

Report of the Trustee Committee on Woodrow Wilson's Legacy at Princeton

In November 2015, the Princeton University Board of Trustees appointed a special committee to consider the legacy of Woodrow Wilson at Princeton. The committee was appointed in response to heartfelt concerns by students and other members of the campus community about the veneration of Wilson on campus, especially in light of increased awareness of his views about race; of particular concern are the position he took as Princeton's president to prevent the enrollment of black students and the policies he instituted as U.S. president that resulted in the re-segregation of the federal civil service. Because the Board of Trustees has authority over decisions about the naming of University facilities and programs, the special committee was asked to consider whether changes should be made in how the University recognizes Wilson's legacy, and specifically whether the school of public and international affairs and the residential college that bear his name should continue to do so.

In the course of a thorough and wide-ranging review, it became clear that the controversy surrounding Wilson's name was emblematic of larger concerns about the University's commitment to diversity and inclusivity – a commitment that in our view is fundamental to Princeton achieving its mission of teaching, research, and service. It was also emblematic of a failure to acknowledge the pain and sense of exclusion that many people of color have experienced, and in some cases continue to experience, on our campus, partly because of the narrow lens through which the University presents its history.

The committee acknowledges that over the course of Princeton's 270-year history, there have been people connected to the University – influential alumni, generous benefactors, and celebrated professors – who have espoused views that are antithetical to our values today. We recognize that the continuing presence of their names on campus may be discomfiting to many, and offensive to some. Our responsibility as trustees is to ensure that the University remains vigilant in placing these representations into a much fuller context and that these representations do not become barriers to the pursuit of our goal of increased diversity and effective inclusion. It was with this understanding that the committee undertook its deliberations.

For reasons that are presented later in this report, the committee recommends that both the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs and Woodrow Wilson College should retain their current names and that the University needs to be honest and forthcoming about its history. This requires transparency in recognizing Wilson's failings and shortcomings as well as the visions and achievements that led to the naming of the school and the college in the first place. Even more important, in the committee's view, is a strong reaffirmation by the Board of Trustees of the University's commitment and determination to be a place that is truly diverse and inclusive, one that embraces, respects, and values all members of its on-campus and alumni communities.

Later in this report we propose some steps to achieve these goals more fully. One of these steps is the designation of a subcommittee of the board's Executive Committee as a Special Committee on Diversity and Inclusion to ensure regular and active trustee attention to these issues. Other steps include establishing a high-profile pipeline program to encourage more students from underrepresented groups to pursue doctoral degrees; modifying Princeton's informal motto; encouraging and supporting a broad range of education and transparency initiatives; and diversifying campus art and iconography.

The Committee

The ten-member special committee was chaired by Brent Henry '69, vice-chair of the Board of Trustees, and included trustees A. Scott Berg '71, Katherine Bradley '86, Denny Chin '75, Angela Groves '12, board chair Kathryn Hall '80, Robert Hugin '76, Robert Murley '72, Margarita Rosa '74, and Ruth Simmons HD 1996 (former president of Brown University). Like the board itself, the committee included members with diverse backgrounds and perspectives.

The Process

The committee created a website (<http://wilsonlegacy.princeton.edu>) to collect observations and opinions about Wilson and his legacy. At the committee's invitation, nine scholars and biographers with relevant expertise posted their understandings of Wilson and his legacy on the website. Committee members met with the Alumni Council Executive Committee and the Council of the Princeton University Community (CPUC), which includes undergraduate students, graduate students, faculty, staff, and alumni, and they conducted a two-hour open forum in Richardson Auditorium on the Friday prior to Alumni Day, which included active participation by a number of the students who had pressed so strongly for this review. The committee also convened a total of 11 on-campus small group discussions in late January and mid-February in which more than 80 students, faculty, staff, alumni, and others participated. These discussions gave members of the committee opportunities to hear directly from people who held a range of views and offered a number of highly constructive suggestions, while also giving participants in the discussions opportunities for dialogue among themselves and with members of the committee.

The committee considered articles and letters about Wilson and his legacy that appeared in a variety of publications, including the *Princeton Alumni Weekly*; kept abreast of similar conversations about naming at other colleges and universities, including Yale, Harvard, Amherst, and Oxford; and engaged in countless conversations outside the formal process. The committee held nine meetings, some in person and some by conference call, between early December and late March, to share information, exchange views, deliberate, and eventually develop its recommendations for the full board.

Submissions through the Website

The committee received more than 635 submissions through its website. They came from undergraduates, graduate students, faculty, staff, alumni of all ages, and members of the general public. Almost without exception, they were thoughtful and appreciative of the opportunity to comment and to learn more about Wilson. They expressed a range of perspectives and suggestions regarding Wilson and his legacy and the naming of the school and the college. Many commented on their own campus experiences or the experiences of others who have not felt truly welcomed at Princeton. A number accepted the committee's invitation to comment on how the University should think about broader questions related to the representation of historical legacy and naming.

Many noted how little they knew about Wilson prior to this set of conversations and how eye-opening it was to learn more about his legacy at Princeton and beyond, especially with regard to issues of race. Some noted that they had long known of Wilson's views and were pleased to see a growing recognition of why some members of the community would object so strongly to the continuation of Wilson's venerated status on campus. Commenters on all sides appreciated the opportunity to participate in an informed, candid, and – many would say – long-overdue conversation about Wilson and his legacy.

A minority of those who commented advocated for changing the name of the school, the college, or both. Even though we eventually came to a different judgment, we acknowledge the passion and thoughtfulness of the arguments they advanced. In most cases, those who advocated change concluded by saying two other things: they emphasized the importance, if the names were retained, of telling Wilson's story more fully and honestly; and they made it clear that the discussion about Wilson's name raised deeper issues about the nature of Princeton as a truly welcoming and inclusive community. Many who advocated for retaining Wilson's name on the school and the college also maintained that Princeton should offer a more honest portrayal of Wilson and express a renewed commitment to diversity and inclusivity. We thank all who took the time to share their views with us through the website.

Scholars and Biographers

This has been a learning experience for the committee and for the University community. We have learned from each other and from the many views that have been presented; and we are especially grateful to the nine expert scholars and biographers who accepted our invitation to inform and shape our conversation. Their comments made it clear that Wilson had a transformative impact on the University, the country, and the world. It is also clear that he held racist views and took or permitted racist actions. In citing and remembering Wilson, Princeton has venerated him in a way that has not been forthcoming or transparent about this harmful aspect of his legacy.

While we encourage all who are interested in Wilson's legacy to read the submissions from the scholars and biographers on our website, we want to recount some of the basic components of his legacy, some of which we admire, but some of which we deplore.

Wilson was an undergraduate in the Princeton Class of 1879 and a faculty member for twelve years before becoming the University's 13th president in 1902. His impact on Princeton as president was profound and enduring, as he transformed an intellectually lethargic campus into a renowned institution of higher learning. Many leading colleges and universities of his time adopted his reforms, and many of them flourish to this day: he raised academic standards and established a modern administrative and departmental structure; he revised the undergraduate curriculum around a concept of distribution requirements followed by departmental specialization, while also introducing independent work for seniors; in an effort to stimulate original thought over rote learning he introduced the preceptorial system, for which he garnered trustee approval to hire 50 dynamic young teachers and scholars as preceptors, at a time when the entire faculty numbered just over 100; he promoted the library and art museum as teaching instruments, and he hired the first Jewish and the first Catholic faculty members; and he sought unsuccessfully to replace the socially exclusive eating clubs with a system of residential quadrangles that would have incorporated many of the features of today's residential colleges.

Despite some efforts to make Princeton more inclusive and diverse, Wilson indisputably opposed the idea of admitting black students to the Princeton of his time. He noted on one occasion that "the whole temper and tradition of the place are such that no negro has ever applied for admission." When a black student in 1909 did inquire about attending, he replied "that it is altogether inadvisable for a colored man to enter Princeton."

As U.S. President, Wilson created the Federal Reserve System and the Federal Trade Commission; instituted tariff reform and the modern income tax; enacted the first federal laws to establish the eight-hour workday and restrict child labor; appointed the first Jewish justice, Louis Brandeis, to the Supreme Court; and fought for and won passage of the nineteenth amendment, which granted suffrage to women. He reshaped governmental processes and recalibrated relationships between the President and the Congress in ways that continue to this day. He led the nation during World War I and sought through his proposed League of Nations to set in motion what was described as "the one great idea of the [twentieth] century in the field of international relations, the idea of an international organization with permanent processes for the peaceful settlement of international disputes." In 1919 he received the Nobel Peace Prize.

At the same time he presided over an expanded and formalized segregation in the federal workplace that went well beyond what it had been when he entered office, especially in the two departments with significant numbers of black employees (the Treasury and the Post Office), an action that one historian said "devastated not only careers but also the very foundation of full citizenship for African Americans." Some historians fault him for his curtailment of civil

liberties during World War I, for sending troops to a number of Caribbean and Latin American countries, and for bringing his racial views to issues of foreign policy.

The Wilson Name on Campus

Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs

Princeton established an interdisciplinary undergraduate school of public and international affairs in 1930. While there is evidence from the beginning that those who donated funds and developed the school's academic program intended that it be named for Wilson, formal trustee action did not occur until January 1935, when the trustees adopted a resolution calling for the school to bear Wilson's name in recognition of his service to the University, the country, and the world. The resolution called for constructing a building to house the school and authorized fundraising for an endowment. After adopting the resolution, the trustees agreed that this action "should not be given any publicity whatever" to allow fundraising and other planning prior to any public announcement. Progress was slowed by the dislocations on campus during World War II, so the formal announcement of the naming of the school was not made until 1948, when the school's graduate program was established. President Harold Dodds called the naming of the school "a natural and fitting memorial" to Wilson, saying that Wilson "expressed in one sentence ... the central truth to which instruction in this school is dedicated: 'We are not put into this world to sit still and know; we are put here to act.'"

After being located at various times in Dickinson Hall, Whig Hall, and the former Arbor Inn eating club (now 5 Ivy Lane), the school moved into its first permanent location in 1952, a red brick building at the corner of Prospect Avenue and Washington Road that was known as Woodrow Wilson Hall. In the late 1960s that building was relocated and renamed Corwin Hall, and a new building, Robertson Hall, was constructed to house the Wilson School. While the school is named for Wilson, there is no longer a building named for Wilson in connection with the school or in connection with Wilson College.

Woodrow Wilson College

The origins of the naming of Wilson College are well recounted on the Wilson College website: <http://www.princeton.edu/wilsoncollege/wilsonia/wilson-college-origins-ti/>. The account begins with Wilson's revision of the academic structure of the University by introducing departmental concentrations and precepts and his proposal to reorganize undergraduate social and intellectual life by replacing the eating clubs with residential colleges, each with its own dining hall, common room, resident faculty leader, and resident preceptors. In December 1956, President Dodds approved the opening of a small facility adjoining Madison Hall (now part of Rockefeller College) for use by a dozen members of the Class of 1959 who wanted to create an alternative to the eating clubs. The students came to refer to this alternative as Woodrow Wilson Lodge. In 1959, ten percent of the Class of 1961 joined Wilson Lodge. When the dorms known as the "New Quad" (now associated with Wilson College) opened in 1961, the students in

Wilson Lodge moved there and renamed themselves the Woodrow Wilson Society. In 1967, a faculty member, Julian Jaynes, then serving as master-in-residence of the Wilson Society, proposed the transformation of the Society into Wilson College, with membership open to students in all four classes.

At a trustee meeting in January 1968, President Robert Goheen reported that a group of some seventy sophomore independents, along with about 50 members of the Wilson Society, were interested in establishing a residential college in and around Wilcox Hall. According to the minutes: “This would be moving toward the college or house pattern, using one or more of the quadrangles near Wilcox Hall with the name, ‘Wilson College.’ ... Such a recasting and rejuvenation of the Wilson Society effort is much to be desired.”

Woodrow Wilson Award

One other prominent use of Wilson’s name at Princeton is the Woodrow Wilson Award, presented each year on Alumni Day as the highest distinction the University can confer on an undergraduate alumnus or alumna. The award was established in 1956 when the trustees accepted an endowment gift from an anonymous donor, resolving that they intended it to be an “ever-living recognition of Woodrow Wilson’s conviction that education is for ‘use’ and as a continuing confirmation by Princeton University of the high aims expressed in his memorable phrase, ‘Princeton in the Nation’s Service.’” That phrase is preserved today as part of Princeton’s informal motto, which was amended in 1996 to “Princeton in the Nation’s Service and the Service of All Nations.”

Other Uses of the Wilson Name

The committee requested an inventory of other uses of the Wilson name at Princeton and found the following: a Woodrow Wilson Professorship of English (established by a donor in 1926); a Fellowship of Woodrow Wilson Scholars program in the Graduate School that was established in 1994 upon the dissolution of the free-standing Woodrow Wilson Foundation; a Woodrow Wilson Foundation Book Award Fund (also created upon the dissolution of the Woodrow Wilson Foundation) that the University administers for a prize that is awarded by the American Political Science Association; and the Woodrow Wilson Honorary Debate Panel at Whig-Clio that administers yearly debates.

Findings and Recommendations

For Princeton’s first 200 years, its student body was almost entirely white and male, as was its faculty and staff. There was intentional discrimination against Jewish applicants and very little presence of international students. Princeton began to take modest steps toward diversification after World War II; in 1947 and 1948, it presented its first undergraduate degrees to black students who had initially arrived on campus through a program sponsored by the U.S. Navy. It began to admit a small number of black and other minority students; adopted a need-

based financial aid program; and enrolled returning veterans under the GI Bill. But it was not until the 1960s, under the leadership of President Goheen, that Princeton finally became coeducational (first at the graduate level and then at the undergraduate level) and began to make a determined effort to become more diverse and inclusive.

Fifty years later there is evidence of progress. The undergraduate student body this year includes 48% women; 11.8% international students; and 42.5% American minorities (7.6% African American, 0.1% American Indian, 21.5% Asian American, 9.2% Latino/Hispanic, 4.0% multiracial non-Hispanic, and 0.2% Pacific Islander). Princeton has a thriving LGBT center and a highly regarded Center for Jewish Life. There are many curricular and extracurricular offerings that reflect this increased diversity; for example, last year the trustees approved the creation of a department of African American Studies, and in our recently adopted strategic framework we recognize the need for the University to add to its scholarly strength in the study of key regions and cultures in the contemporary world. In recent years the Alumni Association has sponsored a number of very successful conferences on campus for black, Asian and Asian American, LGBT, women, and graduate alumni, and there are conferences planned for Jewish alumni this spring and for Latino/Latina alumni next year. These conferences have helped to connect and engage alumni who in many cases did not experience Princeton as fully welcoming to them.

Despite the progress that has been made, much remains to be done. Two years ago the trustees adopted a report from a committee on diversity that was chaired by trustee Brent Henry and then-psychology professor and now dean of the faculty Deborah Prentice that identified the need to make much greater progress in diversifying the faculty, our graduate student population, and the senior administrative staff (<http://www.princeton.edu/reports/2013/diversity/>). Last year, a Special Task Force on Diversity, Equity and Inclusion, under the auspices of the CPUC, made recommendations to improve policies, practices, and programs in six key areas: the student experience; addressing bias, discrimination, and harassment; academic and curricular offerings; learning about diversity and equity outside the classroom; access to and use of data; and public programming (<http://www.princeton.edu/vpsec/cpuc/inclusion/>). The University began implementing some of the recommendations immediately and continues to monitor all of them. Other initiatives were undertaken beginning this past fall. There is central coordination of all of these efforts through the provost's office, and progress is reported through that office's "Inclusive Princeton" website (<http://inclusive.princeton.edu>). We urge the administration to continue to implement these and other measures, and to monitor progress toward achieving greater diversity and inclusivity in every aspect of the life of the University.

An Unwavering Commitment to Diversity and Inclusion

Included in the strategic framework that the trustees adopted in January 2016 is a mission statement that expresses "a commitment to welcome, support, and engage students, faculty, and

staff with a broad range of backgrounds and experiences, and to encourage all members of the University community to learn from the robust expression of diverse perspectives.”

In view of this, the most important recommendation we make is for a renewed and expanded commitment to diversity and inclusion at Princeton. What is needed is nothing less than a change in campus climate that elevates Princeton’s commitment to diversity and inclusion to a higher priority. We recognize that this will require multiple initiatives on many levels, and it will require the support and active engagement of all members of the Princeton community. Princeton aspires to be a university where people of all backgrounds and perspectives are welcomed, valued, and respected; where they learn with and from each other; and where all feel that the Princeton they attend is their Princeton.

The committee recommends that the board re-commit to making Princeton a more diverse, inclusive, and welcoming community through regular and persistent oversight of policies, programs, and other initiatives that help to achieve these goals. We encourage members of the University community to think creatively and expansively about ways we can make further progress; and we urge the board to recognize the importance of providing the resources necessary to achieve meaningful changes in campus climate and culture.

A Special Trustee Committee on Diversity and Inclusion

Given the strong trustee interest in these areas, we call upon the board’s Executive Committee to establish a subcommittee designated as the board’s Special Committee on Diversity and Inclusion to monitor progress in these areas on a regular basis and bring issues to the full board for its consideration as needed. Many of the most important initiatives fall within the purview of the committee on Student Life, Health, and Athletics and the committee on Academic Affairs, and we propose that the Special Committee include the chairs of those committees. Other initiatives are more cross-cutting or fall outside the jurisdiction of existing committees. The establishment of this special committee will help to ensure that the board continues to focus on the University’s overall progress as well as on progress in specific areas of concern.

Further Actions

In addition to encouraging redoubled efforts and more regular accountability to achieve greater progress in reaching higher levels of diversity and inclusion, our committee recommends further steps in four areas.

Establish a High-Profile Pipeline Program to Encourage More Students from Underrepresented Groups to Pursue Doctoral Degrees

Dean of the Faculty Deborah Prentice recently described for the CPUC and the trustees the frustratingly slow progress that has been made at Princeton and its peer universities in

diversifying the ranks of faculty, graduate students, and post-docs, despite significant and sustained efforts and the commitment of substantial resources. Efforts to increase diversity in all these ranks must begin at the graduate student level, as today's graduate students will become tomorrow's post-docs and faculty. When we asked where Princeton could play a transformative leadership role in addressing this issue, President Eisgruber proposed that the University create a new, high-profile, graduate pipeline program to encourage and equip more students from underrepresented groups to pursue doctoral degrees at Princeton and at other leading universities. The program would draw inspiration from successful existing programs at the undergraduate level, including our Princeton University Preparatory Program and our Freshman Scholars Institute, as well as the external Leadership Enterprise for a Diverse America (LEDA) program, which identify exceptional high school students and provide the mentoring and educational experiences (including a summer on the Princeton campus) they need to aspire to and succeed at many of the nation's leading colleges and universities. The new pipeline program would identify highly qualified undergraduates from a broad range of colleges and universities and encourage and prepare them to pursue doctoral degrees. This program would complement other expanded initiatives at Princeton – such as the Princeton Summer Undergraduate Research Experience (PSURE) and ReMatch (Research Matching) – to provide opportunities for students from diverse backgrounds to gain research experience, mentorship opportunities, and an understanding of how graduate school works: all extremely valuable when applying to Ph.D. programs.

We believe such a program would address crucial needs at Princeton and nationally, and that it would represent a meaningful step toward diversification at the graduate school, post-doc, and faculty levels. We encourage the president and his colleagues in the administration and the faculty to proceed with the planning necessary to allow Princeton to implement a program of this kind as soon as feasible.

Modify Princeton's Informal Motto

One of the ways in which Woodrow Wilson is associated with Princeton is through the University's informal motto, which originated with Wilson's address at Princeton's sesquicentennial in 1896. Every time the motto is used, it evokes Princeton's association with Wilson, but it also evokes an aspiration to service that is a fundamental component of Princeton's mission. In 1996, at the celebration of Princeton's 250th anniversary, President Harold Shapiro proposed that the motto be updated to reflect Princeton's growing international presence; and the expanded motto – Princeton in the Nation's Service and the Service of All Nations – was engraved in a plaque that is prominently situated on the front campus.

Upon receiving the Woodrow Wilson award in 2014, Supreme Court Justice Sonia Sotomayor '76 suggested revising the motto so that it focused less on service to nations and more on service to humanity. Her proposal echoed the comments of others over the years who have objected to the limitation of aspiring only to the service of nations, and who have asked whether the University's aspiration was truly to be in the service of *all* nations.

We propose modifying Princeton's informal motto to "Princeton in the Nation's Service and the Service of Humanity." We do so for two compelling reasons. One is that it captures Princeton's mission to serve the public good through teaching, research, and service that make a positive difference in the lives of people in this country and throughout the world. But it also permits the University to recast the front campus plaque, allowing it to reflect both the time-honored aspiration stated by Woodrow Wilson and the forward-looking aspiration stated by Justice Sotomayor. The new plaque would contextualize the legacy of Woodrow Wilson; it would allow us to contemporize his expression of Princeton's commitment to service by linking it to our embrace of the coeducational, multi-racial, multi-ethnic, diverse and inclusive composition and ideals of our community today.

We encourage the board to approve this change in the University's informal motto and to authorize the administration to proceed with the replacement of the plaque on the front campus.

Education and Transparency Initiatives

In citing and remembering Wilson, Princeton has venerated him in a way that has not been forthcoming or transparent about his failings, and especially about his views about race. If the stature and character of Princeton today result partly from reforms that Wilson launched, they likewise benefit from efforts by subsequent generations to repudiate the exclusionary views he espoused. It is critical that one outcome of this process be a much more multi-faceted understanding and representation of Wilson on our campus, especially at the school and the college where his name is commemorated.

The discussion about Woodrow Wilson's legacy has revealed a compelling need for Princeton to provide more opportunities for members of the campus community and others to learn – in courses, lecture series, exhibitions, campus markings, and other ways – about aspects of Princeton's history that have been forgotten, overlooked, subordinated, or suppressed. The University must be more transparent about its historical legacy, especially as it relates to Wilson and especially as it relates to race. We need to acknowledge that Wilson held and acted on racist views and that pernicious racial attitudes and racist actions are part of our institutional history. We also need to focus renewed attention on those who have helped make Princeton a more diverse and inclusive place.

We are pleased that the Wilson School is planning an exhibition and panel discussion this spring about Wilson's legacy; the exhibit, co-sponsored with the Seeley G. Mudd Manuscript Library, will draw on modern scholarship, newly digitized resources, and Princeton's special collections. We encourage additional efforts along these lines, drawing on scholarly resources at Princeton and elsewhere. We encourage the school to install a permanent marker on-site that educates the campus community and others about both the positive and negative dimensions of Wilson's legacy.

Finally, we have greatly appreciated the opportunity over these past few months to think deeply and expansively about issues related to historical legacy, and we encourage the administration and faculty to consider ways in which Princeton could play a leadership role in encouraging similarly expansive thinking about national and international issues related to race, inclusivity, and cross-cultural understanding – perhaps through some kind of global symposium that seeks to shed new light on these persistent and vexing issues. As many have pointed out, the issues that have been raised at Princeton reflect deep currents in this and other countries.

Campus Iconography

Many who shared views with us pointed to the absence of iconography on campus that speaks to Princeton’s aspiration to be diverse and inclusive, which perpetuates (through names on buildings, hangings on walls, campus artwork) a representation of Princeton that is not welcoming to members of the community who come from diverse backgrounds. We encourage the administration to make a concerted effort to diversify campus art and iconography, and to consider the possibility of commissioning artwork that honors those who helped to make Princeton a more diverse and inclusive place, or expresses the University’s aspiration to be more diverse, inclusive, and welcoming to all members of its community.

We also encourage the administration to develop a process to solicit ideas from the University community for naming buildings or other spaces not already named for historical figures or donors to recognize individuals who would bring a more diverse presence to the campus. One specific space on campus that we encourage the Board to consider naming in this way is the atrium in Robertson Hall, which serves as the principal entryway into the Woodrow Wilson School. As trustees, we would welcome opportunities to consider this and other proposals along these lines.

The School and the College

We want to express again our appreciation for the views of those who recommended changing, removing, or in some cases hyphenating the names of the Woodrow Wilson School and/or Wilson College. We considered these views at length, along with the views of others who felt equally strongly about preserving the names. As we said earlier, in many cases those who felt strongly about keeping the names recommended that we be honest and transparent about the ways in which some of Wilson’s views and actions conflict with the University’s aspirations and core values. While there was not unanimity among the members of the committee as to whether the names should remain, in the end our collective judgment was that the names should not be changed, but that proper and transparent contextualization is imperative, and we have called for that contextualization in this report.

Universities must always remain open to change and to evolving articulations of their values and aspirations. The challenge presented by Wilson’s legacy is that some of his views and actions clearly contradict the values we hold today about fair treatment for all individuals,

and our aspirations for Princeton to be a diverse, inclusive, and welcoming community. On the other hand, many of his views and actions – as faculty member and president of this University, as governor of New Jersey and a two-term President of the United States, and as an international leader whose name and legacy are still revered in many parts of the world – speak directly to our values and aspirations for our school of public and international affairs and for the first of our residential colleges.

We believe there is and should be a presumption that names adopted by the trustees after full and thoughtful deliberation, as happened in both of these cases and in the naming of the Woodrow Wilson Award, will remain in place, especially when the original reasons for adopting the names remain valid. There is considerable consensus that Wilson was a transformative and visionary figure in the area of public and international affairs; that he did press for the kinds of living and learning arrangements that are represented today in Princeton’s residential colleges; and that as a strong proponent of education for use, he believed Princeton should prepare its students for lives in the nation’s service. These were the reasons Wilson’s name was associated with the school, the college, and the award.

Contextualization is imperative. Princeton must openly and candidly recognize that Wilson, like other historical figures, leaves behind a complex legacy with both positive and negative repercussions, and that the use of his name implies no endorsement of views and actions that conflict with the values and aspirations of our times. We have said that in this report, and the University must say it in the settings that bear his name.

Finally, we take pride in the diversity of the students and programs that today fill the school and college that bear Wilson’s name. The presence of students, faculty, and staff on our campus today – many of them – who could not have attended when Wilson was president speaks to our commitment to diversity and inclusivity. It is our responsibility, in this age, to expand even further Princeton’s determination to achieve true diversity and inclusivity as core values of this University.

Conclusion

We end this report where we began, by reaffirming our insistence that Princeton be a diverse, inclusive, and welcoming community for students, faculty, staff, alumni, and visitors from all backgrounds and perspectives. We recognize that much work needs to be done to achieve this aspiration, and we encourage the board to provide the oversight, accountability, and resources necessary to make significant progress. We call on all members of the University community to recognize and respect the concerns that led to this re-examination of Wilson’s legacy – concerns that reflect the experiences of members of our community on campus and beyond – and to join in a concerted effort to help the University live up to higher standards of inclusivity and mutual respect. One of the enduring lessons of this reexamination of Woodrow Wilson’s legacy is how much we can learn when we listen deeply to one another, as we have,

and as we need to continue to do. We need to acknowledge both the challenges that confront us today and the shortcomings of our past as we focus together on the Princeton we want to become and the steps we all must take to get there.

Adopted by The Trustees of Princeton University, April 2, 2016