

"Integration with [Relative] Dignity"

*The Desegregation of Clemson College and
George McMillan's Article at Forty*

M. RON COX JR.

Within the study of civil rights history, South Carolina's story has, for the most part, been overlooked or ignored because of the state's self-proclaimed and generally accepted reputation for racial "moderation," particularly in contrast to the violent episodes that occurred elsewhere. The origins of this reputation can in many ways be traced back to a single event and a single publication. Forty years ago, in its March 16, 1963, issue, the *Saturday Evening Post* published George McMillan's "Integration with Dignity—The Inside Story of How South Carolina Kept the Peace." The article's focus, of course, was the orderly, peaceful, and uneventful enrollment of Harvey Gantt as a student at Clemson College on January 28, 1963—or, as McMillan described him, "the first Negro student to enroll in a white school in South Carolina."¹

From a purely historical standpoint, McMillan was wrong. Gantt's achievement made him a "first" in many ways—the first black student admitted to Clemson; the first black student to enroll in a "white school" in South Carolina in the twentieth century. But he was not the first black student ever to have done so. From 1873 to 1877, during the age of so-called Radical Reconstruction, black South Carolinians had enrolled in and attended the University of South Carolina.² Undoubtedly, few readers were aware of this, nor likely would it have made much difference if they were. Then as now, perception is reality, and based on extensive national media coverage of the Clemson desegregation story as it unfolded, as well as their own life experiences of twentieth-century South Carolina, for the readers of McMillan's article Harvey Gantt was the first black man to successfully cross the Palmetto State's Jim Crow barrier in higher education.

Four decades later the story of Clemson's desegregation remains conspicuously absent from most historical accounts. Chapters, books, and documentary films on the American civil rights movement almost always include the stories of Rosa Parks in Montgomery, James Meredith at Ole Miss, and Autherine Lucy at Alabama. Rarely, however, are Gantt and Clemson mentioned, even in passing.

Nor is this oversight strictly a historical phenomenon. By the time McMillan's article appeared—less than two months after Gantt's arrival—the Clemson story had all but disappeared from the national media's scope, aside from an occasional newspaper "update" article, usually tucked neatly among the back pages.

The omission, while regrettable, is easily explained. News, like much of written history, often tends to focus on tragedy, on the stories of human failure. In the fall of 1962 national attention had focused on the violence and bloodshed that accompanied Meredith's court-ordered admission at the University of Mississippi. Coming on the heels of that story, the Gantt case generated so much interest and attention in the media in the months and days before his arrival on the Clemson campus because people across the country expected a repeat performance in yet another Deep South state. As McMillan put it, "The logic of South Carolina's history and the force of her traditions argued that Clemson would be another Oxford, Mississippi."³ Indeed, if Clemson had turned into another Ole Miss, its place in national civil rights history today would no doubt be elevated to the forefront.

Of course, it did not happen that way. Gantt enrolled peacefully at Clemson and completed the spring semester with little incident. National interest in the Carolina Piedmont quickly faded and turned to more newsworthy civil rights hot spots such as Birmingham, Alabama. McMillan's article is somewhat unique, then, not only because it reveals what happened at Clemson College on January 28, 1963, but rather because it explains what did not happen. It is the "inside story" of a nonevent. One can almost discern disappointment in the voice of a New York reporter covering the story, who was overheard to say, "I expected blood. All I got was a cream puff."⁴

Appearing only about six weeks after the events it described, McMillan's article carefully explained that the calm that had prevailed at Clemson "was no mere lucky happenstance."⁵ Rather, it was the result of nearly two years of groundwork that had prepared the college and the state for the inevitability of racial change, and of intensive planning for the dealing with the specific moment when the change actually occurred. McMillan's account is all the more interesting because he presented it to his readers in terms of a covert effort, a "conspiracy for peace," a "plot . . . to avert violence" by a "loose, informal coalition" of six key individuals in various parts of the state's power structure—Greenville businessman (and Clemson trustee) Charles Daniel; businessman (and S.C. Textile Manufacturers Association executive vice president) John K. Cauthen; Clemson president Robert C. Edwards; state senate president pro tempore Edgar Brown of Barnwell; *Greenville News* editor Wayne Freeman (also a member of the South Carolina School Committee, a legislatively created body that had spearheaded the state's official resistance to racial change for nearly a decade); and Governor Ernest F. Hollings. Beginning in 1961, McMillan asserted, these men worked quietly to begin assessing public attitudes in South Carolina, and by the end of that

year had concluded that there existed "an important body of opinion in the state that firmly believed in law and order at all costs."⁶ Putting aside personal opinion about desegregation, these men focused their efforts on one overriding goal: Should Clemson (or any other state institution) be ordered to desegregate, violence must not occur.

Presenting the whole event as a cabal orchestrated by responsible leaders dedicated to "maintaining law and order" is key to McMillan's thesis. By planning secretly, by quietly lining up business and political support for their position, and by making sure that the South Carolina's major newspapers were also in support, they were able to catch the potential opposition largely off guard. As McMillan explained, "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."⁷

Secrecy could not guarantee success, however. McMillan acknowledged three men in South Carolina capable of rallying the opposition and thwarting the plans for peaceful compliance at Clemson: former governor (and still Clemson trustee) James F. Byrnes; state representative A. W. "Red" Bethea of Dillon; and state senator Marion Gressette of Calhoun County, the number-two man in the senate and chairman of the S.C. School Committee (which was commonly referred to as the "Gressette Committee"). Little could be done to stop an independent statement from the octogenarian Byrnes, although McMillan asserted that by 1963 many South Carolinians had come to view the former governor as "bitter." Bethea was a loose cannon with a well-deserved reputation for fiery and bombastic speeches. He reportedly had threatened to go to Clemson himself and lead a protest, but his poor performance in the previous year's gubernatorial race indicated a lack of widespread support. Gressette, on the other hand, was different. McMillan described him as "a man whose sincerity and integrity have never been questioned in the legislature," a man who so held the confidence of opposition groups such as the white citizens' councils that they felt little need to get directly involved. "If Gressette came out publicly against admitting Gantt," McMillan wrote, "all the hitherto latent forces of disorder in the state would come alive."⁸

Accordingly Clemson president Robert Edwards spent extra time and attention on the senator from Calhoun County. McMillan relayed the story of a "very serious" meeting between Edwards and members of Gressette's committee on January 3. According to the account, Edwards threatened to resign if he were not supported in admitting Gantt peacefully. He then "got down to brass tacks with Gressette about the effect of violence." Knowing that a major manufacturer had expressed interest in building a large plant near Gressette's home, Edwards supposedly said bluntly, "Senator, if there's a ruckus at Clemson those people won't even plant scrub oak in Calhoun County."⁹

The relative success of the cabal's covert efforts was confirmed on January 22, the day that U.S. district judge C. C. Wyche signed the order admitting Gantt to Clemson. On the floor of the state senate, John D. Long of Union County and Herbert H. Jessen of Dorchester County heatedly denounced the decision, using words such as *cowardly* and *tyranny* and urging that South Carolina "not lie down and let itself be walked over." Then, as McMillan reported, "The time had come for Gressette to take his stand. He rose and began to speak slowly, sadly. 'A lot of things happen in life,' he said. 'We 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 inflammatory speeches. I have preached peace and good order too long to change my thinking.'"¹⁰

From there, McMillan's article incorporates a statement released by former governor Byrnes, stating only that a court ruling could not force the men and women of Clemson to welcome Gantt, as well as statements from three carefully timed press conferences on January 24 by South Carolina governor Donald Russell, Senator Gressette, and President Edwards, all expressing support for "peace and good order." He further noted that although Representative Bethea was present during Gressette's statement ("hunched deep down in an upholstered chair"), reporters "did not have time to stop and ask him for a comment."¹¹ The article concludes with a conversation between Edgar Brown and John Cauthen in which the latter says, "I think everything's going to be all right now," to which McMillan added his own summation: "And it was all right."¹²

Written as a contemporary account, McMillan's article is a useful starting point for anyone seeking to understand this generally overlooked event in the civil rights movement. Documentary evidence available to the modern historian does not contradict his account, aside from an occasional misquote or some minor confusion about specific dates. In the end McMillan provides his reader not only with a fascinating explanation of how South Carolina avoided violence during Clemson's desegregation, but also some revealing insight into the nature of state politics and power in the early 1960s.

Since the article's publication, the phrase "integration with dignity" has often been employed to describe South Carolina's official response to a challenging period in its recent history—not only during the Clemson episode but also throughout the rest of the 1960s and even into the 1970s. Gantt's peaceful enrollment at Clemson, proponents claim, demonstrated South Carolina's racial "moderation" and set the stage for generally passive accommodation to racial change throughout the remainder of the decade. The appearance of McMillan's article, they assert, is an indication of the nation's recognition of this "moderation."

However, for an article often cited as a positive portrayal of South Carolina, "Integration with Dignity" stirred up considerable controversy in the Palmetto

State when it first appeared. On March 12, shortly after the *Saturday Evening Post* appeared on newsstands, Senator John Long addressed his colleagues and referred to McMillan's handiwork, commenting that he resented the use of the words *dignity* and *integration* in the same article. Senator Gressette took the floor and pronounced the article's account of his meeting with President Edwards on January 3 "a malicious lie—a bald-faced falsehood," and said that he intended to force McMillan (who lived in Aiken) to name his source for that story.¹³

Long and Gressette were not the only ones angry about the McMillan article. On March 13, Representative Bethea made the latest of many personal privilege speeches to the S.C. House of Representatives criticizing not only the article, but also the whole Clemson episode. Claiming that he represented "the thinking of 90 percent" of South Carolinians, he charged that Charles Daniel and other state businessmen had "sold their way of life for a few measly industries" by calling for peaceful compliance at Clemson. He then produced a copy of the *Saturday Evening Post* and waved it in the air, challenging McMillan's assertion that he had threatened to lead a march on Clemson: "I went home when it was the hardest thing I ever had to do," he said, adding that if he had wanted to hold such a march, he easily could have done so and would have received fantastic support. "Are you proud of what the nation thinks about who did what at Clemson?" he asked his fellow legislators. "I'm not." The state, he concluded, "has lost more prestige in the past six months than it will gain in the next ten years. . . . I wouldn't sell my birthright in South Carolina for every industry in the world. We're Southerners, for God's sake let's act like it."¹⁴

Critics of McMillan's article were not limited to the die-hard segregationists, either. At least one South Carolinian believed the author had overlooked an important factor that made peaceful desegregation possible—Clemson's students, most of whom did not favor desegregation but had accepted it peacefully: "I just want the people of the United States to know that the students of Clemson College were the real reason for the success of integration that was carried out peacefully in South Carolina. I might add that I am proud to be a member of Clemson's student body that was responsible for 'Integration With Dignity.'"¹⁵ In an editorial titled "The Post Article—in Perspective," the *Greenville News* commented that overall McMillan had provided favorable press for South Carolina as an example for other states, both North and South, but noted that "certain things must be corrected or placed in perspective." First, it denied that President Edwards had made the "scrub oak" threat to Marion Gressette, asserting that anyone who knew the senator realized such a threat "would have evoked a storm of righteous wrath which would have rocked the state." Secondly, the editorial took exception to McMillan's description of former governor Byrnes as "embittered." Conceding that Byrnes had been "disappointed" by many of the U.S. Supreme Court's recent decisions against segregation, it asserted that he never would have considered doing anything to encourage violence or disorder

at Clemson. Finally the editorial noted that some people had inferred from the article that there had been a conspiracy of state business and political leaders to get Gantt into Clemson. No such conspiracy existed, the *News* maintained, "unless an unspoken agreement among all of the leading citizens of South Carolina to keep the peace constitutes a conspiracy." Clemson deserved much praise, and credit should also go to "the law abiding people of South Carolina," but the paper further stressed that no one should believe that the state welcomed the event. Nor should anyone infer that support for law and order meant support for racial desegregation. "Our policy has been to oppose integration and is to continue to oppose it," the article concluded. "We shall oppose just as strongly those who either thoughtlessly or deliberately, maliciously or with misguided intentions, say or do anything which might tend to turn South Carolina into a racial battleground."¹⁶

This last statement makes an important distinction, one that calls into question the definitions of *dignity* and *moderation*. In essence all the editorial did was to restate the public position of every "law and order" advocate mentioned in the McMillan article—a grudging acceptance of the inevitability of desegregation and a desire to avoid violence without ever conceding that segregation was legally or morally wrong. Indeed, documentary evidence exists that strongly suggests that the racial "moderation" exhibited by South Carolina during Clemson's desegregation, although perhaps accurately described as such in relation to states such as Mississippi or Alabama, was at best a thin veneer that required constant attention and precaution to maintain.

State and college officials clearly realized this at the time, and admitted as much. Their detailed and precise preparations for Gantt's arrival was carefully choreographed and directed in order to limit the opportunities for violence to occur, although it is evident from their correspondence and records that the real possibility of violence was never far from their minds. Most importantly, perhaps, they attempted to learn from mistakes made elsewhere. McMillan notes that in September 1962 Governor Hollings sent State Law Enforcement Division (SLED) chief J. P. Strom and state legal counsel Harry Walker to Oxford, Mississippi, to observe events and to devise a security plan for Clemson that the state could implement without the need for federal marshals. The result was a seven-page confidential outline, approved in its final version on January 12, 1963. Section 1 (four pages) established an overall plan for law enforcement—including college officials, campus security, State Highway Patrol, and other SLED officials—before, during and after registration. Section 2 (two pages) outlined a plan for establishing and maintaining student discipline on campus. Section 3 (one page) detailed arrangements for controlling the media.¹⁷

McMillan's assertion that everything "was all right" after Gantt's enrollment was perhaps overly optimistic, for it is evident that white resentment to his presence there was still quite strong. Governor Donald Russell—who had been in

office less than a month when Gantt arrived on the Clemson campus—received hundreds of letters critical of the state's decision to comply without resistance. One woman wrote that she was appalled by the thought of "the Negro entering Climpson [sic]. My blond girls will not go to school [with] Negroes. . . . I did not vote for the man who I knew did want negroes [in] white schools."¹⁸ Nor was such criticism limited to South Carolinians. A Georgia man encouraged Russell to follow the example of Mississippi governor Ross Barnett, because, he said, "Our nation's survival depends on it."¹⁹ Other critics referred to integrationists as "tools of Satan" and claimed that the mixing of the races in schools went "against God's plan for purity." Still others claimed that the entire desegregation movement was a "Communist conspiracy" inflicted upon the South by the "anti-American, anti-Christ traitors of the Supreme Court."²⁰ Senator Edgar Brown's files indicate that he received similar amounts of critical mail.²¹ In late January a group calling itself the Concerned Clemson Alumni sent a mass mailing to Clemson students, suggesting that with Gantt at Clemson, they "should ignore him, should offer him no assistance and should ostracize both him and any student who may offer him association. . . . He should be treated with cold, silent contempt which he has earned."²²

With Clemson officials threatening expulsion of anyone causing trouble, student opposition had to be waged covertly. In February one group began printing a crudely typed monthly newsletter, the *Rebel Underground*. Its March edition claimed that more than two thousand copies of the first issue had been printed and placed around campus but mysteriously had disappeared. The authors attributed this to "the police state methods of some people on campus." They further accused Clemson's administration of lying to the press when it said no incidents had occurred. Referring to Harvey Gantt as "the Negro" or "the black boy" (never by name), the authors alleged that on two occasions between fifteen and thirty students had gathered in the cafeteria and tried to "stare him down," but campus security had dispersed the group. There were also reports of students marching past his room waving Confederate flags, groups of boys yelling at him from their windows, and several students throwing fireworks at his room. Calling on Clemson students to write opposition letters to the *Tiger*, to give the silent treatment to anyone who favored desegregation, and to boycott any restaurant willing to serve "our unwanted guest," the letter ended with an exhortation: "Make no mistake about it, *we are in a battle!* A battle for our Country and for our Race. . . . Integration will inevitably bring about intermarriage between the two races. . . . FORCED INTEGRATION IS NOT INTEGRATION AT ALL. Refuse to accept it in your heart, and it will never be a fact."²³ Publication of the *Rebel Underground* continued well into the spring semester, and the paper's rhetoric grew increasingly vitriolic. In their April edition the authors reported "several cases where little do-good students gathered up some of our issues and

carried them to the master Gestapo agent, Dean [of Students Walter] Cox," to whom they awarded the title of "Honorary Nigger."²⁴

Back in the state capital, Representative Bethea and Senator Long continued to bluster against the Clemson decision. By accepting Gantt peacefully, Long charged, South Carolina had earned for itself "the reputation of a quitter—a big talker but no action." He referred to former governor Hollings as "a distinguished integrationist" and charged that recent complimentary remarks from President Edwards about Gantt's academic performance at Clemson were nothing more than "propaganda for integrating colleges of this state." Now fired up by his own indignation, he proposed an amendment requiring any racially integrated school in the state to be resegregated by gender. "Now, you brave South Carolina protectors of womanhood," he contemptuously challenged his colleagues, "I'm asking you to place a barrier between our white women and colored men to keep them from being insulted. The plan I propose would take the heart out of the integration movement. They want to amalgamate the races and this would stop that." Rising in opposition, Senator Gressette calmly remarked that his committee had considered this idea but had decided it was unnecessary at present. However, he added, this did not necessarily rule out the need for such a policy in the future, should massive desegregation occur. When Long's motion failed on a voice vote, he proposed a revised version calling for single-gender facilities in *all* South Carolina schools, with no mention of race. This motion failed as well, by a vote of thirty-eight to five.²⁵

The defeat of Senator Long's motions is in itself indicative of South Carolina's refusal to act radically in opposition to desegregation, but their introduction into the senate and the manner in which they were offered do tarnish somewhat the state's carefully molded reputation for racial moderation, for having met "integration with dignity." It is evident that many tempers ran short in the weeks and months after Gantt's arrival at Clemson, and that the "law and order" supporters had to continue to work to prevent them from boiling over into violence. In hindsight, perhaps the best they accomplished was a delay. Five years later, South Carolina's thin veneer of moderation wore off, and the simmering tension of racial violence erupted and led to bloodshed in Orangeburg. That event is mentioned in many of the history books and documentaries.

Perhaps it is, then, that "dignity" must be viewed as a relative concept, subject to the social conventions of the time and the overall context within which it occurs. When Gantt enrolled at Clemson in late January 1963, the violent images of Oxford and Ole Miss were still fresh in the national mind, and attention was already being focused on Alabama, where newly elected governor George Wallace was filling newspaper headlines and television news time with his proclamation to preserve in his state "segregation now, segregation tomorrow, and segregation forever." Comparisons between these events and these three Deep South states were inevitable, and South Carolina, relatively speaking, came out

smelling like the proverbial rose. A *New York Times* editorial proclaimed "Bravo, Clemson!" and congratulated the state for its "encouraging display of order and self-restraint" in contrast to the earlier episode at Ole Miss.²⁶ The *San Francisco Chronicle* wrote: "Too much cannot be said in praise of Governor Donald Russell of South Carolina and all who cooperated with him to guarantee that the shameful events of Oxford, Mississippi, were not repeated, and that the outrageous demagogic defiance of Alabama's Governor [George Wallace] was not emulated. . . . [The state's actions have] already gained great and widespread admiration and support for South Carolina and Clemson College."²⁷

In the *Pittsburgh Courier*, native South Carolinian Benjamin Mays also explained the difference between Clemson and Ole Miss in terms of leadership rather than racial moderation. "We might have had the same thing at Clemson," the article read. "The white people of South Carolina are perhaps just as much segregationists as the white people of Mississippi. But in Mississippi we had a Barnett; in South Carolina we had Hollings and Russell. . . . Mississippi had no responsible leadership. South Carolina has. I salute my native state."²⁸

The *Washington Daily News* credited "months of careful planning by the state's business civic and political leaders" and the overall "quality of South Carolina's leadership." It further gave credit to Gantt, praising his "great poise at Clemson" and noting that he "has shunned publicity. Reportedly Gantt turned down \$10,000 to write a magazine article."²⁹ The *Washington Post* credited moderate leadership as well as economic interests but tied these factors together in what it called the state's "Liberal Heritage." South Carolina's history and traditions, it said, put it more in tune with North Carolina and Virginia, both of which had accommodated to desegregation, than to Alabama and Mississippi, which did not. "It has been said that Mississippi was conceived in sin while South Carolina fell into it," wrote the author. The violence at Ole Miss, he continued, helped South Carolina prepare itself, providing the "final shock therapy that restored complete sanity. . . . South Carolina, it appeared, had turned the corner nicely."³⁰ Editorial cartoons in papers throughout the nation praised Clemson's peaceful desegregation, especially in contrast with the violence at Oxford.

South Carolina's newspapers also tried to explain what had made Clemson so different from Ole Miss. The *Greenville Piedmont* gave the credit to Gantt himself. On February 1 it published an editorial contrasting him with Meredith, the student whose forced enrollment at Ole Miss had led to federal intervention and violence. During his enrollment, it claimed, Meredith "tried to keep the spotlight of publicity on himself by issuing frequent press statements after his arrival, and by meeting with Bobby Kennedy." The paper further criticized him for having exhibited a negative regard for his schoolwork. The article concluded, "Meredith, in short, is a professional Negro." In contrast, Clemson had enrolled Gantt, whose demeanor, youth, academic ability, and desire to be treated as any other student made him "an ideal choice to be hand-picked to become the first

member of his race to attend Clemson" and "mark him as a credit to his State."³¹ In an editorial titled "Why South Carolina Was Calm," the *Columbia Record* rejected economic interests as the motivating factor and even discounted the role played by the state's newspapers, which, it claimed, "only reflected the general feeling of the people." Law and order prevailed, it claimed, because of "the Stoicism of South Carolina [which] far antedates either the industrialization of the State or the modern newspapers. . . . [South Carolina's] tradition of calm courage, so magnificent in the 1860s, was the heritage of the generation of the 1960s."³²

The state's black press was much more reserved in coverage and praise of Gantt's accomplishment. Columbia's *Palmetto Times* referred to the event as "a great victory," and an editorial proclaimed simply, "It Was Worth It"; but there were no full-page headlines, no announcements that Joshua's trumpets had blown, causing segregation's walls to come a-tumblin' down, and no proclamations that this marked the beginning of additional desegregation efforts in the state.³³ For his part, Gantt offered his own explanation for the lack of violence at Clemson: "If you can't appeal to the morals of a South Carolinian," he said, "you can appeal to his manners."³⁴

When George McMillan's article appeared in print in March 1963, South Carolina had indeed turned an important corner and had achieved integration at Clemson with relative dignity. By stressing law and order, the state emerged from the episode with a national reputation for racial moderation, a reputation that most business and political leaders were anxious to protect and foster. Admittedly this was an important first step, and when compared to similar events in Alabama and Mississippi, it was done with a degree of relative dignity.

If "dignity" is taken to mean, however, doing the right thing for the right reason, then South Carolina's claim to having achieved "integration with dignity" falls short. As historian Selden Smith quipped at this conference, "Can you imagine a newspaper reporting a story about a wife-beater who changes his ways, using the headline 'WIFE BEATER SMITH STOPS BEATING WIFE . . . WITH DIGNITY?'" For it seems safe to say that although South Carolina avoided much of the outward violence seen in other Deep South states, among white South Carolinians, most hearts and minds were slow to change; opposition to desegregation in principle was still strong and determined. As other colleges, schools, and towns across South Carolina faced the difficult issue of racial change, it was by no means clear if Clemson's experience had established a pattern for peaceful compliance, or whether, like Fort Sumter over a century earlier, it would prove to have been merely a bloodless battle followed by a long, bloody, and costly tragedy.

Notes

1. George McMillan, "Integration with Dignity: The Inside Story of How South Carolina Kept the Peace," *Saturday Evening Post*, March 16, 1963, 16.
2. Maxie Myron Cox Jr., "1963—The Year of Decision: Desegregation in South Carolina" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of South Carolina, 1996), 3. During its so-called Radical period, the University of South Carolina also had black faculty as well as board of trustees members. The university was closed and reorganized as an all-white institution at the end of Reconstruction.
3. McMillan, "Integration with Dignity," 16.
4. *Charleston News and Courier*, January 30, 1963.
5. McMillan, "Integration with Dignity," 16.
6. *Ibid.*, 16–17. The S.C. School Committee was commonly referred to as the "Gressette Committee," after its chairman, state senator Marion Gressette of Calhoun County.
7. *Ibid.*, 19.
8. *Ibid.*, 20. Bethea won only 5.3 percent of the vote (17,251 votes) in the 1962 S.C. Democratic Primary.
9. *Ibid.*
10. *Ibid.*
11. *Ibid.*, 21. Byrnes's statement was less vitriolic than the McMillan quote might indicate. According to other sources, the former governor specifically professed his disagreement with the court's ruling but added, "However, I am convinced there will be no violence against him [Gantt] by the splendid students of Clemson." See *Charleston Evening Post*, January 24, 1963.
12. McMillan, "Integration with Dignity," 21.
13. *State*, March 13, 1963. Although the McMillan article appeared in the March 16 issue of the *Post*, that magazine, like many others, is postdated. Gressette repeated his protests in April, challenging both Charles Daniel and Edgar Brown to deny publicly that they were the source of the story. Brown did so immediately, but there is no record in the state's press that Daniel made any comment. See the *State*, April 11, 1963, and *Greenville News*, April 11, 1963.
14. *State*, March 14, 1963.
15. James W. Hawkes to W. D. Workman Jr., March 14, 1963, William D. Workman Papers, South Carolina Political Collections, University of South Carolina (hereafter Workman Papers).
16. *Greenville News*, March 19, 1963.
17. McMillan, "Integration with Dignity," 17–18; "Confidential—Outline of the Advanced Plan of Law Enforcement, Maintenance of Student Discipline, and Arrangements for the Press for Implementation by Clemson Officials and the Respective State Law Enforcement Agencies in the Event the Federal Courts Order Harvey Gantt's Admission to Clemson College," January 12, 1963, folder 191, Robert C. Edwards Papers, Special Collections, Robert Muldrow Cooper Library, Clemson University.
18. Mrs. H. B. Mincy to Donald S. Russell, January 22, 1963, Integration subject file, Russell Papers, South Carolina State Archives, Columbia (hereafter Russell Papers).
19. C. C. Perkins to Russell, January 22, 1963, Integration subject file, Russell Papers.
20. Quotes from various letters, January 1963, Integration subject file, Russell Papers.
21. *Charleston News and Courier*, December 31, 1962. A similar story on Senator Brown ran in the *Augusta Chronicle* under the headline "Clemson Won't Tolerate Violence—Brown." An anonymous critic sent the clipping to Brown, with the following note attached: "I am quite sure that the motion would be carries [*sic*] unanimously if the votes were by

whites only if I were to nominate you as South Carolina's all-time number one son of a bitch. . . . If integration must come to South Carolina, as evidently you desire it to, then I hope it comes to your house in a big way, by some one of your immediate family, dearly beloved by you, marrying a negro." See folder 271-B ("Crackpot Letters"), Brown Papers, Special Collections, Robert Muldrow Cooper Library, Clemson University.

22. Concerned Clemson Alumni form letter to Clemson students, January 1963, Integration subject file, Russell Papers. In November 1962 the same group had sent a form letter to Clemson students urging them to resist integration through ostracism, not violence. See the *Tiger* (Clemson College), November 9, 1962.

23. *Rebel Underground* (Clemson College), March 1963, in Integration/Clemson subject file, Workman Papers. Gantt has denied that these incidents occurred.

24. *Rebel Underground*, April 1963, Integration/Clemson subject file, Workman Papers. This same article challenged the favorable impression of Gantt vis-à-vis James Meredith: "We have heard a few misled students say that the black boy here at Clemson is a nice boy and not at all like the black one at Ole Miss. This is pure hogwash! He is here for the same reason the other partially domesticated, semi-literate member of a cannibalistic race is at Ole Miss, and that is to break the race barrier. Russia is much nicer than Red China, but both have the same end results planned for the free world."

25. *State* (Columbia), April 26, 1963. The yea votes came from senators Long, J. B. Lawson (Anderson County), Roger Scott (Dillon County), Wilbur Grant (Chester County), and Herbert Jessen (Dorchester County).

26. *New York Times*, January 30, 1963.

27. *San Francisco Chronicle*, January 30, 1963, quoted in *Progress*, a report of the South Carolina Council on Human Relations, n.d., SCCHR Papers, Manuscripts Division, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia.

28. *Pittsburgh Courier*, February 16, 1963.

29. *Washington* (D.C.) *Daily News*, June 4, 1963, Clippings/Civil Rights/South Carolina—1963 subject file, Olin D. Johnston Papers, South Carolina Political Collections, University of South Carolina, Columbia (hereafter Johnston Papers).

30. *Washington Post*, February 3, 1963, Clippings/Civil Rights/South Carolina—1963 subject file, Johnston Papers.

31. *Greenville Piedmont*, January 1, 1963, clipping in Integration subject file, Johnston Papers.

32. *Columbia Record*, February 7, 1963.

33. *Palmetto Times* (Columbia), February 7, 1963. This edition of the newspaper was vol. 1, no. 19. Because this was clearly a new publication, it may be that the paper lacked the experience or the staff to carry its reporting any further. The paper also contained several advertisements by white merchants and businesses, and lack of coverage may indicate a simple desire to avoid antagonizing and risk losing its sponsors.

34. Jack Nelson and Jack Bass, *The Orangeburg Massacre* (New York: World, 1970), 16.