

**Harvey Gantt
and the Desegregation
of Clemson University,
1960-1963**

Dr. H. Lewis Suggs
Professor of American History
Clemson University

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 Agricul-

tural 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.³

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.⁴

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."⁵

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."⁶

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 house wife, 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

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 activi-



Black employee at President Edwards' House, 1961

ties 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



Clemson students, 1962

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



Harcombe Cafeteria, 1962

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



Rat Hop, 1961

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.”¹⁸

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.¹⁹

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.²⁰

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.²¹

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.”²²

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.



Edgar A. Brown

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 desegre-

gate 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,



Kenneth Vickery

“I request entry in September, 1961.” Vickery acknowledged receipt and placed Gantt’s application with other “pending transfer applications.”²³

But Vickery’s reluctance to take more direct action prompted a letter of inquiry on April 26, 1961. A few days later, the registrar sent identical letters to both Gantt and Fludd which read, “no applications from any prospective transfer students have been processed.” On May 29, 1961, Gantt informed Vickery that he was leaving Iowa for Charleston and would be available for an on-campus interview. “I shall be glad to travel to Clemson,” he wrote. Instead of an invitation to

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.”²⁴

On June 19, the registrar received Gantt’s transcripts from Iowa State indicating he had earned a B plus average for the year. His College Board scores arrived the last of August. 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.²⁵

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.”²⁶

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.²⁷

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.”²⁸

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.”²⁹

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.³⁰

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.³¹

Edwards recognized the inevitability of change for Clemson. The media depicted him as the pre-eminent 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 de-

lay. 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 derailed

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 Charlestonsians 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 1962.³⁷ 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."³⁸

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.³⁹

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 13th 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 26th 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 13th, 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 admittance," 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 19th 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.⁵¹ 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.⁵²

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 inevitability 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.⁵³

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.⁵⁴

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.⁵⁵

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.⁵⁶ Gantt's grade point average was solid, but Iowa's core curriculum in architecture was dissimilar to Clemson's.⁵⁷

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."⁵⁸ 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. Unquestion-

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.⁶⁴ 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.”⁶⁵

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.”⁶⁶ 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 rea-

soned, “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.⁶⁷

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.⁶⁸

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.⁷² 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.”⁷³ 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-



Harvey Gantt leaving the Registrar's office, January 28, 1963

nor John West, and Senator T. Allen Legare “set the tone and atmosphere” for compliance with desegregation.⁷⁴ 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.⁷⁵

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.⁷⁶ 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.

NOTES

¹ For a larger discussion of Thomas Clemson, see “The Founder: Thomas Green Clemson, 1807-1888,” the first chapter in Donald McKale, *Tradition: A History of the Presidency of Clemson University* (Macon, GA: Mercer Univ. Press, 1988), pp. 5-18; *Tiger*, February 15, 1963; *Progress Report 1960-1961*, The Personal Papers of Edgar Brown, Folder 418.

² *Ibid.* Extract from minutes of the Board of Trustees Meeting of June 18, 1948; Office of Admissions and Registration, Folder 99.

³ Wright Bryan, *Clemson: An Informal History of the University* (South Carolina: Bryan, 1979), p. 100; Term paper, D. Bartlett, *Cadet Life At Clemson College During the Early Military Years, 1893-1924*, p. 8. Term paper for History 314, the American South (p. 8), Dr. Lewis Suggs.

⁴ Tinsley E. Yarbrough, *A Passion for Justice: J. Waites Waring and Civil Rights*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1987); Feature, “Waring says outside assistance needed to solve racial problems of the south,” Charleston (SC) *News and Courier*, Oct. 14, 1948; Office of Admissions and Registration, Folder 99; H. Lewis Suggs, *P. B. Young, Newspaperman: Race, Politics, and Journalism in the New South, 1910-1962* (Charlottesville, VA: Univ. of Virginia Press, 1988).

⁵ “Policy Statement from G.E. Metz, Registrar, to Board of Trustees, “What to do about Negro Applicants,” Papers of admissions and registration, Folder 99.

⁶ *Ibid.*

⁷ *Ibid.*

⁸ *Ibid.*

⁹ Letter, Poole to George Chalmers McDermid, Charleston, SC, May 4, 1948; Letter from Daniel R. Moorner (class of 1940) to

Poole, April 29, 1948; see also Extracts, Board Minutes, June 18, 1948.

¹⁰ Letter from Poole to Spencer Bracey, June 18, 1948; Papers of Admission and Registration, Folder 99.

¹¹ Clippings, “Negro Soldier Hopes to Enter Clemson Without Going to Court,” (n.d.), “Negro Soldier Does Not Plan Court Action,” (n.d.), “Clemson Has Application From Negro” (n.d.), *Greenville News* (n.d.); Papers of Admission and Registration, Folder 99.

¹² Editorial, “Gainey’s Choice: Education or Notoriety,” *Greenville News* (n.d.).

¹³ *Ibid.*

¹⁴ Papers of Admissions and Registration, Series 10, Folder 99; see Series 10, Box 7, Folder 99, for Berry’s letter to Gantt on July 21, 1959.

¹⁵ Confidential letter from Senator T. Allen Legare to Senate Pro Tempore, Edgar Brown, Jan. 16, 1961.

¹⁶ Interview, Judge Mathew Perry, Federal Courthouse, Columbia, SC, Dec. 2002; Charleston, March 8, 2003.

¹⁷ Records Court, the Charleston, SC, Police Report, No. 62063 and 62060, April 19, 1960. For a larger discussion of the 1960’s sit-in demonstrations, see William H. Chafe, *Civilities and Civil Rights: Greensboro, North Carolina, and the Black Struggle for Freedom* (New York: Oxford, 1980). For civil rights movement in SC, see Jack Bass, *Orangeburg Massacre* (1970); Cleveland Sellers (now USC professor), *The River of No Return* (1973). Gantt, Fludd and 27 other Burke students arrested.

¹⁸ Letter from Vickery to Hendrix, Office of the President, R. C. Edwards, Correspondence, 1959-1965, Series 11, Folders 188-190.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*; Fludd wrote a second letter on January 10, 1961 and filed an application for the Sept. 1961 term on January 29, 1961. Edwards used Jan. 30th date in letter to Senator Gressette.

²⁰ Papers, Office of the President, R. C. Edwards, Correspondence, 1959-1963, Series 11, Folders 188-190; see also Papers Office of Admissions and Registration, Folder L-416.

²¹ William A. Dunning, *Reconstruction, Political and Economic* (1903). The thesis of Dunning’s book is that radical rule foisted upon the South a decade of malignant rule. Dunning, more so than any other historian of the period, fostered and perpetuated the image of Negro inferiority. See also Paul Gaston, *The New South Creed* (1970).

²² Letter from T. Allen Legare to Edgar A. Brown, January 16, 1961, MS 91, folder L-420; Letter sent to Edwards who scribbled a note to Watkins, “hold for future reference.” Brown, President Pro Tempore of Senate. Legare interviewed, March 8, 2003, Citadel Conference, Charleston, SC.

²³ Papers, Office of Admissions and Registration, Folder 99; see Series 10, Box 7, for K. N. Vickery’s response to Gantt’s application, made on Feb. 17, 1961.

²⁴ Brown Papers, MS, 91, Folder L-416; Office of Admissions and Registration, Records 1893-1970, Series 10, Box 7 and Box 99.

²⁵ *Clemson College Newsletter*, August 1, 1962, Vol. 1, No. 21. President Edwards noted to Senator Gressette on July 14th that Gantt and Fludd were scheduled to take the College Board on June 29th. Since Gantt spent 1960-1961 at Iowa State, it’s safe to assume he was asked to retake College Entrance Board Examination.

²⁶ Clemson College Officials Say “No Comment” on Negro Students,” *The Journal and Tribune*, March 8, 1961; Letter from L. Richard Rhame, Mgr., WTND Radio, to K. N. Vickery, June 20, 1961. Earl Black, *Southern Governors and Civil Rights* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press, 1976), p. 80.

²⁷ Papers of Edgar Brown, Letter Edwards to Brown, June 6, 1961; Edwards to Senator Gressette, June 26, 1961; Letter, Edwards to Senator Gressette, July 14, 1961, Folder L-416.

²⁸ *Ibid.* The typical letter is in the Edwards Papers, Office of the President, Correspondence 1959-1965, Series 11, Folder 214.

²⁹ Papers of R. C. Edwards, Series 11, Folder 188. The words “file Negro” are etched in the corner on most of the original correspondence that relate to the Gantt case. See letter from Rebecca McConnelly, Admin. Sec. State Regional Education Board, to R.C. Edwards, Sept. 26, 1961, for verification of data on out-of-state funding. Legare interview, March 8, 2003.

³⁰ Edward Papers, Extract from Minutes of June 5, 1961 Board Meeting folder L-4116. The move to adopt was made by Paul Quattlebaum, and seconded by A. M. Quattlebaum.

³¹ Extract from the minutes of the June 5, 1961 meeting of the Board of Trustees of Clemson Agricultural College.” Folder L-416.

³² Letter from Vickery to Gantt, August 31, 1961, Office of Admission and Registration, Series 10, Box 7; Personal Papers of Edgar Brown, MS 91, Folder L-416.

³³ Letter from Rebecca M. Connelly, Admin. Sec., SC Regional Educational Board, to Dr. Robert C. Edwards, Sept. 26, 1961 The personal papers of R.C. Edwards, Sept. 26, 1961, Thurmond Institute.

³⁴ Letter, President Edwards to Senator L.M. Gressette, Sept. 2, 1961 Brown papers, Folder L- 411.

³⁵ Letters from Gantt and Fludd to Vickery, Sept. 15, 1961. Brown Papers, Folder L-416.

³⁶ Letters from President Edwards to Senators Brown, Gressette, and Attorney Watkins, September 2, 4, 26, 1961. All in Brown Papers, Folders L-411 to L-416.

³⁷ Letters (identical) from Gantt and Fludd to Vickery, Nov. 13, 1961. Brown Papers, MS 91, Folder L-416.

³⁸ Letter from attorney Watkins to Edwards, Nov. 20, 1961; Letter from Edwards to Vickery, Nov. 22, 1961; Brown Papers, MS, Folder L-416. See also Folders L-415-424.

³⁹ Letter from Harvey Gantt to K. N. Vickery, Dec. 6, 1961; Brown Papers, Folder L-416. See also *Clemson College Newsletter*, Vol. 1, No. 21, August 1, 1962, for chronology of events.

⁴⁰ Letter from attorney Watkins to Edwards, Jan. 30, 1962; Letter from Edwards to Vickery, Feb. 1, 1962., Brown Papers, Folder L-416.

⁴¹ Letters from Gantt and Fludd to Vickery, April 28, 1962. Brown Papers, MS 91, Folders L-416 and 416-424.

⁴² *Clemson College Newsletter*, Vol. 1, No. 21, August 1, 1962; see also biographical sketch of "Harvey Bernard Gantt" in Edwards Papers. Above is "background" sketch after he applied for admission.

⁴³ Telegram to Gantt from Vickery, June 28, 1962; Telegram from Gantt to Vickery, June 26, 1962.

⁴⁴ Letter from Dean Harlan E. McClure to Gantt, July 2, 1962, Office of Admissions and Registration Records 1893-1970, Series 10, Box 7. Gantt's 48 hrs. telegram, June 26, 1962.

⁴⁵ Affidavit filed with Clerk, Miller C. Foster, U.S. District Court for the Western District, Anderson, South Carolina. Harvey Bernard Gantt of 111 Cannon Street, Charleston, SC, is the plaintiff in the action brought on his behalf by his father, Christopher Gantt. A copy of the complaint and the attending documents in Papers of the President, Correspondence, 1959-63, Series 11, Folders 194-211. The suit listed R. M Cooper, President of the Board

of Trustees, K. N. Vickery, and J. T. Anderson, State Supt. of Education. See *Clemson Newsletter*, August 1, 1962 and clipping, "Negro Files Suit to Enter Clemson," *Greenville News*, July 10, 1962. Watkins letter to attorney Perry on July 24, 1962 termed Gantt's suit "an attack." See Admissions and Registration, Folder 99, Gantt's telegram to Vickery, June 26, 1962.

⁴⁶ Feature, "Negro Files Suit to Enter Clemson," *Greenville (SC) News*, July 10, 1962; Gantt's attorneys were Perry, Lincoln Jenkins (Columbia), Donald J. Sampson and Willie T. Smith of Greenville, along with Jack Greenberg and Constance Baker Motley of the National NAACP (New York). See also Feature, "Clemson Integration Sought in S.C. Suit," *Charlotte Observer*, July 10, 1962. File number of suit in Anderson, SC, Courthouse is No. 4101.

⁴⁷ Harvey Gantt to Dean McClure, July 13, 1962. Letter Attorney Watkins to Matthew J. Perry, July 24, 1962, Office of Admissions and Registration, Folder 99.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*; *Clemson Newsletter*, August 1, 1962; Brown Papers, MS 91, Folder L-413.

⁴⁹ Letter from Edwards to all SC college presidents, Sept. 18, 1962; Letter from B. C. Turner, President of South Carolina State to Edwards, Sept. 19, 1962. Office of the President, R. C. Edwards, Correspondence, 1959-1965, Series 11, Folder 190.

⁵⁰ Letter from attorney Watkins to attorney Matthew J. Perry, July 24, 1962; Letter from Edwards to Registrar K. N. Vickery, August 9, 1962.

⁵¹ Feature, "No Decision in Negro's Application," *Anderson-Independent*, August 23, 1962; William Chafe, *Civilities and Civil Rights: Greensboro, North Carolina...*(Oxford, 1980). History of Sit-Ins.

⁵² Affidavits, U.S District Court of Western District of South Carolina, Office of the President, Correspondence, 1959-1963, Series 11, Folders, 194-211; see also Features, "Order Filed in U.S. Court at Greenville, SC," *Greenville News*, Sept. 7, 1962; "Judge Wyche denies Injunction in Clemson integration suit," *Anderson Independent-Mail*, Sept. 7, 1962.

⁵³ Letters, R. W. (M. D.) to Edwards, Oct. 5, 1962; M. K. to Edwards, Oct. 5, 1962; W. C. to Edwards, Oct. 1, 1962; J. D. B. to Edwards, Sept. 30, 1962; R. D. to Edwards, Sept. 30, 1962; M. S. to Edwards, August 19, 1962; K. H. to Edwards, Sept. 27, 1962; E. H. to Edwards, Oct. 5, 1962; G. E. (M. D.) from Easley, SC, to Edwards, Oct. 5, 1962. All of the above letters in Papers of R. C. Edwards, Office of President, Series 11, Folder 214.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*; Letter to Edwards from Willie A. Collins, Oct. 1, 1962;

Letter from Edwards to Willie A. Collins, Oct. 2, 1962; Papers, Office of the President, Series 11, Folder 214; see also Clippings, "Integration Rumor Denied by Edwards" (Radio address), "Attempt to Integrate Clemson Under Study," and "Gantt Case Argued," Greenville (SC) *News* (n.d.).

⁵⁵ Clippings, "U.S. Court Studies Mixer's Bid to Enroll at Clemson," *Greenville News*, Oct. 5, 1962; "Clemson Argues Gantt Failed on Requirements," *Anderson Daily Mail*, Oct. 4, 1962.

⁵⁶ Letter from President Edwards to Messers. Charles Horn, James O. Wynn, and Ralph Clark, Oct. 15, 1962. Papers of President R. C. Edwards, Correspondence, 1959-1965, Folder 190.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*; *Affidavit*, U.S. 4th Circuit Court of Appeals, Alexandria, VA. Filed, Oct. 5, 1962. The three member court consisted of Judges Simon E. Sobelof, Morris A. Soper, and Clement F. Haynsworth.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*; Richard Kluger, *Simple Justice*; John Hope Franklin and Genna Rae McNeil, Editors, *African Americans and the Living Constitution* (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1995); Clipping, "Clemson Argues Gantt Failed On Requirements," *Anderson (SC) Daily Mail*, Oct. 4, 1962.

⁶⁰ Letter from Edwards to Messers Charles L. Horn, James O. Wynn, and Ralph Clark, Oct. 15, 1962, Folder 190.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*; Letter from M. K. (Buncomb Street Methodist Church) to Edwards, Oct. 5, 1962; Editorial, "No Paratroopers, Please." *Atlanta Constitution*, September 26, 1962. An excellent analysis of the ideological struggle of the civil rights movement is in Carol Polsgrove's, *Divided Minds, Intellectuals, and the Civil Rights Movements* (New York: W. W. Norton, 2001); Taylor Branch, *Parting the Waters: America in the King Years, 1954-1963*, (1988); and Steven F. Lawson, *Running for Freedom: Civil Rights and Black Politics In America Since 1941* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1991).

⁶² Robert A. Pratt, *We Shall Not Be Moved* (Athens, GA: Univ. of Georgia Press, 2002), a history of the desegregation of the University of Georgia; Feature, "Clemson Lawsuit Called "Strongest," *Atlanta Journal-Constitution*, Sept. 26, 1962.

⁶³ Editorial, "No Paratroopers, Please," *Atlanta Journal-Constitution*, Sept. 26, 1962; I. A. Newby, *Black Carolinians: A History of Blacks in South Carolina, 1895-1968* (Univ. of SC Press, 1973).

⁶⁴ Letter from Edwards to Trustees, Oct. 24, 1962; Brown Papers, MS 91, Folder L-411.

⁶⁵ Minutes of the Clemson College Board of Trustees, 1961-1963, Vol. 8, p. 82; The Strom Thurmond Institute, Clemson University; Letter from Watkins to Byrnes, Oct. 8, 1962. Papers of James Byrnes, Correspondence, Box 27, Folder 1066. Thurmond Institute.

⁶⁶ Letter from Watkins to Byrnes, Oct. 22, 1962; Judge Wyche feared petition to the Court of Appeals for temporary injunction. Brynes Papers, Box 27, Folder 1066.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*; Letter from Edwards to Horn, Wynn, and Clark, Oct. 15, 1962; Letter from C. C. Wyche to Perry, Oct. 20, 1962; Byrnes Papers, Box 27, Folder 1066; Letter from Watkins to Byrnes, Oct. 22, 1962. Judge Wyche's major comments this letter. Folder, 1066; Letter from Watkins to Byrnes, Oct. 8, 1962

⁶⁸ *Affidavit*, *In the U. S. Western District of South Carolina, Harvey Gantt, A Minor by His Father Christopher Gantt Plaintiff vs. Clemson Agriculture College*, Nov. 1, 1962. Office of Admissions and Registration, Records 1893-1970, Series 10, Box 7, Folder 101. After issue of "Special Emergency Exam" in Disposition hearing, Professor J. L. T. thanked Edwards. "No knowledge of issue ... since not reported in press." See Letter from J. L. T. to Edwards, Nov. 26, 1962 (same reference as above). McClure's remark, *Affidavit*, pp. 16-18.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 72; Vickery noted that, in some instances, Gantt would be "ahead" of Clemson students.

⁷¹ Headline, "Negro Begins Court Fight to Enter Clemson," Features, "Suit to Enter Clemson," and "Testimony Ends in Gantt Suit," *Anderson Independent* Nov. 19-22, 1962. State Senator Edgar Brown R. M. Cooper, Trustee Chair and other trustees present at this famous trial. See also Address, "The University and Integration," given by John D. Williams, Chancellor, Univ. of Miss. at The Commonwealth Club, San Francisco, CA, Feb. 21, 1962; Judge Perry interviewed at Citadel conference, Charleston, SC, March 8, 2003.

⁷² *Affidavit*, U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit (No. 8871), filed Jan. 4, 1963; *Affidavit* U.S. District Court for the Western District of SC, CA/4101.

⁷³ Minutes of the Board, Clemson College, Wade Hampton Hotel, Jan. 24, 1963.

⁷⁴ Interviews, Senator Ernest Hollings, former Governor John West, former state Senator, T. Allen Legare, Citadel Conference on Civil

Rights, Charleston, SC, March 8, 2003.

⁷⁵ Feature, "Russell Refused R. Kennedy Aid," *State*, Jan. 25, 1963.

⁷⁶ I. A. Newby, *Black Carolinians*, p. 344; Governor O. Faubus elected Governor of Arkansas four times.

⁷⁷ Feature, "NAACP Says School Mixing Preceded Gantt," *State*, January 25, 1963; for a longer explanation of the Reconstruction in SC, see Thomas Holt, *Black Over White: Negro Political Leadership in South Carolina During Reconstruction* (Urbana: Univ. of Illinois Press, 1977). One of the best sources for a discussion of segregation in Mississippi is Neil R. McMillen, *Dark Journey: Black Mississippians in the Age of Jim Crow* (Urbana: Univ. of Illinois Press, 1990).

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*