

## **Trinity Legacies Review Working Group**

**Friday 10<sup>th</sup> February 2023**

**11.00am**

**Present:** Eoin O’Sullivan (Chair), Aidan Marsh (Secretary), Gabrielle Fullam (SU), Chloe Staunton (SU), Francis O’Toole (AHSS), Siobhan Ward (HS), Patrick Wyse Jackson (STEM), Rachel Moss (IFUT), Kevin Byrne (SIPTU), Francis Hendron (UNITE), Helen Shenton (Librarian), Linda Hogan (AVPEDI), Catherine O’Mahony (Comms), David O’Shea (Dev. & Alumni), Patrick Walsh (TCL), Catriona Crow (formerly of the NAI), Lynn Scarff (NMI)

**Apologies:** Mihai Mesteru (SU), Clíona O’Farrelly (Fellows), Sinead McBride (College Solicitor),

**In Attendance:** Ciaran O’Neill

### **TLRWG/22-23/008      Opening**

The Chair opened the meeting of the working group with introductions and re-introductions.

### **TLRWG/22-23/009      Minutes of Previous Meeting**

The minutes of the meeting of 9 December 2022 were approved by general consensus.

### **TLGWG/22-23/007      Update on Haddon-Dixon Inishbofin Remains**

It was confirmed to the working group that the remains from Inishbofin in the Haddon-Dixon collection fell outside of the National Monuments legislation, and that therefore it would not be necessary to consult with the National Museum in regards to what may be done with the remains, and that it would only be necessary to consult with the National Monuments Service if seeking reburial within the grounds of the ruined St Colman’s Church and cemetery.

No response to enquiries had yet been received from the office of the Inspector of Anatomy, however an earlier response indicates that the remains do not fall within the province of that office.

As a result of the responses of the National Museum, and Inspector of Anatomy, it was clear to the Working Group that there is no legal impediment to retaining the crania, nor is there any legal impediment to returning the crania. There was brief discussion as to whether there were any additional options, and if there should be further engagement with the community in this regard, but it was recognised that the consensus of the island community already uniformly leaned towards the return and reinterment of the crania. It being recognised that there were no options aside from retaining or returning the crania, the Working Group resolved that these options would be presented to the Provost and Board for final determination on the matter.

**Action: Chair to draft a narrative on the options available to present to the Provost and Board explaining what is entailed in the options so that they may make the final determination on the matter.**

Discussion moved on to how the Working Group might work to consider other similar matters in the future should they be brought to the group’s attention. It was recognised that the desire for a swift resolution on certain matters has led by necessity to those matters reaching resolution before a suitable framework for consideration could be established. It was recognised that such a framework would become necessary for any future considerations by the Working Group, and the Group resolved that a broader discussion on a framework of values and engagement with College’s history would take place at the next meeting.

## **TLGWG/22-23/008      Review of Submissions on the Naming of the Berkeley Library**

The president of the TCD Students Union (SU) gave a presentation explaining the SU's reasoning for the objections they had raised with College regarding the naming of the Berkeley Library.

The public submissions on the matter had been circulated to the Working Group in the period preceding the meeting for review by members, and it was recognised that the majority of those submissions with evidentiary support were in favour of de-naming the Library.

It was recognised that in addition to the Library there exist three other commemorations to Bishop Berkeley in College, namely the Berkeley Medals, which are funded directly by a legacy from Berkeley, three portraits and a window in the chapel which dates from the middle of the 19<sup>th</sup> Century, and that these legacies would also need to be addressed at the same time as the name of the Library.

The Working Group acknowledged that it is important to recognise and base any decisions made on evidentiary submissions, noting a necessity for a coherent and consistent logical framework underpinning the decision. It was recognised that any de-naming would likely be featured as a story internationally and that there was an onus on the group to make a detailed best case for the options that would be presented to the Provost. Therefore the framing of the decisions made by the Working Group would be important.

It was raised that many practical issues would arise should the Berkeley Library be de-named, in that the word Berkeley is used in a lot of library administrative practices over the past c.50 years, from cataloguing and to 3d maps used to locate collections. It was recommended that this information be included when presenting options for the awareness of those making the final decision on the matter. In addition, it was noted that should the Berkeley Library be de-named, it would be necessary to retain the name internally until a new name is agreed upon to its being embedded in administrative and cataloguing systems which would take some time to change.

It was recognised that there would be a lot of public scrutiny in relation to this matter; however it was also recognised that it would not be possible to control those individuals who disapprove of the university's decision. The Working Group should not allow such factors to impact on identifying the options available and should instead focus on deriving its options from College's own values to create opportunity for meaningful discourse and development. It was suggested that College might look into hosting a public debate or series of public debates inviting speakers to engage in critical discourse.

It was suggested that should it be decided that the name of the Library be removed, it may be preferable that it not be treated as a celebratory occasion; rather, the application of a new name afterwards being made the occasion to reduce potential hostility that may arise in the public sphere and the division into camps of "winners" and "losers" in relation to the matter.

Discussion moved on briefly to the nature of legacies within College. Displaying an artwork that commemorates an individual is different to naming a building after them. An artwork is interacted with in a physical way and can be accompanied by additional information that explains a controversial history. In contrast the name of a building becomes embedded in everyday usage in a way that cannot accommodate such clarification.

Significant discussion took place as to whether establishing a framework before taking action would be possible, or if it may be better to extrapolate a framework from the Working Group's decision on the Berkeley Library. It was suggested that College's current values regarding slavery may be used to form the basis of a recommendation. However, there were also concerns that the entire process was being rushed and that this could cause communications issues that, for want of a few more weeks to establish a proper framework, may otherwise be avoided. It was stated as necessary, given the publicity this matter has received, that the Working Group and College has a response for any questions that may be received.

Further to confusion as to whom the recommendation of the Working Group would be presented, it was clarified that any decision on the matter of the naming of the Berkeley Library is ultimately the responsibility of the Provost, in consultation and the agreement of the Board where she deems appropriate.

Discussion moved on to what recommendations on the matter might look like. It was strongly promoted that the options from the Working Group should have weight and narrative, presenting a statement of values, how those values fit into the framework for the decision making, and an explanation of the options presented. There was discussion about the opportunity to be creative in the University's responses, and recent discussion with artists was cited.

It was further proposed that the Working Group move towards the development of two framework/options documents; the first being a broader and more generalised document, with the second being more specific to the various memorials relating to Berkeley in College.

**Action: The current Working Paper regarding Bishop Berkeley is to be revised to form the basis for options for the Provost. The Working Paper shall also be revised to include reference to the Berkeley Medals, Window and other Berkeley related items within College.**

**TLGWG/22-23/009      AOB**

There was no other business

Working Group to reconvene after four weeks.