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ABSTRACT

This paper argues that the field of preservation needs to distance itself from marketing the shells of historic properties as real estate and move toward being a more inclusive movement that focuses on landscape and community preservation. This contention is based upon preservation efforts at four former mill towns in North Carolina. Research shows that mill towns still maintain a strong relationship with paternalism, effecting the amount of agency communities have over what happens to their past. When preservationists control mill structures they become the new paternalistic mill owner with significant control over what happens to existing communities. Preservationists fail at using textile mill structures to accurately represent labor history and usually replace existing communities with the middle class communities to whom they are marketing. This paper calls for a reanalysis of preservation standards suggesting a more proactive and collaborative policy that respects existing landscapes and communities.
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INTRODUCTION: THE PATERNALISM AND PRESERVATION CONNECTION

The last half of the 20th century witnessed the decline of the textile industry’s role in the Southern economy. As this happened deindustrialization threatened the massive industrial structures and mill towns the industry created. By using the four former mill towns of Carrboro, Edenton, Raleigh and Kannapolis, North Carolina this essay will examine the preservation of labor history in relation to current preservation standards. Preservation, historically an endeavor performed by the rich, has evolved into a project for the middle class where the goal is marketing history in order to save it from a society where progress means new development. The preservation of textile mills and villages highlights faults in preservationists’ tendencies to measure success by profit margins. Preserving labor history means dealing with the legacy of paternalism in mill towns. This legacy created isolated dependent communities that do not easily lend themselves to preservation. Market driven preservation in mill towns may work when buffers to paternalism exist, such as less isolated locations and the presence of preservation minded developers, but the result is a romanticized version of the past that does not honor the mill communities that are still present.

The History of Paternalism

Textile mills and the company towns that surrounded them greatly changed the Southern landscape. During the early 20th century 92% of Southern mill workers lived in mill villages. Southern manufacturers adapted and perfected the mill village from the Rhode Island model invented by Samuel Slater. William Gregg started the first Southern mill village in 1846 in Graniteville, South Carolina. The village included a mill surrounded by housing, churches, a school and a community store.¹

¹ Robert W. Blythe, “The Textile Mill and Mill Village in the American South,” in Cotton Mills, Planned Communities and the New Deal,(Columbus, GA: Vernacular Architecture Forum, 1999), 139. For more information
Manufacturers, journalists and scholars promoted the use of the textile industry to revitalize the South. These groups romanticized the realities of the industry and portrayed it as a benevolent system for poor whites. This romanticization continued despite vast evidence of the exploitation associated with the textile industry. The controversial social scientist and supporter of industry Broadus Mitchell stated in 1934,

All of our social gains in the South have been associated with the advance of industry-employment for poor whites, urban growth with all the activity this implies, sound banking, establishment of a wage system, greater productivity of wealth and its more even distribution, larger tax yields, better schools and roads, improvement of farming methods, and the growth of many governmental services.2

Mitchell exemplifies the writers who believed in what scholars later termed the “New South Creed.” This ideology urged white Southern men to take advantage of their vast resources by industrializing. Mitchell thought of the promotion and creation of industry as a selfless process enacted by Southern gentlemen who acted as benevolent father figures toward helpless poor whites.3 The “New South Creed” failed to recognize that the textile industry made a few men rich while using a poor white laboring class to contest African Americans and their newly gained freedoms.4 In actuality the Southern upper class took advantage of improvements in railroad and mill technology to enact a system of paternalism that kept them rich and most others in poverty.

---

An extensive historical literature grapples with the concepts of paternalism. Some scholars have questioned its very existence, while others have struggled to define the system. Writers used the word paternalism so often its meaning is now unclear. A number of definitions for the term exist, from Broadus Mitchell’s earliest claims of the benevolent father to harsher comparisons to the master/slave relationships by later social historians of the 1970s. During the 1980s, scholars objectively located paternalism somewhere between these two realities. It remains a loose term because mill owners differed in their understanding and use of the system. Mill workers also adapted to paternalism in a variety of ways in their distinctive towns. Despite the assorted ways mill owners enacted paternalism, this system impacted community formation.

For the purposes of this study Philip Scranton’s definition is the most appropriate. Paternalism was a system used to attract former farmers to the mill floor. Mill owners offered a variety of community amenities including housing, schools and churches.\(^5\) It is not important to define paternalism beyond that, but instead to realize that paternalism created distinct dependent communities populated by white working class families.\(^6\) The mill owner’s use of community amenities assisted workers with developing ties to the town and the mill. Whether or not mill workers accepted paternalistic principles, mill towns created distinct landscapes with separate communities.

---


In order to fully understand the faith that prominent Southerners placed in the textile industry’s ability to revitalize the South, and also to comprehend the specific plans and ways the industry should do this, it is useful to take a closer look at one of the most vocal supporters of mills and mill villages. Daniel A. Tompkins, a native of South Carolina, was involved with every aspect of textile mill promotion from education and the creation of textile schools to, journalism, manufacturing, supplying machinery for industry, and building mills. These interests culminated in the publication of his book *Cotton Mill, Commercial Features: A Text-Book for the Use of Textile Schools and Investors.*7 Tompkins was educated at Rensslelear Polytechnic Institution in New York.8 His goal was to return to the South and teach businessmen to use industry to bring about economic success. He believed that the South had been on the road to economic dominance in industry before slavery took over as the dominant system. Tompkins stated, “The Southern states prospered before slavery became the dominant influence. The prosperity before that time was a prosperity of man, commerce and agriculture.”9 Tompkins returned from the North and spent years traveling in the South to study industrial conditions. After his travels he compiled his book as a guide for advancing industrialization in the region.10

Tompkins’ book outlined his beliefs concerning how to execute a successful mill and mill village and indicated his support for paternalism. His book perpetuated the idea of a mill village for poor unintelligent white people and provided a handbook for creating such compounds.

---

Tompkins stated that “It would not seem advisable for a cotton mill at this time to undertake to work negro labor, for the reason that they are of doubtful efficiency for this work, and for the reason that it would disorganize the force of white labor.”11 He also wrote, “There is no instance…where a mixed organization of whites and blacks of both sexes have worked together successfully.”12 Tompkins believed that mill work was meant to be done, and profited from, by whites.

Tompkins recommended a poor white labor force that he believed was ignorant. He promoted paternalistic techniques that could be used to control workers. His ideas for the location of the mill and the types of amenities provided indicate this. He stated, “On the whole, it may be considered good advice for a new mill not to locate within the limits of a city or town.”13 He went on to further explain this supposition, “An important advantage of locating in the country,” he wrote, “is that employees go to bed at a reasonable hour and are therefore in better condition to work in day time.”14 Tompkins also believed that mills located in rural areas needed to provide amenities for employees to keep them satisfied. Company housing was an important first step in the process of getting mill workers to do good work, he wrote,

Factory houses are usually built around the mill, and form a little village to themselves. This seems at present the most satisfactory plan in the South, for both the mills and the operatives. They seem disposed to live to themselves and attend their own schools and churches even when the mill village is in the city.15

He attributes this desire to live in separate villages to mill workers’ ignorance, stating, “As operative become better educated and more prosperous, they will be less disposed to live in

---

groups to themselves, and more disposed to mingle with people in other callings, thus acquiring a broader and more equable view of life.”

Tompkins’ book also provided models for company housing and suggested that housing could be used as a tool to placate workers. He recommended a house design that provided for one operative per room, and if possible enough room between houses to allow for a garden space. Tompkins knew that operatives needed ways to express their individuality in a community setting that offered virtually the same house to all employees. The garden was one mechanism used to do this. Tompkins stated, “Different families have different tastes, and as operatives grow in intelligence and prosperity, this differentiation in taste becomes more marked.”

Tompkins died in 1914, but the industry continued to follow his paternalistic model throughout the first part of the 20th century. The Southern Textile Social Service Association, a group organized under the system of paternalism, offered social work to mill workers. They stated in 1925, partially because of paternalism, mill workers were growing as a group from “ignorance and dependence to the present plane of growing confidence and independence, a result obtained by a gradual development of the individual, the home and the village.”

Although the association believed that paternalism was beneficial, the system was nearing the end of its usefulness in the South due to the changing of the textile industry and growing opposition to the system. Union organizers, some mill manufacturers, mill workers and the Southern Textile Social Service Association began to question the practice of paternalism.

---

Figure 1. This photograph shows two identical houses in a mill town. Tompkins understood that this environment offered little room for individuality. This was one reason for his support of a garden space for workers. (Photo from Daniel Tompkins’ text book, Cotton Mill, Commercial Features.)
During the Depression a study done by the American Cotton Manufacturers Association found that mill villages had become a burden on mill manufacturers. Rather than benefiting the owners, these complexes created unnecessary expense. Manufacturers questioned the mill village’s effectiveness, especially during the increased union activity of the 1930s. During this decade employers sold mill houses and focused their energy on the mill. By the 1940s, most mills were no longer locally owned, but controlled by corporate entities. The mid 20th century began a slow decline in the textile industry in the South, due to many factors beyond the control of textile mill workers.

Although the paternalistic mill village was obsolete, the dependence of mill workers on the textile mill industry remained as strong as ever. Textile mill workers have historically had limited agency over their own lives, whether they have been controlled by a local mill owner or a distant corporation. Many mill towns still exist, and although they are more incorporated into the surrounding areas, workers sometimes are still dependent on a single industry. Overwhelmingly they are victims of an industry known for uncertainty and corruption. This victimization is continued as mills shut down in the Southern states. The mill is gone, but the landscape and communities it created remain. The future of these towns is being determined largely by people other than the residents of these communities.

21 Rhonda Zingraff, “Facing Extinction,” in Jeffrey Leiter, Michael D. Schulman and Rhonda Zingraff, eds., Hanging by a Thread: Social Change in Southern Textiles, (Ithaca, NY: ILR Press, 1991), 205. For more information on the factors leading to the decline of the textile industry and the effects it has had on the economy and mill workers see this entire essay by Zingraff 199-216.
22 Zingraff, “Facing Extinction,” in Leiter and others, eds., Hanging by a Thread, 205-206.
Preservation Does Not Offer a Challenge to Paternalism

Preservation is a humanistic endeavor; those who involve themselves with the protection of the past do so to save the things they value. Preservation was introduced in the United States when the country began to focus on forming a national unity. Preservation became the work of rich white women seen best through the example of Ann Pamela Cunningham and Mount Vernon.23

James Lindgren discusses the consequences and successes of a preservation movement led by the rich in *Preserving Historic New England: Preservation, Progressivism and the Remaking of Memory*. Lindgren details the founding of the Society for the Preservation of New England Antiquities (SPNEA). He notes that the organization was founded to protect Yankee traditionalism and Boston Brahmanism. During the time the organization was founded, Yankees felt threatened by an influx of immigrants into the region.24 Lindgren’s work illuminates the use of preservation to save the parts of American culture that are important to dominant groups.

The struggle to preserve the nation’s architectural heritage has been hard fought, so few have criticized the process. American society is focused on development, leaving preservation open to attacks by critics claiming it retards progress. Most preservation literature has a narrow focus on proving the validity and usefulness of preservation, and offering guidelines.25

However, recent academic critics note two main problems in the field of preservation. One problem is the promotion of flawed ethnocentric histories that romanticize and obliterate

---

parts of the past. James W. Loewen’s critique, *Lies Across America: What Our Historic Sites Get Wrong*, offers a harsh analysis of gross misrepresentations at historic sites across the United States. The Southern states tend to misrepresent race relations and glorify racist Confederates.\(^\text{26}\) Midwestern sites tend to demean Native American history by focusing on white Americans as a superior race that discovered America. The fact that professional preservation sites allow this type of amateur and dangerous skewing of history to happen is a concern for the field.

The second main critique of preservation is that preservationists have relied too heavily on cooperation from big business. Historian Mike Wallace has been analyzing historic preservation and history museums for over twenty years. In one of his most recent studies, *Mickey Mouse History: And Other Essays on American Memory*, Wallace complains about preservationists’ lack of vision because of their ties to business. He laments that preservationists’ “preoccupation with the ‘how to’ of saving buildings had obscured ‘why’ it was they were being preserved.”\(^\text{27}\) Many preservationists succumb to the idea that to save a building proof must be offered of its profitability. Finances thus take priority over using the object to teach history.\(^\text{28}\)

The shift toward for-profit preservation began in earnest in the 1950s when preservationists realized they could get more preserved if they sold preservation properties as real estate. Preservationists began focusing on preserving entire neighborhoods that were in decline, bringing a white educated class back to the area. This in turn increased the price of the houses in these neighborhoods and brought renewed prosperity to the area. Gentrification did not have all of the negative connotations it now holds. The term soon developed negative meanings


\(^{28}\) Wallace, *Mickey Mouse History*, 230.
as the prices became outrageous in these newly preserved precincts. African American communities were viewed as collateral damage, and they were forced out of their former neighborhoods because they could not afford increased real estate values. During the 1980s and 1990s preservationists questioned the morality of gentrification and realized that some of these profitable preservation projects did not offer inclusive histories.29

The issues of romanticizing the past and using preservation for profit highlight two of the main problems that textile mill preservation faces. Historically mill towns have been populated with white people of low socioeconomic status. Most people in the preservation field have a hard time applying their methods to this class. As Wallace points out preservation is an “overwhelmingly white middle class movement,” and this is the main reason that textile mill properties are romanticized.30 Preservationists feel that they have to market to the middle and upper classes. As textile mills increasingly draw the interest of preservation groups such as Preservation North Carolina (PNC) the history of paternalism and the history of preservation become important to the fate of mill history.

The case studies of the preservation efforts in Carrboro, Edenton, Raleigh and Kannapolis demonstrate the relationship between paternalism and preservation. Each study shows that as preservationists update their methods towards a more inclusive preservation they will need to become more adept at recognizing the effect paternalism has on communities.

Carrboro offers an example of an older project that benefited from location and access to preservation professionals, yet lacks in the preservation of anything more than the shell of an industrial building. No effort was made to save the surrounding landscape or use the building to...

30 Wallace, Mickey Mouse History, 231.
teach about labor history. It is strictly an adaptive reuse project, representing preservationists’ tendencies toward market driven preservation.

The preservation of mill structures in Edenton and Raleigh are newer projects that are more forward thinking than Carrboro, but Edenton especially falls victim to using outdated methods that do not respect the legacy of paternalism. Preservation North Carolina became the new paternalistic owner of the mill and ended up marketing a romanticized past for the rich to enjoy. Raleigh, a project led by a developer, enjoys more success, but largely because of location. It lends itself well to adaptive reuse because of its location adjacent to a diversified downtown. Because of the close proximity to downtown a variety of businesses and organizations occupy the space, including a charter high school that uses the building as a teaching tool. Overall this is still a project based in outdated preservation methods.

Kanannapolis, certainly the most tragic case, is an example of an impoverished town that could not thrive without the presence of the mill due to the deep entanglements with paternalism. It fell victim to a developer who had no respect for the community’s heritage and now the town is experiencing a demolition of history. This study highlights the importance of a reordering of the preservation movement. Preservationists must understand and fight against the legacy of paternalism, while also using more forward thinking preservation methods that demand community involvement and foster landscape preservation.
CHAPTER ONE: CARR MILL MALL, CARRBORO, NORTH CAROLINA

Carrboro never fully existed as a mill town because of its location beside Chapel Hill. Chapel Hill enjoys a long history as an educational community, and its growth has always influenced the development of Carrboro. The relationship to Chapel Hill offered Carrboro an alternative to sole dependence on the textile industry; however, Carrboro citizens did not escape the dependency that the textile industry and paternalism often foster. Citizens were used to an industry acting as the main economic force in the town, and were complacent and willing to let preservationists and developers decide the path the town should take after the economic dominance of textiles was gone. The remnants of paternalism created an atmosphere for the limited preservation of mill history. Although the former Alberta Cotton Mill became an adaptive reuse shopping center, the preservation of mill history in Carrboro was romanticized and secondary to the goal of launching Carrboro as a residential commercial area with a historic small-town dynamic. [Figure 2]

From Carrboro’s earliest existence, when it was known as the West End, to the present day, Chapel Hill has impacted its development. Carrboro was created as a railway stop on the way to Chapel Hill and was originally a rural area known as the West End consisting of a small population of farmers. The West End was located a mile west of the University of Chapel Hill, and Chapel Hill residents pushed for a rail stop in the West End, providing students with transportation, but maintaining relative isolation from the temptations of city life.¹

Figure 2. This map shows the close proximity of Carrboro to Chapel Hill. (Map Courtesy of Riley Maps, 2006 City Map of Durham, North Carolina, including Chapel Hill & Carrboro, 2006)
The construction of the Durham-Greensboro Southern Railroad in 1882 became a catalyst for development in the previously isolated West End. Thomas F. Lloyd, a resident of Chapel Hill, took notice of the emerging opportunities near the railroad and constructed the first textile mill in the area. This spurred the growth of textiles in the region and later textile magnate Julian S. Carr extended Lloyd’s accomplishments solidifying Carrboro as a mill town.²

In 1899, Lloyd built the Alberta Cotton Mill which began manufacturing that same year.³ Lloyd established a mill town in Carrboro complete with common features of paternalism. Although written evidence is minimal, the 1911 Sanborn Maps show an established mill town. In 1911 the mill was owned by Julian Carr and functioned as the Durham Hosiery Mill Plant, but the mill and the structures surrounding it were originally started by Lloyd. This is supported by oral histories collected by local historians.⁴ In 1911, Sanborn maps show at least twelve company houses and a church located near the mill.⁵ Lloyd’s mill followed mill town patterns promoted by the industry and hired a white workforce. The majority of the mill workers were former farmers, no longer able to sustain a living from sharecropping. Most employees came from Orange County and the surrounding counties of Durham and Chatham.⁶ [Figure 3]

The church served as an important institution, promoting community formation. Lloyd established a church on Weaver Street because he understood the important bonds religion could foster.

---

Figure 3. The 1911 Sanborn Map of Chapel Hill and Carrboro shows a standard mill village layout with the mill at the center of the community. Located around the mill is housing, a church and the railroad. (Courtesy of Digital Sanborn Maps 1867-1970)
Although Lloyd established a church it differed somewhat in membership from other more isolated mill towns. Many workers did not use the mill church and some members of the church were not mill workers.\footnote{Hall, \textit{Like a Family}, 126.} Although the town was clearly developing a reliance on the textile industry, the connection to Chapel Hill and other growing cities nearby meant that mill workers were always left with alternatives. Despite this, the church still offered a place to foster formation of a community.\footnote{Fine, “Church Had Its Beginnings in ‘Old West Chapel Hill’,” \textit{The Chapel Hill Weekly}, December 19, 1965.}

In 1914, the church became known as the Carrboro Baptist Church.\footnote{Fine, “Church Had Its Beginnings in ‘Old West Chapel Hill’,” \textit{The Chapel Hill Weekly}, December 19, 1965.} The church continued to grow over the years, later moving to a bigger lot on Main and Greensboro Streets. The church served as an important recreational feature in Carrboro well into the 1930s, and continued successful operation throughout the 20\textsuperscript{th} century.\footnote{Martha McKeel, “The Changing Role of the Church in Carrboro,” North Carolina, Southern Oral History Project, Series H, Box 24, Manuscripts Department, Special Collections, Wilson Library, University of Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, North Carolina. The information from this paper is derived mostly from oral history interviews.} [Figure 4]

Lloyd started the foundation for a mill town in Carrboro by offering company housing and a religious establishment that enticed a white workforce to the area. He ran a small profitable business, expanding from 4,000 spindles to 10,000 in 10 years. Lloyd saw the opportunity to make a profit from his small mill and in 1909 he sold the mill to Julian Carr.
Figure 4. This 1925 Sanborn Map of Chapel Hill shows the church, located on a bigger lot and expanded in size. (Courtesy of the 1925 Digital Sanborn Map Company 1867-1970)
Carr, a well known and successful textile manufacturer continued a paternalistic relationship with residents of Carrboro and contributed to the town to a greater extent than Lloyd ever could. Carr was from Chapel Hill and descended from a mercantile family. He went to school at UNC, and later became involved with the tobacco industry through connections with his father. When textile manufacturing became popular in the South he took a risk and started a company in Durham. The risk produced a successful business venture that grew out of Durham and into the surrounding areas of North Carolina.

Carr ran the larger Durham Hosiery Factory in Durham, North Carolina, and Alberta Mill became a component of this company. Alberta Cotton Mill became known as Durham Hosiery Mill Number 4. Carr later expanded his operation in Carrboro taking over another mill Lloyd started in Carrboro after he sold Alberta Cotton Mill. This mill became known as Durham Hosiery Mill Number 7.

Carr contributed greatly to the economy and livelihood of the Carrboro area until 1930, but at the same time Carrboro grew stronger attachments to Chapel Hill and other major cities like Raleigh and Durham. The town was seen as a haven from big city living. In 1920, at the height of the success of the mill, only one third of the housing in Carrboro was mill owned. There were also many privately owned businesses that helped create a successful commercial district in the area. The location of the railroad helped other businesses grow in Carrboro. Along

---

12 Hall, *Like a Family*, 29.
with the mill their were lumber yards, flour mills, general stores, hardware stores, drug stores and a Standard Oil Office.\textsuperscript{15}

Despite Carrboro’s existence as a multi functioning town the main economic success stemmed from the textile industry and Carr’s paternalism. This dependence is evidenced through Carr’s dominant role in the town. Carr’s paternalism is shown through his continuation of renting company housing, donations to local schools and his negotiations to bring electricity to the city. After he provided the town with electricity the town adopted the name Carrboro.\textsuperscript{16}

In the 1930s, the dependency residents had developed for the industry and Carr became clear. The Depression forced the closing of the mill in 1930. When the mill closed it was described as, “…a hard blow to Carrboro. There are about 175 persons on the payroll representing perhaps 100 families.”\textsuperscript{17} Some mill workers found employment in Durham, but most people did not find work. The community placed hope in the recovery of the mill. W.F. Thompson, a local banker said, “I understand that the knitters have enough work to keep them busy seven or eight weeks longer, and maybe before that time is up the company will get some more orders.”\textsuperscript{18} Residents were waiting for the textile industry to recover, but the 1930s signified the end of the industry’s success in Carrboro. Durham Hosiery Mill No. 7 remained open until 1938, but struggled to make substantial profits. It was not until almost a decade later that the industry began operation again and never at the level of success Carr had established.

\textsuperscript{17}“Carrboro Mill Will Be Closed,” \textit{The Chapel Hill Weekly}, May 9, 1930.
\textsuperscript{18}“Carrboro Mill Will Be Closed,” \textit{The Chapel Hill Weekly}, May 9, 1930.
During 1938 the mill village began to change. Wilbur Partin, a store owner in Carrboro, stated, “June 1938 ended an era of the mill village life, but it was more than a village. It was a haven, a community of good hard working honest poor people who never gave up and never refused their neighbors in trouble, people who played together, went to school together, worked and worshipped together, and through the good and the bad stuck together.” Partin held a romanticized view of what mill village life was like, but he highlighted an important component of the mill village. Planned living spaces created a community atmosphere and although exploitation from mill owners was evident mill workers benefited from and enjoyed community life. Mill villages usually had a strong community atmosphere, but because of dependency to mill owners the community had little control over sustaining itself. After 1930 Partin noted that many company houses were sold and the village was disappearing. Despite this Carrboro residents were accustomed to operating as a mill dominated town and were content to wait for the industry to revive.

In 1945 the Durham Hosiery Plant No. 4, was reopened by Pacific Mills. Pacific Mills bought the mill from Durham Hosiery Mill, which had been using the space for storage. Pacific Mills was a worsted and weaving plant headquartered in Boston, one of the largest in the nation at this time. Pacific Mill operated in Carrboro until 1958. When Pacific Mills closed, citizens of Carrboro were not impacted as negatively as many other Piedmont towns. Reportedly, the mill had been struggling most of the year making little profit from sales. Nearly half of the 300 employees at the mill were women whose husbands had a job in another field. Many other employees traveled from nearby Durham to work at the mill. The Orange County Commissioners Office predicted that the mill’s closing would not affect the economy significantly. Burlington

---

20 “Pacific Mills of Boston to Employ Many,” News, Hillsboro, N.C. February 1, 1945
Mills officials had already been in discussion with the Department of Conservation and Development for the Research Triangle area about a new industry for the area.\textsuperscript{21}

Most people felt fortunate that mill officials gave them early notice of the closing and offered them paid vacation and unemployment. Mrs. Clyde Rogers, an employee of the mill whose husband had a job in another industry, stated, “They’re [Pacific Mills] about the nicest people I’ve heard of to work for.”\textsuperscript{22} Another worker did not have a plan for the future and said, “I have none [plans], but I guess some other company will start something, they always do.”\textsuperscript{23} This statement illustrates the type of dependence Carrboro citizens placed in the textile industry. This dependence is a characteristic of paternalism Even after textiles were no longer a viable industry in Carrboro residents still held a belief that the industry would return.

Another industry did not occupy the space where the textile mills once ran. The mill functioned mainly as warehouse space until the 1970s.\textsuperscript{24} In 1970 Carrboro was lagging behind in development compared to the neighboring towns of Chapel Hill, Raleigh and Durham. Carrboro was developing as a residential community filled with residents from the Research Triangle. The Research Triangle Regional Planning Commission recommended that Carrboro should shed the image of an industrial town and start projecting itself as a residential community. The Commission reported, “Carrboro’s past existence as a mill town has been left behind; the town is now a rapidly growing community of residences and apartments. Planning horizons suitable for the mill town Carrboro will not do for the new residential Carrboro.”\textsuperscript{25} The identification of Carrboro as a town suitable for industry was outdated. Continued growth in the town depended

\textsuperscript{24} Margaret Thomas, \textit{Carr Mill, Carrboro, North Carolina}, 3.
on the formation of a new identity. This identity centered on the marketing of a small historic town.

**A New Identity, a Skewed Identity**

During the 1970s Carrboro officials wanted to encourage growth in the area, and part of that plan included using the former Alberta Cotton Mill to further the image of a historic town. The old mill was a detriment to the community. In 1967, the EDY Corporation was using the old mill for warehouse space. A 1971 feasibility study concluded that turning the former Alberta Cotton Mill into a shopping center could be a profitable endeavor.26

Carrboro’s location near educational centers proved important as interest grew in preserving the mill. Brent Glass, a historian who received his doctorate from Chapel Hill wrote the National Register nomination for Alberta Cotton Mill in 1975. Glass along with fellow academic Jacquelyn Hall were supported by UNC in their interest in collecting oral histories pertaining to the textile industry in the Piedmont.27 The support of academics helped to interest the EDY Corporation in using the mill for adaptive reuse. EDY Corporation was receptive to the idea of turning the space into a mall. The commercial advantages were obvious; Carrboro would draw shoppers from the surrounding areas, and this would help revitalize the downtown area.28

EDY Corporation partnered with Southern Real Estate, a company located in Charlotte, North Carolina. Preservation plans were advanced when the Tax Reform Act of 1976 was passed.29 EDY Corporation and Southern Real Estate developed plans to use the mill and related structures around the mill to create a shopping mall on the first floor of the mill, but so many
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26 Thomas, *Carr Mill, Carrboro, North Carolina*, 1-6
28 To learn more about the preservation of the former Alberta Mill see National Register of Historic Places Inventory, Nomination Form, compiled by Brent Glass and Kathleen Pepi (Raleigh, NC: State Historic Preservation Office, Division of Archives and History, North Carolina Department of Cultural Resources, 1975).
businesses were interested in leasing space that they also planned to open up the second floor for office space. [Figure 5 and 6]

The project received so much praise and publicity that 80% of the space was leased before the redevelopment was completed.\textsuperscript{30} Today the former Alberta Cotton Mill is known as the Carr Mill Mall. As an adaptive reuse project it is successful. The mall is currently managed by N.R. Milian and Associates, a company that does not usually deal with historic properties. [Figure 7]

Since the preservation of the mill, the population of Carrboro has continued to grow, increasing by over 50% in the last twenty years.\textsuperscript{31} The area surrounding Carrboro ranked as the number one place to live and work in North Carolina, and the number one area for education.\textsuperscript{32} Carr Mill Mall is being used to promote a new identity for Carrboro. Mill history has not been forgotten, but it is used to promote a historic small town atmosphere.

Figure 5. a-This sketch of the mill’s layout shows how easily adaptable this space was to a shopping mall. The floor plan is open with plenty of space for small shops, (Courtesy of Thomas, *Carr Mill, Carrboro, North Carolina*, 18) b-This photograph of the interior of Carr Mill Mall offers an view of the open floor plan after the preservation. This space is well suited for small businesses. (Photo taken by Katie Abbott)
Figure 6. Both a and b show exterior views of the mill after preservation. They illustrate how the historic integrity was maintained after the mill was adapted for a different use. (Photographs taken by Katie Abbott)
Figure 7. A sign located inside the redeveloped Carr Mill Mall showing the variety of businesses located in the former mill. (Photograph taken by Katie Abbott)
The Past as a Marketing Tool

The preservation of the Alberta Cotton Mill was a success in the sense that it saved the outer shell of the textile mill and helped Carrboro promote itself as a small town attracting new residents. [Figure 8] However, using material objects to educate was never part of the process. The building could be used as a tool for educating about the industry, but only one short plaque exists that offers any history. [Figure 9]

In addition to the notable lack of history offered within the mall there has also been no effort to educate with existing mill houses. The town of Carrboro has a virtually intact mill village across the street from the mill, but it is not part of a historic district, meaning the houses are subject to demolition and deterioration. The neglect of these houses as an educational tool is a failure on preservationists’ part. [Figure 10 and 11]

Carrboro offered a unique environment for the textile industry to grow. Wilbur Partin said, “What made Carrboro so different was the environment. It had the university, the mill village, and the countryside…we had the culture of all three blended together…Its something you wouldn’t want to miss. I don’t know how anybody in the world come along without that environment.” Carrboro’s history has developed alongside textiles as opposed to being fully determined by the textile industry. The dependency created by textiles was still evident in the preservation effort. After it was decided that Carrboro should promote itself as a small historic residential area, the preservation of the industry that had such a great impact on the town’s past became a marketing tool. This fostered the promotion of a romanticized version of the past and caused the material objects left behind to be undervalued as a historical resource.

Figure 8. The front of a brochure for the town of Carrboro, highlighting the emphasis on a romanticized mill town. (Courtesy of the North Carolina Room, Wilson Library, University of North Carolina’s North Carolina Room)
Figure 9. This is the title of the plaque located in Carr Mill Mall. The plaque goes on to offer a brief history of the mill, but it is the only object in the mill that offers any background. The title, *If These Buildings Could Speak*, is appropriate. If material objects are used correctly, buildings can speak to a larger historical context. (Photograph taken by Katie Abbott)
Figure 10. a- This picture shows an intact mill house that has luckily retained its historical character. b- This photo represents encroaching development. Note the smaller mill house beside a larger new house that likely replaced a mill house similar to the one pictured. (Photographs taken by Katie Abbott)
Figure 11. This condemned sign posted on a mill house that has become too deteriorated to inhabit represents the impending possibility for the loss of important mill history. (Photograph taken by Katie Abbott)
CHAPTER TWO: THE EDENTON COTTON MILL VILLAGE, EDENTON, NORTH CAROLINA

Since the beginning of the 20th century the textile industry played a significant economic role in Edenton. Despite this the Edenton Cotton Mill did not play a dominant role in the way citizens shaped their history until the mill closed in 1995. This is in large part to Preservation North Carolina’s (PNC) role in revitalizing the mill and the village, helping to make it an important part of Edenton’s identity. Today mill history is being used to draw new residents and tourists to the area. Historically the Edenton Cotton Mill and village were controlled by prominent wealthy Edenton citizens, and although the mill has closed, this tradition continues as PNC revitalizes the properties by marketing a romanticized past.

Fitting the Image of the New South

Edenton, North Carolina, located in Chowan County, is in the Northeastern part of the state near the Albemarle Sound. Chowan County is the smallest county in the state with access to forty miles of waterfront.¹ Most textile mills were located in the Piedmont, and when the Edenton Cotton Mill opened in 1898 only one other mill existed in the Albemarle region.² The growth of the rail line through the area offered the possibility of development in Edenton. By 1881 the Norfolk and Southern Railroad had completed a line through the town. The railroad, constructed near the Edenton waterfront along Blount Street, helped to transform Edenton into a manufacturing town. Local manufacturers found economic success with a variety of industries including lumber, oil and peanuts.³ Despite these manufacturing successes, a town with a textile mill was the true signifier for an economically independent town.

³ Butchko, Edenton, an Architectural Portrait, 40-47.
Prominent Edenton citizens were not oblivious to the growing interest in textiles that was flourishing across North Carolina. This was in part due to publications in the *Fisherman and Farmer*, a local newspaper published by A.H. Mitchell. Reacting to a publication in the *Baltimore Manufacturer’s Record* the paper reported on the hype surrounding the textile industry. In the *Baltimore Manufacturer’s Record* bankers discussed the possibilities of making large profits from starting a textile mill. The *Fisherman and Farmer* reported, “These bankers say cotton mills are building up their towns, making business better, and giving the farmers more profitable home markets.” Bankers believed that mill manufacturers could make up to a 35% net profit. The paper also stated that “The reports from every Northern state show that the mills pay good dividends.”

Publications like this one, better access to outside markets and an already established interest in other manufacturing venues furthered the idea of starting a mill.

In July 1898 prominent Edenton citizens including bankers, merchants, attorneys and industrialists held a meeting at the Chowan County Courthouse to discuss starting a cotton mill. According to the *Fisherman and Farmer* the meeting was attended by “monied men” including W. D. Pruden, who presided over the discussion. After the meeting the paper reported, “The interest we see manifested by those of our citizens who are able to invest in such an enterprise and the liberal manner in which they are taking stock we can safely say Edenton will soon have a cotton mill.” Nineteen investors backed the project, one of the more prominent groups being the Wood family. The Woods were involved in nearly every town enterprise from the plantation to the law office, and Frank Wood became the Edenton Cotton Mills first president.

---

4 *Fisherman and Farmer*, January 25, 1895.
5 “Week at Edenton,” *Fisherman and Farmer*, July 29, 1898
The Edenton Cotton Mill Board of Directors chose a site for the mill along the waterfront and beside the railroad. W.B. Shepard sold the property to the mill in January 1899. The Board purchased 30 acres for $5000. After the purchase of the property construction of the mill began quickly. The Board had already been meeting since August of 1898, and hired Charles R. Makepeace to design the mill.

Charles R. Makepeace was a well known textile mill designer from North Carolina who had designed over 100 mills worldwide. Makepeace and the Board decided to build a one story brick building with the capacity for 5000 spindles. Highlighting the importance mill manufacturers placed on the textile industry to revitalize the South, nearly all of the labor and supplies for the mill were from areas in the South. The Board hired George Borum from Suffolk, Virginia to do the brick and carpentry work for the mill. They received most of the lumber for the mill from the Branning Manufacturing Company, a local company in Edenton, and the larger timber from Biscoe, North Carolina. Construction for the mill was well underway when the Board implemented plans to construct a paternalistic mill village. In June 1898 they decided on building ten houses for operatives.

Architectural historian Thomas Butchko did extensive genealogical and Census Record research concerning families that lived in the mill village. Butchko provides a clear picture of the type of people that lived in the mill. Most workers migrated from nearby farms. The community
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8 Edenton Cotton Mill Board of Directors, Minute Book, August-October 1898, Copy of the minutes located at PNC Northeast Branch in Edenton, North Carolina.
9 Edenton Cotton Mill Board of Directors, Minute Book, January 30, 1899-March 20, 1899.
10 Edenton Cotton Mill Board of Directors Minute Book, March 17, 1899- June 5, 1899.
11 Edenton Cotton Mill Board of Directors, Minute Book, June 19, 1899.
was not very permanent with a large residential turnover.\textsuperscript{12} The work force was nearly identical in composition to other mills in the state employing white workers from rural locations. Many houses held more than five people and nearly all members of the family worked in the mill. By 1910, there were over forty houses and close to 230 residents in the village.\textsuperscript{13} [Figure 12, 13 and 14]

The Edenton Cotton Mill Board of Directors Minute Book spans from the start of the mill into the 1950s and offers a rare insider’s look into the struggles to maintain a paternalistic town in a tumultuous industry. This source shows the uncertainty of a mill worker’s existence. The Minute Book covers various topics including labor laws, economic turmoil and the struggle to maintain the mill village and keep mill workers content.

One of the main topics mentioned throughout the minutes was the struggle to find employees and then provide them with a stable job through tough economic times. In the early existence of the mill the problem was more focused on finding enough employees. Southern mills relied heavily on child labor and the Edenton Cotton Mill was hurt when the National Child Labor Law went into effect on September 1, 1917.

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{12} National Register of Historic Places Inventory, Nomination Form, compiled by Thomas Butchko, (Raleigh, NC: State Historic Preservation Office, Division of Archives and History, North Carolina Department of Cultural Resources, 1999) Section 8, page 10-11.
\textsuperscript{13} National Register of Historic Places Inventory, Nomination Form, Section 8 page 10.
\end{flushleft}
Figure 12. The 1904 Sanborn Map of Edenton. It shows the beginnings of the mill village. (Courtesy of Digital Sanborn Map Company 1867-1970)
Figure 13. This is the 1910 Sanborn Map of Edenton. Here the growth of the mill and village can be seen from 1904. (Courtesy of Digital Sanborn Map Company 1867-1970)
Figure 14. This is the January 1927-October 1943 Sanborn Map of Edenton. The village and the mill have continued to grow. (Courtesy of Digital Sanborn Map Company 1867-1970)
The Minute Book reported that, “This will severely curtail the supply of spinners and doffers and deprive us of the use of about 20 children.”\textsuperscript{14} On July 9, 1919 the Minute Book stated, “As usual the scarcity of labor has been our chief concern. Labor from other mills does not often stay with us.”\textsuperscript{15}

Later the mill struggled to keep employees content during the Depression. In 1928 the Board reported that they were only able to run four days a week.\textsuperscript{16} The problem continued to worsen and in 1931 the Board discussed closing the mill but instead stated, “We would like to close down entirely, but feel that it would demoralize our labor as they cannot well exist on shorter hours than at present.”\textsuperscript{17} The mill did not shut down, but did have to make two wage reductions. By 1932 the mill was only operating 16 hours a week.\textsuperscript{18} The Board tried to offset some of the uncertainty of the industry by providing mill workers with amenities.

Although mill workers were provided housing that was cared for by the mill’s Board, the mill village was not always kept in good condition. The poor living conditions in the mill were another major subject in the Board’s minutes. In 1918 the Board complained about the sanitation in the village. “It has been- practically impossible to get men for outside work and we have not been able to keep the mill village decently clean.”\textsuperscript{19} They continued to complain into the 1940s about the poor conditions of the village whether it was the lack of a proper sewage system, electricity or paved roads. The village was behind in modern advancements compared to the rest of Edenton.\textsuperscript{20}

\textsuperscript{14} Edenton Cotton Mill Board of Directors, Minute Book, July 11, 1917.  
\textsuperscript{15} Edenton Cotton Mill Board of Directors, Minute Book, July 19, 1919.  
\textsuperscript{16} Edenton Cotton Mill Board of Directors, Minute Book, July 11, 1928.  
\textsuperscript{17} Edenton Cotton Mill Board of Directors, Minute Book, July 9, 1930.  
\textsuperscript{18} Edenton Cotton Mill Board of Directors, Minute Book, July 9, 1931.  
\textsuperscript{19} Edenton Cotton Mill Board of Directors, Minute Book, July 10, 1918.  
\textsuperscript{20} Edenton Cotton Mill Board of Directors, Minute Book, 1918-1940.
The Board used paternalistic principles to mask shortcomings in the village. They attempted to make workers happy with health care, a mill church and garden space. By 1903 the Board paid $40 a month to provide employees with a doctor. Very little money came out of the employees pocket for this service.\(^{21}\) The policy of providing health care continued, but it was not until 1951 that the company offered a group insurance plan for employees.\(^ {22}\)

From 1905 until the mill closed the Board supported a church located in the village that acted as a community center. [Figure 15] During 1905, the board donated the land for the church and provided the church with $100.\(^ {23}\) The church, called the East Edenton Methodist church remained a staple of mill village life until the mill closed in 1995. This is due in part to the Board’s continued commitment to the support of the church and village. In 1915 the Board donated more money to the church for a Sunday school room.\(^ {24}\) The Board believed that the church was a vital part of the community and stated in 1950, “We sincerely believe this is an important and worth while part of the village life.”\(^ {25}\)

\(^{21}\) Edenton Cotton Mill Board of Directors Minutes, January 9, 1903.  
\(^{22}\) Edenton Cotton Mill Board of Directors, Minute Book, February 14, 1951.  
\(^{23}\) Edenton Cotton Mill Board of Directors Minutes, May 24, 1905.  
\(^{24}\) Edenton Cotton Mill Board of Directors Minutes, July 14, 1915.  
\(^{25}\) Edenton Cotton Mill Board of Directors, Minute Book, February 8, 1950.
Figure 15. The 1910 Edenton Sanborn Maps shows the addition of a church to the mill village. The church is circled in black. (Courtesy of Digital Sanborn Maps 1867-1970)
One way shortcomings in the village were masked was by focusing on employees gardens. Gardens were supposed to remind workers of farm life, and add to the idea that the mill owner was taking care of them. The Board made a strong attempt to interest workers in taking pride in their gardens and stated in 1943, “We have made many good garden spaces throughout the village… we contemplate offering some suitable prizes for the best gardens this year.”

Despite real conditions at the mill, the Edenton community focused on the mill as a source of economic pride for the town. Just like the rest of the South, the volatility and turmoil of the industry was ignored for the economic profits that could be publicized. When reporting on the ability of the mill to provide steady work, The Chowan Herald stated,

> The company employs about 300 people with payrolls running into thousands of dollars annually and has since it was organized maintained a fairly regular schedule of operations, thus providing its employees practically regular employment and a steady income of wages.”

This same article reported on conditions at the mill village, “The company owns and maintains its own village consisting of comfortable homes, that are well kept by the people who live in them and are employed by the mill. The village is modern with all city conveniences…” The mill was celebrated for its economic success because it added to the Edenton economy by employing local people and containing most of its profits locally. It was the largest industry in the town, supplemented by a strong lumber and peanut manufacturing interest, and remained profitable into the late 1990s.

Despite economic success, Edenton does not identify itself as a mill town. Besides other strong industrial factors in the town, the town identity was shrouded in colonial history. By the
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26 Edenton Cotton Mill Board of Directors, Minute Book, February 10, 1943.
28 The Chowan Herald, 1927.
29 Butchko, Edenton, an Architectural Portrait, 259.
time the mill closed Edenton had already embarked on a new identity focused on heritage
tourism. The Chamber of Commerce’s community guide stated, “The town’s fame for its history
and architectural qualities derives primarily from its colonial past, a heritage among the most
distinguished in the state. Today, the town is well known for its examples of Jacobean, Georgian,
Federal, Greek Revival, and Victorian architectural styles spanning over two hundred and fifty
years.”30 The old cotton mill remained incongruent with the image Edenton was projecting; it
was merely a useful economic tool, and not the real heart of the community. Locals saw the mill
village, “as a dilapidated area on the wrong side of the tracks.”31

When the mill closed in 1995, PNC saw the perfect opportunity to fit the mill into
Edenton’s focus on heritage tourism. From its inception, the preservation of the Edenton Cotton
Mill was about economics with only a romanticized focus on history. The Edenton Cotton Mill’s
Board of Directors minute book portrayed the real conditions of a mill village. The village
fostered a clear sense of the community, but at the same time living conditions were not ideal.
PNC chose to focus on promoting a small town community instead of honoring the multifaceted
history that mill villages offer. They are areas with strong communities, but the implications of a
company controlled town should not be dismissed.

The Edenton Cotton Mill Furthers Heritage Tourism

When the cotton mill closed in 1995 PNC began correspondence with Unifi Incorporated,
the most recent owner of the mill. PNC asked to receive the mill as a gift stating that,

Unifi’s property in Edenton has long been of great interest to PNC from architectural,
historical and educational vantage points. The property is a remarkable survivor for North
Carolina; a textile mill intact with its mill village could be ‘developed’ historically in a
way that would attract very positive national attention in historic preservation and
economic development circles. The mill has great possibilities for adaptive reuse for

Chamber of Commerce, 2005), 2.
mixed uses. The mill houses would make very attractive homes for retirees and small families.\textsuperscript{32}

PNC believed that they would be able to market the mill in Edenton because the town’s “greatest economic resource is its historic character.”\textsuperscript{33} The idea of using the mill for heritage tourism was PNC’s first goal for the mill and village because they believed it would bring about the most profit. Myrick Howard, PNC’s Executive Director, stated, “The Edenton newspaper recently editorialized that tourism is the future industry for Edenton and that economic development efforts should focus on heritage tourism rather than traditional industrial recruitment.”\textsuperscript{34} If PNC received the property they planned to use the mill and village to foster heritage tourism in Edenton.

Unifi, Inc. agreed to donate the property to PNC in December 1995. After PNC received the 44 acre complex with 57 mill houses and 117,000 square feet of industrial space they had to decide how to market the mill and village. The donation of the property shifted PNC’s mission. Prior to the gift PNC acted on a property by property basis using a revolving fund.\textsuperscript{35} Now they owned an entire neighborhood. Initially they worked with the mill houses, preparing them to be sold. This was their expertise and it was not long before they sold a significant number of houses. Plans for the mill were less concrete and developed slower.

During 1996 PNC began to sell houses ranging in price from $17,000 to $100,000. During the next six months 32 of the houses were sold. PNC succeeded in their goal of marketing the village as a unique historic property with small town character and values. [Figure 16] Ann Moscatello, who bought four of the houses, said, “I think all of the buyers here are

\begin{itemize}
\item[33] Howard to Raymond C. Hunt, September 22, 1995.
\item[34] Myrick Howard to Raymond C. Hunt, October 12, 1995, in collection 4858, Box 29 Manuscripts Department, Wilson Library, The University of North Carolina Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, North Carolina.
\item[35] Howard, “Reflecting on a Great Preservation Success.”
\end{itemize}
looking to reconnect with an old fashioned value system. I call this place the land that time forgot, where handshakes still mean something, where your word still means something.”

Moscatello was not the only person charmed by the village atmosphere; today the mill village is mostly occupied by people who are not local. Many residents use the village as a second home. PNC did not have as much success convincing the Edenton community that the property was a good investment. Initially few locals bought mill houses, and presently less than 20 residents of the mill village have a connection to Edenton. Of the few locals less than ten are former mill workers.

Moving Beyond Marketing Real Estate Proves Impossible

PNC reached its goal of marketing the houses for their historic character and were attracting people to the area. The mill village was starting to fit into the identity that the Edenton community wanted to project. In September of 1996 the mill was included as part of Edenton’s Historic District. Shortly after that it was included on the historic trolley tours started by the Edenton Visitor Center in 1997. The Edenton Cotton Mill became a lure for tourists fitting in with the rest of the trolley tour which focused on colonial history. The mill was becoming accepted as an important part of the town’s history.

After the village restoration was well underway PNC struggled with redeveloping the mill. The mill building was supposed to complete the goal of creating heritage tourism by offering a site with a variety of activities for the community and tourists. PNC embarked on an ambitious plan to redevelop the mill. They agreed to work with a non profit arts and humanities group that was composed of members of PNC and prominent Edenton citizens. This organization
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37 Beth Taylor, Phone interview by author, August 24, 2006.
39 Linda Eure, Edenton State Historic Site Manager, email to author, August 24, 2006.
became known as the Edenton Institute and from the beginning their plans for the mill were characterized by high expectations that were never accomplished.

This plan was sponsored by The Town of Edenton, Chowan County, The College of the Albemarle, East Carolina University, Elizabeth State University, Chowan Hospital, The Chowan Arts Council, The Edenton-Chowan 200 Commission and PNC. The Edenton Institute was incorporated in 1997 and began using a plan prepared by Landmark Asset Services, Incorporated of Winston Salem. This plan helped the Institute develop a mission statement.

The mission of the Edenton Institute is to improve the quality of life and enrich the mind, body, and spirit of people through the advancement of education, historic preservation, travel, tourism, art, national resources, and technology in Northeastern North Carolina.  

---

Figure 16. Photos a and b demonstrate preserved mill houses with modern conveniences. The houses also retain their historic integrity. (Photographs taken by Katie Abbott)
The Edenton Institute planned to accomplish this goal by providing education, visual and performing art and health and wellness to Edenton. [Figure 17]

The plan was well supported, but far too ambitious. The Edenton Institute expressed concerns with meeting their goals, “The for profit sector can easily generate the revenues needed to make their part of the project viable, but raising sufficient funds to accomplish the larger mission of the Institute will be more difficult.”41 The Edenton Institute could not move past the for-profit sector and ultimately the project failed. This left PNC with a large industrial space that they needed to redevelop to continue the progress they had made with the village.

Myrick Howard began negotiations with Tom Wilson, a doctor from Mooresville, North Carolina. Wilson had prior experience working with historic properties and wanted to turn the property into predominantly residential space. This plan, far less ambitious than the Edenton Institute’s plan, proved manageable. Wilson hired architect Steven Schuster with Clearscapes PA in Raleigh who had worked with PNC prior to this project.42 Presently the Edenton Cotton Mill is being redeveloped as condominiums. Many of the condos are complete and occupied. [Figure 18]

---

Figure 17. a-This sketch of preliminary plans for the redevelopment of the mill by the Edenton Institute shows the ambitious goals of the project including an art and education center and participant housing. b- This sketch shows the planned Wellness and Fitness Center another ambitious goal developed by the Edenton Institute.
Figure 18. a and b-These exterior photos of the mill show that after the mill restoration the historic integrity is still intact. c and d-These photos show the common space inside of the mill. The mill has been transformed into an expensive living space. e and f- These photographs of the inside of one condo show the meshing of a historic building with modern conveniences. (Photographs by Katie Abbott)
What Have Preservationists Preserved?

PNC considers the Edenton Cotton Mill preservation a successful endeavor. PNC’s initial plan to expand the cotton mill into a heritage tourism site may not have been reached to the extent they hoped, but they still accomplished the task. Preserving the cotton mill also expanded PNC’s mission and helped them acquire more attention for other preservation projects. Since the preservation of the mill, PNC has sold almost 60 historic properties in the region. PNC is also actively pursuing other mill preservation projects.

Although PNC views the Edenton Cotton Mill as a successful project, there are two main problems with the final result. One is the displacement of the community that lived in the mill prior to the preservation. The other is the skewed image residents associate with mill history as opposed to the actual conditions of living in a mill community. By transforming the mill into expensive residential space PNC essentially created a new community in place of an older one. This new community holds a romanticized version of mill history.

A survey conducted with residents who live in the mill village and condos indicates that residents hold a romanticized view of what mill communities were like and that this misunderstanding has played a role in their decision to buy property in the preserved village. Nearly everyone surveyed stated similar reasons for moving to a preserved site mentioning words such as investment, architecture, quality, uniqueness, character, history, and community.

---

43 Claudia Deviney, Preservation North Carolina, Regional Director Northeast Branch, Phone interview with Katie Abbott, August 24, 2006.
44 PNC began its involvement with textile mill preservation in the mid 1990s when they worked to obtain the Edenton Cotton Mill Village in Edenton, North Carolina as a donation from Unifi, Inc. Considering this project a success, PNC continues working with mill properties in Burlington and Gastonia. They have also supported a new mill tax credit for the rehabilitation of textile mills. For more information on the mill tax credit bill that was ratified on June 27, 2006 see Andrea Wilson, “Legislation Puts N.C. Industrial Sites Back in Service,” Preservation Online, July 6, 2006, http://www.nationaltrust.org/Magazine/archives/arc_news_2006/070606.htm; PNC also has a website featuring a compilation of ten case studies that show the advantages of preserving industrial sites, http://www.presnc.org/Mill Reuse Website/PDFs/All%20documents%20from%20Industrial%20Properties%20Rehabilitation%20Case%20Studies.pdf. For more information on the promotion of and philosophy toward industrial structures preservation see Howard, “Reflecting on a Great Preservation Success,” North Carolina Preservation, 2005.
One resident stated, “I love the ‘village’ feeling and a front porch, rather than ‘back deck’ neighborhood.”

The main draw to the area is the search for a community dynamic, residents sensing and assuming that something existed before them that they can re-establish by moving here. When asked what they learned from living in a preserved site only three residents noted any real hardships associated with a mill worker’s way of life. One participant stated, “The preservation of these buildings reminds me of the simple life that the workers lived and also the great contributions that the mill made to the community as well as to the surrounding communities.”

Another participant added to this sentiment and stated, “Communities were structured differently then to promote common activities in open common spaces.”

One resident moved to Edenton expecting to find the community atmosphere they associated with mill history and is upset because they feel this has not been recreated. They feel that the Edenton Cotton Mill District is not living up to its advertisement of a “Quaint Small Town Atmosphere.” They say the town “has taken on the aura of any suburban development,” and that they had hoped the “mill village would be like minded individuals, that is, those with a sense of community.” They went on to say that “Against all these odds, the people I know who have lived and worked here forged a very strong sense of community and camaraderie.” They hold PNC in contempt for this lack of community fellowship today. This participant in particular moved to Edenton to live in a recreated past that unfortunately never existed.

46 Anonymous Survey Participant 1, by author, Edenton, NC Mail Survey, Summer 2006.
Surveys with residents living in the Edenton Cotton Mill show some of the faults in current preservation methods. Ultimately communities can not be recreated, but need to be sustained. The true community dynamic that exists in mill communities is something that should be preserved, but it has already been lost in Edenton because of the preservation of the property. Preservation should not be about recreation, but about sustaining what is already there.
CHAPTER THREE: PILOT MILL, RALEIGH, NORTH CAROLINA

The preservation of the former Pilot Mill follows a slightly different pattern than the other mill town case studies presented thus far. This is because of Raleigh’s short term status as a mill town. The textile industry flourished in Raleigh for only a short time, meaning few ties to paternalism still exist. There were few residents of the mill community left when Pilot Mill was preserved. For this reason, the preservation of Pilot Mill was the preservation of a dilapidated mill and the surrounding neighborhood. Pilot Mill, located near downtown Raleigh, offered a space for preservationists to restore a property into a successful mixed use site. The property could cater to the downtown area, offering many possibilities for its redevelopment. An added success for the property is its use as a tool to foster education about the textile industry. Pilot Mill is a standard preservation project, and it highlights the overall faults in the preservation field. Pilot Mill shows how preservationists cater to gentrification by acting as agents in control of the fate of a community as opposed to partners in the process of preserving a community’s history.

The Capital City and the Textile Industry

By the early 20th century Raleigh was considered a metropolis that was a center for education, the destination of hundreds of thousands of visitors, home to numerous industries and filled with governmental activities.¹ At one time six cotton mills operated in Raleigh, but at the same time other industries were also growing. Raleigh had numerous fertilizer industries, tobacco warehouses, lumber plants and insurance companies.²

---

In 1888, Raleigh’s Chamber of Commerce reported on possible profits to be made from investing in textiles. In the 1890s three cotton mills began operation in Raleigh, and it was for this brief time that Raleigh developed as a fledgling mill town. This status did not last for long because of the textile industry’s instability, but for a brief period Raleigh was home to small mill villages. These mill villages were founded with paternalistic principles. The impact of paternalism was affected by the growth of the Raleigh. Raleigh’s mill villages were never isolated entities and their history is intertwined with the history of the growth of Raleigh.

**A Forgotten Mill Village**

The Williamsons, an experienced family of textile entrepreneurs, opened Pilot Mill in the last decade of the nineteenth century. James N. Williamson and his son William co-owned the mill, and Pilot Mill was used to initiate William into textile mill ownership. James, a former merchant and farmer transitioned into textiles after he married into the Holt family. The Holts were deeply involved with textiles in North Carolina with their main mill located in Alamance County. James received extensive experience working in family owned mills. He later opened his own mill, Ossipee Cotton Mills, in Alamance County where William received his training in running a mill. William drew upon this experience to play an integral role in formulating plans for Pilot Mill where he eventually became company president in 1907.3

William embodied the role of a paternalistic mill owner by creating a mill village and involving himself with the Raleigh community. He was the Director of the Citizen’s National Bank of Raleigh and a member of the Junior Order of United American Mechanics. Williamson worked hard to maintain a paternalistic relationship passed down from generations of textile

---

manufacturers. He was described as an employer who was compassionate toward his employees needs and who had,

…given opportunities for a better life to the mill people on his payroll, as is evidenced by the liberal conduct of the Pilot Mills and the opportunities which he has aided in placing at the command of the people who labor in his employ. The hall, the library, and the social life of the Pilot Mill people have been made possible because of the deep interest Mr. Williamson has shown in the advancement of the home life of the men and women whose lives are spent where the machinery is at work.4

The construction of a mill village and community amenities indicates Williamson’s attempt to maintain a paternalistic relationship. Williamson paid for the construction of a mill village and donated land for the Pilot Mills Baptist Church. [Figure 19, 20 and 21]

Williamson’s use of paternalism contributed to the company’s success and Pilot Mill expanded, but paternalism never gained the stronghold it did in other rural mill towns. [Figure 22] Williamson’s use of paternalism soon became outdated and was discontinued. Despite the demise of paternalism, the mill remained a constant economic force until the early 1980s.

---

Figure 19. Pilot Mill circa 1930. Company housing can be seen behind the mill. (Courtesy of North Carolina State Archives)
Figure 20. This sketch shows the early layout for part of the mill village. Williamson, like most mill owners during this time, offered standard housing for his employees to keep them close to the mill. (Courtesy of Special Collections, Perkins Library, Duke University)
Figure 21. a- These sketches show housing for the Pilot Mill village. They offer proof for the existence of a variety of housing surrounding the mill. b- A sketch of the land donated by the Pilot Mills Company in 1898 for a church. The donation of land for a church represents a clear evidence of Williamson’s support of paternalism. (Courtesy of Special Collections, Perkins Library, Duke University)
Figure 22. a- Pilot Mills’ layout in 1910. During this time the operation was small, but it grew steadily over the years. Compare this figure to the expansion seen in b. b- Pilot Mill in 1955. The growth of the mill since 1910 is obvious. (Courtesy of Special Collections, Perkins Library, Duke University)
Figure 22 shows the expansion of the mill over the century. Even though Raleigh is not traditionally known as a mill town Pilot Mill has an important place in the city’s history. The mill’s growth over the years demonstrates the textile industry’s important contribution to Raleigh’s economic development. Pilot Mill went through a series of different owners over the years, but consistently employed a few hundred employees. When the mill closed in 1982, 320 employees lost their jobs.⁵

The Pilot Mill Preservation: A Familiar Challenge

When the mill closed in 1982 it was an attractive development property. Unlike other mill preservation efforts, a developer did not have to deal with the remnants of paternalism. The mill village was demolished in the early 1980s and Raleigh did not have an economic dependency upon textiles. The Pilot Mill preservation was a challenging preservation project because of environmental concerns surrounding the dilapidated mill structure and the close proximity of a crime ridden public housing project, but these issues were manageable risks. A successful mill preservation had taken place less than half a mile from Pilot Mill and Pilot Mill was surrounded by two historic neighborhoods. Numerous developers attempted to work with the property, but they failed to manage the associated risks, especially the public housing project known as Halifax Court.⁶ In the late 1990s Frank Gailor, a member of PNC’s board, a Raleigh resident and the manager of Hedgehog Holdings, LLC, a company that specializes in restoring risky historic properties, bought the mill and quickly dealt with the two main risks associated with the project.

---

By the time Gailor started to work with the property the mill structure was falling apart and the property was an environmental risk because of contaminated soil and groundwater. Ed Owens, the city inspections director, believed that the plan to revitalize the mill was too great a risk and he said, “In our opinion, it’s just not worth it. Especially now with the roof and the floor gone, I cannot fathom the economics of it.” Even though the mill structure itself was collapsing, Gailor believed he could make a profit from the property especially with the introduction of a new law that helped him manage the environmental concerns. Gailor took advantage of the state’s new Brownfields Property Reuse Act of 1997 that provided businessmen with a financial incentive to work with environmentally unsafe properties. Gailor was responsible for making the Pilot Mill property safe with the understanding that all of the pollution could not be removed. In exchange for this, Gailor was protected against lawsuits concerning pollution on the site. Although the property was now closer to being financially viable, Halifax Court was still a concern. [Figure 23]

The Raleigh Housing Authority (RHA) was working on a plan to tear down Halifax Court, while maintaining affordable housing. Gailor recognized that if he could participate in this process his preservation effort would benefit. Gailor supported the RHA’s plan to tear down Halifax Court stating,

Were the RHA proposal to be implemented, we would accelerate our efforts and expand the scope of the development on the expectation that the implementation of the RHA proposal would remove the single most significant risk to the success of the mill’s redevelopment: the real and perceived problems associated with the adjoining Halifax Court.

---

Figure 23. This map shows the location of Pilot Mill and the close proximity of the former Halifax Court. (Courtesy of Paul Setliff, Raleigh Neighborhoods and Homes, http://www.paulsetliff.com/hoods/mordecai/mordecai.htm)
Following traditional preservation and development standards, the RHA and Gailor essentially played the role of the paternal protectors of Halifax Court residents. When the RHA received a grant for $29 million dollars to tear down Halifax Court and replace it with better housing Gailor made it clear that he was committed to the existing community at Halifax Court. Some residents of Halifax Court feared they were going to be displaced.\textsuperscript{10} Gailor took an active role in assuring the Halifax Court community that they were being treated fairly so he could ensure the success of his own preservation project.

Residents were content, and a new community became attracted to an area that no longer held Halifax Court’s stigma. Gailor was part of a group that signed a contract stating,

Individually and collectively, we will work toward a redeveloped Community with the goal of providing housing opportunities for all residents of Halifax Court who want to remain in the Community…We recognize that long-term availability of affordable housing is a concern and will cooperate with others to address it. Preference for such residences will be given to residents of Halifax Court who want to remain in the Community.\textsuperscript{11}

Halifax Court was replaced with a new development called Capitol Park. [Figure 24] The demolition of Halifax Court facilitated the redevelopment of Pilot Mill and the revitalization of the surrounding areas.

Pilot Mill was redeveloped quickly after Gailor dealt with the major obstacles facing the preservation process. The plan for the mill structure called for a multi use property, home to small businesses and a charter high school.\textsuperscript{12}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{10} Matthew Teague, “Not Everyone’s Happy in Halifax Court,” \textit{Raleigh News and Observer}, September, 2 1999. \\
\textsuperscript{11} “Principles and Agreements for the Redevelopment of the Community,” Contract, in Hedgehog Holdings LLC office, Raleigh, North Carolina. \\
\end{flushright}
Figure 24. This picture shows a view of the area that was a former public housing project called Halifax Court. Now known as Capitol Park, it fits in better with the clear goal of marketing the Pilot Mill area to middle class consumers. (Courtesy of Ernest Pecounis, http://www.pbase.com/raleighmsa/capitol_park, accessed March 21, 2007)
The mill property quickly began leasing space and is now filled with a variety of businesses and Raleigh Charter High School.\footnote{Iris June Vinegar, “Historic Mills Find New Glory,” Raleigh News and Observer, June 25, 2005.} [Figure 25 and 26]

The Pilot Mill preservation is a great success according to current preservation standards, but at the same time the effort caters to the goal of marketing to a new community as opposed to preserving the history of the community that was intact before the preservation started. The Pilot Mill preservation and the demolition of Halifax Court contribute to the ongoing task of revitalizing downtown Raleigh. The area is being marketed as a suburb within walking distance of downtown. The old Pilot Mill village was replaced with newer and larger housing. Now called, The Village at Pilot Mill, it contains over 100 homes, most of them already sold in the $300,000 to $400,000 price range.\footnote{Vinegar, “Historic Mills Find New Glory,” Raleigh News and Observer, June 25, 2005.} The marketing literature for the development states, “Nestled in Raleigh’s historic district, The Village at Pilot Mill offers luxurious, carefree living in beautifully designed homes…Bordered by beautiful Peace College, the Mordecai neighborhood, and the architecturally stunning historic Pilot Mill…”\footnote{“The Village at Pilot Mill,” http://villageatpilotmill.com/description.htm.} [Figure 27] The stigma attached to the area because of Halifax Court is being replaced with a positive image. Real estate agent Kate Kenney stated that the The Village at Pilot Mill, “…is a completely different environment…most of our customers are smart enough to realize that Halifax is gone and downtown Raleigh is on the upswing.”\footnote{Matt Ehlers, “Ripple Effect: As the Memory of a Troubled Past Fades and the Promise of a Future Success Rises, Development Spreads,” Raleigh News and Observer, November 14, 2002.} The statement alone evidences the gentrification of the area. The preservation of Pilot Mill was used to create a new identity for the area, not to preserve the existing identity.
Figure 25. Before and after photographs of Pilot Mill show the dilapidated state of the mill. The photo of the preserved mill shows that the mill retains its historic integrity. (Courtesy of Preservation North Carolina, Industrial Properties Rehabilitation Case Studies, http://www.presnc.org/Mill_Reuse_Website/studies/Pilot%20Mill.htm, accessed March 21, 2007)
Figure 26. One former mill building is now the site of the Raleigh Charter High School. Since the building retains its historic character it can act as an excellent tool for teaching high school students about mill history. (Courtesy of Hedgehog Holdings, LLC)
Figure 27. An advertisement for The Village at Pilot Mill highlights the goal of marketing to a consumer that wants to be close to a growing downtown, but still have the atmosphere of a suburban area. (Courtesy of The Village at Pilot Mill, http://villageatpilotmill.com/, accessed March 21, 2007)
Abundant evidence indicates that the Pilot Mill preservation and demolition of Halifax Court have helped revitalize the surrounding area. The 200 year old Mordecai neighborhood’s development, which is close by, was hurt by the dilapidated mill and the crime ridden Halifax Court. Real estate agent Anne Scruggs stated that the prices of homes in Mordecai have risen significantly since the preservation project. Gailor’s efforts with the Pilot Mill preservation helped revitalize the mill, and the surrounding area. Clearly preservationists estimate their success in terms of real estate. Gentrification is not something that preservationists in North Carolina are fighting against.

Despite the gentrification that is associated with the Pilot Mill preservation, the project does foster education dealing with the textile industry. This appears to be a fortunate by-product of the preservation. The Raleigh Charter High School is located in the 1910 building and acts as a teaching tool for the students. History teacher Shayne Klein focuses on textile history and involves former Pilot Mill employees as part of her class. Mill workers gave a tour of the building to students. The building also acts as an exhibit space with photographs of mill related scenes filling the halls. It is this final success that separates the Pilot Mill preservation from other textile mill preservations in the state.

The Pilot Mill preservation fits well into current preservation standards providing the property with a real chance at success. Along with this advantage the property had a good developer who kept the surrounding community in mind during his efforts to preserve the site as a mixed use property. Although Raleigh is not a mill town, and few remnants of paternalism still exist, the preservation of Pilot Mill provides a venue for textile industry education. One of the

reasons this is the case is because Raleigh is not dependent on textiles and the area has the resources to create a successful preservation.
CHAPTER FOUR: CANNON MILLS, KANNAPOLIS, NORTH CAROLINA

Kannapolis is a mill town entrenched in paternalistic principles. Cannon Mills was one of the largest and most successful textile mills in the United States, and as the company flourished, their paternalistic relationship with the town of Kannapolis remained a constant. Kannapolis is a town dependent on a paternalistic presence economically, politically and socially even after the mill has closed. Kannapolis offers proof of what happens to mill towns in the absence of buffers to paternalism such as an organized preservation movement, diverse economy, or geography. An examination of the paternalistic environment in Kannapolis and the current demolition of the most important mill town in the state indicates that preservationists’ standards are ineffective in places where paternalism operates without mediating factors.

Cannon’s Town

A rigid plan for the success of Cannon Mills was implemented by James Cannon and later continued by his son Charles. The company’s plan focused on Cannon Mills as an innovator in the field of textiles and on maintaining corporate stability. A significant part of the Cannon plan for maintaining stability centered on Kannapolis remaining a company controlled town long after other mill owners had given up paternalistic practices. James Cannon believed in playing the role of the benevolent father figure to the citizens of Kannapolis and he passed this practice on to his son Charles. This plan was successful for over seven decades as Cannon Mills maintained stable operations in an industry that was often volatile. [Figure 28]
Figure 28. View of Cannon Mills circa 1928. (Courtesy of Paul Kearns, *Weavers of Dreams*, inside cover)
By 1914, Cannon Mills was the world’s largest producer of flat weave towels and shortly after this became the first textile company to offer brand name products that quickly became trusted household commodities.¹

James Cannon created Kannapolis as the center of his textile empire. He built near the former site of the North Carolina Railroad near the county line separating Cabarrus and Rowan counties. The connection to the railroad was all that removed the land from isolation, but the railroad allowed for a successful mill operation. Cannon intended to provide everything else for a viable town including schools, churches, housing, stores, and a YMCA.² He understood the importance of securing a stable and loyal workforce.

James Cannon created a paternalistic system where mill workers learned that keeping an alliance with the Cannon family was the best option available to them. As Cannon was building the mill in the early 20th century he also established an entire functional town around the company. Cannon’s early financial records show that he paid for the construction and maintenance of houses and stores.³ This meant that employees did not have to leave Kannapolis or the mill. In addition to these basic amenities Cannon also concerned himself with social and educational institutions, funding the construction of a YMCA and numerous schools. [Figure 29]

---

³James Cannon Ledger 1912-1913 Cannon Collection, Special Collections, Duke University.
Figure 29. This page from J.W. Cannon’s ledger shows his expenses for housing and stores. This highlights his support for paternalism. (Courtesy of Special Collections, Perkins Library, Duke University)
Kannapolis functioned as a paternalistic mill town to a greater extent than any other town in North Carolina. In 1924 the *Chesapeake Pilot* reported, “Kannapolis is not an ordinary cotton mill town by any means; it is more like a big family for all are dependent on the prosperity of the Cannon cotton mills for their livelihood.”

By this time the town was home to over 8,000 people. Cannon had constructed over 1,000 company houses, built two schools and 18 stores. The town of Kannapolis and Cannon Mills did not function as separate entities, but rather mill workers were dependent on the stability and growth of the company. During the Cannon’s reign most workers were content because of Cannon Mills’ success. Cannon Mills experienced steady growth for the next 40 years controlling all of Kannapolis and much of the surrounding area.

Charles Cannon, who remained on the board until his death in the early 1970s maintained the benevolent paternalistic relationship started by his father. Cannon Mills became known for stability which was rare in the textile industry.

In 1972, *Forbes* magazine reported, “… considering that Cannon stock has a book value of $120 a share, these earnings and dividends weren’t all that impressive, but they were remarkably stable especially for a textile company.”

When Charles Cannon died, sales for the company exceeded $305 million a year. During the Cannon family’s control no outsiders were allowed on the board and the company was vertically integrated. Cannon Mills was known for an unwillingness to share information with outsiders.

---

4 “Cannon Manufacturing Company,” *Chesapeake Pilot*, October 20, 1924.
5 “Cannon Manufacturing Company,” *Chesapeake Pilot*, October 20, 1924.
Figure 30. This 1926 Sanborn Map view of Cannon Mills demonstrates that Cannon Mills was already a large operation with a vast amount of company housing. The company continued to grow over the years. (Courtesy of Sanborn Digital Maps, 1867-1970)
Figure 31. The 1943 Sanborn Map view shows how much the company has expanded in less than twenty years. Compared to Figure 30 the company is now much larger. (Courtesy of Sanborn Digital Map Company 1867-1970)
In the 1970s, the company dominated 50% of the sales for towels and 20% for sheets nationwide. The Cannon name earned fierce customer loyalty because the firm provided quality brand name products for seven decades.7

Kannapolis, with a population of 36,000, was unincorporated at the time of Charles Cannon’s death. Charles Cannon played a dominant role in politics in Cabarrus County serving on the state highway, public parks, and public works commissions. He was also the Chairman of the Board for the Cabarrus Memorial Hospital, which he had previously financed through donations. In addition to these local ties he served as chairman for the cotton policy committee for the American Textile Manufacturers Institute and played an important role with the North Carolina Textile Manufacturers Association.8 Cannon’s control over Kannapolis and much of Cabarrus County seemed constant and never ending. This stable control convinced workers to place their trust in the Cannon family. Most workers felt he was a benevolent father figure who would provide for them.

Charles Cannon: The Benevolent Father Figure

The loyalty to the Cannon family represents a deep sentiment in Kannapolis. It is nearly impossible to find a resident who will say anything negative about the Cannons. One child of mill workers, Jewel Kennedy, recalled what her parents thought of Charles Cannon, “They liked Mr. Cannon. Everybody in this community liked Mr. Cannon. He was well liked by everybody, he was good to everybody. I have never heard a bad thing said about the man.”9 Henry McDaniels, who started working at a Cannon Mills plant when he was 17 and worked his way up

---

8 Powell, Dictionary of North Carolina Biography, 319
9 Jewel Kennedy, Audio cassette Interview by author, Fall 2004, Partial Transcript and audio tape in author’s possession.
to mill foreman agreed with this sentiment stating, “Well, I couldn’t help but like the man. He was a good fella. He seen to it that everybody had a job and a place to live, and that was his motto right there.”

Even though genuine positive sentiment exists toward the Cannons, little other choice was available for workers. Workers learned that opposing the benevolent father’s wishes would be detrimental to their futures. In 1921 Cannon Mills experienced its only strike and it became clear that an alliance with a union resulted in disownment from the company. The union drive in Kannapolis was a failure, causing workers to accept Cannon’s benevolence as their best option. The strike lasted only a few months, and Charles Cannon never negotiated with the union. He refused to work with the union and any employee that did no longer enjoyed his benevolence. In a letter to his son in August 1921 Cannon stated his reluctance to take strikers back into the mill. He said, “Just take the help back that want to work and are willing to work and let the agitators go: I hope you will watch out carefully and confer with the others on how important it is to weed out certain operators that are always causing us trouble.” He went on to discuss his desire for the militia to stay near so the company would have no problem with the people they were evicting from company housing.

Mill workers saw that life was difficult without Cannon’s paternalism. On August 15, 1921 The Concord Tribune reported that, “…ejectment notices have been served on 45 families in Kannapolis and that 45 other families will receive similar notices this week.” One former mill worker, Leila Watkins, remembered being a child during the strike and watching her neighbors starve. The union organized a store in the town to feed strikers, but it soon ran out of

---

10 Henry McDaniels, Audio cassette Interview by author, Fall 2004, Audio tape in author’s possession.
11 Charles Cannon to his son, August 19, 1921, Cannon Collection, Special Collections, Duke University.
12 Charles Cannon to his son, August 19, 1921, Cannon Collection, Special Collections, Duke University.
13 “Two Companies of Militia in Concord,” The Concord Tribune, August 15, 1921.
supplies and according to Watkins, “The Union and all the people joined the Union could get food, [from the store] but it wasn’t very long ‘til the Union went busted and those people didn’t have any food.” Workers who had placed their faith in the union quickly realized how hard it was to overcome mill management and became distrustful of unions. The combination of Charles Cannon’s benevolence and a lack of other viable options created a dependency upon Cannon Mills.

The Passing of the Benevolent Mill Owner

Charles Cannon’s death in the early 1970s revealed the precarious relationship paternalism created. Don S. Holt was only the third man to run Cannon Mills. Although he had been the president for nearly a decade, he had always been supervised by Charles Cannon, who remained the Chairman of the Board. Holt felt that he needed to disassociate the company with paternalism. The company had received criticism about their unwillingness to share company practices with the public and for their lack of technological updates. Holt remarked about Cannon, “I just wish he had told the public more about himself and the company.” Holt enacted an active public relations program and began to modernize business practices. Holt worked to deflect criticism that Cannon Mills dominated the town by stating that all the company wanted was what was “good for the townspeople, through their own determination.” To show that he meant this the company started distributing a company newspaper to keep workers informed about company practices. Holt also addressed the possibility of losing some employees because

---

14 Leila Watkins, Audio cassette Interview by author, Fall 2004, Partial Transcript and audio tapes in the author’s possession.
of advancements in technology. This was the beginning of many changes to come at Cannon Mills.¹⁸

By 1979, the company experienced hard financial times for the first time. The chairman of the board resigned and discussion of the company being sold to outsiders began. The textile industry was plagued with instability, but Cannon Mills had usually avoided these problems. During 1979, sales fell dramatically and the company lost $804,000 in one quarter. The prosperity Cannon Mills had always maintained was deteriorating without family management.¹⁹

The precarious financial situation the company found themselves in caused the Textile Workers of America (TWUA), who had never had success organizing in the region, to organize a union drive in Kannapolis to test worker loyalty to the company. Despite instability many workers remained attached to the idea of the paternalistic mill owner that would take care of them. Employees wrote letters to the Don Holt expressing their loyalty. One worker stated, “Cannon Mills has been good to me, and my family. We live in a real nice company house, which is way less than what other houses would rent for…I feel I should say thank you Cannon Mills, for what you have meant to me, and my family, and our community.”²⁰ This employee, along with numerous others, promised to vote against the union.

Even though many workers were loyal to Cannon Mills, a survey compiled by TWUA in 1976 highlighted discontent among workers and the belief that minimal benefits were acceptable. Workers expected little from the company, identifying as a benefit treatment that should be expected. One worker stated, “There was a girl who was in a great deal of pain. The company

²⁰ Kenneth Gaforth to Don Holt, November 6, 1974, Cannon Collection, Special Collections, Duke University.
called an ambulance and sent someone with her to the hospital.”  


Others realized they were not being treated well, but did not see another option. One worker stated, “We are the lowest paid people there are, we work hardest and longest in the worst conditions for the less pay.”  

22 Despite this sentiment workers did not vote for a union. Many workers did not trust unions and felt conditions would deteriorate if they opposed the company. One worker said, “If the mill closed because of the union it would be awful. A lot of people would be out of work.”  

23 Workers realized that the company was not willing to work with the union, and historically had always made workers regret union activity.

Cannon Mills continued to actively opposed unionization. They distributed propaganda against the TWUA forcing workers to choose the company or the union. [Figure 32]
Figure 32. A flyer distributed by management equated union membership with the suffering and hunger that occurred with the 1921 strike. (Courtesy of Special Collections, Perkins Library, Duke University)
Mill workers felt the best decision was again to side with the company. This decision was tested when Cannon Mills was sold to an outsider, David Murdock a businessman from California, in 1982.

David Murdock and the Consequences of Paternalism

When Murdock purchased the mill he also received all of the company owned mill houses and most of the downtown property. Murdock immediately made it clear that he was not going to foster a paternalistic relationship in Kannapolis. He made plans to sell company housing stating, “Providing housing is an enormously losing proposition.”

He promptly sold the mill houses, offering mill workers a chance to buy their homes before they went on the market. In the same year Murdock laid off 8,500 workers, although the company said these were not permanent dismissals. Willie Ratliff, a 14 year employee said, “Morale is pretty low. People really don’t know what is coming…Most don’t know anything but textiles. If that closes down they wouldn’t know what to do.” Mill workers were left in a precarious situation with a new mill owner they did not trust.

The TWUA, sensing discontent in the region, decided again to attempt to organize. Despite the negative attitudes many workers had toward Murdock, the union was again unsuccessful in Kannapolis. Murdock ran a campaign against the union, and despite the fact that he had cut funding for cancer screening, stopped renting almost 2000 company houses, was rumored to be attempting to sell the mill, and had fired 3,000 people, he still managed to convince workers he was the better option. He stated that his relationship with the mill, “…has gone from the paternalistic nature of the Cannon’s to the good corporate citizen.”

them. He warned that unionization would divide the company at a crucial time, and urged residents of Kannapolis to trust him, claiming that he had spent millions of dollars to revitalize the town. Whether mill workers trusted him or not they had no faith in the union and sided with mill management in a larger victory over the union than the previous union vote in the 1970s.

In the late 1980s, Murdock proved continued to pursue corporate, rather than community benefits when he sold Cannon Mills to Fieldcrest Cannon. The next decades were filled with unrest and confusion as the community grew increasingly disillusioned with mill management. The textile industry as a whole had begun to falter in the South as many companies moved their production overseas. During 2003, the mill finally closed after going bankrupt under the direction of Pillowtex. The closing of the mill left over 5.8 million square feet of industrial structures empty and close to 5,000 people without jobs. For over a century the mill had defined the identities of Kannapolis citizens. A new chapter was beginning for the town, and the question remained as to what role mill history would play in the story.

Murdock, who had sold the mill years before, repurchased it in December of 2004 through an auction. He was already formulating plans for the 250 acre site. He intended to announce these plans in a year, and during this time Kannapolis citizens waited to hear what was planned for the property. Murdock appeared to have support from state legislators and local officials. Journalists quoted City Manager Mike Legg as saying “To have a billionaire interested in your city is a wonderful thing.”

29 Kearns, Weavers of Dreams, 289-298.
On September 12, 2005 David Murdock held a press conference where he invited Kannapolis citizens to join him in support of his vision for a better, revitalized Kannapolis. Every resident of Kannapolis received an invitation to the press conference. Karen Whichard, Murdock’s marketing director said, “Because the project is so integral to the downtown of Kannapolis, we thought it was very important to include the citizens as much as possible.”

Mike Legg wanted to make it clear that Murdock’s plans were not a public project. He stated, “It will evolve into a project that a lot of people will be involved in, but right now it’s Mr. Murdock’s announcement.” Murdock announced plans for the North Carolina Research Campus.

Murdock projects cost for this site at around 1 billion dollars, and thinks that it will produce close to 35,000 jobs for the area. He proposes to create a science centered research town. His company Dole Foods will have an institute on the site, along with a privately owned girls high school specializing in math and science, a facility for training in biotechnology, an auditorium and conference facility, new retail areas, a multiplex movie theater, facilities for Northeast Medical Center and Cabarrus Family Medicine, a facility for the Laboratory Corporation of America, and new residential areas. Once the site is finished it will hold one million square feet of office and laboratory space, 350,000 square feet of commercial and retail space, and 700 new residential homes. The design of the building will mimic the downtown style, which was fashioned after Williamsburg by Ruth Cannon, Charles Cannon’s wife in the 1940s. All textile mill structures will be torn down to make room for the research campus.

Senator Richard Burr, proclaimed in reference to tearing down the mill structures, “This is no time to look in the rear view mirror. This is the time to accept the vision Mr. Murdock is presenting.” Murdock credits legislators with supporting his plan, in a letter addressed to the Citizens of North Carolina he stated that, “…we have been very much impressed by the receptiveness of state leaders and their guidance and commitment toward the improvement of the economic viability of different areas across the state, including Kannapolis.”

While state leaders and Murdock are enthusiastic about the project, little focus has been placed on the consequences of the demolition of the former Cannon Mills. The historic importance of Cannon Mills cannot be argued. Catherine Bishir and Michael Southern in, *A Guide to the Historic Architecture of Piedmont North Carolina*, stated that “Kannapolis was long the state’s largest unincorporated municipality and its most famous one-industry, company controlled mill town.” The town of Kannapolis and its historic structures could have been used to educate about the past in a variety of ways. The main question facing preservationists is why was the former Cannon Mills demolished without resistance at a time when the preservation of mill structures is being lauded by organizations such as PNC. The answer lies within the paternalistic environment.

**Kannapolis: A Valuable Lesson for Preservationists**

When paternalism remains a strong force in an isolated mill town, preservation becomes a nearly impossible task with current preservation standards. There was no preservation group with a strong presence in Kannapolis and there was no developer living nearby who could take a risk on such a large project. There was also no community outrage at the destruction of their

---

past. Kannapolis is a town dominated by paternalism and because of this culture of dependency exists among residents. They are used to having no voice, so it came as little shock to them when they were not asked what they wanted when the mill closed.

A survey conducted with residents of Kannapolis after demolition of the mill was underway showed that the majority of them understood that Cannon Mills is part of their legacy and believed part of it should have been preserved.38 One resident stated that some of the mill should have been preserved because it is “part of our heritage, it will help the morale of many, many people were damaged and many still aren’t working. They could have at least preserved the smokestacks.”39 Numerous residents mentioned that they wanted some sort of legacy of textile history left behind for their children. One participant stated that they believed some of the mill should be preserved, wondering “how will little children know if they don’t see.”40 Another resident expressed nearly the same sentiment supporting preservation, believing that it would be “good for neighborhood kids, they need to know, people should know about the past.”41

These comments show that many residents feel a definite loss with the demolition of the mill structures. They know that they are forever losing an important part of themselves and they realize that future generations are not going to understand the lives that they lived. Despite these sentiments, residents do not feel like they have agency toward changing the situation. Kannapolis features paternalism at its strongest and shows preservationists what will happen in similar situations as paternalistic mill towns become susceptible to the total demolition and destruction of history.

---

38 In the Summer of 2006 I conducted door to door surveys with 31 residents of Kannapolis. The survey questions and answers are available in the appendix.
40 Anonymous Survey Participant 22, by author, Kannapolis Interviews, Summer 2006.
41 Anonymous Survey Participant 31, by author, Kannapolis Interviews, Summer 2006.
CONCLUSION: MOVING TOWARDS A MORE INCLUSIVE PRESERVATION

The preservation of the mill structures in Carrboro, Edenton, and Raleigh and the demolition of the mill in Kannapolis provide valuable lessons for preservationists dealing with labor history. Elements of paternalism still exist in towns with an emphasis on manufacturing; its existence inhibits a successful preservation movement. Preservation organizations such as PNC experience more success in areas where buffers to paternalism exist, but these organizations are operating without integrating current preservation scholarship that promotes a complex landscape and community preservation. In doing so, preservationists commit injustices to working class history.

PNC, an organization that has demonstrated an interest in mill preservation, should establish itself as the leader in the promotion of industrial preservation using current academic scholarship. This entails a reexamination of how preservation is done in North Carolina. Preservation must become more proactive, identifying important projects before communities are suffering from economic devastation and are in danger of demolition. Part of the proactive policy is realizing the limitations of under-funded organizations. Preservation organizations need to work with as many outside organizations as possible. They need to be part of the solution because they cannot do it on their own. They should work with the city government, city planners and other academic fields throughout the entire process. Once a proactive policy is accepted, preservationists will be able to draw from existing scholarship on how to preserve landscapes with communities that are not middle class.

PNC began implementing a proactive strategy a few years ago when they started an inventory of existing mill structures in North Carolina, but this project is unfinished
and not far reaching enough.¹ Currently this project is primarily focused on textile mill structures that are abandoned and could be used for redevelopment. The project lends itself to the perpetuation of old preservation methods that treat mill buildings as real estate as opposed to areas that could foster landscape and community preservation. The project needs to be adapted to include information about the community surrounding the mill, not just the mill structure. This entails a brief history of the town and the mill including an examination of the town’s relationship to paternalism. Preservationists could identify areas at risk for demolition because of the relationship they share with paternalism. Areas with a high dependency on textiles should be one of the primary target areas for PNC.

Ideally, PNC should deal with towns where the mill is still functioning or has closed down recently. PNC tried this in Edenton, planning to take over the property and promote heritage tourism before the mill had closed, but they did not fully succeed with the promotion of heritage tourism. They failed to make adequate use of the surrounding community for funding and involvement with the preservation. PNC and the Edenton Institute did not have appropriate funding to implement heritage tourism in the region. This highlights preservationists’ need to use as many resources as necessary in the surrounding community to promote their success.

Heritage Tourism Combined with Economic Revitalization

Since the 1980s heritage tourism has become a popular method for dealing with declining manufacturing communities. The term heritage and the use of heritage tourism have been the topics of criticism and debate for many scholars, but this essay supports heritage and the tourism related to it, with the understanding that preserving heritage is a valid endeavor when it focuses

¹ I completed an internship with PNC in the Summer of 2005 where I began an inventory of existing textile mill structures in North Carolina. The project was not completed and has been added on to by other interns. It is not readily accessible for developers and preservationists
on economic revitalization and preservation of a shared history. The word heritage is more personal than history, making it more relevant to people. David Lowenthal interpreted the complexities of heritage best when he wrote,

> At its best, heritage fabrication is both creative art and act of faith. By means of it we tell ourselves who we are, where we came from, and to what we belong. Ancestral loyalties rest on fraud as well as truth and foment peril along with pride. We cannot escape dependency on this motley and peccable heritage. But we can learn to face its fictions and forgive its flaws as integral to its strengths.

Heritage with all of its faults is what people desire to connect with, and it is one key to a more comprehensive preservation movement. Bella Dicks essentially defines heritage as culture and correlates the recent rise in heritage tourism to a site’s ability to make culture accessible to visitors. Dicks states that promoters of heritage tourism have figured out how to connect objects and places to humans.

There are an abundance of heritage tourism models in the United Kingdom and Northeast that preservationists in North Carolina could use to refine their own methods at former industrial sites. Dicks, who has studied heritage tourism extensively at the Rhondda Heritage Park, a former coal mining valley in Wales, wrote,

> Heritage museums, as many critics point out, have been mushrooming in the UK for several decades…Local authorities were being urged to invest in their areas’ cultural ‘assets’ in order to encourage the leisure-led regeneration of failing industrial economies. Leisure and tourism were to take over where manufacturing had receded, and this was to

---


3 Lowenthal, *Possessed by the Past*, xxii.

4 For more information on how people relate to history better when they connect it to their heritage see, Roy Rosenzweig and David Thelen, *The Presence of the Past: Popular Uses of History in American Life*, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1998).

be achieved by assembling a new alliance between backward-looking heritage and a forward-looking ‘enterprise.’

Dicks used the Rhondda Heritage Park as an example of the evolution of a site from a coal mine to a museum. She highlights the positive and negative outcomes at the site. On the one hand the mine has been preserved and many local people from the community play a role in the interpretation. The government and the community collaborated and often conflicted over how the story of the town was going to be told. A positive of this is that an interesting multi-faceted history is taught at the Rhondda Heritage Park; the history of the past community and the struggle of the present community for representation. The government and local groups never learned how to fully work together and this helped lead to the downside of the project. The downside was the promotion of the site as the sole economic regenerator for the town. It has not lived up to this goal, meaning that heritage tourism is not enough to revitalize a town. This was one of the obstacles the Edenton Institute experienced. Heritage tourism alone is not enough to revitalize a site. The Pennsylvania Heritage Parks Program makes an attempt to use heritage tourism as one part of economic revitalization for a town. Preservationists cannot solve all the problems of a town in economic decline, but they have to be part of the process.

The Pennsylvania Heritage Parks Program focuses on the cultural conservation of areas in decline because of the recession of industry. The key to the success of this program is the three part goal of interdisciplinary collaboration, the integration of cultural resources, and an emphasis on community involvement. What sets this program apart from others is the extensive use of the community as a primary goal, landscape preservation, and the realization that cultural

---

7 Dicks, *Heritage, Place and Community*, 241.
8 Dicks, *Heritage, Place and Community*, 125, 145-147.
conservation needs to take place along with other economic revitalization for the area. There is no simple solution for a stagnant industrial town, but the main lesson is that preservationists need to involve themselves with the complicated process of saving history.

Adapting Current Preservation Standards

Parts of these models can be applied in North Carolina by PNC if they take a proactive involvement in landscape and community preservation. After PNC accepts the responsibility of an interdisciplinary effort they can focus on preserving history, which should be a preservation organization’s primary goal. This means an involvement with the local community, gathering history from them, and educating them about historic preservation. When PNC picks a target area for preservation they should first begin an oral history program and an educational program in the area where they teach about preservation and how it can be an endeavor in which the community plays a part. This is especially important in areas that have developed a dependency because of paternalism. Surveys in Kannapolis show that residents do not think that they can take an active role in what happens to their own community and that they do not associate preservation with progress.

Most Kannapolis citizens expressed regret that the mill was not being preserved in some form, but seemed resigned to the fact that progress is more important than history. One participant who claimed, “Things need to be preserved, I am very serious about that,” also stated that they felt positive about Murdock’s plans for Kannapolis stating they were “Great, because textiles are overseas.” This elucidates a major gap in the thinking of residents in Kannapolis. They want to save their history, but do not realize that this can happen with preservation.

---

10 Anonymous Survey Participant 18, by author, Kannapolis Interviews, Summer 2006.
Preservationists need to fight this ignorance with educational programs about what preservation is and how it can be used to promote progress.

There is no perfect plan for the preservation of industrial communities, but current scholarship on heritage tourism shows that there are models on which preservationists in North Carolina can expand. Two major themes prevail in the scholarship. One is preservation as more than the protection of architecture, but rather as the protection of entire landscapes. Preservationists must look at themselves as one group that will be involved in an interdisciplinary effort to save history. Secondly, while they need to be willing to work with many different groups, the most important collaborator is the local community. Preservationists need the local community’s support to fight paternalism and preserve the legacy of labor history in North Carolina mill towns.
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Public Opinion Survey of Textile Mill Preservation in Edenton, North Carolina

What category does your age fall into (circle one)?
20-29
30-39
40-49
50-59
60-69
70-79
80+

What category does your household income fall into (circle one)?
* 5,000-15,000
* 15,000-24,999
* 25,000-44,999
* 45,000-64,999
* 65,000-84,999
* 85,000-104,999
* 105,000+

Why does living in a preserved mill structure appeal to you?

Do you have a connection to the former mill? If so how? (ex. Former employee or relative of former employee)

What does the mill building and village teach you about the past?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What category does your age fall into?</th>
<th>What category does your income fall into?</th>
<th>Why does living in a preserved mill structure appeal to you?</th>
<th>Do you have a connection to the former mill? If so how? (ex. Former employee or relative of a former employee)</th>
<th>What does the mill building and village teach you about the past?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td></td>
<td>We bought the property because it was a good investment and my husband has family ties to former mill workers</td>
<td>Spouse is a relative of former employees</td>
<td>The preservation of these buildings reminds me of the simple life that the workers lived and also of the great contributions that the mill made to the community as well as to the surrounding communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>105,000 +</td>
<td>Convenient, close knit community, historically interesting and attractive</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Importance of preserving our heritage and conserving existing structure and materials. The mill tells a story of a time in our town's past, not only about cotton but especially about the lives of the folks way of life that is no longer. The mill village had its own identity apart from Edenton.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80+</td>
<td>25,000-44,999</td>
<td>The idea of living in a condo with locked doors appeals to me. And the mill</td>
<td>I was friends with a number of the former employees</td>
<td>Refresh my memory of how it was when I was a child many years ago.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80+</td>
<td>105,000+</td>
<td>The uniqueness of the condo and the safety factor</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>How we can reconstruct an old building into something beautiful and useful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Range</td>
<td>Price Range</td>
<td>Feature</td>
<td>Relevance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>105,000+</td>
<td>Unique setting and ambiance created by original brick walls and maple flooring</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>The “community” atmosphere of the mill and village was extremely important to both mill owners and employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>105,000+</td>
<td>It is situated within walking distance of a great town, the developer took GREAT care to choose a good architect and builders and the character of the building was a bonus.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>That the past produced beautiful buildings made of beautiful, solid, long-lasting materials. That the people who constructed buildings back then were true craftsmen. In addition, it is interesting to understand the way people lived, surrounding the mill, as a group. I'll bet they worked hard but had fun in that little village too.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>65,000-84,999</td>
<td>Closeness of neighbors, manageable house size, interesting features of historic homes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Communities were structured differently then to promote common activities in open common spaces. Families were closer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>65,000-84,999</td>
<td>Appreciation of old structures</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Mill owners wanted to control the lives of the workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>15,000-24,999</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Everything or everyone has some value!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>45,000-64,999</td>
<td>I find the architectural style charming</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Preserve our heritage. It's our link to the past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Range</td>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>65,000-84,999</td>
<td>I live in a mill house by the mill. I love the &quot;village&quot; feeling and a front porch, rather than &quot;back deck&quot;, neighborhood.</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Range</td>
<td>70-79</td>
<td>25,000-44,999</td>
<td>Mother/Family lived in house for many years. Mother worked in the mill for 50 years.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Range</td>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>25,000-44,999</td>
<td>History of N.C. industry/workers, recycling of historic buildings</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>45,000-64,999</td>
<td>My investment in this particular property as a primary residence was based on the desire to live in and be part of the Edenton Cotton Mill Village Community. The Village is unique in its charm, character, history, historical integrity and size.</td>
<td>I do not</td>
<td>We have a responsibility and accountability to respect and care for the Earth. Historical cultures, artifacts, structures, landscapes, grounds and the &quot;stories: of our past teach us about our present and the consequences of our choices and their impact on future generations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>105,000+</td>
<td>We like buildings with a history, uniqueness</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>complete sense of community-family, extended family and friends living, working, playing, worshipping, etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>105,000+</td>
<td>Location in town</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>that we can &quot;re-use&quot; buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>45,000-64,999</td>
<td>I originally bought the house to refurbish and re-sell, but I sold my old home and moved here!</td>
<td>No connection. I am not from here, but came from the Smithfield-Selma area. Edenton is less crowded</td>
<td>Things do not always go as planned, People do not always do what they promised they'd do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>45,000-64,999</td>
<td>The cotton mill is unique, beautiful, historical…We love entertaining guests in our home and showing off the structure. We love the preservation project-they've done such a wonderful job of restoring this structure and not overhauling it. We love everything about our special home.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Edenton's history-it's so funny that only decades ago, the mill village was considered &quot;the other side of the tracks.&quot; I have thoroughly enjoyed meeting people who used to work here-showing them my home and hearing their stories.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>105,000+</td>
<td>The architecture, the beams, the windows, the neighbors-all a bit unusual and independent</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>That they used better construction techniques</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Visitor Survey Form: Kannapolis, North Carolina  Date__________ Time________ No. in Party____

Hello, my name is Katie McClamrock, I am a history graduate student from the University of North Carolina Wilmington. I am studying textile mill preservation for my master’s thesis. Would you mind answering a few questions? This survey is anonymous and takes about 2-5 minutes. Your participation in this research study is entirely voluntary. You may refuse to participate or stop at any time.

Verbal Agreement? __________

Did you work in the mill?

Do you think mill buildings should be preserved?

What are your impressions about preservation in general?

How do you feel about the current development plans for the city of Kannapolis?

What category does your age fall into?
20-29
30-39
40-49
50-59
60-69
70-79
80+

What category does your household income fall into?
* 5,000-15,000
* 15,000-24,999
* 25,000-44,999
* 45,000-64,999
* 65,000-84,999
* 85,000-104,999
* 105,000+
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did you work in the mill?</th>
<th>Do you think mill buildings should be preserved?</th>
<th>What are impressions about preservation in general?</th>
<th>How do you feel about the current development plans for the city of Kannapolis?</th>
<th>What category does your age fall into?</th>
<th>What category does your household income fall into?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yes, 7 yrs</td>
<td>some of them, use for community, housing</td>
<td>for it, I'm interested in old historic stuff</td>
<td>good, Kannapolis was dying, may save the town</td>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>45,000-64,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes, 55 yrs</td>
<td>Some, some in bad shape, Plant 1 shouldn't maybe Plant 6</td>
<td>pretty nice place to work</td>
<td>Don't know much</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>15,000-24,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes, 25 yrs</td>
<td>yes, part of heritage help the moral of many, people were damaged, many still aren't working, could at least preserve the smokestacks</td>
<td>Psychologically it would help if some was left, keep neighborhoods true to history</td>
<td>good, skeptical about David Murdock, I worked there when he left with the retirement money, the people who lost their jobs won't benefit, but manybe their kids will</td>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>85,000-104,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes, 40 yrs.</td>
<td>no, I don't know</td>
<td>It's going to get better</td>
<td></td>
<td>80+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, I'm from CA, grandchildren married someone from Kannapolis</td>
<td>Some should, preserve history and sanctity of location</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>good economically</td>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>45,000-64,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes, 42 yrs</td>
<td>no, it don't make no difference</td>
<td>okay</td>
<td>I believe it will be alright, I traveled with Murdock and he wants it done right, we may lose area (houses)</td>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>25,000-44,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Group</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Opinion</td>
<td>Concerns</td>
<td>Income Range</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 yrs</td>
<td>something should be, Kannapolis history is where it gets its name, there will be nothing left to show it was the mill</td>
<td>Nice to have, enjoy seeing things like that</td>
<td>I'm not sure, I keep hearing they want our houses, according to the plan it will be good</td>
<td>60-69, 25,000-44,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>yeah, I guess Kannapolis history</td>
<td>I like it, old folks worked there, it should be preserved, too late</td>
<td>alright, traffic problem</td>
<td>60-69, 25,000-44,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as a teenager, summer program</td>
<td>I wish they would preserve some heritage in the town</td>
<td>Really like it they should do it</td>
<td>Apprehensive about the size and how much people are saying it will turn into downtown Charlotte</td>
<td>40-49, 25,000-44,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes, 5 yrs</td>
<td>Yes for historical if nothing else, up to the high ups</td>
<td>Not if it is against change, but buildings and artifacts should be kept for nostalgia if nothing else</td>
<td>This is a small town that doesn't need to be turned into a traffic mess</td>
<td>40-49, 65,000-84,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes, 45 yrs</td>
<td>sure, leave something symbolic, like the water tower and smokestacks, ought to leave something</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>good, we have lagged behind the surrounding community for years this is a step in the right direction</td>
<td>80+, 5000-15,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no, but born and raised here, my mom and other family worked in the mill</td>
<td>no, something better came along just like any other real estate</td>
<td>good, more nature focused than man made though</td>
<td>good, we have lagged behind the surrounding community for years this is a step in the right direction</td>
<td>30-39, 45,000-64,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes for how old everything is around here</td>
<td>really good idea, but not sure why</td>
<td>love them, business and jobs</td>
<td>20-29, 25,000-44,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>Age/Income</td>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>I Like It As Long As They Keep The Atmosphere The Same</td>
<td>Age/Income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>support it, people should consider when tearing stuff down</td>
<td>I like it as long as they keep the atmosphere the same</td>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>15,000-24,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes, 18 yrs old-60</td>
<td>if they are in good shape</td>
<td>I guess so</td>
<td>80+</td>
<td>retired</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes, 3.5-4 yrs</td>
<td>good idea if it doesn't confine economic growth</td>
<td>if it works fantastic, wait and see</td>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>25,000-44,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>I don't know</td>
<td>yes, beneficial</td>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>15,000-24,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes, 43 yrs</td>
<td>things need to be preserved, I am very serious about that</td>
<td>great, because textiles are overseas</td>
<td>80+</td>
<td>25,000-44,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>80+</td>
<td>Feels like you should keep some of the buildings</td>
<td>good, older people are angry, but you need progress</td>
<td>80+</td>
<td>5,000-15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes, 42 yrs</td>
<td>shame that one man spent his whole life building the whole town and now it is being torn down</td>
<td>I'll believe it when I see it</td>
<td>70-79</td>
<td>15,000-24,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Stance</td>
<td>Income</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>maybe one as an example or the towers</td>
<td>do it, preserve old buildings</td>
<td>like them, don't know we'll wait and see</td>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>45,000-64,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes, my dad starting working here when I was 2 and I worked here 43 yrs</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>ought to be preserved, how will little children know if they don't see</td>
<td>textiles are overseas, and companies fattening pockets, Charles Cannon would never do that, the plans will work alright if you go to college</td>
<td>70-79</td>
<td>15,000-24,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>Some of them to show perspectives on how to build a town</td>
<td>Like it, if not unsightly and falling apart</td>
<td>pretty good</td>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>45,000-64,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes, 15 years</td>
<td>yes, it was a staple of the county</td>
<td>good for the kids, it won't help the people who lost their jobs</td>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>25,000-44,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes, 30 +</td>
<td>I think it should</td>
<td>historical, save it</td>
<td>it might be good for younger kids, but my kids aren't in college</td>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>45,000-64,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes and my husband, 20 yrs</td>
<td>yes that's history, children need to see what was here</td>
<td>I don't know</td>
<td>alright, need to put sidewalks in and speed limits</td>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>5000-15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes, 5 yrs Plant 16 in China Grove</td>
<td>yes, it was built back in the old days</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>probably help</td>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>5000-15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes, 45 yrs</td>
<td>yes, don't demolish Cannon Mills, one man shouldn't have the authority to remove everything, he doesn't want to know it existed</td>
<td>good idea, should have something here to honor Cannon Mills, he built the mill houses</td>
<td>negative, wish he would leave something to show Cannon</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>5000-15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My husband did for five years</td>
<td>I don't know, most people want to save the smokestacks, but I don't have the sentimental feelings I am from Charlotte</td>
<td>Ought to keep Kannapolis with colonial style like Williamsburg</td>
<td>good if they get it done, I probably won't see it</td>
<td>80+</td>
<td>5000-15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes, 15 years</td>
<td>I don't know and don't care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>15,000-24,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no, I moved down to get out of Charlotte</td>
<td>yes, use part as a museum</td>
<td>agree, good for neighborhood, kids need to know, people should know about the past</td>
<td>too early to tell, bring great jobs, but the type you need a high education for (people around here don't have that)</td>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>25,000-44,999</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>