that the Bible supported slavery; that a slave system was not inherently evil even if it could be administered inhumanely; that abolition would cause even greater problems than slavery itself. The solution for Junkin was “African colonization.” Short of that, he could see only danger ahead for the United States: the abolitionists’ censure of the South was an affront that would tear apart the Union and lead to war. For Junkin, “the Union was more important than the values of antislavery.” In early 1861, he clashed with student advocates of secession; they repeatedly raised a secessionist flag and flouted his orders against it. After Fort Sumter, he found no campus support for his pro-Union convictions. He resigned in May, and the trustees accepted his resignation without dissent. When told of the wartime deaths of his secessionist students, Junkin commented that “all had suffered more or less in consequence of their resistance to the best government which God had ever given to man.”

IV. Lee and the University

Ironically, some of the greatest gaps in knowledge among the W&L constituencies involve the life and historical setting of the man whose image mostly pervades the university, Robert E. Lee. What are the undisputed facts of his career as warrior and educator? How is this namesake of the university to be regarded? The university’s account of Lee’s life and era is surprisingly thin, left largely to one part of one course in the College and lectures by outside speakers.

Lee is best known as a career military man who graduated from the U.S. Military Academy at West Point, served in the U.S. Army for three decades, eventually renounced his loyalty to the Union, and led the Confederate Army throughout the Civil War. His military career, though it precedes his time at Washington College, has
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importance for a full understanding of the experience, mind and values of one of the university’s namesakes.

An important, lesser-known aspect of Lee’s life is that he owned slaves. He and his two brothers inherited 30 enslaved persons from their mother in 1829. They divided the bequest, and Robert “hired out some of his slaves and probably sold others,” so that by 1835 “he retained only one of the original number,” a woman whom Lee sent to his father-in-law (G.W. Parke Custis) to work on the Custis plantation in Virginia. When Custis died, Lee was named executor; the will bequeathed at least 150 enslaved persons to Custis’s heirs (including Lee’s wife). Lee’s task was to pay Custis’s debts and close out the estate. Lee maintained that the terms of the will were to emancipate the slaves within five years; some of the slaves thought Lee was to have emancipated them sooner. There were allegations, denied by Lee, of his forcibly rounding up escaped slaves and punishing them severely. When his job as executor concluded, Lee left the world of the plantation and returned to the Army. Students exposed to this story will have much to ponder and discuss about humanity, morality, economics, responsibility and the meaning of duty.

After Fort Sumter, having turned down command of the U.S. forces, Lee accepted command of the Virginia forces and eventually served as general-in-chief of all Confederate forces. After initial criticism for timidity, he won near adulation from his troops for his leadership at the Seven Days Battles, Second Manassas, and Chancellorsville. A horrific battle — the Battle of the Crater — ended in execution of a division of United States Colored Troops who had already surrendered to Confederate forces. One historian notes that the shocking slaughter “had to have been known to the commanding general,” and questions how Lee’s silence afterwards could be reconciled with a concept of honor. In 1865, after the crushing defeat at Gettysburg and
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Union conquests of Richmond and Petersburg, Lee’s choices were to surrender or to keep fighting through guerrilla actions. His decision to surrender to Grant at Appomattox brought the war to an end. In the period that followed, Lee told young men: “[G]o home, all you boys who fought with me and help build up the shattered fortunes of our old state.”

The circumstances of Lee’s presidency of Washington College decision are central to understanding why the trustees later added Lee to the name of the school. Lee accepted the leadership of Washington College in 1865. The war had reduced the number of students to 40. The college was “perilously in debt” and had not paid faculty salaries in years. It had degenerated into little more than a struggling prep school. Lee encouraged a new sense of the purpose of higher education in the South. He believed that “education could in fact prepare young people for life in the world, beyond service to church or state.” A “report of the faculty” signed by Lee and the professors and submitted to the trustees in 1867 set in motion a “practical reconstruction” of the academic program. With an insistence on academic excellence, the plan provided that the new curriculum would include traditional, social-science, and pre-professional courses. He incorporated a local law school into the institution. In 1868, the trustees added four chairs, and in 1869 two more. The college received impressive financial gifts, and the student body quadrupled by 1870, with students hailing from 22 states.

Lee is often associated with the college’s Honor System, and some claim that he founded it. However, the Honor System preceded Lee’s term as president. The university states that “the earliest evidence of an academic Honor System dates back to the 1840s.” Faculty meeting minutes refer to an honor system in 1850, and research by Professor John Gunn indicates that, while the faculty likely administered the system at its outset, primary responsibility for administering it shifted to the student body after the 1857-58 academic year. On Lee’s arrival seven years later, he “did not impose a
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full-fledged, formal honor code on the campus” but endorsed a standard of conduct.\textsuperscript{68} He “voiced the expectation that all students and faculty should think and behave as ‘gentlemen,’ which by his definition encompassed the qualities of personal honor, fairness, and civility.”\textsuperscript{69} After 1867, it appears that exclusive responsibility for administering the system passed to the student body.\textsuperscript{70} Thirty-five years after Lee’s death, in 1905, “its administration was placed in the newly formed Executive Committee of the Student Body.”\textsuperscript{71} A century later, the system remains strong. President John Wilson attributed its durability to its unspoken presence in daily life: “I believe this impact is measured not by the investigations or by the hearings or still less by the convictions, but by the quiet, united observance of the personal integrity doctrine that we don’t even see it because it’s happening every night in study rooms or in the library or wherever the temptation to take a shortcut might found and is resisted.”\textsuperscript{72}

The conduct of some Washington College students was in question after the opening in 1866 of a Freedmen’s Bureau in Lexington.\textsuperscript{73} The Bureau of Refugees, Freedmen, and Abandoned Lands was a federal agency within the U.S. Department of War and provided various forms of assistance to blacks in the aftermath of the Civil War, including education. When the bureau sent teachers to Lexington, they encountered resistance. Some in the town, including Washington College students, apparently engaged in threatening behavior towards teachers and students at the bureau’s school.\textsuperscript{74} Two documented racial confrontations led to violence.\textsuperscript{75} While Lee “apparently dismissed the worst offenders,” disciplinary measures against others were weak, and “the provocations did not end.”\textsuperscript{76}

Some of Lee’s time was spent outside of Lexington in the public arena. In February 1866, the 39th Congress’s Joint Committee on Reconstruction summoned Lee to Capitol Hill to testify as a witness.\textsuperscript{77} Congress wanted to “gauge the disposition of former Confederates toward the federal government,” which was then debating
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Reconstruction issues, including full citizenship for black Americans. Lee testified, “I do not know of a single person who either feels or contemplates any resistance to the government of the United States, or indeed any opposition to it.” When asked whether the South wanted “peace or to regain their lost power,” Lee said that he was “not inclined to separate the two points.” When asked about race relations, he repeated his stance that he had favored “gradual emancipation”; that he supported black education; that blacks were “not as capable of acquiring knowledge” as whites, although “some [are] more apt than others”; that he was against black enfranchisement at the present time because “they cannot vote intelligently”; that blacks working for their former masters were “well treated”; that Virginia would be a better place if blacks were removed from the state.

Lee died of a stroke in October 1870. Within weeks, the trustees announced that the new president would be Lee’s son, General G.W. Custis Lee, then a professor at Virginia Military Institute. The trustees simultaneously announced the renaming of Washington College as Washington and Lee University. Thirteen years later, an addition to the rear of the chapel was opened to the public, and at its center was a statue of the recumbent general, asleep on a battlefield. This was the start of the chapel’s fame as “the shrine of the South.” Many saw the chapel and statue as icons of the Lost Cause, their term for an idealized Southern civilization that they said had been lost in the Civil War. The Lost Cause narrative absolved slavery of a causal role in the war, and equated Lee to a “priest of his people.” The causes and effects of this portrayal of history are vividly illuminated by the chapel itself, a unique space with great potential (though largely unrealized) to benefit students seeking to learn about the Civil War, its aftermath, and its present-day effects.

If we return to the earlier question, “How should Lee be regarded?” we can see that Lee’s priority as president was to create a serious educational program undertaken in a spirit of regard for personal integrity and honesty. It was designed to give young
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men the skills to contribute to a war-torn society that needed rebuilding in every sense. Although Lee had this practical vision for the education of young whites, he “never made the transformational leap that would recognize the fundamental human nature of the slaves.”

On slavery, he accepted “an elaborate middle ground that acknowledged its faults but justified its existence.” Washington and Lee University has an opportunity to encourage students to make the “transformational leap” that Lee did not make. Among its many goals, a liberal arts education can prompt reflection on how individuals can expand the set of their deepest loyalties and concerns.

Recommendation No. 10: To ensure the credibility of the Honor System and to follow the concerns of students, faculty and staff presented in outreach sessions, relocate the honor orientation and the signing of the Honor Book from the chapel, and give references to Lee in the White Book a more proportionate place in the text.

Recommendation No. 11: Refer to Robert E. Lee as “President Lee” rather than “General Lee,” including in formal documents, on the website, and the like.

V. The Modern Age: Story of Struggle and Growth

The layers of W&L’s 19th-century experience have tended to crowd out its modern story. The contributions of the university’s founders and presidents do not compose the university’s entire story. The school’s modern experience — of struggle and of gradual but steady progress as an academic institution and community — is also rich and essential information.

At the start of the 20th century, the university “was hardly a bastion of social reform or racial progress,” and it came late to integration in the 1960s. The university had taken the road of silence, watching while peer schools either decided to open admissions to black students or moved in that direction. The first two African-American students at W&L (other than John Chavis two centuries earlier) arrived in 1966. In 1968, President Robert Huntley called for new efforts to build “a diverse student body and faculty where members may share in common only the ability and conviction to learn from one another.” Additional initiatives in the late 1990s and the early 2000s sought increased funding for recruitment of African-American faculty and students. Despite sporadic gains, President Dudley in 2017 wrote to alumni: “We
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remain the least racially diverse of the best liberal arts institutions. And the percentage of our first-year students eligible for Pell grants — the most commonly reported measure of economic diversity — was the lowest among the top 150 schools in the country in 2015.” 93 Today, the Strategic Planning Committee’s Subcommittee on Diversity and Inclusion has made a number of strong proposals for enhanced support for diverse students on campus, substantial investment in recruitment of faculty and staff, and increased support for the Office of Diversity and Inclusion. 94 Expected in 2018-19 is a Center for Multicultural Enrichment, envisioned as a “much-needed hub of activity,” to be located in Elrod Commons.

A second story of 20th-century struggle and change in opening up the W&L community took place in the early 1980s, at the start of John Wilson’s presidency, when the university debated whether to admit women as undergraduates. 95 For nine months, all constituencies focused on the question. In a debate both thorough and impassioned, proponents of coeducation argued that the admission of women was critical to maintaining the school’s quality, while opponents said it would change the school unalterably. 96 In mid-July 1984, the trustees voted to adopt coeducation, and the first classes of women were soon admitted. A review committee 10 years later concluded that coeducation was “proceeding well”: enrollment was up, applications had more than doubled, average SAT scores were almost 100 points higher, and retention to graduation had increased. 97 The number of full-time faculty women rose from six to 18. 98 Today, most related questions deal with issues of equality. For example, do women and men have similar senses of ownership of the school? Are they participating in social and political life in equal ways? Invariably, the dominant Greek culture enters the dialogue. Are there alternative spaces for students, women and men alike, who seek them? Additional questions ripe for review concern gender diversity in faculty and administration. 99

A third story of the modern age is the richness of the W&L academic experience, particularly the wealth and creativity of curricular choices, the vitality of offerings in the four-week Spring Term, and the outstanding quality of teaching across the university. The opportunities for service learning, interdisciplinary seminars, and international education are plentiful, and the clinical programs in the School of Law are

93 Quoted in report of the Strategic Planning Steering Committee’s Subcommittee on Diversity and Inclusion, at 3.
94 Ibid., 4-7.
95 Brownell, 440.
96 Ibid., 442-459.
97 Ibid., 467.
98 Ibid.
99 Ibid., 468-71.
nationally recognized. It appears that Washington and Lee University has reached a level of recognition directly attributable to the faculty’s wise pedagogy, both in and out of the classroom. The history of the effective teaching at W&L embraces many styles and strategies, some reliant on technology, others reliant on the old-fashioned blackboard, still others based on travel, role-playing, or intensive primary research. The greatness of the educational experience at W&L is itself a story of diversity, trial and error, frustration, success and innovation. Telling the story of the classroom is an important means of explaining how this institution works at ground zero — and ultimately how the students learn to teach themselves.

Recommendation No. 12: Implement proposals from strategic planning, including the Multicultural Center; a cluster-hiring initiative for faculty; a Diversity Cabinet; additional financial resources dedicated to recruiting and enrolling diverse undergraduate and law students; and need-blind admissions.

Recommendation No. 13: Explore opportunities to encourage students from traditionally underrepresented groups to pursue a career in the legal profession beginning with a legal education at W&L, and fund a position for a law student diversity and inclusion (LDI) counselor.

Recommendation No. 14: Explore the establishment of an exchange program with minority-serving institutions and consider giving incentives to the partner institutions to encourage their participation.

Recommendation No. 15: Approve the School of Law’s proposal for creation of a Center on Civil Rights and Racial Justice. This will be an interdisciplinary center, involving students and faculty from the College, the Williams School, and the School of Law. On a campus that tends to look to the past for its ideals and values, this center will be forward-looking in the sense of seeking new ways of thinking about justice and equality in the 21st century. Participants will take part in cutting-edge research, policy advocacy, other forms of writing, and civil rights litigation in Virginia and around the country. The center’s work will engage the expertise of various disciplines, taking a strong liberal arts approach to thinking collaboratively and responding imaginatively to contemporary issues. Its function in the educational program of the university will be to teach and to allow reflection on the modern justice system, the role of the courts, human rights, and the intersection of political, social, and legal thought.

Recommendation No. 16: Expand the university’s knowledge of the 20th-century experience of black students and faculty at Washington and Lee. There are no individual histories of the young men who integrated the university. The first black students — Leslie Smith ‘69L, Linwood Smothers ’72 and Walter Blake ’72 — have
already died, as have Smith’s brother, Bobby Smith ’74, John White ’74, John Evans ’76, Ernest L. Freeman III ’75, Donald A. Willis ’75L, Rodney Hubbard ’74, Gary Avery ’74 and Phillip Hutcheson ’74. It is vital to collect oral histories of black alumni who are still alive and willing to be interviewed.

Recommendation No. 17: Create a Summer Liberal Arts Institute to provide an interdisciplinary summer experience for middle school or high school students (whether from Lexington, elsewhere in the country, or abroad) to visit, engage and learn about the best that the university has to offer.
PART III: PHYSICAL CAMPUS

I. Assessment and Overarching Goals

A built environment — and the paintings, sculptures and photographs that enhance it, and the nomenclature used to name it — has the potential to inform one’s experience and contour memory. At Washington and Lee, the physical campus frames a specific historical narrative and conveys clear messages about its values and interests. One such message, mentioned by numerous participants in the commission’s outreach, is that the university reveres its 19th-century past almost without qualification and is content to offer mostly minor contextualization and little critical analysis. Another message, also mentioned in the outreach, is that the university’s 19th-century history exceeds its contemporary history in importance — that its past accomplishments eclipse those of today.

In forming the commission, President Dudley specifically noted that “the commission’s work will include studying how our physical campus, a significant portion of which is a National Historical Landmark, can be presented in ways that take full advantage of its educational potential and are consistent with our core values.” With that charge in mind, this section of the report asks whether the campus — in its physical expression as well as its virtual, online dimension — “takes full advantage” of its potential to educate students and to sustain the university’s values as stated in its mission statement.

The changes suggested are not made in the interest of erasing any part of W&L’s history, but rather offer dynamic modes of engagement with our complex past that allow us to teach and respond earnestly and responsibly to our specific history.

II. Process

The commission documented the visual and material culture of the campus and assessed W&L’s web presence. Input came from faculty and staff, guests of W&L’s various committees, authors who have written about W&L’s past, students, and alumni. The inquiry examined portraits (painted and sculptural), memorials, architecture and naming practices. The commission also considered the ways in which W&L disseminates images of the institution and historical personages associated with it.
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100 The commission’s use of the term “physical campus” relates to W&L’s greater material culture and imaging of the physical campus, and to a limited degree its virtual presence.

III. Lee Chapel and Museum

Lee Chapel plays a unique role in communicating the history of W&L and contouring an individual’s campus experience. Significant moments of the academic year are celebrated here, such as first-year orientation, the Honor Book signing, Founders Day Convocation, and the induction ceremonies for Phi Beta Kappa and Omicron Delta Kappa. On those occasions, the university recalls and celebrates its values. At other times, guest speakers deliver lectures, or groups gather for weddings or memorials. The chapel’s history gives these events special prominence, and its approximately 600-person capacity makes it the largest venue on campus. The basement contains the Lee family crypt, Robert E. Lee’s office as president, and a museum that for 10 years has contained an exhibit on the namesakes as educators.

A. Chapel History

The chapel dates to 1866, when Lee suggested to the Board of Trustees the building of a chapel, which was expeditiously planned and constructed by 1867. In its original conception, the chapel was designed according to a rectilinear plan that would serve as a convening space. For the next three years of Lee’s presidency, the chapel functioned as an intentionally unconsecrated space for the campus community to assemble. That use continues today.

Shortly after Lee’s death in October 1870, a group convened to create a fund that would support the construction of a monument to memorialize Lee. The group, which became known as the Lee Memorial Association, consulted Lee’s widow, Mary Custis Lee, about the memorial. She recommended Edward V. Valentine, a Richmond sculptor, to create the white marble cenotaph. She worked with Valentine to decide on the form of the sculpture: an image of Lee, dressed in a Confederate military uniform, asleep on a cot, on a battlefield, with his legs crossed. Lee’s left hand rests on the shaft of the sword that lies beside him, while his right hand holds his heart. His face is tilted toward the assembly space, as if to meet the countenances of visitors.

This sculpture is a potent and carefully constructed image that taps into a long history of medieval Christian European funerary art, although this lineage of imagery is often eclipsed by more common references to Valentine’s interest in the early 19th-
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century sculpture of Louise of Prussia by artist Christian D. Rauch. While the latter work in Germany served as a point of departure for Valentine, he may have been aware of medieval Christian funerary imagery of knights sculpted in repose. Although asleep, these valiant knights, lying supine and cross-legged, held their swords ready to “struggle with Death on a stony battlefield.” Lee’s sculpture follows this iconography quite closely.

The image worked well to promote the idea of Lee as chivalrous knight, a trope that was used in re-creating the South’s post-war image. “Without its own distinctive past upon which to base its nationality, the Confederacy appropriated history and created a mythic past of exiled cavaliers and chivalrous knights.” During the unveiling of the statue and opening of the mausoleum in 1883, the main speaker remembered Lee as the equivalent of King Arthur and the “flower of knighthood,” the leader of a “cause now perished.” The speaker also called Lee a “priest of his people.”

The South itself was seen as sacred, and “history assumed the function of myth.”

The chapel communicates this “sacralization of Lee.” The most significant element of the chapel is the apse, which showcases the slightly-larger-than-life, white marble statue of Lee. Traditionally, the apse is reserved for the holiest of images. Accordingly, this marble sculpture functions as more than an indicator that Lee and his family members are interred in the crypt below. The sculpture and its iconography, in combination with sight lines and organization of physical space, create a shrine that vivifies and centralizes the memory of Lee. As W&L art historian Pamela Simpson noted in 2003, “The burial sites of saints and the places where their relics remain often become shrines.” This is what happened at Lee Chapel.

---

108 Address of John W. Daniel, ibid., 69.
109 Hunter, 205.
111 Simpson, 86.
By continuing to hold rituals and events in Lee Chapel, the university, wittingly or not, sustains the Shrine of the South\textsuperscript{112} and the memory of Lee as a commander of the Confederate Army.\textsuperscript{113} The commission heard repeatedly in its outreach that the effect is problematic for many students, faculty, staff and alumni:

1. Some students and faculty stated that first-year orientation and the Honor Book signing should not be held in a building that is a shrine to the Confederacy. Honoring the Confederacy is evident through the plaques, photos, memorial book, painted portrait and sculpture.
2. The chapel’s most visible portraits of Lee memorialize him as commander of the Confederate Army. These include the 1904 painted portrait by Theodore Pine and the 1875 marble sculpture by Valentine. These portraits of Lee as general are at odds with the university’s claim to honor Lee the civilian, who reinvigorated the university and inspired education during the Reconstruction era.
3. Groups of students, professors and staff are uncomfortable in the chapel and avoid attending events there.
4. Some groups will not host speakers at Lee Chapel because of the Confederate imagery and association.

Options: The commission considered several treatments for the Lee Chapel and Museum. Two options were carefully considered:

A. Create a permanent physical separation, such as a wall or solid doors, between the apse housing the Lee statue and the assembly space. In this iteration, the chapel would continue to function as a gathering space for events. The apse, however, would no longer be visible from or connected to the assembly area. To visit the apse, one would enter on the ground level, and climb the stairs that connect the apse to the lower level.

B. Convert the building into a teaching museum. In this way, the complex retains and maintains its integral design, which is one of the nation’s most compelling and successful examples of Lost Cause architecture and statuary. As a University Museum, the complex also would house the majority of the university’s art collection.

\textsuperscript{112} Simpson, 85.
\textsuperscript{113} When rituals or performances occur in places devoted to memorializing a person or event, the rituals or performances add importance and legitimacy to the site. “[T]he memorial landscape is constituted, shaped, and made important through them.” Owen J. Dwyer and Derek H. Alderman, \textit{Memorial landscapes: analytic questions and metaphors}, GeoJournal, Vol. 73 (Sept. 2008), 173.
Option A was problematic for four reasons. By walling off the apse, W&L literally would mask its history rather than engage it. Second, continued use of the chapel, even with a walled-off apse, amounts to validating Lee in his role as a Confederate general. At the very least, it would send a confusing message about whether or not the university is still commemorating Lee in that role. Third, continued use of the chapel would put the university in conflict with community members who are alienated by the building, even with a walled-off apse. Fourth, walling off the apse would dramatically alter the 1883 design of the space, created to valorize Lee, and thus eliminate the university’s ability to use it for teaching purposes.

The commission preferred Option B, largely in order to take pedagogical advantage of one of the most powerful examples in the nation of architecture reflecting the Lost Cause narrative. The chapel could be used to teach about the specific historical moment of the creation of the sculpture and the apse, and to delve deeply into the effects of that moment on subsequent historical periods. In addition, the chapel could be used to teach about visual literacy, the power of sight lines, the haptic experience of space, and iconography, among other topics for those in disciplines that analyze material culture. Through this change, the university accomplishes several goals at once, and paramount among them is to repurpose what has been an increasingly difficult space into a powerful teaching environment.

**Recommendation No. 18:** Convert Lee Chapel and Museum building into a museum, which would serve as a teaching environment with a well-appointed classroom, offices, and state-of-the-art exhibition space. The University Museum would engage academic departments and programs such as University Collections, campus galleries and display spaces, as well as departments and programs that readily use and teach with material culture, such as History, Classics, Art and Art History, Anthropology, Archaeology, Cultural Heritage and Museum Studies. The new University Museum would no longer hold any university functions.

**Recommendation No. 19:** Create a new community-convening space for university events, particularly for occasions like Orientation, Founders Day Convocation (or, as proposed, University Day), induction ceremonies, and other major occasions. The new space should be welcoming to all members of the university.
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114 “Memorials are important symbolic conduits not only for expressing a version of history but casting legitimacy upon it as well. They give the past a tangibility and familiarity — making the history they commemorate appear to be part of the natural and taken for granted order of things.” Dwyer and Alderman, 167.

115 This name, University Museum, is a suggestion, but the commission understands that this building, Lee Chapel and Museum, will likely undergo a renaming process as recommended in this section.
B. Making the Museum

In converting Lee Chapel into a teaching museum, the W&L community becomes an active agent in shaping and defining the space. As a museum, the chapel becomes a place where students and faculty can critically analyze and discuss the complex issues of history, cultural heritage, museum studies, art history, public history, visual anthropology, and religious studies that are all embedded in this historic site.

With help from experts, the university will consider how best to convert the space into a two-floored museum. The commission discussed use of the top floor as a space in which to tell the complex story of Lee, to illustrate the early development of the shrine, and to trace the full history of the chapel over time. The focus could range broadly from the patronage of the United Daughters of the Confederacy to talks given in the chapel by Ralph Ellison, Nikki Giovanni, David McCullough, Oscar Arias, Garry Wills, and Shelby Foote, among others. The bottom floor could provide space for classes to analyze art objects from the University Collections of Art and History (UCAH) and materials from Special Collections. Exhibition space could be available for revolving shows, either visiting or drawn from UCAH. In sum, the University Museum would present strong learning opportunities, incorporating the university’s holdings and already existent programming, such as Teaching with UCAH.\(^\text{116}\)

Recommendation No. 20: Move the management of Lee Chapel (University Museum) and University Collections from the Office of University Advancement to the Office of the Provost to underscore the academic nature of the new museum.

Recommendation No. 21: Incorporate the newly created University Museum into the university’s larger network of galleries, exhibition spaces, and archival resources (Watson Pavilion, Reeves Center, Stanier Gallery, Williams Galleries, Special Collections, University Collections, and others), thereby creating an organized and interconnected University Museum System.

Recommendation No. 22: Hire a director for the new University Museum System. This person would need to have an advanced degree and/or considerable work experience with curation, preservation and display practices, as well as collection documentation and maintenance. The director would also be responsible for creating

\(^{116}\) See [http://teachingwithucah.academic.wlu.edu/about-the-project/](http://teachingwithucah.academic.wlu.edu/about-the-project/). The web-based toolkit allows students and professors to engage objects from UCAH. The goal is “to facilitate the cross-disciplinary use of Washington and Lee’s (W&L) art collection by creating a series of multidisciplinary lesson plans focused on objects in the collection.” Ibid. The project is funded with the support of the Associated Colleges of the South.
a coherent calendar of programming that would link and support all of the display spaces and exhibitions across campus. The new director would oversee docent training, which would be a critical component to a successful museum, and website and social media presence. Finally, this position would interface with campus galleries, University Collections of Art and History, and Special Collections, as well as departments and programs that readily use and teach with material culture, such as History, Classics, Art and Art History, Anthropology, Archaeology, Cultural Heritage and Museum Studies.

C. Interim Changes to Lee Chapel

The commission recognized that it will take time to complete the changes proposed for Lee Chapel and to create a new community gathering space. If the chapel continues to be used in the interim, the university should make several modifications. The portrait of Lee in military garb in the chapel should be replaced by a portrait of Lee in civilian dress. In addition, the fire doors separating the auditorium from the apse should be closed. The Book of Remembrance and the plaque honoring the Confederate soldiers of the Rockbridge Regiment should be temporarily removed during the interim period; if temporary removal is not feasible, didactics should be put in place that will contextualize the objects. In addition, the university should provide guidelines for programming in the chapel during the interim period, and for managing social media connected to the chapel. Finally, in order to avoid commercializing the university’s connection to Lee and the Confederacy, the museum shop should be closed during the interim period.

Recommendation No. 23: Convert an existing campus space (such as Evans Hall) into a functional venue that can host first-year orientation and other mandatory events.

IV. Portraiture

At highly visible points on W&L’s campus, numerous portraits exist in the form of paintings and sculptures. These images are important. As one scholar explains, portraits are powerful objects freeing many from the bonds of mortality. The viewer’s gaze brings the historical figure into the present day. Accordingly, the university should be aware of who is made present and why.

Because the university was founded at a time when educators and students alike were almost exclusively white males, it is understandable that the majority of the portraits and sculptures on campus represent those individuals. However, to limit the imagery in this manner is not consistent with the 20th- or 21st-century history or with

the mission of the university. The following counts from the University Collection of Art and History illustrate the imbalance of portraits currently displayed: there are 153 portraits on display, only 19 of which are of women. The remainder of the images are of white males in their roles as past presidents, donors, trustees or other positions.\textsuperscript{118}

Most notable are the university’s namesakes, with the majority of their portraits displayed in the spaces named for them, specifically Washington Hall and Lee Chapel.\textsuperscript{119} The university has several portraits, bas-relief images, and sculptures to memorialize George Washington’s contributions to the university. Currently, there are 29 portraits of Washington on display in various buildings. There are also two prominent sculptures of Washington — one located at the pinnacle of Washington Hall, and the other in the hub of student life, Elrod Commons.

Lee’s image is also pervasive. In addition to the Pine portrait in the chapel and images of him in the chapel museum, Lee’s photos, portraits and images are displayed in Lee House, Washington Hall, Wilson Hall, Leyburn Library, Copy Services, and on campus signage. The most prominent image of Lee is the Valentine sculpture. In total, there are 17 portraits of Lee across campus.

Another image worth highlighting is the statue of Cyrus H. McCormick, located on the front lawn. The statue was unveiled in 1931 and depicts McCormick holding his lapel while looking across the eastern part of the campus. It is one of the most visible memorials on campus, and also one of the most mistaken sculptures, as McCormick is often taken to be Lee. As the plaque at the base of the memorial explains, the sculpture commemorates McCormick’s invention of the reaper and subsequent gift to Washington College. No mention is made of McCormick’s slave, Jo Anderson, who is known to have contributed significantly to the overall design and conception of the mechanical reaper.\textsuperscript{120}

In sum, the portraits currently on display shape the visual landscape of the campus and work well within the narrative the university has, up until now, projected: a limited history focused on the 19th century.

Recommendation No. 24: Display only portraits of Lee that portray him in civilian attire, not as a Confederate general. Acquire and prominently display portraits — in either 2D or 3D media — that feature individuals who represent the university’s complete history.

\textsuperscript{118} See Appendix E. It should be noted that there are four images mentioned on the list that are representative of other demographics: Martin Luther King Jr., Pocahontas and John Chavis (two).

\textsuperscript{119} See Appendix E.

\textsuperscript{120} \url{https://slavery.princeton.edu/sources/sketch-of-the-mccormick-reaper}
As a starting point for the latter endeavor, the commission suggests consideration of the following:

- **Pamela H. Simpson**: First female faculty member; four decades on the faculty; chaired professor; award-winning art historian.
- **Ted DeLaney**: First African-American chair of a department at W&L.
- **Jorge Estrada**: First four-year international graduate of W&L (Colombian).
- **Lorena Manríquez**: First Latina graduate of W&L (Chilean).
- **Steven Hobbs**: Professor of law from 1981 to 1997; first African-American to receive tenure from the university.
- **William B. Hill**: First African-American member of the Board of Trustees; attorney, judge, double-degree holder from W&L.
- **Leslie Devan Smith Jr**: First African-American to graduate from the School of Law (1969); member of Law Review.
- **Sarah Wiant**: Member of the first class of women to graduate from the School of Law; long-time law librarian and faculty member.
- **Larry Stuart**: Beloved member of Public Safety; W&L established the Larry Stuart Memorial Award for a student who exemplifies Stuart’s character and commitment to the community.
- **Marjorie Poindexter**: First African-American administrative assistant to the secretary of the Board of Trustees; served in an unofficial capacity as an advisor to students, including students of underrepresented backgrounds.
- **Pamela White**: Distinguished attorney; president, Maryland State Bar Association; Baltimore City Circuit Court judge; first alumna to serve on the W&L Board of Trustees.
- **Alston Parker Watt**: First undergraduate alumna to serve on the Board of Trustees; international and national service.

V. Naming Practices

A. Washington and Lee University

---

121 Andrea Lepage, associate professor in the Department of Art and Art History, shared many of the names. She and her students generated a list in the context of her course, Chicano Art and Muralism: From the Street to Staniar Gallery.
The W&L constituencies had begun discussing the name of the institution before the commission was formed, and continued to address it over the past academic year. Many participants in the outreach expressed views on whether the name of the university should change or be retained.

The following are among primary reasons offered for retaining the name of the university.

The name of Washington & Lee University should not change at this time because:

1. Both namesakes made significant contributions that aided the institution in times of real challenge. Washington gave financial help to a struggling school, and Lee helped the college reinvent itself and begin to thrive after the Civil War.
2. The contemporaries of both men found them worthy of being namesakes.
3. Changing the name would not change the institution’s history or perfect its culture, and runs the risk of denying history rather than learning from it.
4. At this time, a significant number of people associated with the university oppose a name change; some of these have proposed alternative ways of improving the school’s ability to attract a diverse faculty and student body.

The school’s name should change at this time because:

1. W&L’s affiliation with its namesakes — particularly R.E. Lee — greatly limits the school’s ability to attract diverse students, faculty and staff. This is a concern, as the school remains one of the least diverse liberal arts institutions in the nation.
2. Other figures in the school’s history would be more appropriate namesakes.
3. The institution has a tendency to portray Lee as a one-dimensional heroic figure, a simplistic portrayal that is inconsistent with the school’s values.
4. Retaining the current name of the university suggests that the community is out of touch with the national tenor and climate.

Recommendation No. 25: The commission recommends that the university not change its name at this time.
The recommendation to retain the name is not passive. Rather, the commission thought that, at this point, efforts are better spent on concrete recommendations about how best to teach and present the university’s history. At this time, the commission believes that W&L can maintain its namesakes while being a relevant, ethical and vibrant 21st-century institution.

B. The Generals

The name of the university sports teams, “the Generals,” sparked a lengthy and wide-ranging dialogue, and commission members were more divided on this issue than on any other. To capture the range of thinking, even partially, is difficult, but the following points, pro and con, emerged in the discussion.

The following are some of the primary reasons offered for retaining “the Generals.”

1. The name has longevity, popularity and a unifying effect. The name has been in place for decades and is immediately recognized by many university constituencies.

2. While most supporters of the name say that it refers to the two generals who are W&L namesakes, other supporters say that “the Generals” no longer is meant to refer to two specific men but is a generic word for leaders.

3. Eliminating “the Generals” from the university’s vernacular would lead to its removal from a number of recognizable programs and systems. Examples include Generals Unity (an organization that works to promote equal rights, justice and opportunity for all members of the Washington and Lee University community, regardless of sexual orientation or gender identity), Generals Alerts (a system that notifies community members about emergencies), Generals Payment System, Generally Speaking (an alumni newsletter), Women in General (an email newsletter highlighting the achievements of alumnae).

4. In its outreach, the commission did not hear a widespread opinion that the name of the teams be changed, and some thought that such a recommendation would require community input focused solely on that issue.

5. Concern was expressed that recommending disposal of “the Generals” would divert attention from the commission’s other proposed initiatives.

In sum, supporters as a whole see the name as a longstanding tradition that is not meant to be exclusionary and is regarded positively by the W&L constituencies.

The following are some of the primary responses to the aforementioned points and rationales for replacing “the Generals.”
1. The team name is a vestige of a past era that accepted its association with the Civil War and celebrated its Confederate-cause identity.

2. The name invokes the namesakes of the university not as educators but as warriors, an image that the commission has tried to minimize in numerous contexts yet not here. Moreover, “the Generals” honors the namesakes as generals, even though in both instances they stopped being generals and became civilians before the start of their relationship to the university.

3. That student groups employ the General mascot and “the Generals” name demonstrates how uncritically the name has been re-used over time. The inheritance and continued use of the name, though not intended to harm, does in fact perpetuate outdated and problematic conventions.

4. Though the name was not a concern discussed widely among students, alumni or staff, the name was a concern among faculty and among some law students.

5. Recommending changing the name of “the Generals” is consonant with the other important initiatives suggested in this report. Moreover, W&L is not the only university who has had to take measures to create less-offensive mascot names: Elon, Amherst, Carthage and Dartmouth are among those that have progressively responded to name changes of their sports teams. W&L is not in a unique position.

In sum, the opponents of retaining “the Generals” believe that it perpetuates a misleading and harmful nostalgia that has long outlived any positive role.

**Recommendation No. 26: The commission recommends that the university not change the name of W&L teams, “the Generals,” at this time.**

**C. The Name of the College**

The commission suggests that the College be named for Professor Pamela Hemenway Simpson, who died in 2012 after four decades on the W&L faculty. Professor Simpson was the Ernest Williams II Professor of Art and Art History. She was

---

122 When Amherst changed its sports teams’ name and mascot, they came up with a clear set of guidelines that emphasized a strong sense of community and inclusiveness.

- Be unifying for the Amherst campus and larger Amherst community;
- Represent positive qualities, ideals or associations around which people can rally;
- Be broadly relevant across the Amherst community, the student body and generations of alumni;
- Be representative of the Amherst experience or history, either generally or specifically;
- Work equally well for women’s and men’s sports teams; and
- Have the potential to translate in a visually pleasing manner.

For more about the process see https://www.amherst.edu/amherst-story/amherst-pride/mascot/submission-criteria

123 See https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2013/12/10/most-colleges-adjust-moving-away-native-american-mascots
twice chair of the Art and Art History Department, and served as assistant dean and then associate dean of the College. She chaired the Co-education Steering Committee, which implemented the university’s decision to admit women. She received an Outstanding Faculty Award from the Virginia State Council on Higher Education, and the Award for Excellence in Teaching from the Southeast College Art Conference. She was co-author of The Architecture of Historic Lexington, and wrote numerous other works. She was a role model for the teacher-scholars of W&L, and her impact on the university was exceptional.

D. Names of Buildings

The names of W&L’s buildings and places speak to its long history, values and mission. Many colleges and universities have initiated processes of reviewing the names of campus spaces.\(^\text{124}\) Consistent with its examination of history and community in this report, the commission has no purpose to mask history or to obscure difficult discussions. Rather it urges the university to recognize that names reflect values, and that the institution itself speaks whenever it names (or re-names) a particular space. The commission’s sense is that W&L should develop a prudent, in-depth approach to questions of naming, and that it should recognize that change of this kind does not amount to erasure.\(^\text{125}\) Change represents a dynamic and forward-thinking institution that is invested in creating an inclusive environment.

To name buildings after individuals is a powerful memorializing practice that demonstrates the history and people W&L values and honors. Several of the buildings on campus are named after W&L presidents in honor of their service, while others are named for those who made generous donations. While these contributions are

\(^{124}\) See, e.g., Yale University’s discussion of Calhoun College and the establishment of criteria for renaming. https://president.yale.edu/sites/default/files/files/CEPR_FINAL_12-2-16.pdf

\(^{125}\) The idea of change not always being associated with erasure comes from the Yale report, which noted that “the University is rightly a guardian of academic freedom. This is so even when, and indeed especially when, academic freedom leads scholars and students … ‘to think the unthinkable, discuss the unmentionable, and challenge the unchallengeable.’ The names on the University’s buildings, however, perform a different function. They do not mark the boundaries of permissible speech on campus. The decision to change a building name is emphatically not a decision to remove a book from a library, change the contents of a syllabus, strike an idea from a course discussion, or rule out a dining hall conversation. In its building names and its campus symbols, the University communicates values, confers honor, and expresses gratitude to those who have contributed to its mission. In other words, the University itself speaks through its building names…When the University speaks, it chooses its message in light of its mission, just as it has chosen its messages for more than three centuries. One of the values the University rightly communicates is the importance of genuine inclusiveness for all those who will make it a leading center for research and teaching in the years to come.” Letter of the Committee to Establish Principles on Renaming, Nov. 21, 2016, Yale University, 3.
important, it is noticeable that currently only four buildings (Evans, DuPont, Chavis [a residence hall], and Watson) are named for women and/or people of color.

Robinson Hall is named for John Robinson, whose gift to the university included enslaved persons. The building itself was financed through the sale of some of those persons.

Recommendation No. 27: Re-name Robinson Hall immediately. The hall’s association with slavery at Washington College — i.e., that the Robinson bequest included enslaved persons who labored at the institution until the institution sold them to others — gives special urgency to this proposal.

Recommendation No. 28: Appoint members of the W&L community to a standing committee to review and recommend the retention, deletion or alteration of the names of campus buildings, programs, departments and other similar entities. The naming committee would establish specific evaluation criteria for the naming or renaming of buildings and spaces. Considerations may include the following principles:

1. Renaming should be an exceptional event and warranted only if the name is indisputably in conflict with the university’s values.
2. Examination of the standards of the namesake’s time and place is relevant.
3. The building or place should play a substantial role in the life of the W&L community.
4. Removing the name should not have the effect of erasing history.
5. Retaining the name should not have the effect of distorting history.

The review process should include:

1. Historical inquiry and research of the person or space under consideration.
2. Community engagement to ensure that students, faculty, staff and alumni have opportunities to participate in the process.
3. Discussion and deliberation by the committee to synthesize research and outreach.
4. Presentation of recommendations to the university president.

During its outreach, the commission received opinions that the number of campus sites named for Robert E. Lee should be examined on the grounds that the multiple uses of his name are unnecessary and overshadow the names of other individuals who played important roles at the university.

Recommendation No. 29: The newly formed naming committee consider renaming three campus buildings named for Lee (Lee House, Lee Chapel, and Lee-Jackson House).
VI. University Store

W&L’s University Store occupies a central place in Elrod Commons. It draws customers from across the campus and steady streams of campus visitors. It serves as a distribution point for academic materials. As an integral part of the campus, does it have any effect on how the institution’s history is taught or presented?

In asking that question, the commission’s interest was not to suggest materials that should or should not be sold in the store. Instead, the commission’s concern was whether the store has over-emphasized the 19th-century aspects of the school’s story, at the expense of its 20th- and 21st-century stories. A newcomer or visitor could conclude from the current front layout of merchandise that the institution is more strongly focused on its namesakes and the Civil War than it actually is. As the face of the institution in Elrod Commons, the store could find ways of more proportionate merchandising of its materials.

Recommendation No. 30: Evaluate whether the store should be more balanced and proportionate in merchandising its 19th-century-related products.

VII. History Walk

The history of Washington and Lee University and its community members is compelling but too little known. University graduates have served in every military conflict in the history of the country. Alumni have included Rhodes Scholars, senators, federal judges, and civic leaders. The campus has hosted renowned speeches, was the childhood playground of singer Patsy Cline, and was the site of a former vice president’s sudden death. Stories abound from every era, but there are few if any accessible mechanisms to tell them. Students, faculty, staff and visitors spend a day, a month, or even years on the campus without gaining more than a cursory knowledge of its history. From the Liberty Hall Ruins to Robinson Hall to the Ruscio Center for Global Learning, the university is uniquely positioned to provide a narrative that reflects the development of the university and the nation itself.

Recommendation No. 31: Construct a guided History Walk to enable all visitors and the university community to learn about the institution’s history by moving around the campus and encountering markers and other sources of information about Washington and Lee, not limited to pre-war and Civil War history, but including 20th- and 21st-century information as well.

The History Walk could make use of a smart phone application (app) that allows visitors to access text, images and video. In a sense, this app would serve as a virtual museum for the university — a place where the school could share and claim ownership of its historical narrative in totality. Using GPS technology, the app could
offer a virtual map that would guide individuals around campus. As they moved, the app would display content based upon location. The app could have various levels of information at each location, allowing individuals to delve more deeply into areas of personal interest. Individuals off campus could also use the app. They would open the app, find a map of W&L, click on buildings and locations, and access the same information that would be presented to individuals doing the History Walk on campus.

The History Walk ideally would offer a complete narrative of the university’s history, from the 18th to the 21st centuries, and include information about namesakes, alumni, university programs, university collections, and university traditions, including the Honor System, the Speaking Tradition, and student self-governance. The university has much to be proud of, and the History Walk should celebrate that.

The History Walk would also engage difficult parts of W&L’s story that have received little recognition in the past. For example, as recounted in Appendix C, the university owned a significant number of enslaved humans; our football team walked off the field rather than play against a team with a black player; and the Board of Trustees did not allow Martin Luther King Jr. to speak in Lee Chapel. These and other narratives are part of our story and could be incorporated into the app. As an institution of higher education dedicated to academic integrity, we have a responsibility to tell this history in its entirety.

The History Walk gives W&L the opportunity to share a fact-based history of the university and a tool to disseminate that information to visitors, students, faculty, staff and anyone who wants to take the time to learn.

If fully realized, the History Walk could be the museum of Washington and Lee. Rather than a physical space, the museum of Washington and Lee would be an interactive experience that uses our campus to tell our story.

We hope that new students, staff and faculty would be given the time and encouraged to spend a few hours using the History Walk. We heard from faculty and staff that there is limited opportunity to learn about the institution, and that it took years on campus to learn about W&L. We hope that the History Walk could accelerate that process, and give faculty and staff a fuller and better understanding of the history of their employer.

Likewise, new students would be encouraged to utilize the History Walk during their first year and beyond, providing future generations of students with a more complete and complex understanding of their university.

The strength of a virtual University Museum is not only its accessible and interactive nature but also its dynamism. As new content is generated or elements of
our history are uncovered, the app could be constantly updated and improved. The app would be designed by professionals; however, students, faculty and staff could have the opportunity to contribute to the content of the app. For example, student projects creating videos about elements of W&L history could be entered into a competition to be featured on the app. Our hope is that the app would be a critical examination of our shortcomings and a celebration of our triumphs.
CONCLUSION

When the commission was formed, its first task was to lead the W&L community in an examination of its history. Commission members have spent the past nine months engaged in research and extensive conversations with members of our community and with each other. It has been a privilege to study W&L intensively and to get to know the university in a deeper way. We have gained a better understanding of the university’s past; its role in education in the United States; and the progression of the institution from a modest grammar school that pre-dates the history of the nation to a 21st-century leader in liberal arts education. There is much cause for institutional pride.

But our assignment was not to catalog the university’s many accomplishments or its positive attributes. We were asked to examine the university critically, and to propose how the university might teach and present its history more truthfully and effectively. This report has focused on areas where the university can improve. As such, it is necessarily critical.

One of the lessons learned was that 12 people could come together from different backgrounds, professions and perspectives, converse honestly and openly for months, and produce a report of this kind.

Another lesson was that the one thing that is constant is the need for change. During our 269-year history, the school has never been satisfied or complacent. That being said, W&L is generally cautious in the way it responds to societal change and acts only after considerable debate and consideration. The issues included in this report have all been raised and discussed by our community for some time. We think now is the time for Washington and Lee to take action.

Martin Luther King Jr. often stated in public addresses, “The arc of the moral universe is long, but it bends towards justice.” He also spoke eloquently about “the Beloved Community,” which he considered “the end goal” of all the great modern movements for justice. These statements reflected a belief in the possibility of progress — as long as people work for it, sacrifice for it, and make it happen. Guided by the mission of developing every student’s “capacity to think freely, critically, and humanely,” W&L is poised to take important new steps and should embrace that opportunity.
APPENDIX A: COMMISSION MEMBER BIOGRAPHIES

The president appointed 12 members, all drawn from the faculty, staff, students and alumni:

Chair: Brian C. Murchison

Brian C. Murchison is the Charles S. Rowe Professor in the School of Law. He graduated from Yale College in 1974 and then spent two years as a Peace Corps volunteer teaching English in Benin, West Africa. He met his wife, Ann, a fellow Peace Corps teacher, in Benin. He returned to Yale for law school and practiced at a firm in Washington, D.C. In 1982, he joined the W&L Law faculty. He administered the Frances Lewis Law Center, the Law School’s research arm, and he co-founded the Black Lung Legal Clinic. His main writings have been about the First Amendment. He has enjoyed teaching in the Law and Literature Weekend Seminars for the Alumni College. He and his wife have three grown children in the D.C. area.

Faculty: Ted DeLaney ’85; Melissa R. Kerin; Thomas Camden ’76

Theodore C. (Ted) DeLaney is a native of Lexington who grew up riding his bicycle on the Washington and Lee University campus. He attended and graduated from Lylburn Downing School in Lexington, when it had grades 1 through 12 and was all-black. In 1962 he did a brief stint in a Franciscan monastery before returning to Lexington in search of a job. He began working at W&L in August 1963, only two months before his 20th birthday. That first year he had a job as a janitor, but the Biology Department soon hired and trained him as a laboratory technician. After working on campus about 17 years, he began taking courses part time, and in 1983 became a full-time W&L student. At the time of his graduation, Ted was 41 years old. Subsequently, he taught United States history at The Asheville School for three years before pursuing a doctorate in American history at the College of William and Mary. Ted was an A.B.D. fellow at W&L from 1991 to 1993 before taking a teaching job at the State University of New York at Geneseo. He joined the W&L history faculty in 1995 and has served a five-year term as department head. Ted’s son and daughter-in-law are both alumni of the W&L Law School. His wife, Patricia, is treasurer of the City of Lexington, an elective office she has held since 1975.

Melissa R. Kerin is an associate professor of art history whose primary field of research is the art and material culture of South Asia from the medieval and modern periods.
Along with a number of articles and chapters, Kerin has authored two books. Her third book project, under contract with Oxford University Press, is an edited volume analyzing the ethical treatment of cultural heritage in the U.S., South Asia and the Middle East. She is currently finishing a manuscript, *Bodies of Offerings: The Materiality and Vitality of Tibetan Shrines*, which received an American Council of Learned Societies Fellowship (2014-15) and Howard Foundation Fellowship (2018-19). Since joining the faculty of Washington and Lee’s Art and Art History Department in 2011, Kerin has taught a range of courses related to the interconnections among art, religion, memory and identity. Kerin holds a Ph.D. in art history from the University of Pennsylvania and an M.T.S. from Harvard Divinity School.

Tom Camden, associate professor and head of Special Collections and University Archives, serves as a steward of Washington and Lee’s documentary heritage. Tom, whose family settled in Rockbridge County in the 1760s, is a 1976 graduate of Washington and Lee with a degree in religion, and holds advanced degrees from the University of Tennessee and the Modern Archives Institute at the National Archives in Washington, D.C. He is a graduate of the Georgia Certified Public Manager Program as well as of the Commonwealth Management Institute, the Office of Public Policy Training at the Center for Public Policy at Virginia Commonwealth University. After 12 years in Virginia state government, Tom returned to Washington and Lee and his current position in January 2013.

Students: Elizabeth Mugo ’19; Daniele San Román ’19L; Heeth Varnedoe ’19

Elizabeth Mugo is a rising senior who calls both Ruiru, Kenya, and Irmo, South Carolina, home. She is a sociology and anthropology major with a double minor in Africana studies and poverty and human capability studies. Elizabeth has served as a member of the University Committee on Inclusiveness and Campus Climate (UCICC), co-vice president and co-president of the Student Association for Black Unity (SABU), a member of the Office of Diversity and Inclusion (ODI) Advisory Board, and an Owings Fellow. As a member and senior intern in the Bonner Program, a co-curricular community engagement program, she has served with various community partners and service organizations such as the Rockbridge Area Community Anti-Racism Effort (CARE), College Access, and the Burish Intern Program at Rockbridge County High School. Elizabeth is also a member of Omicron Delta Kappa (ODK). This past year, Elizabeth held the position of vice president of the Executive Committee, and she now serves as president.
Daniele San Román is a rising third-year law student from Long Island, New York. She holds a B.S. in biochemistry and molecular biology from Pennsylvania State University. Daniele has served as a student representative on the Law School Task Force and as a Kirgis Fellow, providing mentorship and guidance to first-year law students. Throughout her time at W&L, she has served as a hearing advisor and a Law Ambassador, giving tours to prospective students. Daniele was inducted into Omicron Delta Kappa (ODK) this past year.

Heeth Varnedoe is a rising senior from Thomasville, Georgia. Heeth is an economics major and poverty studies minor. For the past three years, Heeth has served as his class's representative to the Executive Committee. Heeth is a member of Kathekon and has served on the Quality Enhancement Plan selection task force. He is also heavily involved in Washington and Lee's Shepherd Poverty Program, where he serves as a pre-orientation trip leader for the Volunteer Venture program. Heeth is a member of Chi Psi fraternity and Omicron Delta Kappa (ODK).

Staff: Mary Main; Trenya Mason ‘05L

Mary Main, the executive director of Human Resources, is responsible for the administration of the university’s compensation and benefit programs, talent management and workforce development, workplace policies and employee relations. She serves as co-chair of the University Committee on Inclusiveness and Campus Climate (UCICC), and as a member of the university’s Employee Benefits Committee, the Retirement Plan Investment Committee, the Steering Committee of the Strategic Plan, and the Diversity Sub-committee of the Steering Committee. Additionally, Mary serves on the Southern U.S. Region Board of the College and University Professional Association of Human Resources (CUPA-HR). She holds a master’s degree in public administration/HR from Drake University and a B.A. from Pennsylvania State University. Prior to arriving at W&L two years ago, Mary served for nine years as assistant vice president for human resources at Bates College in Lewiston, Maine.

Trenya Mason holds a B.A. in political science and Afro-American studies from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill and a J.D. from Washington and Lee University School of Law. She joined W&L Law in 2015 as the assistant dean of Law Student Affairs, where she provides management support and leadership in all areas of law student life and culture, and serves as the primary point of contact for law student-related matters. She currently serves on a number of university committees, including as one of three chairs of the Harassment and Sexual Misconduct Board, on the QEP.
Selection Task Force, on the Strategic Planning Student Life Task Force, on the Campus Kitchen Advisory Board, on the Diversity & First–Gen Working Group, on the Student Affairs Committee, and on the staff search committees. Prior to joining W&L Law, Trenya practiced consumer bankruptcy law in Alexandria, Virginia, and Richmond, Virginia, serving clients in both northern and central Virginia. Trenya’s professional memberships include the Virginia State Bar, the American Bar Association, Corporate Counsel for Women of Color, and the National Association of Law School Affairs Professionals.

Alumni: Cynthia Cheatham ’07; Mike McGarry ’87; Phil Norwood ’69

Cynthia Cheatham graduated with a B.A. in politics and Spanish and participated in the Shepherd Program for the Interdisciplinary Study of Poverty and Human Capability. She returned to her hometown of Washington, D.C., and continued her studies at Georgetown University, receiving an M.A. from the School of Foreign Service with a focus on Latin American studies and government. She has worked in politics and human rights, and currently manages a career development program for underrepresented students in the United States and a similar program based in Latin America at the Society for Neuroscience. As a student at W&L, Cynthia was on the leadership team of English for Speakers of Other Languages, head resident assistant, and vice-president of Delta Sigma Theta Sorority Inc., and received the Holleman Fellowship. As an alumna, she has just completed her fourth year as a member of the Alumni Board of Directors; joined the steering committee for the 2009 and 2017 Black Alumni Reunions; participated on several career panels; and attended the 2018 Women’s Leadership Summit as a facilitator.

Mike McGarry was a member of SAE and founding member and later president of Kathekon during his time at Washington and Lee University. Since graduation, Mike has served Washington and Lee as a class agent, reunion committee member, and alumni admission chair for the Charlotte Alumni Chapter. Mike is a member of the Alumni Board of Directors and the immediate past president of the Alumni Association. Along with four other alumni, Mike helped found the George Maxwell McGrew Scholarship. Mike and his wife, B. Lee, have two daughters, both of whom graduated from Washington and Lee.

Philip Norwood, of Charlotte, North Carolina, received a B.A. with honors in English. He continued his education at Duke (M.A.) and the University of Georgia School of Law (J.D. cum laude). Following several years in the private practice of law, in 1980
Norwood began a career as a commercial real estate executive, serving as CEO of three different development, acquisition, management and leasing organizations. He currently serves as chair of Pacolet Milliken Enterprises, a real estate, alternative energy and infrastructure company headquartered in Greenville, South Carolina. He has served in a number of volunteer positions over the past 30 years at W&L, first as class agent and 25th reunion chair, then as a member of the Williams School Advisory Board. He was elected to the Board of Trustees in 1996 and served for 12 years, the last five as rector. He recently served as co-chair of the Honor Our Past, Build Our Future capital campaign and is a co-chair of his class’s upcoming 50th reunion.
APPENDIX B: OUTREACH

I. Faculty Outreach

In October and November 2017, commission members facilitated eight faculty outreach sessions, including one session with faculty affiliated with the Women’s, Gender, and Sexuality Studies Program. Faculty members responded to the following questions:

1. What are our core values? What elements of our campus reinforce or are in conflict with these values? How could our campus better reflect these values?
2. How do our curriculum, programs and initiatives reflect our core values?
3. What story or stories does our physical campus tell? Are those stories accurate?
4. What images and motifs create discomfort?
5. What specific aspects of the culture of W&L affected your decision to work here, and what specific aspects directly affect your experience here?
6. In what ways do you feel our culture and history affect the experiences of our diverse students, staff and faculty?

A. Common Themes

- The association with Robert E. Lee needs to be examined.
- Lee Chapel has to be repurposed, or a new space should be identified for university gatherings.
- Use the curriculum to provide factual narratives on history.
- Investment in hiring and recruiting a more diverse faculty and student body should be a priority.

B. Faculty Comments and Recommendations

Faculty members provided the most input on the university’s connection to Lee, ways to increase diversity, and how to improve the campus climate and physical spaces.

- The community needs to discuss: Who was Lee? What does it mean to be linked to him? What does “Lee the educator” mean?
- Lee’s name is a barrier, and places on campus should be renamed.
- Ignoring Lee the general and focusing on a narrow band of his life doesn’t work with the wider world.
- W&L needs to de-emphasize Lee, and that would not diminish what is special and loving about this institution.
• Students may pass on applying to W&L because of the name.
• Lee led an army to defend slavery and fought a war over it. That’s enough reason to change the name of the school. What he did after the war pales in significance.
• Solving the issues of the physical campus will be fairly easy, but the question of identity is fraught. What values are involved with the school’s name?
• Don’t rename the university.
• The university has no coherent message about the physical campus, and athletic programs have had to create a narrative for the prospective athletes who tour W&L.
• Does the Robinson slave marker tell the whole story?
• Should the Trident symbol continue to be used? It is mistaken for a swastika.
• “Generals” is a generic term and does not refer to Washington and/or Lee.
• “The Generals” sports name should go.
• Need for honest history — add Southern history that is honest.
• This is an institution that propagates traditions. Many have a strong emotional connection to the university and its current name. Process matters. Deliberate action is necessary and may not happen quickly enough for some people. Fact-finding will separate fact from myth. This takes time, and documenting reasons for change will be important.
• Need to present an honor tradition not rooted in Lee.
• Consider how talk of campus civility and honor is an attempt to encourage conformity and politeness, to stifle dissent.
• Keep in mind there are some things worth honoring.
• Think about what people we want to honor.
• Examine goals. W&L wants to be a cutting-edge institution of higher learning, and to be one mired in its own heritage and history. The two goals are contradictory.
• Making changes may make W&L a target for white supremacists who were in Charlottesville.
• W&L should not worry about angry alumni.
• Changes at W&L must not be superficial.
• Lee Chapel should be renamed “the chapel,” and Lee House should be “the President’s House.”
• The “Recumbent Lee” statue should be separated from the rest of the visible apse of the chapel.
• Lee Chapel should not be used for university events like the Honor System orientation or first-year orientation; it is not a neutral space although is explained as one.
• The name of Lee-Jackson House should change.
• Students absorb Lee as a symbol of honor; stories on campus and how they translate to the world are a problem; the history of presidents on wlu.edu has more paragraphs on the five years of the Lee administration than the other descriptions; students need to have fuller stories.
• The “Recumbent Lee” statue should be removed, and the chapel could be more multipurpose.
• Chapel is too small for university convocation and graduation; need to build a larger space.
• Need for a better university museum than one in chapel; library desires to expand Special Collections.
• Need to tell the history of John Chavis and tell that story as loudly as possible.
• Change the name of Robinson Hall.
• Need for a painting of Lee in civilian dress rather than a military uniform.
• Evans Hall could be used more often to offset use of the chapel.
• The university store is problematic; too many books and items there that do not help W&L’s image.
• W&L needs to increase faculty of color as a means of attracting a more diverse student body.
• Strategy for recruiting diverse students needs to go beyond the QuestBridge Scholars Program. Posse provides the advantage of cluster recruitment and brings campus leaders.
• Faculty cluster hiring should occur.
• Administration needs to diversify at the upper levels.
• Targeting more diverse faculty members means preparing to have a climate where there is less consensus and more contention.
• Need to talk about fraternities and sororities. Eighty percent Greek mitigates against diversity. Students need to have choices about social life. Not enough of an independent student population to make W&L a truly welcoming school.
• Can we add enough diverse students without changing population size? Need to examine the non-diverse population.
• Examine why students of color turn down Johnson full scholarships.
• Need for a more visual display of Robinson slaves; alternate spaces in library for W&L history.
• Shepherd Program is most diverse program on campus; use it as a means of recruiting students.
• Implement curricular changes to address some of our problems, and involve students in those changes.
• More programs like Bonner could change campus culture.
• Call for faculty involvement in Freshman book selection for orientation
• Tie accreditation for the Journalism Department to achieving a more diverse student population.
• A curriculum that promotes diversity.
• Need to consult with other colleges and institutions who deal with issues like W&L — examples of Princeton and Monticello; Monticello’s slave narrative impressed W&L literature students who visited with a professor; Monticello suggested as a possible model.
• Seek funding for recommendations.

II. Staff Outreach

Commission members facilitated 16 sessions with staff over a two-week period and spoke with approximately 160 employees. Staff members responded to the following questions:

1. What are our core values? What elements of our campus reinforce or are in conflict with these values? How could our campus better reflect these values?
2. How do our curriculum, programs and initiatives reflect our core values?
3. What story or stories does our physical campus tell? Are those stories accurate?
4. What images and motifs create discomfort?
5. What specific aspects of the culture of W&L affected your decision to work here, and what specific aspects directly affect your experience here?
6. In what ways do you feel our culture and history affect the experiences of our diverse students, staff and faculty?

A. Common Themes

• W&L tells the story of one man — and the story is not told critically. Stories of Lee are favorable and contained to one brief period of his life, and even those stories are not completely accurate. The campus tells the story of white, male patriarchs.
• Lee Chapel and Museum causes discomfort, and sometimes harm, to members of the community.
• W&L offers wonderful employment opportunities and employees stay because of the people they work with. Employees genuinely care about W&L. They take pride in their work.
• Faculty and staff are moving out of Lexington due to its homogenous population. It does not offer a welcoming atmosphere for diverse employees. LGBTQI community is hidden.
• W&L needs a physical space more conducive to large gatherings of the university community other than Lee Chapel.
• Core values include the Speaking Tradition and unique history.

B. Staff Comments and Recommendations

• The marker at Robinson Hall is inadequate in telling the story of enslaved people and their history and contributions to W&L.
• Confederate flags in the community are inappropriate and shocking.
• The Greek system does little to create or maintain diversity and in fact contributes to a country club environment of W&L.
• The university needs to do more to create a welcoming atmosphere for diverse employees and students, and a stronger infrastructure is needed to retain diverse employees and faculty.
• How can the Honor System not translate to other parts of student life? It is only academic.
• The university store and museum store merchandise need to be assessed.
• The Honor Book signing in Lee Chapel is inconsistent with the mission.
• “The Generals” sports teams convey reverence for their war history.
• Programs and initiatives are about 10 years behind the rest of higher education. W&L is very traditional/cautious in our approach to change. Examine this trend.
• W&L needs a welcome center that invites everyone to learn history accurately and thoroughly.
• Discussions like these are important. People want to discuss contemporary issues and are hungry for the opportunity to convene.
• W&L needs to provide a wider range of social programming.

III. Student Outreach

Commission members held nine sessions with current students, which included members of the Executive Committee, the Student Bar Association, the Black Law Student Association, the College Democrats, the Panhellenic Council, the College Republicans, the Student Judicial Council, the Student Association for Black Unity, and the Interfraternity Council. Additionally, the student members of the commission attended student organization meetings and held weekly office hours in Elrod Commons through the end of March 2018.

In November, commission members emailed the student leaders of 32 organizations for feedback. Responses were requested from students and the organization as a whole and from individual students. Additional responses were received from these groups and individuals:
Students responded to the following questions:

1. What story or stories does our physical campus tell? Are those stories accurate?
2. What are our core values? What elements of our campus reinforce or are in conflict with these values? How could our campus better reflect these values?
3. What images and motifs create discomfort?
4. W&L struggles to attract diverse students and faculty due to lack of diversity. What could be done to greater improve diversity?
5. How do our curriculum, programs and initiatives reflect our core values?
6. What specific aspects of the culture of W&L affected your decision to come here, and what specific aspects directly affect your experience here?

A. Common Themes

- The names of buildings say a lot about the school, but many of these stories aren’t known to most students, so some stories are lost.
  - R. E. Lee is important — he saved the college. It would be disingenuous to remove Lee, but there is more of a presence of Lee on campus than Washington.
  - There is a disconnect between the new and old areas of campus.
  - Few buildings are named for women.
- The markers about the Robinson slaves and John Chavis tell an important and lesser-known story, and more of this is necessary. The markers are poorly placed.
- The normalization of Confederate history on campus and in Lexington can be unsettling.
- Homogeneous architecture reflects the general homogeneity between ethnic and socioeconomic groups on campus.
- Tours are the first and only interaction with W&L history. Conflicting ideas on whether tours are accurate, but agreement that Special Collections is underutilized.
- Law students and undergraduate students have varied experiences and perceptions.
- The Colonnade is the face of W&L.
- Strong sense of community reflected by student self-governance.
• W&L’s academic reputation is a strength.
• There is tension between the ideals and practice of the Honor System.

B. Student Comments and Recommendations

• Having Robert E. Lee’s portrait in a Confederate uniform or a statue of him in uniform is inaccurate to this campus. Lee was not a fan of the Lost Cause.
• Many students see the Greek system as a positive. Yet some question how the community says diversity is a core value, but isn’t acting on it. There are divisions between students fueled by class differences, a predominately white student body, and predominately white Greek system around which social events revolve. This disconnect should be examined.
• Provide support for multicultural and Greek-life independent students.
• W&L is "not unmindful of the future," but is stuck in the past. The emphasis on tradition impedes progress.
• Money is a prerequisite to fitting in, and it’s assumed that every student comes from a similar socioeconomic status.
• Continue emphasis on liberal arts education.
• The movement towards global learning and diversity must be balanced with remembering the past.
• There is freedom to voice your opinion without being attacked. All ideas are welcome, especially in the classroom.
• Having talks in the chapel venerates R. E. Lee — some students don't go to events in Lee Chapel.
• W&L is not always careful in its portrayal of Lee — we shouldn't see him dressed as a general, but as a president.
• “Recumbent Lee” looks like he is being worshipped.
• The bookstore’s Lee paraphernalia shows a lack of understanding of history.
• Holding honor orientation at Lee Chapel is mandatory and unexplained.
• W&L cannot highlight only the positive characteristics of founders and benefactors without also recognizing the negative qualities.
• The campus is covered in whiteness. Commemorate Chavis or John Minor Wisdom. Many of the paintings and photos celebrate the history only of white men, which leads to a bad perception of the school by visiting students.
• Encourage students to attend the great speakers that come to campus.
• Use the curriculum to have tough discussions. Small classes allow for this to happen.
• FDR's should reflect our commitment to diversity.
• Support programs that give student opportunities to learn, and face tough issues and give back.
• Closing the gap between the undergrad and the law school would be beneficial to both.
• Admissions should provide more financial aid and scholarships. Admissions officers should travel to more diverse places.
• Some concluded that diverse students not wanting to attend W&L isn’t a problem, while others thought it was an opportunity for diverse students to positively impact the campus.
• Create greater interactions between groups on campus. The Greek system should be more inclusive with independent community. The student body should make an effort to cultivate an environment that attracts diverse students.
• W&L can’t bring diverse students here and then expect them to do all the work. Students want to go to college, not to have to fight and overcome, but diverse students have to fight every day. Some students don’t fully understand the benefits of a diverse student body.
• There were different perspectives on the university name. Some believe that the name of the school should not change. Alumni would not support a change, and the school would be harmed. Others noted that W&L cannot attract diverse students with Lee in the name.
• Students believe that this is W&L’s opportunity to be an educator and a leader on how to deal with controversial historical figures.

There is division in the student body between the majority and underrepresented groups. Perceptions of culture, history and traditions vary greatly between these students. Many of these opinions are in direct conflict with each other. Overall, the student body generally recognizes a need and opportunity for W&L to increase diversity and inclusion on campus. Students agree that improvements are possible, although opinions range on how this should be done and to what degree.

IV. Alumni Outreach

The commission hosted four alumni calls in November and December 2017. More than 400 alumni registered to listen, and 80 alumni signed up to speak. Each speaker was given three minutes to speak. Each call started with a three-minute overview of why the commission was formed and the process. Callers were asked to follow W&L’s tradition of civility. The speakers generally reflected the demographics of the alumni population in terms of gender and race (i.e. more men than women and mostly white). Participants on the calls represented eight decades of W&L students, from 1946 to 2017.
Although the name of the university was not one of the topics, since this feedback was requested via email, numerous callers mentioned the topic. The majority favored keeping the name; some speakers mentioned that the commission should provide recommendations to serve the best long-term interest of the school — even changing the name.

1. How can we improve the way we teach, discuss and represent our history?
2. How did W&L’s history and culture impact you as a prospective student, and as a student? How do they affect your current engagement as an alumnus or alumna?
3. Washington and Lee has the least-diverse student body among peer institutions, which contributes to the choice of highly qualified, admitted students of all backgrounds to attend other universities. How might we increase diversity within the student body?
4. Are there any spaces (buildings, places, objects) on our campus, or any content on the website or in our publications, that are inconsistent with W&L’s core values of honor, integrity, civility and citizenship in a global and diverse society?
5. What traditions are important to maintain as part of the W&L experience?

A. Common themes

- The work of the commission is important.
- Examine what diversity means. Some view diversity as consistent with the values of the university and specifically want to ensure that race, ethnicity and socioeconomic status are the focus of these efforts. Others believe diversity should not focus on race and ethnicity. Diversity of opinion and other characteristics are more important.
- Important traditions include the Honor System, Speaking Tradition, civility, and honoring Robert E. Lee.
- Academic excellence is a strength. Use this to examine history and create a narrative that is complete.
- Tell a more complete story about Robert E. Lee.
- Many alumni commented on the name, which is further summarized in the email summary.

B. Alumni Comments and Recommendations

- Expand first-year and faculty orientation to include a balanced history of the university.
- Examine history fully and tell it truthfully.
- Utilize Special Collections more in teaching the university’s history.
The university needs to provide resources and spaces that are welcoming to diverse students.

Additional resources to support diversity of faculty and staff.

Financial aid or need-blind admissions are important.

Examine why fraternities and sororities are exclusionary institutions.

The “Recumbent Lee” statue in the chapel is problematic for some, while many others support retaining the current placement.

Include a history class in the core curriculum/FDR.

Build on the university timeline to show W&L influence and roll through all phases of U.S. history — good and bad.

Some callers expressed specific concerns about making sure that racial and ethnic diversity were not the focus of student recruitment, and that there are other characteristics that make a person diverse.

W&L needs to do a better job in enrolling students across socioeconomic groups.

Student culture impacts student decisions to attend W&L. Many view the school as rich, white, Southern and Greek, and this is an environment that doesn’t support people who don’t have these characteristics.

End preferential treatment for children of alumni.

De-emphasize binding early decision.

Fraternities and sororities are institutions of exclusiveness and antithetical to diversity.

Spend more money, effort and time recruiting students from underrepresented racial and ethnic groups, and on recruitment, which can occur in a broader base of high schools.

Lower the cost of the school — no longer a best buy, which means some folks never even look at the school.

Alumni need to be involved — they are our greatest resource.

Need diversity of opinion within the faculty (i.e., need more conservative faculty).

Partner with historically black colleges and universities.

Plaque commemorating enslaved people is small, hidden and inconsequential.

Other relics of Lee that are troublesome are Traveller’s grave, Lee’s office, Lee’s death mask, and images of Lee as a general rather than president.

Enhance numbers of images of people of color or women.

V. Meetings

The commission met with the following as part of its outreach:
The commission received over 400 emails and written submissions from students, faculty, staff, alumni, family and the public. Due to the volume of correspondence, the commission did not provide individual responses and so includes a summary in this report. University communications staff helped categorize the emails to provide the group with a mechanism for reviewing the feedback in an organized manner. The categories included general suggestions, recommended reading and resources, and approaches on receiving input from the community.

Several themes emerged in the communications that gained prominence, in part based on the questions selected to guide the outreach meetings and calls. The name of the university in particular generated significant emails. The commission members charged with alumni outreach requested that any comments on this topic be directed to the inbox to ensure that discussion on other topics would fill the speaking slots designated for each call. Before the commission began formal outreach, discussions were already occurring across the university community on whether the naming of the university would be central in deliberations. The commission did not have a predetermined objective on this topic. After preliminary discussion, the commission...
deemed it necessary to address the topic, because it had already generated significant interest and concern.

More than one third of the electronic communication centered on the name of the university. The majority of the comments affirmed that Robert E. Lee is central to the university; that his name should be retained; and that Lee’s contributions to Washington College after the Civil War are notable, as recognized by the trustees’ decision at his death. There was notable dissent on this contribution. Much of the dissent did not dispute the value of Lee in relation to Washington College. The primary contention was the potential damage to the institution because of its affiliation with Lee. He is more commonly known for his role in leading the Confederate army.

Another topic of significant feedback was the subject of diversity and a discussion on why there was a specific question on this area. The commission did not define diversity explicitly in the question, but did provide further context when requested. In 2017, there were reports that Washington and Lee had the lowest racial, ethnic and socioeconomic diversity among peer institutions, and this data did influence this question. The commission also recognized that geography, religion, gender, sexual orientation, political belief, national origin and disability, among many other categories, contribute to the composition of the students, faculty and staff at W&L. The decision to include diversity as a specific topic was further influenced by its prominence in strategic planning discussions, and the commission concurred that this topic was relevant and necessary. The email responses on diversity are consistent with descriptions in the alumni summary.

Additional themes communicated in the emails include the importance of honor and transparency throughout the process, and a thorough examination of the historical contributions of George Washington and Robert E. Lee to the university at the time that those contributions were recognized. There was significant concern about the university developing an ahistorical narrative to advance a belief about both men. The resounding message was to be critical, deliberative and objective in contextualizing their contributions to the university. The value emerged as well of creating an accurate narrative on how their contributions to the university impact the current campus climate and culture. Lastly, many of the emails asserted that W&L needs to set a standard in the communities of Lexington and higher education with its examination of complex people and histories.
APPENDIX C: ORIGINS AND DEVELOPMENT OF WASHINGTON AND LEE

As noted in the introduction, Appendix C is a suggested first step in gathering facts for inclusion in a full narrative of W&L’s history.

During its outreach phase, the commission heard from many members of the community that a full narrative of the school is currently missing. The following pages do not purport to be that full narrative. The goal of these pages is to offer information that is sometimes left out of the W&L story and should be considered for inclusion as the university truthfully tells its history. An abbreviated version of the appendix is found in Part II of the commission’s report.

I. Founding and Early History

The institution that became Washington and Lee began in 1749 as a small, classical grammar school known as Augusta Academy. Its founder was Robert Alexander, a citizen of Ulster who arrived in America in 1737 as part of the “great migration of the Scotch-Irish to America.”126 With the goal of preparing boys for college and the Presbyterian ministry, Alexander headed the school until the early 1760s.127 In 1776, the school’s trustees, members of the Presbytery of Hanover, appointed 28-year-old William Graham as rector. Graham was born in Pennsylvania of Scots-Irish parents and educated at the College of New Jersey, which would become Princeton University. Graham’s classmates at the College of New Jersey included Henry “Light-Horse Harry” Lee (the father of Robert E. Lee), and his teachers included Dr. John Witherspoon, exponent of the Scottish Enlightenment and signer of the Declaration of Independence.128 Witherspoon influenced the political philosophy of the founding generation, strongly articulating “his anti-tyrannical and anti-English roots in defense of American freedom.”129 During his tenure as president of the College of New Jersey, Witherspoon tutored free black men to prepare them for the ministry. At the same time, he was a slaveholder.130 In Witherspoon, then, we see the “contradictions between a revolution dedicated to liberty and an economic system based on forced labor.”131

127 Ibid., 5.
130 Wilder, 111.
Scholars have highlighted the fact that Witherspoon’s descendants in the South “built their lives and wealth on a foundation of slavery.”132

Under Graham’s leadership, the grammar school in Virginia was renamed Liberty Hall, perhaps due to the intense “revolutionary sympathies” of Graham, the school’s trustees, and the Witherspoon legacy.133 In 1785, the school began to offer college-level degrees, and its course of study included Latin, Greek, classical literature, English literature, moral philosophy, mathematics, geography and natural science.134 Graham, an ardent anti-Federalist, spoke out against ratification of the proposed U.S. Constitution, seeing the plan as an effort to eclipse powers of the state.135 Like Patrick Henry, he urged Virginia not to ratify, but the pro-ratification forces, led by James Madison, prevailed.

Among the students at Liberty Hall towards the end of Graham’s tenure was John Chavis, the first African-American to receive a collegiate education in the United States.136 Chavis was born in 1763 in Granville County, North Carolina, to free black North Carolinians. He was raised near Mecklenburg, Virginia. At age 29, Chavis began studying for the ministry under Witherspoon at the College of New Jersey. On Witherspoon’s death in 1795, Chavis moved to Virginia and enrolled at Liberty Hall Academy. He completed his studies in 1799. Finding him to be “of unquestionably good character and a communicant in the Presbyterian Church,” the Lexington Presbytery licensed him to minister in the church.137 Neither an abolitionist nor a radical, Chavis enjoyed a successful career as minister and teacher in North Carolina. In Raleigh, he established the John Chavis School, which educated black students as well as whites, although in separate classes taught at different times of the day. Prominent whites saw the value of entrusting the education of their children to Chavis; among his students was a future U.S. senator, Willie P. Mangum. Chavis died in 1838.

Liberty Hall’s finances during this period were precarious at best, but the generosity of an unlikely benefactor made a crucial difference. In 1796, George Washington, in his second term as president of the United States, gave the school its first major endowment — $20,000 of James River Canal stock.138 For years, Washington

133 Crenshaw, 11.
134 Robert Goggin Gillespie, “Reverend William Graham, Presbyterian Minister and Rector of Liberty Hall Academy,” University of Richmond Scholarship Repository (Unpublished Master’s Thesis, 1970), 31; see also Crenshaw, 14, 22.
135 Crenshaw, 15.
137 Ibid.; Crenshaw, 22-23.
138 Crenshaw, 26.
had been interested in developing a river route linking the Atlantic to regions of Ohio and Kentucky. The Virginia legislature chartered the James River Co. in 1785 to make surveys and gave Washington 100 shares of the stock “as a means of winning public confidence in the James River project.” Unwilling on ethical grounds to accept the stock as a personal gift, Washington sought a public purpose for the stock and settled on higher education as a worthy recipient.

In Washington’s view, supporting higher education was of prime importance in the new republic. As Washington put it, “The time is ... come, when a plan of universal education ought to be adopted in the United States. Not only do the exigencies of public and private life demand it, but, if it should ever be apprehended that prejudice would be entertained in one part of the Union against another, an efficacious remedy will be to assemble the youth of every part under such circumstances as will, by the freedom of intercourse and collision of sentiment, give to their minds the direction of truth, philanthropy, and mutual conciliation.” When he selected Liberty Hall to receive the gift in 1796, the grateful trustees renamed the school Washington Academy. In 1813, they changed the name to Washington College.

Washington’s vision of education as a universal right, a bulwark against sectionalism, and a search for truth was complemented by Graham’s own practical approach to education as preparation for life. “The aim of education,” Graham wrote, “is to furnish the mind with the knowledge of truth and to open the first principles of science, so that the student may be capable to pursue any business in life he shall afterwards think proper. The knowledge of truth is therefore the principal end of education, and the most proper means of acquiring this knowledge is diligent application.”

While these men were uncommonly forward-looking in defining and supporting the school’s mission, it is notable that, in other areas, they did not go against the grain. Washington was a slave owner for 56 years. At the time of his death in 1799, he owned 123 of the 317 enslaved persons living at Mount Vernon, and his will provided for emancipation of those 123 slaves on the death of his wife. On her instruction, they were emancipated effective January 1801. The will also directed that slaves who were old or in ill health “shall be comfortably clothed and fed by my heirs while they live,”

---
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and that young slaves upon freedom should be taught reading and writing and “some useful occupation.” Washington’s views on slavery will continue to be parsed and debated. One commentator credits Washington at least for seeing that African-Americans were capable of, in Washington’s words, “a destiny different from that in which they were born.” But though he acknowledged slavery’s evil, he chose to tolerate it throughout his life.

As for Graham, although it is unknown whether he was a slave owner, he did not hide his views on slavery. At Liberty Hall, he taught a course, Human Nature, in which he defended slavery on the ground that free blacks would threaten the white population. Both Washington and Graham could have used their position and influence to undermine slavery in their lifetimes; others did in the same historical period. Ironically, the ideas about universal education and citizenship espoused by both men would eventually be used against the institution of slavery and lead to its demise, but it would take another hundred years — and loss of life on a colossal scale — for slavery to end in America.

II. Pre-Civil War

In 1826, a Washington College trustee, “Jockey” John Robinson, left his estate to the college. It consisted of 73 enslaved African-American women, children and men, as well as a large farm on the James River, livestock and a whiskey distillery. Robinson’s will stated that the slaves and property could not be sold for 50 years, although it also provided that the college could sell “such others as may render themselves by crimes or mutinous habits, unsafe or injurious in their connection with their fellows.” Robinson also wrote, “In any disposition which may be made of these slaves and also in their treatment, it is my earnest desire that the strictest regard be paid to their comfort and happiness as well as to the interests of the estate.”

Robinson’s bequests helped the financially suffering college. In 1825, the college had a mere 65 students and a “diminished bank account.” Proceeds from the sale of the Robinson’s livestock, whiskey, distillery equipment and furniture amounted to $4,500. The college also earned money from hiring out some of the enslaved workers. Robinson’s will had consented to such arrangements: “This right is to be exercised upon

146 Ellis, 263; Chernow, 801. According to Chernow, “By freeing his slaves, Washington accomplished something more glorious than any battlefield victory as a general or legislative act as a president. He did what no other founding father dared to do,” 801.
149 https://www.wlu.edu/Documents/president/AfricanAmerican-marker_brochure.pdf
150 Ibid.
a sound discretion and in such manner as to give the negroes who are allotted for hire the alternative of being sold to masters of their own choice.” In 1836, the college sold most of the enslaved people to Hugh Garland, of Lynchburg, Virginia, for $20,674.91. Garland took them to work in the Mississippi cotton fields. The sale of slaves to Garland allowed the college to build Robinson Hall on the Colonnade. Additional sales of enslaved persons took place over the ensuing two decades, probably to local residents. There is documentation that the college still owned three elderly, incapacitated individuals in 1857. School records include names, appraisals and sparse information about the work of the slaves owned by Washington College. “We wonder,” said President Kenneth Ruscio in 2015, “how the men who led this institution at the time not only tolerated slavery but used these enslaved men and women to help maintain and fund a college.”

From 1836 to 1848, the president of the college was an alumnus, Henry Ruffner, a licensed Presbyterian minister, member of the faculty, and two-time acting president of the school. For Ruffner, “the central purpose of education” was the formation of character. Religion must be the chief element of higher education, he declared at his inaugural, but Washington College would not favor a particular denomination. The college “was designed for the education of youth of all Christian denominations” and would offer “the same opportunities to all moral, qualified young men.” As Ruffner put it, if students “are to be drenched with the bitter waters of sectarian bigotry, they must go somewhere else; we eschew the task.”

Ruffner also espoused the end of slavery in western Virginia. A slaveholder himself, Ruffner favored gradual emancipation and removal of blacks from Virginia. He was a member of the Rockbridge Colonization Society, a branch of the American Colonization Society. While the society initially “enjoyed a reputation as a practical alternative to perpetual slavery,” its reputation fell “when it became clear that some of its followers actually hoped to reinforce the system of slavery by ridding the nation of ‘the great public evil’ of blacks not under direct white control, and removing the disturbing influence of freedmen from the vicinity of their slaves.” In 1847, he expressed his antislavery views at a meeting of Lexington’s Franklin Society, a men’s debate club, and he later published the speech in pamphlet form. His argument was
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that slavery was economically harmful — in fact, “pernicious to the welfare of states.”

Religion and union, not slavery, would bring prosperity. Ruffner noted that investment in slavery caused “Virginians [to] neglect manufacturing and transportation,” and that the use of slave labor in agriculture led to the white population’s geographic dispersal, which negatively affected public education. Ruffner’s concern was that extremists on both sides of the slavery argument — fervent abolitionists and extreme pro-slavery advocates — would lead to destruction.

Presbyterian George Junkin succeeded Ruffner. Junkin possessed substantial academic credentials: He had founded Lafayette College in Easton, Pennsylvania, and served as its first president, and later served as president of Miami University in Oxford, Ohio. He had promoted public education in Pennsylvania and had started a school for teachers in that state. Like Ruffner, Junkin was strongly pro-Union, but unlike Ruffner, he was pro-slavery, and his early advocacy had caught the attention even of John C. Calhoun during Junkin’s tenure at Miami University. Junkin’s argument was that the Bible supported slavery; that a slave system was not inherently evil even if it could be administered inhumanely; that abolition would cause even greater problems than slavery itself. The solution for Junkin was “African colonization.” Short of that, he could see only danger ahead for the United States: the abolitionists’ censure of the South was an affront that would tear apart the Union and lead to war. For Junkin, “the Union was more important than the values of antislavery.” In early 1861, he clashed with student advocates of secession; they repeatedly raised a secessionist flag and flouted his orders against it. After Fort Sumter, he found no campus support for his pro-Union convictions. He resigned in May, and the trustees accepted his resignation without dissent. When told of the wartime deaths of his secessionist students, Junkin commented that “all had suffered more or less in consequence of their resistance to the best government which God had ever given to man.”

III. Washington College and Robert E. Lee

Robert E. Lee served as president of Washington College from October 1865 until his death in October 1870. Because President Dudley’s charge to the commission specifically referenced elements of Lee’s pre-1865 career as “starting points for the full
and critical examination of history that it is our role, as an educational institution, to encourage and undertake,”165 the material in this section addresses Lee’s earlier career as well as his contributions to the college.

C. Pre-Civil War: Lee as Soldier and Superintendent

Robert E. Lee was born in 1807, the son of a Revolutionary War hero, Henry “Light-Horse Harry” Lee III, and Ann Hill Carter Lee, a member of a prominent family in Alexandria, Virginia. After an early career as a soldier in the Revolutionary War, governor of Virginia, and U.S. congressman, Henry Lee III was imprisoned for debt and essentially abandoned his family. Ann Hill Carter Lee was reduced to depending heavily on her extended family. Robert E. Lee grew up in Westmoreland County and Alexandria.166 He attended the U.S. Military Academy at West Point, New York, and compiled an exceptional academic record. He graduated second in his class in 1829 and joined the Corps of Engineers.

The corps posted him to numerous assignments in the “rapidly developing West and the industrializing North.”167 But the “seminal event” for Lee was the Mexican-American War,168 in which he served on the staff of General Winfield Scott and gained his first battlefield experience.169 From 1846 to 1848, his wartime record as engineer and advisor earned great acclaim. Scott praised “the gallant, indefatigable Captain Lee” for his “felicitous execution” of duty and for his “science and daring.”170 Lee’s performance “had the maximum impact possible for a staff officer.”171 The war itself was controversial in American politics, with President James K. Polk defending territorial expansion as necessary for the resolution of the dispute over Texas’s border,172 while political rivals such as John Quincy Adams opposed the war as “a shameless land grab that would extend the reach of slavery.”173

In 1852, Lee was named superintendent of West Point, but he did not warm to the routine of academic administration and disciplinary enforcement. The students
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referred to him as the “Marble Model” because of his “reticence and faultless figure.”

From 1855 to 1857, he served as lieutenant colonel of the new Second Cavalry, in Texas. Of the presidential election of 1856, he wrote, “Mr. Buchanan is to be our next President. I hope he will be able to extinguish fanaticism North & South, & cultivate love for the Country & Union, & restore harmony between the different sections.”

D. Lee and Slavery

On her death in July 1829, Robert E. Lee’s mother left 30 enslaved persons to her three sons. The sons “divided this bequest in some way, and Robert hired out some of his slaves and probably sold the others”; by 1835, “he retained only one of the original number.” That person was Nancy Ruffin, “whom he rented to his father-in-law [George Washington Parke Custis] to work on his plantation White House in New Kent County, Virginia.” Nancy Ruffin had three children “whom Lee presumably hired out as well.” In a letter to his wife in 1856, Lee addressed slavery in general: “In this enlightened age, there are few I believe, but what will acknowledge, that slavery as an institution, is a moral & political evil for any Country. I think it however a greater evil to the white man than to the black race.” Lee then added that “the blacks are immeasurably better off here than in Africa, morally, socially & physically,” and that the “painful discipline they are undergoing” was “necessary for their instruction as a race, & I hope will prepare them to better things.” He concluded that only “a wise Merciful Providence” knew “how long subjugation may be necessary.”

In 1857, during Lee’s time with the Second Cavalry, his father-in-law died. Lee was named executor, and he sought temporary leave from the Army. The will bequeathed at least 150 enslaved persons to the Custis heirs (including Lee’s wife) and some 5,000 acres of residences and farms. The will directed the executor to sell certain residences, collect debts, and distribute proceeds to the Custis heirs. Once the executor accomplished the “sales, collections, and distributions,” the executor was “to emancipate all the Custis slaves.” In any case, “emancipation had to occur within five years of the date of Custis’s death.” As executor, Lee was dismayed to learn that Custis had died owing $10,000 to creditors and had left his residences and financial
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affairs in disarray.\textsuperscript{183} Restoring the Custis assets took time, and some of the Custis enslaved persons accused Lee of inventing the five-year provision and disobeying the will’s intent that they be freed quickly.\textsuperscript{184} On at least two occasions, Custis enslaved persons attempted to escape, were tracked down, and were forced back to the Custis lands. Evidence also exists that Lee “subjected several to the lash” in 1859. One accusation was that Lee ordered the whipping of three escaped enslaved persons; personally whipped one of them, a woman; and ordered that brine be applied to their bloodied bodies to increase the pain.\textsuperscript{185} One account of this was published anonymously in a New York newspaper, and a second account was given in 1866 by Wesley Norris, one of the three recaptured persons.\textsuperscript{186} Lee denied mistreatment of the enslaved persons but “never completely denounced the story.”\textsuperscript{187} Historians continue to discuss this alleged incident.\textsuperscript{188}

Lee had considered retiring from the Army and becoming a full-time planter, but once his father-in-law’s debts were paid and residences put in order, he returned to the Army. The two years he spent as a “major slave holder” executing the will “soured Lee on the system.”\textsuperscript{189} His attitudes about slavery and race continue today to be examined and debated. One interpretation — perceptive even if not definitive — holds that “Lee declined either to defend the institution [of slavery] completely or to work to destroy it. Instead he chose to distance himself and to accept an elaborate middle ground that acknowledged its faults, but justified its existence. Lee seems to have thought that laws and social customs might protect both slave and master from any excesses.”\textsuperscript{190} Lee “never made the transformational leap that would recognize the fundamental human nature of the slaves.”\textsuperscript{191}

\textit{E. Lee and the War}

Lee served in the U.S. Army from 1829 until the Civil War began in 1861. Several years before the war, as sectional strife over slavery gripped the country, Lee expressed commitment to the Union: “I know no other country, no other government, than the United States and their Constitution.”\textsuperscript{192} In 1861, his “thinking became increasingly
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In March, President Abraham Lincoln promoted him to full colonel, and again he swore allegiance to the U.S. But when Virginia seceded from the Union, and he was offered command of U.S. forces, Lee was forced to make up his mind. He rejected the offer, resigned his U.S. commission, and accepted command of the Virginia forces that became part of the Confederate Army. At the time of secession, there were 13 Southern full colonels in the U.S. Army. Ten remained loyal; only Lee and two others became Confederates. He commanded the Army of Northern Virginia and eventually served as general-in-chief of all Confederate forces.

Early in the war, late 1861 and early 1862, Lee was criticized in the Southern press for his reluctance to engage Union forces in western Virginia. Many thought him timid and inexperienced. But subsequent victories in the Seven Days battles and Second Manassas, and in Chancellorsville in May 1863, won him near-adulation throughout the South. Pro-Lee fervor remained high even after the defeat at Gettysburg in July 1863. Scholars are divided in assessing Lee’s skills as a military leader, particularly his use of offense-oriented operations, which often produced victories but resulted in many casualties among his own men. A chapter in the war that remains disturbing is the Battle of the Crater, “a botched Federal attempt to breach the Confederate lines at Petersburg in July 1864.” A Union regiment had dug a 511-feet-long mine shaft beneath Confederate lines and filled it with 320 kegs of gunpowder. The Union’s plan was to set off a massive explosion beneath the Confederates, thus opening a hole in Confederate defenses and setting in motion the conquest of Petersburg. The explosion occurred, but Union forces were slow to seize the advantage. They entered the crater, where the Confederates counter-attacked and took prisoners, including a division of United States Colored Troops. Even after the latter prisoners surrendered, Confederate soldiers killed them with bayonets and musket fire. Lee “made no comment that has survived regarding this murder of prisoners by his troops.” One historian notes that the shocking slaughter “had to have been known to
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the commanding general,” and questions how Lee’s silence could be reconciled with a concept of honor.

With the eventual Union conquests of Richmond and Petersburg, and Union forces surrounding the depleted Confederates near Farmville, Lee faced the decision whether to surrender. He knew that Jefferson Davis was committed to prolonging the war through guerrilla actions. Although Lee himself “had thought about a guerrilla alternative to surrender,” he believed “from the beginning” that the South’s “best chance lay in decisive victories in conventional battle.” Lee “feared anarchy far more than Yankees, and his concern for the social order” predominated. He also rejected General James Longstreet’s idea of a possible escape. On April 9, 1865, Lee surrendered to Ulysses S. Grant at Appomattox. The terms of the surrender granted parole and precluded trials for treason. Months later, he signed an amnesty oath, swearing to “protect and defend” the Constitution and to “abide by and faithfully support all laws and proclamations which have been made during the existing rebellion with reference to the emancipation of slaves.” The oath was a necessary condition of receiving a pardon, and it signaled the importance to Lee of “participating in the rights of citizenship.” In the period that followed, Lee told young men: “[G]o home, all you boys who fought with me and help build up the shattered fortunes of our old state.” To others he said that their obligation now was “not to keep open the sores of civil war but to follow the examples of those nations who endeavored to obliterate its marks.”

Nevertheless, in the year after Appomattox, a “bitter and protracted contest” began in the country at large over “what exactly was decided that April day.” Controversy raged over whether Congress should enact federal civil rights legislation, including protection of African-American citizenship. The law was passed, and Congress overrode President Andrew Johnson’s veto.

F. Lee as President of Washington College
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The trustees of Washington College met on Aug. 3, 1865, and voted to appoint Lee as president of the college. When Lee took office, “Washington College had been ransacked by General David Hunter’s forces and was reduced to forty students.”\(^{211}\) The college “had essentially degenerated into a prep school,”\(^ {212}\) and “the faculty had not been paid in years, and the school was perilously in debt.”\(^ {213}\) Lee’s contributions during his short, five-year term began with re-imagining the purpose of higher education in the South and expanding the curriculum accordingly. He brought the new idea “that education could in fact prepare young people for life in the world, beyond service to church or state.”\(^ {214}\) He also incorporated a local law school into the institution and raised badly needed funds. In signaling that the war was over, he influenced the character of the students who studied at Washington College and Virginia Military Institute during his presidency.

1. **Honor System**

The Honor System at Washington College preceded Lee’s term as president. According to detailed research on the history of the Honor System by Professor John M. Gunn in 2003-04, the university “has had an Honor System continuously from the mid-1840s or possibly earlier.”\(^ {215}\) A letter from a member of the Class of 1844 describes an honor system “whose standards were much like the Honor System” of the present day.\(^ {216}\) The minutes of the faculty first refer to an honor system in 1850. Professor Gunn concludes it likely that the faculty administered the system originally, and that primary responsibility for administering it shifted to the student body after the 1857-58 academic year.\(^ {217}\) Lee became president in 1865 and stated, “We have but one rule — that every student must be a gentleman.”\(^ {218}\) As Blaine Brownell states, “Lee did not impose a full-fledged, formal honor code on the campus” but “voiced the expectation that all students and faculty should think and behave as ‘gentlemen,’ which by his definition encompassed the qualities of personal honor, fairness, and civility.”\(^ {219}\) After 1867, it appears that exclusive responsibility for administering the system passed to the student
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body. In 1905, “its administration was placed in the newly formed Executive Committee of the Student Body of Washington and Lee University.”

Professor Gunn suggested four specific contributions to the system that he thought could be fairly attributed to Lee:

a. “The force of his own exemplary personal integrity and character;

b. “Personal commitment to the system and its noble purposes;

c. “Placement of authority for its administration primarily in the student body;

d. “Promotion of a policy increasing students’ responsibility for their own behavior.”

Lee elaborated on honorable conduct in a document that biographer Emory Thomas states was found in his papers after his death. The document states: “The power which the strong have over the weak, the magistrate over the citizen, the employer over the employed, the educated over the unlettered, the experienced over the confiding, even the clever over the silly — the forbearing or inoffensive use of all this power or authority, or a total absence from it when the case admits it, will show the gentleman in plain light. The gentleman does not needlessly or unnecessarily remind an offender of a wrong he may have committed against him. He can not only forgive; he can forget. And he strives for that nobleness of self and mildness of character which impart sufficient strength to let the past be past.”

The university’s “commitment to the highest standards of honor and integrity” has had an immense practical effect on the institution. As Barry Sullivan, former dean of the School of Law, described it: “Because of [the Honor System], we are able to live in a pervasive atmosphere of trust. That is good. We live, after all, in a larger world in which it is fashionable to trust no one. And the larger world is poorer for that. This community’s commitment to honor is our most obvious and central tradition.”

President John Wilson thought that the Honor System’s strength was its unspoken presence in daily life: “I believe this impact is measured not by the investigations or by the hearings or still less by the convictions, but by the quiet, united observance of the personal integrity doctrine that we don’t even see because it’s happening every night in
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study rooms or in the library or wherever the temptation to take a shortcut might found and is resisted.”

As stated on the university website, “Each new generation defines the Honor System by its actions and the behavior it deems dishonorable. At Washington and Lee, dishonorable conduct is not codified; rather, the Honor System is based upon the principle that any action deemed a breach of the community’s trust will be considered an Honor Violation.” The Honor System remains under the authority and enforcement of the student Executive Committee, which explains it during orientation to incoming students, both law and undergraduate, at the beginning of each academic year. The setting for this orientation is usually Lee Chapel (although law student orientation in recent years has shifted to Lewis Hall). The use of the chapel for this purpose is discussed in Part II of this report.

2. Curriculum

From its earliest days, the school that became Washington College was dedicated to classical education. Lee was aware that veterans of his army would need other tools than Latin, Greek and English literature. As president, Lee “wanted to blend the practical nature of an engineering course at West Point with the enlightened aesthetic of Ovid.” A “Report of the Faculty” signed by Lee and the professors and submitted to the trustees in 1867 set in motion a “practical reconstruction” of the academic program. With an insistence on academic excellence, the plan provided that the new curriculum would include modern languages, chemistry, advanced mathematics, natural history, and mining engineering. In addition, Lee proposed the annexation of the Lexington Law School and raised the possibility of courses for printer-journalists. “The great object of the whole plan,” Lee wrote, “is to provide the facilities required by the large class of our young men, who looking forward to an early entrance into the practical pursuits of life, need a more direct training to this end than the usual literary courses.” Wrote one commentator, “The boldness of the step was astonishing. It was a leap in the dark, with a prayer and a hope.” The trustees approved the reforms and new faculty positions in applied mathematics, modern languages, natural and experimental philosophy, and moral philosophy. In a continuation of planning the
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following year (1868), the faculty proposed offering “the broadest and most thorough
development to the practical and industrial sciences of the age.”\textsuperscript{234} In 1869, the trustees
approved adding political economy and international law to the chair in history, thus
adding “social sciences” to the curriculum.\textsuperscript{235}

3. **Fund-raising**

Although the college had been in financial free fall when Lee arrived, it rebounded during his tenure; by 1870, it was “in relatively good financial condition for a southern institution.”\textsuperscript{236} During his tenure, “the number of students quadrupled,”\textsuperscript{237} “hailing from twenty-two states.”\textsuperscript{238} One of President Lee’s projects was to “strengthen the financial base” of the institution.\textsuperscript{239} He participated in a successful fund-raising approach to inventor Cyrus McCormick, who eventually donated $20,000.\textsuperscript{240} Out of respect for Lee, philanthropist George Peabody donated $60,000 for a professorship and bequeathed a legal claim to the college that eventually netted $250,000.\textsuperscript{241} Mr. and Mrs. Warren Newcomb also contributed generously, and after Lee’s death, Mrs. Newcomb contributed funds for the building of Newcomb Hall.\textsuperscript{242}

4. **Lee’s Views and Actions on Race during His Presidency**

In February 1866, the 39th Congress’s Joint Committee on Reconstruction called Lee to Capitol Hill to testify as a witness.\textsuperscript{243} The point of summoning Lee was to “gauge the disposition of former Confederates toward the federal government,”\textsuperscript{244} which was then debating Reconstruction issues, including full citizenship for black Americans. Lee testified, “I do not know of a single person who either feels or contemplates any resistance to the government of the United States, or indeed any opposition to it.”\textsuperscript{245} When asked whether the South wanted “peace or to regain their lost power,” Lee said that he was “not inclined to separate the two points.”\textsuperscript{246} When asked about race relations, he repeated his stance that he had favored “gradual emancipation”; that he supported black education; that blacks were “not as capable of acquiring knowledge” as
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whites, although “some [are] more apt than others”; that he was against black enfranchisement at the present time because “they cannot vote intelligently”; that blacks working for their former masters were “well-treated”; that Virginia would be a better place if blacks were removed from the state. A similar view about race was contained in a statement signed by Lee and other Democrats before the elections of 1868 — that, “at present, the negroes have neither the intelligence nor the other qualifications which are necessary to make them safe depositories of political power.”

A Freedman’s Bureau opened in Lexington in 1866. The Bureau of Refugees, Freedmen, and Abandoned Lands was a federal agency within the U.S. Department of War and provided various forms of assistance to blacks in the aftermath of the Civil War. When the bureau sent teachers to Lexington, they encountered resistance. Some in the town, including Washington College students, apparently engaged in threatening behavior towards teachers and students at the bureau’s school. Two documented racial confrontations led to violence. While Lee “apparently dismissed the worst offenders,” disciplinary measures against others were weak, and “the provocations did not end.”

5. Death of Lee, Re-Naming of the College, and Unveiling of the “Recumbent Lee” Statue

Lee died of a stroke in Lexington on October 12, 1870, and his funeral took place three days later. The event drew many dignitaries who eulogized the valor and honor of Lee as a hero of the Confederacy. The same day, “a large number of ex-Confederate soldiers assembled in the courthouse at Lexington” and created the Lee Memorial Association, which would organize planning and funding of a monument to Lee. Before the end of that month, the Washington College trustees announced that the new president of the college would be Robert E. Lee’s son, General G.W. Custis Lee, then a
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professor at Virginia Military Institute. The trustees simultaneously announced the renaming of Washington College as Washington and Lee University.²⁵⁶

The Lee Memorial Association then asked Lee’s widow, Mary Custis Lee, “to indicate her preference in regard to the monument to be erected by the Association.”²⁵⁷ Mrs. Lee suggested a sculptor, Richmond-born Edward V. Valentine, who had “modeled a bust of General Lee from life” the previous summer.²⁵⁸ “After examining a number of drawings and photographs of celebrated works of art,” Mrs. Lee suggested “a suitable design”: a “recumbent figure of General Lee lying asleep upon the field of battle.”²⁵⁹ In June 1871, Valentine presented — and the association approved — a model of the proposed statue of Lee in military garb, recumbent on a Civil War battlefield. Valentine completed his work in April 1875. The statue was transported to Lexington and put in storage, pending the construction of a new space for display. It was decided that the space be a rectangular apse and stone crypt built at the rear of the chapel. The new space and statue were unveiled to the public in 1883, 13 years after Lee’s death. The Memorial Association’s contemporaneous account described the space and statue as “a solemn and tender memorial of the warrior who rests in peace beneath.”²⁶⁰ The focus of the occasion was Lee the warrior rather than Lee the educator, although his accomplishments as president were described and praised. By the Memorial Association’s estimate, between 8,000 and 10,000 persons attended the unveiling ceremony, including Confederate Army and Navy veterans, governors of the Southern states, executive and judicial officials of Virginia, and Virginia members of the U.S. Congress.²⁶¹

6. The South and the Lost Cause

In the wake of crushing defeat, some Southern leaders after the Civil War looked for solace in selective memory of the war, its causes, and its meaning. They spoke of a noble “cause” that had been lost.²⁶² Some began “to remember the past in the best possible light by exorcizing parts of it.”²⁶³ As Brownell explained, the campaign amounted to a “southern effort to reclaim regional pride and overturn the political and
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social consequences of Reconstruction.” By the time of the unveiling of the statue of Lee as general in 1883, 13 years after Lee’s death, the Lost Cause narrative of Southern history used religious terminology. During the ceremony, Lee was extolled as a “priest of his people,” a Christ figure, the equivalent of King Arthur, the “flower of knighthood,” the leader of a “cause now perished.” The South itself was seen as sacred, and “history assumed the function of myth.”

The chapel remained a symbol of the Lost Cause. In the 1920s, a controversy arose over whether to enlarge the chapel. The university president (Henry Louis Smith) and the national leadership of the United Daughters of the Confederacy proposed “a complete reconstruction of the old chapel” due to concerns about its size and functionality, but a local UDC chapter opposed the change. The opponents argued that the chapel was “a most holy possession” and should not be altered. A Lee family member supported the opposition and asked the trustees to “spare, keep, and guard the chapel, for in spite of Dr. Smith the chapel is the shrine and not the tomb and mausoleum alone.” After a lengthy debate, the opposition prevailed, and the proposed changes were abandoned. As W&L art historian Pamela Simpson wrote, the chapel was seen as “sacred, the Shrine of the South, from its association with Robert E. Lee.”

Later in the 20th century, the chapel was the site for Founders Day and other university-wide events at which attendance was expected. Some objected that the chapel was racially alienating — specifically, that the central placement in a church-like setting of the recumbent statue, the nearby portrait of Lee in military garb, and the

---

264 Brownell, 11.
265 Gallagher, 4. The Virginia Ordinance of Secession had explicitly declared that the federal government had perverted its powers “not only to the injury of the people of Virginia, but to the oppression of the Southern slaveholding States.”
266 “Address of John W. Daniel,” in Ceremonies Connected with the Inauguration and the Unveiling of the Recumbent Figure of General Robert E. Lee. For an account of this occasion, see also Lloyd A. Hunter, “The Immortal Confederacy: Another Look at Lost Cause Religion,” in The Myth of the Lost Cause and Civil War History, 191-92.
267 Hunter, 205.
269 Ibid.
270 Ibid.
accompanying display of Confederate flags communicated that the university supported — or at least was indifferent to — the quasi-religious veneration of a Confederate general and the pro-slavery values of the South at the time of the Civil War. Community members who knew that the university intended no such message were still concerned that the chapel was prone to such obvious criticism. In 2014, after African-American law students protested that the display of replica Confederate flags was inappropriate for the site, “the University removed them, thereby returning the statue chamber to its originally intended design.”271 As the university continued to seek a more racially integrated student body and faculty, and invited prospective students and faculty to visit campus, the chapel faced continuing criticism that it lacked sufficient contextualization and conveyed an unfortunate message, intended or not, that could deter potential students and faculty from joining the community.

IV. Washington and Lee University in the Modern Age

The complexities of the university’s 19th-century story have tended to crowd out the modern story of Washington and Lee. Although the contributions of Graham, Chavis, Ruffner, Lee and others are significant, and although it is necessary to examine and explore what they said and did, they do not compose the university’s entire story. Far from it. The school’s 20th-century experience — of challenge, struggle and gradual but steady progress as an academic institution and community — is also rich and essential information. Even more directly than the 19th-century story, the modern history of W&L relates to the institution we are today and points to where we may want to go next.

A. Persistent Issues of Race and Diversity

As Blaine Brownell’s recent book acknowledges, W&L in its early-20th-century history “was hardly a bastion of social reform or racial progress.” Three different moments reflected racial attitudes of the school. First, in the fall of 1923, the football team was to play Washington and Jefferson University, and the W&L team traveled to Pennsylvania for the game. One of Washington and Jefferson’s halfbacks was an African-American, Charles West. As Brownell explains, “Following the standard practice for southern institutions at the time, W&L reached — or thought it had reached — a ‘gentleman’s agreement’ (not stated in the contract between the two schools but nonetheless a condition for W&L’s participation) that West would be held out of the game.”272 But Washington and Jefferson, guided by a new coach, John Heisman, kept
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West in the starting line-up. A W&L administrator decided that the game would not be played, and W&L “left the field.” A furor ensued, and W&L fans were pelted with rotten fruit and insults. Later, the decision not to play was applauded by the W&L Executive Committee of the Student Body and garnered wide faculty support. By 1950, the policy of not playing teams with black players was still in force, and Brownell’s book does not say when the practice stopped.

A second moment occurred in the fall of 1961, when the student executive committee of the University Christian Association wanted to invite the Rev. Martin Luther King Jr. to speak to the Seminars in Religion Program. The student group sought advice from the Faculty Committee on Christian Work, and that group voted to extend the invitation. The trustees decided, however, to decline the request to invite King “as not being in the best interests of the University.” The faculty then adopted a resolution expressing regret at the trustees’ decision. Later the trustees declined to reconsider their decision, and the faculty gave itself new authority for decision-making about speakers, leading to “loosening of restrictions on invited speakers.” In 1966, the trustees “decided to take no further action to control outside speakers on campus and to leave such matters to the discretion of the faculty and its committees.”

The remaining issue was the largest: integration. When would the university open its doors to African-Americans and other persons of color? The university had taken the road of silence, watching while peer institutions either decided to open admissions to African-American students or moved in that direction. Finally, in 1964, the trustees acted. Without directly stating that the board had determined to admit students without regard to race or color, it “approved an official statement reaffirming that admissions decisions were left to the faculty.” The statement “noted that no board resolution or provision existed that ‘established a policy of discrimination among qualified applicants for admission’ and that faculty had traditionally decided on qualifications for applicants.” A stronger statement was not forthcoming then or in 1966, and the task of articulating a policy and carrying it out was left to the faculty. The first African-American students (other than John Chavis two centuries earlier) at W&L — Dennis Haston in the College, and Leslie Smith in the School of Law — arrived in the
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fall of 1966. But few plans or provisions had been made for bringing black students into the heterogeneous white student community, thus ensuring a difficult experience for the first to matriculate. Nevertheless, Leslie Smith achieved high academic distinction: He was named to the Washington and Lee Law Review, a student-edited scholarly journal whose staff qualify for positions on the basis of high grades. (Some 40 years later, Brandon Hasbrouck achieved the distinction of being elected editor in chief of the Law Review, becoming the first African-American to head the scholarly journal. Hasbrouck will return to W&L Law in the fall of 2018 as a visiting assistant professor of law.)

For the more than 50 years that have passed since Dennis Haston and Leslie Smith arrived on campus, administrators, faculty and some in the student body have expressed concerns about W&L’s limited success at recruiting faculty and students of color. In 1968, President Robert Huntley called for new efforts to build “a diverse student body and faculty where members may share in common only the ability and conviction to learn from another.” At times, these concerns have generated initiatives that garnered support from important segments of the W&L community. One example from the late 1990s stemmed from an initiative of the late former trustee and alumnus, Tom Shepherd. The Shepherd Commission included trustees, administrators, faculty, staff and students. Professor Ted DeLaney became a member of the Shepherd Commission, and Associate Dean Courtney Penn chaired one of its main committees. The objective was to find a means of recruiting a more diverse student and faculty population.

Much time and energy went into this endeavor, which received two major boosts by two unfortunate racial incidents that occurred during the academic year 1999-2000. The first incident occurred before classes began, when two first-year students visited the Kappa Sigma fraternity house, the former home of Zeta Beta Tau, a Jewish national fraternity. One student was Jewish, and the other was Italian-American. A senior in the house offended the students by stating that persons of certain races, religions and sexual orientation were not allowed in the house. Parents of the Jewish student quickly withdrew him from W&L. The second incident occurred when the Idaho delegation for Mock Convention appeared in T-shirts that offended both black and women students.

These actions prompted the trustees in 2000 to form an ad hoc committee to examine issues of diversity and inclusion. The committee made five recommendations to the board: “Enhance the staff size in admissions to help in recruiting a more diverse student body; develop more aggressive searches for law and
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undergraduate faculty searches; add ‘sexual orientation’ to the University’s non-discrimination statement; develop a public statement of commitment to diversity, assuring an open and welcoming community for all; and create a physical memorial to John Chavis.” 284 In the fall of 2000, the board voted to add sexual orientation to the non-discrimination statement. By that addition, W&L ceased being “the only top-20 national small liberal arts institutions that did not include sexual orientation in its non-discrimination statement.” 285

Also in 2000, the faculty formed a task force on diversity. The task force introduced resolutions in faculty meetings in early 2001 that requested funding for affirmative recruitment of faculty and students. These resolutions established goals and urged the board “to consider all additional means for raising financial aid revenues for the explicit purpose of fulfilling these shared commitments.” 286 For several years, affirmative recruitment of students seemed to work. Conversely, affirmative recruitment of faculty members, requiring deep commitment by individual departments, saw little progress. For whatever reasons, increasing the numbers of African-American students and faculty has not been successful. A third resolution adopted by the faculty focused on campus climate, with the goal of creating a more welcoming and comfortable academic and social atmosphere for all students. In 2017, the Strategic Planning Steering Committee’s Subcommittee on Diversity and Inclusion reviewed this history, called for new energy and vision, and produced a number of specific recommendations, including enhanced support for diverse students on campus, substantial investment in recruitment of faculty and staff, and increased support for the Office of Diversity and Inclusion. 287 Two key initiatives are a multicultural residential house on campus, projected for next academic year, and a Center for Multicultural Enrichment, to be located in Elrod Commons, which is envisioned as a “much-needed hub of activity for diverse students.” 288

But much remains to be done to address the facts cited by President Dudley in his 2017 letter to the President’s Society: “We remain the least racially diverse of the best liberal arts institutions. And the percentage of our first-year students eligible for Pell grants — the most commonly reported measure of economic diversity — was the lowest among the top 150 schools in the country in 2015.” As John David Maguire, former president of the Claremont University Consortium and Claremont Graduate University, and a W&L alumnus, wrote almost two decades ago about attracting more students of color: “Washington and Lee students deserve the diversity of experience, of
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multiple perspectives, of learning how to live together amicably and to delight in each other’s company that a genuine interracial, multicultural student body provides. Human diversity is indispensable for improving and sustaining the quality and texture of a top-flight educational experience.”

Maguire called diversity “the mark of a world-class education,” and he stated that “Washington and Lee has yet to reach the enrollment of diverse students of color that other top-flight colleges have achieved and that, to remain tops, the future will require.”

The history of failed efforts to diversify the university raises a number of questions: Is it possible to recruit and admit a critical mass of African-American students at W&L? Will a critical mass of black students result in a better climate for African-American students? Does Robert E. Lee’s name and Confederate commemoration at W&L deter the recruitment of African-American students? Does it deter faculty recruitment? Does the absence of additional black faculty members affect recruitment? The answers to these questions must be pursued, hopefully in the spirit of George Washington — specifically, his belief in education as a “universal” right, and his vision of education as assembling “the youth of every part under such circumstances as will, by the freedom of intercourse and collision of sentiment, give to their minds the direction of truth, philanthropy, and mutual conciliation.”

It should be added that other groups have experienced their own challenges at W&L. For example, Brownell chronicles the mixed history of Jewish students. The early part of the 20th century saw promising enrollment rates for Jewish students. In 1929 there were 54 Jewish students, approximately 8 percent of the student body, and that relative representation continued through the 1950s and likely through the 1960s. Two historically Jewish fraternities existed on campus, while the remaining fraternities were restricted by national charters to exclusively white Christian male membership. In the early 1970s, those restrictions were removed, and the college’s fraternities were free to admit non-Christian and non-white members. This change imperiled the viability of the existing traditionally Jewish houses of Zeta Beta Tau and Pi Epsilon Phi. They first merged with one another but eventually quit functioning due to a lack of members. As a result, the number of students identifying as Jewish experienced a strong decline throughout the remainder of the 20th century, and coeducation had no effect on that development.
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In 2003, the trustees called upon the deans of Admissions and Student Affairs to develop a plan to reverse the trend. In the deans’ report, the absence of a local synagogue and community center to celebrate Jewish faith and culture was identified as a strong disincentive to prospective students as well as faculty and staff. The trustees decided to create an on-campus Hillel House to meet these needs, not only for W&L students and faculty but also for Jewish people within the greater Lexington community. This project was to be completely funded by donations. Approximately half came from the board members, with most of the remainder given by Jewish alumni. W&L built a $4 million building beside the Episcopal Church on Washington Street, near the heart of the campus, and the building was dedicated in early 2009. The campus community embraced the new facility, and it is widely credited with helping improve Jewish recruitment at W&L. Efforts to encourage the growth of this element of diversity continue, although it should be noted the Jewish student population has yet to reach the level noted nearly 100 years earlier.

B. Coeducation.

In 1983, at the start of President John Wilson’s tenure at Washington and Lee, the university began in earnest to explore admitting women as undergraduates. The university spent nine months studying the issue and consulting with W&L constituencies. The debate was, to say the least, thorough and impassioned. Wilson saw coeducation as critical to “maintaining the quality of this place, which is its distinctive feature.” He also saw coeducation as a key to improving academic standards, remaining competitive, developing a healthier social environment on campus, and preparing graduates for a changing world. Others opposed the admission of women on the grounds that it would change the school unalterably. When the trustees voted on July 14, 1984, to adopt coeducation, they took one of the most consequential steps in the modern history of the university. In a statement that day, Rector James Ballengee said that the board, having heard a steady stream of views on both sides of the issue, “attempted to place those judgments in the larger context of continuing change in American society and in the widening responsibilities assumed by talented women of our time.” Professor Pamela Simpson recounted the nature of the process leading up to the vote: “As you try to retell the story, it’s so easy to try to tell it black and white. It’s so easy to try and tell it right and wrong. And the reality is history is always a lot messier than that. There are always multiple discourses going on and conflicting ideas that all have their own valid stance. That was very clear at the time we were debating

294 Brownell writes that serious financial straits had caused the trustees “to discuss the possibility of coeducation” as early as in 1896. Ibid., 5.
295 Brownell, 445.
296 Ibid.
297 James Ballengee quoted in Brownell, 459.
Hearing the news about the trustees’ vote, Simpson recalled: “It was wonderful. There wasn’t any going back; we were doing it. The study was done, the vote was taken. Now what we had to do was go forward.” Wilson appointed Simpson to chair the Co-education Steering Committee, and the first classes were admitted.

By 1994, the Coeducation Review Committee assessed 10 years of experience and concluded that coeducation was “proceeding well.” Enrollment was up, applications had more than doubled, average SAT scores for the entering class were almost 100 points higher, and retention to graduation had increased. “The number of full-time faculty women had risen from six to eighteen.”

At the same time, the implementation of coeducation provoked questions, most dealing with equality: Do women have a “sense of ownership in the W&L community that equaled that of men,” are women participating in “campus social and political life,” in equal ways; and has the university truly addressed issues of sexism and sexual assault? With the dominance of Greek life, are there sufficient alternative spaces for students, women and men alike, who seek them? With dining patterns, class schedules, sports and extracurricular activities, has the university been able to create conditions for women and men students to have an “interconnected social life”? These and other questions call for continuing scrutiny of how women and men interact at W&L. In addition, although “gender diversity in the faculty and administration was a critical component of the university’s coeducation strategy,” and although hiring of women senior management has picked up in recent years (for example, Suzanne Keen’s tenure as dean of the College, and Nora Demleitner’s tenure as dean of the School of Law), gender diversity in faculty and administration still appears to be a work in progress. The link between coeducation and gender diversity in the faculty and administration is ripe for analysis and discussion.

C. Rise of a Premier Liberal Arts Institution

The university’s mission statement captures its priorities: “Washington and Lee provides a liberal arts education that develops students’ capacity to think freely,
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critically, and humanely and to conduct themselves with honor, integrity, and civility. Graduates will be prepared for life-long learning, personal achievement, responsible leadership, service to others, and engaged citizenship in a global and diverse society.” 308 The liberal arts education described in the mission statement is rooted in small classes, close relationships between teachers and students, and a curriculum that allows students to choose “from a remarkable variety of majors and minors, courses, in-depth study opportunities — a spectrum of options usually found only at large universities.” 309 Thirty-seven undergraduate majors and 29 minors allow students to immerse themselves in traditional disciplines taught by extraordinary scholar-teachers. Students choose as well from a range of pre-professional offerings, in departments such as Journalism and Business Administration. In addition, interdisciplinary courses allow students to see commonalities and conflicts across subject-matter divides and to prepare for professions in which such blending is the norm. The focus on curricular breadth and depth extends to the Law School, which explicitly claims a liberal arts approach to the study of law, balancing courses on fundamental topics with electives and clinics that focus on a range of contemporary issues. Students also benefit from an increasing number of courses that are open to both law students and undergraduates and provide additional opportunities for critical interdisciplinary reflection at a high level. Enrichment is provided at every step, such as the programs of the Mudd Center for Ethics and the outside speakers invited by the Questioning Series.

These features enable the university to offer an education that is personalized, rigorous and intellectually ambitious, with the goal of fostering in each student what Dean James G. Leyburn called an “ideal of excellence” 310 in mind and character. Dean Leyburn envisioned the liberal arts as promoting intellectual and moral courage. He continually challenged W&L students “to be skeptical and questioning, no matter how disturbing this might be to their peace of mind.” 311 Judge Pamela J. White ’77L, the first alumna to serve on the W&L Board of Trustees (1995-2004), spoke similarly about the value of liberal arts education in modern society, crediting it for giving her a “lifetime thirst for knowledge, for problem-solving, for critical analysis, for honest and effective communication, for client-focused advocacy as well as an appreciation for big picture and community consequences.” 312
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The special flavor of the liberal arts at W&L can be found in the school’s motto: “Non incautus futuri,” or “Not unmindful of the future.” Over the years, interpretations of the motto have all related to a profound sense of responsibility. President Kenneth Ruscio understood the motto in terms of duty — an ethical duty owed by citizens of one generation to citizens of the next. In a 2010 address, he suggested that an “intergenerational contract” obligates current members of the W&L community to advance the integrity and excellence of the institution for the sake of those who will come later. Law Dean Barry Sullivan in 1995 saw the motto as describing a special kind of discernment. The person who is “not unmindful of the future” has “the wisdom to distinguish what needs to be conserved and what needs to be changed, having the confidence to listen to the views of others, and having the courage to act.” A liberal arts education thus fosters “the imagination to conceive of a world that would be organized along new lines.” While the motto “takes for granted that the past is on our minds already,” it “reminds us that there is more than the past — that there is the future as well. However much we should honor the past, the motto of our University reminds us that it is the future in which we will have to live. That is a powerful exhortation.” Professor Alexandra Brown, in a 2007 Baccalaureate address, spoke of the “truth-seeking attentiveness” that is “at the heart of the great liberal tradition we claim here. It is at once a commitment to know things and to know larger truths toward which things point; it is also to ask of every certainty we hold, ‘How do I know that?’ It is to submit to the possibility of change.”

Ruscio, Sullivan and Brown may have echoed the words of a long-time member of the English Department, Professor Sidney Coulling, who in 1979 pointed to the social dimension of the liberal arts: “The goal of the humanities has always been the enrichment of society itself” by training each generation to understand and undertake their “political duties in a democratic society.”

D. Campus Life

The commission was not charged with taking a comprehensive look at the social environment of the student body. But the history of the institution includes the
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university’s efforts, large and small, to address and improve the quality of student life outside of the classroom. A list of such efforts cannot be provided here, but they include the building of a broad athletic program for men’s and women’s sports; continuing investment of time and financial resources to issues relating to Greek life, beginning with the Fraternity Renaissance initiative under the presidency of John Wilson; efforts to provide spaces for student life outside the ambit of the Greek system, such as Elrod Commons, Hillel House and Friday Underground; and the recent project to increase campus residential life dramatically through construction of the new third-year housing complex (the Village). In addition, the university has dedicated substantial resources to its Office of Student Affairs, whose staff members address student issues through a range of supportive programs and initiatives. Against this backdrop, questions remain about the quality of student life at Washington and Lee. Most of the questions relate to the fact that the Greek system of fraternities and sororities dominates social life. Thirteen national fraternities are present on campus, and at least 74 percent of W&L men are members. Eight sororities are present, and at least 76 percent of W&L women are members. The high participation rates mean that large numbers of students enjoy the benefits of a supportive network and a home away from home. But many non-participating students experience isolation and alienation both in the classroom and on the campus generally. Addressing this specific issue, the Strategic Planning Steering Committee’s Subcommittee on Diversity and Inclusion wisely recommends creation of a Multicultural Center in Elrod Commons.

In 2013, Candler Communications interviewed undergraduate student focus groups on the subject of campus climate. Findings of the 2013 study were summarized in 2017 by the Strategic Planning Steering Committee’s Subcommittee on Diversity and Inclusion. A chief finding was that “all students — multicultural, international, and mainstream — saw W&L as a very segmented/segregated campus.” As the commission began its work in the fall of 2017, Candler Communications conducted a second study of campus climate through undergraduate focus groups. Although the study was not intended to be comprehensive, it provided an informative snapshot of W&L at this moment. Among other findings, Candler concluded that while Washington and Lee has success in recruiting students of color, due to its active Admissions Office and the availability of generous financial support, those students find their numbers surprisingly small and the environment difficult once they matriculate.319 The cost of joining a Greek organization can present a stumbling block for participation, as well as perceptions that some fraternities do not welcome students of color or international students.320 Other perceptions were that Greek organizations are “rarely held
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accountable for their actions” and “suffer[ed] consequences only for the most egregious of offenses.” 321 At the same time, both Greek and independent students who participated in the study expressed the need for “a more vibrant and active non-Greek social scene.” 322 Some of the Candler Study participants suggested that the university’s teaching of its own history could be improved. Specifically, they advocated that a more prominent telling of the story of John Chavis. 323 The larger related point is that a truthful rendering of W&L’s entire story — including the contributions of persons from varied backgrounds, experiences, races and ethnicities — could be a sizeable factor in fostering a sense of unity and ownership among all sectors of the campus. Campus climate boils down to whether a genuine sense of belonging exists, and a concerted effort to educate all students about the beginnings and development of the university — and the diversity of individuals who made those things happen — can contribute strongly to that end.

E. Connecting to the World

The modern W&L does not perceive the remoteness of Lexington or the smallness of the campus as a fatal impediment to touching, learning about, or experiencing the outside world. A large part of the institution’s modern history has been its commitment to introducing students to issues of social justice and civic responsibility on the local, national and even international scales.

The Shepherd Program for the Interdisciplinary Study of Poverty and Human Capability is one way in which students connect to that world. Founded in 1997 through the efforts of Professor Harlan Beckley, the program continues to integrate “thought and action in direct service to disadvantaged communities.” 324 The program offers courses and service opportunities to “prepare students from a variety of majors and political perspectives to work with those communities to address the problems associated with poverty.” 325 One student who found the Shepherd Program a seminal experience is Kara Karcher ’11. Through Shepherd, she spent a summer at the House of Ruth Legal Clinic, in Baltimore, where she worked firsthand with survivors of domestic abuse. Returning to campus, she joined the Bonner Program and worked as an advocate at Project Horizon, a local shelter. After W&L, she spent two years with Teach for America as a bilingual teacher in the Rio Grande Valley on the Texas-Mexico border. She completed a master’s in bilingual education at University of Texas, and, now in law school with plans to practice public interest law, she has commented, “I am forever
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grateful to the Shepherd Poverty Program at Washington and Lee for sparking my journey through this life-changing path.”

The School of Law also has a history of making it possible for students to work for social justice in legal clinics. These clinics, closely supervised by faculty, allow students to represent actual clients on legal problems across a spectrum of subject matter. For instance, students working in the Virginia Capital Case Clearinghouse assist Virginia attorneys whose clients face the death penalty; students in the Black Lung Clinic represent disabled coal miners whose respiratory illness stems from underground mining and who now seek disability benefits; and students working in the Immigrant Rights Clinic assist non-citizens in immigration matters, with “a particular focus on vulnerable populations such as refugees, unaccompanied minors, and victims of domestic violence.” In addition, the Tax Clinic allows students to work with low-income tax payers who need representation on matters before the IRS or the Virginia Department of Taxation, while the Community Legal Practice Clinic and the Criminal Justice Clinic program serve low-income or indigent members of the local community in a variety of civil and criminal cases. Through these clinics, students gain critical perspective on the challenges and privilege of serving clients, they encounter the difficulties of effective advocacy, and they navigate courts and other venues in today’s practice of law.

Through the generosity of Rupert H. Johnson Jr. ’62, undergraduates have additional opportunities for growth outside of the traditional classroom. In 2008, Johnson made a historic gift of $100 million to Washington and Lee, at the time the largest single gift ever made to a liberal arts college. The gift enables the university to award tuition, room and board to 10 percent of each year’s entering class. The Johnson Scholars are selected “on the basis of academic achievement, demonstrated leadership, and their potential to contribute to the intellectual and civic life of the W&L campus and of the world at large in years to come.” The gift has been transformative; each year, it allows W&L to enroll 44 of the most promising students in the world. But the Johnson scholarships are only one part of a larger program — the Johnson Program in Leadership and Integrity, which provides grant funding for independent summer study “across the country and around the world.” Any rising junior or senior can apply for Opportunity Grants, which in the past have allowed students to engage in a broad array of projects, from shadowing surgeons in Thailand to studying sharks at the Virginia Institute of Marine Science. These projects enable students to develop interests that
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may lead to choices of further academic study or lifelong careers. And when students return to Lexington from these projects, they bring a new zest to their studies and enhance campus life by sharing their experiences.

A further important component of Washington and Lee’s educational mission is its emphasis on international education. A highly visible Center for International Education, recently inaugurated, “promotes global learning within, across, and beyond our campus.” Its ambitious goals include developing students’ understanding of cultural differences and global issues; introducing different frames of reference and alternate perspectives on public issues of transnational importance; assisting students seeking overseas learning opportunities; supporting faculty in overseas research and teaching; and adding to the intellectual life of the campus with a range of speakers and events. With the attitude that “the world is our classroom,” the center invites students to consider the interconnectedness of the world, the nearness of other cultures, and the importance of international perspective.

These programs and academic offerings are important parts of the W&L mosaic, and they contribute strongly to the liberal arts experience of openness to new ideas and engagement in critical reflection. They have hardly replaced the traditional liberal arts disciplines, nor should they. But they complement the traditional disciplines, and offer rich opportunities to put theory into practice.

V. Conclusion: A Sense of Community

The university’s history is, in important respects, the story of a community — one with a strong sense of the past but a continuing (although not always consistent) desire not to be left behind, not to stop evolving, not to stop opening its doors to new ideas and new members. It has been said that the history of Washington and Lee University parallels the history of the country itself. And so it does. Both were products of Enlightenment beliefs in free inquiry and self-governance. Both esteemed charismatic leaders, yet both valued even more the intellectually and morally striving individual. Both survived a cataclysmic Civil War that left nothing untouched: social structure, politics, economics, the legal system and human relations, those between men and women, and those between persons of different races. In the 20th and 21st centuries, in times of war and peace, as the country sought cultural unity amidst profound political differences, the university sought a balance between tradition and progress. Both have been tested in their deepest commitments, both have made mistakes, and both have found strength in dialogue and reform. None of it has been easy, but some of it has borne fruit.
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After Appomattox, there was what contemporaries considered a “golden moment” — an opportunity to own up to the moral failure of slavery and to the importance of political union and personal freedom. The moment unfortunately was squandered. Perhaps in the wake of Charlottesville in 2017, and in the nation’s awakening to new resolve about race and community, W&L is experiencing a similar moment of opportunity, one that should not be wasted. The commission’s sense is that the university should acknowledge its past truthfully and at the same time recognize its capacity to face problems and seek solutions. The commission proposes changes in the spirit of the ongoing evolution of W&L as it seeks to fulfill its promise of “truth, philanthropy, and mutual conciliation.”
APPENDIX D: RECOMMENDATIONS

In President Dudley’s message announcing the membership of the Commission on Institutional History and Community, he called for the commission to:

1. Examine how our history — and the ways that we teach, discuss and represent it — shapes our community.
2. Create various opportunities to engage in conversation with all corners of the community.
3. Set a national example by demonstrating how the divisive issues can be addressed thoughtfully and effectively.

With this charge as the benchmark for the report, the commission has engaged with students, staff, faculty and alumni. The university community has asked for transparency in the examination of its history and recommendations for change.

Recommendation No. 1: Release the commission’s report in full to the university community and post on the website.

Recommendation No. 2: Incorporate the university’s history into its orientation program and its curriculum as a tool for examining society’s challenges and better preparing graduates to face those challenges. There must be a focus on the university’s 18th- and 19th-century history, including the facts about George Washington’s and Robert E. Lee’s involvements with the university. The university’s 20th- and 21st-century history must also be part of the canon, especially its evolution as a premier liberal arts institution and its mission to prepare students for “engaged citizenship in a global and diverse society.”

Possible mechanisms for delivering the university’s history to the student population:

A. Compile a packet that contains a historical overview. The Office of Admissions will send it to students when they decide to attend W&L or will provide it to students once they arrive on campus. The packet will contain key elements of the university’s historical narrative and copies of important primary-source documents. Small-group discussions about the contents of the packet could take place throughout the first-year experience. During Orientation Week, include programming that introduces W&L’s history and makes use of information from Special Collections.
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B. Require each undergraduate student to take a seminar that explores W&L history, including the involvement of the namesakes, the contribution of enslaved persons, the role of W&L in the creation and dissemination of the Lost Cause narrative, the training of soldiers on campus, and the impact of our graduates on the institution and the world. The goal would be neither to mask nor to bash the university’s history, but rather to tell the full story, confident that the university’s positive contributions to society far outweigh its shortcomings. Alternatively, encourage faculty to offer more courses about W&L history, such as race and slavery in Rockbridge County, perhaps modeled on Professor Theodore DeLaney’s current course. In the School of Law, offer a one-credit course focused on W&L and its connection to the history of civil rights and racial justice; the course would not be required, but would be open to second- and third-year law students as well as undergraduate students in the Legal Studies Program.

C. During Spring Term, foster campus unity by selecting a topic or issue that the entire community explores and discusses, whether in multiple class offerings that address the topic from different angles; a speaker series that highlights different aspects of the issue; a reading club that examines the issue; or a staged public debate related to the topic.

D. Digital Humanities Project: Build an active, developing database for articles, bibliographies and archival sources related to the history of the university and the people who played a role in its development.

E. Create an additional, required, extended orientation meeting for first-year law students to introduce the entering class to the history of the university and its impact on the campus community. Following the format of the Virginia State Bar Law School Professionalism Program, provide a lecture for the whole class and then break out into discussion groups.

F. Celebrate the first month of the new Supreme Court term (October) at the School of Law by offering a four-week series of events and speakers in Lewis Hall on aspects of university history.

To state the obvious, alumni are important to the university. But, they are also important to how we tell our story. W&L is among a handful of schools that have almost no local students (although those that we do have are generally exceptional). Unlike most schools, prospective students do not encounter W&L through local news coverage, interaction with students, or occasional visits throughout high school. W&L is a destination, and most prospective students do not visit W&L until they are looking at
colleges. As a result, many/most students’ first interaction with W&L is with alumni from their hometown. So, it is important that alumni know our history.

Recommendation No. 3: Create opportunities for alumni to learn the full history of W&L through programs at chapter meetings, and produce video of selected footage. Knowledgeable speakers would cover a range of topics, and items from Special Collections would help tell the story. Educating W&L graduates is important. About 70 percent of incoming students have contact with graduates before or during the applications process; these alumni are well positioned to pass along accurate information about the school’s background and trajectory. Educational opportunities, devised by the Alumni Office and Special Collections, could be evening programs with several speakers, each covering a time period or facet of W&L history.

Recommendation No. 4: Establish the fall Convocation as University Day. This will celebrate the opening of the academic year; explore the past, present and future of the university; and reflect on the university’s core values and ideals. University Day would replace Founders Day in January, which is currently tied to the university’s namesakes rather than the full history of the university. The Omicron Delta Kappa Convocation would remain in January.

Recommendation No. 5: Use existing and future research generated from course work, exhibitions and lectures to update university web pages and further reflect university history. Pages that would benefit from updates include History & Traditions FAQ for the First-Year Experience; History and Traditions web pages under About W&L; and History of Washington and Lee’s Presidents.

Recommendation No. 6: Rename Robinson Hall, as further explained in Part II, Section V of the report.

Recommendation No. 7: Improve and expand recognition of the contributions to the university of enslaved persons, including those in the Robinson bequest. Improve the space that commemorates those in the Robinson bequest and erect a more prominent monument than the existing marker.

Recommendation No. 8: Invest in continued research to explore contributions of enslaved persons to the university. Hire a genealogist to complete the research on descendants of the Robinson enslaved persons. In addition, hire a two-year post-doctoral student to complete additional research, including the history of enslaved persons who were not part of the Robinson bequest and the 20th-century black experience at W&L.

Washington and Lee University recently erected a marker to commemorate those enslaved people it received through a bequest from trustee John Robinson in 1826, yet, except for the work of Adam Lewis, knowledge of their lives in Mississippi and their
descendants is mostly unknown. Information about other enslaved people in Washington College history is also unknown. Builder John Jordan used enslaved laborers when he built Washington Hall, and he purchased a few of the Robinson slaves. President Henry Ruffner, an ardent advocate of colonization who disliked slavery, was also a slaveholder, and other heads of Washington College more than likely owned enslaved people. Knowledge about how Washington College may have benefitted from the labor and sale of enslaved people remains incomplete.

**Recommendation No. 9:** Take action when the genealogist identifies descendants of enslaved persons owned by Washington College. It is premature to be prescriptive or comprehensive on what follows this research, but options for future consideration include: Establishing an education fund to support a descendant’s secondary or collegiate education, payable to a school to be attended by the descendant; creating an annual community project in the region settled by the descendants, similar to the Lexington programs now assisted by the university’s Community Grants Program; hosting a gathering on campus that provides an opportunity for descendants to meet and learn more about the results of the genealogist’s and post-doctoral fellow’s research; and sponsoring a series of lectures and activities on reconciliation and memorialization, with topics including the trans-Atlantic slave trade, enslavement, the Civil War, Reconstruction, the civil rights era, and the connection to a contemporary and intersectional analysis of race, gender, sexuality, economic inequality and equity.

Throughout the year the commission has researched our history and searched to find truth among many of the myths surrounding our 270-year old institution. One of the most revered traditions at Washington and Lee is our Honor System. Any breach of the community’s trust is considered an honor violation. This creates a community with an uncommon assignment of trust in its members.

One of the myths surrounding the Honor System is that Robert E. Lee created the system during his tenure as president. As seen in the university documents in Special Collections, this myth is inaccurate. The Honor System dates back to the 1840s, if not earlier, and students gained control of the Honor System in the late 1850s. Lee did not become president until 1865. It is undeniable that Lee influenced the student body and the administration of the Honor System with his ideals and demeanor. As acknowledged in the White Book, this is true of all presidents and generations of students at W&L. However, the current portrayal of the Honor System exaggerates Lee’s impact on the system.

Most students’ education of the Honor System begins on their first tour of W&L, when tour guides explain the tradition, often outside of Lee Chapel. Although this is typically a brief overview, stories of Lee’s role in the Honor System differ. The next
instance that students learn more about the Honor System is during Honor Orientation in their first week on campus. At the conclusion of Honor Orientation, students sign the Honor Book and are thereby bound by the Honor System. Undergraduate students attend Honor Orientation and sign the Honor Book in Lee Chapel. Law students typically attend Honor Orientation at the Law School and sign the Honor Book in Lee Chapel.

Throughout students’ time at W&L, their education on the Honor System comes from the EC and the White Book. The White Book is described as “the governing document for all honor system procedure and philosophy” on the Executive Committee’s webpage. The White Book begins its introduction to the Honor System with a discussion of Lee. While it does not state that Lee created the Honor System, it is heavily implied — Lee is the only person mentioned by name in the book. Students are also exposed to the Honor System when an open hearing is conducted. When a student is found guilty of an honor violation in a closed hearing, they have the option to appeal the decision to an open hearing, held in Lee Chapel. A jury of students determine whether the conduct constitutes an honor violation and the entire student body is invited to attend the hearing.

Throughout outreach, students noted a disconnect between the values and the purpose of the Honor System and the exaggeration of Lee’s impact on the Honor System. The W&L community is built on civility, honor and integrity, yet, the system promoting these ideals also promotes an inaccurate myth. As we work to make W&L a home to all students, we must reconcile that Lee is a complicated historical figure. Students have stated feeling uncomfortable or undervalued when mandated to admire his tenure at W&L. Beyond the historical inaccuracy, in working to orient students, faculty and staff to our community of trust, our presentation of our Honor System disregards the discomfort and disorientation felt by many of the members of our community. Moving the location of honor orientation and open hearings as well as distancing Lee from a system that existed at Washington College prior to his arrival, we hope to preserve and protect one of our sacred traditions.

**Recommendation No. 10:** To ensure the credibility of the Honor System and to follow the concerns of students, faculty and staff presented in outreach sessions, relocate the honor orientation and the signing of the Honor Book from the chapel, and give references to Lee in the White Book a more proportionate place in the text.

**Recommendation No. 11:** Refer to Robert E. Lee as “President Lee” rather than “General Lee,” including in formal documents, on the website, and the like.
Recommendation No. 12: Implement proposals from strategic planning, including the Multicultural Center; a cluster-hiring initiative for faculty; a Diversity Cabinet; additional financial resources dedicated to recruiting and enrolling diverse undergraduate and law students; and need-blind admissions.

Recommendation No. 13: Explore opportunities to encourage students from traditionally underrepresented groups to pursue a career in the legal profession beginning with a legal education at W&L, and fund a position for a law student diversity and inclusion (LDI) counselor.

Some suggestions as to ways the Law School can accomplish the first part of this plan include:

1. Partner with the Law School Admission Council (LSAC) and create a four-week PLUS program during the summer after the conclusion of the undergraduate Spring Term.
2. Apply for an LSAC Diversity Matters Grant to fund a four-day course during the law school fall break targeted at, but not restricted to, traditionally underrepresented groups.
3. Initiate a program similar to either of the two above without partnering with LSAC.

The law diversity and inclusion (LDI) counselor would be responsible for the new recruitment and education program run by admissions. The counselor would also coordinate with Student Affairs to serve as a resource for law students from traditionally underrepresented groups. The LDI counselor could also work with the law school representative on the Diversity Cabinet to ensure that underrepresented students feel supported and welcome in the W&L Law community.

Recommendation No. 14: Explore the establishment of an exchange program with minority-serving institutions and consider giving incentives to the partner institutions to encourage their participation.

Washington and Lee University seeks opportunities to ensure that the student body and faculty are racially and ethnically diverse. One such way to advance this goal is a partnership that formalizes an exchange with the Minority Serving Institutions Program. Within this group of institutions, many historically black colleges and universities that award bachelor degrees are within driving distance of Lexington, with a large number in Virginia and the Carolinas.

These schools present a fertile opportunity to establish reciprocal study programs whereby students of color (preferably in groups of two or more from an individual college) would spend a semester or year on campus at Washington and Lee.
while a similar opportunity would be made available to W&L students to attend a semester or year there. The benefits should be significant and the donor schools would still receive tuition income. A similar concept could be extended for faculty exchange programs.

Recommendation No. 15: Approve the School of Law’s proposal for creation of a Center on Civil Rights and Racial Justice. This will be an interdisciplinary center, involving students and faculty from the College, the Williams School, and the School of Law. On a campus that tends to look to the past for its ideals and values, this center will be forward-looking in the sense of seeking new ways of thinking about justice and equality in the 21st century. Participants will take part in cutting-edge research, policy advocacy, other forms of writing, and civil rights litigation in Virginia and around the country. The center’s work will engage the expertise of various disciplines, taking a strong liberal arts approach to thinking collaboratively and responding imaginatively to contemporary issues. Its function in the educational program of the university will be to teach and to allow reflection on the modern justice system, the role of the courts, human rights, and the intersection of political, social, and legal thought.

Recommendation No. 16: Expand the university’s knowledge of the 20th-century experience of black students and faculty at Washington and Lee. There are no individual histories of the young men who integrated the university. The first black students — Leslie Smith ’69L, Linwood Smothers ’72 and Walter Blake ’72 — have already died, as have Smith’s brother, Bobby Smith ’74, John White ’74, John Evans ’76, Ernest L. Freeman III ’75, Donald A. Willis ’75L, Rodney Hubbard ’74, Gary Avery ’74 and Phillip Hutcheson ’74. It is vital to collect oral histories of black alumni who are still alive and willing to be interviewed.

Recommendation No. 17: Create a Summer Liberal Arts Institute to provide an interdisciplinary summer experience for middle school or high school students (whether from Lexington, elsewhere in the country, or abroad) to visit, engage and learn about the best that the university has to offer.

The Summer Liberal Arts Institute would offer sessions on leadership development, guest lectures from faculty and staff, and allow students to learn about programs such as those provided by the Office of Community-Based learning. The program would be targeted for underrepresented students, but would not limit participation to these groups. Many peer institutions have pre-college programs and W&L can provide a distinct experience. This program reflects the goals of the recently selected Quality Enhancement Plan.
Recommendation No. 18: Convert Lee Chapel and Museum building into a museum, which would serve as a teaching environment with a well-appointed classroom, offices, and state-of-the-art exhibition space. The University Museum would engage academic departments and programs such as University Collections, campus galleries and display spaces, as well as departments and programs that readily use and teach with material culture, such as History, Classics, Art and Art History, Anthropology, Archaeology, Cultural Heritage and Museum Studies. The new University Museum would no longer hold any university functions.

Recommendation No. 19: Create a new community-convening space for university events, particularly for occasions like Orientation, Founders Day Convocation (or, as proposed, University Day), induction ceremonies, and other major occasions. The new space should be welcoming to all members of the university.

Recommendation No. 20: Move the management of Lee Chapel (University Museum) and University Collections from the Office of University Advancement to the Office of the Provost to underscore the academic nature of the new museum.

Recommendation No. 21: Incorporate the newly created University Museum into the university’s larger network of galleries, exhibition spaces, and archival resources (Watson Pavilion, Reeves Center, Staniar Gallery, Williams Galleries, Special Collections, University Collections, and others), thereby creating an organized and interconnected University Museum System.

Recommendation No. 22: Hire a director for the new University Museum System. This person would need to have an advanced degree and/or considerable work experience with curation, preservation and display practices, as well as collection documentation and maintenance. The director would also be responsible for creating a coherent calendar of programming that would link and support all of the display spaces and exhibitions across campus. The new director would oversee docent training, which would be a critical component to a successful museum, and website and social media presence. Finally, this position would interface with campus galleries, University Collections of Art and History, and Special Collections, as well as departments and programs that readily use and teach with material culture, such as History, Classics, Art and Art History, Anthropology, Archaeology, Cultural Heritage and Museum Studies.

---
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Recommendation No. 23: Convert an existing campus space (such as Evans Hall) into a functional venue that can host first-year orientation and other mandatory events.

For so long as university events are held at Lee Chapel, we recommend that modifications, some of which would be temporary, be made to the chapel in order to minimize its role as a shrine to Lee and the Confederacy.

1) Temporarily remove the Book of Remembrance memorializing the Confederate dead from the entryway.
2) Temporarily remove the plaque in the entry honoring the Confederate Soldiers of the Rockbridge Regiment. *
3) Temporarily replace the Pine portrait of Lee in Confederate uniform with one of him in civilian dress during his time as president of Washington College.
4) Refinish the fire doors that separate the auditorium and the apse to a quality that is consistent with the rest of the chapel, and that provides a suitable backdrop to the podium area.
5) Close the fire doors when the chapel is in use.
6) Remove the directional signage around campus pointing towards Lee Chapel (it is the only building on campus with remote signage).
7) Discontinue programming at the chapel that celebrates the mythic Lee, particularly events with characters in period costumes and horses that resemble Traveller.
8) Refer to Lee Chapel as either the chapel or the University Chapel, until such time as it can be repurposed into the University Museum.
9) Close the gift shop as soon as possible, as the commission does not support commercializing Lee and the Confederacy on W&L’s campus.

*If temporary removal of the plaque is not feasible, the commission recommends adopting didactics that will contextualize the commemoration of the Confederate soldiers.

Recommendation No. 24: Display only portraits of Lee that portray him in civilian attire, not as a Confederate general. Acquire and prominently display portraits — in either 2D or 3D media — that feature individuals who represent the university’s complete history.

Recommendation No. 25: The commission recommends that the university not change its name at this time.

Recommendation No. 26: The commission recommends that the university not change the name of W&L teams, “the Generals,” at this time.
Recommendation No. 27: Re-name Robinson Hall immediately. The hall’s association with slavery at Washington College — i.e., that the Robinson bequest included enslaved persons who labored at the institution until the institution sold them to others — gives special urgency to this proposal.

Recommendation No. 28: Appoint members of the W&L community to a standing committee to review and recommend the retention, deletion or alteration of the names of campus buildings, programs, departments and other similar entities. The naming committee would establish specific evaluation criteria for the naming or renaming of buildings and spaces. Considerations may include the following principles:

1. Renaming should be an exceptional event and warranted only if the name is indisputably in conflict with the university’s values.
2. Examination of the standards of the namesake’s time and place is relevant.
3. The building or place should play a substantial role in the life of the W&L community.
4. Removing the name should not have the effect of erasing history.
5. Retaining the name should not have the effect of distorting history.

The review process should include:

1. Historical inquiry and research of the person or space under consideration.
2. Community engagement to ensure that students, faculty, staff and alumni have opportunities to participate in the process.
3. Discussion and deliberation by the committee to synthesize research and outreach.
4. Presentation of recommendations to the university president.

Recommendation No. 29: The newly formed naming committee consider renaming three campus buildings named for Lee (Lee House, Lee Chapel, and Lee-Jackson House).

Outreach showed that the number of places named for Lee is disproportionate to his contribution and overshadows other individuals who played an important role in the university.

Recommendation No. 30: Evaluate whether the store should be more balanced and proportionate in merchandising its 19th-century-related products.

Recommendation No. 31: Construct a guided History Walk to enable all visitors and the university community to learn about the institution’s history by moving around the campus and encountering markers and other sources of information about
Washington and Lee, not limited to pre-war and Civil War history, but including 20th- and 21st-century information as well.

The commission challenges the implementers of this recommendation to think of new, creative ways for members of the university to encounter the history represented by the physical campus. The mechanisms for creating this History Walk should be engaging and accessible. The commission offers the following ideas for possible elements of the History Walk with the qualification that this list is by no means exhaustive.

1. Expanding the recognition of people of color and underrepresented groups through historical plaques and markers
2. Offering accessible information that provides crucial context for elements of the physical campus that reflect controversial persons or events.
3. Commission a mural to be featured on a prominent part of campus that reflects W&L’s history, paying particular attention to the history of people of color and underrepresented groups on campus. Art History Professor Andrea Lepage has recommended commissioning Judy Baca as the artist for such a mural. Judy Baca is a Chicana artist who specializes in creating large scale murals that tell untold stories
4. Designing a smartphone application that allows people to access the history represented by the physical campus. This app could use GPS location services and include a virtual map of W&L. As people move through campus, they could access information via the app that offers more narrative surrounding the buildings or historical markers that they encounter. Images, text, videos and photographs would be available via web based app.
5. For example, when someone stands in front of Robinson Hall, they could open their app, click on Robinson Hall on their virtual map, and be presented with a short video that explains the Robinson bequest and the contributions of enslaved persons to the university.
6. Revise the online virtual tour to be more reflective of the university’s history. The current virtual tour could be updated to represent a more complete history of the physical campus. Essentially, the virtual tour could be the web version of the app recommended in item 4.
7. Train students of history to conduct guided tours through the physical campus that allow for individuals to engage with its history. All W&L students could be required to take this tour. This would be a separate entity from the university admissions tour, but could be offered as a supplemental tour for prospective students who request it.
8. Include interactive video screens throughout campus that allow people to watch short clips or read more information about the elements of the physical campus.
9. The history walk would include different modules that would allow the individual to explore various time frames and different themes. These modules would provide a full accounting of the university’s involvement with slavery and recognize the contribution of enslaved humans on an equal footing with the contributions of our financial supporters.
APPENDIX E: PORTRAITS ON DISPLAY ON CAMPUS

University Collections of Art and History

Report: April 21, 2018

Summary
This count of portraits is taken from the UCAH collections database. It includes historical portraits of past presidents, trustees, faculty and donors, in addition to portraits of the university’s namesakes, George Washington and Robert E. Lee. The list also includes a special exhibition of Custis family portraits that opened in April, as well as several portraits of that would be considered "art" as opposed to simply a documentary portrait.

TOTAL #
153 portraits on view across campus

Total #
GW
29 portraits of George Washington
These are primarily in Washington Hall

REL
17 portraits of Robert E. Lee
These are primarily in the Lee Chapel Museum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Portraits of…</th>
<th>GW</th>
<th>REL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 South Main Street</td>
<td>Paul Penick by Allan Jones, U8888.0.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>John Lyle Campbell by Hattie E. Burdette, U8888.0.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>7 Courthouse Square</td>
<td>No portraits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Center for Global Learning</td>
<td>No portraits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Early-Fielding Copy Services</td>
<td>Lt. Robert E. Lee by William E. West, POSTER, U1994.0.340</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Col. George Washington after C.W. Peale, POSTER, U1994.0.341</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Elrod Commons</td>
<td>Old George Reproduction in fiberglass, U1992.12.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>John Chavis bust by Rick Weaver, U2003.3.1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>John W. Elrod by Steve Polson, U2003.7.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Evans Dining Hall</td>
<td>Letitia Pate Evans, U1994.0.175</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Gilliam Admissions House</td>
<td>No portraits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Holekamp Hall</td>
<td>Barry by Al Gury, U2001.3.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hotchkiss Alumni House</td>
<td>William M. McElwee Jr. Class of 1879 by Dudley Feruson Hewitt, U8888.0.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Huntley Hall</td>
<td>Ernest Williams by Scaisbrooke Abbot, U1994.0.176</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Patsy as a Young Woman with her Dachshund by Marion Junkin, U1996.3.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Portrait of a Woman by Ray Prohaska, U1996.3.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Robert Edward Royall Huntley by Dean Paules, U2000.11.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lee Chapel / Museum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3</th>
<th>Auditorium</th>
<th>George Washington as Colonel in Virginia Militia by Peale, U1897.1.1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>General Robert E. Lee by Theodore Pine, LC280.649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Recumbent Lee by Valentine, U1875.2.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3</th>
<th>Lee’s Office</th>
<th>Lee on Traveller, bronze by Schrady, 2008.15.1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>George Peabody, engraving, LC1870.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lee’s Study, lithograph by Volck, LC1963.2.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>Museum Shop</th>
<th>Trade Figure of REL, U2006.2.1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>11</th>
<th>Museum: Main Gallery</th>
<th>Light-Horse Harry Lee, after Gilbert Stuart, U1998.7.1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>William Graham, silhouette, LC280.359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>George Washington (Athenaeum version) by Gilbert Stuart, U1875.1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>George Washington, photo by Miley after pastel by Sharples, U4444.0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>George Washington Parke Custis by Stearns, U1959.1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lt. Robert E. Lee by William West, U1959.10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>President Robert E. Lee copy after Buchser, U2007.7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Farewell to Appomattox (Lee on Traveller), U2005.12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>President Robert E. Lee by Dubour, LC1948.6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cyrus McCormick by GPA Healy, U1999.5.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Robert E. Lee bust by Moses Ezekiel, LC280.141

1  Changing Exhibition Gallery Robert E. Lee, post war, by Cephus Giovanni Thompson, IL2014.1.1

9  Lee House Julia Rush Miller, Age 13 (Mrs. George Junkin), Rembrandt Peale, 2008.7.1

Thomas Jefferson after Gilbert Stuart by GPA Healy, U1875.1.4

Robert E. Lee as President of Washington College by Reid, U1922.1.1

Ann Hill Carter Lee, U1928.1.1

George Washington, silhouette, U1962.1.1

Martha Washington, silhouette, U1962.1.2

Bernard Moore Carter by John Vanderlyn, U1983.4.1

M. C. Lee, Arlington, December 18th, 1858, print, U1994.0.268

Washington at Dorchester Heights after Gilbert Stuart, U5555.0.2

2  Lee Jackson House Beverly Tucker Lacy by James Reeve Stuart, U2007.4.1

George Junkin by Orvin S. Parsons, LC 280.650

1  Lenfest Center Gerry Lenfest by Deena Gu Laties, 2008.19.1

Lewis Hall and Law Library

1  Lewis Hall: First Floor Roy Lee Steinheimer, Jr. by A. Whitlatch, U1994.0.124

1  Lewis Hall: Second Floor Portrait of Eliza By Lucy Anderson, U1994.1.593

13 Lewis Hall: Third Floor John White Brockenbrough by Lillian B. Simpson, U1909.1.1

John William Davis by Frank O. Salisbury, U1955.1.1

William Haywood Moreland by Jack Clifton, U1955.3.1
Charles Porterfield Light, Jr. by Scaisbrooke Abbot, U1973.4.1
Sydney and Frances Lewis by Scaisbrooke Abbot, U1976.1.9
Lewis F. Powell, Jr. by George Augusta, U1987.2.1
Chief Justice Lewis Powell, bust by George M. Kelly, U1997.1.1
Frederic Lee Kirgis by Rick Weaver, U2007.8.1
Henry St. George Tucker by William Polk Dillon, U6666.0.2
William McLaughlin by William Robinson Leigh, U6666.0.4
Martin P. Burks by L. Freiman, U6666.0.7
Joseph Ragland Long by Dorothy Guest, U6666.0.9
Wilbur C. Hall by Scaisbrooke Abbot, U6666.0.12

Justice Powell, Jr., relief sculpture in dean’s conference room, U1978.2.1
Justice John Marshall by Chester Harding, U1875.1.2
James H. Price by Frank Graham Coates, U1979.3.1
J. Timothy Philipps (Timmy Tax) by J. P. Olmes, U1994.7.1
Charles McDowell by Ralph Garafola, U1999.1.15
Alexander M. Harman, Jr. by Istavan Nyikos, U19999.4.2
Roger Groot by Rick Weaver, U2006.5.1
Charles Vaill Laughlin, Photograph, U4444.0.23
Charles Alfred Graves by Bjorn F. Egeli, U6666.0.5
Raymon Johnson by Hattie Burdette, U6666.0.8
Leyburn Library

Leyburn Library: Main Floor

Clayton Eppes Williams by Marion Junkin, U6666.0.10

Portrait of Dean James Leyburn by Steve Polson, U2003.7.2
Grace Haley Mills by Louise Herreshoff, U1988.1.1
Andrew Carnegie by Francis Louis Mora, U8888.0.27
Portrait of Annie Robertson White by Hattie E. Burdette, U8888.0.34
Portrait of Miriam McClure by Nicholas Becker, U1978.1.1
George Washington (Lansdowne version) after Gilbert Stuart, U1980.1.1

Leyburn Library: First Floor including Special Collections

Rupert Nelson Latture by Marcos Blahove, U1994.0.57
Robert E. Lee by Frederick Volck, U1901.2.1
George Washington after Houdon, M.J. Power, U5555.0.33
Fred Carrington Cole by Steve Polson, U2000.11.2
James Leyburn by Marcos Blahove, U1994.0.32
General Robert E. Lee Inspiring the Youth of the South, by Proctor, U1937.2.1
Pocahontas by William Ludlow Sheppard, U2002.5.7
George Washington by C. W. Peale, photographic copy
Old George original by Matthew Kahle, U1884.1.1
George Washington, engraving by Jacques Reich, U1902.3.1
Robert E. Lee, engraving by Jacques Reich, U1913.3.1
William Webb Pusey III, by Pobai Hefflefinger, U1994.0.71
| 8 | Leyburn Library: Second Floor | Janet Borland MacDowell by Frank O. Salisbury, U1994.0.37  
William Gleason Bean by Roberta Carter Clark, U1994.0.73  
William A. Glasgow, Jr. by H. Magnuson Lindling, U2004.8.1  
George Hutcheson Denny by Arthur Dawson, U8888.0.7  
William Alexander Anderson by David Silvette, U8888.0.10  
George Walker St. Clair by David Silvette, U8888.0.11  
Dr. William Newton Mercer by Francisco Bernard, U1875.1.6  
President and Mrs. Robert Huntley by Rick Weaver, 2009.12.1 |
|---|---|---|
| 5 | Leyburn Library: Third Floor | Charles Henry MacDowell by Frank O. Salisbury, U1994.0.36  
James A. Quarles by Richard N. Brooke, U5555.0.8  
Henry Louis Smith by Hans Schlereth, U8888.0.8  
Christopher T. Chenery by Leopold Seyffert, U1979.1.1  
William L. Wilson by Frank M. Peebles, U1916.1.1 |
| 0 | Leyburn Library: Fourth Floor | No portraits |
| 2 | Mattingly House | Portrait of Earl S. Mattingly by K. Donahoe, U1962.2.1  
Jonathan Nabors by David Robertson, U2000.2.1 |
<p>| 1 | Morris House | Girl Looking Out Window by Sarah Chapin, UR1967.1.189 |
| 0 | Natatorium | No portraits |
| 2 | Newcomb Hall: First Floor | Portrait of Warren Newcomb, LC280.655 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Floors</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Artworks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Newcomb: DeLaney office</td>
<td>Maquette for Allies (Roosevelt and Churchill) by L. Holofcener, U2006.10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Martin Luther King by Ben Shahn, Wood engraving, 2010.20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>John Chavis bust by Rick Weaver, plaster, U2003.3.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Payne Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Payne Hall: First Floor</td>
<td>George Washington — 100th Anniv. of Amer. Independence, U1984.3.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>John Barton Payne after Gari Melchers, U1939.12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Garrick in the Character of Richard III, eng. by Hogarth, U1994.0.308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>William Graham, U8888.0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mason Taylor New Room</td>
<td>Mason Taylor New, U2005.13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Reeves Center: First Floor</td>
<td>Jim and Celeste Whitehead by Taylor Harbison, U1993.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>RC: Gottwald Gallery</td>
<td>Miss Edith Howe by Louise Herreshoff, UR1992.11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sarah by Louise Herreshoff, UR1969.2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summertime Girl by Louise Herreshoff Eaton, UR1967.1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Self Portrait by Louise Herreshoff, UR1967.1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>My Aunt Lizzie by Louise Herreshoff Eaton, UR1967.1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aunt Lizzie No. 4 by Louise Herreshoff Eaton, UR1967.1.113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Reid Hall</td>
<td>No portraits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Science Center: Third Floor</td>
<td>Druck V. J. Haller after Reed Hoffman, U1994.0.347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Portrait of Dante, U1994.0.465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Science Center: Library, 3rd</td>
<td>James L. Howe by Hattie Burdette, U8888.0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Charles H. Parmly by Scaisbrooke L. Abbot, U8888.0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Science Center: Fourth Floor</td>
<td><em>Keith Shillington</em> by Ray Prohaska, U1992.10.130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Tucker Hall</td>
<td>No portraits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Washington Hall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>First Floor: Exhibition Room</td>
<td><em>Apotheosis of George Washington</em>, Painting, 2015.13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>His Excellency Geo. Washington Lt Gen of the Armies of the USA</em>, U1984.3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>George Washington</em> bust after William Rush, U1955.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Apotheosis of George Washington</em>, Liverpool jug, 2012.40.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>George Washington after Gilbert Stuart</em>, reverse painting on glass, U1984.4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Silhouettes of Graham, Campbell, Baxter, and Marshall</em>, U5555.0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>George Washington after Sir Francis Chantrey</em>, statuette, U1950.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>First Floor: Hallway</td>
<td><em>Bust of Washington after Houdon</em>, Bronze, U1905.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Washington</em> engravings, rotating sets of 6 to 8, variable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>George Washington after Gilbert Stuart</em>, Painting, U8888.0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Hallway outside Prov. Suite</td>
<td><em>Dean Frank Johnson Gilliam</em>, U1962.3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Washington Crossing the Delaware after Leutze</em>, 2013.38.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Watson Pavilion</td>
<td>Special exhibition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Martha Dandridge Custis</em> by John Wollaston, U1918.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Custis Family portraits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>John Parke Custis</em> by John Wollaston, U1918.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>The Custis Children</em> by John Wollaston, U1918.1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>John Custis IV</em> by Charles Bridges, U1918.1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Frances Parke (Fanny) Custis by Jacquelin-Brodna Limner, U1918.1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>George Washington Parke Custis by James Sharples, U1918.1.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William Fitzhugh by Cephas Thompson, U1918.1.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William Henry Fitzhugh by Cephas Thompson, U1918.1.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Custis Ancestor – Male, U1918.1.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Custis Ancestor – Female, U1918.1.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>George Washington after Gilbert Stuart, U1918.1.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Martha Washington after Gilbert Stuart, U1918.1.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Wilson Hall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Delane Wilson, President of W&amp;L, 1983-95, Istvan Nyikos, U1999.4.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For Lisa (portrait of Lisa Weinstein Deitch) by Ian Hornak, U1991.1.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>University Facilities Offices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No portraits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Front Campus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cyrus McCormick, sculpture by John David Brcin, U1931.2.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>ACROSS CAMPUS</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX F: LIST OF BUILDING NAMES, MARKERS AND MEMORIAL SITES

Below is a partial list of memorial sites, buildings and markers. Though incomplete, the list serves to highlight trends in naming and memorializing practices at W&L. Those highlighted in red are named for or honor people of color and/or women.

I. Memorial Spaces Outside

- "A Difficult, Yet Undeniable, History" Marker/Memorial, 2015. Located in a memorial garden between Robinson and Tucker halls, it includes the names of the enslaved men and women who were bequeathed to Washington College by John Robinson.
- “Free Spirit,” sculpture in memory of Kelsey Durkin ‘14, 2014
- Liberty Hall Ruins, 1782. The name of Augusta Academy was changed to Liberty Hall Academy in 1776 (which is where Chavis enrolls).
- Memorial Gate. It contains the names of alumni who gave their lives in World War I, World War II, Vietnam and other conflicts.
- Robert F. Lindsey, 2008 memorial to a student athlete (located near Wilson Field).
- Robinson Obelisk, 1900. Erected to honor the generosity of the donor.
- Traveller Memorial, 1871. Located on the wall of the garage of the Lee House.
- Washington Hall Cupola Bell, 1871
- William Washburn Tennis Courts
- Alston Parker Watt Field
- Wilson Field
- Cannan Green
- Cap’n Dick Smith Baseball Field
- Cohen Family Amphitheatre
- Davidson Park
- Duchossois Tennis Center
- Stemmons Plaza

II. Rooms Named for People

- Elrod Commons, Stackhouse Theater
- Evans Hall, Washington Room
- Payne Hall, Room 201 marked as the office of “General” Lee

333 Much of the following information comes from Professor Lepage’s website http://uslatinoartmuralism.academic.wlu.edu/?page_id=1584. I’m very grateful to her for having shared her students’ research with us.
• Sydney Lewis Hall, Powell Conference Room
• Sydney Lewis Hall, Middleton/Vellines Mock Trial Court Room
• Sydney Lewis Hall, Millhiser Moot Court Room
• Sydney Lewis Hall, Steinheimer Foyer
• Wilson Field, Track/Field McLaughlin Suite
• Wilson Hall, Staniar Gallery
• Wilson Hall, Lykes Atrium
• Lenfest Hall, Maslansky Studio
• Lenfest Hall, Kamen Gallery
• Lenfest Hall, Keller Theatre
• Lenfest Hall, Johnson Theatre
• Leyburn Library, Northern Auditorium

III. Building Names:

• Belfield House
• Chavis House (part of themed campus housing)
• Doremus Gymnasium, 1913. Robert P. Doremus donated his estate to W&L.
• Baker Hall, after Newton B. Baker, law alumnus and U.S. Secretary of War from 1916 to 1921 (during World War I)
• Davis Hall, after John W. Davis (Class of 1895, 14th Solicitor General of the United States, 1913-1918)
• Early-Fielding Memorial Building
• DuPont Hall
• Elrod Commons (W&L President John Elrod)
• Evans Hall. Named for the businesswoman and philanthropist Letitia Pate Evans, who donated millions of dollars to educational institutions in Virginia and Georgia.
• Gaines (W&L President Francis Pendleton Gaines)
• Gilliam Admissions House (Dean Frank Gilliam)
• Graham-Lees Residence Hall
• Holekamp Hall
• Hopkins House/Connolly Center for Entrepreneurship
• Hotchkiss Alumni House
• Howe Hall
• Huntley Hall
• Lee House, 1867
• Lee Chapel (more about this building below)
• Lee-Jackson House
• Lenfest Hall
• Sydney Lewis Hall
• Leyburn Library (Dean James Leyburn)
• Mattingly House
• Morris House
• Newcomb Hall
• Parmly Hall
• Payne Hall
• Peterson Data Center
• Reeves Center (Euchlin Reeves and Louise Hereshoff Reeves)
• Reid Hall
• Robinson Hall
• Ruscio Center for Global Learning
• Tucker Hall
• Warner Athletic Complex
• Washington Hall
• Watson Pavilion
• John and Anne Wilson Hall