

Proposal to Un-Name Moses Hall

May 26, 2021

Submitted by the faculty, graduate students and staff of the Department of Philosophy,
with the support of Global, International & Area Studies and of the Institute of
Governmental Studies

Introduction

The following proposal grew out of concerns by graduate students in the Department of Philosophy about racist ideas expressed in published works by Bernard Moses, the namesake of Moses Hall. After a brief email discussion of the issues between members of the faculty and graduate students in June of 2020, it was decided that the Department's Equity Advisors and the Equity Task Force (ETF) would look into the process for requesting the un-naming of the building, and develop a way to examine the case for un-naming that is fair and open to various stake-holders. A multi-step plan was developed by the ETF to this end.

The first step was to invite faculty and graduate students in the department to read and write summaries of Moses' [major works](#), with an eye to the question of whether there is anything that might be racist in the works. This was completed in mid-February of 2021. The second step was to invite any faculty, graduate students or administrative staff who are interested to serve on a committee, the Moses Hall Name Review Committee (MHNRC), to review the summaries, to discuss the findings, and to decide whether proceeding with an un-naming proposal is warranted. The result of this discussion was unanimous agreement among members of MHNRC to proceed with a proposal to un-name Moses Hall. At that meeting a sub-committee, which was open to anyone on the MHNRC, was established to draft the proposal, and it was also agreed that the MHNRC would share its thinking about this with other members of the academic community who might have an interest in this issue.

The proposal begins with a biography of Moses and an overview of his service to the University. This is followed by a summary of the racism and colonialism that characterized Moses's work, and then a more detailed presentation of his objectionable views. While the case for un-naming Moses Hall is rooted in the fact that Moses held deeply racist and colonialist views, the case for un-naming extends beyond a mere observation of that fact to a consideration of the relationship the Berkeley community wishes to bear to Moses' legacy; the final section of this proposal explains why Moses' racism and colonialism contribute to a strong case for the un-naming of Moses Hall.

General Biography

Bernard Moses (1846-1931) attended the University of Michigan (B.A.) and the University of Heidelberg (Ph.D.). He began his teaching career at Albion College, and came to the University

of California in 1875 to teach social sciences. He was a member of the U. S. Philippine Commission from 1900-1902, and later participated in the Panamerican Scientific Congress in Santiago, Chile, and in the International Conference of American States in Buenos Aires. He was also appointed as a minister plenipotentiary on a special mission to Chile in 1910.

Service to the University of California

Moses was a prominent and influential faculty member at the University of California. He was appointed professor of history and political economy in 1875 just seven years after the founding of the University. He taught almost all of the economics, history and jurisprudence courses over the next fifteen years, and he created and chaired the Department of History and Political Science in 1883. He was extremely influential in the development of the social sciences in a time of increased specialization, and played an important role in the creation of the Department of Political Science in 1903.

Later in his career, after his teaching duties in economics were relieved by the hiring of more faculty, Moses became a pre-eminent authority on the history of imperial Spain and Latin America. To his credit, he was a proponent of trying to understand “Hispanic” economic history from the perspective of Latin American peoples and states, and he traveled widely in Mexico and South America. Despite the relaxation of his teaching duties in economics, Moses continued to be an influential presence in the area of economics, even after the Department of Economics was separated in 1902. He retired in 1911.

Summary of Moses’ Racist and Colonialist Views

At the core of the case for un-naming Moses Hall is Moses’ expression of racist, white supremacist views in various published works. There is a great deal of evidence of his acceptance of a view that today is called “classical racialism” or “racial essentialism.” This view comprises two distinct ideas. The first is that races are differentiated from one another by inheritable physical, intellectual, aesthetic, and moral characteristics. The second idea is that the white race is superior to the other races with respect to these characteristics (whether they are inherited or not). In some places Moses can be read as suggesting that race is socio-cultural, or socio-historical, rather than biological. However, there are several places in which it seems clear that Moses is talking about traits had in virtue of biology or “blood.” In any case, even if his considered view is that race is socio-historical, rather than a matter of blood, when combined with the second idea just described—the idea that the white race is superior—the result is still a racist and white supremacist perspective.

Importantly, Moses’ white supremacist views are not incidental to his work. Rather they are central to his views about history, society and politics. They are reflected in his academic

writings about colonized people, both in the Americas and elsewhere in the world, and in his discussion of Black ex-slaves and their descendants in the U.S. They are also central to a “problem” that he discusses in several works: the problem of how white people ought to relate to non-white people, and of how to make sure that their interaction does not impede the progression of Western civilization.

It is hard to disentangle the various problematic ideas in Moses’ works. The following presentation and discussion of some of the most egregiously objectionable texts reveals the racist elements in his thought, and shows how these underlie his discussions of the aforementioned “problem,” colonialism, and the situation of Black people in the southern U.S.

Detailed Presentation of Moses’ Racist and Colonialist Views

There is considerable evidence that Moses believed that races were distinguished by *inheritable* physical and mental characteristics, i.e., that race is a matter of “blood” (as he often puts it).

There are undeniably certain characteristics which pass by inheritance from generation to generation. These may be the mental and physical peculiarities of the family, or the more general characteristics or qualities by which one race is distinguished from another. There is no doubt, however, that the persistence of a national or race character may be explained, to a certain extent, by the fact of imitation, but, at the same time, there survives, by inheritance, in the nation as well as in the individual man, somewhat that can be accounted for neither on the ground of imitation nor on the ground of previous instruction. There exists an inherited bias, aptitude, or propensity, which makes certain ideas acceptable and other repugnant, and will, therefore, be likely to insure the adoption of the one and the rejection of the other. (*Data of Mexican and United States History*, p.8)

There is also a great deal of evidence that Moses believed that negative inheritable characteristics are associated with non-white races and positive characteristics are associated with the white race. That is, he believed that non-white races are inferior to the white race.

The United States were settled by a people who, throughout a most remarkable career of conquest and colonization, have never truckled to the savage, nor for the sake of influence over **inferior races**, been willing to give up their purity of blood... **Wherever they [Spaniards] have met the native tribes of the America, they have been willing to descend from their European standard of civilization and affiliate with them on a lower plane. In Mexico, the Spaniards have mingled their blood with the natives....** (*Data of Mexican and United States History*, p.17)

The Spaniards, who settled Mexico and South America intermarried with the Indians, and as a consequence their descendants fell below the European standard. (*The Government of the United States*, 1906, p.2)

“It was understood that **the Indians, like all savages, lacked the habit of consecutive work**, and that compulsion would be necessary to make them persistent laborers.” (*Spain's Declining Power in South America 1730-1806*, p.387)

“The **Spanish-negro union might produce only a member of a subject class.**” (*Spain's Declining Power in South America 1730-1806*, p.396)

In fact, in *South America on the Eve of Emancipation* (1898), Moses devotes considerable attention to developing claims about the characteristics and abilities of certain races or sub-groups, some of which claims suggest that he regarded non-white people as, among other things, intellectually limited—“only a good beginner in learning” (228)—and incapable of innovation or any real enterprise.

The combination of the Indian stock with that of the arrogant, adventurous Spaniard produced the mestizo, who had some of the qualities of both races, but **whatever of the Spaniard was re-produced was belittled and vulgarized. Neither the Indian nor the mestizo was capable of originating and carrying on great enterprises.** (73)

Furthermore, Moses held that these inherent differences among the races play an important role in explaining the superiority along various dimensions of, for example, the United States and Northern Europe, as opposed to places where there the population is non-white or where white blood has been tainted or “contaminated” with non-white or “barbarian” blood. In this way, Moses’ racism underlies his colonialist attitudes:

While the Spanish political policy has tended to drive her colonies into revolt and independence, **her social policy, as already suggested, has tended to preserve the original stock and mingle its blood with the blood of the immigrant population; yet at the end of any considerable period, the increase in the English colony, under conditions equally favorable with those of a given Spanish colony, will be found to have far outrun the increase of the combined Spanish and native populations. ... The English policy is, therefore, consistent with that view which sees in social progress the pursuit of grand ultimate results rather than inferior immediate results, although the latter may be more in harmony with our shortsighted sympathies.** (*Data of Mexican and United States History*, p.19)

The people of the United States have set out with the fundamental idea of equality which involves the abolition of race prejudice, in spite of the fact that **it is the preservation of this prejudice, or of race-respect, that has kept the English stock free from the contamination of barbarian blood, and given it its position of power in the world.** (“Results of the war between Russia and Japan,” p.125)

Our English ancestors generally kept themselves in this condition. In colonizing America they were uncompromising. They moved steadily and irresistibly forward, and their advance was marked by the disappearance of the uncultivated aborigines. **The Spaniards, on the other hand, wherever they met the Indians of America, were willing to descend from their European standard of civilization and affiliate with them on a lower plane. They compromised with them both physically and spiritually. The English policy has tended to the ultimate extermination of the barbarians; but the Indians who have survived contact with the Spaniards have become constituent parts of the new nations.** The important question involved in these facts is not the question of the preservation or disappearance of a people, but the progress of civilization. **It is, therefore, a matter of grave concern whether a nation in colonizing preserves its stock unmixed with lower elements, or, becoming united with barbarians, leaves a posterity less effective than would have been descendants of unadulterated blood.** In the one case, the colony is able to take up the work of civilization at the point to which it had been advanced by the parent nation. **In the other case, the colony finds itself endowed with more or less of the taint and bias of barbarism, and is thus outranked by colonies of the higher race, which have remained true to themselves.** The community which is descended from a union of Europeans and Indians has naturally more or less of an inclination towards the thoughts and life of its Indian ancestors, and is thus compelled to go over a certain part of the path of progress which the European has already trod, and which has led him to his present position of enlightenment. **It is obliged, by a slow and laborious process of cultivation, to eliminate or overcome the influence of the element that makes for degeneracy; and, until this is accomplished, its facility of movement along the way of civilization is impeded, and it is consequently outrun by communities that have been careful to withhold themselves from barbarian contamination.**

The English were induced to hold aloof from the barbarian by that quality in them which we may call their race-respect; and through this it has been possible for them to spread their colonies to the four quarters of the world, with no departure anywhere from the social standard of the parent stock. And the preservation of this standard was rendered easy by keeping the way to the colonies constantly open to the emigration of both men and women from the mother country. The Spaniards, on the other hand, by the provisions of law, prohibited unmarried women from emigrating to

their colonies, and thus made inevitable the rise of a mixed race, whose strain of barbarism rendered it incompetent to participate in the leadership of the world's civilization. **For the advantage possessed by the people of the United States, in being able to start on a course of national progress without a handicap, they are indebted largely to the wise discretion of their colonial ancestors, who were enabled to preserve the purity of the blood of their descendants.** (*Democracy and Social Growth in America*, 1898, pp.4–8)

Moses' belief in the racial superiority of the white race underlies his identification of a "problem" that he discusses in several works. One clear statement of the problem and its relation to white supremacy is in "Results of the War between Russia and Japan" (1905):

It is sometimes inevitable that a people of one of the less developed races should fall under the rule of a nation of another race. This, though inevitable, is a misfortune arising from lack of civilization. It is unfortunate, because it creates a problem which has thus far remained entirely without a solution, **the problem of the relation of the less developed peoples to the dominant nation of the superior race.** (p.121-122)

This is not just a problem that arises from expansion and colonization. It is also a problem that pertains to the situation in the post-emancipation Southern U.S.:

...in the Southern States of the Union, **the presence of the negro introduces a problem,** of which the population of Switzerland gives no hint. (*The Federal Government of Switzerland*, 1889, p.8)

Instead of this, **the question of the white man's relation to the negro in the South is merging itself into a new phase of the larger unsettled question of the relation of the white man to all other men of whatever color. This is one of the serious inquiries of the present age. It concerns the relation which the white man is destined to hold to other races.** By the outward movement of the English, this question has become especially conspicuous, and it is raised wherever Europeans have established themselves beyond the borders of Europe. But where only a sparse and savage population has been encountered, its more serious aspects have not appeared. Here the solution has been simple; the aborigines have been swept away. But the outward movement of the English people has not ceased when all lands with a sparse population have been appropriated. Regions with many millions of inhabitants have been overrun, and here the new problem arises. Here the inhabitants are not savages, nor are they few in number, nor can they be exterminated. They are destined to live, and the white race is destined to live with them. And because this is true, we are bound to inquire what must be the relations between

these two elements, in order that their cooperation may most surely promote the highest interests of humanity. (“New Problems in the Study of Society,” 1900, p.26-27)

A people, like an individual man, that has grown to maturity, and developed strong instincts under a certain line of conduct, is not likely to lose these instincts, or to lay aside its hereditary impulse, in view of the possibility of giving a wider range to its normal activity. **The solutions that are offered by the experience of other times are not applicable. The previously executed English plan of sweeping away the aborigines cannot be carried out here. The Spanish plan of mingling the blood of the white and the colored races encounters grave objections: it is not agreeable to the English mind; it causes the higher civilization to be lost in a lower; and it produces a mongrel people that is able to reach the white man's estate only after centuries of painful effort.** (Ibid, 27-28)

Moses does not say explicitly what the problem of relations among white and non-white people is. One might suggest that Moses has the best interests of both white and non-white people in mind. It is noteworthy, though, that the possible solutions he discusses as no longer available are the following: on the one hand, exterminating non-white people or pushing them out (both identified under the euphemistic heading of “sweeping away”), and on the other hand, mingling of blood. Moses’ issue with the former possibilities *seems to be practical rather than moral*: the non-white inhabitants of an area are too numerous, or there is nowhere else for them to go. His objection to the latter is that it produces a “mongrel people” so inferior to white people that it would take hundreds of years for the mongrel people to achieve the status of the white race. In other words, Moses rejects the latter option on decidedly white supremacist grounds.

In fact, the problem Moses describes only manifests as such against the background of white supremacist assumptions. If Moses was motivated here by a concern with how non-white peoples or their culture would fare in the face of imperialist expansion, then “sweeping away” those peoples would not make sense as a response. Only on the assumption that the white race is superior, and that this superiority is threatened by interactions with “inferior” races, does the coexistence of these races appear as the kind of problem Moses describes—and only then does extermination appear as a possible solution.

While Moses expresses disapproval of some of the cruelest expressions of a white supremacist worldview, he is strikingly quick to excuse these. He describes the subjection of certain countries to colonial rule (by “dominant nation of the superior race”) as an “inevitable [...] misfortune” traceable to the “lack of civilization” of the peoples colonized (“Results of the War between Russia and Japan,” 1905, pp.121-2). Moses describes with alarming coolness the actions of English colonizers:

their advance has been marked by the disappearance of the uncultivated aborigines. The English in colonizing have been uncompromising. To the barbarians whose territory they have overrun, they have held out two simple alternatives, either to accept the English standard of civilization, or to fold their tents and depart. (*Data of Mexican and United States History*, p.17)

Moses suggests, in fact, that the dwindling of colonized populations might not be grounds for morally condemning the colonizer:

A savage people unused to the regular tasks which civilized man imposes upon himself appears unable to maintain itself when subjected to the conditions of civilized life. **The mere fact, therefore, that savages disappear when brought into contact with civilized society does not necessarily involve a condemnation of the superior race.** (*Spain's Declining Power in South America, 1730-1806*, 1919, p.406)

The message seems to be that it is not the fault of civilized people if indigenous people cannot deal with the hard work of being civilized. In another context, he assigns responsibility for poor treatment of non-white people to the mistreated people themselves:

...it is probable that the brutality of the negro had much to do in determining how he was treated. (*South America on the Eve of Emancipation*, 1908, p.106)

In general, Moses' way of talking about non-white people and what they have suffered at the hands of white people is staggeringly inhumane. Even if he does at certain places appear to condemn the excesses of the white supremacist world-view, he excuses, downplays, or otherwise fails to appreciate the gravity of many of the worst acts committed by those in its thrall. For example, in *South America on the Eve of Emancipation*, while Moses often describes colonial policies as cruel (pp.100, 201) and oppressive (p.171), his treatment of slave labor is telling, insofar as it foregrounds the consideration that slave labor causes white children who witness it to detest work (p.112).

As yet another exemplification of this pattern, in his discussion of the relationship between Black and white people in the Southern U.S., Moses suggests that lynching is a justified response to a social emergency, a possible and understandable solution to the aforementioned problem posed by interaction between races. One relevant passage is worth quoting at length:

Furthermore, after the civil war, we attempted, by a simple legal enactment, to make several millions of recently emancipated slaves independent and effective citizens of an enlightened republic. We seemed to believe that men in masses could be lifted from barbarism to civilization by a simple declaration of the law.

After centuries of absolute dependence, with no traditions of responsibility, with no training in the business of government, it was proposed to thrust them into positions where they would be charged directly with the highest interests of humanity. The law was to work the miracle. But the miracle has not been wrought. Those members of society whose antecedents were those of civilization have been constrained to attempt to uphold the achievements of their ancestors; and in the emergencies of the situation they have often demanded that the law should be silent. **They have met the crimes of the barbarian with a method and a punishment that might be supposed to impress and deter the barbarian.** (“New Problems in the Study of Society,” 1900, p.25)

The “problem” to which lynching was a response is the same problem that has already been discussed as central to Moses’ views about history, society and the political situation. It is the threat to the achievements of the ancestors of white people; it is the threat to white Anglo-European culture and political ideals; it is the threat to the progress of Western civilization. Moses does not say anything in this passage about how *exactly* Black people posed a threat to white civilization; here he points out only that they were not sufficiently civilized to be effective citizens. In other places, as described above, he talks about the ways that the barbarian races are not suited, as a matter of heredity and culture, to upholding or promoting the ideals of Western civilization.

Whatever Moses has in mind, it is clear that lynching was not a way of dealing with “emergencies” (i.e., immediate threats to civilization to which there were no legal remedies), but was rather a means of social control, a means of protecting the supremacy of white people and white culture. Moreover, as above, the “problem” with which Moses is here concerned only appears as such on the twin assumptions of white supremacy and the inevitability of colonial expansion.

The idea that white people and white culture were so threatened by Black people as to necessitate violent action—that lynching may have been a justifiable means to a worthwhile end—may have had some currency at the time Moses was writing. Nonetheless, as was recognized by more progressive thinkers at the time, it is deeply wrong. Neither the end (white hegemony, cultural and social) nor the means (a brutal tool of terrorization) could find *any* moral justification. And yet Moses seems to have thought otherwise.

To emphasize: while this text may not be an unambiguous endorsement of lynching, it appears in a context where Moses expresses white supremacist ideas and describes as a problem the fact that white people have to live in a society with non-white “barbarians.” One does not find in this text even the slightest hint of condemnation of lynching as a solution to this problem. As one member of our department summed up Moses’ remarks here: “It is a stunningly sympathetic

depiction of the practice [of lynching], as an intelligible response to a genuine social challenge that does not admit of obviously superior solutions.”

Considering these remarks together with Moses’ similarly exculpatory descriptions of colonization yields a disturbing picture. However common his perspective may have been among white academics in his time, it is at odds with the present values of the U.C., Berkeley community.

The Grounds for Un-Naming Moses Hall

Surely, many in Moses’ time held racist and colonialist views. The discussion in the preceding section, however, suggests that Moses’ racism and colonialism was distinctive in at least two ways. First, in its intensity: if any of the views held by Moses’ contemporaries deserve to be called “moderate,” his would not be among them. Second, his racist and colonialist views are woven into and explicitly defended in his academic work: these are not private opinions.

That Moses’ racism and colonialism are distinctive in these two respects contributes to a strong case for the un-naming of Moses Hall. Indeed, the intensity and institutional context of Moses’ racism and colonialism make the conflict between Moses’ views and the principles that shape our community clearer and more damaging, and the decision to maintain the name of Moses Hall could reasonably be seen as an affront to students, instructors, and staff of color. The hurt that name has already caused to some in our community is what gave rise to this proposal. Far from erasing the past, un-naming would leave open various alternative ways for us to recognize the difficult relationship our community bears to Moses’ legacy.

In light of [The Building Name Review Committee](#)’s assertion that the “legacy of a building’s namesake should be in alignment with the values and mission of the university,” this report submits that Moses’ legacy is not in alignment with the values and mission of the university. Indeed, Moses’ commitments are in direct conflict with several of the [Principles of Community](#). This report focuses on the three principles for which the conflict is most vivid.

One principle states, “We recognize the intrinsic relationship between diversity and excellence in all our endeavors.” Earlier, this report discussed Moses’ assertion that “Neither the Indian nor the mestizo was capable of originating and carrying on great enterprises.” Further, Moses explicitly asserts without explanation that Indigenous heritage is an impediment to “prosperity and progress:”

With its herbs and fruits, its tobacco and maté, **Paraguay presented physical conditions that seemed to favor prosperity and progress. Its impediments were** its isolation in the interior of the continent, about a thousand miles up the

river from the more favored ports of Buenos Aires and Montevideo, **its preponderance of Indian blood in the population**, and the unreasonable internal conflict between secular and ecclesiastical factions. (*Spain's Declining Power in South America 1730-1806*, p.xvii)

One cannot recognize “the intrinsic relationship between diversity and excellence” while regarding Indigenous ancestry as an impediment to “prosperity and progress,” to be assessed along with features of the South American landscape.

Another Principle of Community reads, “We embrace open and equitable access to opportunities for learning and development as our obligation and goal.” Moses writes:

In this agreement it was stipulated ... that the Indians should send their sons to be educated in a school to be opened in Santiago ... The few who were sent to Santiago acquired a certain amount of elementary knowledge; but difficulties arose when attempts were made to give them more advanced instruction. It was found that **the barbarian was only a good beginner in learning**.

The above passage, along with several pages surrounding it, appear in two of Moses' books, *Spain's Declining Power in South America, 1730-1806* (pp.384-389) and *South America on the Eve of Emancipation* (pp.226-230). Here and in other work cited in the preceding section, Moses clearly expresses the racist belief that Indigenous people are intellectually inferior. Given that belief, the support Moses expresses in the first chapter of *Spain's Declining Power in South America, 1730-1806* for the Jesuit project of educating Indigenous people in South America can only be seen as paternalistic. The spirit of Berkeley's principle of “open and equitable access to opportunities for learning and development” is contradicted by the openly racist and paternalistic views repeatedly defended in Moses' academic work.

A third Principle of Community asserts that “We affirm the dignity of all individuals and strive to uphold a just community in which discrimination and hate are not tolerated.” Most of the text cited in the preceding section reveals Moses to have held discriminatory attitudes and not to have affirmed the dignity of all individuals. Especially revealing are Moses' inhumane attitudes towards slavery, lynching, and the murder of Indigenous people, as discussed in the preceding section.

Moses' views are thus in direct conflict with the University's Principles of Community. Further, it should be noted that the un-naming of Barrows Hall establishes a relevant precedent.¹ [The successful proposal](#) to un-name Barrows Hall summarizes the rationale for un-naming as

¹ Incidentally, Barrows was mentored by Moses and followed him as superintendent of the Philippine schools.

follows:

Throughout his lifetime, Barrows' words and actions were anti-Black, anti-Filipinx, anti-Indigenous, xenophobic, and Anglocentric. His actions form a striking pattern of racism and use of institutional power to repress desire for independence from the United States (Clymer, 1976, p.510).

Barrows' actions and words advanced the interests of white supremacy, broadly. Continuing to honor Barrows' legacy is especially harmful to Black and Brown students, faculty, and staff and undermines the integrity of our university. It is time to remove his name from Barrows Hall.

In a [public message](#) on the un-naming of LeConte and Barrows halls, Chancellor Christ explained the decision to unname Barrows Hall by stressing that the "historical record provides ample evidence of [Barrows'] intolerable racist beliefs and biases that are profoundly contrary to what we know, believe and stand for." She writes:

A building name is more than a symbol. Those who we choose to honor reflect who we are and what we believe in. I have committed my administration to doing everything in its power to identify and eliminate racism wherever it may be found on our campus and in our community.

Moses' views were deeply racist and colonialist. It would be reasonable to describe those views as anti-Black, anti-Indigenous, and Anglocentric. Un-naming Moses Hall will express solidarity with students of color who have already expressed feeling alienated and insulted by Moses' work. Moses' academic work is an expression of institutional power, and to maintain the name of Moses Hall is to undermine the integrity of the University, insofar as his legacy conflicts with the University's stated values and mission. While the un-naming of a building is not enough to rectify past and current injustices, it is a step worth taking. It is time to un-name Moses Hall.

Moses' Works Cited

- *Data of Mexican and United States History*, 1887 [av]
- *The Federal Government of Switzerland: An essay on constitution*, 1889 [av]
- *Democracy and Social Growth in America*, 1898 [av]
- "New Problems in the Study of Society", 1900, *Univ Chron*, p.13
- "Results of the War between Russia and Japan", 1905-06, *Univ Chron*, p.118
- *The Government of the United States*, 1906 [av]
- *South America on the Eve of Emancipation*, 1908 [av]
- *Spain's Declining Power in South America, 1730-1806*, 1919 [av]

All of Moses' majors works, including those cited in this proposal, can be found [here](#). The authors of this report bolded the text in the passages from Moses quoted in this report.

Summary of Proposal to Un-Name Moses Hall

1. Proposer's name and affiliation with UC Berkeley, or the name of your group and its affiliation. Please include contact information for yourself or one member of your group (phone and e-mail address), which will not be posted online.

The faculty, graduate students and staff of the Department of Philosophy. Contact person: Prof. Hannah Ginsborg, Department of Philosophy, email address ginsborg@berkeley.edu

2. What building name do you propose removing?

Moses Hall

3. Why was the building named after this person? Was the name honorific or in recognition of a philanthropic gift (donation)?

Honorific in virtue of Moses's service to the University of California.

4. What service, if any, did this person perform for the University?

Moses was one of the earliest teachers of social sciences at the University of California. He founded the Department of History and Political Science in 1883 and was influential in the creation of the Department of Political Science in 1903.

5. What is the history of contesting the legacy of the building's namesake, if any? From the time the building was named up until the present, have individuals or groups objected to using this name?

Discussions among members of the Department of Philosophy occurred in the Spring of 2020, leading to a committee to examine Moses's published work and consider submitting a proposal to un-name the building.

6. Why do you believe that the legacy of the namesake is fundamentally at odds with [the principles guiding the campus today](#). That is, explain why you believe that the legacy's pernicious effects outweigh the individual's contributions.

We believe that Moses--in published writings--expressed racist and white supremacist views that are inconsistent with the University's stated values of inclusion and the dignity of all individuals.

7. What is the likely impact on members of the University community if the name is retained or removed?

Retaining the name would mean continuing to honor a legacy of racism and colonialism. Today, UC Berkeley is committed to principles of diversity and equality. Removing the name of the building would help to bring our community into closer alignment with its principles.

8. Please add any other relevant information or arguments.

See the proposal for more detailed information about views expressed by Moses in his published works.