MEMORANDUM

FROM: WWU Board of Trustees Ad Hoc Legacy Review Committee
    John M. Meyer
    D. Chase Franklin
    Karen Lee
    Faith Pettis

TO:    WWU Board of Trustees

RE:    Findings of Fact and Recommended Conclusions with Respect to the Naming of Haggard Hall

Condensing the extensive resources gathered through the Legacy Review process and posted to the Legacy Review Task Force website, the Ad Hoc Legacy Review Committee presents for the full Board's consideration the following findings of fact and recommended conclusions from applying the principles of de/renaming that have been advanced through the process.

Findings of fact with respect to the personal legacy of William Wade Haggard:

1. Haggard was president of Western Washington from 1939 to 1959, overseeing a period of evolution in the institution’s mission as well as significant increases in students, faculty, and legislative funding. He also guided Western though the volatility of the Second World War, first overseeing a decline in student numbers, and then after the war a huge influx of student veterans.

2. Some notable developments under Haggard’s 20-year tenure:
   a. Haggard oversaw a period of institutional transformation from a normal school, the primary purpose of which was to educate K-8 teachers, to a College of Education, producing teachers capable of teaching K-12. By all accounts Haggard in so doing laid the groundwork from the further transition to becoming a liberal arts institution in the 1960s.
   b. Following the tumultuous firing of President Charles Fisher, Haggard was able to restore morale and confidence among the faculty, and relationships with the community. Haggard also enhanced the reputation of the institution regionally and
nationally with a series of summer conferences led by renowned educators from across the country.

c. Haggard was very successful in advocating for the institution with the state legislature, securing significant increases in the institution’s capital and operating budgets, including for the construction of six new buildings.¹
d. Haggard can be credited with both hiring and supporting faculty members who became critical to Western’s development over the course of his service and beyond. During his 20-year tenure, faculty increased from 61, nine of whom held doctoral degrees in 1939, to 137, 47 of whom held doctoral degrees, in 1959. His relations with faculty were strong, and, notably, he took a public stand in opposition to the Board of Trustees to support a provision of the Faculty Handbook which called for promotions based on individual merit as opposed to discipline affiliation.
e. The first African American faculty member, Eunice Day Lee, was hired at Western Washington State College in 1959.²
f. In 1953, Western was the first teacher’s college in the Northwest to be recognized by the American Association of University Women, an organization devoted to promoting women in higher education.

3. In a 1953 issue of the Western Washington Collegian student newspaper, Haggard appeared in a photograph with two students clothed in traditional Native American attire. There is very little additional context to explain how or why Haggard took the picture, or any evidence that he held discriminatory views about Native Americans or took any action to impede their presence or progress at Western. This photograph was also essentially unknown until it was brought to light by the Heritage Resources Report.

4. The Heritage Resources report on Haggard also included a photograph of Haggard with faculty member Herb Taylor and Art Humphries, himself a Native American, holding a model of a Native racing canoe. The model was presented to Western by Humphries, who was then chairman of the “Advancement of Employment and Education Club in the Betterment of Understanding and Relations of Whites and Indians.”

5. Concerns were raised by some Legacy Review Task Force members that Haggard did not speak out against the internment of Western’s sole Japanese American student, James Okubo, by Executive Order 9066 in 1942. There appear to be only a handful of elected officials who spoke out against internment at the time, and there is no evidence that Haggard’s failure to speak out against the internment reflected personal discriminatory views.

¹ According to a 1959 piece that Haggard wrote for the Editorial Committee of Western Reports, “The reader may be interested to know that the appropriation for salaries, wages and operations in 1939 was $520,000 (a little more in 1941), and in 1959, it is $4,304,174. The buildings and other campus improvements the Legislature has provided need not be enumerated.”

² An article submitted by Heritage Resources staff member Michael Taylor, “Despite the underlying current of racism [in Bellingham], Lee said that WWSC President W.W. Haggard made her feel welcome and offered her an associate professorship.”
Findings of fact with respect to the historical process of naming of the College after Haggard:

6. The Sciences Building that now bears Haggard’s name was a critical step in the evolution of Western from being a College of Education to a State College, and a personal dream of Haggard’s. Once WWCE was authorized to grant B.A. degrees to train teachers in secondary education, a modern facility for the study of science became critically important. Haggard began the planning process in 1954 and took the project to the Legislature in 1957, where he was able to secure the funding necessary for its design, construction, and outfitting.

7. Considering Haggard’s personal involvement in recognizing the importance of the building to the institution’s future, and in securing its funding, naming the Science Building after Haggard was an appropriate recognition of his role.3

Recommended Conclusions Based on Considered Principles of De/Renaming
In the course of its deliberations thus far, the Board of Trustees has given special attention to the principles of de/renaming captured in the Legacy Review Task Force charge, as well as those used by the Yale University Committee to Establish Principles on Renaming. Based on the findings of fact above, the Ad Hoc Legacy Review Committee recommends the following application of those principles for consideration by the full Board.

1. The Legacy Review Task Force charge states that consideration for removing a name should be guided by at least the following factors:

   A. The harm caused by retaining the name. Does the behavior or legacy of the person for whom the feature is named compromise or conflict with the University’s mission, including both its commitment to intellectual integrity and its commitment to diversity and inclusion of all members of the Western community?

   B. The potential harms of de/renaming. The names of certain University features may have a positive value for students, faculty, staff, or alumni, who may find de/renaming disrespectful of their views.

   C. Considering and weighing relevant factors. Such factors include:

      i. The relation of the honoree to the University’s history.

3 In an article written during the three-day dedication of Haggard Hall in 1960, the Seattle Times noted the importance of the building to the future of Western:

   “In a day when high school teachers must be prepared to meet ever-rising standards of science education in the public schools, [newly appointed Western President Jarrett] said ‘We have, for the first time, a scientific environment to match our staff, a science-education program among the best.’”

   “Today the giant step embodied in Haggard Hall heralds a new expansion of study of the physical sciences, a trend that will make Western Washington a feeder school for graduate study at the state universities.”
ii. The behavior of the honoree in terms of creating a significant negative impact on the core mission of the University and its teaching and learning environment.

iii. Broader community identification with the feature.

iv. The strength and clarity of the historical evidence.

v. Whether the harm [of retaining or removing a name] can be mitigated, and historical knowledge preserved by recognizing and addressing an individual’s wrongful behavior.

Recommended Conclusions Based on Principles of De/Renaming in the Task Force charge

2. The harm caused by retaining the name.
   A. It is unclear that there were, or are, any significant harms that resulted from Haggard’s tenure, especially as encapsulated in the photographs that were almost certainly unknown to any member of the Western community before they were surfaced by Heritage Resources. However, some members of the Western community may feel that naming a building after someone who appeared in such photographs is unacceptable.

3. The potential harms of renaming.
   A. Given the preponderance of evidence that Haggard made significant contributions to the institution, and lack of context around the photographs, de/renaming on this basis would undermine confidence in the University’s intellectual integrity and set a precedent for a very low threshold for de/renaming that could alienate prospective donors and past namesakes alike.

   B. Members of the extended Haggard Family live locally in Bellingham and have maintained a close relationship with the institution, supporting it philanthropically, and with some family members working at Western as well.

4. Considering and weighing the relevant factors.
   i. The relation of the honoree to the University’s history. Haggard was the longest serving president in Western’s history, and among the most effective and influential in its advancement. Furthermore, it is doubtful that the building that bears his name would have been built without his efforts.

   ii. The behavior of the honoree in terms of creating a significant negative impact on the core mission of the University and its teaching and learning environment. While the photograph of Haggard in Native attire is insensitive by today’s standards, its obscurity and again, lack of context, would seem to have virtually no effect on the core mission of the University or its teaching and learning environment.

   iii. Broader community identification with the feature. It is unclear how strongly students and faculty identify with the name of Haggard Hall. Clearly the Haggard family, and members of the community who attended Western at the time, identify quite strongly with it. Considering Haggard’s personal role in
bringing the building into existence, there should be a strong presumption to keep his name on it.

iv. The strength and clarity of the historical evidence. The historical evidence, as laid out in former Trustee Phil Sharpe’s letter and supplementary information from Heritage Resources, is quite strong in supporting Haggard’s contributions to the institution and rather weak with respect to any significant harms for which Haggard could be considered responsible.

v. Whether the harm [of retaining or removing a name] can be mitigated, and historical knowledge preserved by recognizing and addressing an individual’s wrongful behavior. While the names of campus features have significant symbolic value, the most important way the institution can mitigate any harms from retaining the name would be to increase focus and funding toward advancing concrete, measurable efforts to increase inclusive success for underrepresented students, faculty, and staff.

Recommended Conclusions Based on The Yale University Principles of Renaming

A. Is a principal legacy of the namesake fundamentally at odds with the mission of the university? Haggard’s legacy was overwhelmingly supportive of the mission of the university.

B. Was the relevant principal legacy significantly contested in the time and place in which the namesake lived? Haggard’s principal legacy was praised in his own time, and there is no evidence of it being significantly contested, particularly regarding the photograph of Haggard in Native attire or his lack of comment about the internment of James Okubo.

C. Did the University, at the time of naming, honor a namesake for reasons that are fundamentally at odds with the mission of the University? On the contrary, Haggard was honored over three days for advancing the institution’s mission.

D. Does a building whose namesake has a principal legacy fundamentally at odds with the University’s mission, or which was named for reasons fundamentally at odds with the University’s mission, play a substantial role in forming community at the University? Haggard Hall is an academic building that includes classrooms as well as administrative functions. It does not play a particularly significant role in building community.

E. Decisions to retain a name or rename come with obligations of non-erasure, contextualization, and process.

i. When a name is altered, there are obligations on the University to ensure that the removal does not have the effect of erasing history. Given the facts above, removing the name would significantly erase or alter history.

ii. When a name is retained, there may be obligations on the University to ensure that preservation does not have the effect of distorting history. Retaining Haggard’s name on the building would not distort history.
iii. The University ought to adopt a formal process for considering whether to alter a building name on account of the values associated with its namesake; such a process should incorporate community input and scholarly expertise. Developing a formal process of this kind going forward, based on lessons learned from this process and best practices from other institutions with more experience, could be among the actions taken by the Board in rendering its decision on these cases.