

9-5-2017

September 5, 2017

Faculty Senate

Follow this and additional works at: https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins

Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, "September 5, 2017" (2017). *Minutes*. 1104.
https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins/1104

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at The Keep. It has been accepted for inclusion in Minutes by an authorized administrator of The Keep. For more information, please contact tabruns@eiu.edu.

EIU Faculty Senate Session Minutes
5 September 2017 ▪ 2:00-3:50 p.m.
Witters Conference Room 4440, Booth Library

The 2017-2018 Faculty Senate agendas, minutes, and other information are available at <http://castle.eiu.edu/facsen/>.
Note: These minutes are not a complete verbatim transcript of the Senate meeting.

Senators present: T. Abebe, S. Brantley, T. Bruns, E. Corrigan, S. Eckert, S. Gosse, N. Hugo, K. Hung, J. Oliver, J. Robertson, G. Sterling, J. Stowell, C. Wharram, J. Williams, B. Young

Guests in attendance: Jay Gatrell (Provost/VPAA), Chrissy Miller (DEN), Jon Blitz (UPI), Newton Key (Faculty Development), Darren Hendrickson (Sociology-Anthropology), Nora Pat Small (History), Bonnie Laughlin-Schultz (History)

Session called to order by Chair J. Robertson at 2:01 p.m.

I. Approval of Minutes from August 22, 2017

Motion to approve by Young; seconded by Stowell

Discussion: *[Young opines that complex discussion was well-represented in the minutes]*

Vote: 14 in favor, none opposed, no abstentions

Motion carried; minutes approved without further modification

II. Executive Committee Report

ROBERTSON: CUPB will be meeting on Friday, I will be there – Exec Cmte scheduled to meet with President Glassman next Tuesday, I will confirm – I received communication from Provost's office re: upcoming date for IBHE

GATRELL: we'll be at Western Illinois for IBHE meeting on Sept. 19th

III. Committee Staffing for 2017-2018

ROBERTSON: thank you for volunteering; I assembled your self-nominations, committees are pretty well filled, just need to work out a few details

[general agreement to work through the list, then vote to approve committees all at once at the end]

tentative rosters listed below as distributed; asterisk indicates chair; see [Committees](#) page for finalized list – note: generic appointment confirmation dialogue omitted

Nominations Committee: *Oliver, Williams, Brantley

Elections Committee: *Stowell, Williams, Brantley, ~~Oliver~~

ROBERTSON: how many members should serve on Elections?

HUNG: Sen. Stowell can speak to workload

STOWELL: I'm the point of contact for ITS, I manage forms, committee provides moral support – fourth member not necessary

Faculty-Staff Relations Committee: Hugo, *Hung, Bruns, Wharram, Corrigan

HUNG: scheduling was difficult, making sure one of us could attend the monthly Staff Senate meeting

CORRIGAN: also finding a time when we could all meet with Staff Senate due to disparate schedules

HUGO: I can chair if needed, unless someone else wants to

ROBERTSON: would you like to continue chairing Awards?

HUGO: if someone wants to take over, that's fine; it's not too work-intensive – I prefer Awards, already having experience as chair of that committee – Brad Green will be transitioning, getting a new member at Foundation office that will be working with Distinguished Faculty Award

BRUNS: no one should have to chair more than one committee

CORRIGAN: I'd like to continue as a member but step down from chairing

ROBERTSON: [proposes Hung to chair Faculty-Staff, Bruns to chair Faculty-Student] – continue with five members, can alternate attendance at Staff Senate meetings

Faculty-Student Relations Committee: Hung, Hugo, *Bruns, Wharram, Student VP

ROBERTSON: I haven't heard any response from Student Senate about a student representative to join us

CORRIGAN: I received email earlier today from Rebecca Cash, new Student VPAA – I replied, copying you [Robertson] and Sen. Stowell, to let her know about today's meeting and sent info re: future dates

Budget Transparency Committee: *Sterling, Eckert, Wharram, ~~Brantley~~

ROBERTSON: how many members?

STERLING: doesn't matter, we usually met and discussed as a group rather than dividing up work, extra bodies welcome but not needed for workload

ROBERTSON: [in that case, proposes Brantley be removed from roster due to long list of other service activities]

Faculty Forum Committee: ~~Sterling~~, Williams, Eckert, Young, *Abebe

Awards Committee: *Hugo, Sterling, Williams, ~~Corrigan~~, Young, Student VP

HUGO: [clarifies membership composition of Distinguished Faculty and Mendez award committees according to Bylaws], last year I coordinated nomination materials but did not vote

ROBERTSON: [proposes that Corrigan be removed from roster due to Recorder duties]

Ad-Hoc Committee on Extracurricular Activities: Sterling, *Eckert, Abebe, Wharram

Parliamentarian: vacant?

ROBERTSON: do we need a parliamentarian?

BRUNS: it would be nice to have one if needed

HUNG: I volunteer to study up on Robert's Rules

ROBERTSON: [designates Hung as parliamentarian]

GOSSE: I'm not appointed to any committees; I didn't reply to call for volunteers – I served on Awards and Extracurricular last year, either would be fine

[Gosse is then appointed to Extracurricular Activities]

Motion to approve all committee rosters: Bruns, seconded by Eckert

Discussion: none

Vote: 15 in favor, none opposed, no abstentions

Motion carried

IV. Provost's Report

GATRELL: official 10-day enrollment numbers scheduled to be released tomorrow – it's positive, but I want to be transparent that we still have challenges ahead – the highlight is that transfer student numbers have increased

GOSSE: anything we can do to help you?

GATRELL: I have met with several departments, getting to know personalities as well as programs – once my tour is done, I will have a better sense of campus resources and how faculty can help advance – Sen. Stowell may be contacting you about HLC documentation; wonderful opportunity to serve, willingness to support academic affairs would be appreciated

STOWELL: 10-year cycle for reaffirmation of accreditation, but 4-year report in new cycle

GATRELL: all 5 standards but abbreviated version approximately half the length

STOWELL: the last report was more than 74,000 words; the next report is limited to 35,000

GATRELL: data have to be updated, to reflect our initiatives; once that's submitted, learning outcomes will come to the forefront as we prepare for the 10-year

STOWELL: impression of marketing feedback?

GATRELL: branding resonates with me personally – the market isn't us – I'm excited about the direction we're moving and broader recruitment initiatives

OLIVER: are you continuing any of your predecessor's initiatives?

GATRELL: high impact practices focusing on undergraduate research; new program focused on faculty mentoring, allocated FNA recovery monies to expand those practices; Bob Chesnut issued RFP ~2 weeks ago, due date is Oct. 2; within that is study abroad – the other piece high on our agenda is learning outcomes

HUNG: faculty/student research collaborations have been slowed down because of budget problems in the last two years – long-term impact of suspended CFR grants and reduction in Faculty Development – initiatives are important to jumpstart the process of getting research back on track

GATRELL: Williams Travel Grants for graduate students have already been renewed and increased – graduate student research fund also still available – research & creativity and mentoring of students are high priorities for me

ABEBE: email sent from the Deans to the faculty of the various colleges re: travel funds – allocation of funds has been delegated to the Deans, centralized in Deans' offices – I'm not sure that's the best thing, now rationale for travel goes directly to deans instead of department chairs

GATRELL: that was my call – I'm committed to normalizing budget processes and getting Ledger 1 travel underway – most efficient way to do that was to assign [travel fund distribution] to the deans, have them determine the most appropriate process for their colleges – resources are limited (\$11,000 spent on faculty travel in the last academic year) – control spending from budgetary perspective – traditional travel related to clinical rotations and teacher education will continue as-is at the departmental level – my hope is that next year we'll have a framework that looks more familiar

V. Committee Reports

ROBERTSON: let's circle back to briefly discuss the upcoming elections and any nominations business to be taken care of

STOWELL: 5 elected positions sent out to faculty; after sending out the call, I was notified that CAA needs a one-year replacement for this year due to medical leave – my recommendation is to offer the replacement position to the candidate who comes in second with votes for the at-large position – I've received only two nominations so far – we need to hold the elections in a timely manner; if the slate doesn't get filled we could extend the call for another week, but still aiming to have all positions filled and vetted by end of September

HUNG: I like the idea of the second-place vote-getter as replacement since they've already put their name in to serve, instead of a second round of solicitations

ROBERTSON: moving on to nominations, handful of replacements to consider because faculty left the university – fully staffed on Faculty Development Advisory Committee or need COS representative?

OLIVER: Amy Rosenstein sent updated list of populated committees as of Fall 2017 – [reads off names, colleges, term expiration dates of members listed under FDAC]

KEY: a number of people had to rotate off

OLIVER: list needs to be reviewed – Rosenstein highlighted a few positions: Library Advisory Board needs nomination for LCBAS position to serve 2017-2020, Parking Appeals needs an alternate for 2017-2018, need a replacement on Textbook Rental Advisory because Svetlana Mitrovski has left

BRUNS: there's an opening on the Brand Champions committee because Molly Niesen is gone

ECKERT: [correcting erroneous listing under ACA] I received notification in May that I'm on the ACA Committee

HUGO: there's another colleague on three committees who's no longer at the university

ROBERTSON: most streamlined thing to do once we update the [appointed positions list] on our website, spread the word to contact us and let us know of any issues

HUNG: publicize the list and ask people to tell us if there's something wrong?

ROBERTSON: people contact me to ask who's on their committee and I point them to the website, communication issue – clean up what we can, publish, then direct the people in charge of committees to let us know if there's anything further to address

BRUNS: should we all email Sen. Oliver?

OLIVER: yes please

VI. Guest: Professor Newton Key, Interim Director of Faculty Development

KEY: Faculty Development Advisory Committee had more changes than normal last year – I've been Director of Faculty Development for a full year now, going around and meeting with various groups, telling them who we are and asking where you'd like us to go – there's myself in a half-time position and Raquael Logan (GA, graduate student in Communication Studies), the Faculty Development Advisory Committee and that's it – we're already off the ground with new faculty orientation; I've learned to keep orientation going through the year; I've done follow-ups with those who've been here a year – 14 faculty members attended orientation, [out of] 11 Unit B and 20 part-time faculty this year; some have been here before, some are new; some couldn't attend but we've established a D2L course shell for new faculty with materials we've handed out – what Faculty Development does: ongoing groups, faculty reading group (*Small Teaching* last semester, we'll continue it this semester), find out if anybody has used that in their classes – looking at books to introduce in Spring, participants receive a free book – good to talk outside department – teaching squares last semester, try to start up again this semester > go to others' classes and reflect on your own teaching; led/organized by Gene Deerman and Jon Oliver, need someone new to run those – trying to establish monthly thematic brown bag in Edgar Room, maybe digital humanities or innovators in D2L – more standard workshops, e.g., faculty mentoring student research on Sept. 13 – Faculty Development also works with other groups such as Sponsored Research and CATS; working with MEI on inclusivity (diversity conference coming up) – support grants have been mothballed but partnership grants are continuing; will have some funding to help with individual registrations for Faculty Summer Institute; last year I paid for anybody giving a session, will pay for attendance this year; also registrations for Brightspace Illinois Connection – would like to set up Faculty Fellows to go to Wakonse teaching/leadership camp in Michigan; talking with student government and Terri Fredrick to send a group to student conference at the same time – two D2L course shells, one for new faculty and one for all of you – subscribing to 20-minute mentor videos – one position needed on FDAC is COS, if I could forward names for Faculty Senate to vet; striving for wide representation from the college instead of multiple people from the same department – all-encompassing mission statement is a little too much for current staffing, would like to revise statement to fit closer to reality and bring it to Faculty Senate

ABEBE: mission statement has developed over many years, has grown over the course of many editions – I suggest keeping the mission statement (so as not to alienate people on campus who have worked on it) but identify what you wish to do faced with budget diminution and other constraints on resources

BRUNS: is there a vision statement? maybe that should be the vision (aspirational), mission should specify what you can actually do

ECKERT: who is going to teach faculty writing course?

KEY: we didn't do it last year; Gene got a little bit of money for it, there isn't the money right now to pay someone to do it – I would like to do it, it would have to be me, there's a limit to what I can do – need a number of participants at the outset because within 4-5 weeks into the semester people start to get overwhelmed, dwindles down to a very small group by the end of the semester

HUGO: my group started with 8, ended with 2 or 3 people; dropped fast, about 4 weeks in

HUNG: I have served on FDAC for four years – board made up of faculty, mix of Faculty Senate and Provost nominations; full list is 14 members – for a campus like EIU where our primary mission is to educate students in a quality manner, it's important to have an engaging Faculty Development office – [expresses appreciation for Key's directorship] – since we're sailing into calmer waters financially, we can find more resources – several hundred faculty on campus; to really support what Faculty Development needs to do is not possible on a tin can and a shoestring – we're doing it now to the stage where we can say we have [a Faculty Development office] so we're not outcompeted by other campuses, but the amount of programming is not at the level where an institution of this size should be – we need to raise our game to be competitive with benchmark schools – we're relying heavily on the goodwill of campus faculty to volunteer their time and expertise; moving forward maybe we can lessen the burden, bring in outside speakers like we used to, raise it back to where it was four years ago – impacts all of us as a faculty body, we all benefit from the outcome

GOSSE: Newton, you've done a great job with very few resources – having a Faculty Development course page is brilliant, but how do you drive people to it – I'd love to see webinars, teaching tips that we can contribute and learn from

KEY: are you volunteering? :)

GOSSE: you just have to make it inviting, with multiple motivations, e.g., video of the week, best practices

KEY: played around with D2L site this summer, used it as sort of a blog – looking for additional contributors to share around, build up materials – we have some materials on YouTube – videos of whole workshops are too long, is there a way to summarize – build up on both the regular site and D2L – more things that I can embed, still learning how to do it – time factor

HUNG: online resources are nice for a distributive model – but interaction of actual meeting workshops is great, too

KEY: returning to Sen. Hung's suggestion to bring in speakers > we'd have to bring somebody in on the cheap, I think we'll have money in the spring – not looking to build up lots of workshops because people are still time-stressed – number of faculty has also shrunk, can't expect huge turnouts, how many are actually on campus on a given day

YOUNG: I want to talk in favor of face-to-face and small scale – I agree that with too much going on, attendance tends to be disappointing – I took part in a teaching square last spring, 4 people (2 History, 2 Sociology); one of the best things I've done with Faculty Development since I've been here; it was decentralized, we attended one meeting to prepare us for it and then organized the rest ourselves; I went to everybody's class twice, and I learned a lot from it; it's different from class visits for DPC, here you learn how other people connect in another discipline – I'm sure it's had a big influence on how I think about classes – my only regret is that we never had time at the end to get together for feedback

KEY: we were planning to have one for all teaching squares at the end

YOUNG: if more faculty learned about this [opportunity], that it's easy and doesn't take up a lot of time

HUNG: Sen. Eckert and I participated in the first [teaching square]; gain a lot out of it for the time put in, but you still have to convince people to commit to 5 hours; when you get into it, it's quite enjoyable

KEY: last year we did a Qualtrics survey of professors, 20-25% response – the downside was that everybody wanted everything, but it did give me a sense of constituencies – not doing one this year, maybe every other year to get a sense of what people are looking for

ROBERTSON: [states need to move on to teleconference; expresses appreciation to Key for coming in to talk]

VII. Proposal to Rename Douglas Hall

A. Teleconference with Chris Hanlon

Please refer to the appendix for a summary submitted by Prof. Hanlon due to a poor audio connection during the conference call.

B. Senate Discussion

ROBERTSON: thank you to Sen. Sterling for the comments you sent [to Senate members by email]; I wasn't sure if it was intended as public or private so I didn't include it with the communications I sent out, but I appreciated the points that you raised – my primary issue is that although the intent in 1951 was to name the buildings after the debate, they named one after Lincoln and one after Douglas – the issue is that we have incoming freshmen who live in that hall – to be fully sensitive we should consider that intent to honor the importance of the debate, the historical context explaining that is on a plaque in a different building

YOUNG: Dr. Small was on the original committee; [addressing Small] you read the minutes of the meeting where the naming decision was made, so my question for you is: was the intent to honor Lincoln and Douglas or simply to commemorate the debate?

SMALL: my recollection is that the minutes mention only the debate – official names are Lincoln and Douglas Halls, not Abraham Lincoln Hall and Stephen Douglas Hall, only surnames – the intent was to commemorate the debate that occurred in Charleston

YOUNG: secondly, thank you to Sen. Robertson for sending the [Yale document](#), which was the result of a whole year's work by a committee of 12 professors and alumni charged not with a decision or recommendation regarding the naming of a specific building (although controversy over Calhoun College generated the charge) but to reflect upon the principles involved in naming – I would be willing to propose writing a resolution thanking Chris Hanlon for bringing the matter back before us – among the principles, renaming on account of values should be an exceptional event – strong presumption against renaming based on values associated with its namesake, consider only in exceptional circumstances – I do not have a (grief?) one way or the other but a decision should be made with the whole community involved – conscious of the importance this community accords to the debate, the most important thing ever to happen in Charleston – at a time when we're being advised to find better ways of communicating what's special about Charleston and its cultural and intellectual traditions – I don't have a specific proposition to make, but we could approach partners in the university, notably Staff & Student Senates, with the state of the discussion, launch a yearlong process of considering it – next year would be the 160th anniversary of the debate – suggest that we involve students, essay contest with cash prize, challenge people in the arts to come up with projects around what this signified – Hanlon ends his memo with a rhetorical flourish: Eastern should disown Douglas and renounce his legacy publicly; further specifying his understanding that Lincoln's eventual ascension to the presidency is the true importance of the debate ... but is it? – it seems to me that you can't take something that happened in 1858 and say it precipitated the Emancipation Proclamation, but there is a connection, it would be interesting for our students to explore this – [American Historical Association statement on confederate monuments](#) formulated in the wake of Charlottesville, points out difference between monuments in honor of Confederate figures who sought to tear the country apart and Northerners who served the country even if they held views that are unacceptable today – also article from the New York Times on Aug. 25, "[Far from Dixie...](#)" shows a potentially useful reconsideration of the way we think about monuments and history, can renew our sense of being part of a democracy together but it can also lead to ugly polarization – Aug. 29 Times-Courier editorial reprinted from the Bowling Green (Ky.) Daily News, I don't agree but pass it along as an exhibit of public interest in these kinds of questions – consider how the people who write editorials are going to see it, not to say we shouldn't defend principles worth defending because people won't like it, but respond in a dignified and considered way

STOWELL: what's generating the second wave reviving this debate on campus? Important to ask – outcome last time produced an exhibit, which I hadn't visited before this second round; very informative, raises issues about a sensitive topic appropriate for our university campus to think about – what are we marketing about this name on our website? the only statement appears on the [residence hall page](#), it states that the building is named after the debate, doesn't lay claim to Douglas or his views – involve the whole community in this conversation, tied to history of Charleston; important to look at those views, something that can continue to be an educational opportunity

GOSSE: I would change that name in a heartbeat if you convinced me it would be beneficial for this learning community – I don't see it as revisionist, it's a matter of how our values now are presented to the world – I'm still not sure, but I'm for change

HUNG: it's difficult to judge thoughts and actions of a different time by current standards – I found an article on the antislavery movement of the early 1800s, prior to Lincoln-Douglas debate – it's clear that there's complexity to it, even people we regard as pro-emancipation held views we now consider unacceptable – Douglas existed at that time, surrounded by oppositional views to slavery, some peers were abolitionists > so we're not necessarily judging by a different standard but judging by his peers' values too – I am personally not sold on the narrative that this is about the debate and therefore not about commemorating the viewpoint held by Douglas; it's the same qualitatively as saying that the Civil War was about states' rights – we say the hall is named after the debate, but what was that debate about? the debate was about slavery, its expansion to be more precise – in that context the hall was named after a debate [about the legitimacy of slavery](#) > no period after "debate," that is the full sentence – presenting it as a full sentence gets a different response than saying it was a debate about an unspecified topic; by naming the topic we change the tenor of conversation – by virtue of the way it's named, it's difficult to convey to the public that the name refers to a historically significant event that happened in Charleston; shortened name creates confusion about what is being commemorated [draws parallel to Stone Mountain in Georgia] – the shortening of the name commemorating that a debate happened, not about the merit of the debate, is too subtle a point to communicate in a name shorter than a paragraph – if we can't fit it in the name of a building, then maybe we shouldn't do it

ROBERTSON: let's move toward wrap up

WHARRAM: complex question – I don't necessarily disagree with either the original letter or the response – I don't think we're addressing the right issue in talking about Douglas as an entire complicated figure, we're talking about the debate and about Douglas who presented ideas in the debate – contextualizing is the naming of the building is extremely important – the intention to name after the debate got lost because of separate buildings, makes it difficult for people to see the connection – the exhibit in Stevenson Hall allows the connection to be seen – “Debate Hall” would actually commemorate the event more clearly – but in reading the debates, that's all it's about, all they talk about is slavery – we have a physical manifestation on campus of one person who became the historical avatar of emancipation (Lincoln's last speech before death was about citizenship for blacks) and one person who clearly argued against those things – it makes me think that because of the context (the Yale report is clear about this) how the naming process is so important, the fact that it was named after the debate, not after Douglas the historical figure but the Douglas in the debates who said those things, we should be able to honor the local community and the history of the region by calling it Debate Hall – find a way without right/wrong, without demonizing – something that more accurately reflects importance of debate

YOUNG: I agree

BRUNS: I don't have the eloquence of other senators but my general thought is that we as a society have not yet come to terms with what we have done, with slavery – reflected in positions we hold – we talk about passing judgment on people from another time > slavery is a timeless guilt, then and now – I don't buy the argument that it was moral and legitimate back then – question of values, what was Douglas as a person, what does the historical event mean to our community, what does it mean for our students living in this building – there's the name: Douglas; that's what they see, we can't divorce values from that

ABEBE: I want you to look around, look at the person next to you—the policy that was advocated was that, so that the people who were affected are not here today—I wasn't affected, you weren't affected—the rarity of those people in this room should say something to you: they're not here to argue their point or respond; it is precisely that policy (advocated by Douglas) that caused their absence here, in part. The second point I wish to make is that slavery was not so much a labor system as it was a property regime, with slaves serving not just as workers for free, but as commodities. In this sense, and as an economist, I see that as individuals being hoarded, commoditized and then, monetized. If you can live with that, then fine. It is not just my values that have been affected. The separation of individuals, the complete disregard of individuals as humans—that is the value that was violated.

ROBERTSON: thank you, we'll continue discussions in a couple of weeks

Session adjourned at 3:59 p.m.

APPENDIX

VII.A. Proposal to Rename Douglas Hall - Teleconference with Chris Hanlon

Summary submitted by Prof. Hanlon due to a poor audio connection during the conference call

6 September, 2017

Dear Jemmie and members of the Faculty Senate,

I'm **sorry to discover** that our audio connection was so poor during our conference call earlier this week, but am grateful for this chance to put my remarks in writing. I also want to offer my thanks to the Faculty Senate for giving this proposal such serious thought. I have just a few further comments to offer: a couple of remarks in response to the **rejoinder I've elicited from some members of the History Department, and then a bit more in light of the document** produced at Yale concerning renaming.

First, just a few things I want to point to regarding the statements my colleagues in **EIU's History Department offer in** their letter. The first point I want to address concerns their suggestion that Douglas Hall is not actually named after Stephen Douglas—that it is actually named in honor of the debate that took place in Charleston between Douglas and Lincoln. I **have reviewed the primary materials concerning the naming of Douglas Hall (which I'll get into in further detail below), and have to confess I'm confused by this statement.** The name of the building I propose re-naming is **Douglas Hall. I don't see how such a name does not commemorate and enshrine Stephen A. Douglas.** Moreover, if **the authors of the History faculty's letter do not believe themselves to be defending a memorial to Stephen Douglas,** one is struck that the remainder of their letter is indeed an attempt at defending Stephen Douglas.

If the building did not commemorate Stephen Douglas, but rather only the 1858 debate, it might be called something like **"Debate Hall" or "1858 Hall." (Both are interesting possibilities, I think.) At the risk of carrying this point too far, I'll** also suggest that if the building was named to memorialize the debate and not Douglas, **it doesn't do so effectively.** The current configuration at EIU (one building for Lincoln; another, the same size and appearance, for Douglas) leaves open a series of bad historical interpretations: for instance, that both Lincoln and Douglas ought to stand upon more or less equal footing in our collective memory; that though some of his expressions might not sound politically correct today, Douglas was an honorable politician who did his share to help the country in his own way, and so on. These interpretations flout the assessments of most historians who work on Lincoln and Douglas, and they are also notions that do harm to our country, which is why so many attempts at memorialization that resemble that of Douglas Hall are now being revised or removed from public space across the United States.

I also want to address what I take as the central historical contention of the letter, which suggests that to refer to Douglas as an ally of what was once called the Slave Power effaces his real legacy as the proponent of popular sovereignty. The authors of the letter are correct to name this (and its expression in the Kansas-Nebraska Act) as the thing for which Douglas should be most remembered. But as I point out in the proposal **you've already read,** what popular sovereignty meant in the 1850s was opening new territory for consideration as land to be worked by slaves and to be governed by pro-slavery laws. What the concept amounted to in its time was that the détente that had existed in this country since 1820 (commonly referred to as the Missouri Compromise), **which limited slavery's** expansion by prohibiting its adaptation in wide swaths of western territory, was now annulled. This is why **Douglas's** Kansas-Nebraska Act was so roundly regarded as pro-slavery legislation around the country during the late 1850s. **The dossier of primary source information I've provided the** Faculty Senate offers much evidence of **Douglas's poor reputation as the nation's primary apostle of "popular sovereignty"**—another artifact I did not include is Massachusetts Senator Charles Sumner's two-day speech to the Senate on **the mass violence in Kansas territory to which Douglas's** legislation gave rise (and for which the Senator was famously clubbed nearly to death by South Carolina Congressman Preston Brooks). To summarize: to point to popular sovereignty in order to deflect the fact—widely enjoined by historians such as Alan Guelzo, Stewart Winger, and Eric Foner—that **Douglas's legislation** supported the interests of slavery ignores every way in which popular sovereignty resonated, as well as the effects it had, in antebellum America. **It's to take a position both ahistorical and disengaged with current historical consensus.**

Lastly, I want to thank you for supplying the very interesting document produced at Yale in light of their own renaming controversy involving Calhoun College (which as it turns out, that university renamed just yesterday). One of the points the authors of this document make is to insist that where discussions over renaming arise, all parties must pay some attention to the context in which the building or memorial in question was dedicated. This issue is critical where EIU is concerned, and so I want to close by offering some of that context.

The name of Douglas Hall was proposed by Glen Seymour, who was a professor of History at EIU and whose 1929 University of Illinois dissertation was typical of mid-century historiography focused on sectionalism and the Civil War. Entitled *An Analysis of the Political Principles of Stephen Douglas*, **Seymour's dissertation equated abolitionist with pro-slavery voices during the antebellum period. Both sides were radical, he argued: in Seymour's scheme** abolitionist figures such as Frederick Douglass and Harriet Beecher Stowe bore as much responsibility for the national tragedy of the Civil War as did southern slave-drivers and their apologists. In his invited talk at EIU during our

last consideration of Douglas Hall, Illinois State University historian Stewart Winger described this sort of mid-century historiography as a project in re-describing the Civil War without the slaves, something very much in fashion among academic historians during the middle decades of the twentieth century. But why? Historians such as Winger maintain that this trend was fueled by a conservative resistance to civil rights, and an attendant impulse to underplay issues of historical racial injustice. Coming into maturation during the nascence of the Civil Rights movement, this generation of historians fashioned a rendition of the Civil War that emphasized the source of the struggle as a tension **between “states’ rights” and “Union” while underplaying slavery and abolition. Thus, the War became the struggle of brother against brother, a parable of immoderation on both sides that installs a moral equivalence that distracts from considerations of racial justice.** (One maneuver of such historiography, unfortunately, was often to imply that there was little difference between the racial attitudes of Abraham Lincoln and his political opponents—often, for example, such historians would present Lincoln quotations in which the president demonstrated his comfort with much of the **casual racism of his period, but without complicating information such as Lincoln’s abiding “hatred” of slavery and preference for abolition, as he himself put as far back as 1847.**)

The state of historical **scholarship at the time of Douglas Hall’s** dedication is thus one part of the relevant context here; another, however, concerns the state of racial and civil-rights-related awareness at EIU during the 1950s. In 1951, when Douglas Hall was dedicated, six African-American students attended Eastern. In January of 1957, the campus paper, then called the Eastern State News, published an editorial critical of integrationists and especially **“Negroes who are for immediate integration,” individuals who fail to “truly represent their race.”**ⁱ As late as 1956, the Daily Eastern News was publishing editorials urging that the integration of public schools, along with the establishment of other civil rights for African Americans, should be implemented gradually—in fact, over the course of **one hundred years. “Rome wasn’t built in a day,” the DEN’s student journalists wrote in a joint editorial, “nor will segregation [...] end more quickly.” “100 years ago most places in the South wouldn’t let Negroes ride on trains,” they pointed out. “Today they may ride [...] in special cars. One hundred years hence Negroes will undoubtedly enjoy the rights and privileges that the white man enjoys today.”**ⁱⁱ This extremely conservative, gradualist response to the questions of civil rights, I would suggest, stands in some relation to the decision to juxtapose a dormitory named after Lincoln with another named after his most famous political opponent.

Finally, I want to end by answering the question Jemmie put to me on the phone during your meeting this week: Why did I begin, years ago, calling for the re-naming of this building? I began the process of making this proposal because as a scholar of the American nineteenth century I take umbrage at the historical inaccuracies in putting **Stephen Douglas’s name in a place of public honor**—I see his commemoration as form of historical revision that belies his reputation during the antebellum period as well as any reasonable assessment of his contribution to American life. But as I researched the matter further, I came to realize that the history of Eastern during the 1950s is also implicated here, as indeed so many monuments, building names, and other memorials around the nation also derive their resonance from the 20th-century politics of race in America. When I was a professor at EIU, on several occasions I spoke with African-American students who took offense at the name of Douglas Hall. They knew what it meant, what it means, to pretend that someone like Stephen Douglas is worthy of public honors, that he and Lincoln are of similar cast. These students, by the way, were not simpletons. They understood that history is complicated, that it is not usefully viewed as a contest between heroes and villains. Having discussed with them the complexities of antebellum America at length, I know that they wrestled with that complexity, and yet they were still able to see in the name of Douglas Hall something of an affront.

To those contexts there is now another, evident as we watch memorials to pro-slavery politicians and military commanders come down across the country—and indeed, other monuments to other figures such as Justice Roger **B. Taney, author of the Supreme Court’s decision in Plessy v. Fergusson, whose statue** was removed in Baltimore just weeks ago. I believe that Douglas Hall will eventually be renamed, and I think it would be a good thing for Eastern to simply do it now.

Thank you for your time, and good luck,

Chris Hanlon
Associate Professor of U.S. Literature
Arizona State University

ⁱ “Integration Fight Must Proceed Slowly,” [Eastern State News](#) (16 January 1957): 2. In an intriguing way, much similar editorial in Eastern’s student paper from the 1950s recapitulates the dynamics of debates from the 1850s, when “immediatist” abolitionists often conflicted with “gradualists” who predicted social, economic, and political disaster in the event of quick emancipation.

ⁱⁱ “It takes time to end South’s feeling for Negroes,” [Eastern State News](#) (15 February 1956): 2.