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Abstract

Universities across the country have been forced to confront how they remember and memorialize the past on their campuses as students and community members protest building names and statues. This qualitative case study used Bolman and Deal’s four-frame theory as a framework to understand the response to protests at one school, the University of North Carolina- Chapel Hill. The four-frames provided insight into the complexities surrounding the changing of the name of Saunders Hall to Carolina Hall and the controversy surrounding the Confederate Monument known as Silent Sam. The symbolic frame was most evident in the conflicting meaning of symbols. The political frame was impacted by the formation of coalitions. Protestors were able to work outside of the structural frame while decision-makers were constrained by the structures of policies and laws. The misalignment of protestors’ needs and the organization’s needs was evident in the human resources frame.
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Chapter I

Introduction

On August 12, 2017, the city of Charlottesville, VA, erupted into violence. The planned removal of a Confederate statue from a city park sparked a protest from white supremacists and a counter-protest to oppose them. At the end of the weekend, there were three dead and 33 injured (Danner, 2017). While there have been protests regarding Confederate symbols across the country and on many university campuses before the events in Charlottesville, the deadly conflict in Virginia brought the debate into sharp focus.

Universities have been and are now increasingly pressured through student protests, alumni demands, or donor threats to either keep memorials or remove them, and universities have offered conflicting responses. Some universities have changed building names or removed memorials in deference to requests, such as Vanderbilt University, which in 2016 returned a gift of $1.2 million to the Daughters of the Confederacy in order to change a building name (Sandoval, 2016). Some universities have kept controversial names or statues in an effort to remember history in order to learn from it or because they are restrained by state law, such as Clemson University refusing to rename Benjamin
T. Tillman Hall, named for former South Carolina senator, governor, and white supremacist, after student protests and a resolution passed by the faculty senate (Cary, 2015).

Still other universities have attempted to find a compromise that tries to remember the past without celebrating it, such as the University of Mississippi which changed the name of one building named after a white supremacist, and placed signs acknowledging slave labor in an effort to add context (Ganucheau, 2017).

But why have university responses been so varied? What causes some universities to change building names, even at substantial financial cost, while others oppose requests made by students and faculty? Is it the particular history of the university? The mindset of the decision makers? The pressure from outside sources, such as alumni or donors? The methods used by protestors? The university’s culture and values? The particular interpretation of the symbols by all those involved? This study will attempt to address these questions.

**Symbols on College Campuses**

Why are these symbols so important and evoke such strong reactions? Symbols make people feel like they belong. They designate a particular group of which one is a part. When one sees someone with the same bumper sticker, there is a flash of recognition of similar passion, an understanding that they are part of the same tribe. When two people wearing the same sports team paraphernalia meet, they automatically have something in common and a place to start the conversation. The school mascot gives every student something
familiar—we are all Gamecocks! And for years to come, seeing the color garnet or a drawing of Cocky will bring back those feelings of being part of a larger whole. However, if symbols make a statement about who belongs, they also make a statement about who does not. Bolman and Deal (2003) explain the importance of symbols to an organization’s culture: “Symbols embody and express an organization’s culture: the interwoven patterns of beliefs, values, practices, and artifacts that defines for members who they are and how they are to do things” (p. 243). Memorials and the names of buildings on university campuses are symbols. They make a statement about who belongs and who does not.

Confederate monuments and buildings named after Confederate soldiers and politicians are examples of these divisive symbols. The Southern Poverty Law Center’s survey of Confederate building names and memorials found that there are 1,190 building names and memorials in cities and communities across the country. The timing of when these memorials were dedicated is indicative of their purpose of inclusion and exclusion: “There were two major periods in which the dedication of Confederate monuments and other symbols spiked—the first two decades of the 20th century [when the Jim Crow laws were enacted] and during the civil rights movement” (Whose Heritage?, n.d.).

Universities across the country, and across the world, are struggling with these divisive symbols. Schools with mission statements and values of inclusivity and diversity also have buildings named after Confederate politicians and memorials to the Old South on their campuses. For example, the University of
North Carolina, Chapel Hill (UNC-Chapel Hill) has a stated commitment to create a community where all feel welcome (*University Commitment to Diversity & Inclusion* | *University Office for Diversity and Inclusion*, n.d.). Concurrently, the campus also memorialized soldiers of the Confederacy on campus with the Confederate Monument, known commonly as Silent Sam, and, until recently, they had a campus building, Saunders Hall, named for a prominent member of the Ku Klux Klan.

Strange and Banning (2001) explain how important the environment is in making students feel included at a university:

> Creating a sense of welcome on campus for all students is where inclusion begins. Absent a basic feeling that one belongs at an institution or that one’s identity or characteristics pose significant personal risk in the setting, the prospects of individual success are limited. Students who do not feel included and who encounter inordinate levels of risk tend to check out first psychologically and then physically; in short, they are much more likely to leave an institution where, for a variety of reasons, success seems beyond their reach. Factors that influence this decision are related to the physical designs of campuses, the aggregate characteristics of individuals who inhabit them, aspects of how they are organized, and artifacts of campus culture. (p. 146)

Many constituents have claims, demands, and concerns over the environment and culture created by the university, in addition to the competing needs between honoring the university’s history and protecting its future. When explaining
contentions at the University of Mississippi regarding Confederate symbols, Strange and Banning (2001) expound on these tensions, “For some of the Caucasian majority, such symbols embodied the university’s heritage, but for students of color these same symbols were painful reminders of deep racial division, social exclusion, and oppression. Once again, tradition conflicted with awareness and sensitivity” (Strange & Banning, 2001, p. 157).

**Student Protests**

Student activism and protest is a potential response to conflicting messages in the culture, such as when a university promotes values of diversity and inclusion but simultaneously honors segregationist or Confederate heroes on campus. Hoffman and Mitchell explain the relationship they discovered in their research: “… we show how student activism calls out the misalignment of stated institutional values and messaging about diversity with institutional actions and initiatives. Further, we address how responses to student activism continue to reflect this misalignment” (Hoffman & Mitchell, 2016, p. 278).

According to the website Thedemands.org, a compilation of protest demands reported by student protestors, at least 79 campuses in the United States had protests over the 2015-2016 school year related to “systemic and structural racism on campus” (Campus Demands, n.d.). Approximately 10 of those protests included the renaming of a building or the removal of a statue in their list of demands. “The substantive task of needing to understand how college students pursue their collective ambitions for change remains a salient matter for
Students’ “ambitions for change” have been around almost as long as there have been universities. Students have and do protest student life issues, such as quality of food, strictness of rules, and social issues, such as war participation, minimum wage, or investiture. Today’s headlines are filled with students protesting sexual assault, immigration policy, election results, campus speakers, and civil rights issues.

Are protests the natural result of education? Once someone is encouraged to think critically, the criticism can be expressed creatively. Some students may see activism as a natural by-product of the civic duty they have been taught to embrace. College students may be drawn to protesting as a natural extension of their identity development or growing independence. How and why students protest is an important topic for educators, and more information can help universities respond to protests appropriately.

When universities respond to protests, they have several constituents and factors to consider. Protests and conflicts on campus may affect donations:

A backlash from alumni is an unexpected aftershock of the campus disruptions of the last academic year. Although fund-raisers are still gauging the extent of the effect on philanthropy, some colleges — particularly small, elite liberal arts institutions — have reported a decline in donations, accompanied by a laundry list of complaints. (Hartocollis, 2016, para. 4)
In addition to donors and alumni, universities have obligations to their students, employees, and communities, and all are factors in how universities respond to activism on campus.

**The Study**

While there is research available regarding protests on college campuses and student activism, which will be discussed in the next chapter, more information is needed to help universities deal with student unrest. Specifically, more information is needed to understand the under-researched phenomenon of protesting historical monuments or the names of buildings. Why are some universities responding positively to student requests and changing building names and why are others not? This research will attempt to shed light on this issue by exploring the following questions at one particular university:

1) How did the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill respond to the controversy regarding the name of a campus building (Saunders Hall) and a historical monument on campus (Silent Sam), particularly following student protests?

2) How do the university’s decision-makers describe the motivations behind their decisions? How do the university decision-makers view their roles and the roles of the other stakeholders, such as students, alumni, supervisors, and the public?

3) How are university decision-makers and their decisions perceived by others in the University of North Carolina Chapel Hill community?
This research uses a case study approach to examine the nuances of the decision-making process, from both the protestors and university decision-makers. The framework of Bolman and Deal's four frames—political, structural, symbolic, and human resources—provides a common basis for examining the motives and behaviors of those involved in the incident. The four frames allow me to examine the issue from several different angles, instead of focusing solely on one viewpoint.

Universities that have faced the issue of controversial building names and monuments on campus are numerous, and many, but not all, are located in the South. Three schools in North Carolina have dealt with buildings named after Charles Aycock, a former governor and white supremacist; UNC- Greensboro and Duke University chose to change the name of the buildings, but Eastern Carolina State University attempted a compromise that included changing the name of the building but creating a heritage hall on campus (E. Anderson, 2015). Georgetown University (Shaver, 2015), the University of Oregon (Press, 2017), University of Texas- Austin (CNN, 2010), and Vanderbilt University (Tamburin, 2016) have all changed the names of buildings, and Harvard University made changes to their law school’s seal—all in an effort to deal with the ties to slavery and segregation represented by the previous names. Clemson University has ongoing tension on campus regarding the Board of Trustees’ decision not to rename Tillman Hall, named for former senator and governor Benjamin Tillman, who used his political power to advance white supremacist causes (Demby, 2015). Other universities which have decided not to change the names of buildings
include New York University (Collison, 2015), Winthrop University (Marchant, 2015), Princeton University (Anderson, 2016), and the University of Alabama (Enoch, 2016). Virginia Tech’s president called for a preemptive review of building names (Jones, 2017), and Yale University (Yale to change Calhoun College’s name to honor Grace Murray Hopper, 2017) and the University of Mississippi (Jacobson, 2017) have attempted other routes, such as creating standards that need to be met to change a name or adding contextualization to the symbol.

This study will examine UNC-Chapel Hill because it exhibits a contemporary example of the issue of protests regarding a building name and a statue on campus. In addition, the university has attempted different types of responses. After protests in 2015, the university decided to change the name of a building on its campus, Saunders Hall, to Carolina Hall. This decision was a compromise with the protestors who wished the building be named Hurston Hall (Stancill, 2015), after Zora Neale Hurston, a black author who sat in on some classes at UNC-Chapel Hill in 1940. The board also decided on a 16-year ban on renaming other buildings on campus, intended to give the university time to develop and assess educational initiatives regarding the history of the campus (Trustees Rename Saunders Hall, Freeze Renamings for 16 Years—UNC General Alumni Association, 2015).

In addition to the controversy surrounding the building name, students have also protested the Silent Sam statue on campus. The statue was erected in 1913 to honor UNC students who fought in the Confederacy, and received the
nickname “Silent Sam” due to the lack of ammunition on the statue leaving him unable to fire his weapon (Commemorative Landscapes of North Carolina, 2010). During a protest in August, protestors removed the statue. The university recently revealed their plan to build a history and education center that would house the statue; this decision spawned more protests (Philip, 2018).

By examining the case at UNC-Chapel Hill, I will gain a greater understanding of the phenomenon of protesting memorials on campus and how and why universities respond. At this one site, there were protests regarding a building name and a monument on campus; additionally, the university responded both positively and negatively to student protests and requests. Furthermore, this study’s goal is to explain scholarly aims and to help universities create environments and cultures that welcome all students, or, as Strange and Banning (2001) state:

As educators acquire a more sophisticated understanding of human environments, they will be better positioned to eliminate those features of institutions that are needlessly stressful or inhibiting and ultimately to create those features that will challenge students toward active learning, growth, and development. Whether we want them to or not, or whether we understand them or not, educational environments do exert an impact of students. (p. 4)
Chapter II

Literature Review

Concerns and protests over the names of buildings on university campuses is a relatively new phenomenon. The literature on such protests or on universities voluntarily or preemptively changing building names is mostly limited to current news and it seems there is little empirical research available. To build a foundation for this project, I examined different aspects of student protests generally and what is available specifically about renaming of buildings and removal of monuments. The major aspects I will be discussing in this literature review include student protests and protestors, university responses to protests regarding race-related issues, and historic Confederate memorials. The places where these issues overlap is where this research project dwells. Before examining the history and literature regarding university protests, it is important to understand how universities are governed—how they make decisions, allocate power, and make the business of higher education work on a daily basis.

Organizational Theory

To understand the situations that arose on campuses regarding the controversial names of buildings, a foundational understanding of how universities go about their business and how those in power make decisions both controversial and mundane is needed. Scholars have proposed numerous
theories for how universities are governed and run. Kezar and Eckel (2004) in their review of the theoretical perspectives of universities’ governance found that structural theories and a few political theories dominate the literature; theories regarding human relations, cultural and social cognition theories are cited infrequently. In addition to the lack of comprehensive theories regarding university governance, Kezar (2008) noted that there is also a lack of research regarding how university leaders respond to potentially controversial topics, even though the stories of controversy and political conflict are frequently reported in news outlets. This research project will attempt to respond to these concerns by using Bolman and Deal’s (2017) model of organizational frames that examines several different perspectives on organizational behavior and decision making and by studying in-depth how one university responded to the controversy attached to the name of a campus building and a Confederate monument on university grounds.

Bolman and Deal’s model, espoused in their book *Reframing Organizations* (Bolman & Deal, 2017), postulates four frames to understand organizational behavior. The four frames are applied to an academic setting in Bolman and Gallos’ (2011) book *Reframing Academic Leadership*; where the original model and frames are the same but all the examples are of an academic nature. The four frames, or ways of viewing organizations, are structural, political, symbolic, and human resource, and Bolman and Deal (and Bolman and Gallos) argue that examining a situation through the combination of these frames leads to greater understanding. “*Reframing* is the deliberate process of looking at a
situation carefully and from multiple perspectives, choosing to be more mindful about the sensemaking process by examining alternative views and explanations" (Bolman & Gallos, 2011, p. 23). I will examine the situation of renaming buildings and removing monuments using Bolman and Deal’s four frames, which are also used by Bolman and Gallos.

The structural frame equates organizations with factories. This frame is concerned with hierarchy, organizational charts, and bureaucracy. When applying this frame to an academic setting, Bolman and Gallos (2011) state “like a manufacturing operation, they [colleges and universities] are designed to transform a variety of inputs into outputs such as educated graduates, journal articles, books, community service, and winning football teams” (p. 51). University leaders in the structural frame design processes, systems, and procedures that enable the university to work together toward its goals.

The political frame, compared to a jungle, is concerned with the how limited resources are allocated and how power is used. Bolman and Gallos (2011) describe the political frame in academic settings:

The political view of academic leadership sees colleges and universities as akin to jungles: vibrant ecosystems that house a variety of different species or groups, each with its own specific characteristics, capabilities, interests, needs, and lifestyles. All live in proximity to one another, sometimes peacefully, but often not because scarce resources and conflicting interests make conflict inevitable. (p. 71)
The political frame is an important key to understanding conflicts in academic settings.

The metaphor used to describe the symbolic frame is the theater. When seen through the symbolic frame, events are less important than what the events mean, how they are interpreted by the actors and audiences. Symbols are relied on to convey meaning and to incite unity. The symbolic frame “sees a college as a sacred place whose legitimacy rests ultimately on faith in the transformational power of knowledge, and as a theater whose success derives from staging powerful dramas that connect and communicate to important audiences” (Bolman & Gallos, 2011, p. 109).

The human resources frame states that organizations can be viewed as families; the relationships between different members and the relationship between members and the organization are important and drive decisions. As Bolman and Gallos (2011) postulate, “organizations and people need each other. But aligning human and institutional needs is never easy, and handling people problems regularly ranks high on the list of leaders’ toughest challenges” (p. 92).

By using the frames to evaluate the situation at UNC-Chapel Hill, I will have a common base to examine the motivations and actions of both the protestors and the university decision-makers. Is the structure for decision making flawed in some way that caused the protestors to find an alternate route to have a decision made? Do both the protestors and the university actors see the campus culture as political, and they are struggling to gain/retain power? How do both groups view the symbols of the building name and the Silent Sam
statue—do these symbols have a different meaning to different people? Or is it a difference in how the groups view the culture that caused the clash, such as one group viewing the culture as familial and the other as political? How both the student activists and the university decision-makers view the situation affects how they act and respond to action, and the frames provide a structure for an analysis of those beliefs and actions.

**Student Protests and Activism**

How students interact with institutions of higher education has been an issue of concern since there have been universities (Thelin, 2011). Students have at times acquiesced to the rules of faculty and administrators, and at other times students have found varied and creative ways to consolidate, hold, and use power. A brief overview of the history of student activism, how activists are viewed, and who activists have been will set the stage for the current protests regarding memorials to the Confederacy and how universities have responded.

As Broadhurst (2014) states, “as students engage in activism in the 21st century, they are building upon tactics and traditions that have existed throughout the history of American higher education” (p. 12).

Student power in universities has been a matter of interest since the foundation of higher education. The University of Bologna was run by student guilds who hired and fired instructors; in addition, the student body used their collective bargaining power to influence the price of food and board from the town (Haskin, 1923). As universities spread across Europe, professors and later administrators consolidated power as students lost the ability to make many
decisions regarding how the school was run. Students eventually found that their voice was often heard most when it was a collective chorus instead of an individual note. One of the first examples of student collective action was the St. Scholastican’s Day riot at Oxford in 1355. What started as a dispute between two students and a local tavern owner became a two-day battle between the university and the town, resulting in the deaths of 63 students and 20 locals and an increase of power of the university over the town (Boren, 2001; Hundscheid, 2010; Thelin, 2011).

Thankfully, most student protests since the St. Scholastican’s Day riot are less deadly and less likely to start over the quality of drinks at the local tavern. Frequent reasons students protest, both historically and currently, are for student-affairs related complaints: the quality of dorm rooms, the strictness of rules, and the price of tuition, board, and food. In addition to protestations over living conditions students will protest social issues, such as war participation and civil rights issues. Social issue protests on college campuses sometimes occur before the general public becomes concerned over the same issues, and sometimes student activists are protesting concurrently with national or societal issues. DeConde (1971) states that students “have frequently functioned as barometers of deep-seated unrest and social change” (p. 4). Recent examples include Black Lives Matter protests on college campuses, or students involved in protests over the latest presidential election.

Although protests are not unusual on college campuses, participation is not universal. Researchers have attempted to discern why some students are
social activists and others are not. A majority of the research on student activists is from the 1960s and 1970s due to a preponderance of protests during this time period (Altbach, 1989).

Several descriptors are frequently associated with typical protestors. Many student protestors are from higher socio-economic statuses, have highly educated parents, and perform well academically (Altbach, 1989). The most common majors among activists are social sciences and humanities. Many of these factors have traditionally been true for college students in general, not just those students who protest: colleges tend to attract students from upper socio-economic strata, and a majority of college students have parents who attended college (Altbach, 1989). Trends in student protestors are not just isolated to students in the United States. There are some characteristics that are general to both domestic and international student protestors:

Generally, university students (or a significant portion of them) are still directly connected to avenues of power, material wealth, and the classes of citizens who can effect institutional, political, or social change. This trend is specifically true in developing nations in which upper-class youth make up the majority of university students, but it is also true of developed nations in which the offspring of the middle and upper classes form a substantial part of the university and in which the entire student body can represent a powerful block of consensus. (Boren, 2001, p. 14)

The protests that occurred in the United States became a major concern for university officials. A curiosity about student protest occurred in the 1960s and
1970s, given the increase of student activism during the civil rights era and the Vietnam War. As Peterson (1970) states, “college student unrest has escalated to the point where perhaps most officials responsible for the higher learning in America would now consider it their number one problem” (p. 59).

Halleck (1970) listed several different reasons or hypotheses regarding student activism; although his research is from 1970, it is a good baseline for understanding attitudes towards protestors and his research was cited frequently in studies in the early 1970s. Halleck grouped the hypotheses into three general categories: critical, sympathetic, and neutral. As suggested by the name, the critical grouping of hypotheses is negative; these hypotheses regarding the cultivation of activism focus on perceived deficits in the students. Reasons include parental permissiveness in child rearing, students not taking responsibilities for their actions, an affluent upbringing, or family pathology. As Lipset states, “child-rearing and educational practices have produced a generation of students who combine belief in equalitarian doctrines with and insistence on instant gratification” (Lipset, 1993, p. i). Altbach (1999) explains that the negative view of student protest is a Western view:

in the West… student politics is considered an illegitimate activity—students are expected to attend university to study and not to engage in revolutionary activity. Not only do Western students have to contend with a rich mixture of competing organizations and movements, but their activism is not respected by most of the public. (p. 57)
This negative view of student activism is not exclusive to the West, although it is more common among western countries.

Although student activism may be viewed negatively by some, it may also be considered in a positive light by others. Halleck (1970) acknowledged this, and he listed five sympathetic reasons for student activism, siding with the activists. The first hypothesis is the two-armed camps reason: the world is divided ideologically, politically, and militarily. In addition to setting the climate for protests, this division frequently leads to more intense protests: “analysis of specific campus protests indicates that they are usually most traumatic when they succeed in polarizing the campus into opposing camps” (Gusfield, 1971, p. 30). Despite the fact that Halleck’s research was conducted almost 50 years ago, this sympathetic hypothesis for student activism is eerily reminiscent of struggles expressed by students today. According to a report on the freshman class of 2016 by the Higher Education Research Institute, the campuses surveyed are the most politically polarized they have ever been in the 51 years the study has been conducted (Eagan et al., 2017).

Other positive reasons for protests that Halleck mentions include the war in Vietnam, the civil rights struggle, a deterioration in the quality of life, and political hopelessness. Astin (1993) elaborates on the sympathetic feelings toward student activists:

The strongest positive associations [of student activism] are with political liberalism, cultural awareness, and commitment to promoting racial understanding. In other words, individual participation in campus protest
activities does not, as some critics would have us believe, serve to alienate students from each other. On the contrary, it seems to strengthen students’ sense of cultural awareness and appreciation and to reinforce their commitment to promoting greater understanding between the races (no page number).

Halleck (1970) also gave three neutral reasons why students protest: technology is making the future unpredictable, the media exaggerates activism, and there is an overreliance on science over the liberal arts and creativity. One could argue that these reasons appear valid today. Kerr (1970) gave six reasons for the increased participation of students in politics that also ring true today. His first reason is the massification of higher education, with students from many different societal segments attending college. Closely related to the massification of higher education is the high concentration of students in large schools. Many of these large schools may be impersonal and focus on graduate students and research instead of the undergraduate experience. This impersonal environment combined with what Kerr sees as a permissive environment of schools that no longer embrace *in loco parentis*, might lead to an independent student culture that is separate from the faculty culture. Kerr also cites explosive social issues as a contributing factor. The last reason for increases in student political involvement is the anomalous dependence of students: they are simultaneously pushed to be full members of society, yet they are denied full access to society and financial independence. Like Halleck’s research, Kerr’s research rings true for today’s students, but the research needs to be updated regarding the
millennial students in our current political and social context. Interestingly, Schussman and Soule (2005), who surveyed 15,053 adults and interviewed 2,517 respondents, found that the greatest contributing factor to protest participation was simply being asked to participate in a protest; however, their research, while more current than Halleck’s and Kerr’s, was not limited to college student activism.

While many of these reasons and hypothesis for student activism appear to be relevant today, further research is needed. Does today’s political climate change the reasons student protest? Does social media influence protest behavior or impact public perception? How about the campus cultural climate? Does the topic of protest, historical monuments on campus, create a different motive for students then more traditional protests?

The research examining the relationship between conventional politics and participation in protests by college students has found that there is a significant group of activists who will protest despite being rather removed from conventional politics (Jenkins & Wallace, 1996). However for a majority of students, “education provides greater political efficacy and tolerance for political expression, thus contributing to both protest and conventional participation” in politics (Jenkins & Wallace, 1996, p. 204). Jenkins and Wallace used survey data from 1973-1974, and the sample was not limited to college students which makes its applicability to this research project limited.

To a certain degree, students need to be intellectually developed enough for activist activities. Bernardo and Baranovich (2016) use Perry’s theory of
intellectual development when they state: “For students to be effective activists to promote social change, they must be able to view social problems and issues from many different points of view, and hence understand why their choice of solutions is the best for society at large” (Bernardo & Baranovich, 2016, p. 200). Their research, which was a case study of a school in the Philippines, centered on activism as related to students’ moral and ethical development. This research, like many others, focuses on the students’ behavior instead of the university’s response, and the mindset of students from another country might not be the same as those living in the United States’ historical and political context.

Astin (1993) found that participating in protest behaviors can be a positive developmental activity for students. He asserts that participating in protest behavior also is positively correlated with developing a meaningful philosophy of life, growth in artistic interests and leadership abilities, aspirations for advanced degrees, and increased chances of voting in a presidential election. Kezar (2010) researched the partnerships between staff/faculty and students in grassroots activism and found gains in student development, such as empowerment.

Hamrick’s (1998) work, which is the only study I was able to find that dealt specifically with the renaming of a building, also focused on how the protest activities affected student development, particularly gains in citizenship attitudes. Her work is a case study at Iowa State University, where a building was renamed for an alumna who worked for women’s suffrage. Students, and others, protested the name when information about the alumna’s racist and xenophobic remarks were revealed. Hamrick analyzed the protest and university actions through the
lens of democratic aims—how a university encourages or discourages
democratic citizenship in its decision-making processes and how it responds to
dissenters.

The research on why students protest is varied. Some of it focuses on the
environment and social context, such as a controversial war or unpopular
university policies. Others focus on the students’ developmental state, viewing
activism as almost a rite of passage or a developmental experience. The
commonality between the varied research is that students protest because they
are dissatisfied with the way the world works, and they are going to try activism
as a way to change it for the better. What causes that dissatisfaction and why
protest activities are seen as a solution are what the researchers cannot agree
on.

The studies mentioned, and others, are concerned with the motivations of
student protestors in general, and they focus on the protestors and their
attitudes—not on how the protestors interact with the university or how the
university responds to them. More holistic view of protests, such as case studies,
are needed to understand the interaction between the two groups. In addition, a
bulk of the research was conducted in the 1960s and 1970s, and it remains to be
decided if today’s students and universities follow the same trends.

Civil rights campus protests

The civil rights protests in the 1950s and 60s set the stage for the protests
for today’s students. Some of the same issues that were previously protested are
being protested again. A brief history of these protests, which current students
can use as role models, can lead to a greater understanding of today’s protesters’ motives and methods.

Student protest behavior in the United States was at its zenith during the 1960s. According to Rhoads (2000), “the Civil Rights movement originating in the 1950s is arguably the principal source of student activism of the subsequent decade” (p. 40). This led to the Free Speech movement that started at Berkeley in 1964 and the Peace Movement in the latter half of the 1960s. Gusfield (1971) elaborates on the student protests during the 1960s:

The demands of student groups are concerned with university policy responses to events and issues which divided and polarize the society. While protests and demonstrations may also relate to university regulations and decision-making structure, they do so in relation to issues which are political in one of two ways: (1) they are connected with national and state policies and with university response to such policies; or (2) they are connected with the actual and potential role of students in the formation of university policy vis-à-vis such issues. (p. 29)

Even though college life often feels like it is lived in a bubble, that bubble changes based on the demands of the larger society. How are today’s national and state policies affecting student activists? How are current students responding to university policies? While this research project centers on protests regarding a university issue, the name of a building or a campus monument, these local protests are in a larger, national and social (and historical) context that cannot be ignored.
The struggle for civil rights was fought both on and off campuses, with what happened on campuses affecting the larger society and vice versa. As Kynard (2005) states:

Black students attacked the basic institutions of racial segregation off campus as a crucial definition on what it meant to be a black student. The racism in higher education was no different from the racism at Woolworth lunch counters and black students would protest them both, changing the shape and pace of the Civil Rights Movement as well as the character of higher education. (395)

During the years of 1960 and 1961, one in four black college students in the south participated in protests, with higher rates of participation from HBCU students (Kynard, 2005). Their protests demanded changes on campuses, including black studies departments; increased recruitment of black students at white universities; black cultural centers and dormitories; attention and credits granted to black students doing community work; and an increased number of black professors, counsellors, and administrators (Weinberg, 1977).

The student protests in the United States around the turn of the 21st century concern the following ideals: “justice, access, equity, and peace. Campuses are fertile grounds for the impulse toward greater justice in the world” (Diversity, 2015, no page number). Specifically, student activism revolved around undocumented students, university investments, rising tuition, racial disparities, sexual harassment and violence, and homophobia (Ransby, 2015). The topics Broadhurst and Martin (2014) specify for more current student protests are
similar: “Issues such as the current wars in the Middle East, rising tuition and fees, bullying on campus, and the rights of the LGBTQ community have become prevalent concerns for today’s students” (p. 75).

According to Rhodes (2000), the civil rights concerns that led students to protest in the 60s became protest issues again in the 1990s. Rhoads (2000) reports that protestors at the 1996 “National Day of Action” protested against what they referred to as a “toxic atmosphere toward students, people of color, and lesbian, gay, and bisexual people” (p. 13). In addition to protesting similar issues as the student activist in the 1960s, students in the 1990s used past protests as a “resource for making sense of their present day lives” (Rhoads, 2000, p. 28). Altbach (1991) agrees that in Western industrialized nations after the 1960s student movements have been less prominent, although “student politics has by no means disappeared from campuses” (p. 117). The tensions on campuses swirled around students pushing for educational equity and other conservative forces fighting battles to eliminate affirmative action (Rhoads, 1998). As other researchers have pointed out, “two or three clear national issues of the 1960s and ‘70s have disappeared in favor of a multiplicity of local issues” (Levine & Hirsch, 1991, p. 121).

Almost twenty years later, the concerns of student activists are still the same--campus protests in 2015 had similar themes as protests in the 1960s and 1990s: minorities still don’t feel welcome and included on predominately white campuses (Jaschik, 2015). According to the website Thedemands.org, a compilation of protest demands reported by student protestors, 79 campuses in
the United States had protests over the 2015-2016 school year related to “systemic and structural racism on campus” (*Campus Demands*, n.d.).

A 2017 study analyzed the demands of Black student activists at 73 universities. The most popular demands were for more faculty of color, diversity training for faculty and staff, more students of color admitted and/or retained, and required social justice courses (Ndemanu, 2017). Ndemanu also stated that “one of the antecedents of the ongoing unrest on campuses emanates from the lack of racial diversity in higher education which has been caused by the failure of the P-12 public schools to prepare Black students for college” (2017, p. 239). This quantitative study found that the names of buildings are fueling current protests at some campuses, however, Ndemanu focused his research on other protest topics. I will attempt to provide some details to this overlooked protest topic by using qualitative methods and focusing on one specific incident.

Broadhurst and Martin (2014) imply that empathy fuels some student activists, stating that they feel the need to speak for others of their race or gender who were silent in the face of hostile campus climates. Linder and Rodriques (2012) elaborate, noticing that environment and personal characteristics lead to protest activity, specifically, identifying as a Person of Color and/or a woman with social justice beliefs. The hope to pay it forward drives many activists, as they want to make the world better not just for themselves but for others in similar situations.

Although the reasons for the current generation’s protests are similar to those of previous generations, there are some marked differences. Johnston
attributes a lack of student organizing to a change in demographics on college campuses—particularly the fact that there are more part-time and commuter students, who are on campus less often than full-time dorm residents and often have family and work commitments that leave little time for protests. Johnston (2015) further explains that the recent college protests concerning racism, sexual assault, and funding issues reflect campuses’ responses, or lack of response, to an evolving student demographic: “These three focal points of protest serve as a rebuke to the ways in which universities as institutions have failed to adapt to demographic changes in their student populations” (no page). Johnston’s piece clearly states the differences between past protestors’ behavior on campuses versus today’s protests, but his work is a review of historical facts and current educational trends, not an empirical research study.

How students perceive campus culture also dictates how students interact with campus administrators. Ropers-Huilman, Carwile, Lee, and Barnett (2003) found that if students view the campus culture as political, they may form coalitions; if bureaucratic, they may try formal avenues of change, such as student government. If students view the campus culture as collegial, they may try open dialogue, and if the campus values rationality student will present well-reasoned arguments. How these viewpoints affect behavior is similar to Bolman and Deal’s frames (and therefore a similar structure to this research project). If students view the campus culture as a political jungle they will act differently than if they feel the culture is a welcoming family (public protests versus private meetings with administrators).
Student protests might have become less prominent around the turn of the 21st century due to a change of methods, not necessarily due to lack of protests. Through social media students have a platform to share their views and make a political or social stand that reaches a vast (sometimes national or even international) network. People can gain national news attention by creating a disturbance online rather than in person. Additionally, Broadhurst and Martin (2014) found that students are turning to volunteerism as a form of activism. With students taking advantage of such options, they may not feel the urgency to take part in protests like they did in the past.

While these studies provide a general understanding of student protestors, these studies have not examined protests specifically related to how history is represented on campuses through building names and monuments. Does the different topic of protest encourage different protest behaviors? The protestors viewed differently now than in the past? Using an organizational model like Bolman and Deal’s will also shift the focus of the research from characteristics of student protestors to how they view the situation, why they chose to protest, and why they chose specific methods.

Campus Responses

How and why students protest is only half of the story of the current controversies surrounding names of buildings on campuses; how the universities respond is the other half. Cho (2018) expounds on the importance of studying institutional responses to student activism:
While these studies provide a foundational context regarding student resistance, this student-centered approach places the onus of positive change on students, and the implications of such research focus (only) on what students have, could, and should do to hold institutions accountable. (p. 83)

An overview of how universities have responded in the past will shed light on how and why universities are responding to current issues.

How universities respond to student activism is an aspect of protest activity that historically has not been thoroughly researched. As Astin, Astin, Bayer, and Bixconti (1975) state, “the impact of protests on the institutions and individuals experiencing them is perhaps the aspect of campus unrest that has been least studied, even though it may, in the final analysis, be the most important legacy for the student movement” (p. 145). Even 40 years later, university responses to protest behavior is still an under-researched. Part of what makes this so difficult to study is the power struggle between many key players: students, administrators, faculty, governing boards, state legislators, and the general public. Gusfield (1971) pointed out the competing values and goals that are often not resolved because the different segments do not work together:

The moral authority of the university has rested on the premise that the search for knowledge and the teaching experience both have a semi-sacred character; they are goals of the organization, and must not be subordinated to organizational needs. But in the realities of life, organizational needs are also important. The resultant needs for
accommodation, liaison, and leadership between the various segments of the university are threatened when each is isolated from influence over the other. (p. 34)

Johnston (2015) noticed a similar conflict: the academic value held by many faculty, the administration’s organizational needs, and the desire for prestige through affiliation with the school. Flexner (1969) noted that how universities respond to crisis depends on several factors, including the attitudes of individuals and groups involved, the institutional structure, and university procedures. Bolman and Deal’s four frames, specifically the political frame, can lend a different viewpoint to these competing values held by different coalitions.

Foster and Long (1970) found that institutions have three implicit goals regarding protests:

1) Institutions do not want to change the policies and procedures to which they are habituated

2) Institutions want to abide by the regulations that it created

3) Institutions wish to avoid embarrassment and/or violence.

Foster and Long elaborate by stating that these goals center around an institutional self-concept of conflict avoidance, “…in the sense that it is hard to imagine administrators or faculty members who would prefer permanent conflict to consensus, or see it as better than a necessary evil” (Foster & Long, 1970, p. 421). While this research provides an important background for understanding university responses to protests, a more current understanding is needed.
The role of presidents in addressing racial incidents and setting a diversity agenda has been studied recently. Cole and Harper (2017) examined the public statements college presidents made regarding racial incidents on their campuses; they concluded that the statements made by college presidents rarely address the incident directly and focus on the perpetrators instead of the institutional context of systematic oppression. Cho (2018) confirms these conclusions, advocating an Institutional Response Framework to student protests that encourages a changing of campus racial climates. Kezar (2008) analyzed the leadership strategies of presidents dealing with the politics of diversity using approaches suggested by Bolman and Deal’s political frame. The study found that every president interviewed faced political pressure, and the subjects had specific strategies to assist them in dealing with the politics and advancing their diversity agendas on campus. Kezar’s research provides a strong example of how Bolman and Deal’s model can be used to analyze such a situation. This research, although refreshingly current, is limited by solely focusing on the response of university presidents. Presidential leadership is important in dealing with crisis and influencing university culture, their power to change building names or remove monuments is frequently limited by the university board of trustees or, sometimes, the state laws and legislators. Others, such as student affairs professionals, faculty members, and students may influence decisions as well.

How presidents, administrators, and other decision-makers respond to student protests and requests for change depends on the many competing
values, priorities, and other factors, including but not limited to campus politics. There is some debate as to whether the civil rights changes made on campuses in the sixties were the result of campus protests or college administrators “who were inspired to action by the moral claims and collective mobilization of the nonviolent civil rights movement in the late 1950s and early 1960s” (Stulberg & Chen, 2014, p. 47).

One factor in how university decision makers respond to protestors is how faculty and administrators view protest activities. Some faculty found benefits in students protesting on campus. A 1970 survey of faculty found that 68% viewed protest activities on their campuses as having specific ‘educational benefits’ ("Education in the Real World," 1970). Benefits include increased motivation toward the regular curriculum and learning, active learning, and change in faculty-student relationships. Only 11% of respondents saw no benefit, but 79% had concerns about negative effects, such as loss of time toward regular pursuits. Biddix, Somers, and Polman (2009) express a similar support for student activism, stating that administrators should welcome student activism because it would aid in building a campus open to discourse and helps build community among marginalized groups (Broadhurst & Martin, 2014). A tension between activism as a behavior to manage and activism (and related attitudes) as desirable college outcomes was found by Martin (2014). Kezar’s (2010) is another recent example of how faculty and staff working with student activist can be a positive developmental experience for students. A concern with such research is that those who support the students and encourage their
developmental and learning outcomes are not often the ones making the ultimate decisions regarding the protests (i.e., the faculty and staff working closely with students are frequently not the administrators and board members who respond to protest demands).

Astin and Bisconti (1971) conducted an examination of protests in the 1969-70 school year. They found that protests concerning racial policy were handled by administrators most severely. Protests regarding racial issues were most successful (in regarding to meeting protest goals) when disruptive and violent tactics were used. When compared to other types of protests (such as the war or student life issues), racial protests were often the result of previous protests going un-resolved. Astin and Bisconti also found that racial protests had the greatest impact, and protests of the war were least impactful. Interestingly, Astin and Bisconti also found that racially related demands and war-related issues were most common at institutions populated by students from a high socioeconomic background, and the protests at the less selective institutions were more often related to issues of student power. The racial protests garnered more student support and were often more violent. Astin and Bisconti’s well-researched project does provide interesting data, but would a similar project in today’s supposedly society have similar results?

Altbach (1989) states that “with only a few exceptions, university authorities are seldom prepared to deal with student protest” (p. 101). He elaborates that institutional responses to protests may be challenging to predict,
but they are rarely seen as completely successful by the protestors. Will similar
attitudes be detected at UNC-Chapel Hill?

Ropers-Hiolman, Carwile, and Barnett (2005) studied how student
activists view administrators. Students believe that administrators have a
dichotomous relationship with the current system. According to student activists,
administrators have power in the current system and are therefore keen on
protecting the system. However, students recognized that administrators’
responses were limited by that very system. Ropers-Huilman et al also found that
student activists often perceive administrators with enmity and feel that
administrators “desire to disempower students through ignoring them or keeping
crucial information from them” (2005, p. 303), as evidenced by the students’
inability to get straight information from the administrators (however, a few
students found the opposite to be true). This research once again focuses on the
students; this time, it focuses on the relationship students have with
administrators rather than administrators’ responses to protests. Bolman and
Deal’s model with its multiple frames may provide more details in how protestors
view administrators and how that affects protest behaviors. It may also provide a
different viewpoint to understand how and why administrators respond the way
that they do.

University administrators respond to student protests in various ways.
Foster and Long (1970) detailed several of these reactions. The first they labeled
the Persuasive strategy: “the typical method involves the issuing of formal
statements through the press, couched in official and restrained language and
appealing to norms which are patently unrelated to the protestors” (p. 104). The next strategy Foster and Long noticed was the restrictive response, in which the administration placed sanctions against the protestors such as setting conditions, injunctions, and disciplinary procedures. The final strategic response by institutions is concession, although conceding to the protestors may cost the institution through changes, loss of support from anti-protestors, and making future protests more likely. Once again, this research provides a good background for current incidents, but more recent research is needed. For this particular project, all three types of responses were evident at UNC-Chapel Hill (restrictive, persuasive, and concession); Bolman and Deal’s model may provide some insight into why administrators respond to protestors the way they do by examining the situation through multiple frames.

Windt (1982) studied the administrative response to the protests at Berkeley, and he noticed that the administration there tried to change the paradigm by focusing on credibility issues instead of policy issues:

First administrators transform the particular issue agitating protestors into general issues of the authority and credibility of the institution to act as it sees fit. Second, they contend that protestors represent only a minority, whereas the administration must act in the interests of the majority (thus drawing upon the rhetorical power of the political maxim, ‘majority rules’.) Third, they attribute base motives to protestors by calling them unsavory political names, thereby consigning them to illegitimate political categories (‘outside agitators,’ ‘non-students,’ ‘anarchists,’ etc.) or by contending that
the ‘real purpose’ of the protest is not to change a particular policy but to destroy American democratic institutions. Fourth, they present themselves as defenders of civil liberties and law and order, all the while characterizing protestors as lawless and irrational, bent on using a pretense to defense of constitutional liberties so as to destroy them for others. Finally, they predict dire and terrible consequences should the protestors win in this symbolic test of power. Thus, dialectic, once thought by Aristotle to be a counter-part to rhetoric, becomes the centerpiece of administrative rhetoric. (pp. 247–248)

By changing the argument and changing perception, the administration hoped to avoid the costs associated with other responses. Such actions suggest a response based in the political frame, treating the protestors as an opposing coalition in competition to the same resource of power and influence. Since this is a case study approach, it would be interesting to discover if such political responses are found at other university protest sites.

The non-response response can also have unproductive reactions. A midwestern university, that the Reynolds and Mayweather (2017) named Main University, experienced racial incidents and protests, students were saddened and disappointed by faculty’s lack of response, “however, when discussing the actions of the University’s leaders, the affect changed to anger, resentment, and hostility” (p. 298). Responding in a way that is contrary to espoused values of the university can also be damaging to students. Hoffman and Mitchell (2016) found that counter-missional responses, such as a campus that advocates for diversity
responding negatively to racial protests, may have damaging effects for minority students’ identities. Both Reynolds and Mayweather and Mitchell’s research focuses on the effect leaders’ responses to protests had on students instead of why universities response.

Astin and Bisconti (1971) research did focus on why universities responded the way that they did. They found that “administrative response was most favorable in the case of racial protests. Complete changes on primary issues were forthcoming in half of these protests as opposed to 37% of academic protests and only 3% of the war-related ones” (p. 55). Possible reasons for favorable responses to racial protests include ‘benevolence’ toward a minority group, many protests were repeats of previous actions, and with a list of demands it is more likely that a concession on at least one is more likely. Would these reasons be similar on contemporary campuses? Fisher (2018), in her research regarding institutional responses to activism, states, “radical student activism yields more accommodation by institutions, whereas moderate activism yields a more advocating stance”(p. 26); her research included content analysis of news stories regarding protests instead of questioning participants in the conflict.

As campuses become more diverse, there may be an increase in disagreements about university policies that may be viewed as “indifferent or hostile to underrepresented students” (Hamrick, 1998, p. 449). Hamrick continues by stating that as students attempt to make changes on campus, this can be a positive educational experience promoting citizenship, or it may further
alienate marginalized students. Astin (1993) agrees stating that an increase in
diversity on campus increases the participation in student protests—this may be
annoying to administrators, but it has positive outcomes for participants. Rhoads
(1998) states, “the efforts of diverse students to forge their own place in campus
life through organized demonstrations may also be understood as a form of
participatory democracy” (p. 623). Thus how administrators view protests and
protestors, and which frames are used when making decisions, impact how they
respond to issues on campus such as requests to change building names.

Off-Campus Memorial Protests

Since there is little research available about campus protests specifically
about memorials and building names, I looked for research about similar protests
not on campuses. Although this topic has been in the news recently, specifically
after the incident in Charlottesville, there is a paucity of empirical research in this
area. Part of the reason for protests regarding Confederate memorials and
names is a shift in how societies view the past. Sodaro (2018) states that in the
late 1900s, “came a shift in how societies relate to the past, from seeing the past
as merely precedent to the nation’s glorious future toward an emphasis on
coming to terms with past violence and oppression” (p. 13). As a result, the way
societies memorialize the past has changed from “triumphant reminders of the
glories of the nation state” (p. 13) to memorials that educate about a past that
should not be forgotten least it be repeated.

Broadhurst and Martin (2014) elaborate on how larger social issues are
symbolically represented on college campuses:
For broader social issues, the most tangible reminders of the injustices students fight against are on their own campuses. Dating back to the 1960s, student activists have targeted ROTC buildings, low minority enrollment, low representation of female faculty, and financial investments in controversial nations as evidence of tacit support of war, institutional racism, and sexism (Anderson, 1996; Heineman, 2001; Rhoads, 1998). For student activists, such symbols on campus further illustrated that higher education was simply part of a larger system of social injustice and forged negative perceptions of their campus climate. (p. 77)

The larger social issue of how to remember a painful past is sometimes expressed with protests and requests to change the names of buildings or roads or to remove statues or other memorials. The Southern Poverty Law Center identified 1,503 Confederate monuments and memorials across the South, and there have been attempts at state or local levels to remove over 100 of those Confederate symbols (Whose Heritage?, n.d.). This trend of removing memorials is seen on college campuses, across the South, the country, and even the globe. Just as each community approaches the problem of painful memorials differently, each college campus approaches the same problem differently.

The research regarding protests on university campuses is prolific; however, the research regarding university or community reactions to Confederate memorials is lacking. This study will help fill the deficit of research regarding universities and confederate memorials. This study will explore how university make decisions to protests regarding memorials using the frames
suggested by Bolman and Deal. I will explore the different responses a college can make and will detail my approach in the next chapter.
Chapter III

Methods

What history a society chooses to remember and who it chooses to celebrate are controversial decisions. How colleges and universities choose to deal with that controversy is particularly difficult considering the many stakeholders involved in such decisions. This study will examine how one particular university, the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, confronted this decision in an effort to gain a greater understanding of this tenuous topic.

Research Questions

1) How did the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill respond to the controversy regarding the name of a campus building (Saunders Hall) and a historical monument on campus (Silent Sam), particularly following student protests?

2) How do the university’s decision-makers describe the motivations behind their decisions? How do the university decision-makers view their roles and the roles of the other stakeholders, such as students, alumni, supervisors, and the public?

3) How are university decision-makers and their decisions perceived by others in the University of North Carolina Chapel Hill community?
Research Design

To answer the research questions, I used the case study approach because it can help to understand the issue being studied and also to help understand the theoretical framework. Bolman and Deal (1991) advocate for the use of qualitative research in their research of their model:

Qualitative methods provide a more direct measure of frames as constructs, because they can tap the subtleties and complexities of leaders’ internal worlds…. Perceptual measures of how leaders behave provide only indirect evidence of how they frame experience. Essentially, researchers have two options: (a) ask people how they think, or (b) study how they perform on tasks which should reflect their thinking. (p. 514)

By using a case study approach, I was able to both explore people how they think and I also how they performed on tasks (protesting, advocating, or decision-making).

As Stake, (1995) remarks, “issues are not simple and clean, but intricately wired to political, social, historical, and especially personal contexts…” (p. 17). The issue of historical memorialization on campuses is just such an issue: it is not simple, and the context surrounding the issue is important. Using a case study approach, I could delve into these contexts and the nuances surrounding the issue and explore in depth the setting, major players, methods, and results.

Participants

The phenomenon that I am studying is the process of changing building names or removal of historical monuments at universities. I not only want to learn
about the specific incident, but I also want to learn about the motivations and methods of the protestors and the decision-making process used by the university. The buildings and monuments reference controversial historical figures, most frequently confederate war heroes or prominent segregationists. With such specific criteria, I used the critical case sampling as described by Patton (2002) to pick the study site. As Patton states, “it makes strategic sense to pick the site that would yield the most information and have the greatest impact on the development of knowledge” (p. 236).

Stake’s advice (1995) for choosing a case study site reinforces the idea of choosing a site to maximize learning of the issues: “The first criterion should be to maximize what we can learn. Given our purposes, which cases are likely to lead us to understandings, to assertions, perhaps even to modifying of generalizations?” (p. 4). I was able to locate 19 schools in the United States that experienced controversy surrounding a building name or monument on campus from 2015 through 2018*. Taking Patton’s advice to choose a site or sites that would provide the most information, I wanted a site that responded by changing the name and one that responded negatively. I also wanted to find two schools that were as similar as possible to remove as much extraneous information as possible, but that made decisions counter to protestors (i.e., choosing two

* These schools include: Duke University, University of North Carolina at Greensboro, University of Oregon, University of Texas-Austin, Harvard University, Georgetown University, Vanderbilt University, Clemson University, Middle Tennessee State University, New York University, University of Carolina Berkley, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Yale University, East Carolina University, Winthrop University, University of Mississippi, Princeton University, University of Alabama, Virginia Tech, and Marshall University.
schools that are both public/private/land-grant/Ivy league, similar in size, and located in a similar region of the country). Process of elimination left only two schools left to do a comparative case study: Middle Tennessee State University and Eastern Carolina State University. While it would be possible to do a comparative study of these two universities, the situation at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill (UNC) provided an interesting alternative.

The University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill experienced protests concerning both a monument and a building name. The university also tried several different responses to the protests-- changing the building name but keeping the statue, and they also tried to compromise by providing contextualization while, conversely, placing a moratorium on future building name changes. UNC meets the criteria established by Patton, because the protests that occurred there fit within the phenomenon under scrutiny and the case is a nuanced and rich example. By using only UNC instead of two alternative sites, the extraneous values that could be influencing change are not an issue, and, since my resources will not be split, I can achieve a more detailed understanding of the situation and environment.

UNC students and employees protested over the name of Saunders Hall and the Silent Sam monument to soldiers of the Confederacy. The university, after years of protests, decided to change the name of Saunders Hall; however, they changed the name to Carolina Hall instead of Hurston Hall as the protesters requested. The Board of Trustees concurrently passed a 16-year moratorium on the renaming of other campus buildings. In addition, protests regarding the Silent
Sam statue, while having surged and waned over the years, culminated in protestors removing the statue on August 20, 2018. The university is now forced to decide if the statue should be permanently removed or if it should be put back in place.

The identification of participants was similar to the site selection criteria. I used Patton’s (2002) critical case sampling to find those students and staff members who were closely involved in the protests or decision-making process. I used media reports, social media, and personal connections initially to locate these critical cases. I fear that only locating participants who were vocal in the media or online might be what Patton refers to as an intensity sampling (p. 243); while a majority of my interviews were with those vocal in the media, I was able to speak with other participants who did not interact as much with the press or the protests.

In order to understand the controversy of renaming buildings or removing monuments, I need to look at both “sides” of the issue. I was able to speak with several people who were not involved with the protests. I also was able to use news reports and letters to the editor to lend understanding to those who were opposed to the demands of the protestors.

**Methods**

The most effective data collection method to answer the research question was semi-structured interviews and document analysis. I interviewed those interested in changing building names or removing monuments, students, faculty, and administrators. I conducted semi-structured interviews with 14 members of
the Chapel Hill community: 4 administrators/staff (Cecilia Moore the university historian; Miguel Jackson, a public communications specialist at the Service Center of Excellence; and Rachel Reynolds and Linda Jacobson from the Special Collections library), three faculty members (Althea Cravey from the Geography department; Harry Watson from the History Department; and Steve May from the Communications department), two students (Dominique Brodie and Jerry Wilson), and five people who chose to remain anonymous.

I contacted these particular members of the Chapel Hill community because I found their names while searching for information in the news and on the internet about the controversies at Chapel Hill, and I was able to find their email addresses to contact them. The faculty members had been quoted or mentioned in news articles; the administrators were involved with the History Task Force (a list of members was on the UNC website). The students and other participants were mentioned in news stories about the protests, were members of student organizations I emailed, or were vocal on social media.

In addition to the interviews, I used items of the public record (newspaper articles, social media posts, meeting records, press releases) to add to my understanding of the decision-making process. I also used field observations while on the campus. I used the data gathered from these sources to aid in the development of interview questions and to assess the decision-making process.

Analyzing the Data

Once the data were transcribed and entered into the data analysis software nVivo, I analyzed the data. This was a reiterative process, using
knowledge gained to review previously collected and analyzed data. To analyze the data I used the steps described by Cresswell (2014). The first step described by Cresswell (2014) is to organize and prepare the data. I began by transcribing the interviews and entering the interviews, field notes, and relevant documents into data analyzing software. The second step was to get an overall sense of the data by reading through all of the gathered information and recording any general impressions.

The third step advocated by Cresswell (2014) was to begin the coding process, which involved parsing the data into categories derived from the data. These categories were divided into themes in step four. Many of the codes surrounded aspects of the stories of Carolina Hall and Silent Sam, such as the history of Silent Sam, the Carolina Hall exhibit, the choice of the building name, and the commonalities between the two incidents. Some codes focused on the protests, such as methods used in protests, motivation behind the activism, and the responses to the protests. Other codes surrounded the cast of characters, particularly those making decisions, such as Carol Folt, the police response, and the trustees. I also developed codes for Boleman and Deal’s four frames—symbolic, human resources, political, and structural. Once the interviews were coded, I examined each code to discover commonalities and disparities, to see if there were larger themes. Cresswell states that “qualitative researchers can do much with them to build additional layers of complex analysis” (p. 200), such as comparing and contrasting themes across participants or cases.
Cresswell’s fifth step is to determine how the themes will be represented in the research. I used narrative passages gleaned from the interviews and documents that represent the themes in the participant’s own language. The final step is to interpret the meaning of the data, at which point I compared the data to the chosen theoretical lens and through the research questions.

**Positionality**

I was different from the participants in this study (according to many socio-demographic variables). I am a white woman who is older than many of the students interviewed. I am currently a student, and I am a former college administrator. While this gave me some things in common with the participants of this study, I am not a student, alum, or administrator at the UNC-Chapel Hill and therefore was viewed as an outsider.

I do not have a relationship with any of the participants of the study. I contacted students and administrators that I found online (Facebook, newspaper articles, and university websites) before I met them in person. To my knowledge I do not hold any power over the participants; in fact, I feel indebted to them—they have the knowledge that I hoped to learn.

My positioning vis-à-vis my participants was a concern for me, starting with participant recruitment, and this concern was not unfounded. Due to the fear and hostility felt on campus, with student activists receiving death threats and armed counter-protestors on campus, I think potential participants were reluctant to answer an unsolicited email from a stranger. I was able to speak with some of the protesters, despite these hurdles. My outsider status was a hinderance in
initial contact with some participants, but many of the interviewees were open about their experiences and willing to share their insider perspective with me. In addition, many of them, administrators, faculty, and graduate students in particular, were sympathetic to the research process.

When I chose the research topic, I thought it was a topic I could be impartial about. I could understand why students would want the names changed or statues removed, but on the other hand, maybe we need to remember the past so we do not forget it. I soon learned that there is a difference between remembering the past as a cautionary tale and celebrating a painful history.

My background as a student affairs professional causes my default reaction to be to side with student, to be their advocate; however, this background in university administration also helps me understand how decisions at university are made and why the decision-making process can be cumbersome, laborious, and nuanced (a process that has been professionally frustrating at times). By being able to understand the frustration each party was feeling—students from not seeing change occurring and university decision-makers from the many constituents and policies they have to consider before enacting change, I should have been neutral. But my impartiality did not last long. The more I got into the research, the more I was swayed to the side of the protestors. I read more news articles about the students and their concerns, I started interviewing students and faculty on the campus, and I developed a greater understanding of the injustice these students were experiencing. My
admiration for the protestors grew as I learned more of their stories and understood their frustrations at the rate of change on campus.
Chapter IV

Findings

Like many universities across the country, UNC Chapel Hill has struggled with how to reconcile a racist history with a diverse constituency. This struggle was at its most pronounced during the controversy of renaming Saunders Hall in 2015 and how to address the issue of the Confederate Monument known as Silent Sam in 2018. The university chose to rename the name of Saunders Hall, named after a Ku Klux Klan member, to Carolina Hall after protests by students on campus. The Silent Sam statue is dedicated to members of the UNC-Chapel Hill community who fought for the Confederacy, and it has been an object of controversy and protest on campus. Bolman and Deal’s model of the four frames is used as a framework to understand how the university responded to these dilemmas. This chapter begins by providing a context for the decisions and outlining the history of the Saunders Hall and Silent Sam decisions. The four frames (structural, political, human resources, and symbolic) will be used to discuss the results. The interviews with 14 members of the university community, as well as secondary sources, will illustrate the various frames and how they were used as the university responded to calls for change.
Context

A student and activist at the University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill (referred to as UNC or Chapel Hill) stated, “you can't have a conversation about legacy at this university that doesn't connect to histories of racial subjugation” (Anonymous 2, personal communication, 2019). According to The Daily Tarheel, the campus newspaper, around 30 of the campus’s many buildings were named after people who are associated with white supremacy (McClellan, 2018). The legacies of Saunders Hall, now Carolina Hall, and Silent Sam are so closely tied to race relations at UNC-Chapel Hill, and of the South in general, that it is hard to know where to begin telling their tale. Does the story start with the protests that immediately proceeded their fall? Earlier protests? When the university was first integrated? Perhaps when the monument was commissioned, erected, and dedicated? Or when the building name was chosen? Is the Civil War the beginning of the story? After all, Silent Sam was installed to memorialize the Chapel Hill students who fought in the Civil War. Or maybe the story begins with the founding of the university, as one faculty member noted:

It’s a beautiful campus, but it’s also… that beauty and the layout of it makes it look like… like it can’t be changed. It’s always got to be these powerful people that are memorialized here. And of course, the university was the flagship and it was probably the first or second public university in the country, but it was built for wealthy, white, powerful young men. So, that’s part of the legacy, that it was built as an exclusionary place. And of course, we’ve broken down a lot of those exclusions, but some of them
are harder to break down. So, I think, yeah, the landscape and all/much of
the things that are honored in the landscape are part of this message of
white supremacy. (Cravey, personal communication, 2019)
The Southern Poverty Law Center found that a majority of 1,503 Confederate
memorials in the country were not commissioned directly after the end of the war,
but rather during times when white supremacy asserted itself against perceived
The dedication of Saunders Hall and the Confederate Monument were part of
this pattern, both being dedicated during times when Jim Crow laws were being
enacted across the south. Silent Sam started guarding McCorkle Place, a
prominent entry to the university, in 1913, and Saunders Hall was named after
William Saunders in 1922.

The attitude of white supremacy did not start with the founding of the
university or with the commissioning of the Confederate Monument; this mindset
of racial superiority is woven throughout its history. And those threads are still
visible on the campus a year after the toppling of Silent Sam and four years after
Saunders’s name was removed from the building: the fate of the monument still
technically remains undecided, there is a moratorium on the renaming of other
questionable building monikers, and students recently started an emergency
warning system to alert each other of potential neo-Confederates or white
supremacists on campus (McGee, 2019).

The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill was founded in January of
1795. It was the first state university in the United States to admit students. The
university, founded by the state legislature, was advocated for by Scots and Scotch-Irish settlers (Snider, 2004). Article 41 of the first constitution of North Carolina stated, “That a school or schools be established by the Legislature, for the convenient Instruction of Youth, with such Salaries to the Masters, paid by the Public, as may enable them to instruct at low prices; and all useful Learning shall be duly encouraged and promoted in one or more universities” (Snider, 2004, p. 7); out of this article, the university at Chapel Hill was founded. The university struggled over the years, growing slowly. Snider states, “during the antebellum years they build and managed a small academy educating the sons of the gentry for public service and professional careers. Slowly, as its clientele grew, including sons of expatriate North Carolinians from all over the South, the university expanded its horizons and became more than a minor college” (Snider, 2004, p. 74). While the clientele might have expanded, it did not expand across the race line.

In the years leading up to the civil war, the university was not united on the issue of slavery and secession (Snider, 2004), but eventually the university, as well as the entire country, was swept into the Civil War. The university remained open during the war, despite the lowered enrollment, decreased financial support, and the number of students and alumni who lost their lives in the fight.

During Reconstruction, the university endeavored to build itself back up. The 1869 commencement was an interesting time regarding race relations at the university and across the state. Governor Holden, in his commencement address, reasserted that the university was for the people, and he also
advocated, controversially, that the university should educate the newly freed slaves (Snider, 2004), despite the fact that the trustees planned to open a school for blacks in Raleigh (that particular plan was never completed) (Snider, 2004). Governor Holden’s eventual downfall, which contributed to a temporary closing of the university, is attributed by Snider to a prolonged battle with the Ku Klux Klan, as his actions to curb the terroristic activity of the Klan lost him the favor of the conservatives and led to his impeachment.

The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill has tried to balance on the knife’s edge of racial tension more than once; a prime example is during the civil rights era and the desegregation of the campus. In the 1940s, there were several “separate but equal” higher education institutes in the state, more than any other southern state at the time. In order to put off desegregation, the governor and general assembly granted funding and resources to black institutions (Snider, 2004), but since there was no black medical school, those concessions could not be made. The trustees voted to not consider race in application to the medical school in April of 1951, but in the same session denied the same policy at the law school, since there was a separate but equal alternative at North Carolina College (Snider, 2004). The U.S. Supreme Court, in June 1951, upheld a middle court’s decision to allow black students admission into the law school. In 1955, three young men became the first black undergraduate students at UNC Chapel Hill after a court case granted their admission (Link, 2017). So in the face of federal mandates, law suits, threats of law suits, and Supreme Court rulings, the university slowly integrated. Snider (2004) expounds on the attitude of the
university: “in this manner the university reluctantly accepted desegregation. Despite its reputation for liberalism, it did not take the lead but trailed other state institutions in the South, among them Virginia and Louisiana” (p. 247). While black students were admitted to the university, they remained segregated in other ways, including no mixed social functions. Snider notes that students were more willing to accept desegregation than the university administration. The overall attitude of state administration was less than accepting, with the governor appointing a committee to “recommend legislation in response to Brown” (Link, 2017, p. 462).

During the early 1960s, protests occurred all over the South demanding desegregation. The most famous lunch counter sit-in occurred in Greensboro, and galvanized college students across North Carolina, particularly those from HBCUs, to protest segregated restaurants, buses, and businesses. The town of Chapel Hill was not exempt, and some university students were involved, including John Dunne and Pat Cusick, who worked with black North Carolina College student Quinton Baker to lead UNC student activists (Link, 2017). Link (2017) describes the racial tension in North Carolina in the 1960s and 70s:

The upsurge of conflict and racial violence in North Carolina in the late 1960s and throughout the 1970s suggested the collapse of the modernizers’ model for racial harmony. Until that time, the state’s leadership had nurtured an image of racial harmony, and they had insisted that the “North Carolina way” of moderation and compromise had made their state one of the most tranquil in the South. But the uprising of African
Americans against Jim Crow had exposed the “North Carolina way” as nothing more than paternalistic smokescreen, and the convulsive changes that accompanied the end of de jure segregation brought a period of raised expectations, pronounced disappointment, and unremitting tension in the state. (Link, 2017, pp. 478–479)

The tension felt in the state was also felt on campus. Modern UNC Chapel Hill protestors cited the story of James Lewis Cates. The Daily Tarheel (McGee, 2018) reports that Cates was a 22-year old Black student in 1970 who was stabbed multiple times by members of a white supremacist biker gang; he died in the hospital later that night, and many believe if he had received treatment in a more timely manner he might have lived (the police did not allow him to be taken to the hospital until 15 to 30 minutes after the attack). Three members of the gang were arrested and charged with his murder, but an all-white jury acquitted them. The case still remains unsolved, and current protestors, such as Mia Little, use the apparent silence about the case as an example of UNC suppressing the memory of protests and civil rights issues on campus (McGee, 2018).

The protests surrounding Silent Sam and Saunders Hall prove that the civil rights issues that have played a part in Chapel Hill’s past are not at rest. The same struggles continue on campus, as students protest the vestiges of white supremacy they see on campus, and outside groups oppose the created momentum, much like the Klan did previously. The current protestors did not start problem, they are simply dealing with its aftermath.
UNC Chapel Hill

The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill has a complex decision-making process, as most universities do. At UNC-Chapel Hill, the Chancellor oversees the running of the university. The UNC-Chapel Hill Faculty Handbook (Faculty Handbook, n.d.) describes the position of Chancellor as:

The Chancellor is vested with complete executive authority, subject to the direction of the President of the UNC System. The Chancellor is responsible for carrying out policies of two governing boards: the UNC System’s Board of Governors and the University’s Board of Trustees. The Chancellor also makes recommendations to the president regarding academic program development, personnel matters (subject to policies of the Governors and Trustees), and budget development. The Chancellor maintains wide discretion in decision-making with regard to student affairs (subject to policies of the governing boards) and other aspects of the administration of the University, as provided under the General Statutes of North Carolina and the UNC Code.

While the Chancellor has a large amount of authority in regard to governing the campus, the position ultimately answers to the two boards and the president of the UNC system, who is elected by the Board of Governors.

Carol Folt was the Chancellor at Chapel Hill starting in 2013; she resigned in January 2019, largely as a result of the controversy surrounding Silent Sam. The role of Chancellor is never an easy one, and Folt was put in a precarious
situation while Silent Sam was in contention—she was expected to make a
decision, but many of her decisions were limited by those she reported to, such
as the Board of Governors and the Board of Trustees.

The Chancellor of UNC-Chapel Hill must report to the Board of Trustees, a
governing board for the Chapel Hill campus of the University of North Carolina.
The board of Trustees is composed of 13 members: eight appointed by the
Board of Governors, four appointed by North Carolina General Assembly, and
the student body president is an ex officio member. According to the Board of
Trustees website, “each board of trustees shall serve as an advisor to the Board
of Governors on matters pertaining to its institution and shall also serve as
advisor to the Chancellor concerning the management and development of the
institution.”

In addition to the Board of Trustees, another board, the Board of
Governors, also shares in the decision-making process. This board is for the
UNC system, not just one campus. Members of the board during the removal of
Silent Sam include several attorneys, members of the real estate field, lobbyists,
members of local or state government, and founders/CEOs/owners of various
companies/corporations/LLCs/nonprofits. The 24 members of the Board of
Governors are appointed by the state legislature, making the legislature yet
another member of this cast of characters deciding the route the university takes.

The North Carolina General Assembly consists of two houses: the Senate
and the House of Representatives. The Senate holds 50 seats and the House
120. The General Assembly is currently held by a majority of Republicans. The
state governor as of 2017 is democrat Roy Cooper, who defeated republican Pat McCrory. As a university for the people, the government of the people affects the decisions made on campus, and the university is impacted by the laws and policies created by the state government.

**Saunders/Carolina Hall**

![Timeline of Saunders/Carolina Hall](image)

Figure 4.1 Saunders/Carolina Hall Timeline

According to a Board of Trustees meeting minutes, a photo of which is posted on the UNC-Chapel Hill website “The Carolina Hall Story,” William Laurence Saunders was a lawyer, solider, historian, and statesman. The minutes list his accomplishments as:

- A UNC graduate
- Colonel of the 46th North Carolina Regiment, C.S.A.
- Head of the Ku Klux Klan in North Carolina
- Editor of the Wilmington Journal
Editor of the Raleigh Observer
Secretary of State of North Carolina, 1879-1891
Trustee of the University of North Carolina, 1874 – 1891
Secretary of the Board of Trustees of the University of North Carolina, 1878 – 1891
Treasurer of the University of North Carolina, 1883 -1891
Compiler and Editor of the Colonial Records of North Carolina
An ardent friend of the University and one of the master minds of North Carolina. (Home, n.d.)

While Saunders never publicly admitted to being a member of the Klan, these records show his affiliation was assumed and considered when the Board voted to name the building after him (Home, n.d.). It is not only the implied connection to the KKK that disturbs protestors, it is the idea that it was a reason for him being honored. One professor (personal communication, 2019), explained:

So, Saunders Hall, I think this was in the late 60s or early 70s, was first published in the student newspaper, I believe, that Saunders was a member of the Ku Klux Klan, or had been a member of the Ku Klux Klan, and essentially what happened was people every so often throughout almost 50 years would protest the name because he was involved in the Ku Klux Klan, of course being a white supremacist organization. And then I think people were really starting to look at the minutes from the Board of Trustees, it became apparent that not only was he in the Ku Klux Klan, but that the Board of Trustees actually named the building in large part
because of that particular role in the Ku Klux Klan, setting that apart as one of the most outstanding things that he contributed to the state. And so, this is pretty offensive to a lot of people for pretty obvious reasons.

Cecelia Moore, university historian and member of the History Task Force, a committee formed to contextualize the history of the university, explains the process of naming buildings during this time:

So, the thing about having the name Saunders on it, what to me was the larger, more important piece there, was in understanding how buildings got named over time. Because when this first started [the protests over Saunders Hall name] everyone, or a lot of people, just made the assumption that William Saunders had given a lot of money and they put his name on a building. That was not the case. William Saunders never knew his name went on a building; he died years before that building was ever named and had nothing to do with its naming. And so, what was interesting in learning about this era in the early 1920s, it was an era when the university undertook a massive new building campaign. It had a lot of money from the state legislature, and it did a lot of new building in the early 1920s in order to accommodate growth. And the people who put the names on the buildings, those new buildings, was a small group of trustees who oversaw that building process and they picked the names, and basically they decided to honor men who they thought had been important in North Carolina's history and were worthy of honoring. And this is part of the whole era of when Confederate monuments went up in public
spaces, and so very much the men they chose to honor, and this is all white men, reflected their belief in … in the validity of white supremacy, in racial segregation. So, once you looked at the naming of Saunders within the larger context, you understood a whole lot more about the history of this institution in the state. (personal communication, 2019)

As mentioned above, controversy surrounded the building’s history; however, the protests that led to name change began in 2014 and were led by the work of the Real Silent Sam Coalition, a group composed mainly of student activists, and other activists. Their protests included letters of support and a rally where some participants wore nooses around their neck with signs stating, “This is what Saunders would do to me” (Lamm, 2015a). A Letter to the Editor was published in *The Daily Tar Heel*, the student newspaper at UNC-Chapel Hill, from three representatives of the Real Silent Sam Coalition. The letter states:

**TO THE EDITOR:**

We are in a moment of tense observance of the violent racism that stretches back to the foundation of this nation. Police brutality against bodies of color has become a topic of discussion and outrage over the past six months. At our university and spaces of higher education across the country, students of color also face violence. We, The Real Silent Sam Coalition and affiliated others, are calling out the continued racialized violence that occurs on our campus. The most recent such incarnations are the Wainstein report, an affirmative action
lawsuit, the Board of Governors’ review of research centers representing marginalized identities and the virtual abuse on Yik Yak against students of color on UNC’s campus. These disturbing examples show that no space (even the often-fantasized utopia of higher ed) is free from the racially oppressive structures our nation was founded upon.

On Friday, Jan. 30, at 12:10 p.m., UNC students will reenact the dedication of the Confederate monument on our campus. The monument is falsely represented as honoring the UNC students who fought for the Confederacy. However, it was erected in 1913, at the height of North Carolina’s white supremacy movement to incite fear in the newly freed black population.

We are calling for the renaming of Saunders Hall (which glorifies William L. Saunders, the Grand Dragon and founder of the N.C. Ku Klux Klan) as Hurston Hall. We choose this name to honor legendary writer and folklorist Zora Neale Hurston, who was the first black student to take classes (in secret) at UNC prior to integration.

By choosing to honor Hurston, we students of color honor ourselves and all those who have come before us. She wasn’t given a place on this campus. Now, we give her one. A public university belongs to its students. Yet our school and schools
across the country refuse to prioritize students of color and their interests. But we do.

Blanche Brown

Omololu Babatunde

Dylan Mott

The Real Silent Sam Coalition. (Brown et al., 2015).

Altha Cravey, a professor in the Geography department, expounded on the work of the Real Silent Sam Coalition in protesting the name of Saunders Hall:

During that 2014-15 academic year, they [the Real Silent Sam Coalition] intensified their efforts and pushed really hard, and shifted away from McCorkle place and the statue, and shifted to this building [Saunders Hall]. They thought they could convince the trustees to change things, and, in fact, they did. At the end of the academic year the Board of Trustees, it was a split vote. And they included a moratorium, a 16-year moratorium on no more building name changes, I think to get a couple of the votes. But, at any rate, the students were right. That was a good strategic choice, because at the end of the year the board voted to take the name down. (Cravey, personal communication, 2019)

The Board of Trustees did decide to change the name of Saunders Hall in a split vote in May of 2015. The News & Observer quoted Trustee Haywood Cochrane, one of the three dissenting votes:

Some of us chose not to focus on a name only, but more fully on our history – good, bad and sometimes very ugly – and combining that with
our university’s mission to teach our history, to learn from it, to let it show us how far we’ve come, but also to let us understand how far we need to go. (Stancill, 2015)

History professor Harry Watson expounded on the Board’s decision:

So, ultimately, even the trustees, who were very resistant to this kind of thing, broke down and agreed to change the name to Carolina Hall, which everybody thought was a pretty lame name. But anyway, that’s what they did. And, it was a name that no one could complain about, or object to. (Watson, personal communication, 2019)

And Rachel Reynolds, a member of the Carolina community who spoke with me, agreed that the choosing of the name Carolina hall was safe, if uninspired:

That was the only one I know about, but there, you know, there could have been other options on the table. And then, somehow, they would have to manage that discussion and debate, and so once the decision that was made to change the name, which is a good decision you know because of William Saunders and what he represented and what he did, so, you know, it’s a good decision to take that off the building. And once that decision’s been made it’s like that’s, mm-hmm, you know let’s move that positive kind of step forward as quickly as possible, and I think that’s why Carolina Hall was chosen, you know? So, you know, did they go far enough? Maybe they went as far as they could in that moment. You know, certainly Carolina was better than Saunders Hall; I know nobody’s
questioning that. (Rachel Reynolds & Jacobson, personal communication, 2019)

Included in the Board’s decision was a 16-year moratorium on further name changes. The Daily Tar Heel reported on the Board’s decision, “Board chairman Lowry Caudill said the board could have picked any amount of time, but they chose 16 years so four generations of students could debate future name changes” (Lamm, 2015b). Another professor has a different view of why the moratorium was enacted:

It appears to me that moratorium was sort of a compromise, especially among the people who didn’t want to rename the hall at all and the people who wanted to go ahead and rename that one particular hall and try to sweep the problem underneath the rug. But it preemptively was meant to cut out the rug from further activists that might suggest other building names be changed. And then they also created what they called a historical task force in order to help the university more adequately deal with some of these issues related to controversial people involved in the university’s past. (Personal communication, 2019)

The board’s decision to change the name of Saunders Hall and the 16-year moratorium also passed with some other resolutions, one was an effort to curate UNC’s history in some public way and a possible historical collection (Stancill, 2015). The History Task Force was created to address these resolutions. Cecelia Moore, a member of the committee, elaborated on the functions of the Task Force:
In May 2015, after, that's when the trustees renamed Saunders Hall, there was, the Chancellor put together this task force, and with me as the project manager, and gave us several specific projects. The first was to do something with Carolina Hall. They had started out with the idea that they would put a marker outside of Carolina Hall, and, after some just internal discussion and listening to a lot of people, we came back and proposed that it be an exhibit inside so that we could use the wall to tell more history. Then the second project was to develop an interpretive plan for McCorkle place, which is that main quad where Silent Sam was, and to use it to do some interpretation of some of the things in the space and to tell a little, put some things in historical context. And then we were also asked to explore ways to institutionalize, so how to better tell the history and make recommendations on that, including whether or not there should be a museum. We were, I'm sorry, we were also asked to do an inventory, a campus inventory, of historical names and objects and places. (personal communication, 2019)

The work of the Task Force can be seen in the Carolina Hall Story website and the exhibit in Carolina Hall (photo in Appendix III).

The History Task force undertook an intimidating task of explaining a complicated and tension-filled history to the campus, and the present intruded upon their work. Watson explains:

But nevertheless, the university appointed this commission, a historical commission, to study the whole issue of campus history, to study the
whole idea contextualization, and putting up signs, not just around Silent Sam, but in connection with all the other buildings, and so on, and so on. And they had worked it all out, and had written their signs, and had gotten them approved and were just about to put them up when the first day of classes came around. And the day before that, of course, is when the crowd has demonstrations and people pulled the statue down. (personal communication, 2019)

The controversy of the building name of Saunders Hall was not a solitary incident. By resolving this issue, the problem was not solved, just postponed. The same undercurrents swirling around the building name were causing other ripples across campus, the largest being Silent Sam.

**The Confederate Monument (a.k.a., Silent Sam)**

```
1913 - Silent Sam erected by the Daughters of the Confederacy
2011 - Carr's dedication speech quoted on campus newspapers
April 2018 - Mia Little doused the statue with red paint and blood
August 2018 - protestors tear down Silent Sam
January 2019 - Folt orders pedestal removed and resigns as Chancellor
```

Figure 4.2 The Confederate Monument (a.k.a., Silent Sam) Timeline
The Confederate Monument, known casually as Silent Sam, was gifted to UNC-Chapel Hill in 1909, by the United Daughters of the Confederacy, has plaques that read:

Left: ERECTED UNDER THE AUSPICES OF THE NORTH CAROLINA DIVISION OF THE UNITED DAUGHTERS OF THE CONFEDERACY / AIDED BY THE ALUMNI OF THE UNIVERSITY


An article in the alumni magazine in 1974, spoke of the statue and its meaning on campus, “‘Silent Sam,’ the patron saint of the Confederacy in Chapel Hill and guardian of the old campus on McCorkle Place, is actually a Yankee” (“Carolina Alumni Review - January 1975 - page 8,” n.d.). The article continues to discuss the statue, the dedication, and the artists and model. The artist was Canadian John Wilson, and the model was Harold V. Langlois from Boston (hence why Silent Sam was considered a Yankee by the author of the article). The statue guarded McCorkle Place, the “Gateway” to the university for years, but not without controversy. In 1968 the statue was painted with graffiti following Martin Luther King, Jr.’s assassination; students cleaned the statue and decorated it
with Confederate flags (Lennon, 2019). Other rallies and marches were centered around the statue, but the current movement to remove Silent Sam began in 2011 when a graduate student sent a Letter to the Editor of *The Daily Tarheel* (Lennon, 2019). This letter quoted Julian Carr’s dedication speech for the Confederate Monument (Domby, 2011) which praises the purity of the Anglo-Saxon blood, and Carr relates this disturbing anecdote:

> 100 yards from where we stand, less than 90 days perhaps after my return from Appomattox, I horse-whipped a negro wench, until her skirts hung in shreds, because upon the streets of this quiet village she had publicly insulted and maligned a Southern lady. (Domby, 2011)

Whatever doubt there might have been as to the meaning given to this symbolic soldier at the time of its dedication was erased when this information was publicly shared. One staff member at UNC stated that he felt the easy access to historical information such as Julian Carr’s dedication speech added to the protest movement:

> I think the information is one of the biggest things that happened in the renaming of Carolina Hall, and information was big. And one of the biggest things, in kind of contextualizing Silent Sam, and it basically gave everyone the ability to see and read themselves the dedication that was, you know, that was given by Julian Carr at the time, you know, when he talked about whipping a negro wench or when he was talking about the preservation of the Anglo-Saxon race. Like you can actually read that now. (Jackson, personal communication, 2019)
According to Jackson, what had previously been considered common knowledge or rumor was now substantiated—anyone with access to a computer could learn more about the context surrounding Silent Sam, and that information was easier to disseminate.

Also in 2011, The Real Silent Sam Coalition was formed. This group was at the forefront of the battle to rename Saunders Hall, but removal or contextualization of Silent Sam was also a focus of their activism. The Real Silent Sam Facebook page (https://www.facebook.com/realsilentsam/) describes their organization:

The Real Silent Sam movement is a broad group of community members who hope to create honest public dialogue and provoke critical thought surrounding the monuments and buildings in Chapel Hill and Carrboro. Physical markers speak volumes about our university and our towns. These structures represent who we are—to natives and to newcomers—and we must continue to be conscious of how we wish to represent ourselves. We believe that we cannot move forward wisely unless we understand our entire history, one that has not been edited selectively. Our interest is not in erasing the legacy of inequity and discrimination of our communities. Quite the opposite, our intention is to ensure that we acknowledge our wrongs to gain the perspective necessary to collectively build a more just future. We aim to achieve these goals by providing access to information that goes beyond standard narratives and challenges our community to think critically about how the legacy of the
past shapes the present and what sort of future we want to create. (*The Real Silent Sam*, n.d.)

The efforts of The Real Silent Sam Coalition kept the issues surrounding public markers in the collective conscious of UNC-Chapel Hill. Altha Cravey, professor of geography, explains some of the protest actions performed by activist, some of them from The Real Silent Sam Coalition, in protesting Saunders Hall, Silent Sam, and the treatment of minority students:

In these brilliant kinds of things of, let me give you an example of one—have you seen the pictures of the Unsung Founders Monument with the little tiny figures holding up a table? It’s out there in McCorkle? [see Appendix II for photo of monument] So, one time they acted out the Unsung Founders Monument. It was mostly black women and they acted that out in The Pit, the free speech area over by the bookstore. And they just sort of froze for about 15 minutes in The Pit. And other students didn’t know what to do. But that’s one example. Another one would be, one time they stood on the stairs out here with nooses around their necks, and a little bit more harsh. But, anyway, they came up with these, they did poetry readings, they came up with very creative things to mix it up. But also, sort of standard protests of people yelling and screaming and marching over to McCorkle place and stuff like that. Writing letters and trying to get different constituencies aware and involved and educated. They started attending trustees’ meetings too, I guess I went to a couple of those. (Cravey, personal communication, 2019)
The protestors were galvanized when their concentrated efforts influenced the Board of Trustees’ decision to rename Saunders Hall.

Two national incidents amplified the controversy at UNC-Chapel Hill: Dylan Roof’s attack in Charleston, SC, in June of 2015, and the deadly rallies concerning Confederate monuments in Charlottesville, VA, in August of 2017. A faculty member at UNC-Chapel Hill, explains the impact these events had:

Clearly somethings happened on the other side of Saunders Hall, you know, Charleston, election of 2016, and the emergence of very public advocates of white supremacy, and then of course Charlottesville. Those certainly played a huge role. And one of the things that a lot of people like to do is they like to hem and haw and say, “well you know, Silent Sam, people weren’t protesting this before.” Which is not true at all. The protests had never reached the level they have, but certainly people have been protesting Silent Sam before. But people need to really, it’s disingenuous to pretend as if Charlottesville, Charleston, and the election of 2016 didn’t happen. That fundamentally altered the context of the Confederate monument, especially in the wake of these guys going to Charlottesville and chanting, “Jews will not replace us” around Robert E. Lee with torches and things like that. (personal communication, 2019)

The political climate and national events put pressure on the powder keg at UNC, as the professor pointed out, and he also allude to past protests. The history of the university included a history of resistance, of activism for inclusion. The history of white supremacy was met with a history of challenging that mindset—a
history that led to the desegregation of the university and activism in the Civil Rights era.

Protests surrounding Silent Sam continued, both advocating for its removal and for it to stay. Then in April 2018, graduate student Maya Little’s protest became a touchpoint. Little’s protest involved dousing the monument with red ink mixed with her own blood (for photo see Appendix II). Little told The Daily Tar Heel why she protested in such a way:

I smeared my blood and red ink on the statue because the statue was lacking proper historical context. This statue, Silent Sam, was built on white supremacy. It was built by white supremacists. It was built by people who believed that Black people were inferior and wanted to intimidate them. So these statues were built on Black blood. These statues symbolize the violence toward Black people. Without that blood on the statue, it’s incomplete, in my opinion. It’s not properly contextualized.

(quoted in Blake, 2018)

While other protests surrounded Silent Sam, the photos of Little’s protest became almost iconic, with departments around the university giving statements in support of her and advocating for the moving of the statue and activists publicly supporting her during her honor court trial.

The legal constraints surrounding the movement or removal of historical monuments was an issue impacting Silent Sam. In 2015, then Governor Pat McCrory signed a law making it illegal to remove monuments, such as Silent Sam, from public grounds without permission from the Historical Commission
As Little pointed out in an interview with The Daily Tar Heel, this law was passed two years into Chancellor Folt’s tenure while protests have been occurring since 1968 (Blake, 2018).

Protestors against Silent Sam took matters into their own hands in August 2018 as the Confederate Monument was torn down. It is believed that it was members of the community, not UNC students, who toppled the statue (Harry Watson, personal communication, 2019). While it might not be clear who was directly responsible there were some community members involved. Raul Arce Jimenez, as well as others, were charged with the toppling of the statue or charges related to the protests; Jimenez had also faced similar charges related to the removal of a Confederate statue in Durham, NC (Quiroz-Gutierrez, 2018), and he was sentenced to 24 hours in jail for injury to public property in regards to the toppling of Silent Sam (Grubb, 2019).

During the protest, activists created a visual shield from the police using backdrops zip-tied together. With the backdrops and crowds of protestors between them and the police, the protestors cut the bolts that held the statue to its pedestal, and Silent Sam fell (Lennon, 2019). While many saw this as a step in a positive direction, it did not end the controversy. The law states that a monument may only be moved for 90 days before being returned. Protests, both for and against Silent Sam, continued at the site and pedestal of Silent Sam, including armed pro-Confederate protestors marching on campus.

Campus opinion, at least the vocal opinion, was largely in favor of leaving Silent Sam wherever it was resting (which is an undisclosed space on campus).
A letter signed by faculty from almost every department at UNC encouraged the Chancellor and Provost to keep Silent Sam down (Lennon, 2019). *The Daily Tar Heel* quotes the letter, "show us that you and the university do indeed stand for *Lux et Libertas*, not sustaining and enforcing the symbols of human cruelty" (Holmes, 2018).

Letters to the editor and support towards the student activists was popular. Either the majority of campus was on the side of the anti-Silent Sam protestors, or the pro-monument supports did not feel comfortable sharing their opinions (May, personal communication, 2019). The most vocal supporters for replacing the monument where it previously stood were not campus members, but rather members of the local community.

The Board of Governors, the board for the UNC system, set a deadline of November 15, 2018, (see Appendix III for copy of the Board Resolution) for the Board of Trustees (UNC-Chapel Hill’s governing board) to come up with a plan to safely deal with the Silent Sam issue. Chancellor Folt stated that she believed the statue did not belong in such a prominent location (Lennon, 2019). The November 15, deadline was extended until December, when the plan proposed by the Board of Trustees was released and not received well. The plan advocated for a free-standing history center to house the statue; the opportunity to provide contextualization might have been welcome if not for the $5.3 million dollar price tag and the proposed location of the history center, a part of campus traditionally populated by historically underrepresented students. The proposal was eventually voted down by the Board of Governors in December 2018.
(Kassir, 2018), and the question of what to do with the statue (which was at an undisclosed location) and its pedestal (which was still in its original location in McCorkle Place) was still an unhealed wound on campus and in the community.

Legally, the university administration, including Carol Folt, and Board of Trustees was in a bind. The cost of maintaining security on Silent Sam's pedestal was a strain on the budget already strained from the security of the statue before it was removed. Additional security measures needed during protests and marches also had a large price tag. The protests, some by armed pro-Silent Sam supporters, were a security risk for the campus community, and death threats were made against specific activists by neo-Confederates. Harry Watson, member of the history department faculty, recounted a statement he made at a Faculty Council meeting after an impassioned presentation from a student regarding the perceived inaction of the administration:

We were in a moment of moral crisis. That every single action we could take in this moral crisis to get out of it was being deemed illegal. That if we left the statue off its pedestal, we were apparently breaking the law. If we tried to put it back, we would create so much chaos and turmoil that we would, in my opinion, be breaking the law because we would be creating conditions under which we couldn’t run a university anymore, and that’s our real legal business, right? So, to get out of this trap, somebody had to break the law. (personal communication, 2019).
Video and minutes of this meeting and Dr. Watson’s statement can be found on the Faculty Council website (*Faculty Council Meeting Minutes, UNC-CH, December 7, 2018, 2018*).

At this Faculty Council meeting, two resolutions were passed regarding the Confederate Monument; one was in opposition to the proposal presented by the Board of Governors and Board of Trustees on December 3, 2018 (Submitted by Prof. Frank Baumgartner), and a resolution submitted by Prof. Edwin B. Fisher that establishes a faculty committee that will be included by administration in the decision-making process and that any money spent on the disposition of the statue shall include matching funds to be used for student assistance, pay raises for service staff, and “student organizations, institutions, and organizations doing the work of an inclusive UNC” (*Faculty Council Meeting Minutes, UNC-CH, December 7, 2018, 2018*).

Eventually Chancellor Carol Folt did end the stalemate between the competing and possibly illegal options when she ordered the removal of the pedestal at the same time she announced her resignation. Her resignation letter to the campus (Folt, 2019) stated:

There is much I intend to accomplish with you in the next few months. I will continue to focus on our core mission, do all I can to make sure every person on our campus can thrive and feel welcome, and push forward with Carolina’s campaign and history task force. There has been too much recent disruption due to the monument controversy. Carolina’s leadership needs to return its full attention to helping our University achieve its vision.
and to live its values… Second, I have authorized the removal of the base and commemorative plaques from the Confederate Monument site in McCorkle Place. As chancellor, the safety of the UNC-Chapel Hill community is my clear, unequivocal and non-negotiable responsibility. The presence of the remaining parts of the monument on campus poses a continuing threat both to the personal safety and well-being of our community and to our ability to provide a stable, productive educational environment. No one learns at their best when they feel unsafe.

Her resignation was intended to take effect at the end of the semester, but after a closed Board of Governors meeting her last day was moved up to January 31.

Rick Seltzer (2019) from Inside Higher Ed details the tension between Carol Folt and the Board of Governors during her resignation. At 3pm on Monday, the Board announced it was going into a closed emergency meeting, 2 hours later Folt announced her resignation effective after graduation in May.

Seltzer (2019) details the board’s reaction:

Board of Governors chair Smith proceeded to issue a statement blasting her action, saying it lacked transparency and undermined the board’s goals of operating “with class and dignity.” The board did not know about the chancellor’s announcement before it was issued, according to Smith.

(n.p.)

On Tuesday, the Board announced that it accepted Folt’s resignation for January 31, instead of the May date Folt had planned.
In public remarks, Folt tried to separate her decision to remove the statue’s pedestal from her decision to resign, but the timing left many questioning the divide between the two decisions (Seltzer, 2019). Seltzer continues by quoting Board chair Harry Smith:

The board’s action wasn’t punishment, according to its chair, Smith. But the board would have liked to have engaged in more conversation about Folt’s actions, he said. “You know, it’s a bit stunning based on how this has gone, that UNC Chapel Hill felt they needed to take this kind of draconian action -- and I think that’s what it is,” Smith said. “When you start scheduling cranes at night and key and critical stakeholders aren’t involved, it’s just unfortunate.” (n.p.)

The removing of the pedestal and the resignation of Folt did not end the tension in regards to the monument. The monument and statue were kept at an undisclosed location on campus, until a decision could be made regarding their permeant disposition.

Protests continued regarding what to do with Silent Sam. The interim Chancellor has stated publicly that he does not wish for Silent Sam to return to campus, but the decision was once again postponed—this time until May (after the semester ended). At that meeting, the Board postponed the final decision indefinitely. Without a decision being made as to whether the monument would be returned or relocated, the campus and community cannot move on. Local pro-Silent Sam groups, sometimes armed, marched on campus. Activists have created a text alert system to warn them when white supremacist groups are on
campus (Student activists at UNC Chapel Hill create text alert system to warn of presence of racist groups, n.d.). Even though the monument has been removed, Silent Sam’s shadow is still cast over the campus.

**Saunders Hall and Silent Sam**

The changing of Saunders Hall to Carolina Hall and the toppling of the Confederate Monument may appear different. One was a name change approved by the Board of Trustees, and one was the result of protestors instead of an official action from the university. However, there are more similarities than differences. The first major similarity is the attitudes of racism and oppression that were interwoven in their creation. Saunders Hall was named after a man whose accomplishments included leading the KKK; Silent Sam was donated by the Daughters of the Confederacy to honor the members of the Chapel Hill family who fought for the Confederacy.

While Saunders Hall was changed as the result of administrative action, it was at least partially, if not wholly, the result of protestors. Silent Sam was toppled by protestors, and the discussion of what to do with the statue has been influenced by protestors from inside and outside the university. The power and influence of civil disobedience, of working outside the system to influence change in the system, played a major role in both incidents. Other similarities of the two incidents can be seen in how the four frames of Bolman and Deal’s (2017) model play out in the decision-making process, which will be discussed in the next chapter.
Halleck (1970) grouped the possible reasons students protest into three general categories: critical, sympathetic, and neutral. How these current protestors may be viewed based on his theory is determined by one’s preconceived notions. Those most likely to view the protests in a critical light are most likely those opposed to the protest goals. There are those on campus and in the community who are sympathetic to the goals of the protestors and therefore more likely to be sympathetic to their cause. Finally, there are those who attribute protests to it being the way the world is today.
Chapter V

Conclusions

Protesting of historical monuments or building names on campuses across the country has become a frequent phenomenon. The conflicting messages sent by universities who encourage diversity in their student body but have Confederate memorials on campus is being pointed out by students and other members of the communities. Universities are varied in their responses; some universities change building names or remove monuments in response to the criticism, others try to find a compromise by contextualizing the monuments or monikers, and still others refuse to change. Why the universities respond so differently is a mystery, but using Bolman and Deal’s four frames as a filter to the following questions may help bring some order to the confusion.

1) How did the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill respond to the controversy regarding the name of a campus building (Saunders Hall) and a historical monument on campus (Silent Sam), particularly following student protests?

2) How do the university’s decision-makers describe the motivations behind their decisions? How do the university decision-makers view their roles and the roles of the other stakeholders, such as students, alumni, supervisors, and the public?
3) How are university decision-makers and their decisions perceived by others in the University of North Carolina Chapel Hill community?

This project used a case study approach. The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (UNC) has been forced to confront its history as students and other members of the university community protested the name of Saunders Hall and the presence of the Confederate Monument colloquially called Silent Sam. The university Board of Trustees voted to rename the building Carolina Hall, although protestors made it clear they preferred the name Hurston Hall. At the same time, the Board enacted a 16-year moratorium against the changing of other building names. The protestors then turned their attention to Silent Sam, asking for the statue to be removed from its place of honor in McCorkle Place (often described as the gateway to campus). During a stalemate, when decision makers were bound by state law not to move the statue, and protestors on both sides of the issue clashing on campus, protestors removed the statue. Protests and tensions have continued, even after then university Chancellor Carol Folt had the pedestal removed in conjunction with her resignation. Maybe once a final decision about the fate of the statue is decided, the tensions will abate.

To gain an understanding of how the decision was made, I interviewed 14 members of the UNC community: 2 students, 4 faculty, 4 members of the administration/staff and 4 people who prefer to remain anonymous. In addition to the interviews, I used local news outlets that published stories and letters to the editor, university reports, social media, and other documents to gain a deeper understanding of the situation at UNC. I then coded the gathered information and
filtered it through the four frames. By looking at the situation through the structural, political, human resource, and symbolic frames, I was able gain a slightly better understanding of how the decisions were made.

**Context and the Symbolic Frame**

Bolman and Deal’s four frames provide an interesting and thorough paradigm to address the research questions of this study, beginning with the symbolic frame. The symbolic frame lends some understanding to why the protest occurred and adds context to the situation.

Symbols make a statement about who belongs, and by default, who does not. One may wear a symbol of their religion around their neck to show that they are a part of a larger group of believers. A sports fan may wear a team’s jersey to symbolize to others their devotion. But sometimes the same symbol has different meanings to different people, and that can create tension in an organization. The differing meanings placed on the same symbol or action is an assumption of the symbolic frame, according to Bolman and Deal (2017). They also state, “what is most important is not what happens but what it means” (p. 248). What the symbols of Saunders name and Silent Sam mean to the different constituents varies greatly. Cravey stated what Silent Sam came to mean to her:

To me it’s come to mean, it’s come to really be a symbol of Jim Crow to me. Rather than about the Confederacy, and I see it as this, kind of, placed very symbolically, and in terms of that open space at McCorkle Place, deliberately there at the entrance of the university to show the kind of dominance of white supremacy, and that threat of violence that Jim
Crow implied and that Jim Crow hierarchy implied. So, I came to start thinking of it like a lynching tree, literally. I’m probably not the only one who said that, but that is what I came to start thinking about it. (personal communication, 2019)

She also shared the meaning expressed by those who support Silent Sam:

I think the most diametrically opposed claim, and it grows out of the lost cause mythology, is that it represents certain people’s ancestors. That claim has been promoted through textbooks, and the Daughters of the Confederacy have a catechism they used to use with younger children. (Cravey, personal communication, 2019)

Cravey points out how the symbols on campus mean different things to different people, and she also alludes to how that meaning is passed on to others.

A student, who wished to remain anonymous, expressed the meaning they found in Silent Sam, “that’s sort of what it means to me, is that it’s just a symbol of just everything you don’t want the world to be” (Anonymous 1, personal communication, 2019).

The local newspaper and the campus newspaper had several letters to the editor concerning the meaning of Silent Sam and what should be done with the monument. This supporter’s letter in The Daily Tar Heel shows the meaning of sacrifice and honor he attaches to the bronze solider:

The Silent Soldier stands and should remain standing as a reminder of the willingness of these men to sacrifice their lives for their community, society
and families and their courage, tenacity and fortitude in the face of
adversities as they went valiantly into the dark night. (Bernosky, 2015)

And, perhaps, this Letter to the Editor expressed the tension between the
opposing viewpoints most clearly:

I find myself struck by the debate over the Silent Sam statue. I understand
that for some it is a symbol of Southern heritage. For others it is a symbol
of slavery. I do not doubt that it is both. (Reichart, 2015)

This letter expresses how sometimes it is only the language that is different when
describing what a symbol means—in this case “Southern heritage” and “slavery”
might mean the same thing, it just depends on if one wants to cover the truth with
a euphemism. So the tension might not be about what Silent Sam means, as
many would argue, but rather the meaning might be the same and the value
placed on that meaning is different.

When the meaning varies so greatly, confusion runs rampant. If clear and
decisive action was immediately taken, some of that confusion might have
diminished. However, as of this writing in October 2019, a final decision about
Silent Sam has not been made. The confusion and resulting anxiety is still
festerling on campus; so much so that students created an early-alert system to
warn each other when white supremacists are on campus (Bauer-Wolf, 2019).

Bolman and Deal (2017), when describing the assumptions of the
symbolic frame, state:

Events and processes are often more important for what is expressed
than for what is produced. Their emblematic form weaves a tapestry of
secular myths, heroes and heroines, rituals, ceremonies, and stories to help people find purpose and passion. (p. 248)

Maya Little’s protest when she splattered her blood mixed with red ink onto Silent Sam became such a story, and she became a folk hero(ine). During my interviews, five different people brought her story into the conversation. Her picture has been posted on websites and news stories, and her trials in court and honors court were covered in *The Daily Tar Heel* and local news outlets. She became a spokesperson for the movement, speaking at the rally that preceded the toppling of Silent Sam (Ward & McGee, 2018) and talking to reporters (Blake, 2018).

**Question 1 and the Structural Frame:** How did the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill respond to the controversy regarding the name of a campus building (Saunders Hall) and a historical monument on campus (Silent Sam), particularly following student protests?

The first question this study attempted to answer is how the university responded to the controversy surrounding the name of a campus building and a confederate monument on campus, particularly after the student protests. Bolman and Deal’s structural frame details the avenues the university had available to them in their response and helps to explain why those decisions may have been made.

The structural frame, described as factory, emphasizes efficiency through specialization. Chain of command and division of labor is important. The administrative structure of a university is an excellent example of the structural
frame. The divisions of labor are clear: faculty teach (and their specialties are specific), administrators each have clear duties (student activities, health clinic, bookstore, public safety, etc…), support staff has a prescribed job description (that keeps everyone else on track). Each employee knows clearly who he/she reports to, and who he/she supervises. For almost any situation that arises, there is a form to fill out or an office to talk to; the only difficulty is learning who deals with what situation or where to find a specific form out of many options.

Bolman and Deal (2017) state the following about the structural frame: “At any given moment, an organization’s structure represents its best effort to align internal activities with outside pressures and opportunities…. Structure represents a resolution of contending claims from various groups” (p. 93). An argument could be made that any protest is an effort to work outside the prescribed structure, to become the outside pressure that to which the structure must align. The protests surrounding Saunders Hall and Silent Sam were outside the prescribed structure, and they created pressure that the structure had to respond to.

Students have been calling for the removal of Saunders’s name at various points throughout the building’s history to no avail. The proper structural procedure would be to work within the avenues laid out for student feedback, such as the Student Government Association, letters to the Chancellor, or petitioning the Board of Trustees. By protesting the students used other avenues to make their needs known, in addition to the traditional structure. The prescribed methods were not gaining traction, so other means, outside the structural frame,
were implemented. Those methods worked, to a certain extent, and the Board of Trustees changed the building name. By implementing a 16-year moratorium on further building name changes and the creation of the History Task Force, the structural frame was re-asserted.

Bolman and Deal, when listing the assumptions of the structural frame, state, “organizations work best when rationality prevails over personal agendas and extraneous pressures” (Bolman & Deal, 2003, p. 45). When coding the interviews and newspaper articles, I chose the structural frame code and the political frame code for the same passage a few times; the pattern I noticed when I asked how the decision of Silent Sam or Saunders Hall was made was an explanation of the chain of command was given (who would make the decision), but that would sometimes be followed with an explanation as to what criteria was used when the ultimate decision was made—and that criteria was often political. This quote from a faculty member who protested for Silent Sam’s removal made this observation:

Students, you know, there’s been community groups and students who’ve gone to Board of Governor meetings to, but those are almost always, it’s arbitrary. Sometimes they, I think in the past two years they’ve sometimes had, what do you call it, public comment sessions where you can talk for three minutes. But sometimes they completely don’t let anyone in. So, sometimes we show up and you can go in and talk for three minutes, with the clock rotating. And a few people listen, but most of them don’t show up. But, at any rate, that was innovation that Spellings [former UNC
system president] brought, was to actually hear from the public. And, but it’s arbitrary. Sometimes it happens, sometimes it doesn’t. So, that hasn’t been a very good place for conversation either. (Cravey, personal communication, 2019)

The structural frame, rules and laws, dictated that the public comment sessions occur; how much weight the comments were given, or even listened to, was a decision made from the political frame.

Cecelia Moore expresses the frustration felt by others, who would like a quick solution to the Silent Sam issue but politics weight the process down:

I think that one of the other factors that is hard, that makes issues like the initial X I don't see them so hard is that for anyone seeking a quick solution, or a solution that we can put this to bed and it's over, that's not possible right now in the place this country is in. And so that makes it very frustrating for people who would like to just figure out what can we do to make it better and move on, but there's so many factors weighing into that that that makes that just, really, I know, it makes it very frustrating.

(personal communication, 2019)

The frustration was most likely those wishing for the factory-like decision making of the structural frame but having to the process slowed down by political considerations.

A student protestor expressed a similar frustration concerning a new Campus Safety Commission:
For example, this semester in the wake of all the police violence I mentioned earlier, we now have this…the interim chancellor is announcing a Campus Safety Commission, which I understand the importance of coalition building, but, rather than creating this new Commission, why don't you just come down hard on campus police here, choking us? That's right. Why do we have to create this whole new thing, and then…all the people sitting on the committee and put out some kind of photo op, right?

(Anonymous 2, personal communication, 2019)

This is an example of the structural frame being used for political concerns. Having a commission to oversee public safety would normally be classified in the structural frame; however, this commission, at least in the view of this student, was created for optics, to make the university look proactive for certain, probably powerful, constituents—a move from the political and/or symbolic frame.

The structural frame is also seen in the situations concerning Saunders Hall and Silent Sam in the general organization of the university and the processes they implemented to obtain information. For example, the History Task Force met with the Real Silent Sam Coalition. Moore elaborates on that meeting:

Oh, after the task force was appointed, we met with the Real Silent Sam Coalition, and, how, we the members of the task force and had a long meeting with them, and, you know, tried to try to listen very much. Because, they came away from it frustrated, I think, I think, in general, I am only speaking very generally, and I don't want to speak for them, they
express some frustrations to us, and I think they were justified in their frustrations. (personal communication, 2019)

This meeting, and the creation of the History Task Force, are prescribed ways the structural frame gathers information, but some of the frustration is from how the structural frame was not working in this situation.

Chancellor Folt was receiving feedback from many different groups when making her decisions regarding Silent Sam, including the Student Advisory Council to the Chancellor (known casually as SAC). SAC, a committee in the Student Government Association, conducted a survey of student opinion regarding Silent Sam and presented it to the Chancellor and posted it on their website (Student Advisory Committee to the Chancellor, 2018). The university also commissioned an After-Action Report regarding the toppling of Silent Sam, which is, in essence, an investigation to find out where the system failed (Glasser, 2018). These reports and committees are further evidence of the structural frame in action.

There were also several legal constraints that influenced how decisions were made, particularly during the Silent Sam tensions. The legal system is also a structure-heavy organization, and how those two structures interplay can create problems. In this case, there was a state law enacted in 2015 that prevented a historical monument, such as Silent Sam, from being moved without permission from the Historical Commission unless there were safety concerns. The spirit of the law only considered physical safety concerns, such as the monument might fall; it did not consider psychological safety or the safety
concerns surrounding the various protests of the monument. Safety was a concern on campus, stated publicly by Chancellor Folt, and felt by many members of the student body, faculty, and staff. However, the threat of armed neo-Confederates was not the type of safety concern outlined in the law. This left university officials, such as the Chancellor, between a rock (Silent Sam) and a structural hard place (the law).

The structural frame factory works best with problems that can be easily classified and resolved as quickly as other issues. The problem with the Silent Sam situation was it was not easily classified, and it could not be quickly resolved. Moore described the situation:

Universities generally are loath to create a problem if they don't see it's already there, right? So they look for “here we've done this and now it's done, and now we fixed that, we have fixed it and we can move on,” and that works against, that works against a situation when really what you need is to commit to doing some really long-term kind of soul-searching, right? So I don't know that any one action or any one individual could have shifted that. I just think that it was always going to be difficult. Other frames handle nuanced situations more easily. This observation from Moore illustrates how the structural frame often doesn't have the flexibility to bend to the situation; instead, it may try to bend the situation to fit the structure.

The structural frame provided guidelines to how the university could respond to controversial monuments on campus and building names. The protestors were able to work outside of the structural frame of the university
bureaucracy, but the university was limited by policies and procedures in their response.

Questions 2 and 3 and the Human Resource and Political Frames: How do the university’s decision-makers describe the motivations behind their decisions? How do the university decision-makers view their roles and the roles of the other stakeholders, such as students, alumni, supervisors, and the public? How are university decision-makers and their decisions perceived by others in the University of North Carolina Chapel Hill community?

Question two, how do university decision makers describe their motivations, turned out to be a difficult question to answer. I made attempts to contact the Board of Governors (an email during my initial research to the Board of Governors address listed on their website, and then a second email months later to the personal emails I was able to find online) and the Chancellor (an email to her new email address at the University of Southern California), and did not receive responses to my emails. Since these were unsolicited emails from an unknown address, the lack of response is hardly surprising. However, it did leave my only avenue for answering the question of the decision-makers motives their public remarks. Question three, how their motives were perceived, was an easier, although more complicated, question to answer, as each interviewee had an interpretation to the Chancellor’s and Board’s motives. Bolman and Deal’s (2017) human resource frame and political frame provide a structure to
understanding the motives and attributed motives of those making the ultimate decision at UNC-Chapel Hill.

**Human Resources Frame**

The human resources frame is concerned with the relationships found in organizations. Bolman and Deal (2017) explain the webs of connection between people and organizations:

The human resource frame highlights the relationship between people and organizations. Organizations need people (for their energy, effort, and talent), and people need organizations (for the many intrinsic and extrinsic rewards they offer), but their respective needs are not always well aligned. When the fit between people and organizations is poor, one or both suffer: individuals may feel neglected or oppressed, and organizations sputter because individuals withdraw their efforts or even work against organizational purposes. (p. 135)

The respective needs of the students, and some faculty and staff, who were concerned with the name of Saunders Hall and the presence of the Confederate Monument, did not align with the needs of the organization. This frustration with the misalignment was expressed in the protests that led to the change in name and removal of Silent Sam.

Some of the protestors expressed this frustration with the misaligned values. Dominique Brodie, a student at UNC, stated:

I think that they see this as an issue of one group’s heritage and another group’s, you know, sort of desire for comfort, but I think it’s really difficult to
truly explain and to truly vocalize and articulate how discouraging it is, and how traumatized really, it is to be on a campus that, especially as a black student, right? So I'm one of nine percent black students here… and so to be at a place that's supposed to be my home and see that the tallest… statue that stands at the front of this university is of a man that literally would have enslaved me and beat me, it's ridiculous. (Brodie, personal communication, 2019)

Brodie is pointing out the misaligned needs—he as a student should feel welcome and comfortable, but the physical environment of the university does not support that goal. And another UNC student expressed her response to one of the protests surrounding Silent Sam and how that changed her views of the statue and the university.

That was a stark moment, because I hid in my dorm room. I did not know. This was my first time in the South. I did not know, necessarily, what could have happened in that rally. So that was what Silent Sam to me then signified: my exclusion, and signified ideals that the university was founded upon that still linger and are still deeply penetrated in the fabric of the institution. (Anonymous 3, personal communication, 2019)

This exclusion that was felt by this student was an expression of the organization and people not fitting, not aligning. Her need for safety was not being met by the organization.
Steve May, a faculty member, relayed frustrations expressed by students:

Their concerns were the ones that are, I think, publicly, voiced. So they’re not unusual, I think for African-American students. It was, this is not a place for me. I am concerned that this is not what I thought it was. This reminds me that this isn’t a safe place, and this is not physically a safe place, but intellectually this may not be a safe place for me as well.

(personal communication, 2019)

The goals of the university to educate students was endangered by the misalignment of the needs expressed by the students and the tradition and structure the university worked within, as May points out. The human resource frame, that is signified by the family metaphor, failed to some extent. Those who were invited to be a part of the family did not feel welcomed or safe in the family’s home.

The human resources frame illustrates the differences in perceived motives of decision makers. Those protesting the statue and the building name did not perceive that their safety and belonging was a priority for those making the decisions.

**Political Frame**

The metaphor used to describe the political frame is that of the jungle. Conflict over scarce resources is the hallmark of this frame, and “organizations are coalitions of different individuals and interest groups” (Bolman & Deal, 2017, p. 188). The political frame generally does not refer to Republicans versus Democrats, Left against Right, but in the case of Silent Sam national and state
politics, right versus left, was a factor (or, at least a perceived factor). The
decision of how to respond to the tensions surrounding Silent Sam rested
somewhere with the Chancellor, who oversees UNC-Chapel Hill, and the Board
of Governors, who have oversight over the UNC System. The Board of
Governors, who has the power to dismiss the chancellor, is appointed by the
state legislature. Right now, the state legislature is weighted to the right. Harry
Watson explains the situation:

She [Chancellor Folt] was facing a Board of Governors, and even a Board
of Trustees, because we have two boards, A Board of Governors definitely
and a General Assembly behind them who are more politized, more
reactionary, more hyper-conservative than any group of non-university
supervisor the university has had to face since probably the 1920s. And,
they have cut our budget. We are up to, every year since 2008, even in
years of budget surplus, and they have said do more with less. We’re
spending too much money on universities, so get over it. And they were
telling her, “Carol, if you don’t do something we like about that statue,
we’re going to cut you all to ribbons.” They said that in closed door
meetings, but I’m morally certain that’s what they told her. So, it wasn’t
just a matter of going to court. It was the matter, it must have felt to
somebody as cautious as Carol Folt, like she was being asked to charge
the machine guns. And that that would not be in the best interest of the
university….I think it was essentially the Board of Governors, but behind
the Board of Governors stands the General Assembly who put them in
their offices. The members of the Board of Governors are chosen entirely by the General Assembly, and I think out of 24 members of the Board of Governors, like 3 of them are Democrats.... But anyway, that's the situation. It's a very, very partisan General Assembly. (Watson, personal communication, 2019)

Watson states very clearly how the state politics and the university politics were blocking Folt's routes forward. Another professor elaborates on the national and state political agenda being played out at UNC:

The white, conservative members of the legislature. It's a fabulous issue for them. This is the view of Southern history, well post-bellum Southern history. Separate poor and black people by race. So, as long as they have this issue of Silent Sam, it's not logical to pay $500,000 to keep up a monument that is just a cancer and potentially attracts violence to your campus. No private company would do that. It's just not logical whatsoever. So, you have to wonder, who is actually benefiting from this thing being here? Because they're not down here looking at it, like it said. I think it's a political issue that's just fabulous for them. You get people voting based upon a Confederate monument. And you don't necessarily have to deal with questions about education and health care, right? Because they're going to vote in favor of the Confederate monument. Because people are divided by race. And, so, I think those were the people the Board of Governors was the most interested in pleasing. There were all these, people suggested that people were worried about donors,
but that’s not a real thing, I don’t think. There were some loud voices that said, “Well I’m not going to give money to UNC anymore.” If people were giving money to UNC only because they had a Confederate monument, or if that’s the sole reason you would stop, you’re not a big donor in the first place, quite frankly. (Personal communication, 2019)

This professor points out how certain politicians can accumulate and keep power through the controversy surrounding the Confederate statue. By keeping the statue, a certain constituent block is kept happy and, therefore, current members of the government will keep their office.

This view of donors expressed by this professor is seen differently by other members of the community. Money is a scarce resource that causes conflicts in many organizations, and UNC is no exception. Cecelia Moore noted the conflicts arising from coalitions and money:

In any decision that happens at a university, some constituents views are given greater weight…. Because there's all different kind of factors going on in an institution this size. The leaders of the institution are weighing many things. So constituents who, like the legislature, carry a great deal of weight because they control money. Students sometimes don't seem to carry much weight because they're here for four years and they're gone. So there's different kinds of factors that get weighed that way…. There’s donors in that mix, there's athletics in that mix, and that's another way in which money comes into that equation for campus like this, an R1 research university there's research funds that come into play, because
those are the big pots of money. And so, right, everyone is not equal.

(Moore, personal communication, 2019)

The scarce resources of money and power made a complicated situation even more complicated. Moore detailed many of the institutional factors that put pressure on those making decisions, and many of those factors are related to money.

In addition to the state politics, the political frame was also present in the Silent Sam and Saunders Hall situations in the building of coalitions, a hallmark of the frame. The protestors gathered power by creating coalitions. A protestor, in explaining the tactics used, spoke of building coalitions and creating allies:

But, like I said, we had to really be strategic and try to be creative about collaborating with different groups, and trying to use different tactics and different ways of getting students to: 1) know about the issue, 2) care about the issue, and 3) actually want to participate in something that was going to help to get the statue removed. (Brodie, personal communication, 2019)

Another protestor elaborated on the structure of the protesting organizations:

So it emerged very, is very planned, but it was also very organic in the sense that different organizations have already been doing the work and sort of just came together, and formed coalitions, and then had like a division of labor. And so that was how it was organized. You saw that, in the student side of it, it was organizations like the Campus Y, Black Congress, and the Black Student Movement. And so, though those were
organizations that primarily had already done work or supported work that was related to the issue, and Black Congress was founded relatively new, but, again, it was made up of new students that were getting involved in the movement and coming together to form that council. And then on the graduate student side, when I say organic I mean that in a sense that grad students decided to take action, and then organize themselves, and then connected with undergrads, and organized. And undergrads decided to take action themselves, organized, and then connected with each other. And so that was sort of how things went. And it was organic in that sense, but still very much based on coalition building. And also wanted to be in the loop of what each other was doing, but understanding that we occupy different types of roles in the movement, and we each could do that as well. (Anonymous 3, personal communication, 2019)

The structure of the student movement was a coalition of like-minded groups, each with their circles of influence, who would work together for even more influence. As both students pointed out, working together was a way to amass more influence, to lend volume to their voices in an environment where the cacophony of demands would drown out their individual words.

A student explains the political tension as he sees it in the situation surrounding the Confederate monument:

I think that ultimately they need to give more weight in terms of stakeholders to the student body because I'm very much of the mindset that people that live within the community that, you know, work there every
day, live there, eat there, play there, every day should have the right to have the most influence on decisions like this, because it's their community at the end of the day. And looking forward at the student body of you and seeing what it's become over the past few years and what it's trying to become it's not very representative of the Board of Governors and the people that make these decisions, and it's hard because there's funding that UNC gets from the state of North Carolina and various parts of North Carolina obviously still would like the statue to be up and so it's hard for the Board of Governors even if they would like to bring it down, or something like that, you know, it's hard for them because first and foremost the law is very prohibitive in this regard and a second even if you were to change the law hypothetically the residents of the state of North Carolina feel very passionately about the University and its role in the community and the fact that their taxpayer dollars are going to the university and so even as miniscule as that might be on a personal level they still have a connection to the university in that regard and so balancing the act is very difficult but I think at the end of the day in an ideal world the student opinion would be given more weight and more appreciation for than the other key stakeholders while still maintaining a high sense of regard for what the North Carolina community wants as a whole. (Anonymous 4, personal communication, 2019)

This student has a grasp of the competing demands that contribute to the political frame—student opinion versus other stakeholders, the law versus the will
of the people. The political frame, and its coalitions, is a frame used either
consciously or subconsciously by many of the stakeholders in both the Saunders
Hall and Silent Sam situations.

The motives of the decision-makers was often viewed as the decision-
makers prioritizing the needs of a different constitution group instead of the group
the speaker felt should be prioritized. The political frame illustrates how those
different groups were viewed, and how the motives for decisions were based on
those perceptions.

Summary

Bolman and Deal’s four frames brings some clarity to a murky situation.
The human resources frame was neglected, leading some students to feel like
they were excluded from the UNC family, tolerated but not celebrated, invited to
holidays (where their pictures could be taken) but not invited to family meetings
where decisions were made. The structural frame, also known as a factory, is
where universities frequently shine. But the bureaucratic factory kept pushing
decisions further along the conveyor belt, away from students and those who live
in the community and into the political frame and those who make decisions from
a distance. The political frame was evident in how students formed coalitions and
pooled their power to make their case and secure their resources. Those with the
power to make changes used conventional political concerns of retaining power
and resources to steer their decisions or to prevent them from making decisions.
The symbolic frame was most easily evident, with each “side” of the controversy
viewing the symbols of Saunders Hall and Silent Sam differently. To one side,
they were viewed as symbols of familial duty and sacrifice, to others they were seen as symbols of hate and exclusion.

Discussion

What is the role of the university? Is it to educate students? To educate the general public? To discover and disseminate truth through research and publication? To provide a safe and secure environment? The university has all these roles and more. How those in power emphasize these roles determines the roles they play in the university and their motivations for the decisions they make. Someone who places more importance on the role of serving the citizens of the state might consider the average citizen’s position when making decisions, such as the dispensation of Silent Sam; whereas, one who sees his/her role as a caretaker and educator of the current students might make a different decision. Two people who view the role of the university as primarily one of educating the public might make a different decision on the same issues, such as whether to change the names of the buildings on campus.

The administrators and Board members have the role of protecting the safety, firstly of its students, but also all those on campus; UNC also takes its position as a public university seriously—it is there to serve the state and its citizens. In addition, the classical role of the university is to search for and disseminate truth. In most cases these roles and duties are held in sympathy and support of one another, but the situation at UNC-Chapel Hill is an example of when those conflict. The university administrators and decision makers had duties and motivations in opposition to one another. Their duty to serve the state,
interpreted as catering to law makers (who control the purse strings) and the average citizen and following the letter of the law if not its spirit, was in conflict with providing a safe learning environment for their students (both physical and psychological safety), which was in conflict with what their faculty put forth as truth (and disagreement on how to present that truth). In such a crucible, it became an issue of who would either crack under the pressure or break the vise first. It became a true moral dilemma with no easy answers.

An opinion piece in *The Daily Tar Heel* in October of 2015, expressed the conflicting roles of the university, as it explained that the research and scholarship conducted by members of the faculty of UNC illuminated the harm Silent Sam was perpetuating was not being used by those making the decisions:

At its core, a university doesn’t exist to pacify people, it exists to discover and promote truth. When UNC’s leaders remain neutral on the issues generated by its own scholarship, they fail the core values of the University. (Opinion: The University failed to promote its own scholarship)

The author of this letter to the editor pointed out the danger and hypocrisy of not using truth as it is discovered to make informed decisions. A professor at UNC-Chapel Hill elaborated on how the university failed to use the resources at its disposal to make their decisions and failed to educate:

Yeah, so the administration fundamentally failed to help educate, not only the public but the rest of the student body. It did not offer many resources at all. There were no special classes. There were no special programs. Anything like that sponsored by the institution. … Any program that was put
on was put on by department or an institute on campus, not by the administration. And to me that’s just… the least that you could do is try to help people try to understand what’s happening. (personal communication, 2019)

The university failed in its role to educate, but it also failed to use the research it had available to make decisions.

The role of providing a safe environment is an important role shared by all educators, and that role was motivation for many actions that took place surrounding Silent Sam. Those decisions were not made without controversy. In a letter to the campus community in August of 2017, Chancellor Carol Folt, Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, and the Chief of Police stated concern for the safety of those on campus in response to a planned rally by white supremist:

Our concern is always for your safety and so considering the potential for a highly charged atmosphere and the very real possibility for confrontation with outside groups, we would encourage you not to attend the rally on Tuesday. However, if you do choose to attend, we ask you to stay alert and vigilant. Campus police will be present to help address safety concerns. If you are not attending this event, please avoid McCorkle Place and the area around the Confederate Monument. (Folt, 2017)

The letter expressed concern for the physical safety of those who may be involved or near the planned rally, and it encouraged members of the UNC community to not attend the rally.
One faculty member expressed his concern over this message and similar messages:

So, I mean, I think from a faculty member’s perspective, there was a lot of concern for both for us and especially our students. Uh, who, on the one hand, wanted to go to those rallies and serve as a source of resistance. And, at the same time, I think legitimate concerns among us as faculty members for our safety and their safety. But I think, uh, Chancellor Folt’s initial messages around that rally and a couple of others subsequently was really focused on safety. And so, one of the things I’ve talked about is my concerns about how our efforts to engage in free speech on our own campus about an issue that concerned us was already being framed in terms of our own safety. So, in effect, a kind of paternalistic, orientation, I think, towards us, which would suggest please don’t go, stay away, this is unsafe, you shouldn’t be there. (May, personal communication, 2019)

And his concerns about safety were echoed in other interviews, citing the armed pro-Silent Sam protestors who have been on campus and the death threats made to student protestors.

A couple of the students I interviewed spoke of the conflicting roles, duties, and motivations of administration, mainly the conflicting roles of caring and educating students and the duty felt by many to the state and its citizens. A student addressed this conflict:

And so it was a very fragile line that we were walking the whole time between the student body, and there’s also a lot of diverse thought within
the student body, but, more so, the student body versus the North Carolina community as a whole, especially being a public university. It's really difficult, because while the Duke University president can essentially has ultimate reign over campus and what they do, because they're a private university, Chancellor Folt did not have the same flexibility and reported instead to the UNC Board of Trustees, the Board of Governors, who respond back to the residents of North Carolina, because it's a public university. And so there's a lot of moving components and a lot of key stakeholders that we have to take into account when learning about this. (Anonymous 4, personal communication, 2019)

Another student expressed some frustration that other roles or motivations were conflicting and making the decision-making process appear more political than structural or human resources:

You go and work in higher ed to help and support students, to research, and to support students, right? Like that is why you become a chancellor. That is why you become a professor. That is, you go to teach and learn and educate others, and that education starts with your student groups, right? Every person who's in higher ed and started out being a teacher at some point, and so I think the mission got lost, that administrators are there to support students. I think it very quickly turned a narrative how was the General Assembly gonna react? How is the Board of Governors going to react? Instead of making an executive call that would have just sped everything along, the process and dealing the repercussions later. And I
certainly don't think good leaders ride a fencepost, and I think that's exactly what happened this year was everyone just trying to stay in the middle as long as they could until they were forced to make a decision.

(Anonymous 1, personal communication, 2019)

These students illuminated how the conflicting roles of serving the students and serving the state, and different frames of human resources and political, influenced the decision-making process regarding Silent Sam. The goals of serving students and researching should be the main motivation for those making decisions, instead those in authority considered other factors, such as the General Assembly or the Board of Governors. Politics were affecting the mission, as this student stated.

Harry Watson describes a situation when he realized the rigidness of the structural frames of the university decision-making process and the laws regarding monuments conflicted, leaving decision-makers to question how they could fulfill their roles as educators and moral exemplars:

And I just, I found myself losing it. Because what that young woman showed me was that it wasn’t even a matter of the statue anymore, it was a matter of not being listened to. That not only the Black students, but a huge number of the white students also desperately wanted the university to take a certain action and to exert some kind of moral leadership and to stand for something. And the administration was absolutely stone deaf, not just tone deaf, stone deaf, to their feelings. So much so that there was this utter disconnect between the student body or the campus community,
I should say, and the administration. I called it a moment of moral crisis. (personal communication, 2019)

The keeping of the law was in conflict with the role of the university to teach and research, leaving a difficult decision for administration and Chancellor Folt. Watson points out in this quote the needs of the students and how they clashed with the actions of the administration; the conflict was a moral dilemma.

A member of the History Task Force, Cecelia Moore, expressed how her role as a historian and the university’s role were not always in sync:

I think in general it's one of the things I learned was kind of taking over this internal institutional historian role, and I come to it as a public historian much more so than just an academic historian, is that universities are not set up really to be historic interpreters. It's rare. What I mean, they're not an historic house. They're not a museum. They're not. And so the all of the impulses that I would have as a public historian to open up that conversation and explore more questions and stuff, universities generally are loath to create a problem if they don't see it's already there, right? So they look for here we've done this and now it's done, and now we fixed that, we have fixed it, and we can move on. And that works against, that works against a situation when really what you need is to commit to doing some really long-term kind of soul-searching, right? So I don't know that any one action or any one individual could have shifted that. I just think that it was always going to be difficult. (personal communication, 2019)
The role of a university to research and teach doesn’t always lend itself to educating the general public, even if/when that is a role the university embraces. Conflicting constituents, the public versus the student, can lead to conflict, and did lead to conflict. The goal to have a smoothly running university, the need to solve problems and resolve conflict that many administrators feel, are not often the most effective educational tools.

The News & Observer quoted Board of Trustees member Haywood Cochrane, one of the three dissenting votes in regards to renaming Saunders Hall:

Some of us chose not to focus on a name only, but more fully on our history – good, bad and sometimes very ugly – and combining that with our university’s mission to teach our history, to learn from it, to let it show us how far we’ve come, but also to let us understand how far we need to go. (Stancill, 2015)

His opinion highlights how the role of educator can be taken seriously by all concerned, and they will ultimately come to different decisions about what should be done. This board member states that the highest goal is to teach the history; for that to happen, vestiges of that history should remain on campus despite the problems it causes in the present.

**Relation to the field**

This study deals with a timely topic, even if the sources of the controversies are a hundred or more years old. Universities and communities across the United States are having to come to terms with how they remember
and/or celebrate history, and how that history conflicts with the present goals and ideals currently expressed by the community. This study, by looking in-depth at how one university is dealing with its reminders of a painful history, can help illuminate the issues and concerns surrounding such controversies. In order to maintain their roles as educators, universities must provide a safe environment, both physical and psychological safe. When students (and faculty and staff) must confront celebrations of a traumatic history on a daily basis, that safety is called into question. With such internal battles having to be fought, what energy is left for the educational process? How schools respond can make a difference, positive or negative, to those in the community, providing an environment where all are not only welcomed in theory but in practice. Only then can the true purpose of the university be realized.

**Limitations and generalizability**

This study has a limited scope. By only focusing on one university, the results may not be applicable to other schools. In addition, qualitative studies such as this one, capture snapshots of information from select people. The snapshots have detail of those individuals’ experiences, but those experiences may or may not be the experiences of everyone involved in the same situation. In addition, by using Bolman and Deal’s four-frame model as a theoretical lens is limiting. While this model provides several lenses to view the situation, there are other theories could provide other lenses that would provide different insights. Psychological theories could focus on the motivations of the protestors. Other theories may give more weight to the history of university or may consider
outside influences such as the national political climate to be of more importance. Such theories and insights may or may not be helpful and generalizable to other similar situations.

Implications for Policy and Practice

As universities face issues surrounding controversial building names and historical monuments on campus, looking at how other communities dealt with similar issues can be helpful. In addition, using the four frames to look at the issues, and those involved with the situation, can help provide insight. This study can, hopefully, help provide some of that insight, allowing other school to dissect the situation at UNC and find pathways through the situations that will benefit the students and the community. Unfortunately, each situation is so nuanced and so engrained into the institutional history and culture, that there cannot be a clear-cut, easy-to-follow, answer that will work in all situations. Each university will put different emphasis on the roles they embrace and how those roles should be fulfilled. Each university has different constituents depending on their support and direction, and whose support they depend upon. While the situation at UNC cannot provide answers to other universities, it can provide better questions, and this study can hopefully provide a direction to begin the search for answers.

Recommendations for Future Research

The avenues for future research are plentiful; while there are some well-researched current studies regarding student protests at universities, there is little research regarding the specific protests of historical monuments or building names. Therefore, other studies similar in nature to this study at different
institutions would provide valuable information for comparison. In addition, studies that consider the overall cultural climate of the studied universities, before and after the removal (or refusal to remove) of historical monuments or questionable names, could illuminate possible paths the universities may take that have more positive results than others. Studies of tactics used by protestors and the results they reap would also be an interesting avenue for future research. How social media influences the actions of protestors or how it may cause the disengagement or nonengagement of other potential activists is a direction needed to be explored in future research. In addition, researching the psychological effects of the monuments on members of the community, and also the psychological effects of protesting those monuments, is another research vein that needs further examination.

Conclusion

Untangling the threads that tie our present to our past is never easy. Often those ties themselves are painful, and sometimes the cutting of those ties is painful. And sometimes either option is painful to someone. Universities facing the controversial names of building or the presence of historical monuments feel those ties keenly, and often times dealing with those ties or ignoring those ties is equally painful and sometimes dangerous. At UNC-Chapel Hill, the university was faced with how to deal with the ties of Saunders Hall and Silent Sam, and those ties were (and are) painful. The university administrators were forced to deal with their, sometimes conflicting, roles of educator, public servant, legal representative, and security officer; they also made decisions based on the
motivations that drove them to those roles. The four frames, advocated by Bolman and Deal, provide interesting lenses to view those roles, motivations, and decisions.

In the structural frame, the conveyor belt of decision-making was slowed down and/or derailed, the legal system’s structure overlaid the university’s structure, and protestors purposefully acted outside of the frame to force decisions to be made. The political frame was evident in the coalitions formed and how state politics were considered. The symbolic frame was seen in the different meanings different constituents placed on the objects of contention and in the creation of new symbols and hero(ine)s. The human resources frame was evident in how some members of the family questioned their belonging based on the symbols on campus and how the university responded to those symbols.

The purpose of education and universities across the world is the search for what is good, beautiful, and true. Not only does each member of a university have a duty to search for the good, beautiful, and truthful, they have the duty to share the results of that search. Universities should be beacons of truth, beauty, and goodness—from the research they do, the classes they teach, and the environment in which learning takes place. Credibility for that search can be shaken when the ugly and hurtful become more prominent than the good and beautiful or when someone’s truth is ignored. How universities and college deal with issue of an ugly past or the speaking of their students’ truths will affect their credibility for seeking and teaching truth, beauty, and goodness. In order to
maintain credibility, universities need to confront their pasts, even the ugly, and hopefully create some beauty in the process.
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Appendix A

Interview Protocol
Interview Protocol
Activist

Name/Pseudonym:

1) Tell me about your experience at UNC-Chapel Hill? (Year, major, involvements, etc…)

2) Describe the culture at UNC-Chapel Hill.

3) How was the student movement organized? Were there leaders who emerged? What was the organizational structure? Were the two protests separate?

4) How did student activists motivate others to join their cause?

5) What happened with Saunders Hall?
   a. What was your experience with the renaming of Saunders Hall?
   b. What made you decide to protest the name of the hall? How did you get involved?
   c. How were you involved? What did you do to protest?
   d. What was your role in the process?
   e. How do you feel about the outcome?
   f. How do you feel about the 16-year ban on renaming buildings on campus?
   g. Why do you think the board made the decision it did?
   h. What affect do you think the actions of the student activists had on the board’s decision?
   i. Why do you think the student activists chose to protest in the ways they did?
j. Were other methods were tried before protesting (i.e., was protesting a last resort? Or was it Plan A?)?

k. What did you learn from the protest? Is there anything you would have done differently?

l. What kind of support did you find on campus (other students, faculty, staff, administrators)?

m. What kind of resistance did you meet?

6) What happened with Silent Sam:

a. What was your experience with the Silent Sam statue?

b. What made you decide to protest the statue? How did you get involved?

c. How were you involved? What did you do to protest?

d. Do you think the two experiences are linked (Saunders Hall and Silent Sam)? In what ways?

e. How do you feel about the outcome?

f. Why do you think the board made the decision it did?

g. What affect do you think the actions of the student activists had on the board's decision?

h. Why do you think the student activists chose to protest in the ways they did?

i. Were other methods tried before protesting (i.e., was protesting a last resort? Or was it Plan A?)
j. What did you learn from the protest? Is there anything you would have done differently?

k. What kind of support did you find on campus (other students, faculty, staff, administrators)?

l. What kind of resistance did you meet?
Interview Protocol
University Decision Makers

Name/Pseudonym:

1) Tell me about your experience at UNC-Chapel Hill (role/position, how long have you been here, etc…).

2) Describe the culture at UNC-Chapel Hill? Is the staff/faculty culture different than the student culture? How?

3) What happened with Saunders Hall?
   a. What was your experience with the renaming of Saunders Hall?
   b. What was your role in the process?
   c. What does the building name mean to you?
   d. What was your recommendation? Why?
   e. Do you think the situation should have been handled differently?
   f. What was the deciding factor for you making the decision you wanted to make?
   g. Did you encounter any resistance to the decision you wanted to make?
   h. What was your interaction with the protestors?
   i. What constituents impacted your decision?
   j. How do you feel about the outcome?

4) What happened with Silent Sam?
   a. What was your experience with the Silent Sam statue?
   b. What was your role in the process?
   c. What does the statue mean to you?
d. What do you think the statue means to different constituents?

e. Do you think the Silent Sam statue and the name of Saunders Hall are related? How?

f. What factors influenced your decision?

g. What interaction did you have with the protestors?

h. Did you encounter resistance to the decision you wanted to make?

i. Do you think the situation should have been handled differently?

j. What was your interaction with the protestors?

k. How do you feel about the outcome?

5) How were the decisions made? Who in the chain of command made the ultimate decision? What input was used in that decision?

6) Were some constituents’ concerns given greater weight? Why?
Sample Informed Consent Script:

My name is Brie McDaniel. I am a doctoral candidate in the Educational Leadership and Policy Department at the University of South Carolina. I am conducting a research study as part of the requirements of my degree in Higher Education Administration, and I would like to invite you to participate.

I am studying how universities respond to controversy surrounding building names or monuments on campus. If you decide to participate, you will be asked to meet with me for an interview about your involvement in the Saunders Hall and/or Silent Sam protests.

In particular, you will be asked questions about your time at UNC and your involvement with the Saunders Hall and/or Silent Sam protests. You do not have to answer any questions that you do not wish to answer. The meeting will take place at a mutually agreed upon time and place, and should last about 60 -90 minutes. The interview will be audio recorded so that I can accurately transcribe what is discussed. The recordings will only be reviewed by members of the research team and destroyed upon completion of the study.

If you wish your identity to be confidential, I can remove identifying information from the study. Study information will be kept in a secure location. The results of the study may be published or presented at professional meetings, but your identity will not be revealed without your permission.
I am happy to answer any questions you have about the study. You may contact me at 423.503.3699/briennem@email.sc.edu or my faculty advisor, (Christian Anderson, anders77@email.sc.edu).

Thank you for your consideration.

Brie McDaniel
Wardlaw 304, 820 Main St.
Columbia, SC 29208
423.503.3699
Briennem@email.sc.edu
Appendix B

Photographs
Figure A.1 The Confederate Monument’s (a.k.a., Silent Sam) commemorative plaque. (Commemorative Landscapes of North Carolina, 2010)
Figure A.2 Silent Sam after Maya Little’s Protest (Lundgren, 2018)
Figure A.3 Personal Photo of the Unsung Founders Memorial (4/11/19)
The Carolina Hall Story

In 1922, UNC’s Board of Trustees honored alumnus William Laurence Saunders by naming this building for him. The board cited his service in the Confederate army; his contributions as a journalist, politician, historian, and fellow trustee; and his leadership of the Ku Klux Klan in North Carolina during the post-Civil War years of Reconstruction.

In 2015, the trustees withdrew that honor and renamed this building Carolina Hall. They did so on grounds that their predecessors made a grave mistake in celebrating Saunders as the head of a “violent terrorist organization.”

Removing Saunders’ name was a vital step toward righting that error, but there is more to be done. This building is a place of scholarship and learning. It has been home to the departments of History, Economics, Commerce, Rural Social Science, Sociology, Public Welfare, English, Germanic Languages, Dramatic Art, Geography, and Religious Studies. Generations of students have gathered in these classrooms to learn about the past, grapple with contemporary problems, and prepare for responsible citizenship. The story told here is part of that work. It invites a frank examination of our past and points to the value of historical study in making a better university for today and tomorrow.

Figure A.4 Personal Photo of the Gallery in Carolina Hall (4/11/19)
Learning from the Past, Seeking a Just Future

Carolina Hall

On May 28, 2015, UNC’s Board of Trustees voted to remove William Saunders’ name from this building and to rename it Carolina Hall. They explained their reasoning:

“The Klan was a violent terrorist organization that sought to overthrow duly elected state governments and to reverse rights granted to newly-emancipated African Americans. Membership in and the activities of the KKK were illegal at that time and their activities would be illegal today. Leadership of the KKK as a qualification for the honor of a building name is inconsistent with UNC’s values of Lux Libertas.”

Confronting Our History

Students had voiced concerns about Saunders Hall as far back as 1976, but found little support. That changed in 2014, when a number of campus organizations – including the Black Student Movement, Real Silent Sam Coalition, and Campus Y – brought together students, alumni, faculty, staff, and local townspeople to petition the trustees to take down Saunders’ name. The various groups also organized teach-ins, rallies, and social media campaigns that connected UNC’s past to contemporary issues of equity, justice, and inclusivity.

“We cannot stand idle by as our history goes unquestioned, and as our silence serves as a glaring memorial to the wrongdoings of our past. We have a responsibility to our peers and ourselves to not only unveil, but confront the past we have inherited.”

Real Silent Sam Coalition

This movement built on earlier efforts to re-examine the history of the university and the state. In 2003, UNC became one of the first universities in the nation to offer a public account of its ties to slavery, and in that same year a state legislative commission issued a candid report on the 1898 Wilmington coup. In 2006, the Raleigh News and Observer published an apology and special supplement on its role in that tragic event. State lawmakers followed in 2007 with an apology for slavery and segregation.

The trustees took up the students’ challenge, studied the history of Saunders Hall, and held open forums to consider a range of opinions. Some speakers warned against “rewriting history” and urging memory of the violent acts that Saunders did so much to shape. Others countered that selective forgetting had been the purpose of the decision to memorialize William Saunders. Now, they said, the university had an opportunity to make the past plainly visible.

Whatever their differences, all of the parties involved in the Saunders debate agreed on one point: the ways we think about the past will define the university we imagine for the future.

“Telling both the good and the bad makes an unequivocal statement about Carolina’s values. We will be reminded of progress that has been made and progress that must continue.”

W. Lowry Caudill, Chair
UNC Memorial Foundation

Figure A.5 Personal Photo of the Gallery in Carolina Hall (4/11/19)
After Slavery — 
Race, Citizenship, and Democracy

TWO CIVIL WARS

The story of this building and the controversy over its name begins in the second half of the nineteenth century, when not one but two civil wars were fought in North Carolina. The first, 1861 to 1865, pitted a southern rebellion against the government of the United States. It took the lives of more than 35,000 North Carolinians who fought for the Confederacy, plus those of another 2,000 who died for the Union.

The second was an internal civil war that arose from the Confederacy’s defeat and ground on until 1900. It set North Carolinians against one another in a battle over citizenship and equality in a society no longer built upon racial slavery.

During the late 1890s, at the height of Reconstruction, and again in the so-called Fusion era of the 1890s, fragile alliances of blacks, whites, and American Indians attempted to create an inclusive democracy in North Carolina. Their opponents stood firmly for the preservation of white rule.

By 1900, the self-styled champions of white supremacy were victorious. They won by stealing elections through fraud and violence, codifying racial segregation, and stripping black men and large numbers of poor whites of the right to vote.

NORTH CAROLINA PEOPLE

The 1900 federal census recorded a total state population of 1,883,810:
- 1,283,818 Whites
- 526,993 Blacks
- 5,687 American Indians
- 81 Chinese

Residents with other origins totaling 50,000 included 70,000 Irish, 78,000 Germans, 32,000 English, 8,000 French, and 5,000 others.

The 1930 census recorded a total state population of 1,875,285:
- 1,283,261 Whites
- 506,024 Blacks
- 5,079 American Indians
- 51 Chinese

Figure A.6 Personal Photo of the Gallery in Carolina Hall (4/11/19)
Figure A.7 Personal Photo of the Gallery in Carolina Hall (4/11/19)
The 1890s —

George White and Fusion

GEORGE HENRY WHITE (1852-1918) was born into slavery. During Reconstruction, he attended a freedmen’s school supported by the federal government and studied at Howard University in Washington, D.C. He then returned to eastern North Carolina, where he taught school, practiced law, and ventured into politics.

White lived in North Carolina’s Second Congressional District—often called the “Black Second” because of its black majority population. Voters in the district had elected three black congressmen since 1874. White became the fourth in 1896.

Allies Across the Race Line

White was a leader in the political movement called Fusion—a multiracial alliance that joined Republicans with debt-ridden white farmers who bolted the Democratic Party in favor of a new national Populist (or People’s) Party. Fusion politicians won control of the state legislature and the governor’s office in the mid 1890s, and, like their predecessors during Reconstruction, enacted progressive reforms. They increased funding for public education and revised the state’s election law to make it easier for poor and illiterate citizens to vote.

“The issue confronting the American people to-day is the liberty of the laboring people both white and black, an issue of vastly more importance than the enslavement or freedom of the negro ever was.”

Fusion editorialist, 1896

A Municipal Coup

In the election of 1898, conservative Democrats set out to break the Fusion alliance and end multiracial politics once and for all. They again made white supremacy their rallying cry and used violence to suppress the vote.

The worst violence occurred in Wilmington, where white insurrectionists set fire to the office of the Daily Record, the city’s black newspaper, and ousted the Fusion board of aldermen in the only municipal coup d’état in American history.

Figure A.8 Personal Photo of the Gallery in Carolina Hall (4/11/19)
Securing White Rule

Back in control of the legislature in 1899, Democrats drafted a disfranchisement amendment to the state constitution that imposed a literacy test designed to take the vote away from their black opponents. In order to register to vote, male citizens would be required to prove their ability to read and write any section of the U.S. Constitution. That barred the 64 percent of black North Carolinians who were illiterate, along with many others who faced the effects of hostile white resentment.

WOULD YOU HAVE PASSED THE LITERACY TEST?

Write your name, address, and the U.S. Constitution on this card or even the back of a grocery bag. Ask a white man to sign it. You are illiterate and不合格 to vote.

"PERMANENT GOOD GOVERNMENT BY THE PARTY OF THE WHITE MAN"

In 1899, Democrat Charles Brantley Aycock (Class of 1888) campaigned for ratification of the disfranchisement amendment and election to the governor’s office. He and party leaders appealed to white racial unity and tried to undercut the voting power of American Indians. They barred members of the Eastern Band of Cherokee from the polls and attempted to win over skeptical Lumbee towns called Oriental by promising protection from disfranchisement. Democrats also employed fraud and intimidation. Their victory established a system of whites-only politics that lasted until the Civil Rights Movement and the Voting Rights Act of 1965 reopened the ballot box to all citizens.

After his death in 1912, Aycock was memorialized as North Carolina’s “Education Governor.” Supporters pointed out that he more than doubled school spending, opposed lawmakers who tried to prohibit the use of white tax receipts for black education, and launched a program to build thousands of rural schoolhouses. But many North Carolinians remembered that the Fusionists Aycock defeated had also valued education, and in the mid-1890s had funded white and black schools on a near-equal basis. That contrasted with sharp disparities under the Aycock administration. In 1900, the state spent less on rural black schools than in 1896, and during the years 1902 to 1906 annual school construction for whites outpaced that for blacks five-to-eight-fold.

VOTER PARTICIPATION

White men and black disfranchisement entered the political life of the state. Fewer black people voted. While disfranchisement, which prohibited all black voting, in 1896, dropped to 54 percent in 1914, and in 1912 had dropped to less than 5 percent.

GEORGE WHITE’S FAREWELL

Shortly after Governor Aycock’s inauguration in January, 1901, George White delivered a farewell address in which he urged fellow members of Congress to “abolish race hatred”.

“These parting words are in behalf of an outraged, heart-broken, bruised and bleeding, but God-fearing people, faithful, industrious, loyal people [who] Phoenix-like will rise up some day and come again.”

White was the last black North Carolinian to serve in Congress until 1892, when Democrats Eva Clayton and Mel Watt were elected to the U.S. House of Representatives.

Figure A.9 Personal Photo of the Gallery in Carolina Hall (4/11/19)
Making Memory, Making White Supremacy

JIM CROW

Leaders of Aycock’s generation worked to make white supremacy seem natural and unremarkable by writing it onto the landscape. They erected Confederate monuments in courthouses squared across the state and marked public and private spaces with Jim Crow signs that separated “whites” from “colored.” In some places, American Indians, too, were set apart—or offered no accommodation at all.

UNCHILLED

We were bottled up and boxed in and set aside—sent to the back of the line, the side window of a restaurant,” recalled civil rights activist Pauli Murray.

“Who was to understand that no matter how real and clear, how horrifying, unforgettable and polite, how crushing and awful, how shaming and void, we were; it needed no essential difference in our place.”

NAMING SAUNDERS HALL

When UNC’s trustees attached Saunders’ name to this building, they contributed to memory-making that sought to vindicate the Confederacy and reconcile North and South. Together with whites throughout the nation, they set aside moral questions of slavery and justice, celebrated the common valor of men who had once been enemies on the battlefield, and made heroes of the Klansmen who had “saved” the defeated South from the “tragedy” of Reconstruction.

On both sides… we fought for the cause which we believed right, as we had been taught to do. The majority of Southerners, the men who fought, were not Ku Klux Klan members. They were Southerners. The Doughboy soldiers, the ordinary farmers, the teachers, the ministers, the young men of the North and the South. There was only one thing in common between the people of the North and the people of the South, and that was the-y were Southerners. You get the idea of the whole thing, the idea of the whole situation. That’s a common heritage to all Americans.

UNEASY DOMINANCE

Black North Carolinians did not give up their claim to equal citizenship. Across the state, they established chapters of the NAACP and worked politically. In 1919, a group of prominent black men in Raleigh backed the mayoral candidacy of Dr. Manassa Thomas Pope, a veteran of Fusion politics. “We knew we would not win,” one of Pope’s supporters later recalled, “but we wanted to wake up our people politically.”

At UNC, a new generation of white faculty and students also questioned Jim Crow. Sociologist Howard Odum and playwright Paul Green roused black life with lively, avant-garde spirit. The student staff of the Carolina Magazine struck at the “Negro dixie” by showcasing the work of Langston Hughes and other writers of the Harlem Renaissance. And from his office in Saunders Hall, history professor Howard Beale declared that the time had come “to cease lauding those who restored white supremacy.”

Though forward-looking, these UNC figures did not call for an immediate end to Jim Crow. That would await a new wave of black activism in the 1950s and 60s.
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Appendix C

Copy of Board of Governors Resolution
RESOLUTION OF

THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF

THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA

August 28, 2018

WHEREAS, Chancellor Folt and the Board of Trustees of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill have engaged in considerable work to explore options regarding the Confederate Monument; and

WHEREAS, Chancellor Folt and the Board of Trustees expect to be in a position to provide a plan for a lawful and lasting path that protects public safety, preserves the monument and its history, and allows the University to focus on its core mission of education, research, economic stimulation, and creating the next generation of leaders.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board of Governors directs Chancellor Folt and the UNC-Chapel Hill Board of Trustees to develop and present to the Board of Governors a plan for the monument’s disposition and preservation, which should be presented to the Board of Governors by November 15, 2018.

 Adopted this ___th day of August, 2018

Harry Smith, Chairman     Secretary