In 1972, University of North Carolina officials named this building to honor Joseph Grégoire de Roulhac Hamilton, professor of history from 1906 to 1951 and founder of the Southern Historical Collection. Hamilton Hall was built to house the Departments of Sociology, Political Science, and History.

Students and faculty raised objections at the time the building was named, noting that "Hamilton was a follower of William A. Dunning," with whom he studied at Columbia University, and that "the 'Dunning School,'" the name attached to Hamilton and others who earned their Ph.D.'s under Dunning's direction, "was best known for its anti-Negro view of Reconstruction." They added that "the theories of Dunning and Hamilton had been discredited, and that many historians [considered] Hamilton a racist."¹

Hamilton:

- Chaired UNC's history department from 1908 to 1930, and held a prestigious Kenan Professorship from 1920 until his retirement in 1951
- Served as founding director of UNC Libraries' Southern Historical Collection, which he directed for twenty-one years, and played a leading role in establishing the university's preeminence in southern studies
- Expressed through his scholarship what one biographer has described as a "racist disdain for the very idea of black people voting and holding office and managing public affairs"²
- Gave scholarly legitimacy to the regime of Jim Crow that subjugated Blacks as second-class citizens
- Remained faithful to self-avowed white supremacist principles throughout his career

Hamilton was one of four self-avowed opponents of Black freedom and equal citizenship honored by the university's trustees amid the protests of the modern civil rights movement. The others were: William Waightstill Avery (Avery Residence Hall, 1958), a lawyer, enslaver, state legislator, and secessionist who represented North Carolina in the Provisional Congress of the Confederate States of America; Cameron Morrison (Morrison Residence Hall, 1964), governor from 1921 to 1925, who began his political career as an organizer of vigilantes known as Red Shirts during the state white supremacy campaigns of 1898 and 1900; and

¹ Jim Becker, "Politics of 'Imposing Edifices,'" Daily Tar Heel, August 31, 1972, noted with thanks to Rebecca Hoffman, a student in American Studies 671, Names in Brick and Stone (Professor Anne Mitchell Whisnant), who researched the naming of Hamilton Hall. As of this writing, a search in university archives has yielded no official record of the naming decision.

Josephus Daniels (Daniels Student Stores Building, 1967), editor of the Raleigh News and Observer and lead propagandist in the white supremacy campaigns.3

Joseph Grégoire de Roulhac Hamilton (known to friends and family as Roulhac) was born in Hillsborough in 1878, the son of Daniel Heyward Hamilton Jr. and Frances Gray Roulhac Hamilton. Before the Civil War, members of his extended family had accumulated great wealth and political influence through the ownership of land and enslaved laborers. Young Hamilton was the great-grandson of James Hamilton Jr., governor of South Carolina during the Nullification Crisis of 1832; Thomas Ruffin, slaveowner and jurist, who served as chief justice of the North Carolina Supreme Court from 1829 to 1852, and again from 1858 to 1859; and Elizabeth Mathews Heyward, heiress to three plantations and two hundred slaves on Callawassie Island, South Carolina. Both Hamilton’s father, a graduate of The Citadel, and paternal grandfather fought as officers in the Confederate army. After the war, Daniel taught for a time at the Hillsborough Military Academy and its successor, the Horner and Graves School, and late in life, served as clerk of court in Orange County. On his mother Frances’s side, Hamilton was related to Joseph Blount Grégoire Roulhac, a Bertie County slaveholder and prosperous Raleigh merchant. At home, Frances raised her son on family lore and taught him formal lessons on history, literature, and politics. She tutored him until he was old enough to attend Sewanee Academy, the preparatory school affiliated with the University of the South, both located in Sewanee, Tennessee. Hamilton graduated from the university with a master’s degree in 1900.4

As an undergraduate, Hamilton was steeped in reverence for the defeated Confederacy. He pledged the Kappa Alpha fraternity, which traced its origins to the Kuklos Adelphon, or Circle of Brothers, founded at the University of North Carolina in 1812. This “old KA,” as it was later known, spread to campuses across the country but was more or less defunct by the time of the Civil War, thanks largely to internal power struggles and public revelations of its secret rites. In 1866, students at the College of Washington (later renamed Washington and Lee)

3 See Avery, Daniels, and Morrison dossiers prepared by the Commission on History, Race, and a Way Forward.

resurrected the order as a neo-Confederate brotherhood, "Southern in its loves . . . Caucasian in its sympathies." John C. Lester, one of the founders of the Reconstruction-era Ku Klux Klan, recalled that the organization's rituals were borrowed from a well-known college fraternity. According to Klan historian Allen Trelease, Kuklos Adelphon "almost certainly provided the model."5

Hamilton continued his studies at Columbia University in New York, where he earned a Ph.D. in American history in 1906. He wrote his dissertation on race and politics in post-Civil War North Carolina. Hamilton joined the history faculty at UNC shortly after graduating from Columbia, and in the years that followed, he rose quickly through the ranks. He was appointed Alumni Professor of History and chairman of the history department in 1908, and in 1920 was elevated to a prestigious Kenan Professorship. Hamilton resigned as head of the history department in 1930, so that he could devote his time to the Southern Historical Collection (SHC), which he founded that same year.6

Hamilton set out to create a "great library . . . of Southern human records," and to that end, he traveled constantly throughout the region, gathering up troves of letters, diaries, plantation records, and related materials, mostly from families made wealthy and powerful before the Civil War by their enslavement of Black men, women, and children. That focus reflected his judgment about whose experiences and perspectives mattered in telling the story of the South’s past. In 1934, a reporter from the campus newspaper, the Daily Tar Heel, spoke with Elizabeth Cotten, Hamilton’s assistant and first curator of the SHC, to learn about the materials that were arriving by the boxload "from the garrets, trunks, and chests of the South." For the better part of a quarter-century, Cotten had been a prominent and outspoken member of the United Daughters of the Confederacy, and in the interview, she made her regional and racial loyalties clear. She dazzled the student-journalist with stories of "precious documents and relics, including letters and possessions of 'Stonewall' Jackson, letters of Robert E. Lee, and of Jefferson Davis" that were stored in the university library’s "fire-proof vaults." She also spoke with great excitement about the newly acquired papers of William Pettigrew, who had enslaved more than one hundred souls on plantations in Tyrrell and Washington Counties. Those materials, Cotten


6 Sitterson, "Joseph Grégoire de Roulhac Hamilton."
explained, would rehabilitate racial slavery as a virtuous institution by illuminating "the master-
slave relations prior to the Civil War in a new and more favorable light."7

Hamilton served as the SHC’s director until his retirement from the university in 1951. His successors continued to acquire new materials at a steady pace, making the archive a destination of necessity for researchers interested in the American South. Over the years, many of those scholars wrote new histories of the region that challenged the neo-Confederate sensibilities that guided Hamilton’s early collecting. Pioneers in that work of re-examining the past included Black historians John Hope Franklin, whose dissertation, The Free Negro in North Carolina, 1790-1860, was published by the University of North Carolina Press in 1943, and Helen G. Edmonds, author of The Negro and Fusion Politics in North Carolina, 1894-1901, which the press published in 1951.8 In recent years, staff in the Wilson Special Collections Library have built on this legacy by diversifying the SHC’s holdings, with a particular emphasis on collecting materials that document the Black experience in the South. They have also established new community partnerships outside of the academy to support "underrepresented history keepers in telling, sharing, and preserving their stories." The aim is to gather up for safekeeping a documentary record of all the people who call themselves southerners.9

This great archive is Hamilton’s most significant legacy at UNC. It is, today, a dynamic, living collection that defines the university’s preeminence in southern studies. As historian Jacquelyn Dowd Hall noted at the SHC’s seventy-fifth anniversary celebration in 2005, it “helped to put UNC on the map in the 1930s, and it has made the university a Mecca for scholars ever since. Now fifteen million items strong, the Southern, moreover, serves not just scholars but researchers of all kinds – including creative writers, local and family historians, and students –


9 Community-Driven Archives, University of North Carolina Libraries, https://unc.live/3cIPVEL. See Appendix 1 for a complete account of SHC initiatives designed to make the collection more inclusive.
who learn here what it means not just to memorize dead historical 'facts' but to 'do history,' to connect their lives to a living past."^{10}

Roulhac Hamilton began his long career as a historian and archivist in 1902, when he enrolled at Columbia University to study under the supervision of William Archibald Dunning. Dunning was a leading figure among a new generation of university faculty who were transforming history writing, once the literary pursuit of amateurs, into a profession. They were experts, credentialed by the Ph.D., an academic degree borrowed from German universities, and they produced original research that was grounded in the kinds of archival sources that Hamilton would later collect in Chapel Hill. Dunning assembled around himself a group of pupils who shared his resolve to rescue the white South from the shame of defeat in the Civil War. Those young scholars wrote their dissertations on Reconstruction, the turbulent era that followed the Confederacy's collapse, when Americans clashed over the consequences of Emancipation and the meaning of Black freedom in a nation that had been founded as a slaveholders' republic. Together, Hamilton and his peers came to be known as the Dunning School, and their accounts of the South after the Civil War held sway in the academy for the better part of half a century.\footnote{11}

Dunning and his students described Reconstruction as a "twelve-year nightmare of debauchery, exploitation, and plunder" by an unholy alliance of vengeful northern politicians and brutish Blacks who were determined to elevate former slaves above their masters and impose "negro rule" on defeated, defenseless white southerners. In the opening decades of the twentieth century, this understanding of the past informed, and was informed by, the mythology of the Lost Cause, which the United Daughters of the Confederacy and United Confederate Veterans promulgated in schools and libraries, public squares and halls of government. That account of the Civil War and its aftermath taught that Confederate soldiers had fought as American patriots, not traitors, and that the tragedy of Reconstruction was the suffering imposed on whites rather than whites' rejection of racial justice and equal citizenship. The Lost Cause's appeal reached well beyond the South – it spoke to people throughout the nation who thought of the United States as a white man's country and longed for reconciliation on that basis.\footnote{12}

\begin{footnotes}
\end{footnotes}
Hamilton was a prolific member of the Dunning School. He authored numerous books—including a study of party politics in antebellum North Carolina, a history of the state from the time of the Civil War, and a biography of Henry Ford—along with hundreds of essays, pamphlets, and articles in the popular press. He also edited multi-volume collections of the papers of North Carolina governors William A. Graham and Jonathan Worth, jurist Thomas Ruffin, and newspaperman and Ku Klux Klan martyr Randolph A. Shotwell. But before all of that, it was Hamilton's scholarship on Reconstruction—or, as he said, the "crime of Reconstruction"—that secured his reputation. That work, together with his accomplishments as curator, won Hamilton election as president of the Southern Historical Association in 1943 and made him a much-sought-after lecturer who taught as a visitor at institutions across the country, most notably Harvard University and the Universities of Chicago, Michigan, and Southern California.\(^{13}\)

An inherently violent racial premise pervades Hamilton's writings on Reconstruction: white supremacy is Nature's law, and its enforcement is essential to good government, social peace, and economic prosperity. That claim echoed political scientist John W. Burgess, Dunning's teacher and colleague at Columbia, with whom Hamilton also studied. "There is something natural in the subordination of an inferior race to a superior race, even to the point of the enslavement of the inferior race," Burgess wrote in his own work on Reconstruction, "but there is nothing natural in the opposite. It is entirely unnatural, ruinous, and utterly demoralizing and barbarizing to both races."\(^{14}\)

Hamilton maintained that the truth of that assertion was readily apparent at the end of the Civil War, when four million enslaved Blacks cast off their chains. Determined to establish meaningful freedom for themselves and their children, they withheld their labor, demanded fair wages from white landlords who had once owned them as chattel, and moved restlessly to maximize their leverage by playing one employer off against another. Hamilton read this as indolence. Freed from the discipline of slavery—or what he called the "security and stability" of the "old order"—Blacks supposedly "had no ambition to excel; to [them] labor was bondage; idleness, freedom." As a result, Hamilton claimed, there was "confusion everywhere" across the South and masters without slaves faced certain destitution.\(^{15}\)

---


Hamilton argued that in these circumstances whites had every right to reassert their dominion over Black lives and labor, which they attempted to do in 1866 with the passage of laws that came to be known as Black Codes. In North Carolina, white lawmakers sought to keep Blacks subjugated and to "fix their status permanently" by attaching to them the same "burthen and disabilities" imposed on free people of color before the Civil War. Under the state's Black Code, freedmen could not vote, carry weapons without a license, or testify in court against a white person, except in cases in which they were either the plaintiff or the defendant. State law also prohibited interracial marriage, made rape and attempted rape capital offenses when committed by a Black man against a white woman, and gave sheriffs broad authority to prosecute freedmen for vagrancy, a crime punishable by hiring out to "service and labor" (in effect, a form of re-enslavement).16

Writing in 1914, at a time when Jim Crow segregation was being firmly established, Hamilton judged these restrictions "to have been on the whole reasonable, temperate, and kindly." He argued that they might have been the basis for a quick national reconciliation, had the victors in the Civil War contented themselves with the abolition of slavery and accepted the restoration of white rule. But the Republican majority in Congress – by Hamilton's lights, a motley "group of humanitarians, negrophiles, and idealistic sentimentalists" – had other ideas. They were determined to fashion a new South according to principles of "negro equality, social and political."17

Between 1868 and 1870, Congress compelled the former Confederate states to ratify the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments to the U.S. Constitution, which granted former slaves birthright citizenship, guaranteed all citizens equal protection of the laws (which mooted the Black Codes), and established the right of universal manhood suffrage. The consequences were nothing short of revolutionary. In North Carolina, as in other southern states, Black men, newly freed from bondage – "'gibbering Africans,’” Hamilton called them – won election as sheriffs and clerks of court, town commissioners and state legislators.18

---


By Hamilton's account, this flush of democracy produced a Black reign of terror. Intoxicated by their power at the polls, he contended, former slaves set out to "kill and burn." "Liberty with the negroes degenerated into license," Hamilton exclaimed, and crime of every sort — "larceny, assault, riot, arson, murder, and rape" — was rampant. Under so-called "negro rule," much of the South became, as Hamilton saw it, "a veritable hell . . . which approximated to anarchy."19

For Hamilton, this view of Black freedom and its consequences gave legitimacy to the "Ku Klux movement" that arose to restore white men to power. He held the Klan in high regard and praised it for "spreading a salutary terror" (emphasis added) among Blacks and their white allies. In Reconstruction in North Carolina, an expanded version of his doctoral dissertation and his most substantial scholarly publication, Hamilton recounted some of "the most notable examples of the [Klan's] work." His tone was sympathetic — at times, reverential.20

The hooded vigilantes were particularly active in Alamance County. There, "the Ku Klux whipped Alonzo Corliss, a Northern man who was teaching a negro school near Company Shops. He . . . had insisted upon the negroes going to church and sitting among the white people," Hamilton reported. "In addition to whipping him, [Klansmen] shaved one side of his head and painted one side of his face black. . . . Shortly thereafter, a flag was set up in the road near his school, trimmed with crape, and a coffin stamped upon it with the following inscription: 'Corliss and the negroes. Let the guilty beware. Don't touch Hell.'"21

On another occasion, the Alamance Klan rode into Graham, the county seat, and seized Wyatt Outlaw, a Black constable and town commissioner — in Hamilton's words, a "blatant negro" who had "fired upon the Ku Klux" in a prior confrontation. The hooded nightriders "carried [Outlaw] to a tree in the court-house square and there hanged him." As the raiders were leaving town, Hamilton added, "a semi-idiotic negro named William Puryear saw some of

---

21 Ibid., 468-69. Company Shops was the community that had developed around maintenance facilities built between 1855 and 1859 for the North Carolina Railroad. It was renamed and incorporated as Burlington in 1887. See Durward T. Stokes, Company Shops: The Town Built by a Railroad (Winston-Salem: J. F. Blair, 1981). Corliss opened his school under the auspices of the American Missionary Association, headquartered in New York, which operated schools for newly emancipated Blacks throughout the South. On November 30, 1869, he sent association director William E. Whiting details of his encounter with the Klan. "We are in trouble," he wrote. "Five men disguised in a Satanic garb on the night of the 26th inst. dragged me from my bed and bore me roughly in double quick time 1½ miles to a thicket, whipped me unmercifully and left me to die. They demanded of me that I should cease 'teaching niggers' and leave in ten days or be treated worse. I wish to have money enough to come home, or to do what I think best, as this case develops. Please send me a check forthwith for ($75) seventy-five to use when I need it. . . . I am not able to sit up yet. I shall never recover from all my injuries." Alonzo B. Corliss to William E. Whiting, November 30, 1869, Series 1: Home Missions and Schools, box 126, American Missionary Association Archives, Amistad Research Center, Tulane University, New Orleans, Louisiana.
them and reported the fact. He disappeared that night and was found some weeks later in a neighboring pond.\footnote{22}

In nearby Caswell County, Klansmen committed another political assassination. The victim this time was John W. Stephens, a white state senator allied with Blacks in North Carolina's biracial Republican Party. Stephens had traveled to the county courthouse to observe a political rally of self-styled Conservatives (they would later call themselves Democrats) who opposed Reconstruction. A Klansman, acting on a clever pretense, lured him down to the building's basement, and there, "seven men seized him." Stephens "was bound, gagged, and laid upon a pile of wood." Hamilton explained that "the original plan was to keep [Stephens hidden] until night and then to hang him in the square, but the danger of discovery was so great, that it was now decided not to delay at all." The men "cut [Stephens's] throat, at the same time drawing a rope tightly about his neck, and stabbed him to the heart, after which they left" to rejoin the rally. Stephens's body was not discovered until the next morning.\footnote{23}

As a backdrop to these spectacular acts of violence, Klansmen also kept up a steady campaign of terror. They raided Black homes under cover of darkness, Hamilton reported, and, like slave drivers, wielded the lash without mercy, whipping "for the purpose of intimidation." During one particularly gruesome raid in Alamance County, "a child was trampled and died from its injuries." The penalty for self-defense was often death. In some cases, Black men who attempted to protect their families "never appeared again"; in others, they were found hanging from trees along public roads. The Klan struck with "a retaliation so violent, a retribution so swift," Hamilton noted with approval, that "panic, not soon allayed, spread among the negroes." "With the mass of the white people," that effect made the Klan's ruthlessness "very popular and . . . naturally so."\footnote{24}

Hamilton freely admitted the Klan's "inherent evils" but insisted that violence was "justifiable" as a means of restoring "the supremacy of the white race and of Anglo-Saxon institutions." Further to that point, he added that "like practically every other evil" of the era, ultimate responsibility for Klan outrages rested "upon those who planned and put into effect" a scheme to "Africanize the State" and deny white men their right to rule. In other words, the victims of Klan violence brought injury and death upon themselves.\footnote{25}

\footnote{22 Hamilton, \textit{Reconstruction in North Carolina}, 467, 470-71. For more on Outlaw and his murder, see Carole Watterson Troxler, "'To Look More Closely at the Man': Wyatt Outlaw, a Nexus of National, Local, and Personal History," \textit{North Carolina Historical Review} 77 (October 2000), 403-33.}


\footnote{24 Hamilton, \textit{Reconstruction in North Carolina}, 342, 466, 469, 471.}

\footnote{25 Ibid., 453-54, 667.
Hamilton celebrated the final collapse of Reconstruction in 1877 as a victory for what a partisan in the battle called "a white man's government, framed by the wisdom of the white men, and secured by the blood of the white race." But there was a problem. Despite the restoration of white rule, Black men still had the right to vote, and so long as that right remained, there was potential for a new upwelling of biracial, coalition politics of the sort that had emerged within the Republican Party after Emancipation. Hamilton grew up with adults who feared such an insurgency, and in his early twenties lived through a contest between democracy and white supremacy that was in many respects an extension of the battle that had taken shape during Reconstruction.26

The second uprising followed closely on the heels of the Panic of 1893, one of the most severe economic downturns in American history. Mounting hardships persuaded a sizable minority of white farmers and laborers to join a third-party Populist movement and forge a Fusion alliance with Black and white Republicans. In 1894, the Fusion coalition won a majority of seats in the state legislature, and in 1896, captured the governor’s office as well. Similar alliances formed elsewhere in the South, but in no other state did they gain control of both the legislative and executive branches of government. If biracial politics were to succeed anywhere in the region, the best chance was in North Carolina.27

26 Ibid., 633.

27 Helen G. Edmonds, The Negro and Fusion Politics in North Carolina: 1894-1901 (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1951). Edmonds’s study was the first scholarly rebuttal of Hamilton’s account of the Fusion movement. As the work of a Black scholar, it was largely ignored by white historians until the 1970s.
Fusion lawmakers enacted reforms that, in many ways, looked like a reprise of Reconstruction. They revised state election law to expand access to the ballot box, equalized per capita spending on Black and white schools, shifted the weight of taxation from individuals to corporations, and made generous appropriations to state charitable and correctional institutions. The response from Democrats – heirs to the Conservatives of the Reconstruction era – also looked familiar. In the elections of 1898 and 1900, they waged a war for white supremacy. The Raleigh News and Observer and other Democratic papers whipped up race hatred with stories of corrupt "negro rule." In nighttime raids and at the polls, Klan-like squads of vigilantes called Red Shirts intimidated Fusion voters, and in Wilmington in 1898, an organized white mob, led by UNC alumni Alfred Moore Waddell (a former congressman) and William Rand Kenan Sr., rampaged through Black neighborhoods, killing wantonly, and forcibly removed the city's biracial Fusion government.²⁸

Democrats won control of the state legislature in 1898, passed the first statewide Jim Crow law in 1899, and in 1900 campaigned for an amendment to the state constitution that would disenfranchise Black men and many of their poor white allies by means of a literacy test and a poll tax. Hamilton detailed these events in the third volume of the mass-market history of North Carolina that he published in 1919 with UNC colleague Robert D. W. Connor and Trinity College (later Duke University) historian William K. Boyd. In that work, he dismissed white Populists as "radical fanatics," the same characterization he had attached to white Reconstruction-era Republicans, and he wrote that Fusion had once again unleashed Black criminality. Under Fusion rule, "conditions were indescribably bad," Hamilton declared. "Murder, burglary, arson, [and] rape stared the [white] people in the face." There was only one cure: the elimination of Black men – once and for all – from the political life of the state.²⁹

Hamilton lionized Governor Charles Brantley Aycock (UNC class of 1877), who won election in 1900 with a promise to usher in a new "era of good feeling" and prosperity among whites. On the stump, Aycock argued that Black political participation had "kept the white people at enmity with each other" and that only the removal of Black voters would heal the body politic. "We must disenfranchise the negro," he explained to white men at his rallies. "Then we shall have . . . peace everywhere. . . . We shall forget the asperities of past years and . . . go forward into the twentieth century a united people." On Election Day, Aycock and the constitutional amendment won voters' approval by a margin of fifty-nine to forty-one percent of ballots cast.³⁰


Hamilton rejoiced in the telling of this tale. "The enfranchisement of the negro [during Reconstruction] partook of the nature of a revolution," he explained to his readers. Now, that grave error was "undone by a counter-revolution," setting loose a "current of progress" that had been "checked by the negro vote" for "three long and dreary decades." At last, Hamilton exclaimed, North Carolina "was ready to go forward to a new day." With Black men stripped of the right to vote and the principle of equal citizenship decisively set aside, whites could reconcile their differences and build for themselves a prosperous future by improving public education, investing in the growth of cities and industries, and modernizing agriculture. A new age of Progress – with a capital P – was to hand. Hamilton so admired what Aycock and his fellow white supremacists had wrought that he chose a portrait of the governor as the frontispiece for his account of North Carolina in the modern era.31

As historians John Roper and James Hunt have noted, Hamilton found in the white supremacy campaigns of 1898 and 1900 the same lesson he had identified in his study of Reconstruction: For North Carolina to advance in its economic and social development, "Black former slaves needed to be controlled in some status less than truly free." But in this instance, history exposed the historian's lie. Aycock's victory marked the beginning of the brutal regime of Jim Crow, which for more than half a century relegated Blacks to second-class citizenship and saddled them, as well as many whites, with merciless burdens of poverty, sickness, and suffering. North Carolina in the early twentieth century was anything but progressive in the ordinary sense of the word.32

With no appreciation for irony or moral accountability, Hamilton declared at the end of his telling of North Carolina's recent past that the white supremacist principles he extolled would enable the state's people to "move forward toward the realization of democratic ideals." He published those words in 1919, America's "year of racial violence," when Black soldiers returning from the First World War, intent on claiming their share of the nation's democratic promise, were met by white mobs who rioted and lynched. The violence struck close to home when a crowd of enraged white men in Franklinton, North Carolina, murdered Powell Green, a twenty-three-year-old veteran, "recently discharged from the army." Green had fatally shot a white theater owner after the man publicly scolded him for "light[ing] a cigarette in the show house." Newspaper accounts reported that Green was a "bad negro" – disrespectful, "disposed to think well of himself," and "resent[ful]" of any affront that "seemed to reflect [poorly] on him or his conduct." The white mob snatched Green from police custody, tied him "to the rear of an automobile while he was alive, and dragged him fully for one-half mile." They then shot Green multiple times and hanged him from a tree. When his body was discovered the next day,

"souvenir hunters" snatched buttons and scraps of fabric from his clothes as mementos of Jim Crow justice.\textsuperscript{33}

The men who lynched Powell Green acted on ideas about Black criminality and white authority over Black lives that formed a through line in Hamilton's scholarship. Their actions, much like events in our own historical moment, offer a sobering reminder that stories we tell about the past have present-day consequences. They sometimes become a matter of life and death.

In July 2020, that awareness led faculty in the Departments of Sociology, Political Science, and History, along with colleagues in the Curriculum in Peace, War, and Defense, to petition Chancellor Kevin M. Guskiewicz for removal of Hamilton's name from the building in which they work (see Appendix 2). They did so on grounds that "throughout his career as an academic and archivist, Hamilton promoted white supremacy in ways that were intellectually dishonest and damaging, even considering the context of his times." They also requested that the building be renamed for civil rights activist, lawyer, and priest Anna Pauli (Pauli) Murray, who, on account of her race, was denied admission to graduate study at UNC during the 1930s.\textsuperscript{34}

We do not address the question of renaming in this document, because it is to be evaluated through a process yet to be established by the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees. We do, however, endorse the petition to rescind the honor bestowed on Hamilton in 1972. The material presented in this dossier supports that endorsement and speaks to concerns that have been raised in response to the faculty petition.

Critics of the call to rename Hamilton Hall have urged that Hamilton the scholar be judged fairly. They contend that he was a man of his times, and that his views on race, though reprehensible by today's standards, were, during the Jim Crow era, widely held and seldom questioned. But we know as a matter of historical fact that the ideas embedded in Hamilton's scholarship were sharply contested, even as he researched and wrote his histories of race and politics in North Carolina. The forty-one percent of voters – whites along with Blacks – who cast their ballots in opposition to Charles Aycock and white supremacy in 1900 clearly rejected the


\textsuperscript{34} Kenneth Andrews, chair, Department of Sociology; Mark Crescenzi, chair, Department of Political Science; Lisa Lindsay, chair, Department of History; and Navan Bapat, chair, Curriculum in Peace, War, and Defense to Chancellor Kevin M. Guskiewicz, July 28, 2020, in author’s possession (see Appendix 2). On Pauli Murray’s life, see Glenda Elizabeth Gilmore, \textit{Defying Dixie: The Radical Roots of Civil Rights, 1919-1950} (New York: W. W. Norton, 2008), chapt. 6.
Jim Crow world that Hamilton embraced. Indeed, those citizens were so determined in their disapproval that the champions of white rule resorted to extreme measures – political violence and disenfranchisement – to silence them.

Other dissenters were outspoken as well. In 1905, at the time Hamilton was completing his Ph.D., William A. Sinclair, a former slave armed with degrees in medicine and theology, published *The Aftermath of Slavery*, an account of Emancipation and Reconstruction that challenged the triumph of Jim Crow on "social, economic, and moral grounds." "The policy pursued by the [white] South," Sinclair wrote, "a policy of mob rule and lynch law; oppressive, prescriptive, and unlawful legislation; harsh persecutions and general ostracism; and debasement of all colored people . . . is not constructive of the peace of the nation, but on the contrary is destructive of the very foundations of peace."35 Five years later, Black scholar-activist W. E. B. Du Bois published an article on "Reconstruction and Its Benefits" in the *American Historical Review*,36 the profession's journal of record, and in 1913, to mark the fiftieth anniversary of the Emancipation Proclamation, John R. Lynch, a Black advocate for civil rights and former congressman from Mississippi, published *The Facts of Reconstruction*, a memoir in which he took the Dunning School to task and argued that in the late 1860s newly liberated Black citizens and their white allies had established genuine democracy in the South for the first time in the region's history.37 Hamilton was decidedly deaf to these Black voices. "Among intelligent and informed people," he declared, there were no defenders of Reconstruction to be found.38

Similarly, at UNC during the 1910s and 1920s, a new generation of students and sympathetic faculty began, ever-so-cautiously, to explore the question of "whether or not to

---


38 Hamilton borrowed his characterization of Black lawmakers from Josiah Turner Jr., who, he said, spoke the words "truly." Turner was a former Confederate congressman, editor of the Raleigh *Sentinel*, and an outspoken apologist for and purported leader of the North Carolina Klan. See Hamilton, *Reconstruction in North Carolina*, 378.
maintain racial segregation." Hamilton's answer was unequivocal: "There must be no yielding on the question of the admission of the negro to equality." Decades later, he remained thoroughly unreconstructed in that view. Writing in the Journal of Southern History in 1948, Hamilton railed against "so-called revisionist" scholars who were busy re-examining the post-Emancipation South in ways that challenged Jim Crow orthodoxy. One of them was his UNC colleague Howard K. Beale, who declared in the American Historical Review that the time had come "for a younger generation of Southern historians to cease lauding [the men] who 'restored white supremacy.'" Hamilton would have none of it. He dismissed the revisionists' scholarship as a shameless "attempt, at this late date, with all available evidence to the contrary, to substitute for historic fact the outworn, disproved, and rejected falsehood by which partisan, self-seeking, and often corrupt politicians, together with ignorant fanatics, moved by sentimental but suspicious humanitarianism, supported the infamy of [Reconstruction]." "No amount of revisionism," Hamilton declared, "can write away the grievous mistakes made in this abnormal period of American history." 39

When we attend to this context, we begin to understand, as historian Eric Foner has pointed out, that Hamilton and like-minded men in the academy "did more than reflect prevailing prejudices – they strengthened and helped to perpetuate them. They offered scholarly legitimacy . . . to the Jim Crow system that was becoming entrenched as they were writing." Hamilton did that work with the authority of an endowed professorship at the South's leading university, a position that amplified his influence in the classroom, the archive, the historical profession, and the public forum. 40

What, in the end, are we to make of Roulhac Hamilton and the question of removing his name from the campus landscape? Some participants in the debate would urge us to pass judgment cautiously, with an awareness that we, too, are likely to be found wanting by future generations. That prospect may well come to pass, but it is not a good and sufficient reason for inaction. It instead underscores our responsibility to examine our history with unflinching honesty and to use the knowledge we gain to make a better, forward-looking university for ourselves and for those who will follow us here. To do so is to recognize that history is more than a settled record of what was – it is also a tool for discerning what is and should be.

That is the point that Amanda Gorman, National Youth Poet Laureate, made in verse at the January 20, 2021 inauguration of the nation's forty-sixth President:


40 Eric Foner, "Foreword," in Smith and Lowery, eds., Dunning School, xi.
Being an American is more than a pride we inherit, 

it’s the past we step into 

and how we repair it.

The new dawn blooms as we free it.

For there is always light,

if we’re brave enough to see it,

if we’re brave enough to be it.

The work of repair, as Gorman reminds us, begins with candid remembrance of our past and a forthright reckoning with the ways that history has been used to veil the truth.41

On March 12, 2021, University Librarian Elaine L. Westbrooks submitted a formal statement to accompany this dossier. See Appendix 1.

UNC Commission on History, Race, and a Way Forward

Appendix 1

University Librarian Elaine L. Westbrooks' Statement on J. G. de Roulhac Hamilton and the Southern Historical Collection

March 12, 2021

As the University Commission on Race, History, and a Way Forward considers removing J.G. de Roulhac Hamilton’s name from Hamilton Hall, I would like to share some thoughts about Hamilton’s most enduring and significant legacy, the Southern Historical Collection, and the work of today’s archivists and librarians to repair past harms and prepare for the future.

Hamilton founded the SHC in 1930 and directed it until 1951. With the support of the University, he built the “premier archive of records and manuscripts pertaining to the South, and one of the most widely consulted in the United States.”¹ With approximately 5,000 manuscript collections, today’s SHC is the largest and most heavily used of the five special collections at Wilson Library. Nearly half of Wilson Library’s research requests are for SHC items. It is not an exaggeration to say that the SHC is a requisite destination for any scholar of the American South.

While Hamilton deserves a great deal of credit for his dedication and tenacity in building collections, we cannot ignore the choices he made in doing so. In his scholarship and personal writings, he promoted the “Lost Cause,” he minimized Ku Klux Klan violence, he supported segregation in the Jim Crow South, and perpetuated falsehoods about Reconstruction.² These white supremacist beliefs shaped his original vision for the Collection and were an impetus for its formation.³

The SHC that Hamilton created was dedicated to the glorification of the Confederate aristocracy while ignoring, minimizing, and even erasing the Black experience in the South. Hamilton documented the plantation system without a thought for the thousands of enslaved Black people who sustained the region’s economy. He wanted to preserve evidence of the social systems of the old South but did not believe that the lives of African Americans were relevant


or that their family Bibles, letters, marriage certificates, or photographs were worthy of preservation for future generations.⁴

Hamilton’s neglect of the African American documentary experience reverberates today in gaps, silences, and limitations of the SHC’s collections. As outstanding as the SHC is, imagine what it could have been had he been devoted to preserving the history of all Southerners.

In the aftermath of the killing of George Floyd in May of 2020, the University Libraries, like many University units, affirmed its commitment to the work of reckoning with systemic racism and oppression.⁵ The Special Collections team, including staff dedicated to the SHC, has long recognized the persistent and deleterious impacts of Hamilton’s practices. Today’s archivists and librarians, recognizing our responsibility to intervene and address harmful legacies, are actively pursuing restorative and reparative practices. These efforts directly challenge Hamilton’s original vision of the SHC as a repository in support of an inaccurate and discredited historical narrative. I am very proud of the following work that we have begun:

- **Prioritizing African American collecting.** In 2006, the University Libraries created the African American Collections and Outreach Archivist position⁶ in the SHC with support from the National Endowment for the Humanities. The Libraries successfully completed fundraising to endow this position in 2017.

- **Partnering with local communities.** Since 2016, with support from the Andrew Mellon Foundation, the SHC has collaborated with community organizations across the Southeast to re-envision the ways that archives work with local communities.⁷ This work prioritizes the needs of local communities as they document, understand, and share their own histories.

- **Surfacing records about slavery.** Many of our users are seeking traces of the African American experience in SHC records. Staff work with students, faculty, and community members to develop guides, offer workshops, and add information to collection guides—such as the names of the enslaved individuals—to facilitate easier access.

- **Conscious editing of archival description.** We are remediating finding aids so that they no longer contain descriptions that diminish and dehumanize the records and experiences of African Americans represented in the collections.⁸

---


• **Re-envisioning instructional programs and services.** Through our instructional work and the adoption of critical pedagogy and primary source literacy standards, Special Collections staff strive to support and create a critical community of researchers whose work challenges the racialized assumptions and historical certainties.

Hamilton built an amazing collection that continues to evolve, grow, and improve with every generation of researchers that interpret the documentary evidence in new ways. The future of the SHC is bright and strong because of the transformative work that the Libraries is committed to doing now and into the future. The librarians and archivists at Carolina are leading the way toward a more equitable and just historical record. In doing so, they are setting an example for archives across the country.

The SHC has passionate donors who are proud and more committed now than ever to helping the University Libraries build, preserve, and make available a more inclusive collection for the students, faculty, and staff of UNC-Chapel Hill, for the citizens of the state of North Carolina, and for the entire region. The state has long trusted the University Libraries to steward the history and culture of the state, and we will continue to fulfill this mission with empathy, integrity, and equity.
Appendix 2

Departments of History, Political Science, and Sociology
Curriculum in Peace, War, and Defense
UNC-Chapel Hill
Chapel Hill, NC 27599

Chancellor Kevin M. Guskiewicz
103 South Building
Campus Box 9100
Chapel Hill, NC 27599-9100
chancellor@unc.edu

July 28, 2020

Dear Chancellor Guskiewicz:

As Chairs of the Departments of History, Political Science, and Sociology, and the Peace, War, and Defense Curriculum, we are writing to request your forceful and expeditious intervention to change the name of the building in which we work from Hamilton Hall to Pauli Murray Hall. We have previously contacted the Commission on History, Race, and a Way Forward with this request for the name change, which we have also forwarded to the chairman of the Board of Trustees.

We do not make this request lightly or without input from a wide range of participants. For years, members of our community have raised questions and concerns about the appropriateness of the current building name. In just one example, a recent petition from History Department graduate students to the department's leadership included this demand: "Call for and take action to rename buildings on campus that are named after racists, Confederates, and/or White supremacists." Even before that petition was issued, a committee composed of faculty members and graduate students from the departments of History, Political Science, and Sociology, along with the chair of the Curriculum in Peace, War, and Defense, considered the name of the building and produced a short report and recommendation. They did so with input from faculty members, students, and staff, and also influenced by the Black Faculty, Faculty of Color, and Indigenous Faculty Roadmap for Racial Equity. Members of the Hamilton and Pauli Murray families were also contacted, to ensure that they support the change. On July 9, faculty members in each of those departments met by Zoom to discuss the recommendation; it was approved overwhelmingly by all of the departments involved. Indeed, in our decades of experience here at UNC, we have never before seen such consensus—both within and between departments--on any issue. This is truly multi-disciplinary and multi-generational.

There is no doubt that the name of Joseph Grégoire de Rouihac Hamilton should be removed from our building. Between 1906 and 1930, Hamilton was a professor in the Department of History at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. From 1931 to his retirement in 1951,
Hamilton served as the director of the UNC Library’s Southern Historical Collection, which he founded. He passed away in 1961.¹

Throughout his career as an academic and archivist, Hamilton promoted white supremacy in ways that were intellectually dishonest and damaging, even considering the context of his times. In his academic work on the US Reconstruction period, he openly defended the racial violence of the Ku Klux Klan and the “Black Codes,” the series of laws commonly seen as the precursor to Southern Jim Crow. As an archivist, Hamilton collected materials that glorified human enslavement and served to exclude African Americans from the historical profession and historical literature.² As the Alabama Department of Archives and History recently argued, this tradition of racist records management in the American South has created a dangerous legacy of “the preservation of Confederate history and the promotion of Lost Cause ideals.”³

The naming of Hamilton Hall in 1972 was a mistake that should now be remedied. At the time, Hamilton’s “anti-Negro view of Reconstruction,” as one journalist wrote then, was already widely known and was forcefully disputed within the historical profession.⁴ Moreover, Hamilton’s living relatives were never consulted in this decision, and they insist that Hamilton would never have accepted the recognition. Hamilton, his grandson has recently argued, “would likely not have accepted the honor had he been alive at the time. He had no interest in that sort of thing.”⁵

Though the building arguably should never have been named after Hamilton, it certainly should not carry that name now, as the university engages in serious reckoning with its racist past. **To continue to glorify Hamilton’s name is to acquiesce in the use of the social sciences—the very disciplines housed in the building—for discrimination and oppression, by one of UNC’s own faculty members.** UNC must not stand for this blatant disregard for the truth, principles of academic integrity, and social justice.

In place of Hamilton, those who use our building unanimously propose that it be named after Pauli Murray. Born in 1910 and raised in Durham, NC, Murray was a black descendant of one of the university’s original trustees, James Strudwick Smith, as well as two other early UNC students and another generous benefactor. In 1938, Murray applied to the Ph.D. program in sociology but was denied admission because, as university officials wrote at the time, “members of your race are not admitted to the university.”⁶ If not for segregation, then, Murray would be a

---

distinguished alumna of UNC and of one of the departments housed in the building we would like to name after her.

Undeterred by her rejection from UNC, Murray achieved prominence as an outspoken scholar and activist whose work continues to make major contributions to numerous disciplines. Murray was a gifted poet, writer, labor organizer, legal theorist, and, later in life, Episcopal priest, who advocated for the rights of all members of society. As a law student, she formulated the argument used by Thurgood Marshall in the *Brown vs. Board of Education* case; later, she co-wrote an article used by Ruth Bader Ginsburg to convince the Supreme Court that the Equal Protection Clause applies to women. Thus, Murray articulated the intellectual foundations of two of the most important social justice movements of the twentieth century—the direct opposite of Hamilton’s use of academic research in the service of segregation and oppression.7

Pauli Murray represents the immutable spirit of scholarship and public service, as she made major contributions to our society in the face of nearly insurmountable resistance. She also represents the forgone knowledge that UNC could have been a part of, could have supported and nurtured, and could have learned from. Naming our building after her will serve as a reminder of what is lost, what could have been, and what can be as we move forward. It will signal inclusiveness and intellectual breadth and serve as a welcome for all scholars.

We send this request to you, Chancellor Guskiewicz, at a moment of crisis for our university and the wider public. The coronavirus pandemic strains all of our capacities as it highlights our public mission and reminds us of the precarity of human life. Across the country, protestors, counter-protesters, and public authorities confront starkly different visions of the common good. Here at UNC, these widespread challenges intersect with our own ongoing reckoning with the legacies of racism and inequality that we inherited from our predecessors.

Such circumstances make bold, visionary leadership imperative. Not only is renaming Hamilton Hall as Pauli Murray Hall the right thing to do; it is the right thing to do now. Moreover, this is the moment to remove offensive names from dozens of campus buildings and to begin the process of widespread renaming. To do so is to proclaim to the campus community, our state, and the wider world that UNC no longer acquiesces to bigotry and white supremacy, or to the perversion of academic research in the service of discrimination. It is to affirm our collective commitment to justice and knowledge in support of it. It is to affirm what we are for, in a way that can offer inspiration and uplift to all in this trying time.

We can assure you that replacing the name Hamilton with Pauli Murray on our social science building, and indeed renaming all campus buildings currently named after white supremacists,

---

would be met with widespread support and acclaim among faculty, staff, graduate and undergraduate students, alumni, and observers. (Indeed, please see the accompanying letter in support of our proposal from the bishop and bishop suffragan of the Episcopal Diocese of North Carolina.) It would move UNC again to the vanguard of forward-thinking state universities—a place certainly befitting our scholarship but not always, thus far, our public symbols. And it would put you at the forefront of this historic change for the good. Thank you in advance for your serious and timely consideration of our request.

Sincerely,

Lisa Lindsay
Chair, Department of History

Kenneth (Andy) Andrews
Chair, Department of Sociology

Mark Crescenzi
Chair, Department of Political Science

Navin Bapat
Chair, Curriculum in Peace, War, and Defense

Cc: Provost Robert Blouin, Dean Terry Rhodes, Senior Associate Dean Rudi Colloredo-Mansfeld, Prof. James Leloudis, Prof. Patricia Parker

enclosure