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A Note from the President

Let me begin by establishing the context that existed forty years ago. In 1963, there were two South Carolinas and two Souths in America. There was a black South and a white South. Segregation was virtually absolute. Our races were legally, politically, socially, and economically separated. Most believed it would always be that way. Those who did not believe that often paid a heavy price. The change that was moving across the nation was manifested in the best and the worst of human nature. During the Civil War, Lincoln had used the term, “the angels of our nature.” In the American South there were “better and lesser angels” at work in the 1960s.

In 1961, riots had closed the University of Georgia when two African-American students had registered for classes. In 1962, Mr. James Meredith had enrolled at the University of Mississippi, but not before federal troops had put an end to riots, and two people died. The following year, riots broke out at the University of Alabama. Most believed and expected (and some even desired) that the same would happen at Clemson.

It was a crisis in the moral fabric of America. At stake were:

- the moral promise of freedom in America
- the American dream
- the Constitution of the United States
- the Bill of Rights
- the position of America as the world’s beacon of freedom.

The world held its breath as Clemson talked, debated and planned. Fortunately, three men of exemplary character were among the principal players in the drama that was about to unfold. All are personal heroes and mentors of mine: Judge Matthew Perry, Class of 2002 with an honorary Doctor of Humanities; Harvey Gantt, Class of 1965; and President Bob Edwards, Class of 1933.

Make no mistake, Clemson had not been on the world stage before nor have we since, but on January 28, 1963, Clemson was at the center of that stage. The stakes for America, South Carolina, and our school were as high as they could be. Clemson has a character and a personality shaped by its history. For you to understand these unique qualities, you must study January 28, 1963. This is why Integration with Dignity was conceived and written. I trust that you enjoy it.

James F. Barker
President of Clemson University
Introduction:
“Quiet Courage”

Reprinted from *Clemson World*
Cathy Sams
Director of Public Affairs
Clemson University
On Jan. 28, 1963, Harvey Bernard Gantt walked into Tillman Hall accompanied by hordes of photographers, reporters and curious onlookers. They were there to watch history being made—not just Clemson history, but American history.

It was Clemson history because Gantt was the University’s first African American student—a native-born South Carolinian who simply wanted to study architecture and wanted to study it at Clemson.

It was American history because of what did NOT happen that day. Unlike desegregation at most previously all-white Southern institutions of higher learning, Clemson’s integration occurred without riots, violence, the presence of federal marshals, protests or acts of defiance by students, government leaders or anyone else. For the era, this was an amazing feat—one that was called “integration with dignity” by the Saturday Evening Post and one that has often been called Clemson’s finest hour.

In January 2003, Clemson celebrated the 40th anniversary of desegregation with two full days of events that included a national conference on issues facing today’s African American college students, the unveiling of a historical marker outside Tillman, a roundtable discussion featuring the people who were there, and the campus premiere of a documentary retelling the fascinating story.

The anniversary also provided an opportunity to educate current students about this particular part of Clemson history. As journalist and author Juan Williams said when speaking on campus in 1991, “Over half the American people were born after 1965 … therefore, most of the people did not live through the heart of the civil rights movement. People don’t know about the sacrifices that people, black and white, had to make.”

On July 7, 1962, Gantt filed suit against Clemson and its Board of Trustees, becoming the first African American legally to challenge the long-standing tradition of denying admission to black students. Behind the University’s admission policies were a state constitution that required its public schools to be segregated and a state law that said a school that chose to desegregate could face termination of state funding and closure.

In support of Gantt and his attorneys, including current U.S. District Court Judge Matthew Perry (who recently received an honorary degree from Clemson), were a Supreme Court ruling abolishing the “separate but equal” tradition, which allowed school segregation as long as both races had access to equal facilities, and a growing number of precedents from legal challenges in other states.

The national environment at the time of Gantt’s suit was ominous. James Meredith’s attempt to enroll at the University of Mississippi just months earlier had led to rioting and bloodshed, causing two deaths and dozens of injuries. Alabama Gov. George Wallace stood in the doorway at the University of Alabama, refusing to allow access to federal troops sent to enforce a court order.

Few expected South Carolina to be different. State leaders had convened a powerful and influential committee of legislators and gubernatorial appointees—named the Gressette Committee after its chair, Sen. Marion Gressette—to study and recommend actions on racial issues. However, many assumed the committee’s unofficial charge to be the preservation of segregated schools.

But desegregation was different in South Carolina—and not by accident. There were three critical ingredients in Clemson’s success: (1) a
defense strategy that bought Clemson valuable months to prepare; (2) the behind-the-scenes work of a group of state leaders, galvanized by Clemson President R. C. Edwards, to influence and change public opinion and develop a strategic plan for what they saw as the inevitable end of segregation; and (3) Gantt himself.

In its response to Gantt's suit, Clemson claimed that it had not denied admission, merely delayed a decision until Gantt completed all admission requirements. Because colleges have substantial discretion over how they evaluate applicants, particularly transfer students, the argument was plausible enough to win early courtroom battles.

Edwards made wise use of the time earned during the appeals process, leading what one reporter later called “a conspiracy for peace” by gaining the support of some of the state's most powerful voices:

- Edgar Brown, state senator and chairman of Clemson's Board of Trustees, who voiced Gantt's enrollment as simply this: Violence would not be tolerated at Clemson—a position no legislator or editorial writer could gracefully oppose;
- S.C. Gov. Ernest Hollings, now senior U.S. senator, who ordered state law enforcement officials to develop a foolproof plan to ensure that Gantt's enrollment would be orderly, and later convinced U.S. Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy not to send federal marshals to the Palmetto State;
- Construction giant Charlie Daniel, whose public comments about “fairness” for black citizens influenced legislators, editorial writers and the general public;
- Gressette himself, who—to the disappointment of those who saw his committee as the protector of segregation—turned out to be dedicated to preserving peace, law and order, not the status quo.

Edwards, a powerful voice in his own right, set the tone early by declaring that Clemson would not disobey the law and would not close. In private meetings with key legislators, Edwards put his job on the line, saying he would resign if they did not support his handling of Gantt's enrollment.

While this unofficial team collaborated to change public opinion, Edwards' administration put together a plan to ensure that Gantt's enrollment would be uneventful. He sent his public relations director, Joe Sherman, to Mississippi to learn from their mistakes. Sherman developed a strategy for managing the news media that kept sensationalism and inflammatory tactics at bay.

The dean of students, future president Walter Cox, engaged student government leaders—current trustees Bill Hendrix and Joe Swann among them—to maintain order among the student body. In a memo to Clemson students, Cox wrote, “The faculty and administration of Clemson College have confidence in the intelligence and integrity of our students and expect them to exercise good judgment,” but also warned that lawlessness and disorder would not be tolerated. Finally, Edwards made sure that Gantt and his attorneys were fully informed about and satisfied with plans for managing the enrollment.

“We kept each other informed of what was happening and why it was happening,” says Edwards. “I am sure that the reason we succeeded and did not have the problems that might have occurred was the fact that everybody knew everything they needed to know as it occurred.”

Gantt continues to admire Edwards for his courage and leadership. “He was on the front line. He was like the general out there with the infantry, so to speak,” says Gantt. “All of the other political leaders were back in Columbia or somewhere else. He was right there, right in the middle of it.”
INTEGRATION WITH DIGNITY

But while state and University leaders deserve the praise they have earned for Clemson’s desegregation, many say that the majority of credit goes to Gantt himself.

“There is no question in my mind … that the [successful integration of Clemson] would not have been possible if we had not had Harvey Gantt, the wonderful person that he is, and Judge [Matthew] Perry, the wonderful person that he is, and the understanding of everyone involved of the responsibility to work together in a positive manner,” says Edwards.

Those who watched as students had the same impression. “[Gantt] did not come across as someone who was there to prove something or someone who had a chip on his shoulder, but as a student,” says Hendrix.

Possibly the only person who was not surprised by Clemson’s handling of desegregation was Harvey Gantt.

“Maybe it was just a gut feeling,” says Gantt. “The Clemson gentleman was always something we heard about. There was this suggestion that even if people disagreed with [desegregation], they would be civil about it.” As he followed events unfolding in state newspapers, including The Tiger, Gantt says he had the sense that people on campus “would not get out of line or do anything to hurt Clemson’s image.”

Hendrix recalls that when he and Swann went to Gantt’s room to introduce themselves, “He was by himself, and everything was quiet.” Hendrix realized at that moment how much courage it must have taken for Gantt to walk into Tillman Hall, knowing he would be the only African American student on campus.

Fortunately, that distinction didn’t last long, beginning with the arrival the following semester of Lucinda Brawley, who would later become Gantt’s wife. Today, Clemson’s student population includes people of all colors, religions and 95 nationalities.

Gantt’s entry paved the way not only for other minority students, but also for a more diverse and advanced Clemson—a Clemson in which South Carolina and America can take much pride.

The rest of the story

In 1965, Harvey Gantt graduated from Clemson with honors in architecture. In 1970, he received a master’s degree in city planning from Massachusetts Institute of Technology. He’s practiced architecture for over three decades in Charlotte, N.C., where he also served two terms as mayor. He’s currently a partner in the architectural and city planning firm of Gantt/Huberman Architects.

His past and present affiliations with professional organizations include being a Fellow of the American Institute of Architects and a board member
and vice president of the N.C. Board of Architecture. He’s also a member of the American Planning Association, the Minority Affairs Committee of the American Institute of Architects and the N.C. Design Foundation.

Lucinda Brawley Gantt finished her college career at the University of North Carolina at Charlotte. She’s worked for the Charlotte-Mecklenburg School System; Peat, Marwick, Mitchell; and F.D.Y. Inc. Currently, she’s business manager of East Towne Manor, an assisted-living establishment.

The Ganttts continue to be prominent residents of Charlotte where they raised four children. They have long been active in numerous civic, professional, cultural and educational organizations.

They also continue to support Clemson. Gantt has held various posts with Clemson’s College of Architecture, Arts and Humanities. He’s currently a member of the President’s Advisory Board.

A Scholarship Endowment Fund was established in the late 1980s to honor Gantt and has since produced many outstanding Gantt Scholars. In 2000, Clemson’s multicultural affairs office suite in the Hendrix Student Center was named for Harvey and Lucinda Gantt.

Even those with tremendous foresight could not have imagined the enduring legacy Gantt’s courage and quiet grace would have for Clemson, the state of South Carolina and far beyond.

Harry Durham contributed to this article.
Harvey Gantt walking on campus after registering, January 28, 1963
“Integration With Dignity”

Reprinted from

THE SATURDAY EVENING POST
State Senator Edgar Brown stood foursquare for law and order.
At 1:30 P.M. on January 28, 1963, a bright but cold day at Clemson College in the Piedmont hills of South Carolina, 160 TV, radio, magazine and newspaper reporters waited quietly for the first Negro student to enroll in a white school in South Carolina.

The Negro's name was and is Harvey Gantt, and many people expected his imminent arrival to bring on one of the nation's worst racial explosions. In fact, of course, it did nothing of the kind—as everyone who has followed the case is aware. But behind that amazing fact lies a complex and fascinating story that has never been told until now.

For the peace with which Harvey Gantt entered Clemson was no mere lucky happenstance. Violence did seem clearly in the cards. South Carolinians are notoriously passionate when it comes to defending the South or southern "customs." The logic of South Carolina's history and the force of her traditions argued that Clemson would be another Oxford, Mississippi.

South Carolina was the spiritual, cultural and financial center of the South when Mississippi was still Indian territory. The fact is that South Carolinians created the South as a politically self-conscious region, led it out of the Union, and then fired the first shot of the Civil War.

Eleven security precautions had been made to protect Gantt at Clemson, and his routine for the day had been scheduled with the precision of an astronaut shot. He was to arrive at Tillman Hall, the old brick administration building, any minute now. He was to go inside and register, come out another door, walk 35 yards to his dormitory, visit his room briefly, and then walk another 790 yards to the architectural-school building to be interviewed by the dean. The press—more than waited for James Meredith at the University of Mississippi—was ready.

At 1:33 P.M., only three minutes behind schedule, a black 1959 Buick sedan came slowly up the drive, parked in front of Tillman, and Gantt stepped out.

There was a frantic jostle. Tripods clanged as they were hastily dragged into position. Cameras whirred and clicked. Voices began to be heard, talking sentimentally into microphones.

But that was the action, all of it. It was one of those moments when the paraphernalia of cover-age overwhelms the event. It was excitement without substance.

The only sign of an "angry mob," aside from the press, was an assemblage of about 200 students, standing with their jacket collars turned up against the wind, laughing at the antics of the reporters. There were still 100 or so of them around when Gantt came out of Tillman. But by the time Gantt emerged from his dormitory, only a handful were there to watch him start his walk to the architectural building. The reporters who had been following Gantt fell back, leaving him to the TV and radio men, who kept sticking microphones in front of the young Negro's mouth, insisting, "Come on, Harvey, say something!" But he was silent, and the campus was now deserted.

For the press, the day was over. And nothing had happened. Not one thing. South Carolina, emotionally the deepest Deep South state of them all, had met and peacefully passed its most serious racial crisis since the Civil War.

Why hadn't something happened? What was the explanation for this astonishing turn of events? Had South Carolina learned a lesson from Oxford? Or was it something else? The question was important; if South Carolina could keep the peace, so could any southern state.

The answer is this: When South Carolina's turn came to face the inevitable fact of racial change, its responsible people, its leadership group, its "power structure" took the initiative and handled the crisis with dignity, dignity for the Negro as well as for the white man. This is why the South Carolina story is one of the most significant—and reassuring—stories in the recent history of race relations in this country.

The story begins on July 1, 1961, a day so hot that the Spanish moss seemed to be sweating. At the annual Watermelon Festival in the small Black Belt county seat of Hampton, the biggest businessman in South Carolina stood up and delivered himself of these somewhat astonishing sentiments:

"The segregation issue cannot continue to be hidden behind the door. This situation cannot satisfactorily be settled at the lunch counter and..."
Textile executive John Cauthen rounded up advance support from the state’s businessmen for Clemson’s decision to accept integration without violence. Robert Edwards, president of Clemson, worked out a security plan designed to prevent friction between Gantt and the other students.

bus station. We have a definite obligation to increase the productivity of our Negro citizens, to provide them with good jobs at good wages and to continue to assure them of fair treatment. . . By raising their education and economic status, we would raise the whole economy of the state.”

Charles Daniel, the speaker, knew what he was doing even if his audience of stunned cotton planters and restless beauty queens did not. Tough, hard-boiled, self-made and ultraconservative, Daniel had hewn together in three decades the largest construction company in the South. Now he had struck the opening blow in a carefully planned effort to save Clemson College. He had joined the ranks of a handful of shrewd, influential and determined men who, in that summer of 1961, pledged themselves to see to it that Clemson stayed open and unharmed, even if it had to integrate.

The little group included besides Daniel: Robert Edwards, Clemson’s president, a hard-driving textile executive who had been brought to Clesmon originally as vice president in charge of development; Edgar Brown, chairman of Clemson’s board of trustees; state senator from Barnwell County, president pro tempore of the state senate and the Daddy Rabbit of South Carolina politics; John K. Cauthen, executive vice president of the South Carolina Textile Manufacturers Association and the most skillful lobbyist in the state; Ernest F. Hollings, the handsome young governor of the state, who was making new industry the focus of his administration’s effort; Wayne Freeman, editor of the Greenville News and one of the five nonlegislative members of the Gressette Committee, the state’s clearinghouse for racial problems, named for State Senator Marion Gressette.

It was a loose, informal coalition; the five men never met as a group. If there was an understanding between them, it was that each would do what he could in whatever way he thought best to fulfill their common intention.

The seed of this understanding was planted in the spring of 1961 when Edwards called Cauthen about something else. Before hanging up, Edwards asked Cauthen if he thought the state’s businessmen would be willing to share some of the responsibility for the problems that would arise if Harvey Gantt, who had applied for admission to Clemson in January, 1961, was finally admitted to the school on court order.

A “monster” to be stopped

Cauthen was sympathetic, and he went to work. South Carolina is a small, unusually cohesive state, and the lines of communication between its seats of political and economic power cross and recross at dozens of points. Cauthen sent feelers and messages along these interior lines, found support not only from businessmen but also from men like Hollings and Freeman and Brown, who are not.

By the end of the year Cauthen, Daniel, Edwards and the others had, in “talking around,” let it be known that there was an important body of opinion in the state that firmly believed in law and order at all costs.

This was a solid achievement. But it was still an “inside” one. When Governor Hollings toured the state in the fall of 1961 he was shocked at the kind of talk he heard. He told me, “People thought I ought to have some magic to stop the monster that was about to gobble us up, or else they expected me to go to jail. It looked to me like it was high time we started sobering people up before it turned out to be too late.”

Having been turned down on his first application, Gantt reapplied for admission to Clemson in January, 1962.

It was Hollings’ custom to hold an off-the-record press briefing the week before the General Assembly convened, and he seized that moment to strike a blow.

“Before 1962 has passed,” he told newsmen that January 9, “South Carolina’s legal defenses will fall like a house of cards. You might as well start preparing your readers for the inevitable. We are not going to segue.”

Not long after this the authoritative Columbia State began to give extensive, detailed coverage to Gantt, forcing by its example other newspapers in the state to treat the story as fully and as fairly. They did.

But there wasn’t much news about Gantt and Clemson during the spring and summer of 1962. It was election time in South Carolina. Hollings ran for the U. S. Senate, trying to unseat the wily old veteran, Olin D. Johnston, in the Democratic primary, and got clobbered. Donald Russell, a wealthy Spartanburg lawyer who had served in Washington as an assistant to James F. Byrnes when the latter was Secretary of State, was elected governor to succeed Hollings, to take over in January, 1963.

Gantt’s second application had never been formally acted upon, and the young Negro, represented by N. A. A. C. P. attorneys, filed suit in Federal court on July 7, 1962. What this meant did not hit hard in South Carolina until September 30, when rioting broke out at Oxford, Mississippi.
Before a joint session of the legislature, Governor Russell praised Clemson's handling of the crisis.

Mississippi indirectly called for help, and there were South Carolinians—plenty of them—who felt that Governor Hollings should go at once to Governor Barnett's side. A member of the state house of representatives, A. W. Red Bethea, insisted that Hollings lead a motorcade of South Carolinians to Oxford. Hollings refused—and was rewarded with a batch of insulting telegrams.

Other South Carolinians began to back up Barnett. Russell praised Barnett's "courage and resolution," and said he was "hopeful that Barnett's conduct may be invaluable to us in demonstrating the strength of Southern conviction.” State Senator Marion B. Crescte, Mister Segregation in South Carolina, the man who is chairman of the state committee set up to "discourage" integration, called on the South "to rally to the support of the great state of Mississippi.”

Hollings' silence stood out and annoyed some South Carolinians. Farley Smith, longtime executive secretary of the Citizens Councils of South Carolina, remarked, "It is inconceivable to me that South Carolina, of all southern states, has not, through its governor, made its position crystal clear.”

A few days later, in the first week of October, a reporter cornered Hollings. Would Hollings, or would Hollings not, be willing to go to jail to prevent integration of a South Carolina school? "If it works out like Mississippi," Hollings replied, "jail would certainly be the safest place.”

He was due to attend the Southern Governors Conference at Hollywood, Florida, the next week. "Faubus and Patterson [Governor Orville Faubus of Arkansas and John M. Patterson of Alabama] were waiting for me to head up a movement to wire and welcome Ross Barnett to the conference," Hollings said. He refused.

If Hollings did nothing to "help" Mississippi, he did something to help South Carolina meet its forthcoming crisis. He sent Pete Strom, head of S.L.E.D. (South Carolina Law Enforcement Division), to Oxford. He told him to study that situation and to come back home and work out with Harry Walker, his legal counsel, a security plan for Clemson.

He laid down three guidelines for Walker: (1) The plan must be foolproof; there should be no question of the need for U.S. marshals; (2) it should be designed to prevent even the possibility of allowing a crowd to gather; and (3) a carefully thought-out schedule must be arranged for controlling the movement of the press.

Through the late summer and fall Gantt's attorneys and South Carolina engaged in a series of legal maneuvers, but by November it was clear that Clemson sooner or later would have to admit Gantt. It was just a matter of time, and there was not much of that.

Meanwhile Cauthen had not been idle. He was "talking around" in those key places he knew so well. One day in the fall, for example, he and Clemson President Edwards went to Hartsville to see A. L. M. Wiggins, the elder statesman of South Carolina's business community. A former railroad president and Under Secretary of the Treasury, Wiggins was head of the Governor's Committee on Higher Education. "Mr. Wiggins was very strong on our side," Cauthen says.

Up to now, none of the little group had taken a public stand on the case of Harvey Gantt, but the hour was obviously near when somebody must speak out clearly. The occasion arose at the end of December, when a Charleston newspaperman called Clemson board chairman Brown and put to him one of those have-you-stopped-beating-your-wife questions: "Now that it is pretty certain that the Clemson board is going to admit Harvey Gantt, what explanation would you give to the people who elected you, in the event of such a decision?"

Nobody had said that Clemson was going to admit Gantt, but Brown took down the reporter's question in shorthand and promised to give him an answer later.

He called Cauthen in Columbia, Edwards at Clemson. Both agreed to meet Brown in Barnwell the next morning. They talked it over, then Cauthen drafted a statement. Brown released it that day to the Charleston newspaperman but at the same time sent it to the press associations.

"Your premise is false," Brown's statement noted. "If the ultimate decision of the Federal courts directs that Harvey Gantt should be admitted, my position is that the board of trustees and the administration at Clemson College will not tolerate violence on the Clemson campus.”

Photographs by Jim Mahan
The riots at Oxford, Mississippi, showed South Carolina the trouble it could expect at Clemson.

Harvey Gantt's reception committee at Clemson consisted almost entirely of milling reporters.

Brown had set the strategy with Cauthen months ago, when he told Cauthen not to hold an open meeting of businessmen, but rather to assemble his forces quietly. Now the strategy was about to pay off. Now the power structure of the state was agreed upon, if not yet openly committed to, a policy of admitting Gantt to Clemson and preserving law and order on the campus at the same time.

The newspapers of the state quickly joined behind Brown, and the opposition was caught flat-footed. The kind of people who might favor making a "protest" had taken it for granted that everyone in South Carolina would agree with them when the time came. They were not organized, not prepared. The Citizens Councils had been, as executive secretary Smith explained to me recently, "mainly a stand-by organization in South Carolina." Present membership is probably "less than 10,000" by Smith's estimate, and these "are not very active." This is not to say that the Citizens Councils favored violence; Smith insists they did not. But in this sense nobody in the South plans violence. What some groups do is stalemate and neutralize local and state law-enforcement agencies so that the relative handful of racists who will be violent can come in from the country, often from across state lines, and create chaos.

Half, maybe more, of the battle had been won without a word's being fired in anger. It was not over, not by any means. But men as savvy in the ways of Palmetto politics as Brown and Cauthen knew where their opposition lay.
State Senator Marion Gressette finally bowed to integration.

The trouble might come from any one or all three of these powerful men:
1. James F. Byrnes. Still, in his 80's, the same dapper little man with gray hair that his picture was once frequently taken on the White House steps, Byrnes is today "a bitter man," according to those who are close to him. When Byrnes returned to South Carolina in the 1950's and became governor, he convinced the legislature that it ought to levy a sales tax, and he undertook an extensive program of school-building designed to create separate and equal school systems in South Carolina. "He thought the Supreme Court would recognize this," I was told. "He had convinced himself the Court would rule five to four in favor of South Carolina in the Clarendon Case [concerning public-school segregation in Clarendon County]. When it voted nine to nothing against him, he turned bitter." As a member of Clemson's board of trustees, Byrnes "wouldn't say yes, and he wouldn't say no," about Gantt. His attitude in board meetings was such that some of the others on the board felt that Byrnes might, if Gantt were admitted, make an independent statement that would, considering his prestige, do serious damage to law and order.
2. State Senator Marion Gressette. Gressette was No. 2 in seniority in the senate, a man whose sincerity and integrity have never been questioned in the legislature. Every bill that might affect or be affected by a change in the status quo in segregation went to the Gressette Committee. From Calhoun, a Black Belt county in the Low Country, Gressette announced to the press that he was praying every night over the Clemson situation, and it is significant that not even the worst cynic doubted his statement.

It was almost solely their confidence in Gressette that caused groups like the Citizens Councils to stay dormant. For Gressette to go along with a plan that called for admitting a Negro to Clemson without some kind of protest would be a severe wrench for Gressette personally, and for all the people who had had complete confidence in him as an anti-integration warrior. If Gressette came out publicly against admitting Gantt, all the hitherto latent forces of disorder in the state would come alive.
3. A. W. Red Bethea. Bethea is the most forthright racist in South Carolina. If Bethea went to Clemson to lead a "protest," as, in fact, he threatened to do, it would be hard to turn him away. He was both a member of the legislature and a Clemson alumnus.

Cauhcn moved quickly to get business support on the line for a public announcement. Eighteen of the state's top textile executives met for lunch at the new, luxurious Palmetto Club in Columbia on January 3, 1963. When they had finished their business, Cauhcn passed out three-by-five file cards, read them a statement he had drawn up. It read in part: "The major business and industrial interests of the state strongly approve the announced [Note: it had not been announced then] determination of the board of trustees and the administration of Clemson College to maintain law and order at all times." Cauhcn asked the executives to vote Yes or No on the cards, and to hand them in without signing their names. He got 18 Yees.

The next day the Chamber of Commerce followed suit. Polled by telephone, 70 South Carolina businessmen—52 were members of the Chamber's board of directors, 12 were former presidents and six were officers—unanimously approved the statement. The state bankers' association and the broadcasters' association followed in quick order.

Nowhere in the South in the recent history of racial change had the business community taken such a strong stand in advance. Clemson President Edward Edwards on January 3 had a "very serious" meeting with Gressette and some members of his committee. Without anynamity Edwards made it plain that if he was not supported in admitting Gantt and handling the whole situation with dignity, he would resign. He got down to brass tacks with Gressette about the effect of violence. One of the nation's largest manufacturers had made overtures about building a multimillion-dollar plant in Gressette's county.

The state makes its choice

"Senator, if there's a racket at Clemson those people won't even plant scrub oak in Calhoun County," Edwards said passionately.

On January 9, Governor Hollings spoke out, in a farewell address to the state legislature. As we meet," he said, "South Carolina is running out of courts. This General Assembly must make clear South Carolina's choice, a government of laws rather than a government of men. We must move on with dignity. It must be done with law and order. The state's institutions and all law-enforcement agencies have been charged with their responsibilities."

When Hollings was halfway through, Bethea rose in his seat, took a step as if to leave, but then changed his mind and sat down. The rest of the joint session gave Hollings an ovation. "They were impressed," a legislative correspondent told me later.

The next night Hollings called Attorney General Robert Kennedy and outlined the security plan which by now had been worked out. He told Kennedy that U.S. marshals would not be needed. Kennedy promised not to send them.

On January 12 Hollings held a meeting in his office for a final review of the security plan. Donald Russell Jr., son of and assistant to his father, the incoming governor, was present and took a copy for his father to see.

The plan is probably the most complete and carefully thought-out one ever drawn up in the United States to meet the threat of racial violence. None of its details have ever before been made public.

It warned all officers of the law: "The state of South Carolina has assumed responsibility of maintaining law and order as a state function, and the state is capable of carrying it out." It told them to "tolerates verbal abuse or similar harassment . . . but, when faced with violation of the law, to perform duties with efficiency and dispatch." It warned the Wilmington police, "remove troublemakers quickly to detention areas set aside for large numbers of persons."

A S.L.E.D. aircraft was to patrol from the sky, police photographers were to be on the campus to take movies and photographs, the sheriffs of adjoining counties were briefed; magistrates were put on duty so that they could issue warrants; fire-fighting and medical equipment was made ready; and a central command post was set up to coordinate all the activity.

An elaborate program of briefing was set up for the Clemson student body and faculty. The student body was to be polled by its own student government. Supervisors were given the right to send students to their individual dormitory rooms.

Students were warned that "gatherings which indicate unnecessary curiosity . . . will be avoided. Counseling, advising and frank discussion should solve most problems. Situations requiring more forthright action will be dealt with firmly and effectively." The courts began to move quickly. On January 22 District Judge C. C. Wyche complied with the Appellate Court ruling and signed the order admitting Gantt to Clemson. That same day State Senator John D. Long of Union County rose in the upper chamber of the legislature on a point of personal order. It was "cowardice" of Clemson to admit Gantt without a fight, he said.

"I would prefer that my children be raised in ignorance—not knowing "B" from Bullshit—to see them cowering and bowing before tyranny," he cried out.

Word of the debate reached the house, and Bethea and many of his colleagues came over to the senate, packed the galleries. Senator H. H. Jessen of Dorchester County joined in on Long's side. "South Carolina should not lie down and let itself be walked over," he said.

The time had come for Gressette to take his stand. He rose and began to speak slowly, sadly. "A lot of things happen," the instructions said, "have disappointments. Sometimes I feel like making a speech like my two friends made. We have lost this battle but we are engaged in a war. But this war cannot be won by violence or by inflammatory speeches. I have preached peace and good order too long to change my thinking."

If the legislature now felt that he had failed in his task, Gressette said, he would resign.
When he had finished, the legislature rose and gave him an ovation. And Senator Long took the floor again, this time to propose that the members remain on their feet for a standing vote of confidence for Gressette.

Before the day was over Byrnes issued a statement. "Gantt has succeeded in forcing himself into Clemson," Byrnes said, but he would not be welcomed at the college "by independent men and women of the student body. . . . Thank goodness," said the former Supreme Court Justice, "not even the Supreme Court has ordered that be done—as yet!"

The Clemson board of trustees met with Governor Russell and the Gressette Committee during the morning to set the strategy for making the formal announcement. At noon word went out to reporters that press conferences would be held separately by Russell, by Gressette, and by President Edwards—in quick successive order, at two P.M., at two-thirty and at three.

Promptly at two Russell came through a door into a paint-fresh new executive conference room, handed out a few copies of his statement and read quickly: "We shall meet and solve this problem peaceably, without violence."

The reporters scampered across the street to the capitol and heard Gressette read: "Peace and good order must be maintained both on and off the college campus."

Bethea was there, hunched deep down in an upholstered chair, an incongruous figure in the light bark-cloth-papered room. Reporters did not have time to stop and ask him for a comment.

It was a short walk from the capitol to the studios of WIS-TV where Edwards was to read his statement before the cameras. A few seconds after the press corps arrived, Edwards emerged, took his position before a microphone and began to talk: The Trustees approved "complete and good-faith" compliance with the court order, and Gantt was to be admitted "exactly as any other transfer student."

When Edwards finished, someone passed out copies of Cauthen's statement—the endorsement of law and order by the manufacturers, bankers, businessmen and broadcasters. It almost got passed by in the rush.

I had made the rounds with the rest of the newsman, and, as I started to leave, I saw Brown and Cauthen sitting against a far wall. I went over and Senator Brown offered me a ride back to my hotel. The three of us walked out into the street again.

"Well, John," said Brown, pulling himself erect, cocking his head on one side and then giving Cauthen a smile, "it's been a long day, hasn't it?"

"Yes, it has, senator," said Cauthen, returning the smile, "but I think everything's going to be all right now."

And it was all right... THE END
Harvey Gantt
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It is often said that history is the lengthening shadow of one man. In Clemson University’s case this man was Harvey Gantt. The desegregation of Clemson University by Gantt on January 28, 1963, was characterized by “Integration with Dignity” and is regarded by many as a signature event in American social history. This event was a well-planned and coordinated effort to prevent violence, to enhance the image of the university and the state, and to elevate the character of the civil rights movement. The architect of this historic strategy was Clemson’s President Robert C. Edwards.

President Edwards’ distinguished character mirrored the legacy of Clemson’s founder, Thomas Green Clemson. Like President Edwards, Clemson was a strategist, innovator, and a risk taker. Unable to get a scientific education at home, he left to study in Paris, France at age nineteen. Under Gay-Lussac, Thenard, and Du Long, Clemson learned of a young science, agricultural chemistry. Undoubtedly, at that time, he envisioned scientific farming as an instrument to break the cycle of poverty in the South, and a program to diversify a region economically whose soil was depleted by years of “King Cotton.” Through the Morrill Act of 1862, “land-grant” colleges acquired land for campuses in return for the promise to institute agricultural programs. In time, approximately sixty-seven of these colleges were established across the nation. This explosion of educational facilities encouraged Clemson’s own vision.

During the post-Civil-War years, he stored his dream of a New South into his memory bank. Unfortunately, his death in 1888 ended his dream but not his legacy; his last will and testament left 114 acres to the state for an agricultural college. Thus, he laid the foundation for Clemson Agricultural College which was incorporated as a land-grant college in 1889. The college opened with 446 male students, one dormitory, three classrooms, and 15 faculty members in the fall of 1893. Excitement gripped the air! From a low of 446 students in 1893, the student population expanded to 2,381 by World War I and to a phenomenal 4,048 during the fall of 1960. At that time, 80% of Clemson students came from within the state; the remaining twenty percent represented thirty-one states. During the fall of 1960, the university had 201 architecture majors. Engineering, the largest school, had 1,598 majors. The name Clemson resounded throughout the state and region as an excellent academic institution. The university’s education, engineering, and architecture curricula attracted the region’s best students.1

Clemson’s founding paralleled the commercial spirit of the age. Shortly after the Morrill Act of 1862, the U.S. Congress authorized the establishment of black land-grant colleges. Thus was born the South Carolina Agricultural and Mechanical College for Negroes in Orangeburg, SC. For many years, according to the minutes of the Board of Trustees, Clemson College and South Carolina A&M “shared equally land-grant funds” on a per capita basis. All black applicants to Clemson were routinely forwarded to South Carolina A&M to receive “a sound education.”2

As America entered the twentieth century, the educational theme of “Preparation for Life” was subsumed under the banner, “Making the World Safe for Democracy” as Clemsonians defended democracy at home and abroad during World War I (1914-1918). Clemson was still an all-male military school when the U.S. declared war against Germany in April 1917. The entire senior class immediately telegraphed President Woodrow
Wilson its intention to volunteer.  

Clemson College’s June 1917 commencement is remembered for “a quietness that was almost painful.” When the name of a cadet senior who had been inducted into the service was called, Samuel Littlejohn, the senior-class president, shouted, “Absent in the service of his country.” Another important change occurred during the war years: the khaki uniforms of WWI replaced the Confederate gray. Although the university accepted a handful of co-eds during the early 1950’s, when desegregation arrived in January 1963, a strong tradition of duty, honor, and country still engulfed the campus. Incidentally, desegregation is using the law as an instrument of social change. Integration is the acceptance of desegregation, a beloved community, and a colorblind society.

Although the cadets fought in France “to make the world safe for Democracy,” they returned to a country where democracy was still what that great bard of the race Langston Hughes termed, “A Dream Deferred.” America was still Jim Crowed, segregated, and King Cotton was a part of the region’s landscape. Likewise, the “Negro Problem” haunted America and assumed added importance with the end of World War II in 1945. America emerged from WWII the strongest military power in the world, yet democracy was denied to black Carolinians. Despite the obstacles, black publisher P. B. Young saw the walls of segregation “crumbling, but not tumbling.” He applauded South Carolina’s federal judge, J. Waties Waring, who had outlawed the white primary and forced the South Carolina Democratic party to admit blacks to its membership. Also, like Judge Waring, Young saw “sunlight” invading the Palmetto State.

During the post-war years, the “sunlight” also penetrated the office of Clemson’s registrar, G. E. Metz. He envisioned the impending crisis over school desegregation which he termed, “A Hot Potato.” In February 1948, months before the official receipt of black applications for admission, he prepared a policy statement for the Board of Trustees titled, “What to do about Negro applicants?” After “A Brief Statement of the General Problem,” he used various subtitles such as: “The Question on Our Doorstep,” “The Problem Is in the Open,” and “The Problem Is Here.” He concluded the report with “We Seek Advice and Counsel.”

Metz’s “foresight” was enhanced by another “hot potato,” the attempted desegregation of Alabama Polytechnic Institute (Auburn). “The more we can anticipate the problem,” he wrote, “the less embarrassing the situation … for Clemson.” He anticipated the inevitability of legal challenges to Clemson’s desegregation policy, and he admonished the Board “to stop wishfully thinking … it can’t happen here.” The problem, he said, is here; it is “in the open on the Clemson campus.” Seemingly, he knew that his policy statement would invest the Board with a sense of urgency. Somewhat cautiously, he placed the word “alarmist” in mid-sentence and then asserted that “the problem is actually immediately upon us.”

The registrar’s policy statement is actually a narrative of Clemson’s admission policies and a brief history of black applicants. It debunks the notion that Spencer Bracey and John Gainey were the first black applicants. There were numerous applicants before either of them applied. In September 1947, “a clerical error” admitted a black male from Kentucky in September 1948 even though the applicant had answered the question on “race” with the word “Negro.” Other applicants answered the question with the word...
“American” or left the space blank. “For various reasons,” Metz noted, the applicant from Kentucky did not pursue his admission.7

Although Metz denied that he was an “alarmist,” he foresaw an immediate “climax” because the Alabama case threatened lawsuits from the NAACP and the on-campus pressure from faculty and students. He noted that faculty members visited the registrar’s office to ask: “Have you received any applications from Negroes yet?” He was lobbied by religious groups and apparently embarrassed by a student forum during Religious Emphasis Week, which asked: “Do we fulfill our Christian duty when we provide separate schools for Negroes.”8

Metz was a visionary! He saw the inevitability of change. He recognized the need to “prepare” because prejudice against the Negro was an unacceptable reality. Throughout the post-war years, the Board discussed “the problem” of black applicants to Clemson. Meanwhile, South Carolinians counseled “obstinacy,” and hoped that “public opinion and time” would solve what Clemson’s President R. F. Poole characterized on May 4, 1948 as “a real problem.” “Maybe,” he wrote, “the Negroes are killing the goose that laid the golden egg.”9

President Poole and the Board’s heightened sense of anxiety over desegregation was prompted by applications from two black men, Spencer M. Bracy and Edward Bracy.

At the June 1948 meeting, the Board discussed the applicants, the recent Supreme Court decisions, and “the rights and privileges” of black applicants. Seemingly, this was an important meeting, for the Board established parietal policies that lasted over a decade. The Board accepted President Poole’s recommendation to lobby the South Carolina General Assembly “to make necessary provisions” to educate black applicants similarly situated at South Carolina A&M. The Board’s discussion was without malice. The members believed that they were acting in the best interests of the applicants and the state. The Board mirrored the best business, professional, educational, and textile interests within the state. The members reflected the mind and ideology of the New South which championed interracial goodwill and economic pluralism. State Senator Edgar Brown and the other Board members “directed” President Poole to reject the Bracy applications because “comparable facilities” for architectural engineering courses were available at S.C. A&M. Of course, this was not the case; otherwise, South Carolina would not have paid to send qualified black students out of state to take courses available in Orangeburg. Also, the Board affirmed that future applications from the Bracys would be denied as well. The Board referenced what President Poole termed “the well-established state policy “of separate but equal.”10

Despite the Board’s well publicized rejection of the Bracys and its support of the policy of separate but equal, another black applicant applied to Clemson in 1955, but he did not pursue his application. A more serious application, however, was received from John L. Gainey, a 21-year old soldier and truck driver stationed at Ft. Sill, Oklahoma, who expressed an interest in chemistry. He decided to apply after a visit to his hometown of Cheraw, SC. Also, he was “encouraged” by white soldiers with whom he lived and worked. “I have nothing to lose by trying.” If refused admission, he continued, “I will accept the decision.” When denied admission, he dismissed legal action and accepted South Carolina A&M College as an alter-
native place of study. Meanwhile, President R. F. Poole referred Gainey’s application to the college’s legal counsel. “The college will abide by the laws of the state,” he noted, and reminded Gainey that South Carolina law prohibited school desegregation.11

A Greenville News editorial titled, “Gainey’s Choice: Education or Notoriety,” questioned Gainey’s motives and sincerity and characterized him as “sadly misinformed.”12 The editor suggested that Gainey was “coached” or “planted” as a test case to desegregate higher education in South Carolina. “In any event,” the editorial concluded, Gainey was “over persuaded.” Although there was no evidence that the NAACP had influenced or even knew Gainey, the News theorized that if Clemson rejected him for admission, the NAACP would provide legal assistance. The editor dubbed the prospect of enforced desegregation as “a pyrrhic victory” because the state assembly had authorized the closing of public colleges to prevent desegregation. Accordingly and “tragically,” the editorial continued, Gainey had nothing to gain, but, what it termed, “a certain kind of notoriety.”13

Gainey’s application for admission was rejected, and he abandoned his interest in Clemson. But within a few years, another black applicant sought admission to Clemson. His name was Harvey Gantt. Like Gainey, he too was inspired by his parents, Clemson’s perceived sophistication, and the goal of an engineering degree. But, unlike Gainey, he desegregated Clemson and thus laid the foundation for the principle of “Integration with Dignity” throughout South Carolina and the South as well.

Harvey Gantt set in motion the historic events which desegregated Clemson with a handwritten letter to Clemson’s office of admission on July 19, 1959. “I would like to obtain a bulletin on your school of engineering,” he wrote. Gantt also requested information about “expenses, prescribed courses, and requirements.” He identified himself as a high school senior who expected to graduate in 1960. “I am definitely interested in architecture … will you please send this information as soon as possible.” Thus, contrary to popular opinion, Gantt expressed an interest in Clemson approximately one year before his graduation from Charleston’s Burke High School. Within days of his letter, he received the requested material along with a friendly note from R. J. Berry, Director of Admissions, which read, “Happy to answer any questions for you.”14

Harvey Gantt was born January 14, 1943 into a middle-class home in Charleston. He is one of four children born to Wilhelmina Gordon and Christopher Gantt. His parents graduated from Burke Industrial School in Charleston and attended the Morris Baptist Church where the youthful Harvey was an active member. They were active in religious and civic affairs throughout the community; indeed, Christopher Gantt was vice-president of the Burke PTA. While Wilhelmina Gantt was a housewife, her husband was a rigger at the Charleston Naval Shipyard. The Gantts owned their own home and obviously had imbued their son with the need for academic excellence. Harvey Gantt graduated from Burke High School on June 3, 1960. He ranked number two in a class of 262 with a cumulative average of 93.75 on a scale of 100.15

Undoubtedly, when Gantt graduated from Charleston’s famed Burke High School, he was excited about his future career as an architect. But his enthusiasm was tempered by the knowledge that he could not attend the best engineering
INTEGRATION WITH DIGNITY

college in the state. Nevertheless, he remained optimistic. He communicated his career objective to the Columbia black attorney Matthew Perry, who was in Charleston to defend students who were arrested during a lunch-counter sit-in protest. Attorney Perry is now a federal judge in Columbia. Within the walls of his federal office in Columbia, Judge Perry recalled affectionately his first encounter with Gantt. “He approached me with his right hand extended and introduced himself,” he recalled. “I'm Harvey Gantt, a senior at Burke High School, and I want to be an architect.” He continued, “I want to attend Clemson which has the best engineering program, . . . but I think that might be a problem.” At that time, the problem was a state law which prohibited desegregated education. Thus, Gantt’s dream was “a Dream Deferred.” He packed his bags and departed for the Midwest where he enrolled at Iowa State University in Ames, Iowa in the fall of 1960.16

Gantt, however, had been struck with the awe and mystique of Clemson. Also when Gantt graduated from Burke High School in June 1960, the state of South Carolina was enjoying a wave of economic prosperity, and Clemson University was in the midst of a building boom. Furthermore, it was one of the most popular universities in the South, enrolling approximately 3900 white male and 100 white female students. Eighty percent of the student body was from within the state and ninety-four percent from the South. The 1960-1961 catalogue shows that tuition, room, and board was $882.00 ($1082 for out-of-state students). There were no female dorms, and single male students lived in Johnstone Hall. The Holtzendorff YMCA and the student union (a part of Johnstone) were centers of extra-curricula activity. There were no social fraternities or sororities.

The annual Thanksgiving Day football classic between the Clemson Tigers and the USC Gamecocks was a signature social event as were dances, concerts, and intramural sports. Card playing was popular on campus as well. Intercollegiate activities attracted large crowds to Memorial Stadium which had a seating capacity of 44,000. The main library was located in Sikes Hall and the newest buildings were Earle, Lee, Kinard, and the Poole Agricultural Center. Had Gantt been admitted in September 1960, he would have been assigned a room in Johnstone Hall dormitory. But no action was taken on Gantt’s request to attend Clemson. Nevertheless, in time, he would return to Clemson...
and change the course of history.

Meanwhile, as America prepared for the November 1960 presidential election between Richard Nixon and John F. Kennedy, the power brokers at Clemson and within the state were more concerned about the impending crisis over school desegregation. Undoubtedly, they recognized the inevitability of change. At this point, legal instruments to desegregate the University of Mississippi, the University of Georgia, the Georgia Institute of Technology, and Auburn University were well established. Both the undergraduate and graduate curriculums at the University of North Carolina and the University of Virginia had already been desegregated. And the much-publicized southern strategy to create separate-but-equal universities throughout the region conflicted with the NAACP’s new focus on integration. What to do? How could the issue be avoided at Clemson?

As the state’s leadership quietly and privately debated the “Negro Problem,” they probably never imagined that Harvey Gantt would answer the question for them. How could he? He was safely removed in distant Iowa. And besides, despite his academic achievements, he had a Charleston arrest record. Chief William F. Kelly arrested Gantt and Cornelius Fludd (who would apply to Clemson later) on April 1, 1960 for “trespassing” at S.H. Kress department store. Each man posted a $10.00 bail and was later fined $50.00. In this instance, Gantt and Flood were part of a national civil rights movement to desegregate lunch counters during the early 1960’s which began in Greensboro, North Carolina, on Feb. 1, 1960.17

Gantt’s desire to attend Clemson was not singularly focused. On October 20, 1960, Willie R. Hendrix, a Lexington, South Carolina native, and a student at historically black North Carolina A&T in Greensboro, North Carolina, requested a transfer to Clemson. He asserted that “the state will not pay my out-of-state fee.” The issue, however, was a miscalculation of fees rather than an unwillingness to pay. At that time, a minority student could enroll in a curriculum out-of-state if the courses (i.e., engineering) were unavailable on a black campus within South Carolina. The state funded the differential between the in-state and out-of-state fees. The miscalculated fees equaled $86.00 dollars. The state forwarded Hendrix a supplemental payment of $24.67 on October 27, 1960. A few days later, Clemson’s registrar K. N. Vickery advised Hendrix that in view of the circumstances,
“we assume...that the matter is closed.”

The Hendrix matter was closed, but Harvey Gantt’s letter of inquiry to K.N. Vickery on November 8, 1960 ignited a series of events which culminated in the desegregation of Clemson. Gantt’s letter to Vickery of July 19, 1959 was dismissed as irrelevant and a violation of state law. His next letter requested a current university catalogue (1960-1961), an application, and a schedule of fees. He requested the information by November 20th. The bulletin was “routinely” forwarded. Inasmuch as the letter was written from Iowa, no one suspected that the prospective applicant was a Negro.

Gantt returned the application for admission in the fall of 1961 postmarked Charleston, S.C., December 24, 1960. A routine check by the registrar, however, showed that Gantt was receiving $149.51 per quarter in out-of-state differential fees for tuition and expenses. Thus, the registrar determined that he was ineligible to transfer to Clemson and returned his application via registered mail. Meanwhile on January 30, 1961, another Charlestonian, Cornelius Timothy Fludd, filed an application to transfer from Morehouse College in Atlanta to Clemson. Like Gantt, he was a graduate of Burke High School with an interest in electrical engineering. His first letter of inquiry was dated April 22, 1960, but no action was taken by Clemson.

Cornelius Fludd was born in Charleston on March 22, 1942 to Edna Smith Wright. Wilmot Wright was his step-father. His mother was born in Midland Park, Charleston County, and attended Burke Industrial; his step-father was born in Charleston and finished the fourth grade at Shaw Elementary School. His mother was a housewife, and his father a house painter. Both were members of the St. Matthews Baptist Church and were in the process of buying their home at 17 Aiken Street when Fludd applied to Clemson. Also like Gantt, Fludd graduated from Burke High School on June 3, 1960 and ranked 8.5 in a class of 262. His grade average for the four years was 90.0. When Fludd applied to Clemson, he was a freshman at Morehouse.

The applications from Gantt and Fludd spawned an exchange of letters between Clemson officials, state Senators L.M.Gressette, Edgar Brown, T. Allen Legare, Jr. and other prominent South Carolinians. A network, and in some cases a kinship existed among prominent whites. Their letters reflected their fears about the future. Moreover, the letters, which are now archival material, reflect the mind and ideology of a people who deemed themselves to represent the honor of the New South and who were the best equipped to solve “the Negro problem.” They were for the most part philanthropic, socially idealistic, and politically conservative. They had matured during the post-WWI era, yet for all their idealism, they were imbued with the ideas of William Dunning’s Reconstruction which exalted black inferiority. The book was used in all schools at all levels.

State Senator T. Allen Legare’s letter to Senator Edgar A. Brown on January 16, 1961, is a mirror of the kinship between state officials and the black leadership during the early stages of the desegregation movement. Legare referenced a telephone call from Senator Brown and responded with enclosed “background” information on Gantt and Fludd. “It is my understanding,” he wrote, that both men have conferred with the NAACP and with Matthew Perry in Columbia concerning the Clemson case. Legare believed that someone known only as “Hunter,” president of the Palmetto Voters League
from Darlington, attended the meeting. An attempt was made, he noted, to “discourage” Gantt and Fludd from “pushing the case.” He asked Senator Brown to check with someone named “Spot” to confirm the meeting. The “boys” only blemish, he asserted, “is their arrest for a ‘sit-in’ strike at Kress last Spring.”

Seemingly, the kinship tentacles extended throughout the state and touched every class, caste, and race. This network provided Clemson and state officials with a steady flow of information. Gantt evolved as a pawn in a power play.

Owing to desegregation efforts elsewhere in the South, and Supreme Court decisions, state officials recognized the inevitability of change. The officials resisted just enough so as to appear that they had not capitulated to the hated NAACP and had not abandoned segregation. Although violence had not yet erupted in Mississippi, the state’s power brokers feared violence would compromise Clemson’s image. Thus at this early stage, the script was written. Harvey Gantt did not desegregate Clemson; he was selected to desegregate Clemson.

Meanwhile, Gantt, undaunted by his rejection in January, reapplied for admission on February 7, 1961 for the September 1961 term. He acknowledged that he had received assistance from the South Carolina Regional Education Board for out-of-state tuition and fees. “However,” he explained, “I especially wish to attend Clemson. I am a citizen of South Carolina,” he asserted. “Clemson is a state-supported institution … and I have a right to attend.” In view of the foregoing,” he concluded,
visit Clemson, Gantt received a detailed letter from Mr. Vickery which outlined the “requirements” for admission. They included examination scores, transcripts from Iowa State, and an “honorable-discharge” statement from Iowa State. “We have not received any of the above items,” Vickery wrote; “thus your application is incomplete.”

On June 19, the registrar received Gantt’s transcripts from Iowa State indicating he had earned a B plus average for the year. Academically, he was more qualified for admission than many white students. Whereas the median score of freshmen entering Clemson in September 1961 was 438, Gantt had a Board score of 471. It is not clear from the record whether the numbers Edwards’ cites refer to the math or the verbal portion of the examination.

Undoubtedly, at this point, Gantt was optimistic about his planned matriculation at Clemson. His plans, however, were thwarted. Although the Seneca Journal and Tribune, WTND Radio in Orangeburg, and other media outlets highlighted “rumors” about the scheduled enrollment of two black students at Clemson, President Edwards had “no comment.” And Governor Ernest Hollings characterized himself as “well-qualified” to defend the “Southern Way of Life.”

But President Edwards was both vocal and active with state Senators Edgar Brown, L. Marion Gressette, Attorney William Watkins, and David Robinson. On June 6, 1961, Edwards asserted to Senator Brown that “both Senator Gressette and Mr. D.W. Robinson concur in our plans for disposing of the problem.” The “problem” was Harvey Gantt. While Gantt waited in Charleston for his letter of acceptance to Clemson, the state power brokers were strategizing to maintain segregation with dignity. On July 11, 1961, in Columbia, Edwards called a meeting of the presidents of the five white state-supported institutions “to discuss the current situation.” This was to be an important meeting because it established unofficially a state desegregation policy that lasted for years.

Although minutes are unavailable for the July meeting, what happened can be gleaned from Edwards’ detailed letter to Senator Gressette a few days later. The President was clearly in charge. What he termed “new developments” had generated a crisis. There was a need to circle the wagons. The group “discussed thoroughly the current situation” because “the problem” affected everyone. The Medical College of Charleston had received two applications from minority applicants; Winthrop College in Rock Hill had two “incomplete applications,” and other colleges had received “inquiries.” The group knew that Clemson would be the first college “to face directly” a serious legal challenge to desegregation. They theorized, if Clemson falls, the public-school system will collapse as well. They recognized the inevitability of desegregation, but at this time, it was socially imprudent and politically inexpedient to desegregate. Remember, this was the civil rights era.

The rumors of Gantt’s application had spawned many letters to Edwards’ office. Most opposed what was termed “race mixing” and specifically Martin Luther King. A typical letter read, “Negroes are like children … Martin Luther King is their God and the NAACP their Kingdom.”

Edwards alerted the group to a tactic that he, Senator Gressette, Watkins, David Robinson, and others had enunciated to delay Gantt’s admission and “to dispose of the problem.” The plan was a new, more definable, “and a more specific admissions policy.” Although race was factored into the
plan, there were other “immediate” issues as well. First, the plan would solve the problem of increased enrollment, sky-rocketing costs, inadequate physical facilities, but ultimately the hope was to elevate the quality of all applicants and enhance Clemson’s image as a citadel of learning. Also, the plan sought to maintain a social and political equilibrium throughout the state so as to prevent violence. It endorsed the Supreme Court’s 1954 Brown desegregation decision “with all deliberate speed,” and it allowed the college to retreat from Jim Crow with dignity.

The plan solved an important legal issue. Gantt’s initial application for admission was rejected because he was receiving “out-of-state” financial assistance from the state. Edwards knew that the fees obligated an applicant for a quarter or semester, not a full year.

Meanwhile, Gantt was kicking at the door and demanding his rights as a U.S. citizen. He knew that the on-campus interview was the only obstacle to his admission in September 1961. He wondered, “What’s a man to do?” He needed time, the alumni needed time, the state needed time! The Board set the policy; Gantt had to follow their agenda, and he was, as Senator T. Allen Legare remembered, “a man walking on eggshells.”

The July conferees discussed Edwards’ plan and concluded, like Clemson’s Board of Trustees, that it encapsulated the ingredients necessary to fulfill their institution’s mission. Also, an analysis of Edwards’ plan shows that he and the Board detected a discrepancy within Gantt’s application. They wondered if Gantt’s class ranking, Board scores, and Iowa transcript accurately reflected his academic ability and maturity. Their opinion was indicative of the commercial spirit of the age. Edwards’ position was also influenced by the exclusion of thirty-two applicants, who were not transfers, from the September 1960 class. These applicants to the freshman class had high Board scores but had not been recommended by their high-school principals. Thus, Edwards saw a need to reassess the admissions policy because of what he termed “predictive factors.” The “predictive factors” were Gantt, increased enrollment, rising costs, and the need to perpetuate the Clemson mystique.

Clemson’s previous admission policy had been focused primarily on the College Entrance Examination scores, transcripts, and an interview. The opinion of high school counselors and principals were less valuable but were occasionally used. The new policy de-emphasized single factors as “a controlling influence,” and injected, what Edwards termed “important intangible factors” such as “character, maturity, motivation, … obedience to authority, and salutary rules of discipline and emotional stability.” The objective was a “well-rounded mature … student.” The message was clear: students with high grades but who lacked maturity, personal integrity, emotional stability, and honor would be rejected. Previously, Gantt had been an exceptionally well qualified student, but the new policy and his arrest record now made him unacceptable for admission.

Edwards recognized the inevitability of change for Clemson. The media depicted him as the preeminent leader within the state and the person best equipped to negotiate the issue of desegregation. Seemingly, he was comfortable with the media’s profile of him as a statesman because it coincided with his expressed mission to prevent violence and protect the image of Clemson. He analyzed desegregation with Senators Brown and Gressette, explained the effects of social reform to the Board,
and inaugurated a new admissions policy as a subtle device to delay the inevitable. He was successful. On August 31, 1961, Kenneth Vickery notified Gantt, Cornelius Fludd, and fifty-one other transfer applicants that their applications for admission had been rejected.

Gantt was stunned! He had performed well on the College Entrance Board Examination and had forwarded his transcripts from Iowa State. He thought he needed only an on-campus interview to complete the admissions process. But his dream was again deferred. Vickery informed Gantt that his College Entrance Board scores arrived “too late” to complete the admissions process for the term opening on Sept. 8, 1961. Also, Gantt needed an on-campus interview.32 Remember, he returned to Charleston in early May from Iowa and was never offered an interview. Although unnerved by his rejection, he packed his bags and returned to Iowa State. He requested “out-of-state” tuition support from the S.C. State Regional Education Board. In late September, he was awarded $166.86 for the fall 1961 quarter.33 Vickery’s form letter to Gantt failed to note that his application was “cancelled.” That word would later become a critical item in Gantt’s legal case. Also, Clemson officials suspected without evidence that Gantt’s Iowa transcript was inflated. President Edwards alluded to the inflation in a letter to Senator Gressette. “We were forced to discontinue the acceptance of transfer students,” he wrote. He believed that transfer students had experienced “academic or other difficulties” at their former institutions, but clearly this was a ploy to keep Gantt at bay.34

Within a few days of their rejection, Gantt and Fludd responded with identical angry letters to Vickery. “My application has been pending since February 1961,” Gantt wrote questioning the delay. Despite the finality of Vickery’s letter, Gantt, nevertheless, pleaded with him for “a personal interview.” He again expressed a willingness to visit the campus.35 Obviously, at this point, Gantt and Fludd were in need of legal counsel. Gantt and Fludd’s “identical letters” alerted Edwards to the possibility of future “litigation.” He placed the letters in his “vault.” This was a mistake! The “vault” reference was later used by Gantt’s attorneys to imply racial discrimination.

Vickery’s identical answer to Gantt and Fludd was both calm and rational. “Incomplete applications were cancelled for All transfer students,” he wrote. He invited them to apply for “any subsequent term.” Although the Board scores remained valid, he reminded them that future applications would require transcripts, design portfolios, interviews, and a statement to verify their eligibility to return to Iowa State. It was an authoritative letter to solve the “problem.” Vickery’s letter shifted the burden of admission to Gantt and Fludd. If either or both failed a course, submitted inadequate professional designs, or, under the new policy, demonstrated immaturity or instability, they would be rejected. Presumably, as noted previously, the college would conduct “background” investigations of the applicants. Meanwhile, President Edwards forwarded the list of the fifty-one rejected transfer applicants (which included names and addresses), and a copy of the new admissions policy to Senators Brown, Gressette, and attorney Watkins. The white college presidents, who’d recently met in Columbia, and prominent whites were recipients as well. Edwards solicited “suggestions” and organized “brief” remarks for Vickery’s response to Gantt’s letter of September 15th.36

Edwards hoped that Vickery’s letter of rejection and his new admissions policy had detailed
Gantt’s desegregation efforts, but, in truth, he knew otherwise. He realized that there was a need to expand his collaborative social network, and, at the same time, an ancillary goal was to solidify himself as a leader. His office was soon bombarded with requests to discuss “the problem” with various state, local, and civic groups. He received mail from alumni, constituents, and school officials who were similarly situated. His increased popularity coincided with his image as a reliable, dependable, and efficient leader. He frequently visited the statehouse in Columbia to discuss “the problem” with Senators Brown and Gressette. He was always the diplomat, the statesman, the magnet, who received, synthesized, and generated a collective response to desegregation. In time, his vision reaped huge rewards. When desegregation arrived several months later, Edwards and his supporters used the collaborative network as a conduit to mail over 10,000 letters to urge “integration with dignity.”

Meanwhile, from Ames, Iowa, two angry men, Gantt and Fludd, bombarded Vickery with letters and phone calls. Fludd having recently transferred to Iowa State from Morehouse, the two Charlestonians now were allied to fight Jim Crow. Their Burke High School friendship was renewed. Both lived in Lincoln Hall a few doors from each other. Undoubtedly, during the cold Iowa winter, they spent hours in rooms 4433 (Gantt) and 4427 (Fludd) reminiscing about Burke High and their desire to attend Clemson College. They exchanged letters and phone calls with the NAACP and Matthew Perry who instructed them to mail identical letters to Vickery on the same day. In a letter to Vickery dated Nov. 13, 1961, Gantt wondered why his application was canceled. “I wish to enter Clemson as soon as possible,” he wrote requesting admission in January 1962. Seemingly, Gantt had misinterpreted Vickery’s letter of Oct.13, 1961. Though he assumed that he could reactivate his original application, it had been cancelled, and he was now required to start over.

Also, the new admissions policy had diminished his chances for admission. Edwards and Vickery believed that transfer students were less academically inclined than students who enrolled directly from high school. However, Gantt and Fludd’s identical letters, their humility, and persistence, touched Edwards’ heart. He consulted attorney Watkins and then instructed Vickery to forward applications to Gantt and Fludd without what was termed “a letter of transmittal.”

Gantt submitted a new application in early December 1961. He promised to forward transcripts and an “eligibility statement” in time to qualify for admission in January 1962. If not, he requested that his application be considered for the fall of 1962 and that his application be considered as “a continuing application…. I am very desirous of attending Clemson,” he asserted.

In December, Gantt returned to Charleston for the Christmas holidays. There he met with attorney Perry and other NAACP officials to discuss his new application to Clemson. Seemingly, he was insensitive to the ingredients and the effects of Edwards’ new admissions policy. He fully expected to matriculate within a few months and certainly no later than the fall of 1962. When he returned to Iowa after the holidays, he attached no significance to the absence of a response from Clemson to his new application. But, as the holiday spirit dissolved into the clouds of winter, his optimism dissipated like the Iowa snow on a sunny afternoon.

Correspondingly, in South Carolina, Edwards
continued to stabilize and expand his collaborative efforts to solve the “problem.” He met regularly with Senators Brown, Gressette, attorney Watkins and other prominent state officials. They evolved a strategy of “silence” in response to the new desegregation efforts. Seemingly, they reasoned, the best response is no response. After consultation with Watkins, Edwards instructed Vickery in early February 1962 “to hold” Gantt and Fludd’s applications in his files. “We will take no action…nor will we acknowledge receipt” of their applications, he wrote to Vickery.40 “We will take no further action in either case unless and until further communications are received from them,” he noted. The strategy of “silence” was coupled with the belief that Gantt and Fludd would fail a course and thus would be rendered academically deficient. And then, there was the possibility that both men would become imbued with the idealism of freedom, sanctified with hope, and enamored with the cornfields of Iowa.

But such was not the case. On April 28, 1962, both men sent identical letters to Vickery. They referenced their December applications, the absence of a response, and their desire to attend Clemson in the fall.41 Each requested “favorable consideration.” But their requests, like their applications, were “a dream deferred.” In frustration, Gantt, Fludd, and Matthew Perry visited Clemson on June 13, 1962 at approximately 4:15 p.m. They strategized with a minister of the Clemson Methodist Church, the Rev. Charles A. Webster, the Director of Student Life, before their planned visit to the campus. Though President Edwards was out of town, the group met with Vickery, Watkins, and Dean Walter Cox for about ten minutes. Gantt opened the conversation with a request that the meeting be considered an “interview” to fulfill his requirements for admission. Vickery declined because the applicant’s Iowa transcripts had not yet arrived. He also rejected their request to meet with Dean McClure of the School of Architecture. As the meeting concluded, Gantt and Fludd confirmed their commitment to Clemson and reaffirmed their desire to major in architecture and electrical engineering respectively.42

Vickery described both applicants as “neatly dressed, intelligent,” and concerned about the status of their applications and the unpublished admissions requirements. “They had obviously been coached,” he wrote. He characterized the meeting as “formal” with “no mention … of race.” Although Perry did not attend the on-campus meeting (he waited at the church), he probably felt somewhat optimistic after Gantt and Fludd’s on-campus meeting. Within days of their visit to the campus, Gantt and Fludd forwarded their transcripts and requested “favorable consideration,” and an “immediate” admissions interview. Vickery telegraphed receipt of the transcripts and noted that the applications were “being processed.”43

A few days later, Dean McClure penned a detailed letter to Gantt (and presumably Fludd). He too acknowledged receipt of the transcript, suggested an on-campus interview, and requested “a complete portfolio” of his architectural design and work. “The more complete the better,” he wrote.44 Since Vickery’s telegram and McClure’s letter were friendly, it appeared to Gantt that Clemson was poised to accept its first black applicant.

Then something happened which probably angered Edwards and Vickery. On June 26th at 3:52 p.m., Gantt telegraphed Vickery to request “favorable consideration…and an interview.” He demanded a reply within “48 hours.” Remember, this was 1962. Also, the telegram was a planned
legal strategy. One week later, on July 7, 1962, Gantt’s attorneys Matthew Perry and Willie T. Smith, Jr. filed a class-action law suit in the Anderson, S.C. Division of the U.S. District Court for the Western District “to enjoin the College from refusing to consider the application of Negro residents upon the same terms as whites.” Gantt demanded admission, “a speedy hearing,” a preliminary injunction against continued alleged practices of discrimination, and an injunction to prohibit the college from closing its doors.\(^{45}\)

Additionally, Gantt charged that white applicants with “inferior academic records” who applied after him were admitted. Gantt claimed that he was denied admission because of his race which was a violation of the “due process … equal protection” clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. “Unless Clemson is restrained,” Gantt declared, he faced “irreparable injury, loss and damage….”\(^{46}\)

Named in the complaint were Clemson’s Kenneth N. Vickery, Jesse T. Anderson, state superintendent of education, and Board chairman R. M. Cooper.

The Gantt suit, which attorney Watkins later termed “an attack,” surprised Edwards and state officials. The evidence is conclusive, however, that Gantt had not been denied admission when he filed suit. The only logical explanation is that he felt personally degraded during his June 13\(^{th}\) visit to the campus. Another scenario is that the NAACP anticipated Gantt’s rejection. However, it was against state law to admit him. Gantt admitted as much during a brief on-campus interview on Jan. 28, 2003. “We saw it coming,” he noted. But, in truth, and in retrospect, had McClure’s letter of July 2, 1962 arrived earlier, it is unlikely that Gantt would have filed suit on July 7, 1962. The June 26\(^{th}\) telegram which demanded admission within forty-eight hours diminished all hope of voluntary admission.

In a letter to McClure from his Charleston home (111 Cannon Street) dated July 13\(^{th}\), Gantt referenced McClure’s letter to him on July 2, 1962. “As you know,” Gantt wrote, “I have instituted an action against the college.” He noted that McClure’s letter had arrived concurrently with the filing of the lawsuit. He inquired about the status of his application, requested an interview, promised to present his architectural portfolio, and strongly expressed a desire to attend Clemson. “I certainly want to do everything possible to secure admission,” he asserted. He pledged “to cooperate fully” with college officials. But, unfortunately, the suit had invalidated his application. Attorney Watkins had advised Dean McClure to “ignore” Gantt’s letter. It would be “highly inappropriate,” he wrote to consider Gantt’s application while litigation is pending.\(^{47}\)

The Clemson Board met with Watkins in Columbia on July 19\(^{th}\) to discuss Gantt’s complaint. The Board denied that his application was rejected, stipulated that all qualified applicants were admitted to Clemson, and noted that Gantt’s case was filed improperly as a class-action suit. Since 1956, the Board noted, with the exception of Fludd, no Negro had officially applied to Clemson. Also, with the exception of Gantt, there were no current Negro applicants for admission. Apparently, Fludd decided to drop his interest in Clemson.

In any case, the Board expressed hope for a “speedy” resolution of the case. Clemson and the Board promised “to conduct itself in an honorable way, legally and otherwise.”\(^{48}\) They did. They expressed no animosity towards Gantt or the NAACP at the Board meeting. In truth, the Board probably welcomed the suit. They recognized the
inevitability of a legal challenge to desegregation. In Gantt, Judge Perry noted, Clemson had “a nice clean cut young man … and a Charlestonian as well.”

Although the Board welcomed the suit, it recognized the consequences as well. The State Budget and Control Board was authorized to close public colleges to prevent court-ordered desegregation. Also, the Board discussed the 1947 lawsuit to desegregate the University of South Carolina’s Law School. As a legal remedy in 1955, the state had established a “separate” law school on the campus of South Carolina A&M in Orangeburg.

After the Board meeting, Edwards forwarded copies of Gantt’s complaint and the Board’s recommendations to all state college presidents, business leaders, and prominent whites throughout the state soliciting their support and suggestions. Academically as well as historically, this strategy was what is termed “deferential politics,” for it enhanced Edwards’ image as a leader and projected Clemson as taking the lead among Southern institutions of higher learning. Moreover, Edwards’ strategy stimulated discussions and functioned as a conduit to disseminate information throughout the state and region. Accordingly, and without fanfare, the loop expanded to include a dialogue with B. C. Turner, the president of South Carolina A&M College in Orangeburg. The two presidents exchanged letters and documents about the Gantt case and agreed to expand their discussion at the next meeting of the State Advisory Commission on Higher Education.49

Apparently, Edwards and Turner enjoyed a cordial relationship. Both schools were land-grant, militarily oriented, and had a large agricultural initiative. Both were obligated to maintain the status quo, and, at the same time, both recognized the inevitability of changes in the bi-racial system. Their action mirrored the American dilemma on race. Whereas Edwards strategized to prevent desegregation, Turner was forced to facilitate a policy of accommodation and appeasement to ensure continued state funding. As the president of South Carolina’s only black, state-supported college, his status as a racial leader was predicated on his continued deference to white leadership. Like Edwards, he probably welcomed Gantt’s suit as the best approach to the situation.

After the suit, Edwards caucused several times with Vickery, McClure, and attorney Watkins, to prepare a motion to dismiss the case and to organize a list of all applicants to the School of Architecture since January 1961. Like attorney Watkins, Edwards regarded Gantt’s law suit as “an attack,” and was probably amused by Gantt’s letter to McClure to ascertain the status of his application. Meanwhile, there was much work to do. Edwards counseled Vickery about his planned deposition to Gantt’s attorney at 10:00 a.m. on August 16, 1962 in Anderson. Also, Edwards announced that Gantt’s desegregation hearing was scheduled in Greenville on August 22nd before Judge C.C. Wyche.50 It should be noted that a deposition is not a trial. Ironically on the appointed date of Gantt’s desegregation hearing, blacks were served at lunch counters in Eckerd’s and Walgreen’s drug stores in downtown Columbia. Meanwhile, at the opposite end of the state, Gantt’s hearing for a permanent injunction enjoining the college from refusing to act expeditiously to admit black applicants opened calmly. In response to Perry’s request, Judge Wyche abandoned his policy of oral arguments by the attorneys and agreed to accept witnesses. Somewhat caustically, he asserted to
Perry, “… you had the nerve to send me a proposed order for setting this hearing.” President Edwards was the first witness, and he testified for forty-five minutes. Edwards was questioned at length about the college’s admission procedure. He noted that Gantt’s application had arrived “too late” to meet the “cut-off” date for transfer applicants and his Board scores were “unavailable.” Additionally, he testified that the college had “no policy” in regard to black applicants. Moreover, Edwards noted, “the college had never received a completed application from a Negro.” A good deal of discussion was devoted to the absence of Gantt’s design portfolio.

On September 6, 1962, Judge Wyche rejected Gantt’s petition for a preliminary injunction against Clemson largely because of Gantt’s incomplete application. “The plaintiff,” he wrote, “must await the development of all relevant and material facts.” He asserted that “the award of an interlocutory injunction by courts of equity has never been regarded as strictly a matter of rights.” “An injunction,” he continued, “is not predicated upon an anticipated determination of issues of fact or questions of law.” He rejected Gantt’s charge of discrimination because fifty-one other transfer students had been denied admission to Clemson as well.

After Wyche’s decision, Edwards’ office was inundated with letters of support and bombarded with requests for speaking engagements. He was literally and figuratively as “Mary,” a Rock Hill, South Carolina resident noted, a man “besieged.” Church congregations, civic groups, and alumni chapters organized letter-writing campaigns. And like “Willie,” a 1943 Clemson alumnus, they favored peaceful desegregation to avoid adverse “world-wide publicity.” Many letters referenced the Bible as a justification for segregation and condemned the NAACP. A medical doctor and Clemson alumnus (class of 1944) recognized the inevitably of desegregation; nevertheless, he wrote, “I loathe the thought of Clemson being integrated.” Another writer urged Edwards to “stand up,” while another asserted that “our right to segregate is just as constitutional as the desire of Negroes to integrate.” A letter from an Inglewood, California resident mirrored the above perspective. He defined the Gantt case as simply, “States Rights…. Why don’t you accept him,” he argued, and then let student “mistreatment” cause him to withdraw? His remarks were atypical, however. Collectively, both before and after Gantt’s admission, Clemson’s students expressed no strong opposition to desegregation. Interestingly, however, after two enrolled students suggested “peaceful integration,” Vickery “pulled up” their transcripts.

After Judge Wyche’s decision, Gantt returned to Iowa State. His attorney, Matthew Perry, announced plans to appeal the case, and President Edwards fortified his defenses. He sent copies of Judge Wyche’s order to Board members, prominent state senators, and white college presidents. He manipulated the media and the student newspaper, The Tiger. He exhibited optimism so as to perpetuate a sense of surety and confidence within the community. Edwards used a local radio address to explain Judge Wyche’s decision, to direct public opinion, and to debunk “rumors of race mixing.” “We are going to follow the policies of this state,” he declared. And in response to a query from Willie A. Collins (class of 1943) of Bennettsville, he wrote, “I shall…preserve the dignity and fine reputation of Clemson College at all times.” He promised Collins, as he did the radio listeners, to keep them “abreast” of the facts at all
times.

At this point, Edwards knew that powerful state officials and the public regarded him as the bulwark against what attorney Watkins termed, Gantt’s “assault.” Symbolically, the resident’s fingers were in the dam, and his foot was locked onto the gate. He was not only a father figure, but a statesman, intellectual, and counselor. He was a social magnet for the state, and a receptacle for disenchanted students and alumni.

Gantt appeared before the U.S. 4th Circuit Court of Appeals in Alexandria, Virginia on September 25 and October 5, 1962. His attorney, Mrs. Constance Baker Motley of the NAACP’s Legal Defense Fund out of New York, argued the case. She characterized Gantt as “well-qualified” and contended that Clemson injected race as a factor to deny him admission. The “obvious” discrimination was a separate black college in Orangeburg (South Carolina A&M), and South Carolina’s “out-of-state” tuition grants for black students. The “obvious” discrimination challenged the constitutionality of the 1954 Brown desegregation decision and the “due process … equal protection” clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. Clemson’s only defense, she asserted, is the absence of Gantt’s portfolio which is not a requirement for admission, but rather a means to assign transfer students to a specific class. Motley asked the court to admit Gantt immediately.

Clemson’s legal defense was clear, swift, and decisive. The college quickly dismissed race as an issue in its denial of admission to Gantt. The college countered that Gantt’s application was “incomplete,” and that was why he was rejected. Furthermore, Gantt’s application was “processed … in precisely the same manner” as fifty-one other transfer students. Clemson argued that the delay, which disadvantaged Gantt, was his culpability. Accordingly, his request for “quick” admission should be dismissed. Also, despite Gantt’s absent portfolio, Clemson had approved the transfer of sixty-seven quarter hours after a “careful” examination of his two-year Iowa transcript. Gantt’s grade point average was solid, but Iowa’s core curriculum in architecture was dissimilar to Clemson’s.

The three-member federal court in Alexandria acted quickly. On October 5, 1962, the court did two things: first it “directed” that the case be “promptly” tried “on the merits” by a Direct Court. But, whereas Clemson was “prepared” for trial, the NAACP advised the court of its unreadiness. The Court then ruled that “the decision on the “Motion for a Preliminary Injunction” be withheld for the present.” The case was later scheduled for trial on its “merits” in the District Court in Anderson on Nov. 19, 1962.

Presumably, the court acted quickly because it was influenced by the bloodshed, mob violence, and troop-enforced desegregation at the University of Mississippi in September of 1962. Also, South Carolina was the last state within the former Confederacy to withstand the federal assault on school segregation. This was the first court action to force the desegregation of South Carolina’s state-supported white colleges. At the time, all public schools within the state were segregated as well. Additionally in Oct. 1962, five desegregation cases were before the U.S. Supreme Court and all involved the public schools of South Carolina. One case involved the NAACP’s attempt to desegregate the public elementary schools in Clarendon County, South Carolina. The U.S. Supreme Court’s historic Brown decision of 1954, emanated in part from Clarendon.
ably, all of the above flowed through the judges’ minds as they debated the Gantt case in Alexandria.59

Edwards was convinced that the court favored Clemson because of Gantt’s “incomplete” application and because his application was processed “precisely” as the other transfer students. Moreover, he concluded, “Harvey Gantt is being used by the NAACP” to desegregate Clemson.60 His prophecy was indeed correct. The NAACP needed Gantt’s case and others similarly situated to highlight social injustices and to pressure President John F. Kennedy for a strong civil-rights bill. Also, at this time (1962), the Student Non-violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) and the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE) had deflected financial support from the NAACP with sit-ins, freedom rides, and massive voter-registration campaigns in Mississippi and the Deep South.

Additionally, Martin Luther King’s Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC), activist Malcolm X, and the Black Panther Party (BPP) functioned as alternatives to the NAACP’s legal accommodationist approach. Thus, the Gantt case was multifaceted. It was just one of many that the NAACP used to demonstrate that it was the pre-eminent civil rights organization in America and the best equipped to empower and to re-enfranchise the black community. Equally important, South Carolina’s public-school system remained segregated even though Clarendon County had been locked into the historic Brown decision of 1954. The Clarendon case, incidentally, was one of five across the country in this historic class-action suit. The Brown-Clarendon decision was the legal basis of Gantt’s suit inasmuch as he used race and the “due process … equal protection” clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. Meanwhile, whereas the crisis over desegregation had sparked mob violence in Little Rock, Athens, and Oxford, Mississippi, Edwards was “determined” not “to allow a Mississippi situation to develop in South Carolina.” He probably applauded an Atlanta Constitution editorial titled, “No Paratroopers, Please,” and a prayer group from Greenville’s Buncombe Street Methodist Church, who urged Edwards to meet with Negro leaders and “settle the situation … intelligently and amicably.”61

Undoubtedly, Edwards was sensitive not only to newspaper editorials and prayer groups but also to the opinions of Senators Gressette, Brown, and former Governor Byrnes. They recognized that Gantt’s suit was the “strongest” desegregation suit filed in the state since the 1954 Brown decision. After enforced desegregation sparked violence at the University of Georgia, they debated the admission of Gantt. But, the governor and “high-placed” state officials “bluntly” rejected the idea. Fearing hostile media and public reaction if the state appeared to capitulate to the despised NAACP, they insisted upon continuing the legal debate. Meanwhile after violence closed the University of Georgia in 1961, Clemson officials organized what the Atlanta Journal-Constitution termed, “a detailed plan” to prevent violence and “to avoid adverse publicity” as well.62 Apparently, the flurry of segregation legislation enacted by the Gressette Committee was part of that planned strategy to prevent violence. Everyone recognized the inevitability of defeat in the Gantt case, but, as the Journal-Constitution noted, each state has to have its own crisis and its own particular twist.63

In late October 1962, Edwards, Watkins, and various state officials began to prepare for Gantt’s late November trial. Edwards mailed “pertinent information” and pleaded with the Board to attend
the Friday, Oct. 26th meeting. “This is the last meeting before the trial,” he noted; “the Board needs precise understanding.” He acknowledged that he was both “anxious” and worried. At the meeting, the Board designated the law firm of Watkins, Vandiver, Freeman and Kirvey to represent Clemson in the Gantt case. Despite a request for a preliminary injunction in two district courts (Anderson and Alexandria, Virginia), and an important pending trial, the official Board minutes only referenced the Gantt case. The Board either went into executive session or sanitized their papers, but the papers of R. C. Edwards, Brown, Gressette, and Byrnes provide an insight into the debate. Before and during the October meeting, the Board debated intensely Perry’s petition to grant attorney Constance Motley the authority to examine all student admission records. Edwards, Watkins, Byrnes and others objected. They favored “restricted reasonable bounds” for a pretrial motion for what is termed, “Discovery of Evidence.”

A few days after Perry’s request, Clemson capitulated, and Judge Wyche accepted Perry’s motion. Although Judge Wyche supported Perry, he sympathized with Clemson. Watkins, and Wyche exchanged numerous phone calls over the weekend. Judge Wyche expressed the “… propriety of excluding Motley.” He feared a complaint of an absence of “fair treatment” to the District court. Watkins agreed. “I feel I should not disagree with Judge Wyche,” Watkins lamented. Also, Watkins was reluctant to assume a position that seemed, in his exact words, “advantageous.” Meanwhile, Perry’s position angered Edwards. He was “amazed” at the leverage accorded the NAACP attorneys in the previous case and in prior legal arguments before the court. Nevertheless, he reasoned, “We must uphold the Constitution … despite the terrible predicament.” He saw enforced desegregation as a ruse by the federal government to enhance the “centralization of power” in Washington. Speaking to posterity, he asserted that America is a nation of law, that if Harvey Gantt, or any other qualified Negroes are admitted to Clemson, he wrote, they will be treated fairly and equitably.

Within days of Edwards’ remarks on Thursday, November 1st at 10 a.m., Vickery and McClure met Gantt’s attorneys in Tillman Hall for a deposition. Attorney Sampson was the lead attorney; Professor Harlan Ewart McClure was the first witness. He stated that the School of Architecture had 180 students, “no quotas,” and provisionally accepted students “without portfolio.” Sampson remembered that Gantt was rejected because his application was “incomplete.” Attorney Sampson’s reaction was both sharp and intense. “Is the question of admission different from the question of classification,” he asked? McClure replied, “the two matters are intertwined.” McClure asserted that architecture students were treated “separately” and subjected to “separate hurdles … above and beyond” the general college population, which was and remains the case. Sampson’s queries to McClure about provisional acceptance and preferential treatment sparked a heated exchange. Sampson revealed that the wife of a new faculty member from Florida was administered a “Special Emergency Exam” and accepted provisionally within weeks of her application to the school of architecture.” “I know nothing about that,” McClure snapped.

Attorney Sampson questioned Clemson’s alleged discriminatory admissions policy. Although Gantt’s curriculum at Iowa State was accredited,
McClure admitted that Clemson accepted students from non-accredited curriculums. “Is Gantt qualified?” he asked. “Assuming other factors are in line,” McClure retorted. The word “other” probably angered Sampson. McClure explained that the absence of an interview and a portfolio was infused with intangible issues such as “motivation, ethical standards, and talent.” Also, McClure referenced Gantt’s “satisfactory” College Board scores. He saw what he characterized as “a discrepancy” between the Board scores and the transcript, but there was none. Moreover, McClure wondered why Gantt was interested in Clemson. He noted that Iowa State’s architecture curriculum was unlike Clemson’s. Also, the registrar had accepted only sixty-seven hours and had reclassified him as a probable freshman. (Iowa State was on a quarter system at the time.) Gantt faced what McClure termed “a hardship” because his curriculum courses were out of sequence.69

After lunch, Motley questioned Vickery with the same degree of intensity Sampson used towards McClure. Vickery admitted that “no written policy” existed for the deadline for transfer applications and that the word “canceled” was not used in his August 31st letter to Gantt. Accordingly, Motley quizzed him about the “other” requirements for admission. “Are there any good moral character requirements for admission that Harvey Gantt is unaware of,” she thundered. Vickery replied, “None.”70 Seemingly, Vickery disagreed with Motley’s aggressive style of questioning, and Motley objected to Vickery’s vagueness about the admissions policies. All of the participants in the deposition hearing knew that this phase was a precursor to the full trial in late November. They recognized that their words and deeds would set a legal precedent. And like Gantt, they were conscious of their place in history. All that remained was the final act in the drama, Nov.19, 1962.

After the deposition hearing, Gantt withdrew from Iowa State and returned to Charleston. He was optimistic because he anticipated a favorable ruling from Judge C. C. Wyche and a letter of acceptance from Clemson. But his dream had to be deferred until after the November trial in Anderson. On Nov. 19th, the Anderson Independent headlined in bold type, “Negro Begins Court Fight to Enter Clemson.” Judge Wyche established a stern courtroom decorum for the mixed audience of 150 spectators who packed the courthouse. He quickly dismissed Gantt’s suit as “class action,” which it was intended to be, declared the case an individual suit, and accepted the first witness, K.N. Vickery. Vickery repeated almost verbatim his testimony at the deposition hearing.

On the second day, a major development occurred. Attorney Motley, who was James Meredith’s attorney in Mississippi, linked Clemson’s suit with the Meredith case. “Our pending motions and strategy [were] fashioned after Mississippi,” Judge Perry recalled. But despite intense questioning, Motley failed to make what one reporter termed, “a dent,” in the defense. On the third day, Edwards recited almost verbatim his testimony before the deposition hearing.71 Attorneys waived oral arguments and instead filed written briefs. Meanwhile throughout the trial, Gantt chatted with several male students from Clemson. Seemingly, there was neither racial tension nor social anxiety at the trial.

On December 21, 1962, Judge C.C. Wyche issued one of the most important judicial decisions of his thirty-seven-year career. The seventy-seven-year-old jurist dismissed Gantt’s complaint because
“he failed to prove” that Clemson used the issue of race to deny him admission. Instead, Wyche wrote, “the plaintiff’s case is based upon circumstantial evidence.” Gantt neglected to comply with the rules and regulations of admittance. But, he continued, Clemson College can admit him “voluntarily” without violating any laws of the State of South Carolina. “Existing laws,” he wrote, “do not specifically prohibit admittance.” He referenced the mandated state closing of state colleges in response to court-ordered desegregation decrees and out-of-state tuition grants. He characterized the statutes as “legislative-policy.” The objective, he said, was not to prohibit, but to discourage integration in state-supported colleges. He referenced the 1955 statute which authorized the Budget and Control Board to shut down colleges to avoid court-ordered desegregation. “Voluntary admittance is lawful,” he wrote. If a white transfer student from Iowa had pursued the same course, he noted, “I should not and would not enter an order to compel Clemson to admit him.”

Matthew Perry appealed Judge Wyche’s decision to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fourth Judicial Circuit on January 4, 1963. The appeal did not address any new legal issues. It is a summary of earlier arguments that were advanced at the hearings in August, September, October, and at the full trial in late November. The case was argued before the Court on Jan. 9th, and on January 16th, the Court “reversed” Judge Wyche’s decision. The court “remanded” the case to the United States District Court in Anderson and directed that Harvey Gantt be admitted to Clemson College starting January 28, 1963. As directed, Judge Wyche issued an order dated January 22nd which admitted Gantt to Clemson and further ordered that “the plaintiff recover from the defendants [Clemson] his costs of this action.”

Two days later, the Clemson Board gathered at the Wade Hampton Hotel in Columbia. Edwards lamented, “The college has exhausted all legal remedies.” Attorney Watkins had appealed Judge Wyche’s “Enforcement Order” to Chief Justice Earl Warren of the U.S. Supreme Court. It was quickly returned labeled, “Denied, E.W.” At that time, the Board then unanimously adopted a series of “Recommendations” to maintain “law, order, peace, and dignity.” Edwards later ordered that the recommendations be posted throughout the campus. He sent letters to all students to assert that he would not tolerate misbehavior, and threatened suspension from the college for any who disagreed.

Matthew Perry drove Gantt to Clemson on January 28, 1963 and arrived on campus at 1:33 p.m. The whole world was watching. A black custodian who watched quietly within a crowd of two hundred national and international reporters best summarized the events. He said, “Nothing happened.” Thus, one of the most significant events in the history of school desegregation ended without incident.

Why did Clemson College integrate with dignity while her sister institutions succumbed to violence? One reason might be what is termed the South Carolinians’ historic “uniqueness, courtly manners, distinctive character, and their Blue Blood Heritage.” But a more solid, immediate, and important explanation was Governor Ernest Hollings’ “Farewell Address” to the state legislature in January 1963. Unlike Mississippi’s Governor Ross Barnett, Hollings calmly and deliberately counseled dignity and restraint. “We are running out of courts, we are running out of appeals, and time,” he lamented. “That speech,” noted, former Gover-
nor John West, and Senator T. Allen Legare “set the tone and atmosphere” for compliance with desegregation. Also, South Carolina’s new Governor, Donald Russell mustered public support for “orderly conduct.” “With an intense expression” on his face, he asserted to U.S. Attorney General, Robert F. Kennedy that South Carolina neither “needed nor wanted” federal help to maintain law and order.”

Another reason for “Integration with Dignity” was President R. C. Edwards and Harvey Gantt. Edwards and Gantt were pioneers. Both recognized the inevitability of change and each fought uniquely to accomplish his mission. Edwards knew that changes were coming in the bi-racial system; thus, he evolved a strategy of dignity and restraint.

Equally important, he recognized that the Gressette Committee was segregationist, “unwise … and vindictive” and a disadvantage to black Carolinians. If the committee was indeed a safety valve, it should have ventilated less forcefully. On the flip-side, the committee was a magnet to white supremacists. Thus, unlike Mississippi, which relied upon custom and tradition, the Gressette Committee unwittingly prevented various groups from fractionalizing and competing for racial purity. Also, unlike Mississippi, Arkansas, and Georgia, Edwards did not politicize Gantt’s efforts to desegregate Clemson. He did not use Gantt as a platform to run for the Governorship or the Presidency. And he never succumbed to George Wallace’s theatrical and infamous “stand in the
school-house door.” Instead, he was a statesman and a diplomat.

An equally significant explanation for Clemson’s desegregation with dignity is Gantt himself, a person of integrity, whom Edwards respected for his intelligence. His attorney Matthew Perry is a person of honor and integrity as well. Although this was the civil rights era, he never invoked the militant rhetoric of the “black revolution.” Attorney Perry is a calm, deliberate, and meticulous legal scholar. He is a visionary and his patience laid the foundation for “Integration with Dignity.” For the record, Gantt desegregated Clemson.

Also for the record, contrary to published reports, Harvey Gantt was not the first black to desegregate South Carolina’s public schools. Gantt represented “the resumption of a process that was interrupted with the collapse of Reconstruction.”\(^77\) Blacks attended the University of South Carolina during Reconstruction (1865-1877), and in 1875 had more black students than white. Richard T. Greener, an African American, was a member of USC’s faculty, who was the first black graduate from Harvard in 1870 and later became a distinguished professor of philosophy at USC. Another black, Alonzo Gray Townsend of Sumter graduated with an A.B. in 1876, and was the school’s oldest living alumnus in 1936. (The school made a public search to honor its most venerable alumnus, but when it was discovered he was an African American, officials quietly canceled the celebration.) Mixed elementary schools briefly existed during Reconstruction. In 1895, white and black youths (probably mulatto) attended the same school in Charleston but were taught in separate classrooms.\(^78\)

Finally, these precedents are indicative of what historians term time and place. Clemson’s R. C. Edwards, Harvey Gantt, and Matthew Perry left a legacy of commitment, hope, and interracial goodwill, which Clemson has an obligation to continue. Harvey Gantt had a dream, and as an African-American scholar who has taught at Clemson for twenty years, I am a partial fulfillment of that dream.
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Clemson and Harvey Gantt

Dr. Jerome V. Reel, Jr.
University Historian
Clemson University
January 28, 1963, was an important day for the United States of America and for Clemson Agricultural College of South Carolina. One of the most memorable days in Clemson history, it stands as only one of a few days when an action taken at Clemson truly affected the nation. It was “integration day,” the day that the first public, traditionally-white institution in South Carolina since Reconstruction admitted an African-American student.

What made the day all the more important was that it culminated in some ways the more than two-decade legal struggle of African Americans for “civil rights.” While the battle itself was as old as the nation, even as old as European North America, the confluence of many streams swelled mightily with President Harry Truman’s executive order in 1948 ending racial segregation in the American military. In May 1954, the United States Supreme Court unanimously overturned its 1896 “Plessy versus Ferguson” decision permitting “separate but equal” treatment of the races.

For Clemson Agricultural College of South Carolina, the historical streams originated in a series of events as well. Thomas Green Clemson had founded the school by his will, which was drafted in 1886 and submitted for probate shortly after his death on April 6, 1888.

The will provided for the creation of a “high seminary of learning,” a school mindful of the needs of the agriculturally engaged citizens of South Carolina. Mr. Clemson also urged those who carried out the provisions of the will to model the new school after the Agricultural College of Mississippi, now Mississippi State University in Starkville. This recommendation and the Morrill Act’s stipulation (1862) that all land-grant colleges must teach military tactics, are why Clemson opened its doors as a military institution, which it remained until 1955. The will is remarkable for its time in that it made no restrictions on who might benefit from the institution; no restrictions on residency, gender, or race were included. The only other provision Mr. Clemson stipulated was the considerable authority he granted the school’s board of trustees. He established seven life trustees as a self-perpetuating corporation and provided that should the state accept his donation the legislature could name up to six additional members. The majority, therefore, would always rest with the life trustees.

After more than a year of political maneuvering and dispute, John Richardson, Governor of South Carolina, signed what has come to be known as the “Act of Acceptance” (November 27, 1889). Following this formality, it took slightly less than four years to build the college, hire the faculty, and design the curriculum. When the college opened for business, the president, the secretary-treasurer, fifteen faculty, a physician, and a janitor greeted four hundred forty-six students. (In the same year, the University of South Carolina in Columbia had about one hundred students.) Despite the latitude of the will, every student admitted was a white male from South Carolina, but the restrictions avoided by the will were there in force on July 6, 1893.

The residency restriction was relaxed as students from neighboring states started to enroll in the first decade of the twentieth century. But the all-male, all-white characteristics would remain for another half century or more. In fact, there were some, including Trustee and United States Senator Benjamin Ryan Tillman who declared that the composition and authority of the board was designed to guarantee racial separation. (Tillman Papers, CUL Special Collection)

By the 1950s, the Clemson Board of Trustees was convinced that the school needed to change if it was to remain useful to the state. Charles
Daniel, the industrialist-trustee, proposed hiring a management-consulting group, Cresap, McCormick and Paget, to make recommendations. In their report, the consultants urged ending gender segregation. The trustees adopted the recommendation because there was no restriction against women in the will. In the autumn of 1955, women were admitted to Clemson for the first time. But racial restrictions, required by the South Carolina Constitution of 1895, remained.

Yet at the same time, the civil rights movement was gaining momentum across the country. To counter this impetus, the South Carolina legislature established the “Gressette Committee” in an effort among other things to maintain racial separation in all South Carolina schools. Nevertheless in 1960, Harvey Gantt, an African-American high-school student from Charleston, applied to study architecture at Clemson, which was and is considered one of the leading undergraduate programs in the United States. By chance he met the civil rights lawyer, now Federal judge, Matthew Perry who remembered, “I met him when I was in Charleston handling a case that involved a student demonstration, and young Harvey Gantt and others were involved. He came up to me and said, ‘Hello. My name is Harvey Gantt. I’m going to be an architect. I want to go to school at what I understand is one of the finest schools of architecture in the country, Clemson College. But I understand [that] there might be a problem, and they tell me that I might not qualify because of the color of my skin.’ He wanted to know if he applied and was not accepted, whether I felt I could, nevertheless, try to get him in. In other states, we were reading about black students being admitted pursuant to court order. Just over in Georgia, there was the case of Charlene Hunter. There were other such cases … [for example,] down in Alabama. So, you see, he was mindful of what was going on around the country. So, he and I established our relationship right there. I immediately considered him a bright young man. People thereafter have said, ‘Well, you certainly chose a very fine, very bright young person. We didn’t choose Harvey Gantt. He found me.” (Interview of Reel and Michael Allsep with Matthew Perry, February 2000).

Harvey Gantt first wrote Clemson asking for the school catalog in 1959. He was, at that point, interested in four schools: Clemson, Howard, Iowa State, and Tuskegee. “[My] counselor at Burke High School pointed out that 99% of the people in this country who practice architecture are white, and you need to be trained at an institution where they are.” (Interview of Reel and Allsep with Gantt, January 2000.) Based upon his counselor’s advice, Gantt enrolled at Iowa State where the South Carolina Regional Education Board paid $149.51 per quarter (the difference in the cost between in-state and out-of-state tuition and fees) rather than permit him to attend Clemson, which had the only architecture program in the state. Gantt recalled, “It was only when I got [to Iowa] that I realized I didn’t want to be there. I realized I was a child of the South. It was the South where I wanted to be. It was only when I got there [that] I discovered kids who were going to graduate from the school . . . [and] go on to practice architecture in Iowa or maybe Illinois or Nebraska. I certainly didn’t want to stay there. It was January of 1961 when I decided [to apply to Clemson] after traipsing across to the physics class and freezing my nose in the 23 degree below zero weather. When I got back to my dorm, I said, ‘This is for the birds. There is no way I will stay here. I’m not used to this.’” So Gantt applied to transfer from Iowa State to Clemson. He remembered that the correspondence with Clemson was pleasant until the transcript from Burke High School, an all African-
American school in Charleston, arrived. The court records show that Gantt was not accepted at Clemson because his application was incomplete; it seems the most recent transcripts had not been sent by the Iowa school. Though the application was still incomplete, Gantt was, nevertheless, asked to come for an interview. Accompanying him on that initial visit was Timothy Cornelius Fludd, another prospective student, and Matthew Perry. Perry remembered, “... we did not go on campus. We fully understood that that would be inappropriate.” In June of 1962, it was too late to be admitted for the fall semester. Robert Cook Edwards, then the President of Clemson College remembered, “Let's look at the picture as it was at that time. Following the [1954] Supreme Court decision, the General Assembly of South Carolina became really concerned. The legislature created a committee, which became known as the “Gressette Committee.” The late state Senator Marion Gressette was the chairman.... A provision was written [and approved by the committee] that in the event of integration, funds would be stopped, and for all practical purposes, we would [have been] out of business. We would have been shut down. In June of 1962, Matthew Perry, attorney at that time, came to the campus with Harvey Gantt and Timothy Cornelius Fludd for their interview. I happened to be in Gaffney at the Peach Festival at that time. Dean Kenneth Vickery [Dean of Admissions and Registration] telephoned me and let me know what had happened. There had been enough correspondence over time with Harvey. Gantt was enrolled at that time at Iowa State, but he was determined to have a degree in architecture from Clemson.... We were boxed in as to what we could legally do.... Early on, I talked with state Senator Edgar Brown, the chairman of the [Clemson] Board of Trustees.... We all knew that Harvey Gantt was qualified for admission to Clemson. We recognized that we had to go through the judicial process, but we were going to go through it step by step...in the most positive way possible and accomplish everything we could with the least confusion at every step.” (Interview of Harry Durham with Robert C. Edwards, November 2002.)

The pace quickened significantly in the autumn of 1962. During the summer, Gantt had filed suit in court to gain admission. As the case moved from court to court five different times, Perry and Edwards took the measure of each other, each gaining the other's respect, a respect that would ultimately lead to friendship. Perry remembered that, “Based upon the Dr. Edwards that I came to know subsequently, I have to feel that Dr. Edwards would have gladly received Harvey Gantt had he not been operating under the [state's] restrictions.” Forty years after Gantt's admission, Dr. Edwards still feels that the integration of Clemson would have been unquestionably more difficult if Gantt and Perry had not been men of sterling character.

After the suit had been filed, the first ruling of Judge Cecil Wyche was that because Clemson did not have a complete application the school was not in violation of the law. Undeterred, Perry appealed to the Fourth Circuit Court in Richmond, which overturned the decision returning it to the lower court to try the case on merit. During Thanksgiving week, Justice Wyche ruled again in Clemson's favor. Like the first, that decision was appealed to the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals which overturned it. Clemson College’s lawyer, William L. Watkins, then took the case to the Supreme Court. In January, Chief Justice Earl Warren upheld the Circuit Court's ruling that Gantt should be admitted at the start of the next semester. As Chief Justice Earl Warren emerged from a barber shop, he was handed Clemson's appeal by Mr. Watkins. Warren read it and wrote, “Denied, E.
W.” The legal phase was over. Gantt would be admitted in the spring of 1963 with the blessing of the United States Supreme Court.

Having survived the terrible September of 1962 in Mississippi, President John F. Kennedy and Attorney General Robert Kennedy were very concerned about South Carolina. Senator Edgar Brown, as President of the Clemson College Board of Trustees, called on the Attorney General in Washington to assure him that civil order would be maintained because the Clemson administration had a plan for peace.

Indeed they did. Even before the legal actions had started, Edwards, given his commitments to the state and especially his commitment to Clemson, had begun the planning process. Dutifully, he met with the Clemson board and kept them apprised each step of the way. He discussed the impending change with faculty leaders, administrators, and student leaders, among them the President of the Student Body, Bill Hendrix. President Edwards arranged for the student leaders to meet in early October 1962. He explained the process that would be followed and told the students the issue would be settled in the courts. Hendrix, now a Life Trustee of Clemson University, remembered, “Dr. Edwards and Dean Cox were clear in the way they conveyed the coming events to us, about what was going to take place, and how we were going to deal with it. They made it clear that it was going to be a peaceful, appropriate academic acceptance for our first African-American student.” (Interview of Harry Durham with Bill Hendrix, October 25, 2002.) The business leadership of the state through Charles Daniel, the construction magnate, and John Cauthen, Director of the Textile Management Association, were also kept well informed. Governor Ernest Hollings, then in the last months of his term, was firm in his support of Dr. Edwards’s plan. Edwards also visited with Donald Russell, the governor-elect who was similarly supportive. One of Dr. Edwards’s decisions was to issue 4,300 students, nearly 2,000 staff members, and 400 faculty members a picture...
In order to keep strangers from coming on campus and causing trouble, each person had to be photographed and put on a laminated I.D. card. Jim Burns, who was in charge of Clemson photography, remembered, “We had to photograph each one of them and put the picture on a laminated I.D. card to keep strangers from coming on campus [and causing] trouble. (Interview of Harry Durham with Jim Burns, December 2002.) Burns was also asked by Edwards to be the primary contact with the State Constabulary (now known as the State Law Enforcement Division or SLED) because he had been an officer in the Greenville Police Department since 1946. (Interview of Harry Durham with Jim Burns, December 2002.) Through his work in Greenville, Burns got to know Peter Strom, SLED’s director, very well, so it was both a useful and most appropriate contact. Burns was also assigned to work with the press covering Gantt’s arrival.

Finally, the planned-for day arrived. Matthew Perry remembered, “The morning of the trip to Clemson, I met in the office of the State Attorney General first and then in the Office of the Governor. This was when I was given the written itinerary that I have come to know that Dr. Edwards authored.” When Perry was asked if there was a fear that an effort would be made to stop the process on the 120-mile drive from Columbia to Clemson, he commented, “We were being preceded up the road by highway patrolmen as much as a half mile or more away, we were being followed … by another such officer, and we were being monitored from the air. We arrived in Greenville where at a prearranged place Mr. Gantt [Harvey’s father] and Reverend Blake [Harvey’s minister] got out of the vehicle, and we proceeded. The plan was to arrive at Clemson as close to 1:30 as possible. Harvey became aware that he and I were going to part company when he got out of my car at the administration building. The plan was for somebody … to escort me around to the dormitory where Gantt was to stay. Others were to remove his luggage from my vehicle, and I was instructed to exit the campus along a specified route. So Harvey knew that once he got out of my car, we would not see each other again, certainly not at the moment on that date. And the record will display that we arrived in front of [Tillman Hall] at 1:34 p.m.” Had the two men not stopped somewhere along U.S. 123 to allow Gantt an opportunity to make sure he had not forgotten his checkbook, they no doubt would have been precisely on time! (Interview of Reel and Allsep with Matthew Perry, February 2000).

As Gantt left Perry’s car, a select cadre of newsmen and photographers confronted him. About one hundred students were also in front of Tillman Hall, the central administration building. Other than the clicking of camera shutters, the scribbling of pencils and pens, the muffled voices of the journalists speaking into tape recorders, all were quiet and respectful. No epithets or taunts were shouted, no antagonizing signs displayed, no rocks thrown. All were quiet and respectful. Gantt entered the building with the statue of the founder, Thomas Green Clemson, behind him. Through the Romanesque archway at the base of the bell tower and into the hall, Gantt moved with an escort of college officials towards the registrar’s office. A few journalists of each medium followed in his wake. He matriculated, wrote a check for his tuition and fees, gave a brief interview to the press, and walked three blocks to the office of Harlan McClure, dean of Clemson’s School of Architecture and a highly regarded architect himself. McClure, many years later, remembered that Harvey was polite and reserved as he presented his transcript and the catalog from Iowa State for course evaluation. Normally this duty is performed by the student’s faculty advisor, but Dr. Edwards was determined that there would be no mistakes.
Harvey Gantt answers questions from the press, January 28, 1963

Harvey Gantt consults with Dean Harlan McClure, January 28, 1963
It would be wrong, however, to suggest that there were no problems. During the months of preparation for Gantt’s admission, several crude “hate” letters were received by the administration. Furthermore, a spate of Ku Klux Klan rallies took place around the state. Former Governor Ernest B. Fritz Hollings remembered, “It began the day I was inaugurated. I will never forget walking back up [to the State House and finding], a green [and] gold embossed envelope on my desk. I had [been given] a lifetime membership to the Grand Klavern of the Klan. I got hold of Peter Strom and asked if we had many Ku Klux Klan [members] in this state because I had never run into it.” He said, “We sure have. We have got 1687 members.” I said, “Well, let’s get rid of them.” He said, “You are the first governor that is willing to do it.” Strom told Hollings that there had been weekly meetings of the Klan, including Klansmen from North Carolina. Hollings continued, “So I had to control that group, and then I moved on from there. I knew where the trouble would come from, and I moved with the university authorities. There is none better than Dr. Edwards, himself. He and I were, of course, friends. [As the chief state law enforcement officer, however] I was in charge. We were not going to have any of that nonsense that they had at Oxford, Mississippi, and the other college campuses. Bobby Kennedy and I were two of ‘Ten Young Men of the Year’ back in 1954, [so] we were close friends. I told Robert, ‘Don’t be sending marshals running around here starting news stories about all the trouble we are going to have.’” (Interview of Harry Durham with Ernest B. Hollings, December 2002.) Fortunately—and for whatever reason—the Federal government did take a hands-off approach in South Carolina.

The press was also something of an unpredictable element. At that time, Clemson College owned and operated the Clemson House, a pleasant eight-story brick hotel with Tillman Hall and Bowman Field directly down the hill. The press corps was encouraged to stay in the Clemson House, and, from them, a small pool of journalists was accredited to be on campus at any one time. Before the event, there was a briefing set up by Joe Sherman and the College News Services staff. Governor Hollings told the journalists, “. . . the primary function here is education, but you will have Harvey Gantt [to interview] when he comes on campus . . .” (Interview of Harry Durham with Ernest F. Hollings, December 2002). Sherman met with the media on the Sunday evening before Gantt’s arrival. Telephone lines for the press were
set up in the Clemson House basement and lounge. On the evening of the 28th when the Gantt enrollment was complete, Dr. Edwards recalled that, “Everything went off precisely and beautifully....” (Interview of Harry Durham with Robert C. Edwards, December 2002). Edwards has long given much of the credit for the success in handling the media, and tempering public opinion, to Wayne Freeman, editor of the Greenville News.

The day ended without trouble, but that is not the end of the story. After Gantt registered, President Edwards shook his hand and welcomed him into the Clemson family. Gantt commented that because of the administration's firmness, there were no altercations. Just to be safe, Gantt was followed for a few months by young SLED agents. He remembered, “I recall an architecture buddy of mine faking a fight just to see what would happen. [We wanted to] see whether or not there would be people coming out of the woodwork and sure enough they were still there....One afternoon after a football game [in the fall of 1963], some students were inebriated, and somebody on the fourth or fifth floor of [Johnstone dormitory] ... yelled out something to the effect, ‘Nigger, go home.’ [But this was] definitely not the pattern at all.”

After a few days had gone by, Bill Hendrix, the former student-body president, and his close friend, Joe Swann, now a Clemson trustee, went to call on Harvey. “We went by and met him and introduced ourselves and had a brief talk. After that, I really never crossed paths with him very often. He was in the architecture department where the students stayed basically by themselves.”

On weekends, Anna Reid and other members of the Clemson African-American community offered Harvey a taste of home. He became involved with the Golden View Baptist Church, and Mrs. Reid remembered, “He joined the adult choir and he just sang.” In 2003, Gantt publicly acknowledged his debt to the Clemson staff, especially the African-American custodians, gardeners, and cafeteria line workers who always had a kind word, a smile, or an extra helping for their young hero.

In the fall semester of 1963, a few more African-American students enrolled in Clemson. Among them was mathematics major, Lucinda Brawley. She and Harvey met, began to date, and fell in love. Ronnie Estes was one of the new students admitted that year. Estes recalled that, “Lucinda and I became friendly, and she sometimes
rode on the back of my motor scooter. Eventually [however] she and Harvey got together.”

In his conversation in January of 2003 with Harry Durham, President Edwards remembered that a reporter asked, “Do you consider this to be a great day for Clemson?” Edwards said to the reporter, “I simply stated that as far as I was concerned, we are happy that things occurred as they have, and we'll let future generations determine whether this was the greatest day in the life of this institution” (interview of Harry Durham with Robert C. Edwards, November 2002).

Forty years have gone by. More than a generation has passed. The racial violence associated with the civil rights movements has had a profound effect on the conscience of America. It is not too much to see in the people and the events surrounding Harvey Gantt’s peaceful entrance into Clemson a new direction. Clemson Agricultural College of South Carolina’s peaceful and purposeful response to one of America’s greatest challenges was a turning point in the long struggle for civil rights. South Carolina’s response to one of its greatest challenges was a great day for Clemson, a great day for South Carolina, and a great day for the United States.

Thanks to the Honorable Matthew J. Perry and Harvey Gantt for interviews provided to me and to my research assistant, Michael Allsep; to Robert C. Edwards for various interviews provided by Dr. Donald McKale and Harry Durham; to Kenneth Vickery for an interview provided to McKale, and to research assistants, Michael Allsep, John Robinson, and Andrew Land, all while students at Clemson. Thanks also to Mrs. Barbara Rogers, my administrative assistant for her special support.
Afterword

Dr. Skip Eisiminger
Professor of English and Humanities
Clemson University
I keep copies of two photographs in my office. They help to keep me grounded, so I pull them from the files with some regularity. One was taken in 1939 and shows a poor black Louisiana mother home-schooling her two sons. Was there no public school for her attentive pupils? The six and seven-year-old boys sit on hard-bottom chairs (there are no desks), as their thirty-something mother sternly points a stick at the day’s reading lesson white-washed on a rectangle of black fabric pinned to a wall that’s been papered over in newsprint. The lesson reads in its entirety, “The rain are fallin.” Below that sentence are the numerals and the alphabet—essentially a code consisting of thirty-six ciphers the boys may have a hard time cracking given the limitations of their tutor and the shortcomings of their classroom.

The other photograph shows the legendary Clemson English professor John Lane advising a uniformed cadet across his cluttered desk in 1943. The setting is most likely Tillman Hall. As Lane expounds upon honor, a word written large on the chalkboard behind them, his advisee pauses in his note taking and cocks his head to look his mentor squarely in the eye. Also on the board is a list of grammatical errors and their precise consequences: “‘its’ for ‘it’s’ = 8 points. . . . ‘Dear Sir,’ = 10 points. . . . sentence fragment = 15 points. . . .” There’s no telling what penalty the honorable professor would have imposed on “The rain are fallin.” There’s no telling because the two worlds, black and white seldom intersected.

When Harvey Gantt entered Clemson College in 1963, people like Professor Lane, the sons of his well-advised cadet, and people like me who entered the albescent halls of Georgia Tech in 1959, were forced to pay attention. As a college freshman, I was so naïve about race I thought college presidents were virtual gods, men and women like President Edward Everett of Harvard who with heroic virtue said in 1848, “If this boy [an African-American applicant] passes the examination, he will be admitted, and if the white students choose to withdraw, all the income of the college will be devoted to his education.”

Harvey Gantt, who’d been arrested for trying to buy a soda at a whites’-only lunch counter in Charleston before he ever came to Clemson, would surely have understood how absurdly innocent I was. Gantt may also have read that John C. Calhoun, on whose former plantation Clemson University now sprawls, once wrote, “Show me a nigger who can do a problem in Euclid or parse a Greek verb, and I’ll admit he’s a human being.” Doubtless Gantt had heard of the famed Plessy v. Ferguson case settled in 1896 because for nearly sixty years this had been the principal stumbling block to Gantt’s ancestors coming to Clemson.

“Plessy” eventually made its way to the high court because there was some doubt in the lower courts that “separate” in the real world did not mean “equal.” The high court ruled 7-1 that there was no confusion at all. Mr. Plessy, who was seven-eighths of a white man himself, had purchased a ticket to ride in a Louisiana railroad car, but he was forced to take a seat in the “Jim Crow car” even if it was used to haul cattle when African-Americans didn’t fill it up. Young Mr. Gantt may also have heard of Cumming v. Board of Education of Richmond County, Georgia (1899), another deathless decision from the country’s highest court. “Cumming” ruled that separate educational facilities were permissible even when there were no facilities available to black students. One didn’t need Euclid to figure that decision would not hold.
water or logic much less justice. I don’t know, but I like to think Gantt knew that Ben Tillman, one of Clemson’s founding fathers, a former governor of the state and Clemson life trustee, once threatened, “The Negro must remain subordinate or be exterminated.” And finally I feel sure Gantt knew that Strom Thurmond, a Clemson graduate, former governor and candidate for the US Presidency, had opposed federal anti-lynching legislation. Yet for all this foreknowledge present in the Zeitgeist of the 1950s and 60s, to everyone’s astonishment, including Clemson President Robert Edwards and his registrar, Kenneth Vickery, Gantt felt he was entitled to pursue an education at Clemson College. What an unexpected and remarkable conclusion! Nevertheless, though Gantt’s parents had faithfully paid their state taxes, a gambling man would not have granted their son very favorable odds. Despite two years worth of foot-dragging, looking the other way, occasional rudenesses, and ultimately futile legal gambits by Clemson’s administration, Gantt enrolled and succeeded beyond anyone’s dreams.

Indeed, it’s a wonder that Gantt ever arrived on Tillman’s granite steps. Between 1882 and 1952 an estimated 2000 African Americans were lynched in the South. In 1949 South Carolina spent an average of $148 per white student and $70 per black student. In 1940, South Carolina awarded 10,717 diplomas to whites and 1,009 to blacks when the population was 57% white, 43% black. (Where is Euclid when you need him?) In Gantt’s hometown, a black nanny could push her precious white charge through the park, but she was not permitted to take a seat on a park bench. Indeed the Battery was off-limits to African Americans every day except the Fourth of July when blacks were invited into the city’s “salon” to celebrate independence. They just couldn’t sit down; Harry Golden called it “vertical integration.” Up in Winston-Salem, Wake Forest admitted their first black student in 1962. Because of a “shortage” of black students in North Carolina, however, Wake’s board of trustees chose a Baptist from Ghana to break the color barrier. In South Carolina’s capital, the police stretched chains down the middle of some inner-city streets to keep the races apart. Over in Lake City, Ronald McNair, the future American astronaut with a Ph. D. in physics, was denied access to the town’s library. Today the same building is a museum in McNair’s honor. The next time Greenville County builds a library they ought to name it after their native son Jesse Jackson, who was likewise denied access to books and magazines. He and his civilly disobedient cohorts were repaid for their attempts to educate themselves by having their names and addresses printed in the Greenville News. Surely the KKK appreciated the secretarial assistance. Indeed, every African American of Gantt’s era has a sheaf of Jim Crow stories. Appalled by tales such as these, Bill Mauldin, the famed political cartoonist, sketched a black character carrying a shotgun-toting white man on his shoulders through a swamp. Says the soaked black man to his wet white burden: “You ain’t gaining much altitude holding me down.”

There’s a story of an anonymous Jewish rabbi telling an anonymous African American during the Civil Rights Era, “Don’t wait for people to love you.” Harvey Gantt seems to have taken that advice to heart when he entered Clemson. Wise, he realized that he wasn’t in a popularity contest. Once he was admitted, he buckled down to his studies and graduated with honors within two years. From here, he went to MIT to earn a Masters in architecture. After graduation, he
returned to the South and established his own business while teaching part-time at Clemson. Fortunately, there were no hard feelings. Ultimately he rose to become mayor of one of the most progressive cities in the South—Charlotte, North Carolina, and to make a run for the US Senate. No one will be surprised if he makes another bid for the legislature sometime in the future.

In 1993, on the thirtieth anniversary of his admission to Clemson, Harvey Gantt told a considerable audience gathered in Littlejohn Coliseum, “In 1963, Clemson was a large salt shaker with a single fleck of pepper; that was me. Tonight it is a pleasure to look out over this salt-and-pepper audience. There has been progress!” He was especially thankful, he said, for the cafeteria line workers, custodians, gardeners, indeed, the entire black community of Clemson who at the time gave him “daily courage.” It is a shame that it took courage for anyone to matriculate at this institution, but it did. It’s a shame Clemson’s registrar didn’t welcome Gantt’s application to Clemson, but he didn’t. It’s a shame that admitting Gantt in 1961 would have broken a state law, but it would. It’s a shame that President Edwards and Dean Vickery didn’t become advocates for Gantt, but they didn’t. And it’s a shame that it took five court cases to allow Gantt to continue his education, but it did. “Human history is a race between education and catastrophe,” wrote H. G. Wells. On January 28, 1963, in Harvey Gantt’s preliminary contest at least, education won. It wasn’t “ebony and ivory... in perfect harmony,” à la Paul McCartney and Stevie Wonder. It was something far more complex: a paradox. Had Clemson won its appeal to the Supreme Court, it would have lost; but in losing, it won. To his credit, President Edwards saw Clemson’s loss as an opportunity to begin anew, and we did.
Appendix
S. C. State A. & M. College
Orangeburg, South Carolina
April 26, 1948

Dr. Robert Franklin Poole, President,
Clemson Agricultural College
Clemson, South Carolina

Dear Dr. Poole:

Do to the fact that I cannot get a complete course of training in Architectural Engineering, leading to the Master degree at the S. C. State A. & M. College, I am making application to you in this form to enter Clemson College in September, 1948.

I am a junior at the S. C. State A. & M. College, and I would like to make the necessary steps now so I can be accepted in a graduate school when I complete the course I am now pursuing at the S. C. State A. & M. College.

An early reply would be very much appreciated.

Very truly yours,
June 18, 1948

Mr. Spencer M. Bracey
S. C. State Agricultural and Mechanical College
Orangeburg, South Carolina

Dear Sir:

Your letter of application for admission to The
Clemson Agricultural College has been given careful con-
sideration by the Board of Trustees of this institution
in a meeting held today. In accordance with the decision
of the Board of Trustees I have been instructed to send
you this reply.

On the date of receipt of your letter of application
the college had already received applications for admission
in September 1948 far in excess of all available facilities
and for this reason your application cannot be considered
for admission to the September class.

The Board of Trustees feels that it is only fair,
however, to say that in as much as you are now attending
a land-grant college where comparable facilities are avail-
able for taking the Architectural Engineering course, which
you desire, your application for admission to The Clemson
Agricultural College would not be favorably considered even
at a later date.

We understand it to be the well-established policy
of this state to furnish separate and comparable facilities
for the education of the white and Negro races within the
state. As long as this policy is maintained the Board of
Trustees of this institution does not feel that it has the
right to consider the application of a Negro student for
admission to a white institution.

Very truly yours,

R. F. Pool, President

(A similar letter was written to Mr. Edward Bracey.)
INTEGRATION WITH DIGNITY

South Carolina State Conference of N. A. A. C. P.
STATE OFFICE
P. O. Box 1145, Columbia, S. C.

April 29th, 1948
President's Office

Dr. Robert Franklin Fools, President,
Clemson Agricultural College
Clemson, South Carolina.

Dear Dr. Fools:

Contrary to a statement over the radio attributed to you, the State Conference of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, never communicated with, saw, or even knew Mr. Spencer Tracy, who applied to Clemson College. Mr. Tracy's letter was written at S. C. State A. & M. College, Orangeburg, dated April 26th, 1948, & only a copy came to us. His application was as much a surprise to us, as to you.

The National Association is interested however in seeing South Carolina give Negroes the same opportunities in education as it gives to whites.

I send this letter that you may be clear in your thinking, how Mr. Tracy filed his application.

Thanking you for your attention to this letter.

Very truly yours,
Clemson College
Office of Admissions
Clemson, S.C.

Dear Sir:

I would like to obtain a bulletin on your school of engineering. I am interested in a degree in architecture; therefore, I would like to obtain all necessary information such as expenses, prescribed courses, requirements, etc., for that subject.

I am a high school student here in Charleston and I expect to graduate in 1960. I am definitely interested in a course in Architecture and I am considering your school as a possibility.

Will you please send this information as soon as possible? It will be greatly appreciated.

Yours truly,

Harvey Smith
Office of Registrar
Clemson College
Clemson, South Carolina

Dear Sir:

Will you please send me a bulletin for the 1960-61 school year. I should like the bulletin to include the different curriculums and the cost of attending Clemson for one year. Also, I am asking that you send me some applications for admission next semester or the fall of 61.

If possible, may I have this information by the 20th of November. Thank you for your cooperation.

Yours Truly,
Harvey Baunt
PLEAS PRINT

Name of Student HARVEY BERNARD GANT
(First Name) (Middle Name) (Last Name)
Parent or Guardian MR. & MRS. CHRISTOPHER GANT
(First Name) (Middle Name) (Last Name)
Mail Address 111 CANNON STREET
(City) (State) CHARLESTON
(P. O. Box, B.P. or Street) (County)

The Clemson Agricultural College

NEW STUDENT APPLICATION

Name and Address of High School Attended (Name) BURKE HIGH SCHOOL
(City) CHARLESTON (State) CHARLESTON
(Country)
Date of graduation JUNE 1960 Date you desire to enter Clemson SEP'T 1961
(Month) (Year) (Month) (Year)
Have you attended college? YES If so, give the name and address of the institution you attended IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY AMES, IOWA Date last attended 1960 - 61

If you are currently enrolled in another college give date present quarter or semester ends 1960 - 61 WINTER QUARTER

Date of birth 1/14/43 Place of birth CHARLESTON Sex M Race N

Occupation of Parent or Guardian RIGGER MECHANIC

Have you served in the Armed Forces of the United States? NO If so, give Service No.

Dates of Service 19_ to 19_
(Month) (Month)

If church member, what is your denomination? BAPTIST If not member, what preference?

Indicate the major course you desire to take ARCHITECTURE

Do you wish a place reserved for you in the dormitories? Yes No

Signature HARVEY GANT

For Office Use

E
M
EE

Transcript Received

Accepted

IBM Code

Student Number
High School
State
County
Entrance Date
Student Status

For Office Use

Birth
Parent's
Occup. Veteran
Status
Marital
Status
Church
Pref.
Major
Pref.
Residence
Sex

Card Received

Plate Cut

Letter Mailed

63
4433 Lincoln House  
Friley Hall  
Iowa State University  
Ames, Iowa  
February , 1961

Mr. K. N. Wickery  
Registrar  
Clemson College  
Clemson, South Carolina

Dear Mr. Wickery:

I have received your letter of January 19, 1961 in which you returned my application for entrance as a student to Clemson in September, 1961.

It is true that I have been receiving assistance from the South Carolina Regional Education Board representing the difference in cost between in-State and out-of-State enrollment. However, I especially wish to attend Clemson College. Since I am a citizen of South Carolina, and since Clemson is a State supported institution, I believe I have a right to attend Clemson College.

In view of the foregoing, I am herewith returning my application and am requesting that it be processed for entry as a student in September, 1961.

I shall appreciate hearing from you as soon as possible.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

Harvey B. Gantt
4433 Lincoln House
Friley Hall
Iowa State University
Ames, Iowa
November 13, 1961

Mr. K. N. Vickery
Registrar
Clemson College
Clemson, South Carolina

Dear Mr. Vickery:

I have received your letter of October 13, 1961. When I received your form letter dated August 31, 1961 I got the impression that my application was still being considered. However, your letter of October 13, 1961 seems to indicate that my application has been cancelled.

I do wish to enter Clemson as soon as possible. Since I have already applied for admission, it seems that my original application would be enough and I am asking that you consider it an application for the next ensuing and subsequent semesters and school terms. However, if this is not possible, please send me an appropriate application form in order that I may file it without any further delay.

I shall appreciate hearing from you as soon as possible.

Very truly yours,

Harvey B. Gantt

Harvey B. Gantt

Application card mailed 11-22-61
4433 Lincoln House
Friley Hall
Iowa State University
Ames, Iowa
December 6, 1961

Mr. K. N. Vickery, Registrar
Clemson College
Clemson, South Carolina

Dear Mr. Vickery:

In accordance with your instructions, I have completed the application form which you recently forwarded to me and am herewith returning it to your office. I will cause a copy of my transcript of work to be completed during the present period at Iowa State University as soon as it is ended. I will also obtain a statement from the appropriate officials of Iowa State University concerning my eligibility to return to that institution.

In the event this application is not processed in time for the beginning of the next semester at Clemson, please consider it an application for the next ensuing and subsequent semester or school term and that it be considered a continuing application. As I have stated to you in several previous letters, I am very desirous of attending Clemson College. I therefore urge that this application be given prompt attention.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

Harvey B. Gantt
APPENDIX

WESTERN UNION
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K N VICKERY REGISTRAR
CLEMSON COLLEGE CLEMSON SOCAR

AM INFORMED TRANSCRIPT OF MY GRADES FORWARD TO YOUR
OFFICE JUNE 13 1962 REQUEST MY APPLICATION TO CLEMSON
BE FAVORABLY CONSIDERED AND I BE GIVEN INTERVIEW
IMMEDIATELY REPLY WITHIN 48 HOURS PLEASE

=HARVEY B CANTT 111 CANNON S CHARLESTON SC=437PM

THE COMPANY WILL APPRECIATE SUGGESTIONS FROM ITS PATRONS CONCERNING ITS SERVICE

WESTERN UNION
TELEGRAM

June 28, 1962

Mr. Harvey B. Canttt
III Cannon Street
Charleston, S. C.

Retel June 26. Transcript received. Your application along with all others pending completion is being processed in manner we advised during your visit to this office on June 13. You will be advised date for interview as soon as other details relative to your application have been completed.

K. N. Vickery
Director of Admissions and Registration

THE COMPANY WILL APPRECIATE SUGGESTIONS FROM ITS PATRONS CONCERNING ITS SERVICE
Congress of the United States
House of Representatives
Washington, D.C.
January 25, 1963

Dr. Robert C. Edwards
President, Clemson College
Clemson, South Carolina

Dear Bob:

Nice talking with you. Here is a copy of the letter I delivered to the President a moment ago. I wish you much luck next week.

Millie joins me in much pride in your administration and in your many accomplishments.

Sincerely,

Wm. Jennings Bryan Dorn, M.C.

D/o
Mr. President,

The Clemson situation will be handled in such a way as to reflect honor upon local officials and the State of S.C. I assured you last Dec. This would be 30a. I have the utmost confidence in Dr. Bob Edwards, Clemson's Board of Trustees, the student body and in my people.

In the spirit of my telephone conversation with you I have refrained from any public comment whatsoever. I am grateful for the restraint on the part of the Federal Government. I hope you can visit Clemson someday. Respectfully -- Bryan Dorn
United States District Court
FOR THE
WESTERN DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

HARVEY B. GANTT, a minor, by his father and
next friend, CHRISTOPHER GANTT, 

vs.

THE CLEMSON AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE OF SOUTH CAROLINA, a public body corporate; R.W. COOPER, etc., 

Plaintiffs

To ROBERT C. EDWARDS

Defendants

YOU ARE HEREBY COMMANDED to appear in the United States District Court for the
Western District of South Carolina,
at United States Courthouse in the city of Anderson, S.C.,
on the 19th day of November, 1962, at 3:00 o'clock P.M. to testify on
behalf of the Defendants
in the above entitled action.

November 16, 1962

Attorney for the Defendants
Anderson, South Carolina

RETURN ON SERVICE

Received this subpoena at and on at
I served it on the within named
by delivering a copy to h and tendering to h the fee for one day's attendance and the
mileage allowed by law.¹

Dated_________________________, 19__________

By______________________________

Service Fees
Travel $__________
Services $__________
Total $__________

Due and legal service of the within Subpoena hereby accepted
Subscribed and sworn to before me, this
day of November, 1962.

NOTE: Affidavit required only if service is made by a person other than a United States Marshal or his Deputy.
¹ Fees and mileage need not be tendered to the witness upon service of a subpoena issued in behalf of the United States or an officer or agency thereof. 28 USC 1958.
IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
ANDERSON DIVISION

HARVEY B. GANTT, a minor, by his father
and next friend, CHRISTOPHER GANTT,

Plaintiffs,

-vs-

THE CLEMSON AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE OF SOUTH
CAROLINA, a public body corporate; R. M.
COOPER, President of the Board of Trustees
of The Clemson Agricultural College of
South Carolina; EDGAR A. BROWN, JAMES F.
BYRNEs, CHARLES E. DANIEL, WINCHESTER SMITH,
ROBERT R. COKER, JAMES G. SELF, ROBERT L.
STODDARD, PAUL QUATTLEBAUM, JR., W. GORDON
McCabe, JR., W. A. BARNETTE, A. M. QUATTLE-
BAUM and L. D. HOLMES, Members of the Board
of Trustees of The Clemson Agricultural Col-
lege; KENNETH N. VICKERY, Registrar of The
Clemson Agricultural College of South Caro-
olina; and J. T. ANDERSON, Superintendent of
Education of the State of South Carolina,

Defendants.

The Defendants, answering the Complaint, allege:

1. The jurisdiction of this Court is acknowledged.

2. It is admitted that The Clemson Agricultural College
of South Carolina is a body corporate under South Carolina law and
that the individual Defendants hold the respective offices as al-
leged except that Robert L. Stoddard resigned as a Member of the
Board of Trustees of Clemson College upon his election as Mayor of
the City of Spartanburg, South Carolina, and that W. A. Barnette is
deceased; that no successors to them have been elected and that the
eleven (11) others named in the Complaint compose the Board of
Trustees of Clemson College as now constituted.
IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

--------
ANDERSON DIVISION

Harvey B. Gantt, a minor, by his father
and next friend, Christopher Gantt,
Plaintiff,

The Clemson Agricultural College of South
Carolina, a public body corporate; R. M.
Cooper, President of the Board of Trustees
of the Clemson Agricultural College of
South Carolina; Edgar A. Brown, James F.
Byrnes, Charles E. Daniel, Winchester Smith,
Robert R. Coker, James C. Self, Paul
Quattlebaum, Jr., W. Gordon McCabe, Jr.,
A. M. Quattlebaum and L. D. Holmes, Members
of the Board of Trustees of the Clemson
Agricultural College; Kenneth N. Vickery,
Registrar of the Clemson Agricultural College
of South Carolina,

Defendants.

ORDER IN COMPLIANCE
WITH THE OPINION, ORDER
AND MANDATE OF THE
UNITED STATES COURT OF
APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH
CIRCUIT

The above case is now before me on the Opinion, Mandate and Order of the
Court of Appeals of the Fourth Circuit wherein the Court of Appeals declared in
its Opinion that "Gantt's admission to Clemson College commencing with the
opening of the next semester, will be ordered, **. The injunctive order will
require only that he be treated as any other transfer student.

** The action was brought by the plaintiff not only for his own benefit
but on behalf of other negro citizens of South Carolina similarly situated.

****

"Accordingly, the issuance of an injunction will be ordered.

"Reversed and remanded."

The Order and Mandate of the Court of Appeals is as follows:
'CAUSE No. 8871 came on to be heard on the motion of the appellees to dismiss the appeal and on the record from the United States District Court for the Western District of South Carolina, and was argued by counsel.'

'ON CONSIDERATION WHEREOF, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the order of the said District Court entered December 21, 1962, and appealed from December 26, 1962, in cause No. 8871, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the United States District Court for the Western District of South Carolina, at Anderson, for proceedings consistent with the opinion of the Court filed herein; that the appeal from the order of September 6, 1962, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed; and that the costs on the appeals be paid by the appellees.'

'FURTHER ORDERED that a certified copy of this decree and a copy of the opinion be forthwith transmitted to the Clerk of the United States District Court for the Western District of South Carolina. January 16, 1963.'

'Therefore, in compliance with the Opinion, the Order and the Mandate of the Court of Appeals of the Fourth Circuit,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, That the defendants admit the plaintiff Harvey B. Gantt to Clemson College "commencing with the opening of the next semester" and that "he be treated as any other transfer student".

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, That the defendants be enjoined and restrained from discriminating against the plaintiff or any other qualified negro applicant similarly situated seeking admission to The Clemson Agricultural College of South Carolina, solely because of his race.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, That the plaintiff recover from the defendants his costs of this action.

/s/
G. G. WYCHE
United States District Judge

Dated:
Spartanburg, South Carolina,

January 22, 1963
October 1, 1962

Dr. R. C. Edwards, President
Clemson College
Clemson, S. C.

Dear Dr. Edwards:

As an alumnus of Clemson College, I would like to support the opinion that I have heard expressed by other Clemson alumni and loyal South Carolinians, in regards to school integration.

I sincerely hope that South Carolina will not get involved in any such affair as Mississippi has just experienced. It has been proved that you can not win. I hate to see integration in Clemson and other schools of South Carolina, but resisting is playing into the hands of the NAACP by giving world-wide publicity. If Clemson must be integrated, as it appears it will be, please do so quietly and without any publicity if possible - even to omitting any mention of it in the local school paper. Just notify the Clemson alumni through the letters of the Alumni Association.

I believe that you, Clemson Trustees, the Governor of South Carolina, and South Carolinians in general prefer not to experience what Mississippi has experienced and still lose.

Sincerely yours,

P. S. No reply necessary
Dear Sir,

We are in Calif. think the South is putting up such beautiful resistance to Federal law. We do not regard this issue as racial but as a states rights issue. But you're bound to lose. Physical power you can not resist.

So I have a suggestion (be quiet read)

Where a negro is going to enter Clemson
Why don't you accept him. Then let the students treat him so coldly, make it so rough on him he would prefer not to go or stay in college and maybe he would just disappear.

We do not regard the Supreme Court as the law of the land. Our Constitution is the law of the land. Education does not come under Federal jurisdiction according to our Constitution. Though the way they dealt with Barnett,a hearing, legality means nothing to them. This is all merely pretense and the legal tool to get across to the rest of the states where there is no such thing as a sovereign State left in these United States —

Sincerely,

Dean of Clemson College
Spartanburg, South Carolina
CONCERNED CLEMSON ALUMNI
P. O. BOX 268
Greenville, South Carolina
November 30, 1962

Dear Clemson Man:

We have been informed that you are being "conditioned" to accept racial integration at Clemson. Integration is COMMUNISM IN ACTION and is one of the most potent weapons being used in the Red cold war to take over America. The Commies know that forced integration will stir up discord and violence to weaken our country's resistance.

Contrary to the Supreme Court's ruling, racial integration in schools and colleges is not the "law of the land". Article Six of our U. S. Constitution, Section 2, states: "This Constitution, and the laws of the United States ... and all treaties made ... shall be the supreme law of the land; ..." Only the Congress can make laws.

For forty years the Communists, their allies, and their dupes have been conducting propaganda campaigns to promote racial integration in the U. S. A. Political leaders seeking negro votes are aiding pro-integration organizations. Great civilizations like Egypt, Rome and Portugal have collapsed from the mongrelization that followed integration. Much of this false propaganda has infiltrated schools, colleges and religious seminaries. J. Edgar Hoover, F. B. I. director, says that youth is "a prime target of Communist attack."

Our State leaders must stand up and exhaust every legal avenue before submitting to brute force and federal tyranny.

Should unconstitutional federal force finally thrust a negro student in your midst, we urge you to leave him alone; don't notice him; ostracize him and all those who associate with him. Do not resort to violence, for that is what the Commies want. Help Clemson remain true to her tradition.

Yours for a Better Clemson,
CONCERNED CLEMSON ALUMNI
New York City,
December 5, 1962

Mr. R.C. Edwards,
Sir:

You are now about to get the soft soap treatment by the northern press. You know a typical "Time" headline. The ugly southern mob versus the freight, eject Negro off your belf for this and admit a Negro, then you will be guilty of bringing about a future way of life in the South which is now prevalent in N.Y.C.
Rape, murder, mugging, dope, deserted streets. All ascetic values fall by the wayside. Don't be a naive, intellectual do-gooder. You'll rue the day you experienced.
January 16, 1963

President of Clemson College
Clemson, South Carolina

Dear Sir:

May I please express to you the feelings of pride and respect that I felt for your students as they answered the press on a very controversial matter. They spoke with intelligence, quiet dignity, and a sense of democratic fair play.

I am a teacher, a Southerner, fully aware of the complex problems, but I feel that young people like those at Clemson can show us the way.

My heartiest good wishes for Clemson College.

Sincerely,
January 29, 1963

Friends,

If the American people, both Negro and white, wanted integration, they would have readily adopted and accepted it many years ago.

Keep faith with -

MAJORITY RULE.

Rev. C. F. Candler, Minister
Hopewell Baptist Church
Route 3
Seneca

Called to express for himself and his members their appreciation of your leadership as President of the College in this difficult time. They sincerely admire you and offer their support.
Clemson College
Clemson, South Carolina

January 28, 1963

To All Clemson Students:

This is a continuation of our policy to keep you fully informed of events that affect the college and you as members of our student body.

The Federal Courts have ruled that Harvey Gantt is to be admitted to Clemson College and the Board of Trustees has directed the Clemson administration to comply and to employ all of the means at the disposal of the college to preserve the orderly operation of the total educational program of the college and to preserve law and order upon the campus and the peace and dignity of the institution. The faculty and administration of Clemson College have confidence in the intelligence and integrity of our students and expect them to exercise good judgment.

The sole purpose justifying the existence of Clemson College is a program of education. Your only reason for being at Clemson is for the purpose of obtaining an education. You are expected to continue to carry out the duties of a mature student as you pursue this objective. Calmness and good judgment on the part of all concerned are necessary. Counseling, advising and frank discussion will solve most problems. Lawlessness and disorder will no more be tolerated on the Clemson campus in the future than it has been in the past. Please do not let idle curiosity allow you to become involved in a situation in which you have no connection or responsibility.

We would like to call the following two points to your attention:

1. You will carry your identification card at all times. Student government officers, student hall supervisors and members of the college faculty and staff have the authority to ask you to exhibit it.

2. If in the event of any disorder you are in the library, or in the classroom, or in your residence hall you should remain there. Otherwise you should go to your residence hall and remain. When it appears that the situation has returned to normal, resume your routine activities.

Reporters and photographers from many agencies will undoubtedly be here. Of course the college has no intention and no desire to impose censorship. However, to hold the disruption of college activities to a minimum, newsmen have been instructed to report and to register at a press headquarters at the Clemson House. They will not be permitted to go into dormitories, classrooms or other campus areas except upon arrangements made with the Director of Public Relations. Student interviews will be arranged and conducted only at press headquarters. The college will permit no "press
conferences or posed photographs on the college campus except by arrangements made by the Director of Public Relations.

Clemson College enjoys an enviable reputation as an educational institution, and none of us want anything to occur which could reflect unfavorably on the college, the Clemson Student Body and the Citizens of South Carolina. Your understanding of the importance of this fact and your fullest cooperation during this period is anticipated. I know from experience we can count on your help.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Walter Cox
Dean

Harvey Gantt and Walter Cox, 1988
This issue strikes the first roll of drums proclaiming organized resistance to the forces of racial integration on the Clemson College Campus. It will introduce the voice of the REBEL UNDERGROUND.

The REBEL UNDERGROUND is composed of students on the Clemson Campus who are unwilling to accept integration as "inevitable." We believe with the CONCERNED ALUMNI that integration is Communism in action. There is ample documentary evidence to prove this. RU opposes Communism in its entirety—this naturally includes integration.

We deeply resent the attempts by Clemson officials to depict us as indifferent and too preoccupied with "grades" to be concerned over such important matters as States Rights, Racial Integrity or the menace of the Communist conspiracy.

We must necessarily work underground due to the police state methods of the race-mixers, but we want the people of South Carolina and throughout the United States to know that every Clemson student is not a "lizard sleeping in the sun." If our elders are too cowardly to stand up to this evil, then young and old must part company.

College ministers have attempted to make integration synonymous with Christianity, but this does not make it so. They claim to know God's will in this matter, but why should we believe that God reveals His will to integrationists more so than to others? We might change our course of study from ceramics to Bible in order to make better grades, but this would not make us holy, nor endow us with divine wisdom.

By making a public statement to the effect that he would go along with integration, Dan has betrayed a trust. We challenge Dan to answer this question fairly: Have you made your living from Clemson students, or Clemson officials? Of course, the students have patronized your business, not the liberal, integrationist administration. When Dan was asked to shoot off his mouth he should have answered, "I will not, for any reason, conspire against my friends." By speaking out he aided the integrationists—and we shall act accordingly, even if we must walk a little farther.

Clemson Men, is there anything you will fight for? Is there any principle worth defending? Do you truly believe that apathy is the same as "law and order?"

RU members are fighting for the Southern way of life. RU is defending the principle of Racial Integrity. We appeal to fellow students not only at Clemson, but throughout South Carolina to join this movement against integration.

WE URGE THE ORGANIZATION OF REBEL UNDERGROUND TEAMS AND UNITS ON EVERY FLOOR OF EVERY DORMITORY. When you have to be allowed to protest, you have lost your right to protest.

BEWARE OF STUDENT INFORMERS! Be sure you know who you are talking to. There are those who are acting as segregationists only to gather information for the rabid race-mixers in high places.

FORCED INTEGRATION IS NOT INTEGRATION AT ALL. Refuse to accept it in your heart, and it will never be a fact.

LOOK FOR THE NEXT EDITION OF REBEL UNDERGROUND.

READ AND PASS ON
Editorial

Two Points Of View

It would be silly for the Alumni News to imply, by omission, that no mail has been received in relation to the admission of Harvey Gantt, a Negro, to Clemson. There has been mail—and a great deal of it. A lot came from alumni, a lot came from friends of Clemson, a lot came from total strangers.

Presented below are two letters that are completely typical of all received. In the interest of accurate evaluation, it should be noted that letters of the type written by Bill McDonald, Jr., outweigh the second type by something approximating 75 to 1.

—Joe Sherman

---

Johnson City, Tenn.
February 6, 1963

Dear Joe:

I should like to take this means of extending congratulations for the outstanding job Clemson did in regard to the enrollment of Harvey Gantt at Clemson.

It is regrettable that this integration was forced upon the College, but the conduct of the administration and staff in a difficult and trying situation has reflected great credit upon all of you and has raised the prestige of Clemson to new heights. That this enrollment was unwelcome and unpopular makes all the more impressive the excellent handling of a ticklish and explosive situation.

Many people in this area, some of whom seem to derive their greatest pleasure in life from razzing me whenever the Tigers suffer a reversal in sports, have gone out of their way to express their great admiration for the honor and dignity with which Clemson took care of a situation which it did not at all like. Clemson’s untiring efforts have presented to the nation a true picture of the great stature of Clemson, and today it is more than ever a source of pride to be known as a Clemson Man.

Again congratulations on a job well done, and best wishes for the future.

Cordially,

William A. McDonald, Jr., ’61

---

Sumter, S. C.
February 6, 1963

Dear Joe:

I enclose nothing as an alumni gift as long as you have a nigger at Clemson.

Unsigned

Clemson Alumni News
Clemson Integrates

The governor of South Carolina is entitled to that drink from the governor of North Carolina — or anybody else. His calm, deliberate pledge that his state would accept the court order for Clemson College to integrate, and would attempt to do so without violence, was in sharp contrast to the strutting, rabble-rousing speeches made by Mississippi’s governor.

There could be little doubt, in listening to his words, but that the South Carolina governor is as deeply and sincerely opposed to integration as his Southern neighbor. But he chose to meet his responsibilities maturely and with dignity. The students of Clemson responded in kind.

We cannot expect that there will be no incidents at all at the South Carolina state land grant institution. This is asking too much of human nature. But the South can learn a good deal from the dignity and maturity with which Clemson student leaders, their college officials and the governor himself responded. This will, at least, not be another Mississippi — and the two institutions will wind up with the same number of Negro students enrolled.
Clemson Bows To The Law

Negro student Harvey Gantt, a transfer student from Iowa State University in Ames, was quietly enrolled at Clemson College in Columbia, S. C. Monday.

Uniformed highway patrolmen were on hand but Clemson students accepted enrollment of their first Negro with laughs and jokes rather than insults. Gantt was the first Negro to enter a segregated South Carolina school on any level.

President Robert C. Edwards of Clemson said, "It is an historic day for South Carolina—whether it's a great day we will let the historians say later."

South Carolina authorities and most white people of the state do not like the move. They have accepted it. They are bowing to the law.

In doing so they are furnishing a good example to officials, people and students of Mississippi who defied laws so disgracefully when James Meredith was admitted to the University of Mississippi a few months ago and to those of Alabama where a new governor has been trying to act like Jefferson Davis.

Good Show, South Carolina and Clemson College!

Though segregationist by sentiment, South Carolina has bowed to the rulings of the courts and the demands of common sense in admitting to Clemson College the first Negro ever to attend that state institution.

The dignified manner in which officials and students of Clemson accepted Harvey Gantt was an admirable contrast to the sorry scenes at the University of Mississippi last fall.

Are the young men of South Carolina any different than the youth of Mississippi? Of course not. The difference was in example. The governor and legislative leaders of the Palmetto State found it “distasteful” to desegregate the college, but bowed to the rulings of the courts and called for the citizens to do likewise. There were no incidents. The shame of Ole Miss also could have been avoided if Governor Ross Barnett and his colleagues had adopted a similar approach.

Some in the South may feel that Monday was a sad day in South Carolina. For our part, we are proud to welcome that state to the Union.

Davenport, Iowa Democrat newspaper article, January 29, 1963

Bellingham newspaper article, January 29, 1963
The Contrasts At Clemson

The contrast is heartening between the way South Carolina authorities met their obvious responsibilities and the way the Mississippi authorities avoided theirs in their historic integration tests.

The legal barriers against Negroes in America are down. The traditional barriers are giving in to the justice involved; custom is waging a rearguard fight. But when South Carolina's Clemson College admitted a young Negro who wants to become an architect, the most disturbance on campus was that caused by the 150-man press corps there to report the story.

At Clemson, law and order prevailed. There were no defiant cries from elected officials; there were no mobs summoned to the scene; there were no costly moves of Federal troops onto the campus; and, so far, the Negro student has been allowed essentially the same privileges that any other citizen gets. That is all he is entitled to, of course, but he is entitled to that.

San Antonio (TX) Express article, January 30, 1963
Footnotes To History

Clemson College
S.C.

Greensboro Daily News
'South Carolina Done Seceded From The South, Boy'
—Dear Ol’ Golden Rule Days—
From The Courier-Journal