

CLOSING IN ON THE "PLANTATION": COALITION BUILDING AND THE ROLE OF BLACK WOMEN'S GRIEVANCES IN DUKE UNIVERSITY LABOR DISPUTES, 1965-1968

ERIK LUDWIG

In the spring of 1998, Duke University's student newspaper, the *Chronicle*, celebrated the thirtieth anniversary of the largest demonstration in the university's history, known as the "silent vigil." Following Martin Luther King Jr.'s assassination in 1968, the mass protest sought to pressure the administration into meeting the demands of the unrecognized Black workers' union, the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees (AFSCME) Local 77. The *Chronicle's* anniversary issue implied that the largely white student body, moved by the slain civil rights leader's message alone, had taken to the main quadrangle in an impromptu and unrehearsed display of support for Duke's Black service staff.¹ By depicting the vigil as student centered and spontaneous, the *Chronicle* ignored the critical role of student, employee, and faculty coalitions throughout the union campaign and undermined the central part that workers, particularly Black female maids and food service workers, had played in mobilizing support for the union in the preceding years. As an undergraduate student at Duke from 1994 to 1998, I served as an organizer of a group called the Student Employee Relations Coalition (SERC), a small alliance of employees (many Local 77 members), students, and faculty concerned with issues affecting Duke's nonacademic employees. As a history and women's studies major, I came to believe that a more accurate interpretation of Duke's past would allow us to recognize and better address many of the labor concerns the university now faces. This commentary is born of that convergence of contemporary campus politics and historical perspective.

When nineteen-year-old Shirley Ramsey became one of the first Black cashiers in the Duke University dining halls in 1963, her

Feminist Studies 25, no. 1 (spring 1999). © 1999 by Feminist Studies, Inc.

promotion reflected the fruits of the civil rights movement sweeping Durham, North Carolina, the home of the university, as well as much of the South. Between 1960 and 1963, Durham Blacks and white sympathizers (including a small number of Duke faculty and students) had launched a successful campaign seeking desegregation of the city's motels, restaurants, and theaters. A majority of these protesters were Black women and girls, many of them from the ranks of the working class. In 1963, when movement participants protested the segregation of Howard Johnson's, the last segregated motel in Durham, most of the five thousand protesters were female. And although the presence of women in official positions of leadership may have been more the exception than the rule, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People youth chapters had female presidents as early as 1956, and women served on protest strategy and demonstration negotiation committees throughout the movement.²

Despite Shirley Ramsey's token promotion, the Duke administration appeared largely unmoved by the early activities in Durham. Most African Americans on campus were limited to work as housekeepers, food service workers, and groundskeepers, where they earned far below the federal minimum wage and received no overtime pay or medical insurance benefits.³ They were also prevented from building seniority. Managers were predominantly white and male, thus making the promotion of Blacks virtually impossible. In addition, Black workers were treated in a humiliating manner, forced to call students "Mister" or "Miss" although the reverse was not true, and were subjected to ridicule and insults by management.⁴ Isolated from economically depressed sections of Durham by a vast forest surrounding the men's campus and by a stone wall on the women's, Duke's landscape appeared plantation-like, its administration a privileged aristocracy.

At the time, the Duke administration was more concerned with expanding and developing the university's research capabilities than with improving the lot of its Black work force. In 1965, Duke announced the largest development plan in the school's history, an almost 200-million-dollar effort to build upon the university's growing national reputation. Under this "ten-year plan," Duke would recruit internationally known scholars and build modern facilities to hold an ever-growing library and science labs. The university's Public Relations Committee was to assure that "all

persons necessary for the advancement of the University will so appreciate the mission and the contributions of the Institution that they will enthusiastically support it in an enlightened and coordinated manner."⁵ However, Duke's workers were not recognized by the administration as valuable contributors to the university's development. It was within this context then, defined both by civil rights and institutional discourses, that Duke's workers framed their demands as "persons necessary for the advancement of the University."⁶ In February 1965, they organized the Duke Employees Benevolent Society, which in August of that year affiliated as AFSCME Local 77.

The union initially floundered. In an atmosphere historically hostile to unionization, the administration consistently refused to recognize Local 77 as a bargaining unit of its members. The most the workers accomplished was a small pay raise, and a new four-step procedure for filing grievances in which only management and administrators had the authority to judge the employees' claims. In the winter of 1966, when Hattie Williams and Viola Watson, two female food service employees and active members of the union, were unexpectedly fired, they attempted to use the grievance procedure to demand their jobs back and to expose the need for a more impartial hearing process. The committee, which considered both grievances as one, returned Hattie Williams to her previous position but not Viola Watson. The Duke administration prevented a union outcry by making it difficult to criticize the Watson decision without delegitimizing the Williams victory. This decision illustrates what sociologist Howard Winant identifies as the process of racial hegemony, whereby Duke seemingly met a demand of Local 77, the introduction of grievances, but used the partisan procedure to maintain, not rescind its power.⁷

But perhaps the greatest single reason why Local 77's campaign met with little success in the year of its inception was its lack of visibility and the resulting difficulties in mobilizing campuswide support. Much of this was due to the fact that the union's largely male leadership believed closed-door negotiation with the administration was the best means to win recognition as well as substantial wage and benefit gains. Private meetings only served to impede the visibility needed to generate more widespread concern. Lack of exposure, coupled with the administration's unwillingness to arbitrate or even meet with leaders on a continuous basis, stifled union progress.

However, by the spring of 1966, Local 77's momentum began to change. On May 9, after serving as a cashier for three years, Shirley Ramsey refused a supervisor's request to leave her cashier position to cut pies during lunch service, a job not within her work description. Even though there was a labor shortage in the men's dining room, Ramsey said she had been singled out because of her race since the other cashiers, white women, were not asked to perform the task traditionally assigned to Black women.⁸ Although she reluctantly agreed to bus tables that afternoon (one of the positions she had held before her promotion), when asked to cut pies by a Black dining hall supervisor the next day, she again refused.⁹ The white personnel manager told her that if she did not do as she was told, she would no longer be needed. Ramsey stood her ground and was terminated. Within days of being fired, Ramsey filed a claim through the grievance procedure, charging racial discrimination and demanding her job back.

Only twenty-two years old in 1966, Shirley Ramsey was much younger than many other Black workers who were employed at Duke and had come of age during the years of national and local desegregation movements. When the union was organized in 1965, Ramsey became an active member. She sat on the Board of Trustees of Local 77, and also wrote for its newsletter, *We the People*. Her grievance marked the beginning of a new and more effectual period in the union's campaign, one where Black women advanced the cause by utilizing direct action tactics which catalyzed alliances among students and faculty necessary to successfully challenge administrative abuses.

Unlike the grievance filed by Hattie Williams and Viola Watson only a few months earlier, Ramsey's grievance attracted a growing number of student and faculty supporters and greater media attention. Whereas the two food servers worked among an all-Black staff, Ramsey's cashier position was traditionally held by white women. She was therefore very visible and came into direct contact with students on a regular basis. Additionally, because Ramsey held a position traditionally assumed by white women, her termination, in particular, represented a setback for Black occupational advancement at the university. The *Chronicle* noted this in a May 13 editorial, writing that "until the University strictly enforces its stated labor policies and erases all vestiges of the old system based on racial discrimination, embarrassing situa-

tions [to the university] are likely to occur." Finally, Local 77 was poised to take public advantage of the situation. Within a day of Ramsey's termination, the union submitted a letter to the editor of the *Chronicle* explaining the cashier's firing and asking for student and faculty support.¹⁰

When it became known that Ramsey filed a grievance against the university, a few coworkers in the dining hall, including several Duke students who labored part-time, wore buttons in support. One of the students, Sid Kauffman, was told by Theodore Minah, the dining hall manager, that he was doing a "stupid" thing by wearing the pin at work and was purportedly released from his duties later that week.¹¹ Meanwhile, Local 77 made a concerted effort to keep student and faculty supporters—who included student religious group members, a small number of New Left radicals, and faculty already associated with the civil rights movement—apprised of Ramsey's case. At the same time, the writeup of the firing in the student newspaper and Local 77's public request for outside support was mobilizing greater interest on the campus. In a May 23 memorandum addressed to student and faculty supporters, Local 77 described Ramsey's grievance proceedings and quoted parts of a letter written by Duke's business manager to Ramsey explaining her termination.¹² Whereas the previous year's closed-door negotiations received no public audience, Local 77 now communicated its actions through multiplying networks.

The grievance panel rejected Ramsey's complaint at the final step. Ignoring her claims of racial discrimination, the panel characterized her merely as an unsatisfactory worker who refused to do the job demanded by her supervisor.¹³ In response, Local 77 reported that white cashiers had begun to be assigned work previously relegated only to African Americans. In effect, the union claimed, "supervisors complied with Miss Ramsey's request [that white women share the work], but fired her for making it."¹⁴ Ramsey's actions served to catalyze and encourage more workers to challenge unfair work conditions.

Emboldened by Ramsey's fight, university maids, including Iola Woods, a Duke employee for over twenty-five years, protested the nearly doubled workload demanded of her in the fall of 1966. The increased labor was the result of recommendations made by the Alexander Proudfoot Company. Proudfoot was an

efficiency firm whose goal was to substantially reduce university costs within the service and clerical sectors, particularly in the categories of unskilled and semi-skilled jobs, which were filled by predominantly Black workers. In addition, the company sought "to provide improved management control."¹⁵ Bringing in efficiency experts threatened workers who could lose their jobs in the name of reducing operating costs, and it undermined their claims as "persons necessary for the advancement of the university" who deserved better pay and working conditions. Certainly, the Proudfoot study appeared to be an effort in part to destabilize worker unity and union organization.

In accordance with its recommendations, Iola Woods was expected to clean twelve dormitory rooms, empty trash from an additional twelve, and clean two dorm bathrooms in one hour and twenty minutes' time.¹⁶ Woods, like most university maids, was over fifty years old. Complaints among affected workers began to circulate, and Local 77 established a committee to meet with Duke's personnel directors to discuss workloads, especially among dormitory maids, who may have been most adversely affected by the Proudfoot study. Administrators still failed to lighten workloads.

On October 24, 1966, forty-two maids, including Woods, all Black women, submitted grievances in a joint effort, demanding decreases and changes in their workload. Fearing the potential power of a collective action, the administration insisted on treating each case individually. Just as in the Ramsey case, the grievances were filed for multiple reasons: to challenge Proudfoot's "efficiency" recommendations and to raise awareness among workers and community supporters to the need for an impartial grievance process. All forty-two grievances were turned down at the second or third steps; none even reached the highest stage.

Of the maids who filed grievances, only Iola Woods and Dafine Evans continued to pursue their grievances to the final step. Subsequently, Evans found another job outside of the university, leaving Woods as the sole claimant. At the final step of the procedure, the Personnel Policy Committee—made up of three administrators—again ruled against Woods, saying that her testimony left doubt as to whether "she had tried conscientiously to perform the schedule assigned." It also questioned whether she "fully understand[ed] the importance of the sequence in which her assigned

duties were to be performed."¹⁷ Just as had been done in the case of Ramsey, the committee attempted to defame Woods's character, work ethic, and even her intelligence.

In light of the maids' oppressive work schedules, Local 77's student and faculty supporters decided to establish an official committee to assist workers in their struggle. In an open letter to the Duke community, the Students, Faculty, and Friends of Local 77 (SFFL) called on the academic community to express its support for the union. The letter stated that "a student-faculty group could provide education and consultation in technical matters, assist with public information, help with fund raising, and serve to focus public opinion around specific issues."¹⁸ By organizing a separate support group that would adhere to particular matters, SFFL sought to assist Local 77 without threatening the union's leadership of the campaign.

Following the failure of the Woods grievance, SFFL set out to investigate worker claims in the spring of 1967. Members held a workshop on March 12 in which they gathered information regarding the workloads of twenty-six maids who attended. The group found huge discrepancies in the amount of work assigned and concluded that many maids were forced to do "sloppy" jobs in order to complete the work. Finally, SFFL found that Woods's schedule, like other maids, was inconsistent, and that they had heavier workload expectancies at different points in the day. In a written brief, SFFL concluded that until employees "are treated with dignity, the idea of 'Community' is at best weak rhetoric. A true community can never exist where one of its members is treated as a lesser breed."¹⁹

Impartial arbitration, the brief argued, was necessary to ensure fairness for Duke's workers. In order to raise awareness about the work conditions and SFFL's position, the organization set up a table on the West Campus quadrangle, handing out copies of the brief to students and selling union buttons to contributors. Local 77 and SFFL decided that if there was no word from the administration by April 11, they would begin protests. When there was no response, the union members began picketing during the lunch hour on Thursday, April 13. Picketing took place over the next five days in front of the university's main administrative building and the Duke Medical Center. Understanding the need to show employee leadership, Local 77's founding president, Oliver Harvey,

asked students and faculty not to join the pickets until the fourth day.²⁰ For the first three days, more than sixty employees walked the picket lines in support of impartial grievances. On the fourth day, two hundred students and faculty joined the lunchtime picketing.²¹ Using Duke's claim to be a first-tier institution, the *Chronicle* supported the protesters and called on the administration to allow impartial grievances, arguing that a great university should pay due attention to employee injustices.²² Later that week, the undergraduate student government called for the establishment of a "fair and equitable grievance procedure by the addition of a final appeal of employee grievances to impartial arbitration."²³

As a result of the picketing, and because the union, students, and faculty functioned as a coalition, the university agreed to open talks with Local 77 over impartial arbitration of grievances. By the end of May, a new grievance panel was established. It was composed of three people—one chosen by the union, one by administration, and a third to be agreed upon by both parties. The person selected by the administration would chair the committee. Although the new process proved to favor management, the struggle over impartial grievances, which had begun with a single woman's refusal to cut pies, had grown into a coordinated effort which had much of the momentum needed to organize an all-out campaign for union recognition as the new year, 1968, approached.

The headline of a January 1968 union newsletter declared "Local 77 Closing in on 'Plantation System.'" Local 77 was so confident of success that it was contacting television and wire services "early so that they can be in on the biggest student-worker picket line Duke has ever seen." Following the victory on grievance policies, Local 77 organized massive membership drives and now represented a majority of service workers on campus.²⁴

Local 77 intended to focus on two major issues for the new year—an increase in wages and support for a five-day work week for nonacademic employees. The union members hoped that by demanding the new federal minimum wage of \$1.60 per hour for all workers, and also a \$ 0.45-cent-per-hour increase for all Duke employees, Black and white, they could attract new supporters to the movement.²⁵ The tactic proved successful. Operating engineers who were mostly white men decided to support the wage drive. Local 77 vowed: "We're all going to fight together."²⁶

By January 1968, in an attempt to slow momentum for this mass movement and to avoid the embarrassment of a predominantly white student body and faculty picketing with Black workers, Duke President Douglas Knight announced that disruptive picketing and demonstrations were outlawed at the university. Then, in February, Duke released a "No Solicitation Policy" which prohibited union discussion during work hours and in work areas. Local 77 was not intimidated. On March 21, it kicked off its own "war on poverty," using the language of President Johnson's national campaign. Approximately fifty nonacademic workers gathered on the campus's main quadrangle, carrying with them hundreds of signatures that they had collected in a wage campaign petition drive.²⁷ Five days later, more than 100 food service workers in the Medical Center, mostly Black women, demanded that they receive at least two weekends off per month (rather than one). Writing to the Duke community, workers argued that they, like everybody else, wanted to attend Sunday church services.²⁸ As a Methodist affiliate, and one that taught students Christian morality, Duke could not ignore this argument. When workers struck for two days during the last week in March, they were close to 90 percent effective. The administration agreed to meet worker demands.²⁹

As a result of the hospital workers' success, Local 77 began planning an all-out strike of food service and housekeeping employees to begin the following week, the first week of April.³⁰ Then, on April 4, Martin Luther King Jr. was assassinated. Within hours of King's death, students who had been active in the union campaign and civil rights activities in Durham seized the moment to plan a campuswide demonstration. Just as King had been fighting for economic justice in Memphis, so the memorial demonstration would testify to his activist legacy by fighting for economic justice on the Duke campus.

Over the next week, Local 77's alliance building of the previous two years led to the largest demonstration in Duke University history. It was *not* organized "spontaneously" as today's Duke student newspaper would suggest but was begun during the very week employees and students had planned to begin an all-out strike. A "silent vigil" was established on the main quadrangle following two days of failed negotiation at the president's house. Demanding a minimum wage of \$1.60 per hour for nonacademic



Photograph by Randy Teslik for *The Duke Chronicle*, 10 April 1968.

workers and the formation of a committee to consider collective bargaining for Local 77, thousands of employees, students, and faculty took to the quad. Student activists used their knowledge of the workers' plight and their organizing experiences to bring together an alliance of students, faculty, and nonacademic workers to address concrete economic issues as well as support for the civil rights movement in general. Hundreds of students slept and studied silently in organized rows in front of the Duke Chapel. For over three-quarters of the participants, this was their first demonstration.³¹ Just a month before, a *Sports Illustrated* feature had described Duke students as members of a "timid generation . . . plodding patiently along, doggedly heading for some post-college cubbyhole-like Daddy's baling wire factory."³² Many faculty members also declared their support for the vigil, signing petitions and, in some cases, joining the vigil as well.

With over a thousand students and faculty encamped on the main quad, Local 77 members decided that if administrators did not respond to their demands by April 9, the late-shift dining hall workers would strike as they had planned to do before King's death. Union leaders suggested a student boycott of dining facilities to show support.³³ Students were asked to eat off campus or to get food from a student- and employee-led food distribution center on the quad. Students also announced a class boycott that would commence the same day.

On Tuesday morning, more than 60 percent of dining hall employees failed to report to work.³⁴ They set up pickets and distributed petitions demanding a \$1.60-per-hour wage. The boycott of the dining halls proved 75 percent successful and later that evening, operation employees joined the pickets after their shifts. Eighty-five percent of housekeepers, 75 percent of the dining hall staff, and 50 percent of groundskeepers then struck.³⁵ Those departments where Black women were most numerous, dining and housekeeping, had the highest rates of participation.

With national media attention on Duke, striking workers, protesting faculty, and student supporters had brought the university to a standstill. Not only was the administration's power diminished but with much of the nation watching, including those people funding its 200-million-dollar development plan, the situation proved embarrassing and potentially costly to administrative priorities. On April 10, six days after King's assassination,

the Board of Trustees announced that workers would receive a minimum wage of \$1.60 per hour the following year and that a committee to discuss collective bargaining would be established. Local 77 chose to remain on strike another week in hopes of gaining recognition from the administration. Students decided to end the boycott of classes as a result of the trustees' announcement, but they continued the dining hall boycott in support of striking workers. The boycott remained 75 percent effective.³⁶

Local 77 members returned to work in the following week, not yet having received bargaining status. Although some were upset that they had not been able to force immediate union recognition, the employee, student, and faculty protesters had challenged an institution that had long dominated the lives of many Blacks in Durham. They had won higher wages, greater respect in the workplace, and had shown that Duke workers were a force *within* the very institution that had marginalized them. Black women's grievances, especially those of Shirley Ramsey and Iola Woods, had begun a series of events which culminated in the campus-wide vigil. Most important, workers, along with the entire university community, learned that peaceful coalitions of employees, students, and faculty could transform the way administrators and trustees dealt with workers.³⁷ Local 77 continued its struggle toward its ultimate goal, union recognition, which it finally received in 1972.

As a Duke student I saw how the legacy of Local 77's organizing campaign continues today. In the fall of 1996, Hurricane Fran hit Durham. Despite the fact that the governor had declared a state of emergency and warned residents that they should not leave their homes, all Duke employees were told to report to work. In addition to the physical danger to which the workers were exposed, none was paid overtime. Showing a blatant lack of concern, a Duke spokesperson explained that the "administration [had] an obligation to other members of the university community such as students and lab animals—not just employees."³⁸ In response, SERC launched a major petition drive to demand a new severe-weather policy and overtime pay for those who worked during the hurricane. Over 1,700 members of the community supported the petition, and the administration was forced to create a new policy. Just as often occurred in the 1960s, the administration stalled after receiving the petition and then never directly replied

to its demands; but the policy was reformulated so that only essential employees would be required to work in the case of another emergency.

However, as was often the case during my tenure at Duke, labor concerns usually met with little or no agitation. Since Local 77 received recognition in 1972, progress has continuously slowed. Although union representation has ensured higher wages and benefits for Duke's nonacademic work staff, work at Duke remains segregated along race and gender lines. Just as in the 1960s, the predominantly Black and female service sector is often supervised by a white and male managerial staff. As a result, the university is still unable to dodge its image as a plantation. Several factors have contributed to a weakening of Local 77 in the years following recognition. Anti-union sentiment throughout the South, coupled with the Reagan and Bush administrations' harsh policies toward labor organizing, have exacerbated negative feelings toward unions. Second, Duke has an even greater share of the labor market in Durham today than it had in the 1960s. Few companies retain their headquarters here. Thus, the university and the medical center have few business competitors in the service sector labor market.

Still, the most disturbing factor that explains the union's decreased power at Duke is the dismantling of those coalitions that proved so successful during the 1960s. For example, in the spring of 1998, the Duke campus was full of talk about the university's potential privatization of dining services. Part of a larger national trend, the establishment of a fast-food chain on campus which refuses to hire union labor would lead to downsizing the unionized labor force that Local 77 represents. Although most students maintain liberal notions of race and race relations, almost 80 percent of undergraduate voters supported the administration's position, even though the predominantly Black work force would not earn Durham's living wage.³⁹

The *Chronicle's* seemingly contradictory position on labor mirrors that of the general student body. A March 30, 1998, editorial advocating the establishment of a fast-food franchise which refuses to hire union labor was followed only a week later by the aforementioned editorial celebrating the thirtieth anniversary of the silent vigil. The messages of these editorials—one glorifying a vigil that served as the founding of a union thirty years before, the

other calling for the installation of nonunion dining services—shows the newspaper's failure to recognize that the same issues the university community struggled with after King's death are part of the very dream that privatization threatens to shatter today.

Perhaps part of the reason that today's *Chronicle* staff members are eager to embrace the vigil's message, and at the same time favor privatization, is that they do not realize that the vigil was closely tied to a union movement. By portraying the vigil as spontaneous and student centered, evidence of the critical coalitions among students, employees, and faculty has been lost. This perpetuates conventional perceptions in which campus activism is viewed solely in terms of student activities. It has become easier for students and administrators to remember the vigil as a moment when students expressed a *moral* conscience, rather than one in which they disrupted and challenged the operation of Duke's institutional apparatus. With the blessing of administrators and trustees, a political act in search of economic justice has been rewritten as a moral one. Whereas advocates of civil rights in the 1960s understood that race and class (and sometimes gender) were all interconnected, all perpetuated by the same institutional structures, students at Duke today, and throughout the nation, often embrace a liberal individualist ideology. Much like this age of "community service," where young people seek to "help" others through one-on-one connections without contesting established institutions and practices, today's students often hold anti-racist intentions yet have little or no concern for exploitation in the workplace. Bigotry is seen as an individual matter, not a systemic one. Recovery of Duke's labor history would allow students to rethink campus activism in terms of labor disputes and racial conflict, and might inspire new alliances to challenge similar institutional policies today.

And so in the 1990s, the eager alliances that once made Duke the focus of national attention, when thousands supported Local 77 employees in the aftermath of the death of Martin Luther King Jr., are replaced by small pockets of student and faculty sympathizers, often struggling to get others involved. In the spring of 1998, although it could not garner widespread support because nearly four-fifths of students supported privatization, Duke Students for Justice (SFJ), a group opposing dining hall privatization, was established to support union members. Small alliances

like SERC and SFJ can provide some support as the privatization battle continues. Understanding the need for sustainable coalitions in challenging the university administration is the most useful lesson to come out of the union movement at Duke during the 1960s. This lesson must be remembered as part of the campaign's legacy today.

NOTES

Thank you to Paula Giddings and Janice Radway for their support throughout the preparation of this article. My thanks also to Karen Brodtkin, Sara Evans, and the anonymous readers of *Feminist Studies* for their comments and criticisms. I am grateful to the Duke Archives staff for their assistance.

1. Today, the newspaper is known simply as the *Chronicle*. Throughout much of the 1960s, it was called the *Duke Chronicle*. I will use the *Chronicle* throughout. See *Chronicle*, 6 Apr. 1998.
2. Christina Greene, "'Our Separate Ways': Women and the Black Freedom Movement in Durham, North Carolina, 1940s-1970s" (Ph.D. diss., Duke University, 1996), 133-57.
3. Maids, all Black women, averaged \$0.85 per hour and janitors, Black men, averaged \$0.95 per hour, although the federal minimum wage was \$1.25. See Duke University Wage Survey, 1965, Duke University Archives (DUA hereafter), Duke University.
4. Interview with Vivian McCoy, 13 Nov. 1996 and 9 Apr. 1998, Durham.
5. "Staff Public Relations Outline: Atlanta Meeting," Duke Public Relations Committee, 15 Apr. 1966, DUA (my emphasis).
6. The first edition of Local 77's newsletter announced that the union was "born at the same time that Duke launched a \$187 million . . . drive." It continued, "these millions [are] part of an INSTITUTIONAL advancement effort designed to enhance Duke's image . . . [Yet] Duke has shown a reticence to commit itself on a PERSONAL level" to better the lives of its own employees. See the *Real World* 1 (14 Oct. 1965), 1, DUA.
7. Winant writes: "Hegemony . . . involves a splitting or doubling of opposition, which simultaneously wins and loses, gains entrance into the halls of power and is co-opted, 'crosses over' into mainstream culture and is deprived of its critical content." See Howard Winant, *Racial Conditions: Politics, Theory, Comparisons* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1994), 113-14.
8. Account from "News Bulletin," Duke Employees Local 77, 11 May 1966, DUA.
9. Ramsey was asked to cut pies by Mae Eaton. Ironically, Eaton would be appointed Duke's first Black dining hall manager in 1967. See the *Carolina Times*, 19 Aug. 1967.
10. "An Unfair System" (Editorial), *Chronicle*, 13 May 1966; *ibid*.
11. Letter to the Editor, *Chronicle*, 18 May 1966.
12. Memorandum to Students, Faculty, and Friends of Local 77, from Duke Employees Local 77, 23 May 1966, DUA.
13. Ramsey would persist, filing a claim with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission in 1967, and then suing Duke in May 1968. W.G. Cooper, Duke Personnel Director, to John Dozier, Duke Business Manager, 16 May 1966, DUA.
14. Memorandum to Students, Faculty, and Friends of Local 77.
15. Letter from Alexander Proudfoot Co., to Duke University, 31 Mar. 1966, DUA.
16. "Impartial Arbitration = A Protection for All Workers at Duke University," Local 77 flyer, 1967, DUA.

17. "Report of the Panel Appointed to Hear the Grievance of Mrs. Iola Woods," E.C. Bryson, Chair of the Personnel Policy Committee, 2 Feb. 1967, DUA.
18. Sections of the letter are reprinted in *We the People*, Local 77 newsletter 2 (30 Sept. 1966), 1.
19. Students, Faculty, and Friends of Local 77, "Brief: The Need for Impartial Arbitration of Labor Disputes at Duke University," March 1967, DUA.
20. "Come Picket," Local 77 flyer, April 1967, DUA.
21. Betty Waldron, "Local 77 Pickets Allen Building," *Chronicle*, 14 Apr. 1967; "Students Rally for Arbitration," *ibid.*, 20 Apr. 1967.
22. "A National Force?" (Editorial), *Chronicle*, 20 Apr. 1967.
23. Resolution of the Associated Students of Duke University, 26 Apr. 1967, DUA, no. R-1967-2.
24. "Local 77 Newsflash," Local 77, January 1968, DUA.
25. In 1968, Black workers at Duke earned an average of 19 percent below that of other service employees in Durham County. Maids, for example, still earned 22 percent below the 1968 minimum wage of \$1.25 per hour. See "Wage Comparison," 1968 Wage Survey, Personnel Policy Committee, 6 Mar. 1968, DUA.
26. "The Local 77 Wage Drive Newsletter," 11 Mar. 1968, DUA.
27. News Bureau press release, Duke University, 22 Mar. 1968.
28. Letter to the Duke Community from the Dietetics Department, 28 Mar. 1968, DUA.
29. For a more comprehensive description of the hospital workers' strike, see Karen Brodtkin Sacks, *Caring by the Hour: Women, Work, and Organizing at Duke Medical Center* (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1988). Catherine Arnold, "Hospital Workers Strike," *Chronicle*, 3 Apr. 1968; "The Story of the Dietetic Workers Strike," Local 77 flyer, April 1968, DUA.
30. Sacks, 52.
31. Compiled by W.J. Griffin, 30 May 1968, DUA.
32. Quoted in Theodore David Segal, "A New Genesis: The 'Silent' Vigil at Duke University, April 5th through 12th, 1968" (honors thesis, Duke University, 1977), 12.
33. Susan Taylor, "Silent Vigil Runs like 'Dad's Own Business,'" *Chronicle*, 8 Apr. 1968.
34. "Operation Employees Demand Higher Wages," *ibid.*, 10 Apr. 1968.
35. David Cooper, "Duke Sit-in Spurs 'Activism,'" *Winston-Salem Journal*, 14 Apr. 1968.
36. "Local Unions Join Picketing," *Chronicle*, 19 Apr. 1968.
37. Local 77's movement for recognition inspired Black student supporters to fight for an Afro-American studies program, a Black faculty advisor, and greater representation within the student body, in the late 1960s. See Robert Creamer, "Duke Employees Local 77—Confrontation over Impartial Arbitration of Grievances" (unpublished student paper, Duke University, n.d.), 36.
38. Misty Allen and Marsha Johnson, "Severe Weather Policy under Fire," *Chronicle*, 13 Sept. 1996.
39. In an information memo sent to all undergraduates by the university's auxiliary services, which oversees the dining halls, it was stated that the fast-food franchise's starting wage would be below that of Durham's living wage. Memorandum to students from Joseph G. Pietrantonio, 1 May 1998; Katherine Stroup, "Revote Confirms Student Support for Wendy's," *Chronicle*, 21 May 1998.