

C.C. Little Hall Name Task Force
University of Maine
Final Report for Committee Review
23 June 2020

Purpose and Scope of the Task Force

Partly in response to a student petition to remove the name of Clarence C. Little from UMaine's Little Hall, a resolution passed by the UMaine Student Government in support of that petition, and a letter from the campus organization Decolonizing UMaine, President Joan Ferrini-Mundy created a task force of university stakeholders to address the issue with the following charge:

1. Recommend criteria for deciding whether an individual's name should be removed from a physical facility named for them.
2. Recommend whether to remove Clarence C. Little's name from the campus building bearing his name, with pros and cons, and rationale. If you recommend removal, please also suggest replacement names, if any and rationale for the naming.
3. If a name replacement is recommended, what criteria did you consider for the name replacement?

Task Force Members

Hailey Cedor, undergraduate, Class of 2021
Thomas Connolly, Assistant General Counsel-Contracting, University of Maine System
John Dieffenbacher-Krall, Assistant Director, Research, College of Natural Sciences,
Forestry, and Agriculture
Stewart Harvey, Executive Director of Facilities and Capital Management Services
Jeffery Mills, President/CEO, UMaine Foundation
Liam Riordan, Professor, History
Joyce Rumery, Dean of Libraries
Kenda Scheele, Associate Vice President, Student Life
Howard Segal, Professor, History
David Townsend, Professor, School of Marine Sciences and President, Faculty Senate

Executive Summary

Clarence Cook Little (1888-1971) was the president of the University of Maine from 1922 to 1925. Little Hall was named for him in a dedication ceremony of the new building in June 1966. Major funds for the building had been raised by Maine voters via statewide referendum in the fall of 1963 and a grant from the U.S. Office of Education. The building continues its original function today with offices for the departments of Psychology and Modern Languages and Classics. It has some of the largest lecture halls on campus and has a prominent location on the mall.

Little made an enduring positive contribution to science through genetic research and as a key figure in the founding of Jackson Laboratory in Bar Harbor, Maine. However, two major aspects of his career are disturbing today. First, he was a notable figure in the eugenics movement in the United States, which sanctioned the identification and forced sterilization of individuals with

undesirable characteristics. Second, he was the lead expert in the tobacco industry’s attempt to hide the link between smoking tobacco and cancer. Little’s leadership in these latter two areas raise doubts about the appropriateness of having his name on a campus building. His short tenure as UMaine president (his only formal relationship to the university) raises further questions about whether or not he merits the symbolic honor of a building named after him in perpetuity.

Little left UMaine in 1925 for the University of Michigan, where he served as president to 1929. A science building was named for him on the Ann Arbor campus in 1968. The University of Michigan conducted a thorough review of the merits of his name on their Little Building, which led to its removal in early 2018. The UMaine Task Force has directly built on material produced through the review process at Michigan, and we have come to the same recommendation.¹

C. C. Little’s name should be removed from Little Hall because major areas of his professional life violate the ideals that are central to the educational mission of the University of Maine and its commitment to the public good. A new name for the building is a significant opportunity to better align the campus landscape with the values of the university, a process that should include public commemoration of Little’s career as well as information about the renaming process.

I. Task Force Recommendations for Building Name Criteria

Current Criteria for Naming a UMaine Building

The current criteria for the “Naming of Physical Facilities,” as per UMS Policy Manual Section 803 (effective 4/10/70, last revised 03/18/92), are quite general. Most relevant for the Task Force is Policy Statement 3: “Facilities may be named for any individual, living or dead, except for current employees or current members of the Board of Trustees. Other acceptable names include, but are not limited to, geographical designators, functions, or University groups.”

Building Name Criteria: General Principle

A building name is a symbolic and public statement. When a person’s name is given to a building that individual should have made an exemplary contribution to the university and/or to society more generally. This can include naming gifts by financial donors as stated in UMS Policy Manual Section 803.

The UMaine mission statement expresses the commitment of the university to “research-based knowledge” in clear terms. This includes “opportunity for all members of the University of Maine community” in “an atmosphere that honors the heritage and diversity of our state and nation.” In addition, the “integrated teaching, research, and outreach” functions of the university stress excellence that “improves the quality of life for people in Maine and around the world” via “responsible stewardship of human, natural, and financial resources.”²

¹ The University of Michigan committee report recommending removal of C.C. Little’s name from their building: https://drive.google.com/file/d/0By_BduXhL06LeUhKN2UtS1k2Rkk/view, accessed 24 April 2020.

² University of Maine, Mission Statement, <https://umaine.edu/about/mission-2/>, approved by UMS Trustees, November 2010, accessed 11 May 2020.

Building Name Criteria: Specific Naming Principles

1. Pedagogy. As an institution with a foundational commitment to pedagogy, UMaine building names should provide opportunities for learning about our past and the purpose of the university. This can include names that recognize the distinguished lives of alumni, extraordinary acts of generosity, path breaking achievements by faculty, and important administrative leadership as well as individuals who have made notable contributions to local, state, or national life.

2. Due Diligence. In approaching a naming decision, the University owes it to itself and to succeeding generations to do substantial research into the name.

3. Interpretation. When a name is selected for a building (or portion of a building) the obligation to explain and interpret that name is not fulfilled merely by a naming ceremony. There is an affirmative obligation to continuously interpret – and if necessary reinterpret – the stories behind the names of UMaine facilities. In some cases, changing a name may be less important than providing adequate interpretation about the existing name.

4. Commitment. In general, the university makes a significant commitment to an individual or a family when it names a space after a person. This applies both to spaces named for donors and for others. Cases involving donors are often regulated by a binding legal agreement. Those who wish to change the formally designated names of spaces or buildings carry a heavy burden of argument to justify it. Any such discussions must take account of appropriate legal guidelines and university policies.

5. Revision. A crucial aspect of the study of history is that our understanding of the past changes over time. New historical discoveries and interpretations can sometimes produce controversy over space names. This is part of a meaningful engagement with the past. The naming decision by one generation may appropriately be questioned by new historical perspectives achieved by a later generation.

6. Historical and Institutional Context. It is easy to blame those in the past for lacking the knowledge, wisdom, and values that we seem to possess today. Keeping in mind that we will likely suffer the same fate at the hands of those who come after us, we recognize that it is impossible to hold someone accountable for failing to share our contemporary ideas and values. Instead, the question must be what ideas, values, and actions were possible in a particular historical context. As an institution committed to the creation of research-based knowledge, we acknowledge that research is often messy, and today's shared values or reigning frameworks may be overturned through the give and take of future scholarship.

II. Should Clarence C. Little's Name be Removed from UMaine's Little Hall?

General Biography

Clarence Cook Little (1888-1971) was born in Brookline, Massachusetts, and attended Harvard University, where he earned a D. Sci. in Zoology in 1914. Prior to his UMaine presidency, Little had been a research associate and assistant director of the Station for Experimental Evolution, Carnegie Institution, Cold Spring Harbor, N. Y. The Station was the brainchild of Charles Davenport, a foundational member of the early American eugenics movement. Little was the director of the American Eugenics Society from 1923 to 1939 and its president in 1929.

Clarence Little assumed the position of university president on April 8, 1922.³ He was heralded as something of a wunderkind serving as the youngest university president in the nation.⁴ Little accepted the office of UMaine president with a reform agenda in mind relishing the prospect of implementing his ideas concerning higher education.

Though Little was recognized as possessing several outstanding qualities and talents, an ability and willingness to work with state government executive and legislative leaders was not one of his strengths. He clashed repeatedly with Governor Percival Baxter during the initial portion of his tenure as university president. He initially thought he would have a more constructive relationship with Governor Owen Brewster indicated by his submission of an ambitious ten-year plan for the university.⁵ Not long thereafter Little's initial optimism faded to pessimism that he would realize many of the twelve items some with multiple sub-parts that he had laid out.

Little's most enduring achievement during his term as university president involves the creation of a freshman orientation week in September 1923.⁶ He is also credited with procuring "funds for a new arts and sciences building (Stevens Hall)" and "the wherewithal to build the Memorial Gymnasium" with money "raised entirely from alumni, student, and faculty subscriptions." In addition, "A women's dormitory building was approved, and the women's educational, athletic, and self-government programs were strengthened."⁷

Little was recognized during the time as an accomplished public speaker and enjoyed a degree of public prominence. He did not hesitate to make controversial statements that offended individuals and groups. Some supporters defended his right to free speech while others thought he exercised poor judgment with some of his declarations. He refused to be politically dominated. However, his insistence on speaking out on whatever topic moved him undermined his effectiveness as UMaine president.⁸

³<https://umaine.edu/president/umaine-presidents/clarence-cook-little>, accessed 14 May 2020.

⁴ George D. Snell, "Clarence Cook Little," National Academy of Sciences Biographical Memoirs, 46 (Washington, D. C.: National Academy of Science, 1975), 243.

⁵ Clarence Cook Little, "Proposed Ten-Year Program for University of Maine," General University of Maine Publications. 47 (1924). https://digitalcommons.library.umaine.edu/univ_publications/47, accessed 15 May 2020).

⁶ Dorothy E, Finnegan and Nathan Alleman, "The YMCA and the Origins of American Freshman Orientation Programs," *Historical Studies in Education*, 25 (2013), 95-97.

⁷ Roberta Gallant Clark, "The Social Uses of Scientific Knowledge: Eugenics in the Career of Clarence Cook Little, 1919-1954" (M.A. Thesis, University of Maine at Orono, 1986), 95.

⁸ Clark, 93-97.

Little left UMaine to become president of the University of Michigan, where he served from 1925 to 1929. He then returned to Maine and was the Founding Director of what has become Jackson Laboratory. In addition, he held significant positions in the American Society for the Control of Cancer (later renamed the American Cancer Society), the American Birth Control League, and the Tobacco Industry Research Committee (later renamed the Council for Tobacco Research).

Little made significant contributions to science in the areas of mouse genetics, cancer genetics, and organ transplantation. He helped pioneer the development of strains of mice that were genetically very susceptible to cancer and others that were genetically cancer-resistant, which has proved invaluable to a wide range of scientific research. Maintaining and providing genetically defined mice to researchers remains the purpose for which Jackson Laboratory is best known.

Beatrice J. Little, President Little's wife, was a member of the University of Maine Board of Trustees from 1951-1965 and was a 1924 graduate of the university as were two of their children: Laura (Little) Moen, Class of 1955, and Richard W. Little, Class of 1961.

Little's Questionable Scientific Work

A. Eugenics

C. C. Little was an early supporter of the American eugenics movement and a founder of the American Eugenics Society. Many of Little's views on eugenics were widely shared by other scientists and were adopted as public policy in the U.S. and internationally. However, in part due to the association of eugenics with Nazism, it increasingly came to be seen as a violation of human rights. The Carnegie Institution closed the Eugenics Research Office in 1939, a division at the Station for Experimental Evolution where Little had worked.

Little was a particularly visible eugenicist in two ways: he led a large number of influential organizations, and he had a flair for publicizing his views in attention-grabbing language. As the Vice President of the Immigration Restriction League Little supported the 1924 Johnson Act setting eugenically inspired ethnic quotas on immigrants to the U.S. He viewed that law as heralding a new world order where individual rights would be subordinated to eugenic progress. Little also promoted anti-miscegenation laws to prohibit inter-racial marriage. The *New York Times* reported the following about Little in 1925: "Warning against reckless inter-racial marriage, Clarence C. Little, eugenicist and President of the University of Maine, compared the United States to a soda fountain. He represented the different races . . . as the different flavors of soda" that should not be allowed "to mix at random. . . [rather] they should be guided to blend in correct proportion the desired racial characteristics according to eugenic laws."⁹

⁹ No author, "Finds Excitement Injures the Race," *New York Times*, 29 March 1925, p. 16, <https://library.umaine.edu/auth/EZproxy/test/authej.asp?url=https://search.proquest.com/docview/103619926?accountid=14583>, accessed 16 May 2020.

B. Tobacco

As a former head of what became the American Cancer Society, Little believed that cancer was a genetic disease and that only those with a genetic susceptibility got cancer from “carcinogens.” This was a not-implausible scientific view at the time, but the historian of science Robert Proctor (Stanford University) makes the case that Little was culpably blind to how the industry used him for its own public relations purposes. Little became the Scientific Director of the Tobacco Industry Research Committee (TIRC) in 1954, later the Council for Tobacco Research, and held the position until his death in 1971. Proctor concludes that “Little was little more than a puppet for Big Tobacco.”¹⁰

Proctor characterizes TIRC as an organization whose purpose was to create public doubt about the role of tobacco in cancer. It diverted attention from the campaign against deaths from smoking and became a direct model for later science skeptics to the present day. Little’s own work focused on genetics and rarely mentioned smoking. Indeed, TIRC-funded research rarely targeted tobacco at all, but sought to find other causes for cancer. As Little testified in a 1960 court case, “Your questions were: ‘Have we tried to find carcinogenic substances in tobacco smoke?’ And we have not because we do not believe that they are there.” When Little did provide expert legal testimony about smoking, he seemed to revise his views to support tobacco industry goals. In a 1944 American Cancer Society booklet Little had written that it was “unwise to fill the lungs repeatedly with the suspension of fine particles of tobacco products of which smoke consists,” but in 1960, as the well-paid Scientific Director of TIRC, he replied “no” when asked if he still believed that 1944 statement.¹¹

Arguments Against the Little Hall Name Change

1. The current name is causing little harm. Most of the campus community does not know who Little was, and few appear to find it upsetting or disturbing to attend classes in Little Hall.
2. Little made significant contributions to science in the areas of mouse genetics, cancer genetics, and organ transplantation. He advanced understanding about the role of genetic predisposition to certain types of cancer, and he made advances in uses of the mouse as a model organism for cancer research.
3. Little founded the Jackson Laboratory, which remains a premier institution for genetic research into cancer; in this capacity, he helped to set up summer training programs for high school and college students and some consider him an educational innovator in this regard.
4. An institution should honor its previous leaders even if some of their ideas were distasteful. To remove his name is to engage in “politically correct” censorship.

¹⁰ Robert N. Proctor, Golden Holocaust: Origins of the Cigarette Catastrophe and the Case for Abolition (University of California Press, 2011), p. 286 (quote) and chap 16, generally, p. 260ff.

¹¹ Proctor, Golden Holocaust, pp. 257, 274. Further details of Little’s misleading work as part of TIRC can be found in K.M. Cummings, C. P. Morley, A. Hyland, “Failed promises of the cigarette industry and its effect on consumer misperceptions about the health risks of smoking,” *Tobacco Control* 11 (2002): i110-i117.

5. Removing his name would sanitize the past, erasing history that, even if ugly, should not be forgotten.

6. If we rename this building, we will set a precedent of retrospective judgment that is sanctimonious and could prompt a constant cycle of renaming that would waste time and resources.

Arguments in Favor of the Little Hall Name Change

1. While Little's eugenic legacy and career may not make certain students at UMaine uncomfortable, it can be disturbing for students, faculty, and staff who are aware of it, especially if they hold identities that were directly targeted by Little's work. At least one faculty member in this last group refuses to have his classes scheduled in Little Hall for this reason.

2. There have been clear calls both on and off campus to rename Little Hall. In addition to the student-led petition calling for the renaming of Little Hall and the UMaine student government's support of that petition, the issue has also been reported on by the *Maine Campus* and in an op-ed in the *Ellsworth American*.¹² Little Hall's name has also been reported on in the *Portland Press Herald* and in a strident editorial that followed, entitled "Building Named for Racist Scientist Doesn't Reflect University of Maine's Values."¹³

3. That Little is best-known for his genetic research and not eugenics is merely an indicator of the selective nature of historical memory, not what he was most actively involved in or believed in during his lifetime. He is not known to have ever renounced his views on eugenics.

4. Little spent much of the last phase of his career representing the tobacco industry that sought to undercut efforts to warn the public about the dangers of smoking. He contributed to disinformation about tobacco and cancer that, even if inadvertent, helped maintain tobacco industry profits at the cost of thousands of lives and billions in healthcare.

5. It is particularly egregious to have a university building named after someone who was both an advocate of eugenics and part of an industry effort to shield the public from adverse scientific findings about their product. Playing a lead role in a campaign to create doubt about scientific research violates a fundamental tenet of the university.

6. Changing the name of Little Hall should not result in the sanitization of the past. Renaming should be accompanied by memorialization of the building's original name and the rationale for its renaming. This could be done in an existing display case in the lobby of the building that does not appear to be currently used. The public explanation of the building's name history should include an effective explanation of why the new name is more appropriate and would be a positive achievement.

¹² *Maine Campus*, 23 April 2018, 28 October 2019 and *Ellsworth American*, 12 December 2019.

¹³ *Portland Press Herald*, 31 March 2018, 4 April 2018.

7. President Little had a short tenure at UMaine, which does not warrant his name remaining on a building in perpetuity. Furthermore, he has no known connection with the building itself other than its ceremonial naming.

8. Universities across the nation are doing their due diligence and reassessing how the figures they commemorate demonstrate – or do not demonstrate – their institutional values. UMaine should be a leader in this movement.

Task Force Recommendation to Change the Name of Little Hall

A combination of the historical record about the career of C. C. Little and the goal to create and maintain a university topography representative of current institutional values compels a renaming of Little Hall. Little clearly made valuable contributions to science, particularly with regard to mouse genetics. However, his career also includes two major violations of current UMaine values. First, he promoted a scientific theory anchored in invidious judgments about the relative worth of different kinds of people. This clearly violates the UMaine mission statement “that honors the heritage and diversity of our state and nation.” Second, he had a long leadership role in a campaign orchestrated by a PR firm to discredit public health evidence about smoking in order to protect a profitable industry. This violates UMaine’s commitment to “research-based knowledge” that “improves the quality of life for people in Maine and around the world” via “responsible stewardship.” Finally, Little’s time at UMaine was relatively brief and not especially noteworthy, whether looked at in terms of his scientific accomplishments or his contributions to the university. Little Hall exemplifies the kind of university structure that should be renamed based on a careful reevaluation of a previous historical period.

In many ways Little was typical of leading eugenicists and scientists in the early twentieth century. He held positions at elite institutions and was a member of a range of organizations that advocated for various scientific and public policy positions. Little’s career needs to be understood in its historical context when eugenics, which we assess today as misguided science, was seen as valid. However, Little was more active and more vocal in his support of eugenics measures than most of his contemporaries. No mere foot soldier, Little was a Director or President of the American Eugenics Society for 18 years and president of the third Race Betterment Conference; he was also a vice president of the Immigration Restriction League and continued to advocate for eugenics well into the 1930s, after many scientists had renounced their support for eugenics.

When we turn to his work for the tobacco industry, Little’s initial doubts about the links between smoking and cancer may have been shared by a number of researchers, yet Little continued to publicly advocate for this position well after the Surgeon General’s report of 1964, when the evidence for tobacco as carcinogenic had become overwhelming. In both instances, Little’s actions eventually placed him well outside of the mainstream of the contemporary scientific community and suggest that even judged by the standards of his time, his positions are open to serious question.¹⁴ Renaming Little Hall would better align the UMaine campus landscape with our fundamental values of nondiscrimination, diversity, and the importance of clear and accurate communication of research to the public.

¹⁴ David D. Rutstein, M.D., “An Open Letter to Dr. Clarence Cook Little,” *Atlantic Magazine* (October 1957).

Little's advocacy of eugenics could understandably make many people feel unwelcome on campus; moreover, his work for the tobacco industry to amplify doubt about the harms of smoking contributed to the early deaths of many and helped to establish a pattern for industry-sponsored pseudo-science to try and obscure the deleterious effects of the industry's products. At a moment of intense concern about truth claims in science, Little Hall is an inappropriate name for a prominent building at the University of Maine.

Enriching the University Community's Sense of Place and Understanding of the Past

Renaming Little Hall provides an opportunity to promote reflection and conversations about the meaning of diversity, equity, and inclusion on our campus, and to consider how Little's work – as university president, eugenicist, and tobacco apologist – militated against values we now hold dear. The possibility of renaming the building also raises the question of how and when to apply contemporary definitions of justice and inclusion to the past, when we have the luxury of hindsight.

A commitment to institutional history and integrity suggests the importance of interpreting and contextualizing Little's role at UMaine and his broader career. Interpretation should be an integral part of renaming so that his relationship to the university is situated in a longer history of value setting and place names at UMaine. Building names in and of themselves generally have little pedagogical power. Little's name has been on this building for over 50 years, and yet few in the university community know who he was, what he did, or even why there might be controversy about having a building named after him. We see it as critical that the Little Hall renaming process entail a permanent assessment of C. C. Little's career and an explanation of the reasons for the new name chosen to replace him on the building.

III. The Renaming Process: Beyond C. C. Little

The charge to the Little Hall Name Task Force directing it to suggest replacement names for the building, should it recommend the removal of Little's name, was particularly open-ended.

Colleges and universities across the United States are engaged in debates over building renaming on their campuses, especially due to legacies of slavery, racism, and discrimination. For example, after a series of vocal protests from students, Yale's president announced that the university would change the name of Calhoun College to Hopper College. John C. Calhoun had been a proponent of slavery, a white supremacist, and the nation's seventh Vice President, while Grace Murray Hopper was a trailblazing computer scientist and mathematician.¹⁵ Other institutions have faced their eugenic legacies. For example, Jordan Hall at the University of Virginia, named after a former School of Medicine Dean and prominent eugenicist Harvey E. Jordan, has been renamed for Vivian Pinn, the only African American woman to graduate from the school of medicine in the Class of 1967, who went on to receive numerous awards for her work as a physician.¹⁶

¹⁵ Craig Steven Wilder, Ebony & Ivy: Race, Slavery, and the Troubled History of America's Universities (New York: Bloomsbury Press, 2013).

¹⁶ <https://www.philanthropydaily.com/uva-building-named-for-eugenicist-to-be-renamed/>, accessed 8 June 2020.

Advocates for name change argue that it is an affront to the dignity of universities and an insult to racially and socially diverse populations of students to maintain buildings named after leaders with reprehensible beliefs and actions. Opponents to renaming often assert that such leaders made important contributions, are deeply connected to proud institutional histories, and should not be judged by anachronistic standards.

Renaming a facility provides the opportunity to present a more diverse representation of the university community and Maine society. A UMaine webpage provides information about 41 buildings on campus that are named for individuals.¹⁷ Although not a comprehensive list, a basic tabulation of those listings finds that the individuals who have current UMaine facilities named for them have the following characteristics:

| | | |
|-------------------|------|--|
| European descent | 100% | |
| Male | 85% | |
| UM administrators | 59% | (many were also faculty but are counted as administrators) |
| UM degree | 39% | |
| UM faculty | 27% | |
| Businessman/Donor | 10% | |

Given the unlikelihood of major campus expansion in the foreseeable future, opportunities for memorializing important figures in the history of the university will become very rare if past naming decisions are held sacrosanct. If the built landscape of campus is to have any hope of reflecting the diversity of its community, UMaine should seek positive opportunities to rename existing buildings in order to bring to light the contributions of women and non-white students, staff, faculty, administrators, and community members.

Recommendation to Rename Little Hall

The Task Force considered several possibilities for a post-Little building name and makes the following ranked recommendations.

1. Penobscot/Wabanaki

Naming the building for a person of Wabanaki descent would begin to correct the total lack of racial diversity in buildings named after individuals at the University of Maine. Because UMaine is located within Wabanaki territory and in immediate proximity to Indian Island, the seat of the tribal government of the Penobscot Nation, this is an important priority. Recognizing an individual of Penobscot heritage with a building name is long overdue and would provide the most positive outcome for the renaming process of Little Hall.

An attempt to address the often-fraught relationship between the university and Wabanaki individuals and groups has begun with the MOU entered into by the Penobscot Nation and the University of Maine in May 2018. This relationship is also addressed in the University of Maine Land Acknowledgement statement, largely based on the MOU, which states:

¹⁷ <https://umaine.edu/150/faces-behind-the-places/>, accessed 15 May 2020.

The University of Maine recognizes that it is located on Marsh Island in the homeland of the Penobscot Nation, where issues of water and territorial rights, and encroachment upon sacred sites, are ongoing. Penobscot homeland is connected to the other Wabanaki Tribal Nations—the Passamaquoddy, Maliseet, and Micmac—through kinship, alliances, and diplomacy. The University also recognizes that the Penobscot Nation and the other Wabanaki Tribal Nations are distinct, sovereign, legal and political entities with their own powers of self-governance and self-determination.¹⁸

It has long been the case that the largest group of students of non-European descent at the University of Maine are of Indigenous ancestry. In addition, the creation of UMaine and of public higher education in the United States, generally, via the Morrill Land Grant Act of 1862, was directly based on the federal government’s claim to own Indigenous lands.¹⁹

The foundation of the Penobscot-UMaine MOU is a commitment to the collaborative development of the “management of Penobscot cultural heritage” in which the university plays a role. The MOU particularly highlights the work of the Hudson Museum, Fogler Library Special Collections, UMaine Press, and the Anthropology Department. To be consistent with the collaborative intent of the MOU, we further recommend that the selection of appropriate Penobscot (and/or Wabanaki) names for Little Hall be the charge of a joint committee of university and Wabanaki stakeholders. The renaming process should be undertaken in a transparent manner with the opportunity for public comment, such as through a campus forum to help raise attention to the importance of naming traditions and about the value of the UMaine landscape more generally.

2. African American

Given the fundamental place of slavery in U.S. history, the University of Maine should identify appropriate people of African descent to be recognized in the naming of campus buildings and locations. Given the upsurge of public concern about systemic racism and anti-black violence in U.S. society today, a priority should be made to identify a person of African descent to so honor.

3. Women

Given the low rate of female representation on building names at UMaine, correcting this shortcoming should be an important consideration for future building names.

4. Fundraising Opportunity

¹⁸ The MOU and the statement both appear on the Native American Programs website of the University of Maine: <https://umaine.edu/nativeamericanprograms/>, accessed 18 May 2020.]

¹⁹ "The dark history of land-grant universities." Washingtonpost.com, 8 Nov. 2019, p. NA. Gale Academic OneFile, https://link-galecom.wv-o-ursus-proxy02.ursus.maine.edu/apps/doc/A605235227/AONE?u=maine_orono&sid=AONE&xid=88149610, accessed 18 May 2020.

A substantial “naming rights” donor could provide needed funds to tackle deferred maintenance and even make improvements to a building that is now over fifty years old. Its prominence on the mall as well as the use of its large lecture halls by many classes from a wide range of departments and units should make this highly visible building a priority for major renovations.

The Task Force also discussed if the building should temporarily have a functional name as a transitional phase while a more permanent one is selected. This is not recommended for two main reasons. First, it would prolong the renaming process and risks lingering on the negative qualities of the change without the positive outcome to be gained from an appropriate new name. Second, given the multiple uses of the building in question, a fitting functional name is not readily apparent.

Bibliography

Print Sources Cited in the Report

- Clark, Roberta Gallant. "The Social Uses of Scientific Knowledge: Eugenics in the Career of Clarence Cook Little, 1919-1954," (M.A. Thesis, University of Maine at Orono, 1986)
- Cummings, K.M., C. P. Morley, A. Hyland, “Failed promises of the cigarette industry and its effect on consumer misperceptions about the health risks of smoking,” *Tobacco Control* 11 (2002): i110-i117
- Finnegan, Dorothy E. and Nathan Alleman, “The YMCA and the Origins of American Freshman Orientation Programs,” *Historical Studies in Education*, 25 (2013), 95-97
- Little, Clarence Cook. "Proposed Ten-Year Program for University of Maine," General University of Maine Publications, 47 (1924):
https://digitalcommons.library.umaine.edu/univ_publications/47
- Proctor, Robert N. Golden Holocaust: Origins of the Cigarette Catastrophe and the Case for Abolition (University of California Press, 2011)
- Rutstein, M.D., David D. “An Open Letter to Dr. Clarence Cook Little,” *Atlantic Magazine* (October 1957)
- Snell, George D. “Clarence Cook Little,” *National Academy of Sciences Biographical Memoirs*, 46 (Washington, D. C.: National Academy of Science, 1975), 239-263
- Wilder, Craig Steven. Ebony & Ivy: Race, Slavery, and the Troubled History of America’s Universities (New York: Bloomsbury Press, 2013)

University of Michigan Little Building Reports (available online)

- University of Michigan Committee Report, “C. C. Little Building Name Change Request” (n.d., 2018?) https://drive.google.com/file/d/0By_BduXhL06LeUhKN2UtS1k2Rkk/view
- University of Michigan Regents Communication, “Authorization to rescind and to remove the name of the Clarence Cook Little Science Building” approved 29 March 2018, with enclosed documents, <https://regents.umich.edu/files/meetings/03-18/2018-03-X-2.pdf>

Periodical Articles Cited in Report

Ellsworth American, 12 December 2019
Maine Campus, 23 April 2018, 28 October 2019
“Finds Excitement Injures the Race,” *New York Times*, 29 March 1925, 16
“UVA Building Named for Eugenicist to be Renamed,” *Philanthropy Today*, 26
September 2016
Portland Press Herald, 31 March 2018, 4 April 2018
“The dark history of land-grant universities,” *Washington Post*, 8 November 2019

Additional Sources

Brandt Allan M. *The Cigarette Century: The Rise, Fall, and Deadly Persistence of the Product That Defined America* (New York: Basic Books, 2007)
Leckrone, Bennett. “Why New Research Calls Some Flagships ‘Land-Grab Universities,’” *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 8 April 2020
The Eugenics Crusade (1 hour 53 minutes, 2018?), American Experience documentary film series, online: <https://video.mainepublic.org/video/the-eugenics-crusade-jtaetc/>