

**INVESTIGATIVE REPORT REGARDING PRINCETON UNIVERSITY'S
ROLE IN THE HANDLING OF VICTIM REMAINS FROM THE 1985
MOVE BOMBING IN PHILADELPHIA**

Date: August 30, 2021

Ballard Spahr LLP

Marcel S. Pratt
Stephen J. Kastenber
Emilia McKee Vassallo
1735 Market Street, 51st Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19103

Contents

	Page
I. Executive Summary	1
II. Assignment and Investigation Methodology	8
III. History of the MOVE Tragedy and Background on the Forensic Analysis	10
A. The MOVE Organization.....	10
B. The 1985 MOVE Tragedy	11
C. The Processing of the Site of the MOVE Bombing.....	14
IV. Media Reports that the MOVE Victim Remains Were Used for Teaching by Professors Affiliated with Penn and Princeton	14
V. The Investigation's Factual Findings.....	17
A. An Overview of the Location of the MOVE Victim Remains from May 13, 1985 to July 2, 2021.....	17
B. From 1985 to 2001.....	20
1. The Philadelphia Medical Examiner's Office Engages Dr. Alan Mann as a Consultant.....	20
2. Dr. Mann, with then-Graduate Student Janet Monge, Begins Assisting the Medical Examiner with the MOVE Forensic Investigation.....	20
3. Dr. Mann Reaches a Conclusion Regarding the MOVE Victim Remains.....	21
4. The Medical Examiner's Office Transfers the MOVE Victim Remains to Dr. Mann's Custody.....	23
5. The MOVE Victim Remains Are Stored in the Penn Museum and Are Not Used for Teaching.....	26
6. Dr. Mann and Dr. Monge Become Affiliated with Princeton's Anthropology Department	27
7. Dr. Monge Describes Seeking to Discuss the MOVE Victim Remains with a Member of the Africa Family in 1995	28
C. From 2001 to 2018.....	29
1. Dr. Mann Joins the Princeton Anthropology Department Full-Time in 2001	29
2. Dr. Mann Leaves the MOVE Victim Remains at Penn When He Joins the Princeton Faculty Full-Time.....	30
3. During the Period from 2001 to 2015, Dr. Monge Brought the MOVE Victim Remains to Princeton up to Four Times in Furtherance of Her Identification Efforts	30
4. During the Period from 2001–2015, Dr. Monge Reports Using the MOVE Victim Remains Once for Teaching on Princeton's Campus, in 2015	32
5. Dr. Monge Attempts Again to Identify the MOVE Victim Remains During the Period from 2014 until 2019.....	34
D. From 2018 to April 2021	35
1. An Overview of Princeton's Online Learning Programs.....	35

	a.	The McGraw Center’s Course Approval Process	36
2.		Dr. Monge and Other Princeton Personnel Develop the Coursera Course, “Real Bones: Adventures in Forensic Anthropology”	36
	a.	Anthropology 309 as a Flipped Course and the Creation of the MOOC.....	37
	i.	The 2018 Test Shoot	39
	ii.	Filming the Course.....	40
3.		The MOOC Course Launches in August 2020	42
4.		Concerns Are Raised Regarding the Coursera Course	42
5.		Princeton Determines to Remove the Coursera Course.....	43
6.		The MOVE Victim Remains Are Returned to Dr. Mann	43
	E.	The Africa Family’s Reactions to the Use of the MOVE Victim Remains.....	44
VI.		The Ethical Landscape for Biological Anthropology	44
	A.	Codes of Ethics by Anthropological Associations.....	45
	B.	Laws Applicable to Anthropological Activities	47
	C.	University Policies	48
VII.		Conclusions.....	49
VIII.		Recommendations.....	54

I. Executive Summary

We submit this report to assist Princeton University in gaining a complete understanding of the scope and nature of Princeton's role in the handling of the remains of a victim of the 1985 bombing of the MOVE house in Philadelphia, including the use of the remains in a publicly available online course supported by Princeton and the use of the remains for teaching on Princeton's campus.

On May 13, 1985, the Philadelphia Police Department attempted to serve various search and arrest warrants at the communal home of MOVE, a Black liberation organization that lived according to natural law. Members of MOVE resisted and a violent confrontation ensued, with the Police Department firing approximately 10,000 rounds into the occupied MOVE home. Ultimately, the City of Philadelphia dropped a bomb on the roof, which ignited a fire that City officials allowed to burn as a tactical weapon. The City's decisions that day resulted in the deaths of six adults and five children inside of the MOVE home and destroyed over 60 homes in a primarily Black neighborhood, leaving more than 250 people homeless.

A fire burning in excess of 2,000 degrees Fahrenheit and the resulting collapse of buildings left the bodies of the MOVE victims severely burned, dismembered, and unrecognizable to varying degrees. The City's use of a construction crane and heavy machinery to sift through the wreckage contributed to the disturbance and co-mingling of the victims' remains. It also made recovery and identification of the remains more difficult.

Given the magnitude of the forensic challenges, the Philadelphia Medical Examiner's Office required the assistance of outside experts to help identify the victims and determine their causes of death. To assist with the identification of human remains, the Medical Examiner retained biological anthropologist Dr. Alan Mann, then a professor in the Department of Anthropology at the University of Pennsylvania ("Penn") with expertise in identifying small bone fragments. Dr. Mann invited then-doctoral student Janet Monge to assist with the investigation. Thereafter, the Philadelphia Special Investigation Commission (the "MOVE Commission"), an independent commission formed by the Mayor on May 22, 1985 to investigate this tragedy, separately established a pathology group of outside forensic specialists led by forensic pathologist Dr. Ali Hameli. The MOVE Commission tasked the pathology group, which did not include Dr. Mann or Dr. Monge, with identifying the remains of the victims. Notwithstanding the formation of the MOVE Commission's pathology group, the Medical Examiner's Office retained the governmental responsibility and authority for determining the identity of unidentified human remains.

Drs. Mann and Hameli disagreed in some of their conclusions. Their most significant disagreement, which was a matter of public record at the time, involved the identification of a set of remains designated as "B-1." The B-1 victim remains consist of fragments of a femur and pelvis including pubic hair attached to a portion of tissue. The MOVE Commission pathology group initially aged the B-1 victim remains at 13 to 15 years old and identified them as belonging to Katricia Dotson Africa, who was approximately 14 years, 8 months old when she died. Drs. Mann and Monge examined the B-1 victim remains at the request of the Medical Examiner's Office and concluded that they belonged to an unknown twelfth victim of the bombing, a woman between the ages of 18 to 20. In November 1985, the relatives of Katricia

Africa held a funeral without her body because the Medical Examiner's Office initially refused to release the remains identified by the MOVE Commission as hers. Almost immediately thereafter, the Medical Examiner's Office, based on the MOVE Commission's finding, ordered the release of the B-1 remains to Katricia Africa's next of kin for burial in December 1985. However, the Medical Examiner's Office continued to consider the identification of the B-1 remains an unresolved question, as indicated publicly by news reports at the time.

More than 35 years later, on April 21, 2021, West Philadelphia organizer and writer Abdul-Aliy Muhammad published an op-ed in *The Philadelphia Inquirer* titled, "Penn Museum owes reparations for previously holding remains of a MOVE bombing victim," revealing that MOVE victim remains had been held at the Penn Museum. The op-ed further reported that Dr. Monge, then-curator-in-charge at the Penn Museum, used remains—remains that fit the description of the B-1 remains—in a publicly available video course supported by Princeton on the Coursera platform. Significant public discourse, including within the Princeton community, followed the publication of the April 21 op-ed.

On April 28, 2021, Princeton University, through President Christopher Eisgruber, "extend[ed] its apologies to the Africa family for the use of the remains in courses offered by Princeton."¹ President Eisgruber stated:

I was deeply troubled, as many others have been, by the questions that came to light this past week surrounding the treatment of the remains of a victim of the 1985 bombing of the MOVE house in Philadelphia. I am especially concerned that the remains were used for instruction on our campus, including in a publicly available online course created at Princeton for the Coursera platform and taught by a visiting lecturer from the University of Pennsylvania.²

As also announced in his statement, President Eisgruber authorized a fact-finding effort, to be conducted by outside counsel, to assist Princeton in understanding the scope and nature of its role in the handling of the remains and related issues and said that the University would share its findings and use them to inform Princeton's next steps.³

This Report is the product of the fact-finding effort authorized by President Eisgruber. Our primary goal was to describe Princeton's relationship to the B-1 victim remains ("the MOVE Victim Remains") that Dr. Monge used in a Coursera course titled: "Real Bones: Adventures in

¹ Christopher L. Eisgruber, *President's Blog: Princeton's Responsibilities with the Human Remains from the MOVE Bombing*, PRINCETON UNIVERSITY (Apr. 28, 2021), <https://president.princeton.edu/blogs/princetons-responsibilities-human-remains-move-bombing>.

² *Id.*

³ Penn announced that it, too, would conduct an investigation to "examine how this unfolded and provide [Penn] with a complete report on what transpired." See Amy Gutmann and Wendell Pritchett, *Statement regarding human remains recovered from the MOVE home*, PENN TODAY (Apr. 26, 2021), <https://penntoday.upenn.edu/announcements/statement-regarding-human-remains-recovered-move-home>.

Forensic Anthropology.”⁴ Our efforts involved detailing the location and use of the MOVE Victim Remains for the past 36 years, including exploring the continued identification efforts after 1986 by Drs. Mann and Monge, contextualizing the work of biological anthropologists through understanding prevailing ethics in the field, and identifying the events and actions relevant to the University’s involvement.

After conducting a thorough investigation that involved reviewing a wide range of documentary material and interviewing Dr. Mann, Dr. Monge, Princeton faculty and staff, outside anthropologists, and other fact witnesses, we reached factual conclusions as detailed in the pages that follow. Below is a summary of our factual findings:

1. ***The Medical Examiner’s Office ordered the release of the MOVE Victim Remains to Katricia Africa’s next of kin, but later determined that the remains were unidentified and permitted Dr. Mann to continue his identification efforts.*** Between November 14-16, 1985, based on the identification made by the MOVE Commission pathology group, the Medical Examiner’s Office ordered the release of the B-1 remains to Katricia Africa’s next of kin; sent letters to Katricia Africa’s parents, Consuewella Africa and Nathaniel Galloway, informing them of the identification of the remains as those of Katricia Africa; and had Mr. Galloway sign a certification stating that he accepted the identification. On November 15, 1985, Dr. Mann – who, assisted by Dr. Monge, had also been investigating the B-1 remains at the request of the Medical Examiner’s Office – authored a report disagreeing with the MOVE Commission pathology group, opining that the remains instead belonged to a Jane Doe between the ages of 18 to 20. Dr. Hameli, on behalf of the MOVE Commission pathology group, also aged teeth and a mandible fragment, labeled as E-1, at 13 to 15 years old and determined that they belonged to Katricia Africa; Dr. Mann reached a similar age of 13 to 16 years old for the E-1 remains but concluded that the E-1 remains did not belong to Katricia Africa. Katricia Africa was buried on December 14, 1985; contemporaneous documents from the Medical Examiner’s Office and news reports state that the Medical Examiner’s Office, based on the MOVE Commission’s findings, released the B-1 remains for her burial. It is unclear from City records what remains were in fact released for Katricia Africa’s burial, but the Medical Examiner’s Office did not release the B-1 remains. During our investigation, Dr. Monge theorized that the Medical Examiner’s Office released only the E-1 remains for Katricia Africa’s burial.

Between November 1985 and March 1986, Assistant Medical Examiner Dr. Robert Segal, who led the office’s forensic investigation, alternated between crediting the findings of the MOVE Commission’s pathology group and the findings of Dr. Mann. During the forensic investigation, other forensic experts were asked to age the B-1 remains, i.e., the MOVE Victim Remains; some agreed with Dr. Mann and others agreed with the MOVE Commission pathology group. In March 1986, Dr. Segal issued a report officially siding with Dr. Mann, to whom he subsequently transferred the MOVE Victim

⁴ Because Drs. Mann and Monge still believe that the remains do not belong to Katricia Africa, this report will refer to the B-1 victim remains as the “MOVE Victim Remains.” We do not attempt to resolve the scientific disagreement around the identity of the remains; it is not within the scope of our investigation, nor is it necessary for our conclusions.

Remains for continued evaluation. The transfer occurred on September 23, 1986 according to an evidence receipt from the Medical Examiner's Office signed by Drs. Segal and Monge indicating the transfer of "various bones for anthropologic examination" to Dr. Mann. Our investigation found no evidence that Katricia Africa's family was informed that Dr. Mann had been given possession of the MOVE Victim Remains.

2. ***Since 1986, Drs. Mann and Monge believed they had no duty to return the MOVE Victim Remains to the Medical Examiner's Office until they successfully identified them; our investigation found no evidence that the Medical Examiner's Office ever sought to retrieve or locate the MOVE Victim Remains once they were provided to Dr. Mann.*** Beginning in September 1986 – after the MOVE Commission and the Medical Examiner issued their respective findings relative to the MOVE Victim Remains – Dr. Mann kept the MOVE Victim Remains at the Penn Museum to continue his identification efforts. Over the next 35 years, and after Dr. Segal was no longer associated with the Medical Examiner's Office, Drs. Mann and Monge never sought further oversight or direction from the Medical Examiner's Office regarding their possession of the remains, nor did they attempt to return them to the Medical Examiner's Office. Dr. Mann believed that he had no ongoing reporting obligations to the Medical Examiner's Office during the entire period of retention and that he and Dr. Monge could retain them indefinitely and until one of them made a positive identification. On April 19, 2021, after journalists began investigating the matter, Drs. Mann and Monge discussed returning the remains to the Medical Examiner's Office, and agreed they should do so as soon as possible.

The Medical Examiner's Office bears the governmental responsibility of determining the identity of unidentified human remains. This remained so notwithstanding the formation of the MOVE Commission and its pathology group. In providing the MOVE Victim Remains to Drs. Mann and Monge, the Medical Examiner's Office informed them it was doing so "for anthropologic examination." None of the documents that we reviewed, including documents produced by the City, show that the Medical Examiner's Office imposed any other conditions on the transfer of the MOVE Victim Remains upon Dr. Mann, including any time limitation or reporting obligation, or attempted to communicate with Dr. Mann or Dr. Monge about the remains after the transfer occurred. Nor did Drs. Mann and Monge recall the Medical Examiner's Office ever seeking to contact them after they received the remains.

3. ***The MOVE Victim Remains were never held in storage on Princeton's campus.*** Drs. Mann and Monge stored the MOVE Victim Remains at the Penn Museum when they received them from the Medical Examiner's Office in 1986. Both Drs. Mann and Monge confirmed that Dr. Mann did not take the MOVE Victim Remains with him to Princeton when he left Penn in 2001 to join the Princeton faculty full-time. Dr. Mann never stored the remains on Princeton's campus thereafter. As discussed in Finding Number 4 below, Dr. Monge brought the MOVE Victim Remains to Princeton's campus no more than five times after Dr. Mann joined the Princeton faculty, returning them to their place of storage at the Penn Museum each time, either the same day or at most a couple of days later.

From when the remains were received in 1986 until 2021, they were normally stored in a locked cabinet at the Penn Museum. On April 18, 2021, after journalists started asking questions about the remains, but before the news stories broke, Dr. Monge brought the remains to Dr. Mann's private residence in Princeton, New Jersey at the direction of a Penn Museum official. Dr. Mann stored the MOVE Victim Remains in his basement for 12 days until Terry Funeral Home retrieved them.

4. ***While affiliated with Princeton in a visiting capacity,⁵ Dr. Monge brought the MOVE Victim Remains to Princeton's campus on several occasions between 2001 and 2015 to analyze them with Dr. Mann and displayed them during one class; each time the remains were used in the Anthropology Department's laboratory on the Princeton campus.*** After Dr. Mann joined Princeton in 2001, Dr. Monge recalls bringing the MOVE Victim Remains from the Penn Museum to Princeton between two and four times to engage in efforts to identify the remains. On each of those occasions, Dr. Monge did so because outside biological anthropologists with experience estimating the ages of damaged bones, some of whom were from Europe, had been visiting Dr. Mann on campus; Dr. Monge hoped that these experts could further their identification efforts. Each time that Dr. Monge brought the MOVE Victim Remains to campus, they were there for a short period of time, at most a couple of days. Dr. Mann's recollection is not as specific; he generally recalls analyzing the MOVE Victim Remains on certain occasions when Dr. Monge brought them to Princeton's campus.

In addition, Dr. Monge recalled bringing the MOVE Victim Remains to campus one additional time in 2015 for use in a small course: Anthropology 522A, "Topics in Theory and Practice," that she led and co-taught with Dr. Mann and Professor Carolyn Rouse. The class was about race and anthropology, and Dr. Monge brought the remains to help tell the story of the MOVE bombing. Dr. Rouse was not present the day that Dr. Monge used the MOVE Victim Remains, and did not know that they would be – or had been – used. Drs. Mann and Monge do not recall whether Dr. Mann was present. Dr. Monge stated that she did not otherwise use the MOVE Victim Remains in courses she taught at Princeton. Dr. Mann stated that he did not use the MOVE Victim Remains in teaching at Princeton.

5. ***Dr. Monge renewed her efforts in 2014 to 2015, and again in 2019, to identify the MOVE Victim Remains; as part of that effort, she worked with a local writer who communicated with two members of the Africa family.*** In 2014, while working with a local writer on a story about MOVE, Dr. Monge revisited efforts to identify the MOVE Victim Remains by pursuing DNA analysis. Had these efforts been successful, the remains presumably would then have been returned to the deceased's next of kin. Dr. Monge wanted to obtain DNA samples from Consuewella Africa and Ramona Africa, but she did not attempt to establish contact with the Africa family herself. Rather, she used,

⁵ Dr. Monge held a number of different part-time appointments at Princeton over the years: lecturer (1988-94); visiting assistant professor (1995-98); visiting lecturer (1999-2004); visiting associate professor (2004-13); and visiting professor (2013-20). Throughout the period, Dr. Monge remained affiliated with Penn.

as an intermediary, a local writer, whom she believed might have better success than she would. Both Consuewella Africa and Ramona Africa declined to speak substantively with the local writer in December 2014 according to contemporaneous emails. The local writer did not mention to Ramona Africa that the Penn Museum had possession of the MOVE Victim Remains. In a December 1, 2014 email to Dr. Monge, the writer recounted a same-day, brief conversation with Consuewella Africa. He stated that he “managed to convey that the City might’ve gotten something wrong about her daughter’s remains.” According to the writer’s exchanges with Dr. Monge, Consuewella Africa was bothered by the outreach and did not speak with him again. Once these efforts failed, Dr. Monge considered the case “cold,” and concluded for that reason she could use the remains in her teaching activities.

Despite having earlier concluded the case was “cold,” in 2019, Dr. Monge again attempted with the local writer’s assistance to contact members of the Africa family. When these attempts were unsuccessful, she considered and discussed with the writer obtaining a DNA sample from Consuewella Africa’s curbside trash, but ultimately abandoned these plans. When she could not obtain a DNA sample to rule out definitively that the remains were those of Katricia Africa, she again considered the case “cold.” None of these outreach or specific investigatory activities occurred on Princeton’s campus or involved Princeton personnel (other than Dr. Monge) or students.

6. ***The videos comprising the Coursera Course were initially developed and used for a Princeton undergraduate course, Anthropology 309: “Forensic Anthropology and Urban Bodies,” co-taught by Dr. Monge and Dr. Jeffrey Himpele in the fall of 2019. Dr. Monge used the MOVE Victim Remains in the Coursera Course, but did not bring them to Princeton for any portion of the filming.*** The Coursera Course consists of videos initially created and used for a Princeton undergraduate Anthropology course. While the lectures for the course were filmed in the Broadcast Center on Princeton’s campus, the one video segment in which Dr. Monge shows and analyzes the MOVE Victim Remains was filmed by a Princeton film crew at the Penn Museum with the Samuel Morton Collection as a backdrop. Dr. Mann, who retired in 2015, had no involvement in the development or production of the video course. Dr. Monge owns the copyright for the videos that were published. The public version of the course was offered free of charge on Coursera’s platform, and Princeton did not receive any revenue from the course.
7. ***Princeton did not have policies in place specifically addressing the ethical use of human remains in teaching or research during the relevant time period.*** Princeton does not offer a full, four-field anthropology program (e.g., sociocultural, archaeology, biological (physical), and linguistic). Rather, the focus of Princeton’s program is sociocultural anthropology, which does not typically use human remains in research or teaching. As a result, the Anthropology Department did not perceive the need to have policies regarding human remains in place. Similarly, the University had no guidance specifically governing the use of human remains in teaching or research.
8. ***Neither Dr. Mann nor Dr. Monge consulted with individuals or communities, such as the Africa family, who might be affected by the use of the MOVE Victim Remains in***

course videos, teaching, or analysis. There is no singular source of ethics for biological anthropologists, but they are often guided by non-binding ethical codes published by a number of different anthropological associations. Certain ethics guidance that existed in 1986 emphasized the importance of respecting the dignity of and communicating with individuals and communities being studied and/or who would be impacted by anthropological activities. Moreover, academic sources show that relevant standards and expectations continued to evolve over time, particularly after the 1990 enactment of the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA), which effectuated the principle that Native American descendant communities should steward the disposition of their ancestral remains. Over the past three decades, it has become less acceptable in biological anthropology to teach with or display human remains associated with recent conflictual situations, particularly racialized violence. However, laws or binding professional standards for biological anthropologists are lacking.

The MOVE Victim Remains had a complex history of identification, with conflicting determinations made by numerous experts. Assistant Medical Examiner Dr. Segal ultimately determined that the remains had not been identified. To this day, Drs. Mann and Monge continue to opine that the MOVE Victim Remains belong to an unidentified twelfth victim; Dr. Monge theorized that the remains might not belong to a member of MOVE. Be that as it may, there is no dispute that the victim lived within or was affiliated with the community destroyed by the MOVE tragedy. Regardless of the victim's identity, both the Africa family and the community surrounding 62nd and Osage Avenue were identifiable groups of people with an expressed and apparent interest in the use of the MOVE Victim Remains. Dr. Monge, however, did not consult with these communities prior to her using the MOVE Victim Remains for teaching purposes in the two Princeton courses. Nor did she consult the Medical Examiner's Office, which retained the legal authority for the remains, to determine whether their identification effort should continue. Dr. Mann did not teach with the MOVE Victim Remains at Princeton, but was aware that Dr. Monge used the remains—which had been entrusted to him by the Medical Examiner's Office—in some of her teaching activities; however, he thought the use was appropriate.

Given the lack of binding ethical regulations from 1985 until the present and the absence of on-point Princeton policies, Drs. Mann and Monge's conduct relative to the use of the MOVE Victim Remains does not appear to have violated any Princeton policies, laws, or binding rules governing professional standards for biological anthropologists. Indeed, Dr. Monge identified the lack of rules, at an institutional or governmental level, as one reason for her actions. Nonetheless, Dr. Monge's – as well as Dr. Mann's – prolonged failure to consult with the Medical Examiner's Office, the Africa family or other members of the community victimized by the MOVE bombing, under these factual circumstances, demonstrated exceedingly poor judgment and insensitivity to the ramifications of their actions and omissions. The fact that the MOVE Victim Remains belong to a person killed by a modern, racialized act of police violence should have strongly counseled Drs. Mann and Monge against retaining them indefinitely. Similarly, the origins of the MOVE Victim Remains should have strongly counseled Dr. Monge against using them for teaching purposes in Princeton courses without communicating

with persons directly affected by the MOVE tragedy or, at least, the Medical Examiner's Office.

Our findings are substantiated in the pages that follow by documentary sources, various media, and witness interviews. Our conclusions are based on the totality of the evidence and where sources of information disagree, we have been careful to note as much.

II. Assignment and Investigation Methodology

Princeton engaged Ballard Spahr LLP to conduct a fact-finding effort into the scope and nature of Princeton's role in the handling of human remains from the 1985 MOVE bombing and related issues. Through the investigation, Ballard Spahr attorneys (the "Investigation Team") explored: (i) Emeritus Professor Alan Mann's possession and use of the MOVE Victim Remains while at Princeton; (ii) Former Visiting Professor Janet Monge's use of the MOVE Victim Remains in connection with her role at Princeton; (iii) the pedagogical use of the MOVE Victim Remains, including in the publicly available course entitled, "Real Bones: Adventures in Forensic Anthropology" (the "Coursera Course"); and (iv) related issues. Additionally, to provide context to the Investigation and its Findings, the Investigation Team considered the broader background of the MOVE tragedy and events demonstrating Drs. Mann and Monge's connections to the MOVE Victim Remains, many of which occurred outside of their affiliation with Princeton.

1. Document Collection and Review

The Investigation Team reviewed the following materials:

- The Coursera Course videos and materials related to its planning, development, and content;
- Documents relating to other Princeton courses taught by Drs. Mann and Monge, including Human Evolution (Dr. Mann) and Forensic Anthropology (Dr. Monge);
- Over 2,500 emails in the custody, control, and possession of Princeton, including emails from Dr. Mann's Princeton email account;
- 230 pages of documents provided by Dr. Monge,⁶ twelve class presentations provided by Dr. Mann related to courses he taught at Princeton, and numerous other documents provided by members of the Princeton faculty and staff;
- A public report and a thesis regarding the MOVE Victim Remains authored by Penn students working with Dr. Monge;

⁶ During her interview, Dr. Monge reported that she maintained a folder in her Penn lab that contained notes and other information related to the MOVE investigation. When she visited the lab with Penn's independent investigators from the Tucker Law Group in May 2021, however, the folder was missing. The last time that she remembers seeing the folder was in the spring of 2019. Interview with Janet Monge (June 4, 2021).

- The Rules and Procedures of the Faculty of Princeton University and Other Provisions of Concern to the Faculty;
- 643 documents from the City of Philadelphia regarding the MOVE Commission’s investigation, the Medical Examiner’s forensic efforts to identify the victims of the MOVE bombing, the work of Drs. Mann and Monge, and other related documents at the publicly accessible Philadelphia City Archives;
- The archives of the MOVE Commission investigation materials maintained at the Special Collections Research Center at Temple University’s Charles Library, particularly materials related to the forensic investigations;⁷
- Video of the April 26, 2021 press conference held by members of the MOVE organization, including Consuewella Africa, Janet Africa, Janine Africa, Carlos Africa, and Eddie Africa;
- Ethical codes produced by international and national anthropological associations, including but not limited to those from the American Anthropological Association (“AAA”), the American Association of Biological Anthropologists (“AABA”), the Society of American Archaeologists (“SAA”), and the Society of Forensic Anthropologists (“SoFA”), as well as university ethics policies governing the use of human remains in research and teaching and laws applicable to anthropological activities, in particular the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (“NAGPRA”), 25 U.S.C. §§ 3001 *et seq.*;
- The public statements of Princeton faculty, the Princeton Anthropology Department, and the University made in response to the 2021 press reports concerning the MOVE Victim Remains;
- Various articles, including but not limited to local and national news reports between 1985 and 1986 and pieces published by *The Philadelphia Inquirer* and *Billy Penn* on April 21, 2021 and subsequent media reports, including those published in the *Daily Princetonian*; and
- Academic materials and journals regarding anthropological ethics, including materials by Michael Blakey, National Endowment for the Humanities Professor at the College of William and Mary.

2. Interviews

The Investigation Team interviewed a total of 23 individuals including: Dr. Alan Mann; Dr. Janet Monge; Dr. Jeffrey Himpele, Lecturer in the Department of Anthropology at Princeton; and Dr. Carolyn Rouse, Chair, Department of Anthropology at Princeton. In addition to these

⁷ References to documentary evidence from the MOVE Commission in this report are to documents maintained in the archives located at the Special Collections Research Center at Temple University’s Charles Library, and can only be accessed by visiting the archives in person.

named individuals, the Investigation Team interviewed several other current and former members of Princeton’s Anthropology faculty, several Princeton administrators, and former Princeton students.⁸ The interviewees also included three anthropologists not affiliated with Princeton, who helped us understand relevant anthropological concepts. They are: Michael Blakey, National Endowment for the Humanities Professor, College of William and Mary; Ed Liebow, Executive Director, American Anthropological Association; and Anne Grauer, Past President, American Association of Biological Anthropologists, and Professor of Anthropology, Loyola University Chicago. The Investigation Team additionally interviewed Abdul-Aliy A. Muhammad, author of the April 21, 2021 op-ed in *The Philadelphia Inquirer*, and another local writer who, while attempting to develop articles about MOVE, contacted various members of the Africa family in 2014 to 2015 and again in 2019, in efforts to identify the MOVE Victim Remains. Finally, we spoke with three members of MOVE: Janine Africa, Sue Africa, and Ramona Africa.

We are grateful to the Princeton Office of the General Counsel for their diligence in coordinating access to the University materials and persons necessary to complete this comprehensive report.

3. Site Visits

The Investigation Team visited a Department of Anthropology storage room and laboratory/seminar room at Princeton. The Investigation Team also inspected the office assigned to Dr. Mann as an emeritus professor at Princeton.

III. History of the MOVE Tragedy and Background on the Forensic Analysis

The following factual background is derived primarily from the findings, conclusions, and recommendations report (the “MOVE Commission Report”) issued by the Philadelphia Special Investigation Commission (the “MOVE Commission”) on March 7, 1986 regarding the police confrontation on May 13, 1985 with the MOVE organization. This information is included for background to contextualize this investigation.

A. The MOVE Organization

The MOVE organization was founded in 1972 by John Africa, also known as Vincent Leaphart.⁹ John Africa and other members of the MOVE organization changed their surnames to “Africa” to show reverence to the continent, which they regarded as the mother continent.¹⁰ MOVE was originally called the Christian Movement for Life.¹¹ As of August 25, 2021, the MOVE organization website describes the group as “a family of strong, serious, deeply committed revolutionaries founded by a wise, perceptive, strategically-minded Black man named John

⁸ We have identified by name only those individuals closely associated with the pertinent events or who have spoken publicly about the matter.

⁹ *The Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations of the Philadelphia Special Investigation Commission*, 59 TEMP. L.Q. 339, 345 (1986) (“MOVE Commission Report”).

¹⁰ *Timeline of the MOVE Organization Leading to May 13, 1985*, PHILADELPHIA TRIBUNE (May 9, 2015), https://www.phillytrib.com/news/timeline-of-the-move-organization-leading-to-may-13-1985/article_91170189-7446-5a6b-97cc-db04660d69a6.html.

¹¹ *Id.*

Africa.”¹² The MOVE Commission Report described MOVE as “a small group of self-styled back-to-nature, anti-technology, anti-social advocates.”¹³ The MOVE Commission Report also opined that, in the 1980s, MOVE “came to reject and to place themselves above the laws, customs, and social contracts of society” and “threatened violence to anyone who would attempt to enforce normal societal rules.”¹⁴

The members of MOVE saw themselves as the targets of persistent harassment by regulatory agencies, unjust treatment by the courts, and periodic violent suppression efforts by the police.

B. The 1985 MOVE Tragedy

Members of the MOVE organization began living at 6221 Osage Avenue in Philadelphia between 1982 and 1983.¹⁵ Neighborhood residents petitioned public officials “for relief from MOVE’s intrusion into their lives,” after the occupants of 6221 Osage Avenue repeatedly made demands for the release of imprisoned MOVE members over a loudspeaker day and night for a period of time.¹⁶

Mayor Wilson Goode was briefed by the Police Commissioner on MOVE’s occupancy and fortification of 6221 Osage Avenue on March 9, 1984.¹⁷ Between May 13-27, 1984, MOVE members staged a series of loudspeaker addresses.¹⁸ On May 28, neighbors of 6221 Osage Avenue met with Mayor Goode and asserted that MOVE was infringing upon their rights.¹⁹ From late May to the end of 1984, the Mayor consulted various City officials and advisors, as well as officials from the FBI and Secret Service to determine whether grounds existed for action against MOVE or certain occupants of 6221 Osage Avenue.²⁰ The Mayor determined that action against MOVE and the occupants of 6221 Osage Avenue was not appropriate at that time.²¹

Complaints from MOVE’s neighbors escalated in early 1985.²² Between February and March, MOVE’s neighbors formed the United Residents of the 6200 Block of Osage Avenue (“United Residents”) to protest MOVE’s presence in their neighborhood.²³ Over a two-week period: Mayor Goode met with the Managing Director, Police Commissioner, and District Attorney, and authorized the Police Commissioner to prepare and execute a tactical plan under the supervision

¹² *About MOVE: Belief and Practice* MOVE ORGANIZATION (last visited Aug. 25, 2021), <http://onamove.com/about/>.

¹³ MOVE Commission Report, at 345.

¹⁴ *Id.* at 354.

¹⁵ *Id.* at 346. These members of MOVE began to live in the Osage Avenue home after a violent confrontation between the Philadelphia Police Department and MOVE in 1978. During that confrontation, a Philadelphia Police Officer was killed; nine members of MOVE were convicted of third degree murder and sentenced to 30-100 years in prison as a result. *Id.* at 345.

¹⁶ *Id.* at 346.

¹⁷ *Id.*

¹⁸ *Id.*

¹⁹ MOVE Commission Report, at 346.

²⁰ *Id.* at 346-47.

²¹ *Id.* at 346.

²² *Id.* at 347.

²³ *Id.*

of the Managing Director; the Mayor also approved the plan and authorized its execution on the morning of May 13; and a Court of Common Pleas judge approved search and arrest warrants.²⁴ On May 12, police evacuated the Osage Avenue neighborhood.²⁵

Around 4:00 AM on May 13, 1985, utility crews cut off gas and electricity to the 6200 block of Osage Avenue.²⁶ Shortly thereafter, the Fire Department positioned high-pressure water hoses on remote controlled booms on Pine Street, one block behind the MOVE house.²⁷ At 5:35 AM, the Police Commissioner, using a bullhorn from inside a house on Osage Avenue, announced that four people inside 6221 Osage Avenue were named in arrest warrants and had fifteen minutes to surrender.²⁸ A man and woman responded over MOVE's loudspeaker, rejecting the ultimatum.²⁹ Fifteen minutes later, police fired tear gas and smoke projectiles at the front and rear of the MOVE house to provide cover for police entry.³⁰ The police insertion teams then entered houses at 6217 and 6223 Osage Avenue.³¹ At 6:00 AM, the first shots were fired at the police from the MOVE house.³² The police then fired at least 10,000 rounds of ammunition in the next 90 minutes.³³ At 7:30 AM, after the gunfire ended, insertion teams began using explosives in houses on both sides of 6221 Osage Avenue.³⁴ Members of the MOVE organization remained in 6221 Osage Avenue.³⁵

At approximately 3:45 PM, the Mayor announced at a televised press conference that he intended to "seize control of the [MOVE] house . . . by any means necessary."³⁶ At 5:00 PM, Mayor Goode approved the use of explosives on the roof of 6221 Osage Avenue.³⁷ The bomb was dropped on the MOVE house at 5:27 PM.³⁸ Two men and one woman were observed inside the front porch of the house.³⁹ Twenty-two minutes later, the head of the Bomb Disposal Unit reported seeing flames on the roof of the house.⁴⁰ About forty-five minutes after the bomb was dropped, the Police Commissioner and Fire Commissioner had a two-minute conversation during which they decided to let the house burn.⁴¹ At 9:30 PM, firefighters began for the first time fighting the fire in a conventional manner.⁴² Five children and six adults within the MOVE

²⁴ *Id.*

²⁵ MOVE Commission Report, at 347-48.

²⁶ *Id.* at 348.

²⁷ *Id.*

²⁸ *Id.*

²⁹ *Id.*

³⁰ *Id.*

³¹ MOVE Commission Report, at 348.

³² *Id.*

³³ *Id.*

³⁴ *Id.*

³⁵ *Id.* at 349.

³⁶ *Id.*

³⁷ MOVE Commission Report, at 349.

³⁸ *Id.*

³⁹ *Id.*

⁴⁰ *Id.*

⁴¹ *Id.* at 349.

⁴² *Id.* at 350.

home were killed during the confrontation.⁴³ Ramona Africa and Michael Moses Ward (formerly known as Birdie Africa) were the only survivors.

On June 4, 1985, the Mayor signed Executive Order No. 4-85, forming the MOVE Commission.⁴⁴ The Mayor further elaborated on the Commission's powers in Executive Order 5-85, which stated that the Commission was "investigatory only" and charged it with conducting a "thorough, independent and impartial examination of the events leading up to and including the incident of May 13, 1985."⁴⁵ The Commission was comprised of eleven private individuals appointed by the Mayor and serving without pay.⁴⁶ The Commission was tasked with "find[ing] facts and prepar[ing] a report for the Mayor and the Citizens of Philadelphia concerning the operation of City government as it relates to the events giving rise to the incident of May 13, 1985"⁴⁷ Ultimately, the MOVE Commission found, among other things:

- The City's administration discounted negotiation as a method of resolving the problem. Any attempted negotiations were haphazard and uncoordinated.⁴⁸
- Directives to remove the children from 6221 Osage Avenue were unclear, poorly communicated, and not carried out.⁴⁹
- The Mayor's failure to call a halt to the operation on May 12th, when he knew that children were in the house, was grossly negligent and clearly risked the lives of those children.⁵⁰
- The plan to bomb the MOVE house was reckless, ill-conceived, and hastily approved. Dropping a bomb on an occupied row house was unconscionable and should have been rejected out-of-hand.⁵¹
- The performance of the Medical Examiner's Office following the MOVE bombing was unprofessional and violated generally accepted practices for pathologists.⁵²

Despite the creation of the MOVE Commission and given its limited authority, the Medical Examiner's Office retained the governmental responsibility for determining the identity of unidentified human remains. A City lawyer, who was directing all MOVE-related matters at the time, acknowledged the same, stating "[w]ithout any disrespect to Dr. Hameli or his people, they

⁴³ MOVE Commission Report, at 353.

⁴⁴ Phila. Exec. Order No. 4-85 (June 4, 1985).

⁴⁵ Phila. Exec. Order No. 5-85 (June 19, 1985).

⁴⁶ MOVE Commission Report, at 342.

⁴⁷ Exec. Order No. 5-85 (June 19, 1985).

⁴⁸ MOVE Commission Report, at 350.

⁴⁹ *Id.* at 351.

⁵⁰ *Id.*

⁵¹ MOVE Commission Report, at 352.

⁵² *Id.* at 353.

are not the (city's) medical examiners, and there must be an identification by the medical examiner's office" before the remains could be released.⁵³

The Special Investigating Grand Jury of May 15, 1986 (the "MOVE Grand Jury") investigated the tragedy; it determined that no criminal charges against City officials were warranted. The MOVE Grand Jury's report emphasized, however, that its determination was not a "vindication of those officials" and that its report "should stand as a permanent record of their morally reprehensible behavior."⁵⁴

C. The Processing of the Site of the MOVE Bombing

The forensic analyses of the site of the bombing and the remains of the victims faced tremendous challenges from the outset. The fire, which reached temperatures in excess of 2,000 degrees Fahrenheit, reduced the homes on Osage Avenue to "nothing more than debris, smoldering in piles up to six feet deep"⁵⁵

The City's initial processing of the scene exacerbated the challenges for forensic analysis. When processing began the day after the bombing, Chief Medical Examiner Dr. Marvin Aronson⁵⁶ initially refused two requests by the Fire Marshal to come to the scene or send an assistant until a body had been recovered.⁵⁷ The City began using a clamshell or bucket apparatus to scoop and deposit material from the MOVE home onto Osage Avenue, until someone noticed a human leg dangling from the crane's scoop.⁵⁸ Police and fire personnel raked and shoveled through the debris that had been deposited onto Osage Avenue, further damaging the body parts within the debris.⁵⁹ Some body parts had been placed in body bags without the Medical Examiner's Office directing their excavation.⁶⁰ The MOVE Commission found that the use of the crane "resulted in dismemberment, commingling of body parts, and the destruction of important physical and medical evidence."⁶¹ The MOVE Grand Jury would later find, "[b]ecause of the absence of a specific protocol for processing scenes such as this, the evidence retrieval was not well-coordinated among the various offices, and appropriate care was not taken."⁶²

IV. Media Reports that the MOVE Victim Remains Were Used for Teaching by Professors Affiliated with Penn and Princeton

Until recently, it was not generally known to the public that the Medical Examiner's Office transferred the MOVE Victim Remains to Dr. Mann for continued evaluation in 1986, rather

⁵³ THE PHILADELPHIA INQUIRER, *City Won't Release MOVE Bodies to Families* (Nov. 13, 1985).

⁵⁴ Report and Record, *In re County Investigating Grand Jury of May 15, 1986*, No. 86-007363 ("MOVE Grand Jury Report"), at 279 (Phila. CCP).

⁵⁵ MOVE Grand Jury Report, at 241.

⁵⁶ Dr. Aronson died on September 6, 2014. THE PHILADELPHIA INQUIRER, *Marvin Aronson, medical examiner* (Sept. 20, 2014).

⁵⁷ MOVE Grand Jury Report, at 251-52.

⁵⁸ *Id.* at 241.

⁵⁹ *Id.* at 241, 253.

⁶⁰ *Id.* at 252.

⁶¹ MOVE Commission Report, at 370.

⁶² MOVE Grand Jury Report, at 252.

than releasing them to be buried as Katricia Africa consistent with November 1985 communications to her family.

That changed on April 21, 2021, when *The Philadelphia Inquirer* published an op-ed that described how the MOVE Victim Remains had been and continued to be held at the Penn Museum and that Dr. Monge, then-curator-in-charge at the Penn Museum, used the remains in a video course supported by Princeton University on the Coursera platform. MOVE members have indicated that before the publication of the April 21 op-ed, they did not know that the Penn Museum had been in possession of the MOVE Victim Remains.⁶³

On April 21, 2021, an online news website named *Billy Penn* (affiliated with Philadelphia's public radio station WHYY) published an article titled "Remains of children killed in MOVE bombing sat in a box at Penn Museum for decades."⁶⁴ The *Billy Penn* piece briefly describes the Hameli-Mann disagreement regarding the B-1 victim remains as well as their disagreement regarding the G victim remains, which consisted of a portion of that victim's skull and jaw, pelvis, tibia, and fibula. The MOVE Commission found the MOVE Victim Remains (B-1) and G victim remains to belong to Katricia Africa and Delisha Africa, respectively. However, the *Billy Penn* piece incorrectly reported that the remains used by Dr. Monge in the Coursera video were of both B-1 and G. The B-1 remains consisted of a femur and pelvis (seen in the video), whereas fragments consistent with the G victim remains are not seen in the video. As discussed *infra*, while the identity of the G victim remains was a subject of dispute between Drs. Hameli and Mann, there is no evidence that the G victim remains have ever been on Princeton's campus or used in Princeton courses.

The news coverage generated reactions from Princeton and others, including the broader academic community. On April 25, 2021, Princeton's Department of Anthropology published a statement on its webpage entitled "Legacies of Violence and Complicity." In that statement, the Department acknowledged Dr. Mann's involvement in the initial attempt to identify remains from the MOVE bombing and noted that he "continued to study one set of the remains with unclear identification."⁶⁵ The Department further noted that "[g]iven Prof. Mann's affiliation with our department, coupled with what we know about the troubled history of the field of physical anthropology, we should have asked more questions about his research." Additionally, the Department expressed that the field of biological anthropology has, in its history, "used, abused and disrespected bodies, bones and lives of indigenous and racialized communities under the guise of research and scholarship." The Department committed to "working against elements of the anthropological approaches that facilitate, perpetuate or reiterate the racist and harmful practices relating to human bodies, lives and experiences."

⁶³ MOVE Press Conference (Apr. 26, 2021).

⁶⁴ Maya Kassutto, *Remains of Children Killed in MOVE Bombing Sat in a Box at Penn Museum for Decades*, BILLY PENN (Apr. 21, 2021), <https://billypenn.com/2021/04/21/move-bombing-penn-museum-bones-remains-princeton-africa/>.

⁶⁵ Princeton's Department of Anthropology, *Legacies of Violence and Complicity ~ Current Policies and Guidelines*, PRINCETON UNIVERSITY (Apr. 25, 2021), <https://anthropology.princeton.edu/news/legacies-violence-and-complicity-current-policies-and-guidelines>.

With the statement, the Department included its current policies and guidelines—developed after the recent controversy—regarding the use of human remains in teaching. The policy noted that the Department “is not in possession of, and has no plans to create, a human osteological collection or to acquire human remains in any form.” It further provided a framework for the use of human remains should there be an instructional context where such materials may be used. First, the Department stated that legal, ethical, and cultural expectations and considerations “must be acknowledged and strictly adhered to with regard to the care, use and stewardship of human remains.” Also, the framework provides that undergraduate instruction in the Department “shall be undertaken primarily with casts and replicas, not actual skeletal material.” Where actual skeletal material is to be used, students must be adequately trained and supervised to ensure proper handling methods are used. And, should actual skeletal materials be on campus and in the Department’s possession, the Department committed to storing them in a “secure facility,” and to ensuring that “[a]ny and all human remains are treated with dignity and respect.”⁶⁶

The day after the Department posted its statement, 70 members of the Princeton faculty signed a letter to the University published in *The Daily Princetonian* entitled, “Princeton owes the families of the MOVE bombing victims answers.”⁶⁷ The letter states that, “[t]he exploitation of the bones of Black children killed by state violence has appalled us, and Princeton University played a role in this.” The letter continues that “[Dr.] Monge’s use of these bones further dehumanizes the victims, recalling the long history of commodification of and experimentation on Black people’s bodies.” The signatories asked for an “investigation into whether the remains were used within courses or for independent research at Princeton” and that “the findings should be made public.”

On April 28, 2021, three associations of Black anthropologists – the Association of Black Anthropologists, the Society of Black Archaeologists, and the Black in Bioanthropology Collective – issued a collective statement entitled “Concerning the Possession and Unethical Use of the Remains of the Children of MOVE and the Africa Family.”⁶⁸ This statement, which Princeton’s Anthropology Department posted to its webpage shortly after it was issued, noted that in the aftermath of the revelations regarding the MOVE Victim Remains, “[w]hat emerged was the disturbing complicity of anthropologists and anthropological institutions.” In light of the “history of racism in anthropology,” and the missions of each of the respective organizations, the associations “condemn[ed] in the strongest possible language . . . [the] horrific treatment of the remains of Tree and Delisha Africa, and . . . unfathomable heartlessness and disrespect shown

⁶⁶ *Id.*

⁶⁷ Princeton Faculty Guest Contributors, *Princeton Owes the Families of the MOVE Bombing Victims Answers*, DAILY PRINCETONIAN (Apr. 26, 2021), <https://www.dailyprincetonian.com/article/2021/04/princeton-university-move-families-bombing-victims-philadelphia>.

⁶⁸ The Association of Black Anthropologists, The Society of Black Archaeologists & The Black in Bioanthropology Collective, *A Collective Statement*, PRINCETON UNIVERSITY (Apr. 28, 2021), <https://anthropology.princeton.edu/news/collective-statement>.

towards the Africa family.” The associations further condemned the “stunning ethical indifference shown by all parties involved.”⁶⁹

V. The Investigation’s Factual Findings

A. An Overview of the Location of the MOVE Victim Remains from May 13, 1985 to July 2, 2021

One of our investigation’s goals was to identify where the MOVE Victim Remains were located during the years following the 1985 MOVE bombing. The table below provides an overview of the MOVE Victim Remains’ location from 1985 through 2021. We provide further details and analysis in the sections that follow.

Date/Timeframe	Location and Events
May 13, 1985	The City of Philadelphia dropped an explosive device on the MOVE house at 6221 Osage Avenue; eleven people were killed.
May 14-16, 1985	City personnel sift through the debris and recover the remains of bombing victims. All recovered remains were found within the confines of the MOVE house property line. ⁷⁰
May 15-17, 1985	Drs. Mann and Monge evaluate the MOVE Victim Remains at the Medical Examiner’s Office.
July – October, 1985	The remains are reported to be examined at the Medical Examiner’s Office, where Dr. Hameli and the other experts retained by the MOVE Commission independently investigate the identities of the victims and their causes of death. ⁷¹

⁶⁹ Various other anthropological associations also issued public statements in reaction to the new reports. For example, on May 18, 2021, the Executive Committee of the Biological Anthropology Section of the American Anthropological Association (“AAA”) issued a statement that recognized “that the prolonged possession and use of the Africa family’s remains – and the forensic standards that inform these decisions – are simultaneously outcomes and continuations of systemic violence.” The group made a call for action, asserting that “the use and display of human remains obtained by violent or dubious means, retained beyond their original scope, or used for purposes other than those which descendant or stakeholder communities have explicitly allowed must end.” Holly Dunsworth, *AAA Biological Anthropology Section (BAS) Statement on the MOVE Remains*, BIOLOGICAL ANTHROPOLOGY SECTION (May 18, 2021), <https://bas.americananthro.org/news/591>.

⁷⁰ Diagram of Location of the Victim Remains (undated) (available at the Special Collections Research Center at Temple University’s Charles Library).

⁷¹ Dr. Ellis R. Kerley, MOVE-85-1, Anthropological Report, (undated) (available at the Special Collections Research Center at Temple University’s Charles Library).

Date/Timeframe	Location and Events
November 5, 1985	The Medical Examiner's Office, which had been stripped of control over the remains by the MOVE Commission, regains control over the MOVE Victim Remains once more. ⁷²
November 14, 1985	Drs. Mann and Monge again examine the MOVE Victim Remains at the Medical Examiner's Office. ⁷³ The following day, Dr. Mann issues his report concluding that the MOVE Victim Remains belong to a Jane Doe.
November 16, 1985	Relying on the MOVE Commission's identification of the MOVE Victim Remains as Katricia Africa, a Medical Examiner's Office investigator contacts Katricia Africa's parents and invites them to claim her body.
November 25, 1985	Dr. Segal takes the MOVE Victim Remains to the Smithsonian Institution for evaluation, ⁷⁴ but brings them back to Philadelphia at some point before December 3.
December 3-4, 1985	On December 3, Drs. Hameli and Ellis Kerley, another forensic anthropologist in the MOVE Commission pathology group, examine the MOVE Victim Remains in the Medical Examiner's Office. ⁷⁵ The next day, the MOVE Commission informs the Medical Examiner's Office that it may "feel free to release [the remains] in accordance with normal procedures." ⁷⁶
December 14, 1985	A record signed by a morgue attendant and an undertaker indicate that "Unknown Stake B1" was released. Katricia Africa is reportedly buried that same day.

⁷² Dr. Robert J. Segal, Final Report on the MOVE Investigation (Mar. 18, 1986) at 5 (the "Segal Report").

⁷³ THE PHILADELPHIA INQUIRER, *Anthropologist: MOVE Victim Misidentified*, (Nov. 21, 1985) (noting that Dr. Mann "released his report after re-examining the remains at the city morgue last Thursday").

⁷⁴ Handwritten file note in City Archives; see also THE PHILADELPHIA INQUIRER, *Pathologist to Restudy Remains MOVE Siege Death Toll, Identities in Question* (Dec. 1, 1985) ("Last week, [Dr. Segal] took the same bones to the Smithsonian Institution in Washington for examination.").

⁷⁵ Letter from Dr. Ellis Kerley to William Lytton (Dec. 28, 1985) (available at the Special Collections Research Center at Temple University's Charles Library).

⁷⁶ Letter from William Lytton to Dr. Robert Segal (Dec. 4, 1985) (available at the Special Collections Research Center at Temple University's Charles Library).

Date/Timeframe	Location and Events
January 22, 1986	The MOVE Victim Remains are in the possession of a Professor of Anthropology at California State University, in Fullerton, CA for an aging analysis. According to a January 22, 1986, letter to Dr. Segal, this Professor of Anthropology planned to “send the MOVE specimen back to [Dr. Segal’s] office by certified mail on Friday afternoon of this week.” ⁷⁷ This Professor aged the remains at 13-16 years old.
Between January 23-September 17, 1986	The MOVE Victim Remains are sent to the Smithsonian Institution for identification for an unknown period during this timeframe; the Smithsonian sends them back to Dr. Segal on September 17, 1986. ⁷⁸
September 23, 1986	The Medical Examiner’s Office receives by mail the remains from the Smithsonian and transfers them to Dr. Mann for “continued evaluation.” ⁷⁹
September 23, 1986–2001	The MOVE Victim Remains are stored at the Penn Museum in a cabinet.
2001–2019	The MOVE Victim Remains continue to be kept at the Penn Museum. During this period, Dr. Monge transports the remains to Princeton no more than five times, once for teaching Anthropology 522A in 2015 and the other times for further analysis by biological anthropologists visiting Princeton’s campus. ⁸⁰
January 21, 2019	Dr. Monge uses the MOVE Victim Remains at the Penn Museum to film a segment for a flipped Princeton course, Anthropology 309, which would later be used for the Coursera Course.
April 18, 2021	Dr. Monge transports the MOVE Victim Remains from the Penn Museum to Dr. Mann’s private residence in Princeton, NJ at the direction of a Penn Museum official. ⁸¹ Dr. Mann stores the box in his basement.

⁷⁷ Letter to Dr. Robert Segal (Jan. 22, 1986) (Phila. City Archives).

⁷⁸ Smithsonian Institution, Shipping Invoice, No. 258820 (dated Sep. 17, 1986) (“one box containing human skeletal remains from Philadelphia, PA Medical Examiner’s Office”) (Phila. City Archives).

⁷⁹ Memo to File, Sep. 23, 1986, attaching Receipt from the Office of the Medical Examiner (Phila. City Archives).

⁸⁰ Interview with Janet Monge (June 4, 2021); Interview with Janet Monge (June 24, 2021); Interview with Alan Mann (June 16, 2021); Interview with Alan Mann (June 21, 2021).

⁸¹ Interview with Janet Monge (June 4, 2021). This occurred in anticipation that there could be media coverage regarding the location of the MOVE Victim Remains. Indeed, on April 21, 2021, *The Philadelphia Inquirer* op-ed and *Billy Penn* article were published.

Date/Timeframe	Location and Events
April 30, 2021	The Terry Funeral Home retrieves the MOVE Victim Remains from Dr. Mann's Princeton home and transports the remains back to its facility in West Philadelphia.
July 2, 2021	According to news reports, the MOVE Victim Remains are transferred to members of the MOVE organization from the Terry Funeral Home. ⁸²

B. From 1985 to 2001

1. The Philadelphia Medical Examiner's Office Engages Dr. Alan Mann as a Consultant

Around 1980, the then-Medical Examiner, Dr. Marvin Aronson, invited Dr. Mann to serve as a consultant to the Medical Examiner's Office. In that role, Dr. Mann, on at least a dozen occasions before the MOVE investigation, had been tasked with evaluating skeletal material and providing the office with an opinion regarding the identity of the deceased, particularly when there were unusual circumstances surrounding the death. Despite being engaged to serve in a forensic role, Dr. Mann reports that he does not consider himself a forensic anthropologist. Rather, he considers himself a biological anthropologist and specifically a paleoanthropologist, i.e., one who studies human evolution.⁸³ Dr. Mann explains that he was qualified to assist the Medical Examiner because of his training and scholarly focus, from which he had experience evaluating and identifying skeletal materials, particularly small skeletal fragments.⁸⁴

2. Dr. Mann, with then-Graduate Student Janet Monge, Begins Assisting the Medical Examiner with the MOVE Forensic Investigation

Shortly after the MOVE tragedy, the Medical Examiner, Dr. Aronson, called Dr. Mann to ask whether he would assist in reviewing the skeletonized remains from the MOVE house. To aid in the analysis of the remains, Dr. Mann engaged Dr. Monge, a then-graduate student in Penn's Anthropology Department. Dr. Mann became Dr. Monge's graduate advisor in January 1977.⁸⁵ Dr. Monge reported that as a part of the normal training process at Penn, Dr. Mann would enlist students to help him in forensic cases, both obtaining their assistance and providing learning opportunities. Together, the two helped to sort and analyze the remains from the site. Dr. Mann has stated that he and Dr. Monge undertook the assignment "because we wanted to help

⁸² Ximena Conde, *MOVE Bombing Victim Remains from Penn have Been Returned, Family Says*, WHYY (July 13, 2021), <https://whyy.org/articles/move-bombing-victim-remains-from-penn-have-been-returned-family-says/>.

⁸³ Forensic anthropology as a distinct field was still in its nascent phases in the mid-1980s, according to a biological anthropologist whom the Investigation Team interviewed. Thus, those who routinely assisted in a forensic capacity did not necessarily self-identify principally as forensic anthropologists.

⁸⁴ Interview with Alan Mann (June 16, 2021).

⁸⁵ Interview with Janet Monge (June 4, 2021).

document a crime, with the hope that identification of the victims would bring a small measure of peace to their families.”⁸⁶

On May 20, 1985, Dr. Mann submitted an invoice to the Medical Examiner’s Office. In a cover letter accompanying the invoice, Dr. Mann wrote “[i]n my ten years of work with the OME, this is the first bill I have ever submitted. I trust you will understand that it is because of the time that I put in.” He enclosed an invoice for \$300 that reflected one and one half days of work that occurred on May 16 and 17. Both the invoice and the cover letter were on Penn stationery and described Dr. Mann’s affiliation with the Department of Anthropology and the Penn Museum. The invoice did not provide any instructions for payment.

Dr. Aronson tasked Dr. Mann with reviewing remains from the site and, if possible, providing information regarding their identities. Dr. Mann stated that his initial analysis of the MOVE Victim Remains occurred in the basement of the MOVE home approximately two days after the fire.

Dr. Monge reported that the first time that she saw the MOVE Victim Remains was when she and Dr. Mann participated in further sorting the victims’ remains at the Medical Examiner’s Office. At that time, she and Dr. Mann took a couple of days to come to a consensus on how to sort the materials that were removed from the site. In the months following the bombing, Dr. Monge returned to the Medical Examiner’s Office several times to provide further clarification on the manner in which the materials were sorted and to continue to evaluate the remains. The remains that were the focus of Drs. Mann and Monge’s evaluation were labeled as the B-1 remains, i.e., the MOVE Victim Remains. Those remains consisted of two bones – a portion of the right side of the pelvis (a right innominate) and a portion of a right proximal femur bone including pubic hair attached to a portion of tissue. Both bones belonged to the same person; they were found in a pair of blue jeans that were not retained.⁸⁷

Both Drs. Mann and Monge agree that the City ultimately transported the victim remains from the MOVE home to the Medical Examiner’s Office, where they remained for some time.

3. Dr. Mann Reaches a Conclusion Regarding the MOVE Victim Remains

As noted above, the MOVE Commission’s pathology group, led by Dr. Hameli, opined that the B-1 remains were those of Katricia Africa.⁸⁸ Dr. Hameli, in consultation with Drs. Kerley and Lowell Levine, a forensic odontologist, concluded that the partial pelvis and femur belonged to a female child between 13 and 15 years of age. They also determined that E-1 (teeth and a mandible fragment) were from a child 13 to 16 years of age and, therefore, associated them with B-1. Dr. Hameli and his team relied upon interviews from family members that “indicated that

⁸⁶ Alan Mann, Draft Op. Ed. (May 14, 2021) (never published). Dr. Mann drafted a newspaper op-ed to explain his role in these matters but he decided against submitting it for publication.

⁸⁷ Interview with Janet Monge (June 4, 2021); Robert Segal, Post Mortem Report of Medical Examiner’s Office (Jun. 17, 1985) (available at the Special Collections Research Center at Temple University’s Charles Library).

⁸⁸ Dr. Ali Z. Hameli, Identification of Remains (undated) (available at the Special Collections Research Center at Temple University’s Charles Library).

among the . . . female children in that house, Katricia was the only one that had pubic hair.”⁸⁹ Lastly, Dr. Hameli confirmed that like Consuewella Africa, the remains were from an individual with an “O” blood type. Based upon this analysis, Dr. Hameli concluded that the B-1 remains were those of Katricia Africa. The MOVE Commission adopted this finding.

Drs. Mann and Monge, however, disagreed – and continue to disagree – with this determination.⁹⁰ In a report that Dr. Mann authored dated November 15, 1985, he wrote that he and Dr. Monge’s “findings on [B-1] differ dramatically from those presented in the pathology group report.”⁹¹ Drs. Mann and Monge concluded that the MOVE Victim Remains belonged to a female individual with “an age at death of about 19 with a plus and minus range of 1 year: 18-20 years of age.”⁹² They also disagreed with the MOVE Commission’s association of the E-1 remains with the MOVE Victim Remains, which was a basis of the Commission’s conclusion that these remains belonged to Katricia Africa.⁹³ Dr. Mann indicated such in his November 1985 report, stating that “[t]he mandible, ‘E-1’, of a dental age 13-15 placed with this body by the pathology group, can not [sic] reasonably be placed with these older in age postcranial materials, and it has been removed.”⁹⁴

Dr. Monge’s long-held belief, which she shared with the Investigation Team, was that there were no other materials in the home that belonged to Katricia Africa. And, upon analysis of the B-1 pelvis, Drs. Mann and Monge concluded that a key growth plate had completely fused, indicating that the victim’s age of death was “about 19 with a plus and minus range of 1 year: 18-20 years of age.”⁹⁵ Thus, Drs. Mann and Monge believed that the MOVE Victim Remains could not have been Katricia Africa’s. However, they could not provide a conclusion as to whom these remains belonged, thus suggesting the existence of a twelfth, unknown victim.⁹⁶

Drs. Mann and Monge also disputed the MOVE Commission’s findings regarding the remains designated as the Body G remains. While the MOVE Commission determined that these remains were from a child aged 9-12,⁹⁷ and therefore were those of Delisha Africa (approximately 13 years old), Drs. Mann and Monge concluded that the remains were more properly associated with a child whose age at death was 6-7 years old.⁹⁸

⁸⁹ Transcript of MOVE Commission Hearing, Nov. 5 1985, at 42:15-19 (Testimony of Dr. Ali Hameli).

⁹⁰ Drs. Mann and Monge were not alone in this disagreement. A news report published on January 21, 1986, stated that the B-1 remains had “been examined recently by four anthropologists who concluded that they belonged to a female significantly older than Katricia – probably from 17 to 21.” THE PHILADELPHIA INQUIRER, *MOVE finding disputed: 4 experts challenge panel on remains* (Jan. 21, 1986) (available at the Special Collections Research Center at Temple University’s Charles Library).

⁹¹ Dr. Alan Mann, Report on MOVE Remains (Nov. 14, 1985), at 1 (the “Mann Report”). The report’s title contains a date of November 14, 1985, but the signature page is dated November 15, 1985.

⁹² *Id.* at 3.

⁹³ Interview with Janet Monge (June 4, 2021).

⁹⁴ Mann Report (Nov. 14, 1985), at 3.

⁹⁵ *Id.*

⁹⁶ *Id.*

⁹⁷ Dr. Ellis R. Kerley, MOVE-85-1, Anthropological Report, (undated).

⁹⁸ Mann Report (Nov. 14, 1985), at 5.

Dr. Monge stated that one of the many complications in identifying the remains removed from the MOVE site was that there was conflicting information regarding who was in the home at the time of the bombing.⁹⁹ Thus, based upon their conclusion, Dr. Mann noted that “[i]n keeping with standard practice in forensic investigations at the time, we labeled these unidentified [the B-1] remains as belonging to ‘Jane Doe.’”¹⁰⁰

In the midst of the disagreement between the two groups of experts, on November 16, 1985, Eugene Suplee, an investigator for the Medical Examiner’s Office and a subordinate to Dr. Segal,¹⁰¹ wrote to Consuewella Africa, who was incarcerated at State Correctional Institution – Muncy at the time. In that letter he wrote, “[w]e regret to inform you that your daughters, Katricia and Zanetta, have been identified by the [MOVE Commission’s] Consultant as victims in the MOVE house fire on Osage Avenue.”¹⁰² Two days later, on November 18, 1985, Nathaniel Galloway, Sr., Katricia Africa’s father, signed a Certification of Identification with the Medical Examiner’s Office. In that document, he wrote: “I am Katricia’s father and am exercising my right to claim her remains. I understand that the MEO is awaiting to hear from her mother who is in Muncy. I accept the identification of my daughter Katricia as established by the [MOVE Commission].”¹⁰³

On November 22, 1985, the Assistant Medical Examiner, Dr. Robert Segal, who oversaw the investigation by the Medical Examiner’s Office, committed publicly to studying Dr. Mann’s opinion, after Michael Ward (Birdie Africa) – one of two survivors of the tragedy – reported to the MOVE Commission that he saw Katricia and another child run from the MOVE house with him after the fire began.¹⁰⁴

4. The Medical Examiner’s Office Transfers the MOVE Victim Remains to Dr. Mann’s Custody

On December 3, 1985, Drs. Hameli and Kerley examined the MOVE Victim Remains in Dr. Segal’s office inside of the Medical Examiner’s Office.¹⁰⁵ The following day, the MOVE Commission informed the Medical Examiner’s Office that it could release the remains in accordance with normal procedures.¹⁰⁶ A “Body Delivery Record (Outgoing)” for “Unknown Stake B1” from the Medical Examiner’s Office was signed on December 14, 1985 by a morgue

⁹⁹ Interview with Janet Monge (June 4, 2021). Dr. Segal, too, rejected the conclusion that the remains were those of Katricia Africa simply based upon the assumption that she was the only individual present in the MOVE house at the time of the bombing not accounted for. Segal Report at 11.

¹⁰⁰ Alan Mann, Draft Op. Ed. (May 14, 2021), at 1 (never published).

¹⁰¹ The Medical Examiner, Dr. Aronson, was relieved of his duties in the days following the bombing. Dr. Segal, the Assistant Medical Examiner, was placed in charge of the investigation.

¹⁰² Letter from Eugene Suplee to Consuewella Dotson (Nov. 16, 1985).

¹⁰³ Certification of Identification (Nov. 18, 1985).

¹⁰⁴ THE NEW YORK TIMES, *Blaze Victim Identity at Issue* (Nov. 22, 1985) <https://www.nytimes.com/1985/11/22/us/blaze-victim-identity-at-issue.html>.

¹⁰⁵ Letter from Dr. Ellis Kerley to William Lytton, Staff Director, MOVE Commission (Dec. 28, 1985) (available at the Special Collections Research Center at Temple University’s Charles Library).

¹⁰⁶ Letter from William Lytton to Dr. Robert Segal (Dec. 4, 1985) (available at the Special Collections Research Center at Temple University’s Charles Library).

attendant and an undertaker.¹⁰⁷ The remains of Katricia Africa were reportedly buried that same day by her relatives. It is unclear, however, from the records available what remains were released for burial.¹⁰⁸ An article published the day after the burial suggests that Dr. Segal confirmed the release of the MOVE Victim Remains for burial while acknowledging the ongoing scientific dispute regarding their identification.¹⁰⁹ Dr. Monge theorized, during our investigation, that the E-1 remains only were released for Katricia Africa's burial.

On January 23, 1986, Dr. Segal wrote to the Staff Director and Counsel for the MOVE Commission that an independent examination of the MOVE Victim Remains "strongly supports Dr. Hameli's conclusion." Dr. Segal also wrote that "[i]t would be unreasonable for me to reject these findings in light of the evidence available at this time."¹¹⁰

One week later, on January 30, 1986, Dr. Hameli released his addendum and final report to the MOVE Commission.¹¹¹ Based on subsequent analyses by Dr. Kerley and other independent forensic anthropologists, Dr. Hameli modified his age estimate of B-1 from 13-16 years old to "12-18 with [a] more probable range of 14-16 years old."¹¹² As a result, he affirmed his earlier conclusion that the B-1 remains (the MOVE Victim Remains) were of Katricia Africa. Dr. Hameli also noted, "[a]lthough Dr. Segal continues to believe, based on the advice of his anthropologists, that Case B-1 belongs to an adult female, he has nonetheless released that body as the 14 year-8 month old Katricia Do[t]son."¹¹³

In his "Final Report on the MOVE Investigation," authored in March of 1986, Dr. Segal – who, as noted above, headed the Medical Examiner's Office's investigation – concluded that "it is clear that 'positive' identification of [the B-1 remains] cannot be established as there are no unique identifying features."¹¹⁴ However, Dr. Segal's report made no mention of the whereabouts of the MOVE Victim Remains or Dr. Mann's continued analysis.

Dr. Mann recalls that before he was given the MOVE Victim Remains, and after the MOVE Commission issued its findings, he spoke with Dr. Segal. Dr. Mann reported that, at that time, Dr. Segal thought that it was "necessary and justified" for Dr. Mann to further evaluate the remains to "fully determine" their identity and age. Dr. Mann believed that Dr. Segal thus conveyed that it was appropriate for Dr. Mann to retain the MOVE Victim Remains. Neither Dr.

¹⁰⁷ Body Delivery Record (Outgoing), Case No. 2599, (Dec. 14, 1985) (signed 9:30 AM).

¹⁰⁸ See ASSOCIATED PRESS NEWS, *Bodies of Three Children Unclaimed at Morgue with –AM-MOVE Anniversary Btj* (May 13, 1986), <https://apnews.com/article/d4c82af53f243815728011517c793161>.

¹⁰⁹ THE PHILADELPHIA INQUIRER, *2 MOVE Girls Buried, But Questions Linger* (Dec. 15, 1985) ("Dr. Robert Segal, assistant medical examiner, said last night that the remains were released on the basis of the identification made to the MOVE [C]ommission and at the request of the relatives. However, he said, the dispute over the identifications remains.").

¹¹⁰ Letter from Dr. Robert J. Segal to William Lytton (Jan. 23, 1986) (available at the Special Collections Research Center at Temple University's Charles Library).

¹¹¹ Memorandum from the MOVE Commission to William Lytton (Jan. 31, 1986) (available at the Special Collections Research Center at Temple University's Charles Library).

¹¹² Addendum Report of Dr. Ali Hameli at 3 (Jan. 30, 1986).

¹¹³ *Id.* at 2 (emphasis in original).

¹¹⁴ Segal Report at 11 (emphasis in original).

Mann nor Dr. Monge could recall precisely when this occurred. However, a handwritten “Memo to File,” titled “MOVE” and dated September 23, 1986, reads as follows:

Bones arrived by mail from the Smithsonian and will be turned over to Allan [sic] Mann for his continued evaluation under an attached receipt.

The memorandum also attaches a Medical Examiner evidence receipt form dated September 23, 1986. The receipt reads:

Case No. MOVE
Received from [signature of Dr. Segal] the following material in the case of “Move”
Various bones for anthropologic examination.
[Signature of Janet M. Monge]¹¹⁵

We conclude that this receipt covered the MOVE Victim Remains, i.e., the femur and pelvis fragments. Dr. Monge confirmed that the receipt pertained to the B-1 remains (the MOVE Victim Remains) only. Drs. Mann and Monge also both stated that the Medical Examiner’s Office did not provide them with any other remains for continued evaluation.

Dr. Mann reported that the Medical Examiner’s Office did not provide him with any written instructions or conditions with respect to the MOVE Victim Remains. Nor did our investigation uncover any Medical Examiner’s Office policies regarding the transfer of human remains that applied in 1986.¹¹⁶ Dr. Mann opined that his and Dr. Monge’s determination that the MOVE Victim Remains were those of a “Jane Doe” did not impact how long they could retain the remains. Dr. Mann acknowledged that the further examination of the remains could potentially have occurred at the Medical Examiner’s Office. Dr. Monge agreed, but noted it would not have been easily done.¹¹⁷

Dr. Mann reported that the MOVE investigation was the first time that he had received remains from the Medical Examiner’s Office to evaluate in his lab at Penn.¹¹⁸ He reported that there was “no expectation at all” that he would return the remains to the Medical Examiner’s Office.

¹¹⁵ Dr. Robert J. Segal Memo to File (Sep. 23, 1986) attaching Receipt from the Office of the Medical Examiner (Phila. City Archives).

¹¹⁶ The Investigation Team requested from the City, among other things, policies regarding “procedures for the tracking and return of unidentified human remains that leave the Medical Examiner’s Office for purposes other than burial.”

¹¹⁷ Interview with Janet Monge (June 4, 2021).

¹¹⁸ Dr. Mann’s recollection here, however, may not be accurate, as Dr. Mann also reported that there were a “couple cases” where Dr. Aronson provided him with bone fragments from a victim to assess their age and gender outside of the Medical Examiner’s Office. Dr. Mann reported that he kept these remains in his possession and evaluated them for a period of time. Upon either identifying the remains or concluding he would never be able to do so, depending on the case, Dr. Mann returned the remains at issue to the Medical Examiner’s Office. Dr. Mann was clear that he at no point concluded that he would never be able to identify the MOVE Victim Remains. Interview with Alan Mann (June 16, 2021).

Indeed, Dr. Mann reported that “no one said anything” to him about the matter. He believed that when the Medical Examiner’s Office provided him with the MOVE Victim Remains, he could keep them and continue to attempt to identify them for as long as he wanted. Dr. Mann thought that he would ultimately return the remains once he was able to identify the individual to whom they belonged. But he was not sure how long that analysis might take.

While Dr. Mann was initially tasked with conducting this analysis by Dr. Aronson, and considered himself “responsible to” Dr. Aronson as a result, after Dr. Aronson was relieved of his duties on May 15, 1985, Dr. Mann continued to report to Dr. Segal. After Dr. Segal left the Medical Examiner’s Office at some point in late 1986 or 1987, Dr. Mann believed that he reported to no one. Moreover, as time passed, Dr. Mann reported that things were “quieting down” with regard to the incident. As a result, although Dr. Mann continued to feel strongly that he had to identify the person to whom the MOVE Victim Remains belonged to ensure that the City was held responsible, Dr. Mann did not contact the Medical Examiner’s Office to discuss the case after Dr. Segal left that office.¹¹⁹

Dr. Monge stated that in 1986 it was not – and still is not – uncommon for a forensic anthropologist to retain remains when a case is declared “cold,” meaning that there is no next of kin to whom the remains can be returned. In such a situation, the forensic anthropologist retains the remains in their lab and continues to work with them, especially if the forensic anthropologist believes that they might be able to identify the victim later due to, for example, advancements in available technology.¹²⁰ Dr. Monge reported that in her experience, there was no limit on how long a forensic anthropologist could retain such remains, and believed that most forensic anthropologists have remains from these types of cold cases in their labs.

When asked whether there were any attempts to return the MOVE Victim Remains to the Medical Examiner’s Office, Dr. Monge stated that she did not believe that she or Dr. Mann could do so. She reported that the case was closed, i.e., that there was no conclusion that could be made regarding the remains, which meant that the Medical Examiner’s Office would not accept the remains. She did note, however, that this may have been a misunderstanding on her part.

Dr. Mann indicated that in retrospect he “probably” should have contacted the Medical Examiner’s Office at some point after Dr. Segal left that office to discuss the remains.¹²¹

5. The MOVE Victim Remains Are Stored in the Penn Museum and Are Not Used for Teaching

Drs. Mann and Monge agree that once the MOVE Victim Remains were released to Dr. Mann, the remains were taken to and stored in a cabinet at the Penn Museum, wrapped in protective bubble wrap and some sort of cushion or cotton material.¹²² Both Drs. Mann and Monge stated

¹¹⁹ Interview with Alan Mann (June 21, 2021).

¹²⁰ Interview with Janet Monge (June 4, 2021).

¹²¹ Interview with Alan Mann (June 21, 2021).

¹²² While Dr. Mann and Dr. Monge’s recollections differ about the exact location, access, and manner of storage at the Penn Museum (e.g., a locked basement-room (Dr. Mann) versus the office of graduates students working with Dr. Mann (Dr. Monge)), these differences are not pertinent to Princeton’s involvement with the remains. Also, several news reports in April 2021 suggested that there were

that they never used the MOVE Victim Remains to teach during this period of time (1985–2001), with Dr. Mann stating that he never used the MOVE Victim Remains to teach at all, although he worked, on occasion and when his scheduled permitted, to further evaluate them in an attempt to identify the decedent.¹²³

6. Dr. Mann and Dr. Monge Become Affiliated with Princeton's Anthropology Department

In 1986, Drs. Mann and Monge first became affiliated with Princeton on a part-time basis as visiting faculty. Although both Penn and Princeton have anthropology departments, the focus of each department differs. Traditionally, the study of anthropology has been divided into four fields: (1) biological/physical;¹²⁴ (2) sociocultural; (3) archaeological; and (4) linguistics. Penn's department, which is larger than Princeton's, has faculty members who specialize and teach in all four fields. Additionally, Penn has a large physical collection of remains and other artifacts in the Penn Museum.

Princeton's Department of Anthropology is focused almost exclusively on the field of sociocultural anthropology, particularly at the graduate level. A former Chair of Princeton's Department reported that biological anthropologists are typically at universities with associated medical schools, where they principally teach gross anatomy. However, because Princeton does not have a medical school, it had not historically had a biological anthropologist on its faculty.

During the 1986 spring semester, as a visiting professor, Dr. Mann taught his first class – Anthropology 206: Human Evolution – at Princeton. Dr. Mann continued to teach this course each spring at Princeton as a part-time visiting professor until 2001. Over this period, Dr. Monge worked with Dr. Mann at Princeton, initially as his teaching assistant.¹²⁵ Dr. Mann conducted the lectures and half of the seminar sessions, while Dr. Monge taught the other half of the seminar sessions. While Dr. Mann reports that he did not use, or even discuss, the MOVE Victim Remains while teaching this course, as they were “not germane to the course,” he did use other human remains as demonstrative tools when he met with individual students and/or small

remains from a second victim of the MOVE bombing that were also in Dr. Monge's possession at the Penn Museum. The second set of remains purportedly included an occipital bone that was associated with Delisha Africa. Dr. Monge, however, reported that a second set of remains were never transferred to her or Dr. Mann's possession from the Medical Examiner's Office. Nor were a second set of MOVE remains ever present on Princeton's campus, or used in the Coursera Course.

¹²³ Interview with Alan Mann (June 16, 2021).

¹²⁴ According to a biological anthropology professor, physical anthropology is the traditional discipline of analyzing bones, particularly measurements. *Biological* anthropology, however, later emerged as a discipline and is more integrative in its approach, aiming to understand how the body works from the genes to the skull. In fact, there has recently been a movement towards renaming the subspecialty as biological anthropology. As such, this report will refer to the field as biological anthropology in lieu of physical anthropology.

¹²⁵ Interview with Janet Monge (June 24, 2021).

groups.¹²⁶ These remains were from the Penn Museum's teaching collection and were mainly obtained from Penn's medical school.

Dr. Mann reported that the Penn Museum did not have formal policies or procedures governing how remains were to be signed out from the collection. Nor was there an agreement between Penn and Princeton regarding Dr. Mann's use of remains from the Penn Museum during his teaching activities on Princeton's campus. Dr. Monge reported that because there was no formal process, she simply told individuals at Penn that the items were being used at Princeton.¹²⁷

Generally speaking, the human remains that Dr. Mann used in his teaching activities at Princeton while a visiting professor were stored on Penn's campus at the Penn Museum. Dr. Mann would pack and transport the remains from the Penn Museum to Princeton for each class. After each class, Dr. Mann would return the remains to the Penn Museum. The exception was at the end of the semester, when Dr. Mann recalls that he may have left remains on Princeton's campus for a week or two while he reviewed the semester's materials with the class in advance of their exam.

Dr. Mann reported that while he was teaching as a visiting professor at Princeton, he neither sought permission from nor informed anyone at the University that he was using human remains in his teaching activities on campus. Nor would he have been expected to do so as part of the ordinary University process for approving courses, including those taught by visiting faculty. Dr. Mann believes that only the students enrolled in the class knew of the use of the remains.¹²⁸ No one else associated with Princeton interviewed by the Investigation Team reported being aware that Dr. Mann was using human remains in teaching these classes.

7. Dr. Monge Describes Seeking to Discuss the MOVE Victim Remains with a Member of the Africa Family in 1995

Dr. Monge stated that in 1995, around the 10th anniversary of the MOVE bombing, Ramona Africa was participating in the making of a documentary about the tragedy and visited the Penn Museum during the production process. This was the first contact that Dr. Monge had had with Ramona Africa. In an email dated April 24, 2021, Dr. Monge wrote to Princeton's Professor Rouse about her meeting with Ramona Africa. Dr. Monge reported that during that meeting she and Dr. Mann relayed their findings to Ramona Africa. However, Dr. Monge concluded that Ramona Africa was not interested in receiving the remains. In a subsequent interview with our Investigation Team, Dr. Monge elaborated that Ramona Africa came to the Penn Museum in part to interview her and Dr. Mann regarding their involvement in the investigation. The interview was, according to Dr. Monge, "unstructured" and not recorded. Dr. Monge reported that she and Dr. Mann wanted to speak with Ramona Africa specifically about the MOVE Victim Remains that were in their possession and whether she had any thoughts on how to proceed. Dr. Monge reported that she told Ramona Africa during this meeting that she and Dr. Mann had the remains

¹²⁶ Dr. Monge also said she did not use the MOVE Victim Remains in the course, which Dr. Mann confirmed.

¹²⁷ Interview with Janet Monge (June 4, 2021). Dr. Monge reported that in January 2020, when she stopped teaching at Princeton and returned materials to the Penn Museum, she was directed by Penn Museum staff to prepare a loan agreement documenting which pieces had been used on Princeton's campus.

¹²⁸ Interview of Alan Mann (June 16, 2021).

of an unidentified victim from the MOVE tragedy. Dr. Monge did not, however, tell Ramona Africa that the remains were those identified by the MOVE Commission as belonging to Katricia Africa. According to Dr. Monge, however, Ramona Africa wanted to discuss only the MOVE organization more generally and the way in which the City treated MOVE's members.¹²⁹

Understanding that this exchange occurred 25 years ago, Dr. Mann does not believe that he participated in the interview with Ramona Africa and does not recall trying to have a conversation with her regarding the MOVE Victim Remains. Nor did our investigation find any evidence corroborating Dr. Monge's recollection of this event from members of MOVE, including Ramona Africa.

C. From 2001 to 2018

1. Dr. Mann Joins the Princeton Anthropology Department Full-Time in 2001

In 2001, Dr. Mann joined the Anthropology Department as a full-time faculty member. At that time he was provided "a research fund of \$50,000" that was "intended for [Dr. Mann's] own research needs and would include the purchase of those casts and skeletal models that [Dr. Mann] would use in both [his] research and teaching, as well as other research needs." Dr. Mann reported that this was necessary because when he arrived at Princeton, the Department had "virtually no" skeletal materials that he could use to teach his courses. With the funds, he purchased two human skeletons (a male and a female), skulls, and other models, all of which were made out of plastic. He reported that he did not transfer any human remains from Penn when he joined the Princeton faculty because he "did not have any."¹³⁰

The then-Anthropology department chair reported to the Investigation Team that he was aware that Dr. Mann brought skeletal materials with him from Penn in 2001, but explained that to his knowledge, all of these materials were either casts or from animals, such as lemurs. He never, however, saw this collection. The former chair did not know that Dr. Mann maintained human remains on campus at any point in time. He also stated that he did not review Dr. Mann's collection to confirm that it did not contain any human remains. Rather, he reported that the faculty's practice was to "trust [their] colleagues" and "not investigate what they [were] doing."¹³¹

When Dr. Mann joined Princeton's Department on a full-time basis, as the only biological anthropologist, he required teaching support. Therefore, the former chair reported that Dr. Monge continued to assist Dr. Mann in his teaching activities part-time, as she had done since 1986.¹³² She later began to teach her own courses at Princeton.¹³³

¹²⁹ Interview with Janet Monge (June 4, 2021).

¹³⁰ According to Dr. Mann, he brought many casts – none of which were human remains – with him to Princeton in 2001. These pieces were stored in the Anthropology lab room at Princeton.

¹³¹ *Id.*

¹³² *Id.*

¹³³ *Id.*

2. Dr. Mann Leaves the MOVE Victim Remains at Penn When He Joins the Princeton Faculty Full-Time

Drs. Mann and Monge reported that when Dr. Mann left Penn in 2001, the MOVE Victim Remains remained at the Penn Museum, with the remains moving to different office and lab space at Penn with Dr. Monge when she herself moved.

Dr. Mann explained that there was a “very good reason” why he left the MOVE Victim Remains at Penn, as they were not relevant to his field of interest, specialization, or research. Dr. Mann’s research and interests were not in modern human biology, but rather involved human evolution. Dr. Mann does not recall discussing with Dr. Monge – or anyone else – what would happen to the MOVE Victim Remains when he left Penn. Dr. Monge agreed that it was appropriate that the MOVE Victim Remains stayed at Penn despite Dr. Mann’s departure. She noted that Penn had a “huge advantage” with regard to the facilities available at the Penn Museum to evaluate forensic cases. For example, Penn’s physical collection allowed for comparative analyses to be conducted on site. Additionally, because Penn has a medical school (whereas Princeton does not), the Penn anthropology department has access to computed tomography (CT) scans and other testing facilities to assist in their analyses.¹³⁴

3. During the Period from 2001 to 2015, Dr. Monge Brought the MOVE Victim Remains to Princeton up to Four Times in Furtherance of Her Identification Efforts

Although Dr. Monge did not have a full recollection of the period from 2001 to 2015, she was confident that the MOVE Victim Remains were not stored at Princeton other than potentially for brief, temporary periods of no longer than a few days.

Dr. Monge stated that from 2001 until 2015, when Dr. Mann retired, she brought the MOVE Victim Remains to Princeton’s campus between two and four times to have anthropologists visiting Dr. Mann on campus review the remains with the hope that these anthropologists could provide additional insight into the age of the deceased individual. She did not recall the specifics around the timing of those occasions.¹³⁵ Dr. Monge explained there were few other biological anthropologists experienced in aging remains with similar characteristics, given the manner in which the fire had burned the MOVE Victim Remains. Thus, when Dr. Mann met with

¹³⁴ Interview with Janet Monge (June 24, 2021).

¹³⁵ Dr. Monge reported that since 1985, she and Dr. Mann have shown the MOVE Victim Remains to approximately 20 or more experts for their opinion on their analysis. Dr. Monge reported that she has a list of the individuals to whom she has shown the remains. Interview with Janet Monge (June 24, 2021). The Investigation Team requested this list from Dr. Monge through her counsel, however, as of the date of this Report, the Investigation Team has not received it. However, Dr. Monge did recall that among the experts was a group of four anthropologists sitting for the American Society of Forensic Sciences certification examination in 1988. All four of the anthropologists who took this examination, which asked the candidates to age the MOVE Victim Remains, determined that the victim’s age was consistent with Drs. Mann and Monge’s conclusion.

anthropologists who might have such a skillset, Dr. Monge would bring the MOVE Victim Remains to Princeton's campus to solicit their views.¹³⁶

Dr. Monge stated that she never would have transported the MOVE Victim Remains if she had to make any stops along her route. Thus, it is possible that if there were a time that she could not return the remains directly to Penn, she would have left them on Princeton's campus.¹³⁷ For this reason, she "may have" left the remains on Princeton's campus for a couple of days.¹³⁸ In retrospect, Dr. Monge wishes that she had used a diary or kept a log of when she brought the remains to Princeton's campus, but she did not believe it necessary at the time.¹³⁹

In a written summary Dr. Monge prepared in April 2021 of the location of the MOVE Victim Remains from 1985 to 2021, she wrote that from 2001 to 2015, the remains "were in a secure location at the [Princeton] Department of Anthropology." In this summary, Dr. Monge further wrote that "[i]n this time frame there was a lot of back and forth with the remains." When interviewed by the Investigation Team, Dr. Monge explained that when she wrote that the MOVE Victim Remains were stored in the Anthropology Department, she meant that *when* the remains were on the Princeton campus that was where they were kept. In any event, Dr. Monge agreed with Dr. Mann that any connection between Princeton and the remains was "fleeting."¹⁴⁰

Dr. Mann reported that he only saw and worked with the MOVE Victim Remains when Dr. Monge would bring them to Princeton's campus. In an email to the Chair of the Department dated April 23, 2021, Dr. Mann wrote that he "had the bones for a while perhaps 8-10 years ago while I worked on them but returned them to [Dr. Monge] at the Penn Museum." He further wrote that "[Dr. Monge] brought them up to Princeton a couple of times to demonstrate them to her forensic anthropology class, but that was it." However, Dr. Monge reported that while she did bring the remains to Princeton's campus for other experts to review, she never used the remains in her forensic anthropology classes. Dr. Mann further reported, like Dr. Monge, that Dr. Monge would return the MOVE Victim Remains to Penn after each session.¹⁴¹ Dr. Mann reported that he had no contact with the Medical Examiner's Office regarding the MOVE Victim Remains during this period or at any time after leaving Penn.¹⁴²

A student who was at Princeton during the pertinent time frame told the Investigation Team that the student had a conversation with Dr. Mann in which Dr. Mann said that the MOVE Victim Remains were in the anthropology lab and gestured to a cardboard box in which they were stored. The student reported telling Dr. Mann that it was inappropriate for the remains to be there and he responded that he would take them home. When asked specifically whether they had seen the MOVE Victim Remains, the student reported seeing a cardboard box but did not recall ever seeing the remains themselves. The investigation revealed no evidence to corroborate this student's report, which is not inconsistent with the possibility that the remains were kept

¹³⁶ Interview with Janet Monge (June 4, 2021); Interview with Janet Monge (August 12, 2021).

¹³⁷ Interview with Janet Monge (June 24, 2021).

¹³⁸ Interview with Janet Monge (June 4, 2021).

¹³⁹ Indeed, Dr. Monge noted that no formal record existed of when she transported the MOVE Victim Remains from Penn to Princeton.

¹⁴⁰ Interview with Janet Monge (June 4, 2021).

¹⁴¹ Interview with Alan Mann (June 16, 2021).

¹⁴² Interview with Alan Mann (June 21, 2021).

temporarily on campus for a couple of days, on at most five occasions. The student also recalled commenting to another anthropology professor that the remains were in the lab and not receiving a substantive response. The student could not recall precisely when these conversations took place, and the professor did not recall any student raising concerns with them about the MOVE remains. Dr. Monge reported never having any concerns about the MOVE Victim Remains relayed to her by any Princeton students, either directly or indirectly.

4. During the Period from 2001–2015, Dr. Monge Reports Using the MOVE Victim Remains Once for Teaching on Princeton’s Campus, in 2015

Dr. Mann stated that he never taught using the MOVE Victim Remains at Princeton. Dr. Monge recalls only teaching with the MOVE Victim Remains once on Princeton’s campus. She reported that she never used the remains in her Princeton undergraduate forensic class, Anthropology 308, which she taught with assistance from a lecturer at Penn.¹⁴³ The Investigation Team questioned Dr. Monge about an April 23, 2021 email from Dr. Mann to her and Dr. Rouse in which Dr. Mann stated, “Janet brought [the MOVE Victim Remains] up to Princeton a couple of times to demonstrate them to her forensic anthropology class, but that was it.”¹⁴⁴ Dr. Monge stated that Dr. Mann was mistaken. Dr. Monge reported that her forensic anthropology class, which she last taught in the spring of 2013, was a large lecture class and thus not an appropriate venue for the use of the MOVE Victim Remains. She explained that it would have been “inappropriate” for her to have shown the MOVE Victim Remains to people outside of small, teaching situations or situations where she and Dr. Mann were seeking opinions from other experts in the field.¹⁴⁵ And, while Dr. Monge reported that she “always” used MOVE as a case study in her forensic courses, she was quite certain that prior to 2015, she never used the MOVE Victim Remains in any of her Princeton courses.¹⁴⁶

The one time in which the MOVE Victim Remains were used on Princeton’s campus for teaching purposes occurred in the spring of 2015, when Dr. Monge co-taught Anthropology 522A, “Topics in Theory and Practice,” with Dr. Rouse and Dr. Mann.¹⁴⁷ Dr. Monge explained that this was a small and specialized graduate-level course, in which she taught a session on forensic anthropology and race.¹⁴⁸ She provided the small group of students with background regarding the bombing, the political context of the incident, and the issues they faced as forensic anthropologists working with materials that had not been properly excavated. It was in this

¹⁴³ The Investigation Team interviewed an individual who audited Anthropology 308 during one of its offerings. This individual reported that while the MOVE tragedy was discussed, the MOVE Victim Remains were not displayed during this offering of the course. Another individual interviewed further reported that Dr. Monge’s forensic anthropology course did not have a lab component until it was offered as Anthropology 309, in the fall of 2017. The individual further confirmed that the MOVE Victim Remains were not used during any of the lab sessions for this course.

¹⁴⁴ Interview with Janet Monge (Aug. 12, 2021).

¹⁴⁵ Interview with Janet Monge (June 24, 2021).

¹⁴⁶ *Id.*

¹⁴⁷ Dr. Monge believes that this is the course that Dr. Mann referenced in his April 23 email to Dr. Rouse.

¹⁴⁸ Dr. Rouse described the course as a six-week course in which issues related to science and race were debated.

context that she displayed the MOVE Victim Remains, which she believed was important and appropriate.¹⁴⁹

Although Dr. Rouse acknowledged co-teaching this course and being present during a session in which MOVE was discussed,¹⁵⁰ she reported that the MOVE Victim Remains were not used in it. She acknowledged that the MOVE bombing was discussed and stated that a movie was shown about it.¹⁵¹ Dr. Monge likewise reported that Dr. Rouse was not present for the session in which the MOVE Victim Remains were shown; individual professors led certain classes which did not require one or both of the others to attend.¹⁵² Dr. Rouse confirmed that she did not attend every session for the course and Dr. Mann reported that he could not recall attending the class when MOVE was discussed.

To Dr. Rouse, the manner in which Dr. Monge spoke about the incident during the course was empathetic and nonjudgmental – indeed, Dr. Monge appeared to be angry at the police and the City for what occurred. Dr. Rouse recounted that, during the course, both Drs. Mann and Monge spoke about how they fought with the City about their findings and some called for them to lose their jobs as a result. They also told the class that they believed that there was a twelfth and unidentified victim from the bombing. However, Dr. Rouse reported that the manner in which they discussed the incident and their findings was as if the event was in the past – she did not interpret the discussion to indicate that they were still actively working with or had possession of the MOVE Victim Remains. In fact, Dr. Rouse stated that neither Dr. Mann nor Dr. Monge indicated to her that they had possession of the remains. Instead, the classroom conversation focused on the importance of understanding how environmental exposures can impact growth, and how such factors may have impacted their analysis in the MOVE case.

Although Dr. Rouse reported not being present when the MOVE Victim Remains were used in this course, on April 21, 2021, she wrote to Dr. Monge stating, “I have only seen you handle the MOVE remains with the utmost respect. You celebrate the dignity of all the people whose remains you handle.” Dr. Rouse explained to the Investigation Team that she was referring more generally to the manner in which Dr. Monge discussed the MOVE bombing and its victims. She further noted that while she never saw Dr. Monge physically holding the MOVE Victim Remains, she had previously seen Dr. Monge hold other human remains both at the Penn Museum, where she traveled with students to see the Museum’s physical collection, and on Princeton’s campus, when she saw Dr. Monge hold remains during labs she taught there. However, Dr. Rouse was certain that she never saw Dr. Monge physically hold the MOVE Victim Remains at any point in time.

¹⁴⁹ Interview with Janet Monge (June 4, 2021); Interview with Janet Monge (June 24, 2021).

¹⁵⁰ A review of the syllabus from the six-week course shows that the professors planned to discuss MOVE during two of the sessions. It makes no reference, however, to any planned use of MOVE Victim Remains during either of the two classes.

¹⁵¹ Dr. Rouse reported that she only learned of Drs. Mann and Monge’s involvement in the MOVE investigation in the months preceding the course, through a conversation with an Anthropology Department administrator.

¹⁵² Interview with Janet Monge (Aug. 12, 2021).

5. Dr. Monge Attempts Again to Identify the MOVE Victim Remains During the Period from 2014 until 2019

Dr. Monge reported that from 2014 to 2019, she was actively engaged in efforts to finalize her analysis of the MOVE Victim Remains.¹⁵³ Had she been able to identify the remains, she presumably would have initiated their return to the victim's next of kin. She led these efforts, as Dr. Mann retired in 2015. She noted that she may have periodically informed Dr. Mann about her efforts, but Dr. Monge reported (and Dr. Mann agreed) that Dr. Mann was not actively participating in them. And, although Dr. Monge was a visiting professor at Princeton during this period, she was clear that her efforts were all undertaken at Penn in her laboratory in the Penn Museum. Further, when students assisted her, those students were Penn students.

Dr. Monge's renewed efforts began in 2014, when she moved to her new lab in the physical anthropology department at Penn. Around this same time, Dr. Monge began to work with a geneticist at another leading research university on other research projects. Dr. Monge and the geneticist discussed the MOVE-related issues. Dr. Monge reported that the geneticist had agreed to consider whether he could take a DNA sample from the MOVE Victim Remains even though they had tissue on them.¹⁵⁴ However, to complete this analysis, Dr. Monge needed to obtain a DNA sample from Consuewella and/or Ramona Africa. Because Dr. Monge was never able to obtain the necessary sample, the genetic analysis did not occur.

Around 2014, a local writer began using Dr. Monge as a reporting source to write a story about the MOVE tragedy. Dr. Monge felt that the local writer was a better person to approach the MOVE organization and the Africa family, as members of the MOVE organization might be more receptive to speaking to him than to her.¹⁵⁵ However, despite his reported efforts to discuss the issue with Consuewella Africa, he was unsuccessful in speaking with her other than a brief call seeking to schedule a more substantive call, which never occurred. At the same time, the local writer emailed Ramona Africa; she declined to speak with him. Neither in the local writer's email to Ramona Africa nor in his brief call with Consuewella Africa did the writer mention the existence of the MOVE Victim Remains.

Given the difficulties in obtaining a DNA sample, around 2014, Dr. Monge decided to conduct a lab-based analysis of the MOVE Victim Remains. Dr. Monge reported that no one had conducted an analysis of the age-related changes in the MOVE Victim Remains. Although she worked on this renewed effort for two years, her efforts ultimately failed, as the analysis proved not to be feasible. Dr. Monge stated that when these efforts were not successful, which she reported occurred in early 2015, she determined that the case was "cold," and that she would be unable to come to a conclusion on the MOVE Victim Remains' identity.

In December 2018, the local writer reached out to Dr. Monge via email regarding their prior efforts. Despite considering the case "cold" in 2015, Dr. Monge once more began to work with

¹⁵³ Interview with Janet Monge (June 4, 2021).

¹⁵⁴ *Id.* According to Dr. Monge, it is harder to conduct a DNA analysis where tissue remains on the bones, as was the case with the MOVE Victim Remains.

¹⁵⁵ *Id.* The local writer, however, did not consider his attempts to contact members of the Africa family to be on Dr. Monge's behalf. Rather, he considered them to be in furtherance of his journalistic efforts to report on the matter.

the local writer and involved a Penn undergraduate student. Dr. Monge and the local writer discussed trying to obtain a DNA sample from one of Katricia Africa's living relatives, which would allow them to conduct a comparative DNA analysis. These attempts were unsuccessful. Dr. Monge said that she was "desperate"¹⁵⁶ to identify the remains, and therefore, the group contemplated collecting trash from outside the home where they believed Consuewella Africa lived.

Dr. Monge reported that they ultimately abandoned the plan. While she did not believe that the plan was "traditionally unethical," she still personally considered it to be unethical. Dr. Monge noted during her interview, however, that "in hindsight," she wishes that they had collected the trash to obtain a DNA sample so that she would have been able to run the testing in furtherance of her identification efforts.¹⁵⁷

Dr. Monge noted that during this period, she and the local writer also considered obtaining DNA from Consuewella Africa's brother, Isaac Dotson, but the option was not pursued. Dr. Monge believed, again, that she had reached the end of all potential avenues for evaluating the remains and that she would not be able to come to a final conclusion regarding their identity.¹⁵⁸

D. From 2018 to April 2021

1. An Overview of Princeton's Online Learning Programs

From 2018 to 2019, Dr. Monge worked with others at Princeton to develop an online course in which she used the MOVE Victim Remains. Princeton's online program is managed by the McGraw Center for Teaching and Learning. The center supports both small private online courses ("SPOCs") as well as Massive Open Online Courses ("MOOCs"). SPOCs are courses that are offered solely to Princeton students, yet have a significant online component, usually video lectures. A subset of this type of course is a "flipped" course. In flipped courses, a significant amount of the lecture content is offered outside of class and online, in order to enable the instructor and students to dedicate the in-person class time to hands-on work, such as labs.

MOOCs, on the other hand, are open to the general public and are housed on two online learning platforms with which Princeton collaborates – Coursera and EdX. A McGraw Center administrator described Princeton's online program as small when compared to its peers. They also described the University's online program as unique because the content is available to learners on these platforms at no cost – Princeton generates no revenue from these online courses. Princeton does not offer any verified certificates or credentials to those who participate in its online courses. All that is required is an email address to enroll in a course and, once enrolled, a learner may view all of the course's content and complete all of the quizzes and/or modules associated with the course. Because learners receive no proof of their participation in the course, these courses are completely self-led. In other words, those who enroll in and complete the courses participate solely due to their interest in the course's content. And, because Princeton does not offer any certificates or credentials through its online course program, each

¹⁵⁶ Interview with Janet Monge (June 24, 2021).

¹⁵⁷ Interview with Janet Monge (June 4, 2021); Interview with Janet Monge (June 24, 2021).

¹⁵⁸ Interview with Janet Monge (June 4, 2021).

course offered is a standalone course; the courses cannot be combined to create an overall program and no course credit is offered.

a. The McGraw Center's Course Approval Process

Typically, the McGraw Center supports any course requested by a faculty member. For MOOCs, the faculty member must submit a proposal for the course through the McGraw Center's website. As part of the application process, the faculty member must also obtain a letter of support from the appropriate department's chair. At times, the McGraw Center will consult with the Office of the Dean of the College ("ODOC") regarding a proposal. However, generally, if the course has been previously offered at Princeton and the proposing faculty member is teaching in their field of expertise, then the McGraw Center will assume that the course has been through the necessary curricular review. In these circumstances, the Center will generally approve the course as a MOOC.

A University administrator reported that the course review process for MOOCs that are developed through the McGraw Center is less rigorous than the applicable process for courses offered to Princeton's students. They described MOOCs as being more faculty driven than University cultivated, which they noted was an important distinction. Moreover, the University administrator explained that the McGraw Center's role is not to influence the content of these online courses, but rather to support the faculty member or members generating the content to place on the various platforms.

2. Dr. Monge and Other Princeton Personnel Develop the Coursera Course, "Real Bones: Adventures in Forensic Anthropology"

In the fall of 2017, Dr. Monge and Lecturer in Anthropology, Jeffrey Himpele, co-taught Anthropology 309: "Forensic Anthropology and Epigenetics in Urban America." Dr. Himpele is the Director, VizE Lab for Ethnographic Data Visualization, and his scholarship focuses on visualizing anthropological knowledge through documentary video and data visualization. At the same time, the two were working together to study a large set of data from the William M. Krogman Center for Research in Child Growth and Development (the "Krogman data"). This data relates to human growth and development and was collected in Philadelphia from the 1940s to the 1970s. Included in the data set are medical records containing the height, weight, eating patterns, and other physiological characteristics of those who participated in the study. Additionally, the data set includes x-rays from the participants.

The first time that Drs. Monge and Himpele taught Anthropology 309, the course was taught as a traditional course. The goal of the course was to combine the fields of sociocultural and biological anthropology, thereby allowing students to get a better understanding of the relationship between human society and culture as a context for human growth and development. The course was divided into two sections, an "A" section, which Dr. Himpele taught from a sociocultural perspective, and a "B" section, which Dr. Monge taught from a biological perspective. For the first six weeks of the course, the A and B sections met together and Dr. Monge lectured the group on forensic anthropology. This allowed all of the students enrolled in the course to learn about forensic anthropology and to understand what the labs entailed. During the second half of the course, the students split into two groups (sections) and were taught by

either Dr. Monge, who continued to approach the course from a biological perspective, or Dr. Himpele, who focused on the sociocultural aspect of the course, studying the Krogman data and how environmental factors, for example, living conditions, affected growth and development.

Dr. Himpele reported that during one of Dr. Monge's lectures he attended, Dr. Monge discussed MOVE as a case study. He reported that Dr. Monge lectured not only on her involvement, but also on her general thoughts about the incident. One of the slides that Dr. Monge used during the lecture contained graphic images of charred bodies. While he was not sure whether the images were of victims from the MOVE bombing, he recalled finding the images themselves "very disturbing to look at." However, Dr. Himpele also reported that such images were important for students interested in the field of forensic anthropology to see because they needed to know what they might have to confront in their work. Dr. Monge reported that the images were not of victims from the MOVE bombing.¹⁵⁹ Dr. Monge also reported that she did not use the MOVE Victim Remains in this course (other than in 2019, as described immediately below).

a. Anthropology 309 as a Flipped Course and the Creation of the MOOC

In the fall of 2019, Drs. Monge and Himpele once more offered Anthropology 309 to Princeton students. The name of the course changed to "Forensic Anthropology and Urban Bodies," and its format also changed from a traditional course comprised of lectures and lab sections to a flipped course.¹⁶⁰

Dr. Rouse also worked with Drs. Monge and Himpele on the Krogman Center data, and reported that her understanding of the purpose of the flipped course was to educate students to evaluate x-ray data from the Krogman Center, which would, among other things, allow research on the data to begin while the group awaited funding for the research.

Dr. Himpele reported that he proposed creating the flipped course in January 2018 and a MOOC at the same time. The ultimate goal was to further his research with Drs. Rouse and Monge of the Krogman data and to develop a new set of growth standards that were relevant to the context in which those studied lived. While Drs. Himpele and Monge had attempted to educate the students enrolled in the fall 2017 version of Anthropology 309 on how to conduct the measurements of this x-ray data, the two had found it difficult to do so effectively given the limited number of lab sessions.¹⁶¹ In creating a flipped course, the team believed that they could offer the lectures and trainings in videos that the students would view before attending class. This would allow Dr. Monge to use the in-person lab sessions to give hands-on guidance to students and to provide them with more hands-on experience. Ultimately, the hope was that those students who did well in the class would be interested in helping to build out and develop

¹⁵⁹ A different version of this slide deck contains a slide at the end of the presentation indicating that the graphic images were not from the MOVE bombing. This, however, was not apparent from the face of the slide containing the pictures.

¹⁶⁰ Dr. Mann did not have any involvement in the development of this course, which occurred after he assumed emeritus status. Interview with Alan Mann (June 16, 2021).

¹⁶¹ The students had to be trained to standardize their measurements to conduct the research. Given Dr. Monge's limited availability on campus, the team thought that a flipped course would be particularly helpful.

the standards based upon the data. The videos would also be used to train later-hired research assistants.

Dr. Himpele applied for and received funding from Princeton's 250th Anniversary Fund, which is used to support innovation in the undergraduate curriculum.¹⁶² The \$9,500 grant funded costs such as the travel associated with filming the videos for use in the flipped and MOOC courses and graduate student time to assist in the courses' development.

On June 13, 2018, Drs. Himpele, Rouse, and Monge met to discuss the course. Representatives from the McGraw Center were also present for the meeting. The group discussed the need to develop expertise in the field of forensic anthropology as well as the general lack of online anthropology courses available to the public.¹⁶³ Afterward, Dr. Himpele circulated to the group an email attaching a photograph of the white board used during the meeting to outline the course's structure. In that photo, the goal was identified as "how to evaluate growth + development in forensic anthropology," and MOVE was identified as an example of forensic cases, listed next to the topic "growth process." Thus, as of June 2018, MOVE as a topic was identified for discussion during the course. Drs. Himpele, Rouse, and Monge all reported, however, that the use of the MOVE Victim Remains was not contemplated or discussed at this juncture.¹⁶⁴ Instead, Dr. Himpele reported that MOVE was only to be used as a way for Dr. Monge to teach about a real-world example where the difference between chronological age and bone development was at issue. And, given that Dr. Monge was personally involved in the MOVE analysis, the group thought the example was a good fit.

In her interview, Dr. Monge was "almost certain" that when the course was in the earliest stages of planning – which she reported occurred in 2017, not 2018 – use of the MOVE Victim Remains was not discussed. She attributed this in part to her continued efforts to identify the remains at that time, as well as to her belief that the case was not yet cold. In her interview, Dr. Monge told the Investigation Team that, after she determined that this was a "cold case," she believes she discussed with Drs. Himpele and Rouse the use of the MOVE Victim Remains in the course as a "really stimulating way" to address the topic of forensics and anthropology.¹⁶⁵ However, both Drs. Rouse and Himpele reported that they did not participate in any planning conversations in which the use of the MOVE Victim Remains during the course was discussed. Dr. Rouse advised us that, because she stepped back from involvement in the course development, she did not know, until media reports in 2021, that the remains had been used in the video.¹⁶⁶ In any event, once Dr. Monge concluded that the case was cold, she believed that it

¹⁶² Office of the Dean of the College, *The 250th Anniversary Fund for Innovation in Undergraduate Education*, PRINCETON UNIVERSITY (last visited Aug. 25, 2021), <https://odoc.princeton.edu/faculty-staff/innovation-fund>.

¹⁶³ *Id.*

¹⁶⁴ The McGraw Center administrator, too, reported that the use of MOVE as a case study was discussed during this initial meeting. They also reported that the use of bones "was part of the conversation all along; that students would have a lab element to be able to see and analyze the bones." However, they could not recall whether the use of the MOVE Victim Remains specifically was discussed during this meeting.

¹⁶⁵ Interview with Janet Monge (June 24, 2021).

¹⁶⁶ Dr. Rouse reported that beginning July 2018, after attending two meetings related to the planning for the course, she was no longer involved in its development. Consistent with that recollection, the

was appropriate to use the MOVE Victim Remains in her teaching activities. She further noted to the Investigation Team that MOVE as a topic was an “exceptionally important” case study to use, especially for a course that would have a global reach, where forensic anthropologists routinely handle cases involving missing persons or genocide.

Further, Dr. Monge reported that the MOVE investigation was also closely related to the research issues with the Krogman data. Indeed, the Krogman data reflected the first time that growth data had been collected from a more diverse set of children, including Black children, whereas the standards currently in use were developed from middle-class White individuals. Dr. Monge believed that a more diverse data set would have aided her analysis of the MOVE Victim Remains.¹⁶⁷

i. The 2018 Test Shoot

On July 11, 2018, Dr. Monge participated in a test shoot for the online course. The session was filmed in a broadcast studio at Princeton. Present for the test shoot were Dr. Monge, Dr. Himpele, Dr. Rouse, two members of the McGraw Center’s production staff, and a student. Although remains were used during this session, Dr. Monge confirmed that they were not the MOVE Victim Remains. Rather, they were fragments from Penn’s teaching collection that were on Princeton’s campus for use in her courses. Dr. Himpele reported that there were no discussions at this time regarding whether Dr. Monge had permission to use the remains during the shoot. A McGraw Center administrator, who reported not being present during the filming session, watched the video at a later time. The administrator said that they did not know to whom the human remains used during the session belonged. This administrator did not view it as the role of the McGraw Center to question the content of a course, as the Center’s staff are not content experts.

In an email dated July 12, 2018, the day after the test shoot, Dr. Rouse wrote to the group after viewing the test recording, which never referenced MOVE or the associated tragedy. In her email, she stated, “[n]ote: Even though the bones pop with the black curtain, it feels kind of morbid.” Dr. Himpele responded later that morning, “[Dr. Rouse] makes a good point, which suggests that we might shoot most if not all of the segments with bones either in our lab here or at Penn” Like Dr. Himpele, Dr. Rouse and the McGraw Center administrator also reported that there were no discussions, at this time or later, about whether the use of human remains in the course’s videos was appropriate. In retrospect, during her interview with the Investigation Team, Dr. Rouse believed that not discussing whether the use of remains was appropriate in connection with the test shoot “was [her] mistake.” She explained, however, that she is not a biological anthropologist, and therefore, she relied upon Dr. Monge as a biological anthropologist and the Penn Museum’s Keeper of Collections of the Physical Anthropology

Investigation did not find evidence suggesting her continued involvement in the course’s development beyond this time. Dr. Rouse did not have a personal interest in developing a MOOC; moreover, as the development of the MOOC was underway, Dr. Rouse went on leave. As a result, her participation in the MOOC’s development was minimal. And, while Dr. Rouse reported that she may have signed off on the course’s proposal in her capacity as department chair, she only learned, as noted, of the use of the MOVE Victim Remains in the flipped course and MOOC after the recent media reports.

¹⁶⁷ Interview with Janet Monge (June 24, 2021).

Section. Given that, Dr. Rouse did not think to question from where the remains were obtained or to whom they belonged. Nor did Dr. Rouse understand that Dr. Monge was contemplating using the MOVE Victim Remains in a session to be filmed later. Ultimately, the team decided, consistent with Dr. Himpele's July 12 email, that any videos that were to be filmed using skeletal material would be filmed at the Penn Museum. As a result, the video in which the MOVE Victim Remains were used was not filmed on Princeton's campus.¹⁶⁸

ii. Filming the Course

The Coursera Course had two types of video components, both of which were filmed by a Princeton film crew. The first were seven lectures that Dr. Monge shot on Princeton's campus in front of a monitor. The second were the four segments with Dr. Monge filmed at the Penn Museum. In each of these segments, Dr. Monge and a Penn student reviewed a piece from the Museum's collections and discussed them. These segments were referred to as the "Anthropologist at Work" segments in the syllabus. The syllabus for the course spanned a six-week period. During each week, the learner was assigned several readings and several lecture videos to view. Each week also included a quiz, while four of the six contained an "Anthropologist at Work" segment. Dr. Monge coordinated the logistics associated with the filming at the Penn Museum.

The lab segments were filmed in a classroom in the Penn Museum, where the skeletal materials used in the videos, including the MOVE Victim Remains, were housed. The Penn students were chosen to participate in the filming of these segments mostly due to convenience. Because the space that the team used to film was used for teaching, they filmed over the January 19-21, 2019 weekend. Present for the shoot were Dr. Monge, Dr. Himpele, two members of the McGraw Center's production team, and the four Penn undergraduate students who were featured in the "Anthropologist at Work" segments.

Dr. Monge explained that she thought that the setting was the appropriate location to shoot the lab sections for the course. The classroom used was originally funded and developed for use by Penn's biological anthropology department. The room was lined with cabinets in which numerous human skulls were stored. Dr. Monge reported that these skulls, which can be seen in the background of the four lab videos, were from the Morton Collection.¹⁶⁹ Dr. Monge frequently used the classroom in her teaching activities at Penn.

The video in which the MOVE Victim Remains were displayed was entitled "MOVE: An Analysis of the Remains" and lasted approximately 14 minutes. Although the title of the video

¹⁶⁸ Interview with Janet Monge (June 24, 2021).

¹⁶⁹ Interview with Janet Monge (June 24, 2021). Samuel Morton was a nineteenth century biological anthropologist who conducted research on crania, including those of enslaved peoples, to promote white supremacist views. See PENN MUSEUM, *Morton Cranial Collection*, <https://www.penn.museum/sites/morton/>, (last visited Aug. 16 2021). The Morton Collection is made up of more than 1,300 crania, including skulls from enslaved individuals. We understand that the Penn Museum is undergoing efforts, with community involvement and consultation, to pursue repatriation or reburial of the crania of enslaved individuals within the collection. According to Dr. Monge, recently, these skulls were removed from the classroom space and are now in storage at the Penn Museum.

indicates that the remains were from the MOVE bombing, neither Dr. Monge nor the Penn student refers to the MOVE bombing itself. During the video, Dr. Monge and the Penn student examine the MOVE Victim Remains while wearing rubber gloves. Dr. Monge explained to the viewers the anatomical structures of both the partial pelvis and the femur. When describing the MOVE Victim Remains, Dr. Monge stated that they were “juicy, meaning that you can tell that they are of a recently deceased individual.” She further described the remains as “slick” in appearance and noted that they did not smell bad, but rather smelled “greasy.” A biological anthropologist explained to the Investigation Team that these terms are commonly used when describing remains from recently deceased individuals (i.e., those from the last 20-40 years). They are terms of practice that are likely not found in any textbooks, but rather are used to help students or those not otherwise familiar with such remains understand their key characteristics. For example, the term “greasy” is used to reference that the cartilage within the bone has retained some plasticity and, therefore, has not completely solidified. This biological anthropologist noted that there are more technical terms that can be used, but that many who teach with such remains use these terms, as they are more accessible to students.

In the video, Dr. Monge and the Penn student discussed the manner in which they attempted to provide an age estimate for the MOVE Victim Remains. During this process, the MOVE Victim Remains are compared to other human remains from the Penn Museum’s teaching collection. Towards the end of the video, Dr. Monge disclosed that the case had been in the lab for approximately 35 years and that it was a “work in process.”¹⁷⁰ Dr. Monge also noted that this was not unusual, as “a lot” of forensic cases are not resolved.

As to the lecture components, Dr. Monge had all of the non-“Anthropologist at Work” lectures for the course filmed in a broadcast center on Princeton’s campus. None of these lectures involved displaying human remains. As Dr. Monge worked to complete the lecture content for the course, she emailed Dr. Himpele and others at the McGraw Center on February 25, 2019. In that email, she advised the group that she “recently xrayed [sic] the MOVE materials and I think I would like to add a slide with the xrays [sic].” The next day, Dr. Monge provided the group with a series of x-ray images of the MOVE Victim Remains. On February 27, 2019, Professor Monge filmed her slide deck-based presentation about the MOVE tragedy. Ultimately, Dr. Monge included images of the MOVE Victim Remains as well as these x-ray images in her lectures entitled “Restoring Personhood” and “Tools of the Trade,” which discussed growth and development.

By June 2019, filming for the course was complete and a member of the McGraw Center’s staff was tasked with building out the course for use on the online platforms. On July 10, 2019, Dr. Monge asked the McGraw Center staff to ensure the video filmed at the Penn Museum with the MOVE Victim Remains was added to the lesson plan unit on the MOVE tragedy.

¹⁷⁰ As noted *supra*, Dr. Monge reported that it was after she determined the case was “cold” that she decided to use the MOVE Victim Remains in the flipped course and MOOC. Her statement that the case was still a “work in process,” was not, however, inconsistent with this determination as she reported that she never considered the case “closed.” Indeed, a “cold case” is defined as an “unsolved criminal investigation . . . that has stopped being actively pursued because of a lack of evidence.” Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary, <http://www.merriam-webster.com> (Aug. 29, 2021).

Dr. Monge owns the copyright for the videos developed for the online course, including the video in which the MOVE Victim Remains was used, as the copyright notices for the video depict. Although Dr. Monge never signed one, the University's standard agreement with faculty regarding development of online courses provides that the faculty instructor retains all common law, statutory, and other reserved rights, including copyright, in the course materials.

3. The MOOC Course Launches in August 2020

Although both the flipped course and the MOOC were intended to launch at the same time, the decision was made to launch the Princeton-only flipped course first given the team's timing in completing all of the course's components. The components of the flipped course were completed as the course progressed. While the flipped course (which was only available to Princeton students) was housed on the EdX platform, the MOOC version of the course was housed on Coursera's platform. Ultimately, and despite the initial delay in completing the materials, the materials used in both courses were the same and in August 2020, the course went live via the Coursera Platform with an announcement by the Anthropology Department on August 13, 2020.

4. Concerns Are Raised Regarding the Coursera Course

On April 18, 2021, an online learner submitted a message through the McGraw Center's online contact form. This form generates an email to a general mailbox which a McGraw Center administrator monitors. In this email, the online learner wrote:

To whom it may concern, I am writing to you re: the course REAL BONES: Adventures in Forensic Anthropology taught by Janet Monge. In this course, the instructor uses the remains of victims of the infamous 1985 MOVE bombing in Philadelphia as props in her lesson. Dr. Monge and a student handle the remains of people's ancestors who were violently murdered by police. This is harmful and shameful behavior, and completely inappropriate for a Princeton course that is available to the public. I am writing to request that this course be taken down for the ways that it is extremely harmful to the Black Philadelphia community and especially to members of the MOVE family. I would be happy to discuss more about the details. Thank you.

Upon receiving the email, the McGraw Center administrator reached out to Drs. Monge and Himpele for guidance on how to respond. Dr. Monge responded quickly and noted that she "knew about this already and there is nothing strange to be studying cases like this." Dr. Monge was familiar with the individual who had submitted the message. Dr. Monge further stated that she was "not concerned on the content, only that it makes you uncomfortable." Dr. Himpele suggested that it might make sense to edit the videos so that "learners could gain from the lesson."

Ultimately, the McGraw Center administrator, Dr. Himpele, and Dr. Monge determined that the course could remain online at that time despite the online learner's concern. To that end, the

McGraw Center administrator reported that they responded to the online learner to inform them that Princeton would post something regarding the ethical handling of human remains.¹⁷¹

5. Princeton Determines to Remove the Coursera Course

Dr. Rouse reported that it was ultimately her decision, after internal consultation with Princeton administrators, to take the Coursera Course down on April 23, 2021. Although she reported that she worked to try and gather as much relevant information from Drs. Mann and Monge to help the University answer questions in light of the news reports, once Dr. Rouse came to understand that the MOVE Victim Remains may have belonged to someone whose family was still alive and had apparently not consented to their use, she concluded that the course could not remain on the platform even though the course had pedagogical value. Before Princeton removed the course from the Coursera platform, it had an enrollment of 4,675, and the segment in which the MOVE Victim Remains were physically used had 1,092 views by learners.

6. The MOVE Victim Remains Are Returned to Dr. Mann

Dr. Mann reported that he first learned about the impending news coverage when Dr. Monge called him on April 18, 2021. Dr. Mann stated that Dr. Monge was upset and wanted to return the remains to him.¹⁷² That same day – three days before the *Billy Penn* article and *The Philadelphia Inquirer* op-ed were published – Dr. Monge retrieved the MOVE Victim Remains from the Penn Museum and drove them directly to Dr. Mann’s home in Princeton. Dr. Monge reported that she returned the MOVE Victim Remains to Dr. Mann at the direction of a Penn Museum official. When she arrived at Dr. Mann’s home, she gave Dr. Mann the remains, which were in a sealed flat box about twelve inches long and six inches wide. Dr. Monge reported that Dr. Mann was upset, but she was not sure what to do. She thought it was sensible to return the MOVE Victim Remains to Dr. Mann because he was the person to whom the bones were “checked out” and she was unsure whether the Medical Examiner’s Office would accept them.¹⁷³ The next day, April 19, 2021, Dr. Monge forwarded Dr. Mann a letter from the Director of the Penn Museum to the Museum’s staff alerting them to existing and anticipated further news coverage around the MOVE Victim Remains. In forwarding the email, Dr. Monge wrote, in pertinent part, “I think we should return these to the MEs office now.” Dr. Mann responded the next day, agreeing that they should return the MOVE Victim Remains “to the ME’s office ASAP.”

Dr. Mann wrote, “Penn officials inexplicably demanded that I personally take possession of the young woman’s remains,” and “Penn chose to remove the young woman’s bones from a secure lab and bring them to my house, where I had them for a few days while arrangements were being made with a funeral home.”¹⁷⁴ Dr. Mann reported that when he received the MOVE Victim Remains, the box in which they were stored was taped closed. Dr. Mann did not inspect the remains, and the box remained sealed while it was in his possession. Because Dr. Mann was concerned about his security, given the news coverage and threatening messages he had

¹⁷¹ It is unclear whether this was ever accomplished given the University’s ultimate decision to remove the course from the Coursera platform days later.

¹⁷² Interview with Alan Mann (June 21, 2021).

¹⁷³ Interview with Janet Monge (June 24, 2021).

¹⁷⁴ Alan Mann, Draft Op. Ed. (May 14, 2021) (never published).

received, he did not want to acknowledge publicly that the remains were in his home. To secure them, he hid the box in his basement from April 18 until April 30, when the Terry Funeral Home sent someone to retrieve them from Dr. Mann.¹⁷⁵

No one from Princeton was involved in the transfer of the MOVE Victim Remains to Terry Funeral Home or the remains' storage at Dr. Mann's home.

E. The Africa Family's Reactions to the Use of the MOVE Victim Remains

On April 27, 2021, Dr. Rouse, as Chair of the Anthropology Department, initiated efforts to open a line of communication with the Africa family and started searching for the contact information of Mike Africa, Jr. On May 3, 2021, Dr. Rouse emailed Mike Africa, Jr. that she was "writing to again offer [her] apologies," and noted that she was "trying to understand what went wrong and how to fix things."

Members of MOVE have publicly stated that they first learned that Drs. Mann and Monge had retained custody of the MOVE Victim Remains from the op-ed that was published in *The Philadelphia Inquirer* on April 21, 2021. In a press conference held on April 26, 2021, members of the MOVE organization – Pamela Africa, Eddie Africa, Consuewella Africa, Janine Africa, Janet Africa, and Carlos Africa – stated that "apologies mean nothing to us." They also were clear that they were not asking for an investigation. Rather, the only recourse that they would find acceptable is for authorities to release Mumia Abu-Jamal from prison because MOVE believes that he is innocent. Abu-Jamal was an activist and journalist in Philadelphia who strongly supported MOVE through his journalism before his arrest in 1981 and subsequent conviction for the murder of a Philadelphia police officer. According to MOVE, providing Abu-Jamal the remainder of his life back is the only appropriate recourse since no can give them back the lives of their family members. During the press conference, MOVE mothers – Consuewella and Janine Africa – also expressed frustration and pain that they were not contacted over the previous 36 years to ask how they wanted the remains handled.

According to news reports, MOVE received the MOVE Victim Remains from the Terry Funeral Home on July 2, 2021, and members of MOVE put them to rest in accordance with MOVE's beliefs.¹⁷⁶

On August 2, 2021, a member of the Investigation Team discussed the investigation with Janine and Sue Africa. On August 11, 2021, a member of the Investigation Team discussed the investigation with Janine and Ramona Africa.

VI. The Ethical Landscape for Biological Anthropology

As part of our investigation, we explored potentially relevant ethical standards regarding the treatment of human remains, to help provide context to the factual events described in our report. Biological anthropologists derive ethical principles to guide their teaching and research activities

¹⁷⁵ Interview with Alan Mann (June 21, 2021).

¹⁷⁶ Ximena Conde, *MOVE Bombing Victim Remains from Penn have Been Returned, Family Says*, WHYY (July 13, 2021), <https://whyy.org/articles/move-bombing-victim-remains-from-penn-have-been-returned-family-says/>.

from a number of sources, including ethical codes produced by international or national anthropological associations, university policies and governing bodies, and applicable laws such as the Native American Grave Protection and Repatriation Act (“NAGPRA”). Prevailing ethical principles for biological anthropologists have evolved over time in response to social progress, major crises impacting the discipline, and significant technological developments.

For purposes of our investigation, the Investigation Team consulted the ethical guidelines and codes promulgated by the following organizations: the American Anthropological Association (“AAA”); the American Association of Biological Anthropologists (“AABA”);¹⁷⁷ the Society of American Archaeologists (“SAA”); the Society of Forensic Anthropologists (“SoFA”); and the American Board of Forensic Anthropology (“ABFA”).¹⁷⁸ This report does not purport to represent the full range of current thought and discussion regarding the ethical treatment of human remains. For example, there are resources detailing ethical considerations and best practices for the accessioning of human remains in museums that maintain human osteological collections. There are also robust discussions among anthropologists about the repatriation of a wide range of human remains and cultural objects from ethnographic museums. Because the MOVE Victim Remains were never accessioned or maintained as part of any collection at Princeton, this report does not elaborate on principles applicable in these contexts.

A. Codes of Ethics by Anthropological Associations

The ethical codes of anthropological associations provide the most widely accepted standards. The major associations, however, do not regulate the profession or formally investigate or adjudicate violations. Their codes are aspirational in nature and provide frameworks for anthropologists to utilize in their work.¹⁷⁹ While some of these codes are only applicable to the respective organization’s membership, others seem to be intended for the benefit of the field as a whole.

We have analyzed the codes and statements of several anthropological associations spanning a period of 50 years.¹⁸⁰ Acknowledging that we are lawyers and not anthropologists, we have distilled what we believe are several, key principles that are relevant to our analysis:

1. Anthropologists, including biological (physical) anthropologists, have had a longstanding general obligation to reflect on the “foreseeable repercussions of research and publication on the general population being studied,” and to communicate the “anticipated consequences of research . . . as fully as possible to the individuals and groups likely to

¹⁷⁷ The AABA was formerly known as the American Association of Physical Anthropologists (AAPA).

¹⁷⁸ An Appendix attached hereto contains links to the various codes that the Investigation Team consulted.

¹⁷⁹ Trudy Turner, Jennifer Wagner, Graciela Cabana, *Ethics in biological anthropology*, JOURNAL OF PHYSICAL ANTHROPOLOGY 939, 939-51 (Nov. 2017).

¹⁸⁰ While additional codes issued by other associations may also be relevant, we highlight the ten ethical statements in the Appendix because of their longevity, recognition, and relevance according to our investigation. See *Id.* at 941–42 (listing a selection of 18 different relevant codes of ethics and guidance for biological anthropology).

be affected.”¹⁸¹ A theme that runs through all ethical sources that we reviewed is that anthropological activities must prioritize dignity, respect, and cooperation with communities who could be harmed by anthropological activities.

2. Anthropologists “have a duty to be informed about ethical codes relating to their work, and ought periodically to receive training on current research activities and ethical issues.”¹⁸²
3. When applicable and appropriate, “[a]nthropological researchers should obtain in advance the informed consent of persons being studied, providing information, owning or controlling access to material being studied, or otherwise identified as having interests which might be impacted by the research.”¹⁸³ Informed consent in the anthropology context is a flexible and dynamic concept that involves ongoing communication and dialogue with impacted communities. It is fact specific and “does not necessarily imply or require a particular written or signed form.”¹⁸⁴
4. Following the 1990 enactment of NAGPRA, there was an increased awareness around the general notion that anthropologists should consult with descendant or culturally affiliated communities to steward the disposition of their ancestral remains.¹⁸⁵
5. During the past 25 years, biological anthropology has shown an increased sensitivity when operating in racialized contexts. In 1996, the AAPA recognized the impact of racism on science and in 2019 acknowledged that “biological anthropology has played an important role in the creation and perpetuation of both the race concept and racist ideologies.”¹⁸⁶ During that same timeframe, it became less acceptable in biological anthropology, as an ethical notion, to use human remains associated with recent conflictual situations, particularly racialized violence.

¹⁸¹ See AAA Principles of Professional Responsibility, Section 1, May 1971, and as amended through December 1986,

<https://www.americananthro.org/ParticipateAndAdvocate/Content.aspx?ItemNumber=1656>.

¹⁸² See AAA, Code of Ethics of the American Anthropological Association, Section II (June 1998) (“1998 AAA Code”), <http://s3.amazonaws.com/rdcms-aaa/files/production/public/FileDownloads/pdfs/issues/policy-advocacy/upload/ethicscode.pdf>.

¹⁸³ 1998 AAA Code Section III.A.4; see also American Association of Physical Anthropologists, Code of Ethics, III.4 (April 25, 2003) (“2003 AAPA/AABA Code of Ethics”).

¹⁸⁴ See 1998 AAA Code Section III.A.4; 2003 AAPA/AABA Code of Ethics, III.4; see also Carolyn Fluehr-Lobban, *A Century of Ethics and Professional Responsibility*, ANTHROPOLOGY NEWS, (March 2002).

¹⁸⁵ SOCIETY FOR AMERICAN ARCHAEOLOGY, *Ethics in Professional Archaeology* (1996) (last visited Aug. 25, 2021), <https://www.saa.org/career-practice/ethics-in-professional-archaeology>. (Principle No. 2 requires “a commitment to make every reasonable effort, in good faith, to consult actively with affected group(s), with the goal of establishing a working relationship that can be beneficial to all parties involved.”).

¹⁸⁶ AAPA, 1996 Statement on Biological Aspects of Race (last visited Aug. 25, 2021), https://physanth.org/documents/200/AAPA_Biological_Race_1996.pdf; *Executive Summary: AAPA Statement on Race and Racism*, (Mar. 8, 2019), https://physanth.org/documents/199/AAPA_Race_statement_March_2019.pdf, at 2.

6. It is important for biological anthropologists to analyze whether the use of human remains is appropriate in a given academic context.¹⁸⁷ The activities of biological anthropologists are largely unregulated. They do not fall within the purview of Institutional Review Board (“IRB”) oversight at universities, which applies to research on living human subjects.
7. As a general matter, the codes reviewed did not contain provisions relating specifically to the ethical treatment of human remains. The exception was SoFA’s Guidelines for Professional Conduct, which provide that SoFA members “shall at all times demonstrate respect for human remains and authority, to include all aspects of recovery, analysis, data collection, research, teaching and proper disposition in accordance with applicable country, province, state, and local laws.”¹⁸⁸

A well-known example of the successful embodiment of some of these principles is the African Burial Ground Project, which involved the 1991 discovery of free and enslaved Africans buried in New York City, the reinternment of excavated human remains, research and study of remains, and the establishment of a memorial.¹⁸⁹ The anthropological research team viewed their ethical commitment as running to the “descendant community” (a concept similar to culturally affiliated groups in NAGPRA), which in this case meant the local African American community who expressed an interest in the matter. The researchers viewed the descendant community as a client, and conducted research only with community approval and only with substantial community input on research questions of interest to them.¹⁹⁰ The researchers recognized that the community should “debate and resolve its own diverse views,” noting “earlier mistakes by anthropologists attempting to choose leaders or make decisions for culturally affiliated groups.”¹⁹¹

With respect to the MOVE Victim Remains, Drs. Mann and Monge made critical decisions about their retention and use without input from potentially impacted communities or constituencies. Nor did they consult ethical resources specifically to evaluate the propriety of their actions with respect to the MOVE Victim Remains.

B. Laws Applicable to Anthropological Activities

In the United States, there are no uniform laws that govern the activities and ethics of biological anthropologists, unlike, for example, the practice of law which is regulated by the States through rules of professional conduct.

The most significant U.S. law implicating the activities of biological anthropologists, particularly regarding the use of human remains, is NAGPRA, 25 U.S.C. §§ 3001 *et seq.* Following many

¹⁸⁷ Holly Dunsworth, AAA *Biological Anthropology Section (BAS) Statement on the MOVE Remains*, BIOLOGICAL ANTHROPOLOGY SECTION (May 18, 2021), <https://bas.americananthro.org/news/591>.

¹⁸⁸ SOCIETY OF FORENSIC ANTHROPOLOGISTS, *Ethics*, at H (last visited Aug. 25, 2021), <http://www.sofainc.org/code-of-ethics>.

¹⁸⁹ Michael Blakey, *African Burial Ground Project: paradigm for cooperation?* 62 MUSEUM INTERNATIONAL 61 (2010).

¹⁹⁰ *Id.*

¹⁹¹ *Id.*

years of insensitive possession and display of Native remains, Native Americans demanded the repatriation of their cultural items, including human remains, funerary objects, sacred objects, and objects of cultural patrimony. NAGPRA requires federal agencies and institutions that receive federal funding (e.g., museums, state, and local governments) to provide information about Native American cultural items to Native groups and to consult with lineal descendants or culturally affiliated tribes or organizations regarding disposition or repatriation.

Many states have laws, developed to varying degrees, which govern disturbances of burial sites and cemeteries and the disposition of dead bodies.¹⁹² Pennsylvania and New Jersey have laws that govern processes for governmental entities to transfer unclaimed bodies for scientific or academic purposes, such as educating future health care professionals through first-hand exposure to human anatomy.¹⁹³ However, legal standards that govern the work of biological anthropologists are largely lacking; neither Pennsylvania nor New Jersey has laws that specifically regulate the conduct of private anthropologists engaged in research or forensic activities.

C. University Policies

The activities of biological anthropologists could also be subject to regulation through the universities with which they are affiliated. For example, federally required Institutional Review Boards (IRBs) protect the rights, privacy, and welfare of human subjects who participate in university-connected studies and research; however, IRBs generally govern research activities that involve *living* human subjects, not human remains of deceased persons.¹⁹⁴

Universities could adopt their own policies specific to human remains to facilitate the proper preservation and treatment of such remains. University policies can fill in gaps that exist in the ethical codes enacted by anthropological associations or in statutes. Such policies would be particularly useful for universities that operate museums with osteological collections or expect faculty and students (e.g., anthropology, medicine, biology) to utilize human remains in research or coursework. At least one research university in the United States has a policy specific to human remains that prohibits recent skeletal remains from being put on public display and recognizes the rights of descendant communities, among other things.¹⁹⁵

¹⁹² See 9 Pa. Cons. Stat. Chs. 1-5 (“Burial Grounds”); see also e.g., 35 Pa. Stat. § 450.504 (“No person shall dispose of a dead body or fetal remains until a local registrar or the State Registrar of Vital Statistics issues a permit for disposal.”); 18 Pa. Cons. Stat. § 5510 (“Except as authorized by law, a person who treats a corpse in a way that he knows would outrage ordinary family sensibilities commits a misdemeanor of the second degree.”); N.J. Rev. Stat. § 2C:22-1 (rendering it unlawful to “purposely or knowingly fail[] to dispose of human remains in a manner required by law.”).

¹⁹³ See 35 Pa. Stat. § 1091 (“Humanity gifts registry for distribution of dead bodies”); N.J. Stat. § 45:9-49 (“Delivery to and use by associations of certain unclaimed bodies for advancement of medical and surgical science”).

¹⁹⁴ PRINCETON UNIVERSITY, *Human Research Protection Program*, (last visited Aug. 19, 2021), <https://ria.princeton.edu/human-research>.

¹⁹⁵ STANFORD UNIVERSITY, *Research Policy Handbook*, 12.1 *Human Remains*, (Mar. 27, 2009), <https://doresearch.stanford.edu/policies/research-policy-handbook/skeletal-remains/human-skeletal-remains>.

Museums also have policies regarding accessioning items, including human remains. After a museum acquires an item, it undergoes accessioning, which is a formal process for legally accepting objects into a museum's permanent collection.¹⁹⁶

As stated *supra*, Princeton University did not have a policy specifically governing the treatment of human remains during the relevant time period. Princeton does not have a four-field anthropology program and its anthropology department has a sociocultural focus (rather than a biological one). Princeton does not have a medical school or other graduate programs that would render the use of human remains a regular occurrence. While the Princeton University Art Museum does have in its collections several pieces of skeletal material, these remains are of ancient and/or historical context. Despite the infrequency with which the University possesses human remains for teaching or research, we suggest that Princeton formulate and implement a human remains policy, as discussed below.

VII. Conclusions

A. The Medical Examiner's Office Provided Dr. Mann with the MOVE Victim Remains to Continue His Analysis After Asking Katricia Africa's Family to Acknowledge that the MOVE Victim Remains Were Katricia Africa's Remains

Although there was a vigorous public debate regarding the identity of the MOVE Victim Remains, with numerous experts opining on the subject, on November 16, 1985 – just days after Dr. Hameli testified before the MOVE Commission regarding his identification findings – the Medical Examiner's Office wrote to Katricia Africa's parents, Consuewella Africa and Nathaniel Galloway. In these letters, an investigator from the office notified the parents that the MOVE Commission had identified their daughter, Katricia Africa, as a victim of the MOVE tragedy.¹⁹⁷ Two days later, Nathaniel Galloway acknowledged the MOVE Commission's findings, and noted his acceptance of the MOVE Commission's conclusion regarding the remains' identity.¹⁹⁸ Medical Examiner orders and body release records indicate that the MOVE Victim Remains were released by the Medical Examiner's Office for Katricia Africa's December 14, 1985 burial.

The MOVE Victim Remains, however, ultimately would not be given to Katricia Africa's family. Instead, the office retained the remains and transferred them to Dr. Mann on September 23, 1986 for "his continued evaluation," according to a handwritten memorandum to file and an accompanying evidence receipt by the Medical Examiner's Office. Therefore, we credit Dr. Mann's recollection that Dr. Segal told him the transfer was so that Dr. Mann could continue efforts to identify the remains.

Dr. Segal's March 18, 1986 report reflects his final opinion, which was consistent with that of Drs. Mann and Monge, that "there is no scientific evidence to support the identification of 'B-1'

¹⁹⁶ The MOVE Victim Remains were not accessioned into any collection at Princeton. Therefore, this Report does not address or evaluate the Princeton University Art Museum's practices, as the University's accessioning practices are not at issue.

¹⁹⁷ Letter from Eugene Suplee to Consuewella Dotson (Nov. 16, 1985).

¹⁹⁸ Certification of Identification (Nov. 18, 1985).

as Katricia Dotson [sic].”¹⁹⁹ That report, however, does not mention that the Medical Examiner’s Office had retained the MOVE Victim Remains for continued evaluation. Nor does it clarify which remains were reportedly released to the family in December 1985. Our investigation found no evidence that Katricia Africa’s family was ever informed that the MOVE Victim Remains had been transferred to Dr. Mann so that he could continue identification efforts.

B. Since 1986, Drs. Mann and Monge Believed They Were Not Required to Return the MOVE Victim Remains to the Medical Examiner’s Office Until They Successfully Identified the MOVE Victim Remains, and the Medical Examiner’s Office Imposed No Conditions on Their Return

Dr. Mann reported during the course of the investigation that after the two Medical Examiners with whom he had worked on the MOVE investigation – Drs. Aronson and Segal – were no longer affiliated with the Medical Examiner’s Office, he believed that he reported to no one in connection with the MOVE Victim Remains. Drs. Mann and Monge never sought further oversight or direction from the Medical Examiner’s Office regarding their possession of the remains, nor did they attempt to return them to the Medical Examiner’s Office before April 2021. Both Drs. Mann and Monge believed that they could retain the MOVE Victim Remains indefinitely, given that they could not identify the victim to whom they belonged. As far as Dr. Mann could recall, at the time he left Penn, he did not have any discussions with Dr. Monge about what would happen to the MOVE Victim Remains. Dr. Monge reported that she continued to work with the remains, ultimately considering the case “cold” in early 2015 and confirming that conclusion in 2019. On April 19, 2021, two days before the publication of two news stories that would reveal that the remains were in their possession, Drs. Mann and Monge for the first time discussed the possibility of returning the MOVE Victim Remains to the Medical Examiner’s Office, and agreed they should do so.

Our investigation found no evidence that the Medical Examiner’s Office attempted to contact Drs. Mann and Monge regarding the remains since their transfer to Dr. Mann in 1986. Nor did our investigation find any evidence that the Medical Examiner’s Office tracked the whereabouts of the MOVE Victim Remains. While an evidence receipt and accompanying handwritten memorandum to file documents the transfer of MOVE remains “for his [Dr. Mann’s] continued evaluation,” our investigation found no documentation imposing other limitations on Drs. Mann and Monge or a deadline for return. Nor did our investigation find evidence of the Medical Examiner’s Office’s policies governing the transfer of human remains outside of the office in 1986.

C. The MOVE Victim Remains Were Never Held in Storage on Princeton’s Campus

The MOVE Victim Remains were stored at the Penn Museum from the time Dr. Mann received them from the Medical Examiner’s Office until they were returned to Dr. Mann’s possession on April 18, 2021, as confirmed by both Drs. Mann and Monge. Although Dr. Monge wrote to colleagues in April 2021 that the MOVE Victim Remains were “in a secure location at the

¹⁹⁹ Segal Report at 11 (emphasis in original).

Department of Anthropology” at Princeton from 2001 to 2015, during her interview she clarified that she could only recall bringing the remains to Princeton’s campus at most four times for analysis with Dr. Mann and once for teaching. According to Dr. Monge, she would only transport the MOVE Victim Remains when she knew that she could drive directly from the Penn Museum to Princeton’s campus and back. If there were any possibility that she might have to make a stop along the route, she would not bring the remains with her. Therefore, she noted that there was a possibility that the MOVE Victim Remains may have been left on Princeton’s campus for a few days during this period for this reason. Thus, the investigation revealed that the MOVE Victim Remains were present on Princeton’s campus no more than five times over the pertinent time period, and then only for short periods of time; the remains were never stored on Princeton’s campus for any substantial period of time.

D. Dr. Monge Brought the MOVE Victim Remains to Princeton’s Campus on Several Occasions Between 2001 and 2015 to Analyze Them with Dr. Mann and Displayed Them During One In-Person Class

Dr. Monge reported that she routinely discussed MOVE as a case study in the forensics courses that she taught on Princeton’s campus, but never used the MOVE Victim Remains in these courses. Dr. Monge could only recall bringing the MOVE Victim Remains to Princeton’s campus for use in one graduate-level class – Anthropology 522A, entitled “Topics in Theory and Practice.” Dr. Monge taught this class with Drs. Rouse and Mann in 2015. This course focused on the role of race in anthropology, and in this context, at the graduate level with a small class size, Dr. Monge believed that the use of the remains was appropriate given that her efforts to identify the remains to that point had been unsuccessful. Dr. Rouse was not present on the day that the MOVE Victim Remains were shown, and did not know that they had been shown. Drs. Mann and Monge could not recall whether Dr. Mann was present on the day Dr. Monge displayed the MOVE Victim Remains.

In addition to the one time that Dr. Monge brought the MOVE Victim Remains for use in this class, Dr. Monge reported that from 2001 to 2015, there were two to four other times that she brought the remains to campus for further analysis. This analysis was conducted by anthropologists visiting Dr. Mann on campus who had expertise in aging remains that were damaged, like the MOVE Victim Remains. The purpose of asking these visiting scholars to analyze the remains was in furtherance of their efforts to identify the MOVE Victim Remains. Each time this occurred, the MOVE Victim Remains were viewed in the Anthropology lab on Princeton’s campus.

E. The MOVE Victim Remains Were Not Brought to Princeton for Any Portion of the Coursera Course

The investigation revealed that only the lecture portions of the Coursera Course were filmed on Princeton’s campus. All portions of the course where human remains were handled, including the one video segment showing the MOVE Victim Remains, were filmed at the Penn Museum. The MOVE Victim Remains were not brought to Princeton’s campus for use in any portion of the Coursera Course. While the segment of the Coursera Course video showing the MOVE Victim Remains was also used in Anthropology 309, offered to Princeton students during the fall 2019 semester as a flipped course, we found no evidence that this segment of video, or the

MOVE Victim Remains themselves, were used in the previous or later iterations of the course, or in any of Dr. Monge's other forensic anthropology courses at Princeton. Dr. Monge owns the copyright for the videos that were used, as shown by the copyright notices in the videos. Princeton received no revenue from the Coursera Course; the course was offered to the public free of charge on the Coursera platform.

F. Princeton Did Not Have Policies in Place Specifically Addressing the Ethical Use of Human Remains in Teaching and Research Activities During the Relevant Time Period

At all relevant times, Princeton did not have any policies in place that specifically governed the use of human remains in teaching and research activities. As a result, there was no clear guidance from the University regarding how Drs. Mann and Monge should use human remains in their teaching activities on campus. At leading research universities, like Princeton, where academic freedom is considered fundamental to the institution's mission, the absence of guiding rules can, and in this instance did, contribute to a situation in which Dr. Monge used the MOVE Victim Remains in teaching without exploring or addressing the potential ethical concerns.

Absent guidance from the University regarding what it viewed as acceptable or appropriate in this arena, Drs. Mann and Monge determined on their own what constituted the appropriate use of the MOVE Victim Remains. This meant that there was no set process through which those who may have been aware of the use of human remains – the MOVE Victim Remains or others – could raise any questions or concerns they might have had.

G. Prevailing Ethics for Biological Anthropologists Have Developed to Encourage Communication with Communities Who Are Impacted By Anthropological Activities

Although there is not a singular source of ethics for biological anthropologists, there are various sources that identify and provide ethical standards to guide their research and teaching activities. These standards have evolved over time according to various academic sources.²⁰⁰ However, since the 1990s, there has been an emerging trend towards the incorporation of flexible, context-specific informed consent principles, as well as an emphasis on the importance of respecting and communicating with communities that are impacted by one's research activities.

"Anthropologists are required to be ethically responsive to many entities responsible for and potentially damaged by [their] research."²⁰¹ Over the past three decades, it also became less acceptable in biological anthropology, as an ethical notion, to use human remains that stem from recent conflictual situations, particularly racialized violence. The AABA Code of Ethics encourages biological anthropologists "[t]o consult actively with the affected individuals or group(s), with the goal of establishing a working relationship that can be beneficial to all parties involved."²⁰²

²⁰⁰ See, e.g., Trudy Turner, Jennifer Wagner, Graciela Cabana, *Ethics in biological anthropology*, JOURNAL OF PHYSICAL ANTHROPOLOGY 939-51 (Nov. 2017).

²⁰¹ Michael Blakey, *African Burial Ground Project: paradigm for cooperation?* 62 MUSEUM INTERNATIONAL 63 (2010).

²⁰² 2003 AAPA/AABA Code of Ethics.

Our investigation found no evidence of anyone involved in this matter having consulted ethical codes or guidance prior to the use of the MOVE Victim Remains in Anthropology 522A or Anthropology 309, or before the content was launched as a flipped course or as the Coursera Course. While ethical sensitivity in biological anthropology lacked prevalence until the passage of NAGPRA in 1990, when the content of the course was filmed in 2019, ethical principles were significantly more developed. Dr. Monge acknowledged that she did not consult any ethical sources specifically to evaluate her use of the MOVE Victim Remains in the video segment included in the flipped course and the Coursera Course. However, additional ethical research or outreach to other anthropologists at or outside of Princeton regarding currently accepted practices in the field of biological anthropology could have helped inform decisions regarding the use of the MOVE Victim Remains in her teaching activities beginning in 2015. For example, one biological anthropologist interviewed opined that it is now generally accepted in the field of biological anthropology that any human remains that emerge from a conflictual situation, particularly one that is racialized and involved complex violence – like the MOVE bombing – could have harmful effects if used in teaching. This is particularly true where the incident in question occurred in recent time.

H. No One Consulted with Individuals or Communities, Including the Africa Family, Who Could be Impacted by the Use of the MOVE Victim Remains in Course Videos or Teaching

The MOVE Victim Remains were removed from the site of the bombing. It is highly likely that the remains were the body parts of a person who was part of a community that suffered a common tragedy—whether that person was Katricia Africa, another member of MOVE, or someone else from the community surrounding 62nd and Osage Avenue whose neighborhood was destroyed by the bombing. (Although evidence collected at the time of the tragedy indicates that the remains most likely belonged to a MOVE member, during her interview, Dr. Monge speculated that the remains may have instead been of an unidentified individual from this surrounding community.) In either case, there was a readily identifiable community of people who would potentially be impacted by the retention and use of the MOVE Victim Remains. Consistent with modern ethical notions in biological anthropology, those persons could have been consulted about the future of the MOVE Victim Remains before they were used to make a course video or for in-person teaching, but they were not.

Even if the lack of official identification by the City precluded obtaining informed consent from a specific next of kin, the Africa family could comprise persons “otherwise identified as having interests which might be impacted by the research,”²⁰³ as Dr. Monge acknowledged to the Investigation Team during her interview. Although the Medical Examiner ultimately concluded that the MOVE Victim Remains were unidentified, the MOVE tragedy killed eleven MOVE members, and the MOVE Commission and City officials at various points in time opined that the MOVE Victim Remains belonged to Katricia Africa. Dr. Monge seemingly recognized the family’s interest when she stated in an April 27, 2021 email to Dr. Mann and others:

I did try to return them in 2016. It was just that I did not know the state of the organization and tried to return them to the mom of

²⁰³ See 2003 AAPA/AABA Code of Ethics.

Katricia Africa. It was only after it was clear that she did not want them, that I used them in teaching. It was indeed my fault
And based on faulty judgment

As indicated during the April 26, 2021 press conference, none of the MOVE members present, including Consuewella Africa, was aware that the MOVE Victim Remains had been in Drs. Mann and Monge's possession. Rather, they first learned that the MOVE Victim Remains had not been released by the Medical Examiner's Office from the April 21, 2021 op-ed in *The Philadelphia Inquirer*. And, to the extent that there was outreach from Dr. Monge through the local writer to Consuewella and Ramona Africa in 2014 to 2015 and 2019, this outreach was not to consult with the Africa family about the use of the MOVE Victim Remains. Rather, the purpose of the outreach was to obtain information—such as a DNA sample—that would aid Dr. Monge in efforts to identify the remains (which, presumably, would have eventually led to their release to the deceased's next of kin). Likewise, the local writer reported that his efforts were in the furtherance of his journalistic activities, not in an effort to return the remains.

As there was (and is) a lack of binding ethical regulations from 1985 until present and an absence of on-point university policies, Drs. Mann and Monge's conduct relative to the use of the MOVE Victim Remains while they taught at Princeton cannot be said to violate any binding rule or any law governing professional standards for biological anthropologists. But, their failure either: (1) to consult with the Medical Examiner's Office or any persons or communities who would seem to be impacted by their use of the remains in teaching; or (2) remain apprised of the evolving ethical standards in their field demonstrated exceedingly poor judgment. Indeed, in hindsight, Dr. Monge was self-critical of her decisions during interviews. And, Dr. Mann recognized, in retrospect, that he probably should have returned the MOVE Victim Remains to the Medical Examiner's Office.

In addition, regardless of any uncertainty as to the victim's precise identity, the MOVE Victim Remains are the body parts of a person who died from a modern, racialized act of police violence that had an extraordinarily destructive impact on families and a community a short distance from where Drs. Mann and Monge stored them at the Penn Museum. That fact alone strongly counseled against using those remains for teaching, especially in the absence of communication with the Medical Examiner's Office and communities who stood to be impacted, including the Africa family.

VIII. Recommendations

With an understanding that Princeton's Anthropology Department has no plans to create a human osteological collection or to acquire human remains going forward, the Investigation Team makes the following policy-based recommendations regarding the use of human remains at Princeton.

1. Princeton should consider establishing an oversight board to guide the appropriate use of human remains for research or teaching at the University. Given the University's limited contact with human remains, it did not consider the need to have formal oversight of the use of human remains in research or teaching. However, this resulted in the one or two biological anthropologists affiliated with Princeton (e.g., Drs. Mann and Monge) having

no formal checks or University-provided resource for guidance on their use of human skeletal material. Moreover, this is an issue that could also arise in other departments where human remains may be studied. An oversight board, particularly one whose mission is to prioritize dignified treatment of human remains and adherence to applicable ethical norms, would ensure an institutional decision-making process and create accountability for – and support of – faculty researchers in this area of particular sensitivity. Among other things, the oversight board should be comprised of relevant experts from within or outside the University; require faculty and staff members to submit a usage plan in connection with proposals to teach using, or to store or accept on behalf of the University, human remains; and require such usage plans to explain how the contemplated plan accords with prevailing ethical standards using, for example, the ethical codes of applicable anthropological associations as frameworks. The plan should also identify any complex histories or events associated with the remains.

One factor that the oversight board should consider is whether the human remains are from victims of government-sanctioned or racialized violence. Thought leaders from the field of biological anthropology have articulated that it is less acceptable today to teach courses with the remains of victims who died from violence with complex histories, particularly recent acts of racialized violence in the United States where informed consent to use the remains has not been obtained. The benefit of using such materials without obtaining informed consent is outweighed by the potential traumatizing effect that the display of victim remains could have on those communities and groups. At bottom, given Princeton's strong commitment to academic freedom – a foundational principle at the University that benefits faculty, students, and society at large – we expect that the oversight board would help foster an environment in which that principle may be effectively exercised in a manner that acknowledges, considers, and respects the applicable ethical standards prevalent in the field.

2. Princeton should consider issuing a position statement regarding the use of human remains. When conducted with cultural sensitivity, respect for impacted communities, and adherence to legal and ethical standards, the scientific study of human remains can have tremendous medical, historical, social, and educational value. Now having the benefit of the findings of this Report, the University could consider an institutional position statement regarding the use of human remains at Princeton, perhaps in connection with the establishment of the aforementioned proposed board. In considering such a position statement, Princeton could reflect on the diverse cultural and historical significance of human remains and the role of historic scientific racism in disciplines like biological anthropology. Among other things, the statement could address the preservation and respectful treatment of human remains, the rights of Native American groups under NAGPRA, and consultation with identifiable descendant communities. The position statement, NAGPRA, and other applicable laws would comprise the University's policy position on the use of human remains and guide the decision making of the proposed board.

3. Human remains that are authorized for use in research or teaching should be stored in a secure, dedicated location on campus that is respectful, facilitates preservation, and properly identifies the human remains. One of the many components of giving dignity to human remains is their proper storage and identification. Although our investigation revealed that the MOVE Victim Remains were stored at the Penn Museum, not Princeton, it is

nonetheless important that any human remains that may be stored at Princeton, now or in the future, will be treated with dignity.²⁰⁴

4. The University should periodically conduct an audit of laboratories or facilities in which human remains might reasonably be located, and be cognizant of research and teaching activities in which human remains have the potential to be used. To ensure that the use of human remains complies with University policies and usage plans approved by the oversight board, if one is established, the Anthropology Department and the Art and Archaeology Department should conduct audits on a periodic basis. The results of each audit should be provided to the oversight board. In addition, the Princeton University Art Museum should consider evaluating its policies and conducting a periodic audit of its holdings to ensure adherence to best practices and proper treatment of human remains and funerary objects, if any. Indeed, in reaction to the subject controversy, the Biological Anthropology Section of the AAA recommended that “evaluations of institutional holdings and practices involving human remains become a standard part of departmental and institutional external reviews.”

²⁰⁴ In the Anthropology Department’s current policy, articulated in April 2021, the Department stated that “[a]ny human remains must be stored in a secure facility, and their usage supervised to ensure that they are handled appropriately. Any and all human remains are [to be] treated with dignity and respect.” Princeton’s Department of Anthropology, *Legacies of Violence and Complicity ~Current Policies and Guidelines*, PRINCETON UNIVERSITY (Apr. 25, 2021), <https://anthropology.princeton.edu/news/legacies-violence-and-complicity-current-policies-and-guidelines>.

Appendix

Ethical Codes Consulted by the Investigation Team

- AMERICAN ANTHROPOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION, [*Principles of Professional Responsibility*](#) (May 1971, as amended through Dec. 1986).
- AMERICAN ANTHROPOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION, [*Principles of Professional Responsibility*](#) (May 1971, as amended through Nov. 1, 2012).
- AMERICAN ANTHROPOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION, [*Code of Ethics of the American Anthropological Association*](#) (June 1998).
- AMERICAN ANTHROPOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION, [*Code of Ethics of the American Anthropological Association*](#) (Feb. 2009).
- AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF PHYSICAL ANTHROPOLOGISTS, [*Code of Ethics of the American Association of Physical Anthropologists*](#) (Apr. 25, 2003).
- AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF PHYSICAL ANTHROPOLOGISTS, [*Executive Summary: AAPA Statement on Race and Racism*](#) (Mar. 8, 2019).
- AMERICAN BOARD OF FORENSIC ANTHROPOLOGY, INC., [*Policies and Procedures Manual*](#) (Mar. 29, 2020).
- SOCIETY OF AMERICAN ARCHAEOLOGY, [*Ethics in Professional Archaeology*](#) (1996).
- SOCIETY OF FORENSIC ANTHROPOLOGISTS, [*Guidelines for Professional Conduct*](#) (Version 3) (undated).
- AMERICAN ACADEMY OF FORENSIC SCIENCES, [*Bylaws*](#) (Feb. 1988, as amended through Apr. 2021).