APPENDIX

Aycock Auditorium Arts and History Committee Proposal

Proposal

To establish a campus-wide committee charged with exploring and deciding on such multi-faceted additions that recognize, challenge, complicate, and contextualize the history of Aycock Auditorium as a building named for Charles B. Aycock, a man both revered for his contributions to public education and condemned as a leading architect and instigator of white supremacy in the Jim Crow era.

Committee’s Brief

To select (by open competition or some other equitable, transparent, and judicious means) a work of art that physically and conceptually enhances the Aycock Auditorium in such a way as to preserve its name while redressing a history of white supremacy.

Discussion

During the Spring Semester of 2015, the Aycock Ad Hoc Committee <http://aycock.wp.uncg.edu/> worked to collect information and solicit opinions on the question of whether or not to remove the Aycock name from the University’s landmark auditorium. A broad range of constituencies – students, alumni, faculty, administrators, staff, community members, donors, fund-raisers, and performing artists – came down, passionately and persuasively, in substantial and evenly divided numbers, on both sides of the issue. The same held true for the thirteen members of the Committee itself.

In broadest outline, two opposing positions emerged:

1) Removing the name of Aycock from the largest and most prominent auditorium on campus, while running the risk of erasing history, does nothing to address or ameliorate the racial injustices of the past. Such an erasure would only establish a “slippery slope.” If the Aycock name goes, why not Curry and Foust (here at UNCG) and finally Washington and Jefferson (nationwide), since all are complicit in the sins of slavery and white supremacy?

2) To keep the name, with or without a historical marker by way of explanation, is to collude with a past history of murderous white supremacy, racist bigotry, and systemic social injustice in such a way as to make a mockery of UNCG’s present-day commitments to diversity, inclusiveness, and social justice.

Faced with an untenable and divisive choice between removing Aycock’s name or keeping it, a third possibility presents itself: to keep the name on the building as part of a substantially altered (additive) setting that names the difficulties and allows a constructive campus and community dialogue to continue.
It is the unique, oxymoronic gift of contemporary art in all its various permutations – performance, conceptual, social practice, site-specific, video, installation, intermedia, lens-based, sound-based, light-based, material and virtual, individualist and collectivist – to work (and play) with intractable oppositions in order to confound and transcend them in the name of a greater common good or higher (more complex and integrated) aesthetic/philosophical unity. The following examples (in no particular order) suggest some of the ways a work of art has enlarged our capacity to imaginatively engage contemporary struggles and heal from the wounds of the past.


2) Glenn Ligon, *To Disembark* (inspired by the story of Henry “Box” Brown)

http://www.feldmangallery.com/pages/artistsrffa/artuke01.html

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ThmdkP6v-0o

5) Krzysztof Wodiczko, *Projections*
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Krzysztof_Wodiczko#Projections

6) Sheryl Oring, *I Wish To Say* (ongoing)
http://www.sheryloring.org/i-wish-to-say/

http://www.leewalton.com/Project_Life_Theater_main.html


9) Byron Kim, *Synecdoche* (1991-present)
http://www.jamescohan/artists/byron-kim/15
Possible Funding Sources

UNCG (building maintenance and improvement funds)
UNCG Alumni
**UNCG Student Fees**
North Carolina Arts Council
National Endowment for the Arts
National Endowment for the Humanities
Aycock Family Members
Contemporary Collectors Group, Weatherspoon Art Museum
APPENDIX

History Document

Who was Charles B. Aycock?

Born in 1859 in Wayne County, Charles Brantley Aycock graduated from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill in 1880. He worked as a lawyer in Goldsboro and became active in Democratic Party politics in the 1880s.

In 1894, the Democrats lost power in state elections to a Populist/Republican political alliance that depended upon the votes of African Americans. During the election campaigns of 1898 and 1900, Aycock and many other Democrats were determined to win back the state government and restore Democratic rule based on white supremacy. During the 1898 elections, the Democrats used racist appeals and anti-black violence to regain power. Armed whites in Wilmington after the election forcibly removed the remaining black officeholders; shot African Americans down in the streets, killing likely more than a dozen; and forced hundreds of black citizens to flee the city. Back in power, the Democratic legislature proposed an amendment to disfranchise black voters, which required ratification in a referendum for inclusion into the state Constitution.

In 1900, Aycock campaigned for the disfranchisement amendment and for himself as governor. Overall, Aycock had a progressive platform, the centerpiece of which was improving public education—but he linked that program to the need to eliminate blacks from the electorate. Upon accepting the Democratic nomination, he declared: "we must disfranchise the negro... To do so is both desirable and necessary—desirable because it sets the white man free to move along faster than he can go when retarded by the slower movement of the negro; necessary because we must have good order and peace while we work out the industrial, commercial, intellectual and moral development of the State." (Address Accepting the Democratic Nomination for Governor, April 11, 1900) In many ways, Aycock was a typical white southern progressive of the time: an advocate of a variety of reforms to advance society, yet also a proponent of racial segregation and black disfranchisement as necessary preconditions for the progress of both whites and blacks.

The voters of North Carolina responded by approving the disfranchisement amendment and sending Charles Aycock to the Governor's Mansion. During his four years in office, from 1901 to 1905, Aycock, as promised, made the upgrading of North Carolina's education system the focus of his administration's efforts. Aycock and the General Assembly improved standards for teachers, raised white teacher salaries, adopted a textbook law, lengthened the school term, and increased appropriations for all levels of education from elementary schools to the state's colleges.

Six years after Aycock left the governor's office, he ran for the U.S. Senate. While campaigning for that office in 1912, he travelled to Birmingham, Alabama, to
deliver his famous "Universal Education" speech. In the middle of the talk, Aycock collapsed on the stage, suffering a fatal heart attack at the age of fifty-two.

**Why is Charles Aycock considered the Education Governor?**

Charles Aycock had a strong commitment to building and strengthening the public school system for the state of North Carolina. Aycock believed that public education represented a crucial investment for the state. He assumed a better-educated population would create greater individual wealth, which would lead to widespread prosperity in North Carolina. The array of education reforms Aycock promoted during his term as governor began the process of modernizing North Carolina's education system.

Governor Aycock supported the idea of universal education, which included funding for black education. This stance distinguished Aycock from some whites both within and beyond North Carolina, people who believed that little or no public resources should be devoted to black schooling. In a speech Aycock made at Greensboro in 1904, he defended his support for black education:

> My position has brought satisfaction and even happiness to many humble homes in North Carolina, and the negro, whose political control I have fought with so much earnestness, has turned to me with gratitude for my support of his right to a public school education. The [disfranchisement] Amendment drove many of them out of the State. An effort to reduce their public schools would send thousands more of them away from us. In this hour, when our industrial development demands more labor and not less, it becomes of the utmost importance that we shall make no mistake in dealing with that race which does a very large part of the work, of actual hard labor in the State. *(Address Before the Democratic State Convention at Greensboro, June 23, 1904)*

Governor Aycock's program of universal education included a firm belief in the necessity of racially segregated education. And Aycock did not believe that blacks and whites should always receive the same kind of education. He assumed that the proper training for most blacks—and some whites—meant a curriculum of industrial education (what we today would call vocational education). For Aycock and other whites, industrial education for blacks "promised to cultivate a new sense of self and social place among African American school children, convincing them to accept their subordination as a normal and inevitable fact of life." *(Leloudis, *Schooling in the New South*, 82)*

While Governor Aycock's education reforms did improve black education, more resources were devoted to the project of advancing white education during his administration and for decades afterward. Before 1900, North Carolina spent little on education, but of the funds expended, black and white schools received roughly equal shares. However, after 1900, as the amount of money spent on public education increased overall, the gap between the sum spent on white and black school systems began to widen significantly (see table below). By 1910, spending for black education in North Carolina was 40 percent of that appropriated for white education.
Statewide per Capita Expenditures on Education by Race
North Carolina, 1880-1910

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Black/White Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1880-1885</td>
<td>$0.93</td>
<td>$0.98</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1886-1890</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891-1895</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1896-1900</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901-1905</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906-1910</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


What was Charles Aycock’s relationship to UNCG?

Charles Aycock and Charles McIver, the first president of the State Normal and Industrial School (UNCG), from 1891 to 1906, became friends when the two attended the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill together, graduating a year apart. Later, during the time Aycock was governor, the two men both worked with the Southern Education Board, a group of southern reformers who advocated for increased support and funding for public education; part of the group’s program involved working with northern philanthropists to secure funding for industrial education for black Southerners.

Aycock visited the State Normal College several times during his years as governor. He spoke at the 1902 commencement ceremony at the College. In January 1904, after a fire destroyed Brick Dormitory, Aycock came to the college, and along with McIver, spoke at the student assembly the next day. Governor Aycock later worked with President McIver to secure funds to construct a new facility.

In 1928, an alumnae committee was appointed to propose names for a number of new buildings on what was by then known as the North Carolina College for Women. In its report to the Board of Directors of the College, the committee explained that

for the new auditorium we propose the name Aycock Auditorium. It is almost superfluous to remind ourselves that Governor Aycock was the great apostle of public education in North Carolina, that he shared with our first president, Dr. McIver, the place that this college might have in contributing to this ideal, and that he was the constant friend in her times of prosperity and notably in one of her great crises, the fire. (North Carolina College for Women Board of Directors Proceedings from June 19, 1928)

For further reading:


Recommendation of the ECU Ad Hoc Committee on the Naming of Aycock Hall

February 11th, 2015

Ad Hoc Committee Members and Affiliation

Andrew Morehead, Jr., Chair of the Faculty, Chair of the Committee
Reginald Watson, Associate Professor, English
Janae Brown, Student
Jake Srednicki, Student (replaced by Tyler Moore, Student)
Lamont Lowery, Director of Admissions, ECU School of Dental Medicine
Mary Schiller, Chair of the Staff Senate
Paul Zigas, Senior Associate University Attorney
Griffin Lamb, Associate Vice Chancellor, University Advancement
Brenda Myrick, Past Chair of the ECU Alumni Association
E. Neal Crawford, Chair of the ECU Alumni Association
The following constitutes the final recommendation of the ECU Ad Hoc Committee on the Naming of Aycock Residence Hall and addresses the revised and expanded charge from Chancellor Ballard dated January 14, 2015 (appendix 5). This recommendation is the result of the committee members’ deliberations following an extensive review of primary and secondary sources regarding Aycock Residence Hall, Governor Charles B. Aycock, input from faculty, staff, students, alumni, and interested community members, and the contemporary values and mission of our University. The Ad Hoc Committee issues this recommendation to Chancellor Ballard with reverence for East Carolina University’s great history and hope for its even greater future.

I. **Recommendation:** The Ad Hoc Committee respectfully recommends:

   a. **Rename Aycock Residence Hall.** A process acceptable to the Trustees, Chancellor, and University Community should be undertaken to determine a new name. The process should ensure adequate opportunities for input from University stakeholders and community members. The new name should meet the criteria of Section 5.6 (Honorary Namings) of the East Carolina University Board of Trustee’s “Policy on Naming University Facilities and Activities (the “Naming Policy”).” The Trustees and Chancellor may consider convening a committee comprised of representatives from trustees, faculty, staff, students, alumni, and other interested stakeholders to vet honorees and recommend a new name or names to the Board of Trustees for consideration.

   b. **Establish, through ongoing educational programing, an ongoing candid and authentic dialogue on campus concerning the legacy of Governor Charles B. Aycock.** This dialogue should include discussion of the unquestionable contributions to the advancement of education for the people of North Carolina and, also, to the paradoxical and abhorrent role he played in establishing, as a matter of state policy, the decades-long systematic disenfranchisement from meaningful participation in government and society of people of color and other vulnerable populations who lived in this State.

   c. **Consider establishing appropriate historical educational displays to ensure ongoing dialog and appreciation of East Carolina University’s legacy.** The committee supports Dr. Prokopowicz’s suggestion of artwork created by ECU faculty to commemorate the University’s ascension from its roots in white supremacy and the political climate of the early 1900’s and further that a space be designated “Heritage Hall” or a similar name to contain displays about important figures in the University’s history.

   d. **Carefully consider whether the adoption of alternatives to the binary question of renaming Aycock Residence Hall meets the intent of the Naming Policy** (specifically, whether those alternatives meet the requirement that all namings of campus facilities and activities are in accordance with the University’s vision, mission, and core values). Three proposed actions considered by the committee following review of the stakeholder feedback may be more divisive than simply answering the binary question. First, precedent exists for hyphenating surnames to name a physical space both at ECU and other Universities. This is most often done when donors collaborate to make a gift in line with the naming opportunity. These names work in concert with one another; they do not compare and contrast or attempt to serve as foils. Hyphenating Aycock enters a gray area and puts the decision maker(s) in the impossible position of choosing the right counterbalance. Second, increasing the number of buildings named after African Americans similarly puts future decision makers in a very challenging position. The issue
of whether to rename Aycock Residence Hall is not merely an issue of achieving a numerical balance on campus of buildings named after ECU figures of varied ethnic backgrounds, but, instead goes to the question of what values the University wishes to project to the world-at-large. Third, the suggestion to capture Aycock's more complex biography on a plaque within Aycock residence hall does not address the very passionate student and parent concerns that a minority student does not feel comfortable calling Aycock home.

II. Standard of Review

The Committee's examination of the proposal to rename Aycock Residence Hall was conducted pursuant to the East Carolina University Board of Trustees' "Policy on Naming University Facilities and Activities." Of particular importance to the Committee is the Trustees' policy that "all namings of campus facilities and activities are in accordance with the University's vision, mission, and core values" (emphasis added). Also receiving strong consideration was the policy that "Naming a facility to honor individuals should be extraordinary, and made if: the individual has had a University-wide influence, or the individual has made exceptional contributions to the nation or world" and "The act endurably recognizes the person, family, or organization so honored, and it perpetually exhibits to the world the judgment and standards of this university as to the qualities and actions that justify linking the name of the individual, family, or organization so honored with that of this institution." The Committee further noted that policy includes a non-exhaustive list of circumstances that could justify a name change, including, explicitly, that a "honoree's reputation changes substantially so that the continued use of that name may compromise the public trust, dishonor the University's standards, or otherwise be contrary to the best interest of the University." The Committee exercised due care to recognize that "with the passage of time, the standards and achievements deemed to justify a naming action may change and observers of a later age may deem those who have conferred a naming honor at an earlier age to have erred."

In determining the University's vision, mission, and core values, the Committee considered the University's Mission Statement, current strategic plan, institutional makeup and organization, and history. The Committee took formal notice of commonly understood values held by the campus community that the Committee deemed to be vital to the successful pursuit of the University's service, teaching, and research mission, including, but not limited to, academic freedom, equality, and tolerance.

III. Schedule of Meetings and Record

The Committee met on the following dates: December 3, 2014, December 5, 2014, December 8, 2014, December 11, 2014 (editing workgroup), December 12, 2014 (Final recommendation made on the initial charge). The committee met and began to consider the elements of the revised and expanded charge on January 16, 2015, with subsequent meetings on January 30, 2015, February 9, 2015 (editing workgroup) and February 9, 2015.

Committee members also participated in two open forums hosted by the ECU Board of Trustees held on January 26 and 27, 2015.

A copy of many of the materials considered by the Committee is publically available at www.ecu.edu/aycock.
IV. Findings (based on the review of historical and contemporary documents, present day policy, mission statements and strategic plans, and constituent feedback)

(1) The Committee finds that Governor Aycock’s Qualities and Actions are not in accordance with the University’s vision, mission, and core values

   a. It is the policy of the East Carolina University Board of Trustees that the naming of a facility for a person by the University is to be a high and conspicuous honor that is intended to be a permanent act that “perpetually exhibits to the world the judgment and standards of this University as to the qualities and actions that justify linking the name . . . so honored with that of” East Carolina University.8 Further, “all namings of campus facilities and activities” shall be “in accordance with the University’s vision, mission, and core values.”

   b. The University is “committed to enriching the lives of students, faculty and staff by providing a diverse academic community where the exchange of ideas, knowledge, and perspectives is an active part of living and learning.”9

   c. The University “desires a pluralistic academic community where, teaching, learning, and living occurs in an atmosphere of mutual respect in pursuit of excellence.”10

   d. It is the policy of East Carolina University that our Institution “is committed to equality of opportunity and does not discriminate against applicants, students, employees, or visitors based on race/ethnicity, color, creed, national origin, sex, sexual orientation, age, veteran status, political affiliation, genetic information, or disability.”11

   e. In 2015 East Carolina University serves a richly diverse community of students, faculty, staff, and alumni, including among ethnic and racial lines, and it is core to the University’s mission that its services are offered in ways that are effective for and welcoming of people of all backgrounds and beliefs.12

   f. Aycock Hall has a capacity of 470 of 2465 total beds currently available on College Hill.13 The current residents reflect the diversity of the ECU student body, with African-Americans making up 30% of Aycock Hall’s residents. The Committee recognizes that Aycock Hall is not merely a university administrative space, such as offices or meeting space, but is a home for, and community of, students. Multiple speakers during the public forum and in feedback to the online portal expressed concern about students being asked to live in a residence that has come to be associated with white supremacy.

(2) Governor Aycock was not found to have had a University-wide influence, and that his contributions to the state are inextricably tied to his White Supremacy beliefs

   a. The committee found that Governor Aycock’s contributions to East Carolina University were limited to the increased demand for teachers in the state due to the expansion of public education, which eventually (several years after the end of his term as Governor) led to the construction of a teacher training school in the east (e.g. ECTTS). In addition, Governor Aycock spoke at the 1910 commencement ceremony.

   b. Governor Charles B. Aycock is among the most commemorated Governors in the history of North Carolina. His statue represents North Carolina in the U.S. Capital Building, another statue of him is located on the grounds of the North Carolina Capital Building, his words on are etched onto the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction Headquarters Building, and there are numerous public schools and other buildings named for Governor Aycock, including on the campuses of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill and at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro.
c. Governor Aycock is known as the “Education Governor” and he is widely praised for his support of “Universal Education.” While he served as governor 599 schools for whites and 91 schools for African Americans were constructed. He was praised by both white and black contemporaries for his stance on education, including Charles M. Eppes, for whom C. M. Eppes High School is named. Governor Aycock was a “progressive” politician in his day.

d. Contemporary research has shed light on the political motivations of Governor Aycock and his support of “Universal Education.” Governor Aycock is among the most prominent figures associated with the institutionalization of “Jim Crow” laws in North Carolina, including the requirement that voters pass literacy tests and pay a poll tax. It is recognized that participation in North Carolina elections plummeted following implementation of these laws, effectively barring minority and poor voters from participation in our democracy.

e. Governor Aycock set the stage for his eventual election to Governor by motivating the North Carolina white electorate with racist, fear mongering rhetoric designed to polarize the white community against African Americans.

f. Governor Aycock was not merely a “man of his times.” Instead, Governor Aycock defined his times. As discussed above, along with Fumiford Simmons and Josephus Daniels, he was the architect and primary advocate of the “White Supremacy” movement and the Suffrage Amendment designed to disenfranchise African-American voters. Those voters, as part of the coalition of Republican and Populist Parties called the “Fusion Party,” had successfully brought a number of African-Americans to positions of authority.

g. While many suggest that Governor Aycock may have modified or softened his views over time, the racist policies enacted by him and his supporters caused irreparable harm to the State and left a decades-long legacy of intolerance and disenfranchisement that continues to affect our society today.

(3) Further, that Governor Aycock’s reputation has changed “substantially so that the continued use of that name may compromise the public trust, dishonor the University’s standards, or otherwise be contrary to the best interest of the University.” The committee found that Aycock’s reputation has changed substantially over time in a negative manner, as evidenced by actions that included Governor Aycock’s name being removed from a residence hall at Duke, from the Vance-Aycock political meeting, and that there are proposals for removal of his name at other universities. In addition, feedback gathered at the public forums and through the online portal reflect a sizable percentage of the University’s stakeholders possessing strong feelings about Governor Aycock’s legacy of white supremacy and disenfranchisement of African-American voters.

The supporting evidence for these findings are included in Appendix 1

V. Conclusion

Following review of the historical documents and the feedback received via the survey and forums, the committee recommends that East Carolina University rename Aycock Hall. We find that the honoree’s qualities and actions were not in accordance with the University’s vision, mission, and core values, that he did not make a University-wide contribution, and that his reputation has changed substantially so that the continued use of that name dishonors the University’s standards and is contrary to the best interest of the University. Continuing to honor Governor Aycock prevents the University from fostering a “diverse community where intellectual freedom, scholarly discipline, and
the rigorous pursuit of knowledge thrive” for students, staff, and faculty, and does not reflect our
tolerance of such racist actions.

Continuing educational efforts and campus-wide discussions of the issues brought forth during the
debate over the naming of Aycock Hall and Governor Aycock’s legacy should be continued. The
University should pursue appropriate artwork and/or a dedicated space that will inspire such
discussions and growth as an institution.

Appendices:

1. Supporting Materials for the Committee Findings
2. Documents Reviewed
3. Professor Gerald Prokopowicz Memo
4. Summary of on-line portal comments and campus forms
5. Revised Charge

1 The Ad Hoc Committee’s revised charge superseding the original recommendation is included as Appendix 5
2 Available for review at http://www.ecu.edu/cs-
studentaffairs/aycock/loader.cfm?csModule=security/getfile&pageid=171310
3 Available for review at http://www.ecu.edu/cs-
studentaffairs/aycock/loader.cfm?csModule=security/getfile&pageid=171310
4 Naming Policy, Section 6.1.
5 Naming Policy, Section 5.6.1
6 Naming Policy, Section 1.2
7 Naming Policy, Section 6.3.
8 Naming Policy, Section 1.2
9 University Diversity Goal (http://www.ecu.edu/cs-acad/oed/diversityandinclusion.cfm)
10 University Diversity Goal (http://www.ecu.edu/cs-acad/oed/diversityandinclusion.cfm)
11 ECU Notice of Nondiscrimination (http://www.ecu.edu/cs-acad/oed/upload/Notice-of-Nondiscrimination-2.pdf)
12 For the Fall 2014 semester East Carolina University is reported by the UNC General Administration Student Data
Files to have a total enrollment of twenty-seven thousand five-hundred and eleven (27,511) students of whom at
least six-thousand eight-hundred and forty six (6,846) students were identified as having an ethnicity/race other than
“White”, and further, four-thousand three-hundred and fifty nine (4359) students were identified as having an ethnicity/race as “Black or African American.”

For the 2013-2014 academic year East Carolina University is reported as having two-thousand and forty-
three (2043) full and part-time faculty members, of which at least two-hundred and fifty-eight (258 or approximately
13%) faculty members are identified as having an ethnicity/race other than “White”, and of which ninety-three (93)
faculty members were identified as having an ethnicity/race of “Black or African American.”

For the 2013-2014 academic year East Carolina University is reported as having a total of five-thousand
seven-hundred and ninety-eight (5,798) full and part-time employees, of which at least eleven-hundred and eighty-
two (1182) employees are identified as having an ethnicity other than “White”, and of which nine-hundred and
twenty-three (923) employees were identified as having an ethnicity as “Black or African American.”

13 From Residential Life: Residence halls serve as a place for students to live, eat, study, develop leadership, learn
about themselves and others, and cultivate friendships...all in a safe and welcoming environment. Residence hall
living and all that happens there provide opportunities to support students’ academic performance, personal
development, and participate in a close-knit community that encourages all to be respectful of each other.
The buildings and their names are visible symbols of the institution and the institution’s values. Residential living
supports ECU’s model of a “diversely integrated inclusive community of staff, students...” committed to the holistic
education of students and teaches them how to live harmoniously with each and each other’s differences.
Bed count on *The Hill* as of February 2015:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residence</th>
<th>Beds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scott Residence Hall</td>
<td>609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Hill Suites</td>
<td>483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyler Residence Hall</td>
<td>472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aycock Residence Hall</td>
<td>470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones Residence Hall</td>
<td>431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total beds</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,465</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gateway East &amp; West</td>
<td>720*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (Aug. 2015)</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,185</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Beginning in fall 2015, we will open Gateway East and Gateway West residence halls. This will bring an additional 720 beds to the inventory which will make the total bed count on *The Hill* 3,185.*

To date, we have a total of 5,089 beds in the complete housing inventory. In fall 2015, that count goes to 5,809. Of the upper class students who choose to live on campus, the majority of them live on *The Hill* because of the designs of College Hill Suites and Scott Hall.

Appendix 1: Supporting Information for the Committee Findings

Finding 1: Governor Aycock's Qualities and Actions are not in accordance with the University's vision, mission, and core values

The vision, mission and core values quoted in the findings are from Beyond Tomorrow, ECU's strategic plan and the ECU mission statement.

Governor Aycock is renowned for his support of "Universal Education," earning him the nickname "The Education Governor." Under his leadership, North Carolina founded more than 1,100 public schools, originated the textbook commission for the state, built 877 libraries, and enacted temperance and child labor laws. He is frequently cited by supporters for defending funding for black schools and advocating against lynchings. He was also one of the principle architects of the 1898 "White Supremacy" movement by taking an active role in Democratic party campaigning and leadership, pushing the white supremacy platform to attract the maximum number of white voters. Following the success of the party in capturing a majority in both houses in the 1898 elections, Aycock worked closely with the legislature to pass an amendment to the constitution imposing poll taxes and literacy tests, with a grandfather clause designed to allow those who could vote in 1867 (and their descendants) to avoid such measures. In addition, his white supremacy beliefs where consistently expressed in his relative level of support for black and white education and remained unchanged until the time of his death.

Governor Aycock's beliefs and actions around "Universal Education" and "White Supremacy" are clearly reflected in his words, with many excerpts below.

Comments on Universal Education for Whites and the suffrage amendment from his speech accepting the nomination as candidate for Governor:15

"The man who seeks in the face of these provisions to encourage illiteracy is a public enemy and deserves the contempt of all mankind. . . . Gentlemen of the convention, this clause of our Amendment does not weaken but strengthens it. In your speeches to the people, in your talks with them on the streets and farms and by the firesides, do not hesitate to discuss this section. . . . Speak the truth, 'tell it in Gath, publish it in the streets of Askalon' that universal education of the white children of North Carolina will send us forward with a bound in the race with the world. . . . With the adoption of our Amendment after 1908 there will be no State in the Union with a larger percentage of boys and girls who can read and write and no State will rush forward with more celerity or certainty than conservative old North Carolina. The miserable demagogue who seeks to perpetuate illiteracy in the State will then have happily passed forever. There is one other provision of the Amendment to which I must advert that is the payment of the poll tax by March 1st of election years as a condition to voting. The largest part of the poll tax goes to public education under the Constitution. If our boys are to be educated as a condition precedent to voting after 1908, then no man who will not contribute to that end ought to vote. Nearly all white persons liable to poll tax pay it now. If the negro wants to vote it is no hardship on him that he should be required to pay his tax to the support of these schools in which his race gets more than it pays of the public fund. The various provisions of the Amendment work together for good to all men. We are going to carry them through to success. The fight is on. We unfurl anew the old banner of Democracy. We inscribe thereon 'White Supremacy and Its Perpetuation.'"

That the White Man owes the negro an education from a 1902 speech to the Chamber of Commerce in Charlotte:16

"I find in the State men who think that the negro has gone backward rather than forward and that education is injurious to him. Have these men forgotten that the negro was well educated
before the war? Do they not recall that he was trained in those things essential for his life work? He has been less educated since the war than before. It is true that he has been sent to school, but his contact with the old planter and with the accomplished and elegant wife of that planter has been broken. This contact was in itself a better education than he can receive from the public schools, but shall we, for this reason, say that he is incapable of training? Ought we not, on the contrary, to study the conditions and realize that the training which he needs has not been given to him since the war in like manner that it was before?"

The economic necessity of educating the negro. 1904 speech “In Defence Of His Policies And His Administration,” Address Before The Democratic State Convention.17

“The Amendment drove many of them out of the State. An effort to reduce their public schools would send thousands more of them away from us. In this hour, when we industrial development demands more labor and not less, it becomes of the utmost importance that we shall make no mistake in dealing with that race which does a very large part of the work, of actual hard labor in the State.”

On the equality of education for whites and negroes, also from the 1904 speech “In Defence Of His Policies And His Administration,” Address Before The Democratic State Convention.

“While holding these views, it is needful for me to say that I have recognized that, heretofore, much injustice has in many instances been done to the whites in that in the same county schools were frequently maintained for six or seven months for the colored in certain districts and for only two or three months for the whites in other districts. It has been the aim of this administration to correct this inequality and to see to it that provision was made for the whites which should certainly be equal to that made for negroes. This has been done without any Constitutional Amendment, but under the plain provisions of our law. It may be of interest to you to know in this connection the facts about the expenditure of money for the public schools from 1883 to 1903. In 1883 there was spent for the schools for whites $306,805.55; for colored $260,955.87. There was spent $1.04 per capita for white children and $1.50 per capita for colored children — a difference of 48 cents in favor of the negro... For 1903 there was spent for the education of the white children $865,700.17 and for the education of colored children $252,820.54; per capita expenditure of $1.89 for whites and $1.14 for the colored; a difference in favor of the whites of 75 cents per capita. These are the facts and they speak for themselves.”
Governor Aycock’s opposition to lynchings:\(^{18}\)

"It ought not to be necessary," said he to the Legislature, "for the Governor of your State to have to accompany his requisition with an assurance that the prisoner will not be lynched. Our character as a law-abiding people . . . ought to be such as to furnish a guarantee everywhere of a fair trial for any prisoner for whom requisition is asked . . . I cannot too strongly urge on your Honorable Body the duty of devising some means for the efficient, certain and speedy trial of crimes, and at the same time to make such provision as will protect every citizen, however humble, however vicious, however guilty, against trial by the mob."

"The best way to safeguard society is for good people themselves to obey the law. We cannot stop crime by committing it; we cannot teach obedience to the law by disobeying it; we cannot preserve order by the means of a mob. . . . The creating of better public opinion, the passage of laws making more effective the means of ascertaining and punishing all those participating in lynching, speedy trial and prompt punishment of criminals, shall all be invoked until we secure for ourselves the absolute and unquestioned reign of the law."

Two excerpts from the “Universal Education” speech, Birmingham, AL, 1912.\(^{19}\)

"What do you mean by education? You mean bringing out of a thing what God Almighty put into it. I repeat that I am in favor of educating everybody and educating everything. Why, we have educated the Irish potato. You know what an Irish potato is now; but what did the Irish potato used to be when it was ignorant and had never gone to school? Why, it was a little thing, and it was tough and bitter, but some wiser man than the average found it, and he says, ‘I believe this thing has got good in it, and I will fetch it out.’ ‘Fetch’ is a good word in North Carolina, but I do not know how it is in Alabama. I taught school myself, and I know ‘English as she is spoke.’ He said it is not good and I will fetch it out, and he proceeded to educate it; to bring out of it what it had in it. He planted and fertilized it and cultivated it, and planted it and fertilized and cultivated, and planted it, fertilized it and cultivated it, until the Irish potato has become so good that we have it three times a day, every day in the year, and we thank God when leap year comes and gives us one more day in which to eat Irish potatoes. (Laughter.) But you must understand that is an educated Irish potato, and that is not an ignorant Irish potato. You would not eat that old-fashioned, ignorant Irish potato on Saturday.

So education is good for a vegetable, and it is good for animals, and it is good for a mule. You know the most dangerous thing in this country is an old, unbroken mule. Josh Billings said if he had to preach the funeral of a mule he would stand at his head. (Laughter.) But that is your unbroken mule. We call it "breaking" them. What is "breaking" a mule except training him, educating him, bringing out of him what there is in him? Why, when you buy a mule fresh from a drove it takes two white men and one Fifteenth Amendment to hitch him to a plow. (Laughter.) And when you get him hitched up he plows up more cotton than he does grass; but after you have broken him, trained him, developed him, educated him, why that old mule goes right along. He used to, in our State, when I was a farmer. Why, that old mule would go right along down the side of this cotton and when a clod dropped over on it she would keep her head so you could lift it off. (Laughter.) I have done it and I know how to do it; I say what I believe because I know that if you don’t let me make a living practising law or in politics I can plow it out."

“Oh, my friends, I thank God Almighty, who is no respecter of persons, that you cannot get the best for your boy and your girl until you are ready to give the best to my boy and my girl. You
can take that boy of yours and send him through the schools, send him through the college, send him through the university, send him abroad, bring him back home, head and shoulders above his friends and neighbors, but he won't be very high when he is head and shoulders above his neighbors if his neighbors are ignorant and untaught and weak. You cannot get the best out of your boy unless other people's boys are educated nearly or quite as well as your boy; you have got to get the best out of your boy by competing with other boys that are near about as good as he is but not quite.”
Finding 2: Governor Aycock was not found to have had a University-wide influence, and that his contributions to the state are inextricably tied to his White Supremacy beliefs

*East Carolina University: The Formative Years, 1907-1982* by Mary Jo Jackson Bratton (quote below from pages 11-13) discusses the contribution made by Governor Aycock to the founding of East Carolina University, which may be summarized that the literacy requirement in the suffrage amendment created an increasing demand for teachers, and that Governor Aycock led the campaign for the necessary tax increases necessary to support statewide expansion of education. This quote is also consistent with the historical record and Findings (a) above that demonstrate that the Governor's drive for universal education was intimately linked to the suffrage amendment and economic concerns.

"Throughout the land, it was a time of heady optimism and blind faith. Despite all that progressive critics of society saw wrong in American life, they saw little that could not be repaired or improved once the right people gained control of the government and enacted the appropriate legislation. To make sure that the right people were in control, the progressive movement in the South was imbedded in a paradox. In addition to the general reforming zeal manifested throughout the nation, North Carolina, following the lead of other Southern states, ushered in the twentieth century with a constitutional amendment to disfranchise illiterate black voters. This suffrage amendment, ironically, proved to be the wheel that drove the educational reform movement. North Carolina's "grandfather clause," which enabled illiterate white men to vote, was designed to expire in 1908; after that year, the law required that both white and black men would be required to pass the literacy test for voter registration.

In 1900 Charles Brantley Aycock, Democratic candidate for governor, whose white-supremacy platform was buttressed by the suffrage amendment, was elected with a mandate, perhaps stronger than he realized, to institute a crusade for universal education. The white voter, from Manteo to Murphy, was persuaded to embrace the 1908 deadline on illiteracy by Aycock's pledge that increased support for public school education would be his primary commitment as governor. And so it was.

If Aycock is memorialized as the "Educational Governor," it is well to remember that the vision of universal education he so eloquently conveyed in 1900 had captivated other North Carolinians years earlier. For one, Thomas Jordan Jarvis, pioneer educational governor, had struggled to revive the postwar system of common schools that had been established in the antebellum years. During the last two decades of the nineteenth century, the ground was prepared and the seeds were sown by Jarvis and his generation of educators for the remarkable harvest that Charles B. Aycock and his dedicated band of reformers would harvest at the turn of the century.

But anyone who supposed that the battle for tax-supported public schools was over in 1900 just because Aycock had been elected governor on a platform of universal education needed instruction in the political facts of life. His election was no guarantee that many of those who supported him took his pledge seriously. Some hoped, while others feared, that it was all a campaign ploy to gain support for the white supremacy-black disfranchisement plank of his platform. For the most part, the larger property holders hoped they would not be taxed to educate the masses; and those possessing little or no property-and at that time 52 percent of North Carolinians owned neither land nor houses-feared that universal education was an empty dream.

Thus, the campaign to eradicate illiteracy was dependent on convincing the voters to finance public schools through local taxation. The brunt of this educational program to improve the public schools was carried by a small group of men appointed by Governor Aycock and supported by the newly created Southern Education Board. The Central Campaign Committee for the Promotion of Public Education in North Carolina, composed of Governor Aycock, Charles Duncan McIver, president of the State Normal and Industrial College, and
James Yadkin Joyner, state superintendent of public instruction, directed the educational crusade and organized public rallies. As the featured speaker for the opening round of this ambitious campaign against illiteracy, former Governor Jarvis delivered a "soul stirring" address exhorting the people to improve and expand facilities for public education.

"Do this, and the future will be glorious; neglect it, and we go back to barbarism," the veteran advocate of universal education proclaimed. The result of this and countless other educational rallies over the first several years of the twentieth century was striking. An unparalleled enthusiasm spread throughout the state as public education was increasingly recognized as the lever that could lift it into the modern age. Nowhere was this realization more edifying than in the East, and nowhere was there a lustier challenge for educational progress."

In addition, per a Daily Reflector article, Governor Aycock presented an address on “Universal Education” in May 1910 at the closing of ECTTS for the year.
Finding 3: Governor Aycock’s reputation has changed substantially so that the continued use of that name may compromise the public trust, dishonor the University’s standards, or otherwise be contrary to the best interest of the University.

It is the committee’s view that the contemporary association of white supremacy with Governor Aycock has changed his reputation substantially since 1961, when he was posthumously honored with the naming of an ECU residence hall. This judgment is based on the information reviewed and the viewpoints and information gathered during the electronic survey and public forums.

There has been a substantial increase in the public awareness of and a decrease in tolerance for Governor Aycock’s record of advocacy of white supremacy. Much of this awareness arose around a broader understanding of the events of the 1898 Wilmington Coup.20

The Democratic Party removed Governor Aycock’s name from their annual dinner in 2011 over concerns that the name no longer reflected an increasingly diverse constituency.21

This change in reputation prompted the June 2014 removal of the Aycock name from a residential hall at Duke University, following a student government resolution. Currently, University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill and University of North Carolina-Greensboro are also considering similar renamings. The “Silent Sam” controversy at UNC-Chapel Hill is part of the related dialog around legacy and naming.

The decision to honor an individual implies that the values and reputation of that individual are representative of the values the institution also holds. That growing awareness of Governor Aycock’s advocacy of white supremacy, his belief that African Americans were inherently inferior to the white race, and his actions to advance those beliefs, must be contrasted with the values stated in ECU’s mission and values statement.

15 The life and speeches of Charles Brantley Aycock, p. 223
16 The life and speeches of Charles Brantley Aycock, p. 132
17 The life and speeches of Charles Brantley Aycock, p. 257
18 The life and speeches of Charles Brantley Aycock, p. 101
19 The life and speeches of Charles Brantley Aycock, p. 316-324
Appendix 2: Documents Reviewed

Documents Reviewed


A variety of newspaper clippings, letters, and other documents provided by John Tucker, University Historian and the library archivists of ECU. Such documents focused on the naming process in 1961 and dedication of Aycock Hall the subsequent year, the news stories and obituaries from his death in 1912, and his visit to speak at ECTTS commencement in 1910.

The committee also reviewed the letters of request for renaming and additional articles from The Herald Sun, The Chronicle, Inside Higher Education, Diversity, Inc. and The Daily Reflector.
TO: Steve Ballard, Chancellor  
FR: Gerald Prokopowicz, Professor of History  
DATE: January 23, 2015  
RE: Proposal to rename Aycock Hall

SITUATION
East Carolina University has a residence hall named for Charles B. Aycock, who was governor of North Carolina from 1901 to 1905. Aycock became known as the “Education Governor” for his dedication to public education, which included support for a state-funded teachers’ training school in Greenville that in time would grow to become East Carolina University. Unfortunately, Aycock was also an outspoken white supremacist, and at least part of his motivation for supporting public education was to insure that white residents could pass the literacy test that had been instituted to prevent black North Carolinians from voting. In late 2014 a committee was appointed to study a proposal to rename Aycock Hall. The proposal immediately sparked controversy, which continues today.

ARGUMENTS
For renaming:
Values
Supporters argue Aycock is not an appropriate representative of the values of East Carolina University. No one argues that East Carolina University in any way accepts the white supremacist view of Aycock’s era.

Action required
For ECU to do nothing, now that Aycock’s views on racial supremacy are receiving wide publicity, would be in effect a declaration of the institution’s indifference to its minority community; especially after Duke University has already removed Aycock’s name from one of its buildings, and other universities are reportedly contemplating similar action.

Against renaming:
Wishful thinking
Opponents of renaming offer a number of arguments. Some, such as the claim that Aycock was really a racial progressive by the standards of his day, or that everyone in Aycock’s era shared his racial views, are historically inaccurate and would make a poor basis for policy.

 Tradition
Another argument for maintaining the status quo is that building names should not be changed too quickly, just because times have changed or new information has come to light. This however can be perceived as another way of saying that Aycock’s racism shouldn’t be seen as truly evil. Penn State University couldn’t act quickly enough to remove Jerry Sandusky’s name from anything on its campus, and removed Joe Paterno’s statue as well, demonstrating that where there is consensus that a person has done something truly wrong, quick action is not only appropriate but mandatory. If evidence emerged showing that one of ECU’s later building namesakes had in fact been a Communist spy during the Cold War, how long would it take the Board of Trustees to remove that name?

Slippery slope
The most potent argument against renaming the building is the “slippery slope.” Aycock was not the only white North Carolinian of his day who openly endorsed white supremacy. Thomas Jarvis, for example, made no secret that he shared the prevailing view among white people of the early 20th century in North Carolina that black people should not be treated as political or social equals. If Aycock’s name must be removed, then by the same logic ECU will have to rename Jarvis Hall and a number of other buildings. Applied more broadly, the anti-Aycock position would ultimately require the renaming of anything anywhere named for George Washington or Thomas Jefferson, both slaveholders.

The extreme version of the “slippery slope” argument fails on historical grounds. Washington and Jefferson lived more than a century before Aycock, at a time when human slavery was widely accepted. They participated in the institution as slaveholders, but did nothing in particular to promote it, and in Jefferson’s case contributed to its destruction by planting the ideological seed of equality in the
Declaration of Independence, and halting the spread of slavery out of the South by prohibiting it in the territories of the Northwest Ordinance. In contrast, Aycock and his contemporaries were not simply floating in a sea of assumed white supremacy like Washington or Jefferson; they were actively fighting the tide of equality by supporting laws to disenfranchise black men, decades after the Fifteenth Amendment gave all adult males the right to vote. Where Jefferson believed in theoretical equality and lamented the real state of society, Aycock and his peers believed in inequality, lamented the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments that tried to legislate equality, and worked hard to turn the clock back to a time before any black political rights existed. There is no hypocrisy in suggesting that people can continue to honor Washington and Jefferson while rejecting Charles B. Aycock.

The “slippery slope” argument is much stronger in regard to Jarvis and other contemporaries of Aycock. As research on Jarvis reveals, he shared Aycock’s political and racial views. If he did not do as much as Aycock to promote white supremacy in North Carolina, it was only because he did not hold as much political power during the heyday of the white supremacy movement, from 1890 to 1916. If Aycock’s name were to be removed because he does not represent the current values of the institution, it would be difficult to justify keeping the name of Jarvis, and possibly others, on other buildings.

This argument carries still further. East Carolina Teachers Training School was chartered in 1907 “to train young white men and women” as an integral part of a political movement throughout North Carolina and the rest of the South that was aimed at eliminating black political power and restoring white political and social supremacy. As Aycock himself noted when the state began testing voters for literacy, it would be up to white voters to prove their “supremacy” by learning to read, so that only black voters would be disenfranchised. The institution we know as ECU was born at the outset of the Jim Crow era, with Jim Crow policies among the motivations of its founders.

**POLICY OPTIONS**

1. **Do nothing**
   
   At one extreme, ECU could do nothing. As noted earlier, this would be perceived by many as a declaration of indifference toward minorities at ECU and throughout eastern North Carolina. It would reinforce the idea that tradition matters more than equality, and it would reaffirm the notion that history belongs to the majority, which gets to choose what to remember and celebrate (Aycock’s dedication to public education) and what to sweep under the rug and forget (Aycock’s racism). This policy would run counter to the intellectual foundations of the university as well as its current values of fairness, tolerance, and equal opportunity.

2. **Change all names**
   
   At the other extreme, ECU could remove the names not just of Aycock and Jarvis but of all of its founders who participated in the widespread racism of their day, and who created this school to help maintain white political power by training teachers who would educate future white voters. This would essentially erase the names of the founders from the campus, much as leaders in the Soviet Union regularly ordered the names and pictures of historical figures erased from history books, to bring their version of the past into line with current policy. To pretend that the university had never been connected to Aycock and his generation would be just as anti-historical as pretending that Aycock was not a white supremacist.

3. **Change only the name of Aycock Hall only**
   
   This option, which may appear to be a middle ground, runs the risk of starting on the slippery slope. It is hard to argue historically that there is any bright line between Aycock and Jarvis, and as research continues it is likely that others will be found who fall into the same category. Changing one name will upset the defenders of the status quo without satisfying all those who object to honoring known white supremacists. The action will draw attention in the national media, and the controversy will almost certainly continue and intensify, making ultimate resolution more difficult.

4. **Seize the opportunity**
   
   This is a divisive issue. There are strong arguments on both sides. As a parent, I would be uncomfortable paying room and board for my daughter to sleep in a building named for a prominent white supremacist; I can’t even imagine how much less comfortable a black parent would feel. At the
same time, as a member of the ECU community, I would not be comfortable see the names of Aycock, Jarvis, and other founders swept away as though the only legacy they bequeathed to ECU was the racism of the early 20th century. If the university takes either course, it will inflame passions on the other side, and open new wounds instead of healing old ones.

What is needed is a bold, comprehensive course of action that will allow all of us at ECU to confront and come to terms with our institution’s past. Consider the metaphor of an ancestor that you never met, but whose name you bear. Your ancestor is well known locally for many civic deeds. You grow up revering your ancestor, proud to have “III” after your name. One day, however, you hear a story told about your ancestor, and you go to the internet and the library to do some research. You find the truth—that your ancestor once participated in a terrible act, along with others in the community. What do you do? Do you change your name? Run from the community in shame for an act you didn’t commit? Forget about all the good your ancestor did? Or do you resolve to wipe away the stain? To continue to revere the memory of all the good your ancestor did, while using the memory of evil deeds as a constant inspiration to repair the damage and to make the world a better place?

This is where we find ourselves as an institution. We can no longer pretend not to know the totality of Aycock, Jarvis, and others, and we cannot accept association with their values of racial inequality and oppression. But we cannot pretend that they were not our founders either. What we can do is to continue to value the good things they did while rejecting their racism.

If history teaches one thing, it is that human actions have unpredictable consequences. Often good intentions lead to bad consequences. Sometimes, however, it works the other way around. The founders of East Carolina Teachers Training School may have thought they were building a foundation for white supremacy, but they instead they were unknowingly planting the seed of a great university, dedicated to equal opportunity for all people. We can celebrate them for what they did, not what they thought they were doing.
ACTIONS
How can ECU do this?

1. Educate

- Conduct panels and programs where faculty experts share their knowledge of ECU’s past. Historians would play a major role, but political scientists, geographers, sociologists and other faculty would contribute. The History Department, in conjunction with Sociology and Geography, is currently prepared to conduct such an event and is awaiting administrative approval.

- Add three hours of lecture and other instruction on ECU history to the curriculum COAD 1000, to be taught to every section by History faculty or by instructors trained by History faculty.

- Encourage students to take HIST 3907 “Pirate Nation: An ECU History.”

- Offer one lecture each year, from one of the existing lecture series on campus, on a topic related to ECU’s history.

- Expand the brief (and sometimes misleading) sentences on the ECU student housing websites for each residence hall with more detailed and accurate information about their namesakes. Create a separate central web page with similar information for all the buildings on campus.

2. Commemorate

- Announce a comprehensive renaming initiative, affecting buildings named for Aycock, Jarvis and selected others. The boldest step would be simply to take the names down (to be commemorated elsewhere; see below), and perhaps use the naming opportunities to raise funds from donors (a suggestions beyond my pay grade). An alternative would be to find names representing other eras and other values from North Carolina and ECU history, and pair them with existing names, e.g. Jarvis Hall could become Holden & Jarvis Hall, honoring Gov. William Woods Holden who battled the Ku Klux Klan in 1870 and was impeached for his efforts.

- In each building on campus, install a prominent cased exhibit near the entrance that portrays the history of the building and the person for whom it is named. Note that ECU, alone among UNC system campuses, has no museum of its own (other than the Country Doctor Museum, in Bailey) where students can learn of their school’s past.

- Commission a Founders’ Monument on the Mall, to be designed by ECU art faculty, that reflects the paradox of a great institution rising from a mixture of good and evil motives. The monument will honor the achievement of the founders while simultaneously exposing the racial inequality of the world in which they lived. I have no idea how that might be done, but I have confidence in our talented faculty.

- Endow a scholarship for minority students named for Charles B. Aycock. It will serve as a constant reminder that the university continues to carry on Aycock’s belief in education while rejecting his racism. This should be a highly competitive scholarship, awarded only to the most capable and mature students, because the winners of the Aycock Scholarship will carry
a special burden as living symbols of the emptiness of Aycock’s belief that one race was inferior to another.

3. Celebrate
   - Revise the annual Founders’ Day celebration to include recognition of the victims of the racist ideology that suffused the lives of Aycock, Jarvis and other founders, and acknowledge that we reject their racial views even as we celebrate their other accomplishments. Expand the definition of “founders” to include those who pioneered the integration of ECU.

   - Create an annual day of remembrance, celebration, and purgation, where students engage in some kind of activity that symbolically purges the institution of the negative side of its heritage, something like Guy Fawkes Day in England, but without the bonfires. Perhaps it could be worked into the popular Polar Bear Plunge every January, washing away what we don’t want to keep from the past and exhilarating in our common identity as shivering Pirates. Schedule the event at a time when students and faculty are free to participate (not just before final exams like Founders Day).

CONCLUSION
   ECU has been given a rare opportunity to come to terms with its own past. Looking into our institutional closet and seeing the skeletons of past racism will not be pleasant, and many people will not want to do it. The letters page and “Bless Your Heart” section of the Daily Reflector as well as the Pirate Rants section of The East Carolinian regularly express discomfort at the idea of changing names of buildings.

   The problem is that the reality of Aycock’s racism can’t be changed, either by telling people they shouldn’t care about it, or by removing his and others’ names and denying that they were integral to our founding. Since the reality won’t go away, the only long-term solution is to face it, to recognize who our founders were, to continue to embrace their good deeds, to confess that racism was among their motivations, to celebrate how far we have come from their day, and to dedicate ourselves to advancing farther still.
Appendix 4: Summary of on-line portal comments and campus forms

Constituent Opinion Data collected between December 5, 2014, and December 10, 2014 via the www.ecu.edu/Aycock web site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>% Yes for Renaming</th>
<th>% No for Renaming</th>
<th>Approximate Response Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td>1180</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>3% 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total*</td>
<td>2434</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note that number of respondents in each category reflects those who checked multiple categories

The online portal, which included most of the documents listed appendix 2, went live Friday, December 5, and a link was sent to the ECU Official (all faculty and staff), student, and alumni email lists. The committee was aware that this was not a scientific sampling of the constituents (convenience sample), that locking out multiple submissions was not feasible, and that the timeframe for submission would be short. Thus, the opinions collected were not intended to provide a binding referendum on the issue, but as a means of gathering as much feedback as possible. Ultimately, 2434 total responses were submitted by noon of 12/10/2014 (note that some of the respondents fit multiple categories). The data are contained in the original report, along with email communications expressing opinions that were prompted by the website.

Alumni and staff expressed by a significant majority the opinion that the Aycock name should be retained; faculty expressed a significant preference for renaming; while the students were closely split. The qualitative responses expressed strong opinions on both sides of the issue.

Resolutions were passed by the Student Government Association and the Faculty Senate calling for the renaming of Aycock Hall.

The Board of Trustees held public forums on January 26th and January 27th, both were recorded and available to the committee and Board. These sessions validated the committee’s expanded charge to consider a way forward for our school community beyond a binary “rename or maintain” decision. While some constituents urged ECU to “move on” and stop “wasting time” in its continued discussion of the topic, the one constant in this lengthy, and yes time-consuming, dialogue is the passion those with an opinion on the naming issue possess.

Constituent opinions draw upon deeply personal interpretations of post-Reconstruction North Carolina and our country’s long and tangled history with race. In our opinion, this extends beyond the reach of one committee, one board, or any single leader. This requires all school leaders—students, staff, faculty, and alumni alike—to work together to provide a framework for continued dialogue about our school and regional history.

---

22 Of the approximately 155,000 living ECU alumni, approximately 43,000 have an email on record with the alumni office and receive all-alumni emails. Open rates on the invitations to participate in the on-line portal and on-campus forum were 16% (December 5th on-line portal invitation), 22% (January 16 campus forum), 16% (January 21 campus forum reminder), and 15% (January 26 campus forum reminder)
Memorandum

To: Dr. Andrew Morehead, Chair
    Ad Hoc Renaming Committee

From: Steve Ballard, Chancellor

Date: January 14, 2015

Subject: Amended Committee Charge

The purpose of this memo is to request you reconvene the Ad Hoc Renaming Committee and conduct a minimum of two additional public meetings in response to the following charge:

- Fully discuss and deliberate the issues previously considered by the committee prior to the original vote.
- Encourage the committee to attend the upcoming forums for students, faculty, staff, alumni, and the community and during at least one ad hoc committee meeting consider the feedback given during the forums.
- Review additional historical research on named buildings (A request for supplemental information is pending with Dr. Prokopowicz and the reports will be forwarded to you as they are received).
- Discuss your thoughts about acceptable ways to address the concerns expressed in relation to the renaming request beyond the binary options to remove or retain the name.
- Conduct another vote of the committee and forward to me a second written recommendation.

I appreciate the committee's willingness to continue this important work. Please submit the second recommendation no later than February 11, 2015.

Please let me know if we need to discuss this further.
The Aycock name: Time for a change


A couple of years ago, a fascinating change took place. For many years, the North Carolina Democratic Party hosted a major fundraiser called the Vance-Aycock Dinner.

What was the problem?

Charles Aycock served as North Carolina governor around the turn of the 20th century. He has been described as the first “progressive” governor in North Carolina history. He was a huge advocate of public education. Numerous schools were built when he served; and teacher salaries were raised. Of course, Charles Aycock was a quintessential North Carolina Democrat.

But in fact, Governor Aycock was also a major white supremacist. He served around the time Jim Crow laws were increasingly enacted in North Carolina. It seems to be undisputed that he was a segregationist.

This is, in fact, part of the legacy of the North Carolina Democratic Party. Jim Crow and segregation were, almost by definition, Democratic Party institutions.

North Carolina Democrats finally came to the realization during 2011 that they should no longer name their major fundraising dinner after Governor Aycock; and they made a change.

But what happened here in Greensboro in response to this revelation? Apparently, nothing.

We have four major public “facilities” in Greensboro named after Governor Aycock. These include Aycock Middle School; UNCG’s Aycock Auditorium; Aycock Street; and the historic Aycock neighborhood.

It is apparent that community leaders in Greensboro absolutely adored Governor Aycock. Years ago, they stuck his name on nearly anything they could fathom.

The local political culture has had the reputation of patting itself on the back because of its putative progressive enlightenment. But it never even lifted a finger to change the names of these public facilities named after Aycock. In spite of all our local politicians who buy into our local identity politics, nothing has been done.

In the spirit of making a positive civic contribution, I would like to make a proposal for renaming these four Greensboro Aycock locations:

1. **Aycock Street should be renamed the Billy Graham Parkway.**

Greensboro leaders always want to emulate Charlotte. We can do so by having our own Billy Graham Parkway. During his heyday, of course, Rev. Graham took a bold stand against segregation.

2. **The historic Aycock neighborhood should be renamed after Margaret Thatcher.**

Aycock is a neighborhood of bold urban homesteaders. To the extent they might possess an Anglophilic
sensibly, they might also enjoy living in a neighborhood named “Thatcher.”

3. Aycock Middle School should be renamed after Ronald Reagan.

Reagan, of course, was one of our greatest presidents; but has been insufficiently memorialized in the city of Greensboro. One would think that area residents and parents would appreciate no longer having the school named after Aycock.

4. The UNCG Aycock Auditorium should be renamed after Pope John Paul II.

A UNCG website states that the Aycock Auditorium has served as an “arts hub” for the university, for the city of Greensboro and for the entire Piedmont Triad. One must presume that the arts community would object to Aycock’s name being used if they knew it truly represented.

These changes would be enormously positive. In the past, institutional Greensboro has begrudgingly tolerated the belief systems of evangelicals and devout Catholics. This would be a rare opportunity to celebrate what these citizens bring to our area. Graham and John Paul are particularly revered figures within those respective traditions.

Honoring Reagan, Thatcher and John Paul II would give a rightful place to outstanding leaders who helped slay Soviet Communism. While socialism is quite fashionable in Greensboro, I think most of our neighbors in the GateCity would still agree that the Soviet version was particularly problematic.

Having John Paul’s name on the facade of the former Aycock Auditorium at UNCG would be particularly meaningful. It would strikingly contrast with the type of worldview typically perpetuated in that university environment.

But ultimately, adopting the names of Reagan, Graham, Thatcher and John Paul would help assert a more genuine form of diversity than we have ever had in Greensboro. It would represent genuine intellectual and cultural diversity—instead of having the same old mold always forced upon us.

Let’s do it. Let’s rid ourselves of these anachronistic reminders of North Carolina Democratic segregationists. Let’s embrace true diversity. Let’s celebrate some true heroes.

Dr. Joe Guarino is a Guardian columnist.

10 Responses to The Aycock name: Time for a change

Titus Quinctius Cincinnatus says:
February 14, 2013 at 7:50 PM
The Democrats still are white supremacists.

How else can we explain the fact that they seem to think that black people can’t do anything for themselves without the help of patronising, condescending white liberals to do it for them?

David Craft says:
February 15, 2013 at 8:53 AM
Billy Graham held segregated crusades in his early years. We forgive him for that. Charles Aycock brought
education to the masses. He was a man of his time. We can forgive him for his segregationist views.

Titus? I thought this blog did not allow posting under pseudonyms?

Jacqui Hawkins says:
February 15, 2013 at 10:53 AM
This is just a ridiculous article. As David Craft said, you can forgive one and not the other. Margaret Thatcher? Ronald Reagan? Pope John Paul II? If you are changing the names of ANY local landmarks, including street names, I think we need to stick within our own city’s history. There are many great things and people to come out of Greensboro, let’s choose our own local historical figures. For instance, I have befriended a 93 year old woman who taught at Bessemer Elementary and was the first teacher to have a black student in her classroom AND her family has roots within NC since the late 1700s.

Titus? REALLY?!? You are lost on the definition of a “liberal”.

Joe Guarino says:
February 15, 2013 at 1:57 PM
Titus, thanks for the interesting observation. The actions of the modern Democratic Party certainly tend to have the effect of keeping far too many African-Americans “on the plantation”.

David, and Jacqui, let me understand the implications of the position the two of you are taking. Charles Aycock was responsible in part for Jim Crow laws that were passed and signed into law when he served as Governor. Are you suggesting that you are opposed to the names of Reagan and Graham and John Paul and Thatcher being placed on these facilities even though they played no such role? You would oppose their names, but support leaving Aycock’s name in place? Wow.

(BTW, David, Graham changed his policy during 1952, long before the the civil rights movement reached a full head of steam, and long before the resulting federal interventions took place. It was a very courageous thing to do at that particular moment. You can’t equate Graham with the guy who helped pass the Jim Crow laws into effect.)

T. Seabolt says:
February 15, 2013 at 6:53 PM
Alinsky Auditorium.....that has a ring to it!

dailypicnc says:
February 16, 2013 at 9:34 AM
Actually, that isn’t what I said. What I said was IF you are changing the name to ANY OTHER name, let’s delve into our own local history to find a name, not only appropriate, but LOCAL. Everyone knows Reagan, he’s probably got at least a hundred schools named after him and that’s wonderful, but when you have so many wonderful and unique individuals that have walked our streets, it would be a more fitting tribute to our local community.

Joe Guarino says:
February 16, 2013 at 10:41 AM
Tom, indeed it does. And I suppose it would be a better “fit” than the name of John Paul, unfortunately. It would probably be a better fit, both with Greensboro itself and with UNCG.

But the idea here is to introduce diversity. If we truly believe in the inherent value of diversity, then we need to start naming some things in our city and county after some orthodox Christians, some warriors against socialist authoritarianism, and some political conservatives.

Bob Grenier says:
February 16, 2013 at 7:00 PM
Here’s a question for Jacqui and Crafty: Did Aycock ever publically repent for his role as a segregationist? Did he ever apologize for behaving in a way that the two of you would find obnoxious?

On the other hand, when there’s a beloved “progressive” agenda item to be supported, like Publlick Edju cashun, any unflattering past history can be forgiven by those who love to claim the non-existent moral high ground.

We see a shining example of such in Craft’s and Hawkins’ response.

**Joe Guarino says:**  
February 16, 2013 at 10:44 PM  
Bob, what you say unfortunately appears to be true.

Picnc, there is no immutable rule that we must name facilities here on local individuals. And if we did that, we would just get more of the same cast. If we want true diversity, we might need to look outside of the local sphere.

**T. Seabolt says:**  
February 17, 2013 at 2:04 PM  
Dr. Guarino, thanks for picking up on my sarcasm in my last comment. I find it hard to believe that there isn’t a city building or landmark named after at least one of the sit in participants here in Greensboro. Just a thought....
Duke and UNC debate changing names of buildings that honor racists

Submitted by Cory Weinberg on May 5, 2014 - 3:00am

In the center of Tobacco Road, students are trying to wash away traces of racism and white supremacy on their campuses.

Students at University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill want to rename an academic building that is currently named after a Reconstruction-era Ku Klux Klan leader. Ten miles away, at Duke University, students want to strip the name off a residence hall named for a state governor who was a vocal white supremacist.

The proposals are getting attention from the colleges' top brass. The University of North Carolina Board of Trustees will hear the proposal this month to rename Saunders Hall, which houses the geography and religious studies departments. It was named in 1922 after alumnus, former trustee and local chief KKK organizer William Lawrence Saunders.

Duke’s administration is "reviewing" the potential renaming, spokesman Keith Lawrence said. The freshman residence hall was named in 1914 for former North Carolina governor Charles B. Aycock, who pushed for both expanded public education and segregation.
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“This is our role, to create this kind of discussion and make students look at their campus with fresh eyes so they can see things they didn’t see before,” said a UNC senior, Stéphanie Najjar. “We want to recover from historical amnesia.”

More than ever, colleges are getting in tune with the grimy parts of their roots. Which trustees were white supremacists? Which researchers propped up pro-slavery movements? How much of the college was funded by money made from slavery?

“People are paying more attention to the roles universities played in honoring white supremacists,” said Thomas D. Russell, a law professor at University of Denver who studied the issue at University of Texas at Austin. “I was a little bit dumbfounded by how legitimate suddenly this had become.”
With that question answered, another arises: What do you do about it?

There’s the eraser approach. After Russell’s research, the University of Texas renamed a residence hall [2] named for a Klansman who became a law professor. Vanderbilt University went to court in 2005 to try to rename Confederate Memorial Hall, which was gifted by the United Daughters of the Confederacy in the 1910s — but lost. [3]

Colleges can also say “Sorry.” Within the past decade, the University of Alabama at Tuscaloosa and the University of Virginia [4] apologized for their institutions’ connections to slavery.

They can also do what they do best and launch scholarly probes into the topic, as Brown University, Emory University and the College of William and Mary have done.

At Washington & Lee University, top administrators are considering whether to take action after law students called for civil disobedience if the college did not ban “neo-confederates” from marching on campus with Confederate flags, and take those flags down from a campus chapel. Those flags in Lee Chapel are “designed for historical and educational purposes,” President Ken Ruscio said in a statement.

North Carolina trustees will have their own script to follow. W. Lowry Caudill, chair of the Board of Trustees, wrote in a statement that they are listening to students’ concerns, but will abide by a “policy on renaming campus facilities.”

The standards [5] are hazy: While a building can be renamed if the honoree’s “reputation changes substantially so that the continued use of that name may compromise the public trust,” the policy also states that “namings should not be altered simply because later observers would have made different judgments.”

That’s the central question when colleges are considering the renaming of a building because of an ugly historical connection, said Terry Meyers, professor of English at the College of William and Mary who helps run an initiative that investigates the college’s past ties to slavery.

“Each generation has a right to commemorate or honor those people they think are significant. But how long does that right go on into the future as values change?” he said.

Not every scholar agrees. Alfred L. Brophy, a law professor at University of North Carolina School of Law, penned an apology [6] from University of Alabama professors to the descendants of slaves when he was a member of the faculty senate there a decade ago.

Now, he said, while it is vital for universities to explore their own histories, renaming buildings would hurt institutions’ abilities to remember those struggles. “That’s the moment we forgot that the evil past ever happened. It’s part of our past, it’s our legacy,” he said in an interview.

Still, he added: “The movement itself for renaming is part of the education process, so wherever we end up, it’s heightened people’s awareness.”

Students both at Duke and North Carolina are rallying around that idea. Najjar, the senior at North Carolina, said students are also asking that trustees hang a plaque explaining the history of Saunders Hall if it’s renamed. Duke students want similar signage on the Aycock dormitory.

“Our objective is to not have his name celebrated anymore,” Najjar said. “But we don’t want to just erase the name and forget it was called Saunders.”

Diversity [7]
This Duke dorm is no longer named after a white supremacist former governor

By Abby Phillip  June 17, 2014

Duke University is removing the name of white supremacist leader and former North Carolina governor Charles B. Aycock from an undergraduate dorm, which will now be known as East Residence Hall.

Aycock, who served as governor from 1901 to 1905, has had his name affixed to the building for more than 100 years. But that is coming to an end after the university’s Board of Trustees voted to revert the building to its original name, East Residence Hall, after petitions from the student body urged the school to re-evaluate the former governor’s legacy.

“Today, 50 years after the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and at the conclusion of a commemoration of integration at Duke, the values of inclusion and nondiscrimination are key parts of the university’s mission,” Duke President Richard H. Brodhead wrote in a letter to student body leaders Monday. “After careful consideration, we believe it is no longer appropriate to honor a figure who played so active a role in the history that countered those values.”

In the late 1890s, Aycock was a leading spokesman for the Democratic Party’s white supremacist activities in the state. He was a part of a campaign of fear and intimidation that sought to forcefully suppress the black vote and sow racial distrust.

According to an extensive News & Observer report on the rise of white supremacy in the state in the 1890s:

The white supremacy forces did not depend solely on newspapers, but also required a statewide campaign of stump speakers, torchlight parades and physical intimidation....

“The king of oratory, however, was Charles B. Aycock,” historian H. Leon Prather writes, “the Democratic Moses, who would lead North Carolina out of the chaos and darkness of ‘Negro domination.’ ” As he did throughout the campaign, Aycock mesmerized a standing-room only crowd at the Metropolitan House in Raleigh, pounding the podium for white supremacy and the protection of white womanhood.

In the state of North Carolina, there is also a high school named after Aycock, along with a monument in the state Capitol. An auditorium at UNC-Greensboro bears his name, and his words are engraved on the state education building.

A statue of Aycock also sits in the Statuary Hall collection at the U.S. Capitol. The overview of Aycock’s legacy on the Architect of the Capitol’s Web site completely overlooks the more unsavory — yet critical — aspects of his political career; it focuses instead on his role in expanding public education in the state.

How Aycock came to have a building named after him on the Duke campus appears to be something of a mystery. He was not a Duke graduate, nor was he personally involved in the university community, according to Brodhead’s letter. He didn’t donate money to have his name on the building, nor did anyone else on his behalf.
This Duke dorm is no longer named after a white supremacist former...
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Historical records are similarly vague, the Duke Chronicle notes:

The decision to name the building after Aycock is touched upon only briefly in the minutes of the Board of Trustees’ September 1912 meeting, and no explanation is given for the choice.

“The committee appointed for renaming the new buildings reported as follows: that the East Dormitory be named ‘Aycock Hall,’ in honor of ex-governor Charles Brantley Aycock,” the minutes read, as found in the University Archive.

Duke, of course, is not the only institution — nor is North Carolina the only state in the South — that’s still dealing with the legacy of racism in the not-so-distant past.

In 2010, the University of Texas weighed renaming a dormitory that took its name from a member of the Ku Klux Klan.

And in 2007, the Democratic Party of North Carolina faced protests from African American members who wanted the party to rename its annual Vance-Aycock fundraising dinner. Three years after the election of the country’s first African American president (and after President Obama won the state of North Carolina), the name finally changed.

Some North Carolinians have argued that changing the name of Aycock Residence Hall would be akin to removing references to slave-owning Founders from the history books. In a guest column published by the Durham News, a local resident wrote:

Should Stone Mountain be demolished for showcasing notable Civil War Confederacy members? Should we expurgate any mention of the Founding Fathers from our lives because some of them — most notably Thomas Jefferson — owned slaves? Certainly not — we must always be reminded of the past, lest we repeat its mistakes, and the good qualities of many men outweigh their bad qualities.

Acknowledging the difficulty of these debates, however, Duke’s president said the university would not simply scrub Aycock’s name from the dorm and pretend it was never there.

“In keeping with our educational role, an explanation of the history of the building’s name will be displayed in the lobby of the East Residence Hall,” Brodhead said.

Duke’s Black Student Association — which worked with the Duke Student Government to pass a resolution in support of renaming the dorm in January — praised the university’s decision on Twitter.

Duke BSA
@dukebsa

This enormous feat for the black community symbolizes Duke’s public stance against exclusion and discrimination.

#ByeByeAycock

10:49 PM - 16 Jun 2014
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Duke renames dorm after student leaders oppose name’s history

By: Emma Hinchliffe June 26, 2014 4:46 pm @emmahinchtwife

1.4k shares

Charles Aycock was the 50th governor of North Carolina, a lawyer and an advocate for public education.

He was also a leader of the white supremacy movement in the 1890s and architect of some of the nation’s first codified Jim Crow laws, disenfranchising black voters through a literacy test and poll tax.

The name of North Carolina’s “education governor,” however, graces buildings at public schools and universities throughout the state, including the University of North Carolina at Greensboro, the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill and, until recently, Duke University.

Last Monday, Duke, located in Durham, N.C., announced it
would change the name of Aycock Hall, a first-year dormitory, to East Residence Hall — the name the building bore before it was named for Aycock after his death in 1912.

The change is effective immediately, and a display in the building's lobby will explain the context behind it.

The change comes after a campaign by Duke students and a resolution passed unanimously by Duke Student Government in support of renaming the building, which drew the attention of Duke's administration, according to student activists.

**RELATED** 5 things you should never say to your professor

"The values of inclusion and nondiscrimination are key parts of the university's mission," Duke President Richard Brodhead wrote in a letter to student leaders involved in the campaign announcing the decision. "After careful consideration, we believe it is no longer appropriate to honor a figure who played so active a role in the history that countered those values."

Students at Duke have campaigned to remove Aycock's name from campus on and off for years. They are one part of a larger movement to re-evaluate the legacy of slavery and racism on university campuses.

At Washington and Lee University in Lexington, Va. — named for Robert E. Lee — a group of law students drew national attention in April for demanding the university remove Confederate flags from the school's Lee Chapel, ban Confederate re-enactors on Lee-Jackson Day and cancel classes on Martin Luther King Jr. Day.

At UNC-Chapel Hill, students are campaigning to rename Saunders Hall, named for William Saunders, a university trustee, North Carolina historian and "grand dragon" of the state's Ku Klux Klan. They have also campaigned to add a plaque to the school's Silent Sam statue of a Confederate soldier that acknowledges the statue's history as a monument to white supremacy. The university also has a building named after Aycock, a landmark UNC students are eventually looking to tackle.

Similar efforts have taken place at Vanderbilt University and the University of Texas at Austin in the past decade.
These campaigns emphasize the importance of legacies on campus and education about the truth behind them.

"Who gets to choose who gets to be remembered and who doesn’t? Who gets to choose whose voices are remembered and thought of in our legacy and on our campus?" says Omololu Babatunde, a rising senior at UNC-Chapel Hill and a member of the university's Real Silent Sam Coalition, which is behind the push to rename Saunders Hall.

**RELATED** This college course starts with 15 minutes of doing absolutely nothing

To students at Duke, renaming Aycock Hall represents a step forward. The campaign to rename the dorm coincided with the university's 50th anniversary of integration.

"For me, changing the name shows Duke is mindful of the uncomfortable past of North Carolina's history and how it still affects minorities, people of color, people of lower socioeconomic statuses today," says Adrienne Harreveld, a 2014 Duke graduate and member of the advocacy group Students for a Democratic Society. "By renaming the dorm, we're being more mindful of how ... this harmful history of segregation in the South still has lingering effects."

"It's calling attention to the history of our beautiful and divided and deeply damaged state of North Carolina so we can understand what needs to be done for the future," adds Prashanth Kamalakanthan, a 2014 Duke graduate and former chair of Students for a Democratic Society.

Students for a Democratic Society led the Aycock campaign along with Duke's Black Student Alliance, NAACP chapter and LGBTQ group Blue Devils United.

According to Harreveld and Kamalakanthan, campus response to the campaign has been generally positive. Mike Schoenfeld, Duke's vice president for public affairs and government relations, also said that feedback from students and alumni has been positive, with nearly no negative response.

"Changing the name makes a lot of sense due to the fact that Aycock was not closely associated with Duke and because of his involvement with supremacist movements. However, the decision to place an educational plaque by the
entranceway was important because it emphasized the importance of standing by your history," says Grant Kelly, a rising junior at Duke. "Since about 10% of Duke students are from North Carolina, I think that many of my classmates only knew who Aycock was because of student activism. The plaque will allow students to learn about Duke's history without honoring anybody associated with racism."

Renaming Aycock Hall at Duke, however, was more of a straightforward decision than similar campaigns elsewhere might find. Aycock had no direct connection to Duke — he did not attend the university, nor did he donate money to it, and it is unclear why the building was named for him at all. He did, however, attend UNC, as did Saunders, the KKK grand dragon.

Additionally, as a public university, UNC faces more scrutiny when renaming a building than a private university like Duke. UNC has a clear policy on renaming buildings, which includes the caveat that "namings should not be altered simply because later observers would have made different judgments."

RELATED ALERT: Squirrels are taking over college campuses

UNC students involved in the campaign to rename Saunders Hall made a presentation to the school's board of trustees in May to make their case to rename the building. The board has not yet announced a decision, according to a statement from the board's chair, Lowry Caudill, sent via UNC News Services, the school's office of communications.

The campaign at Washington & Lee is also awaiting a final verdict, with the university still investigating ways to remove Confederate flags from the chapel — a historic landmark — and committees set to release findings on Martin Luther King Jr. Day and the school's ties to slavery, according to Dominik Taylor, a 2014 Washington & Lee law school graduate, who led the campaign.

"We're continuing to meet with administrators. They seem willing to work with us now and there's a continued dialogue with them," Taylor says.

Students are hopeful that progress at Duke will influence other universities' decisions.
"I'm hoping Duke's success can really pressure the administration to see other institutions taking this quote-unquote progressive stance and pressure them to also make those moves," Babatunde says.

To students leading these efforts, the decision reaffirms that success is within reach.

"When you put concrete on something, you feel like you can't really contest those names," Babatunde says. "But you can take down something that's been put up in cement, and you can question these truths that have been written down in time."

Emma Hinchliffe is a rising senior at Georgetown University
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Preserving the monuments of a controversial past

Jul. 08, 2014 @ 08:11 AM
By D.G. Martin, guest columnist

"You see him and ask: 'Why is the statue still here? What was it he actually stood for?' This is the kind of debate that a public work of art makes possible. We won't change the way people think just by getting rid of a monument."

The mayor of one of Mecklenburg's largest municipalities is defending the refusal to remove a statue of a hero of another era, but one who today offends many residents.

This raises again the question of what to do about the statues, building names, and nicknames and mascots of sports teams that offend and demean groups of our people.

For example, how should we have responded when students at the University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill this spring demanded a name change for the building known as Saunders Hall, because William C. Saunders had been the leader of the North Carolina Ku Klux Klan after the Civil War? Or when students suggested that the "Silent Sam" statue in the center of the old campus should come down...
because it glorifies the institution of slavery that the soldier fought to preserve? Or when some American Indians, now backed by the United States government, insisted that the Washington Redskins change its name to something other than a derogatory term for an important American ethnic group? Or when a group of African-American law students at Washington and Lee University demanded that their school apologize for the racism of the iconic general who gave his name to their university, because of his actions in support of slavery?

When these things happen, many of us respond like the Mecklenburg mayor, who says that you can change street names and tear down monuments, but the history remains. The mayor acknowledges that the old society represented by the statue ‘is not good. But that legacy is something all sides can learn to deal with without revising history.”

In North Carolina, if we decide to remove the reminders of every representative of our racist past, we will have a lot of work to do. Most prominent white North Carolinians a hundred years ago would, by today’s standards, be judged racist.

For instance, Gov. Charles B. Aycock was once so much a hero to North Carolina’s progressives that Terry Sanford displayed his picture in his office when he was governor. Last month, Duke University, which Sanford led from 1969 to 1985, removed Aycock’s name from a campus building.

Even the sainted Robert E. Lee is not exempt. According to The Roanoke Times, the Washington and Lee law school students insist, “The time has come for us, as students, to ask that the university hold itself responsible for its past and present dishonorable conduct and for the racist and dishonorable conduct of Robert E. Lee.”

Back to the Mecklenburg mayor and her battle to preserve the monuments to the past, even if the past is discredited. Her name is Angelika Gramkow. She is not the mayor of a North Carolina city or town. She is the mayor of Schwerin, the capital of the German region that gave our Mecklenburg its name.

Until 25 years ago, the German Mecklenburg was a part of East Germany. The controversial statue that the mayor is fighting to preserve is a 13-foot-tall bronze depiction of Vladimir Lenin. Lenin was the leader of the Russian Revolution, as much an icon of the Communist movement as General Lee was to the Confederacy.

If you agree with the mayor that this historical monument should be preserved you should know that she is probably fighting a losing battle with other Mecklenburgers who do not want to keep a
monument to the painful and oppressive Communist past that the Lenin statue represents.

So, if you want to see that statue of Lenin in German Mecklenburg, you had better hurry.

D.G. Martin hosts “North Carolina Bookwatch,” which airs Sundays at noon and Thursdays at 5 p.m. on UNC-TV. Preview the upcoming program on UNC-MX digital channel (Time Warner #1276) on Fridays at 9 p.m. Next week’s (Sunday, July 17) guest is Philip Gerard, author of “Down the Wild Cape Fear: A River Journey through the Heart of North Carolina.” To view prior programs: http://video.unctv.org/program/nc-bookwatch/episodes/. For upcoming programs: www.unctv.org/ncbookwatch
Opinions divided on Aycock issue | The Daily Reflector
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By Jane Dail
January 28, 2015

Several dozen staff, faculty, alumni and students spoke at the second of two forums on the possibility of renaming a residence hall on campus, with participants split on their opinions about retaining the name or changing it.

More than 130 people filled up the auditorium at the East Carolina Heart on Tuesday to express their thoughts to ECU officials or listen to others speak about Aycock Residence Hall, named after former governor Charles B. Aycock.

Story continues below advertisement.

Aycock was known as the "Education Governor" but also was a white supremacist who disenfranchised black voters.

Moderators extended the forum by about 30 minutes to accommodate those who wished to speak about the issue.

The board of trustees will vote on the issue at its next meeting on Feb. 20.

Lynn Ceverly, an alumna of ECU and an employee with student affairs, said the university is an institute of higher learning that should act on knowledge.

"In my life, I've learned you either change, grow and evolve or you stagnate, rot and die," Ceverly said.

She said concerns with other buildings on campus possibly facing renaming are invalid because others were part of the "ECU family" but Aycock was not.

"In my opinion, he doesn't get that pass," she said.

Rudy Alexander, an alum and retired vice chancellor, said Aycock was a man of his time.

"I have no love for him, but I don't believe in rewriting history," Alexander said. "It's a part of our history. To me, to start changing the names of buildings is tampering with history, and I think it's wrong. I think it will create problems."

Alexander said Joyner Library was named after someone who headed up public education in the state in the early 1900s, which was deplorable for blacks.

He said several others who are distinguished and have namesakes on campus did not support integration.

"They can be blamed some, too," he said. "Where does it all end? ... If we move along this way, we are really treading on grounds we should not."

Some members of the audience suggested having detailed exhibits somewhere prominent on campus about Aycock's history while keeping the name.

Julie Rose, a staff member at ECU, said losing the knowledge of what he did could be harmful, but she would like to see a more complete history and more information about what he did at the residence hall.

"He was an educator, he was a governor, but he was also a racist," she said. "Put it up there."

David Stevens, a former professor and former university attorney, said trustees decided to
dedicate the building to Aycock in the 1960s because of what he did for education in the state. He said changing the building name would be emphasizing his bad attributes and not the good he did in his time in public service.

"This insanity can go on and on and on, and at some point we've got to stand up and say history is history, and we don't change history," Stevens said.

Elizabeth Aycock Krewson, a doctoral candidate at ECU, said she is relative of Aycock. She said Aycock had an effect on ECU because he allocated funds to create a teaching college in Greenville.

"Just consider everything he has done," she said.

ECU historian and history professor John Tucker said Aycock was outspoken against lynching and had respect from black leaders, including Charles Montgomery Eppes.

Eppes was a black school administrator and has a cultural center and middle school in Greenville named after him.

"Aycock was not perfect, but he had respect in the African-American community," Tucker said. "Aycock stood for a lot that we stand for today. When we disassociate ourselves with him, we disassociate ourselves by extension to those same values."

ECU English professor David Wilson said the university still can celebrate the ideals of Aycock even after removing the name from the residence hall.

"I don’t think taking Aycock’s name off a building means that we drown every good idea he had, that we’re somehow taking a step back from universal education," Wilson said. "The good things Governor Aycock did will survive, too, with or without his name on them."

Wilson said the trustees can delay the renaming, but it will happen eventually.

ECU student Sheree-Ah Graves suggested changing the name and also having a plaque on the building explaining Aycock’s history and the reasoning behind the decision.

"We don’t want to remove Aycock from history," Graves said. "We’re not trying to disrespect him in any form or way. We’re not trying to discredit anything he did, but at the same time we are moving forward with that. That means making changes for the betterment of the students and of the community."

Associate history professor David Denard said keeping the name would be marching backward, and removing it would mean improving the future.

He said Aycock was not simply a man of his time but an activist supporting segregation, white supremacy and disenfranchising blacks.

"You can choose to keep the name up," Denard said. "In my view and the views of students who spoke yesterday, you’ll trivialize what you say when you say 'Tomorrow Starts Here.'"

"You will trivialize your efforts to promote diversity. You’ll trivialize your position as a leadership university," Denard said.

Lauren Piner, an alumna and history teacher in Pitt County, said she is glad people are taking an interest in their history, which is something she tries to do for her students every day. She encouraged the trustees to look at every side of the issue.

"History is ugly; I tell my students that every day," Piner said. "But we can’t clean it up. We simply have to learn from what has happened and agree that we will never let it happen again."
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ECU to remove former Gov. Charles B. Aycock's name from dorm

BY JANE STANCILL - JSTANCILL@NEWSOBSERVER.COM
02/20/2015 2:47 PM | Updated: 02/20/2015 3:11 PM

East Carolina University trustees voted Friday to remove from a campus dormitory the name of former Gov. Charles B. Aycock, who espoused white supremacist views.

But the name Aycock will be preserved in a soon-to-be designated location in another campus building, where founders and other university supporters will be recognized. That space will be known as "Heritage Hall," and it will include facts about Aycock's contradictory history.

After Friday's meeting, the trustee board released a statement: "We believe that Aycock's legacy to education will be better served represented in the overall history of ECU in Heritage Hall ... In this place, Aycock and others can be recognized with an appropriate explanation of his or her contribution and connection to the university's history."

The statement said work would begin immediately on a timeline for the transition of the Aycock name, but it was unclear exactly when that would happen.

Trustee Chairman Robert Brinkley said it made sense for ECU, as an institution of higher learning, to educate people about Aycock more fully in a historical context.

"We definitely were not intending at all to try to erase or sanitize his name," Brinkley said. "That name is important to us, and his legacy is important to us, and we think that's a good way to do that."

Student discussions

Student forums about the Aycock name were held in the past few months and attended by trustees. The Black Student Union and other student groups at ECU advocated for the name change and dubbed this week as "Judgment Week."

Tyree' Barnes, 23, a senior from Weldon, attended the vote Friday. He said the moment was surreal
and historic, and it hadn't sunk in for him yet. He applauded the trustees.

"It sets a precedent for what we truly stand for, which is leadership, which is service," Barnes said. "It proves that from the very top, we want to set the bar high, where there is empathy on our campus. It is a human issue that is affecting our students, no matter what race. They wanted to do something about it. They wanted to really deal with the issue and resolve it for us all."

The unanimous vote Friday capped a debate that lasted months at ECU. The conversation has played out elsewhere over the name of Aycock, who was known as the state's first "education governor."

The state Democratic party ditched the name Vance-Aycock for its fall dinner in 2011, now calling it the Western Gala. Last year, Duke University removed the former governor's name from a dormitory following pressure from student government. Two other public campuses – UNC Greensboro and UNC-Chapel Hill – also have Aycock buildings and may reconsider. Public schools around North Carolina are also named for Aycock.

Contentious debate

Aycock was governor from 1901 to 1905 and established 1,100 schools and nearly 900 libraries around the state. He also worked with the legislature to pass laws that disenfranchised black voters. He was prominent in the Democratic Party’s white supremacy campaigns of 1898 and 1900.

ECU Chancellor Steve Ballard and an internal committee had recommended removal of the Aycock name from the residence hall, saying it hurt the university’s mission to serve a diverse population. Students of color make up 22 percent of ECU’s student body.

But the debate among trustees was contentious. They could not reach agreement during a lengthy meeting in December.

Friday's vote represented a compromise of sorts. There won't be a building at ECU named for Aycock, but the former governor's contributions and history will be represented at a place on campus.

A motion at Friday's meeting said in part that the new location "will be the place for which all members of the Pirate Family can make their own value judgments of any person recognized in Heritage Hall."

Campus opinion varied, Barnes said, and while the issue united and divided students, it became a topic of widespread discussion. Messages had spread on social media sites, and everyone, it seemed knew who Charles Aycock was leading up to Friday's trustee vote.

Afterward, Barnes said: "I officially say that I'm proud to be a Pirate. Officially."

Colleges Ponder Their Options When Racism Is Set in Stone

By MADELINE WILL

EARLY THIS MONTH, a group of about 15 students, most of whom were black, gathered in front of Saunders Hall, one of many iconic brick buildings on the campus of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

Then the students hung nooses around their necks and held up signs: “This is what Saunders would do to me.”

Born in 1835, William L. Saunders graduated from the university in 1854 and was a historian of the state and a member of the university’s Board of Trustees. He was also a Confederate colonel and then a chief organizer of the Ku Klux Klan in North Carolina.

“It’s those last, troubling details that have spurred a student movement seeking, among other things, to rename Saunders Hall.

“No so much am I frustrated at Saunders and his hate and his legacy of violence,” said Omololu R. Babatunde, a senior. “I’m really frustrated at the university who allowed this building to stand so long. It makes me feel like we’re foreigners in a space where don’t belong.”

Such a sentiment would give new life to college administrators. At Chapel Hill, concerns over the name have prompted a review by the trustees, who have been gathering research and opinions for months.

That review won’t stop at Saunders Hall, said Charles G. Duckett, one trustee. Other campus buildings and monuments, too, are named after now-controversial historical figures or honor the Confederate era.

“How do we address the history of the university and its ties, good and bad, to various people?” Mr. Duckett asked. “We’re seeking a comprehensive solution. How do you define where you would and would not take a name down?”

As Chapel Hill grapples with striking a balance between history and sensitivity to students, similar debates are unfolding universities across the country, particularly in the South.

**TAKING THE CHALLENGE OUT**

In 1984, as a response to the U.S. Supreme Court’s decision in Brown v. Board of Education, the University of Texas at Austin named a dormitory after William S. Simmons, an active Klansman, who had taught law at Austin for 30 years. For nearly five decades the name stood, until Thomas D. Russell, a professor of law at the University of Denver, wrote a research paper about Simms and the university. That paper, published in 2010, sparked a national conversation. Later that year, the University of Texas renamed the dormitory.

Now, Mr. Russell said, more universities are aware of their racial histories and are debating how best to make amends.

Changing the name of a building is one way to acknowledge a troubled past. But administrators find it’s not as simple as that.

founders, who was also a virulent white supremacist. Some students and faculty members have called for the university to rename the building.

But these calls have met with a backlash. An online petition called “Save Tillman Hall,” which seeks to maintain the current name, has gathered more than 6,000 signatures in less than a month. A university spokesperson said Clemson is not considering any proposal to change the name.

The University of Mississippi has been examining its own connection to slavery. Recently, among other reforms, it renamed a campus street, Confederate Drive, as Chapel Lane.

Donald R. Cole, assistant to the chancellor for multicultural affairs, said that there was some external backlash to the change, but that students and faculty members were mostly supportive. Educating people in the state about the university’s racial legacy and its lasting effects has been key to making changes, he said.

The university, he said, also had to decide what to do with the campus’s Confederate Statue and Vardaman Hall, named for James K. Vardaman, a former governor who advocated white supremacy. The university did not rename any buildings, but it plans to provide “appropriate historical context,” in the form of plaques, alongside the structures.

“Slowly but surely, we’re beginning to dismantle the symbols associated with slavery in our institution,” he said. “If we could, we would give a blanket command to do so throughout, but we recognize that the opposition would probably not allow us to do that.”

**ONE MAN, FOUR CAMPUSES**

Last year, Duke University renamed Aycock Hall, a dormitory that had been named after a former governor of North Carolina, Charles B. Aycock. He was known as the “education governor” for his support of public schools, but he also held white-supremacist views and supported disenfranchising African-Americans.

Michael J. Schoenfeld, a university spokesperson, said the decision had been made for several reasons. For one, the building’s name predates Duke itself; the dormitory was built when Duke was still Trinity College. For another, Aycock didn’t have a direct connection to either Trinity or Duke.

“We believe that it is no longer appropriate to honor a figure who played so active a role in the history that countered the university’s values of inclusion and nondiscrimination,” wrote Richard H. Brodhead, the university’s president, in a letter to students who had championed renaming the building.

Charles Aycock’s mark, however, was also left on campus buildings at East Carolina University and at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro and at Chapel Hill.

Some students at Chapel Hill have called for the university’s own Aycock Residence Hall to be renamed. The trustees will provide an update on the progress of their review at their next meeting, in late March, and the board’s final report could mention that building.

Trustees at East Carolina are to decide this month whether to rename the university’s Aycock Residence Hall. And Greensboro administrators recently formed a committee to examine a possible name change for Aycock Auditorium.

Charles C. Bolot, a history professor and co-chairman of the Greensboro committee, said campus administrators hadn’t received any specific complaints about the name but wanted to deal with the issue pre-emptively.

**MONASH University**
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ECU trustees do right thing by removing name from dorm

JIM JENKINS - JJENKINS@NEWSOBSERVER.COM
03/05/2015 6:56 AM | Updated: 03/05/2015 7:01 AM

News item: The trustees of East Carolina University, after months of discussion and contention, voted unanimously to remove the name of Charles Brantley Aycock, governor of North Carolina from 1901-1905, from a dormitory on campus. The decision came because Aycock, long heralded as the state’s first “education governor,” also happened to be a white supremacist, and a well-documented one.

Naysayers might contend the action was prompted by “political correctness,” a decision made under pressure from a black student group and other students on campus. The line of logic from opponents, when other such decisions have been made elsewhere, goes that this amounts to rewriting history made in the context of different times. Aycock, it could be said (continuing this line of logic) was a man typical of the post-Reconstruction era whose views likely were shared by most North Carolinians of that time.

And he did good things, right? A school a day was built during his four years as governor. He made the case for investment in public education.

That part is true. But Aycock’s white supremacist views infected his view of education as well.

Here is what he said at a Greensboro meeting of the Democratic Party in 1904: “Let us cast away all fear of rivalry with the negro, all apprehension that he shall ever overtake us in the race of life. We are the thoroughbreds and should have no fear of winning the race against commoner stock. An effort to reduce their public schools would send thousands of them away from us. In this hour, when our industrial development demands more labor and not less, it becomes of the utmost importance that we shall make no mistake in dealing with that race which does a very large part of the work, of actual hard labor in the State.”

In other words, black people should be educated (which, granted, many whites didn’t believe at the
time). But it was because their “commoner stock” was needed to do hard labor.

Moderate for the times? Maybe. But Aycock earlier had allegedly been involved in the growing movement of white supremacist Democrats trying to overcome the Republican tide during Reconstruction.

Aycock, a lawyer and teacher, was governor at the dawn of the 20th century, from 1901-1905. And yes, apparently he had the credentials as a public education advocate. That’s why college dormitories all over the state have been named for him, why he has a statue on the Capitol grounds and why a few schools bear his name as well.

But Aycock’s election in a way represented a triumph of white supremacy and some historians believe was the dawn of Jim Crow segregation that lasted for more than 60 years.

The surprise over the controversy around Aycock isn’t that it happened, but that it’s taken so long to happen.

The state Democratic Party, after all, changed the name of its fall dinner from Vance-Aycock to Western Gala in 2011, and Duke University took his name off of a dorm, something UNC-Chapel Hill and UNC Greensboro are likely to consider in the near future.

It’s the right thing to do.

The action at ECU recognizes that those whose names are carved into history, literally, need to stand the test of the ages in terms of lasting contributions to humankind. All of humankind. In the scope of this state’s history, not many people stand that test, which is why naming buildings or highways for people is likely something that needs to be done more sparingly, and in some cases, not all, long after a person has passed on.

North Carolina and other southern states have long lionized the fallen of the Confederacy in concrete and bronze. Those monuments are justified by defenders as part of history, but those who criticize them see them as things built to glorify a cause that is undeniably linked to the preservation of slavery.

This great-great grandson of a Confederate corporal killed at Gettysburg would be satisfied with a periodic, balanced forum looking at both sides in the Lost Cause at the Museum of History. But that would be enough.

And so it will be enough for Charles B. Aycock to remembered, not glorified, in another campus building in an exhibit where his legacy, good and ill, can be explained for those who want to know more.
It's fine to respect those who came before us, but we need to respect those around us and those who will come after us, and who could blame minority students for not wanting to set foot in a building named for someone, anyone, who denied their ancestors simple humane and legal rights? To feel so isn't "political correctness." It's enlightened common sense and fairness.

Deputy editorial page editor Jim Jenkins can be reached at 919-829-4513 or at jjenkins@newsobserver.com
Aycock name removal is ‘de-Stalinization’ in NC

By Rob Christensen - rchristensen@newsobserver.com
03/07/2015 4:00 PM | Updated: 03/08/2015 9:05 AM

Gov. Charles Brantley Aycock was a hero and role model to many of the progressive leaders in North Carolina’s history.


Aycock’s words are set in stone on the outside wall of the Department of Education Building on the State Government Mall. His statue is on the Capitol grounds and represents the state in the U.S. Capitol. His birthplace in Wayne County is a state historical site.

Aycock, who was governor from 1901 to 1905, was venerated by generations of North Carolinians because he led a crusade to improve the state’s public schools at a time when the Tar Heel State had one of the worst school systems and the highest illiteracy rates in the country.

But Aycock, who died in 1912 of a heart attack while delivering an education speech in Alabama, is in the process of being made a non-person. If this were the Soviet Union, it would be called de-Stalinization.

His name was stripped from an annual Democratic fundraising dinner in Asheville started by Sanford. In recent days, the East Carolina University board of trustees voted to take his name off a dormitory at the Greenville campus. So did Duke University, and UNC Greensboro is taking a close look at Aycock Auditorium.

The effort is being led by African-Americans, and there is no mystery as to why they find Aycock offensive. Aycock was a leading spokesman for the white supremacy campaigns of 1898 and 1900 that led to the Democrats taking control of the state, the disenfranchisement of most black voters...
and the implementation of Jim Crow laws.

Aycock was a racist who believed in white supremacy, and there are plenty of quotations to back up those views.

But, then, it is the same for President Abraham Lincoln, who freed the slaves. There lies the rub. Lincoln may have signed the Emancipation Proclamation, but he did not believe in complete racial equality, and he talked about sending the freed slaves to Liberia, Haiti or Central America.

"Whether Lincoln ever went beyond being an anti-slavery white supremacist is a question that is difficult to resolve," wrote historian George Frederickson.

Why stop at supremacy?

That is the problem with judging men in 2015 who lived in the age of the horse and buggy. It is not that their views should be excused, but they should be understood in the context of their times.

Aycock lived in a racist era. There was not only segregation in the South, but blacks faced widespread prejudice in the North. It was an age of Rudyard Kipling colonialism, where white Europeans thought it was the natural order of things to rule over people of color all over the world – whether they be in Africa, the Middle East or Asia.

During the Aycock age, the U.S. engaged in a brutal war to put down an armed Philippine independence movement that resulted in anywhere from 34,000 deaths (U.S. estimate) to 220,000 deaths (the Filipino estimate.) It is a war few Americans even remember today.

If we are to remove honors accorded long-dead white supremacists, what about slaveholders? Surely those who believed in and practiced slavery were at least as objectionable as those who believed in white supremacy.

Four of our first five presidents were slaveholders, including George Washington and Thomas Jefferson.

Twelve presidents were slaveholders, including the three claimed by North Carolina who are honored with a statue on the state Capitol grounds.

Why stop at just the racial wrongs done to African-Americans? Think of the Japanese-Americans locked up in detention camps during World War II with the blessing of President Franklin Roosevelt. Should schools or buildings named after Roosevelt also be re-evaluated?

Or how about women? Before 1920, women were not allowed to vote. Most of the pre-1920 political leaders were, in different ways, obviously complicit in this decision. Should the sexist politicians of yesteryear be punished?
If we start down this road, many of the buildings on college campuses will have to undergo a political cleansing.

It is hard for us to understand the politics of 1898 and 1900, which is just the point. While we should learn from the past, we should not try to erase it.

Christensen: 919-829-4532 or rchristensen@newsobserver.com
Gov. Aycock and the tug-of-war over NC history

Neither those who wish to rename buildings nor those who wish to leave these monuments present an ideal solution. What would be best is to erect plaques explaining Aycock's legacy.

BY TIM TYSON -
03/13/2015 3:04 PM | Updated: 03/13/2015 10:39 PM
During World War II, Josephus Daniels, 80-year-old scion of The News & Observer, shared a profound memory of Gov. Charles B. Aycock, our original “education governor.” "When Governor Aycock was elected ... and we adopted the Grandfather Clause,” which effectively disfranchised black citizens, Daniels wrote to a friend, “I said to him that I was very glad that we had settled the Negro question for all times.”

Aycock’s response haunted Daniels. “Joe, you are badly mistaken,” Daniels recalled the governor telling him. “I hope we have settled it for 25 years. Every generation will have the problem on their hands, and they will have to settle it for themselves.”

Aycock was right. Today, a new generation wrestles with the legacy of white supremacy. Students at East Carolina University, Duke, UNC-Chapel Hill and UNC at Greensboro, among others, are agitating with mixed success to rename campus buildings named for Aycock. These public monuments, protesters believe, honor the dishonorable and present a sugarcoated history of North Carolina that obscures its complex past. Their adversaries accuse them of wanting to obliterare North Carolina’s history. Beneath their differences over Aycock’s legacy lies a battle for the soul of our state and a tug-of-war over the meaning of history.

Aycock and Daniels first joined forces to fight the interracial “Fusion Movement” of the 1890s. In 1894 and 1896, Fusionists, campaigning on free public schools for all children and equal political rights for all men, swept the North Carolina legislature and won the governorship. Their imperfect interracial alliance, which persuaded many whites to put their pocketbooks above their prejudices, could not be beaten at the polls.

**Worse still for conservatives, the new Fusion legislature** substantially increased spending on public education. For some whites, black citizenship itself – let alone raising taxes to educate the poor – justified any level of resistance. Fueled by Daniels’ newspaper and Aycock’s oratory, the “white supremacy campaigns” overthrew North Carolina’s government by terrorism, fraud and demagogy. In Wilmington, which Aycock called “the storm center of the White Supremacy movement,” business leaders in 1898 organized mass slaughter in the streets and armed coup d’état in the courthouse. In 1900, the white supremacy movement elected Aycock governor and stripped the vote from black North Carolinians using literacy tests with the so-called “grandfather clause,” which exempted all voters whose grandfathers had been eligible to vote. African-American grandfathers, of course, had been slaves, not citizens. Conservatives created a one-party state under what Daniels called “permanent good government by the party of the White Man.” They built the social order of segregation, which prevailed until the civil rights movement toppled it in the 1960s.

After white conservatives seized power, Aycock shifted from firebrand to paternalist, parting with hard-line conservatives, and consolidated the white supremacy revolution by making public schools
Gov. Aycock and the tug-of-war over NC history | News and Observ... http://www.newsobserver.com/opinion/op-ed/article14060240.html

his signature cause. His hard-liners favored defunding black schools altogether; Aycock refused. Though the Fusionists had spent similar amounts on black and white children, Aycock allocated three times more on each white child than on each black child. For Aycock, becoming the “education governor” was a blend of white supremacy with racial paternalism – in addition to becoming the icon of North Carolina progressivism.

The problem with this history is that it is not simple. Some Democrats identify with Aycock’s educational legacy but refuse to acknowledge his leadership in the white supremacy movement. Others dismiss the contradictions by insisting that he was simply “a man of his times.” Of course, the Fusionists were also men of their times, and Aycock was instrumental in stripping them of their rights to vote and disfranchising African-Americans for decades to come. “Everywhere and all the time we have fought for white supremacy,” he declared. Even so, his contribution to public education cannot be denied.

Neither those who wish to rename the buildings nor those who wish to leave these monuments present an ideal solution. Those who honor Aycock have done more to scrub North Carolina history clean than anyone else. The historic site at the Aycock birthplace makes no mention of the white supremacy campaigns. The North Carolina history textbook my son’s Chapel Hill class used says nothing, too, though Aycock gets extensive coverage. Buildings are silent; one is left to assume that the namesake must have been a commendable figure.

What would be best is not the renaming of the buildings but the erection of plaques explaining Aycock’s legacy. We need to remember that we have been the sort of people who name buildings after white supremacist revolutionaries – and education leaders. Explanatory plaques could help us see our history in its full complexity.

But if the only choice is to silently honor Aycock, I side with students who wish to rename the building. It is an affront to our best selves that the Capitol holds no statue of the African-Americans who helped write our Constitution or end the system of legal segregation. Names like Abraham Galloway, Bishop J.W. Hood, Ella Baker or Floyd McKissick grace no university halls.

That our young people care about these things is a tribute to education itself. We should listen to them with respect, regardless of how we resolve the questions. For Aycock was right: Every generation has to wrestle with the issue of race and settle it for themselves. Whatever answers we choose, they should enlarge our understandings of the complexities of our history – all of our history.

Dr. Timothy B. Tyson, Ph.D., is a senior research scholar for the Center for Documentary Studies at Duke University.
Aycock Ad Hoc Committee

Feedback

Your feedback will assist the Aycock Ad Hoc Committee in their recommendation to remove the Aycock name, maintain the Aycock name, or make modifications to the Aycock name. Please review the information found on this comprehensive website before providing informed responses via this feedback form.

Please tell us how you are affiliated with UNCG. Select all that apply.

☐ Administration
☐ Alumna/us
☐ Community Partner
☐ Donor
☐ Faculty
☐ Friend
☐ Parent
☐ Staff
☐ Student
☐ Other (please specify)

Considering the information provided on this website, do you believe that UNCG should remove Governor Aycock’s name from Aycock Auditorium?

☐ Yes
☐ No

Why?

Should UNCG acknowledge the controversy surrounding Governor Aycock?

☐ Yes
☐ No

How?
Please provide any additional feedback you would like the committee to consider.

Submit