

VOICES OF SOUTHERN PROTEST DURING THE VIETNAM WAR ERA: THE UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA AS A CASE STUDY

by Andrew Grose

Throughout the decades following America's involvement in the Vietnam War, historians have documented various aspects of the antiwar and dissident movements across the nation and on college campuses. Over time, the historiography of the antiwar movement, especially as related to campus protest movements, has expanded considerably, particularly in regard to the origins, structure, and internal dynamics of the groups involved. Yet there are shortcomings in the scholarly literature on this subject. Most historians have focused upon dissident movements in the American North and West while all but neglecting protest activities at colleges in the South. In this article, I show that dissent similar to that which shook other colleges around the nation occurred on the campus of the University of South Carolina.

The spring of 1970 will be forever remembered as a tumultuous period in the history of the United States. By this time, America's continuous involvement in the Vietnam War had resulted in massive increases in military and civilian casualties, contributing to a polarization of the country's population that sparked numerous instances of massive protests. Moreover, in April 1970, President Richard Nixon, who had earlier proposed a strategy to end American involvement in Vietnam through his plan of "Vietnamization," ordered American military incursions into Cambodia. When the invasion plan became public knowledge in late April, large-scale college campus protests erupted in reaction to the perceived escalation of the war. On May 4, 1970, a massive protest on the campus of Kent State University ended tragically when a group of National Guardsmen fired their weapons into a crowd of students, in which four persons were killed and nine others were seriously wounded.¹ In the wake of this incident, hundreds of university and college campus protests took a radical turn, which resulted in over 700 campuses being either partially or totally closed.²

Throughout the decades following America's involvement in the Vietnam War, numerous historians have documented the various aspects of the antiwar and dissident movements in the nation and within the nation's college campuses during the late 1960s and early 1970s. Over the years, the scope, context, and overall analysis of this movement, especially as related to campus protest movements, have positively evolved and expanded considerably, especially regarding issues such as the origins, structure, and internal dynamics of the groups involved. Current studies also show that many other issues, such as the challenge to *in loco parentis* policies and efforts to increase free speech, played a major role in the organization and efforts of many dissident groups of the era. Yet the historiography of the anti-Vietnam War and counterculture movements of the period are not without shortcomings. Throughout the scholarly literature, most historians have tended to focus upon the counterculture and dissident movements in the American North and West while virtually neglecting an analysis of the protest activities in other less influential areas and regions. Specifically, there has existed a major absence of scholarship of the activities of the colleges and universities of the American South.³

Nonetheless, a study of the events that occurred at the University of South Carolina (USC) in the late 1960s and early 1970s shows that legitimate campus dissent and protest occurred within elements of the southern campus during the Vietnam era. A major example of this can be seen in the massive campus dissent and disruption that took place upon the grounds of USC throughout the month of May 1970. Although their protests were not as large as those that occurred at other state universities, the turmoil at USC did result in two separate building takeovers, several hundreds of arrests, and thousands of dollars in property damages. While the events at Kent State played a significant role in the outbreak of campus anger at USC, official university reports, as well as research by university historian Henry Lesesne, show that local events, such as resentment over continuing *in loco parentis* policies by the administration at USC and blatant attempts by state officials to repress the activities of counterculture activists, were the immediate causes of the outbreak of massive protests.⁴

The complexity of the activity at USC during May 1970 can also be seen in the dynamics and interchanges of the groups involved before and during the major protests of May 1970. For instance, the protest activities were not a monolithic movement among the whole student body. Rather, they were composed of several diverse factions of students,

such as conservative groups, New Left organizations, and apolitical students, that all had different approaches to political engagement. However, university administration and state authorities, both influenced by southern conservative and Cold War ideologies, began to take repressive measures before and during the protests that seemed to threaten individual liberties; consequently, a fragile alliance between the various student sectors was forged in reaction. Ultimately, differences of ideals and tactics among the student groups eventually caused the dissolution of the loose coalitions, which partially led to increased frustration, fears, and confusion. As a result, the diverse dynamics among students and officials would both be partially responsible for heightening tensions that would lead hundreds of USC students to actively protest and engage in civil disobedience to preserve control over their own lives and university.

Throughout the 1950s and 1960s, USC, which is located in the heart of Columbia, South Carolina, evolved from a small underdeveloped southern university to one of the region's largest multiversities that attracted prominent scholars and ten of thousands of students. These changes were largely the results of University Presidents Donald Russell (1952–1957) and Thomas Jones (1962–1974), who both increased allocations for faculty salaries, research facilities, and new graduate departments.⁵ Within this framework, many students became exposed to new ideas and philosophies that led them to question the paternalistic nature of the university's administration. Issues such as dorm room curfews, the buying and selling of alcohol on campus, dress codes, classroom attendance policies, and unannounced room searches, came to be viewed by many students as unnecessary and restrictive to personal liberties.⁶

However, the majority of students on campus remained relatively apolitical, apathetic, and largely focused upon developing their academic and social lives within the campus in a noncontroversial manner. For instance, Jim Bradford, an active member of campus student government between 1967 and 1970, recalls, "Carolina was anything but in the forefront of radical political thought in the 1960s."⁷ By the late 1960s, USC had earned the reputation as one of the southern region's largest party schools, which Bradford characterized as "an honor that people [on campus] cherished."⁸ Concerns over fraternity and sorority parties, as well as participation in football and basketball events, largely dominated the majority of students' attention throughout the 1960s and into the 1970s. Although students were conscious of local, state, and national events, the majority of students, who held relatively conservative

ideologies, were reluctant to get involved in activities that could bring political and social change within their daily existence. Most, according to one student, held to the philosophy of "I don't want to knock the establishment, I want in."⁹ In a 1969 editorial in *The Gamecock*, the campus student newspaper, assistant professor of history John Scott Wilson further decried this sense of "passivity" among students at the university. According to Wilson, the failure of most students to challenge the traditional ideals that they brought with them to the university undermined the principles of a higher education.¹⁰

Apart from the majority apolitical students was a relatively small group of conservative students who wished to bring about change through the legal means available in student government. According to Mike Spears, who was president of the USC Student Senate in 1970, "We [the representatives of student government] projected a very middle of the road posture that was absolutely antiviolent, but permissive of free expression."¹¹ Using resolutions from the Student Senate, changes were implemented to improve student freedom and increase interaction between students, faculty, and administration. In 1968, the Student Senate approved a "Statement of Student Rights and Responsibilities," which provided statements protecting student free speech and proclaimed that "institutional control of campus facilities should not be used as a device of censorship of ideas."¹² The work of the Student Senate also resulted in the president of the student body gaining a seat on the Board of Trustees, which allowed a representative of the students to participate in decisions involving the student population.¹³ In addition, resolutions of the Student Senate during 1968 and 1969, which called for allowance of the sale of beer on campus and the liberalizing of dorm curfew rules, went before the board of trustees for study and consideration.¹⁴

However, the work of the Student Senate was viewed by many as somewhat ineffective. For instance, when the faculty and the board of trustees accepted the "Statement of Student Rights and Responsibilities," the administration released additional attached "understandings" that applied to students' rights, which essentially maintained administrative control over the decisions made by the student government.¹⁵ Furthermore, although proposals to change dorm restrictions brought extended curfew hours, the board of trustees, in May 1969, voted to continue the ban on the sale of alcohol on campus.¹⁶

The student government also tended to overtly avoid the issues of the war or civil rights, which became the focal point for several student organizations that were considered part of the national New Left

movement. One of the leading groups of this type at USC was AWARE. AWARE was originally formed in the spring of 1966 as a group that promoted “the dissemination of ideas which will lead students into an awareness of the full spectrum of political and social thought.”¹⁷ Instead of only relying upon resolutions passed by student government, AWARE believed in direct action and focused its attention on grassroots campaigns in order to educate and mobilize the student population. In February 1969, AWARE sponsored a “White Awareness Week” program in which workshops and speakers discussed the black power movement and lashed out at regional leaders for the continuing problems of racism in the South.¹⁸ According to Brett Bursey, a white student member of AWARE, the activities of “White Awareness Week” were done to illustrate that the problems of southern racism were largely “the white man’s problem ... [and that] the white power structure was the enemy.”¹⁹

AWARE and other offshoot groups, such as the Student Mobilization Committee (SMC), also actively worked to protest U.S. involvement in the Vietnam War. In September 1969, AWARE and the newly formed South Carolina Revolutionary Youth Movement (SCRYM) sponsored a “Bring the War Home” rally on the university’s Horseshoe, which was the main campus courtyard. At the rally, which was attended by several hundred students, representatives from Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) called for the end of the Vietnam War and a “general overthrow of the existing system.”²⁰ AWARE also worked very closely with the UFO Coffeehouse, an anti-war G.I. coffeehouse located in downtown Columbia, in an effort to protest the war, provide draft counseling, and obtain conscientious objector status for numerous soldiers at nearby Fort Jackson.²¹

Ultimately, the actions of the UFO Coffeehouse and AWARE, which had affiliated with SDS in 1968, appeared extremely threatening and drew the ire of university, state, and federal officials. For instance, in a 1970 state legislative report, the Committee to Investigate Communist Activities in South Carolina labeled the activities of New Left groups in the state’s college campuses as communist in nature and linked to “a subversive force ... [that] represents militant, nihilistic, and anarchistic forces ... which threaten the orderly process of education as the forerunner of a more determined effort to destroy our economic, social, and political structures.”²² In the end, this report recommended that students engaging in “campus disturbance” should be quickly and harshly dealt with.²³

These Cold War and conservative attitudes would directly affect how local and federal officials dealt with dissident groups in and

around USC. FBI files reveal that federal agents in Columbia tracked the movements of several AWARE members and employees of the UFO. Through this activity, federal agents supplied local police with information regarding “pot parties” that many activists engaged in, which authorities hoped would result in “the arrest [of dissidents] and their eventual dismissal from school.”²⁴ The FBI also supplied information to the Internal Revenue Service that the UFO failed to pay tax on admission fees for persons coming into the coffeehouse on nights when live bands were performing. Although the FBI hoped the “additional collection of taxes” would cause the organization ruin, the IRS discovered that the UFO was paying a state-required cabaret tax, which undercut the ability of the IRS to collect additional federal taxes.²⁵

Likewise, the university’s administration, under pressures from state officials, also began efforts to limit the effectiveness of AWARE and other dissident groups on campus. Throughout the 1960s and into the 1970s, the university held a strict policy that only allowed administrative approved public speakers, especially from outside the university, to participate in rallies and teach-ins. President Thomas Jones emphatically stated, “We will not bring to campus any person who speaks only to incite or to inflame passions of his or her listeners.”²⁶ AWARE viewed this policy as a violation of the rights to freedom of speech. In March 1969, AWARE tested this policy by inviting an unapproved speaker on campus for a teach-in session. As a result, the group was placed on temporary probation.²⁷ AWARE would be permanently suspended from campus activities following a meeting in February 1970, during which the university stated that the group had invited numerous unauthorized outsiders to campus. Moreover, the administration claimed that AWARE was “soliciting money without university permission,” which represented another violation of university rules.²⁸

Yet, it was the actions taken against AWARE and the UFO Coffeehouse that would cause many various groups of students to openly question the repressive policies of the university’s administration and state officials. In January 1970, John Foard, the 5th Circuit solicitor of South Carolina, led a successful campaign to shut down the UFO Coffeehouse.²⁹ Although the coffeehouse challenged contemporary southern norms regarding the Vietnam War, the UFO also challenged the racial norms within the city of Columbia. According to a 1968 report in the *New York Times*, “They [patrons of the UFO] have an interracial crowd ... [and] kisses of greetings in public between white and Negro friends is still fairly new to Columbia.”³⁰ Local detective John Earl

Dennis further declared, “The type of people it [the UFO] draws may be good people, but they are different. Their attire is strange. There are tables for seating, but sometimes they sit on the floor, holding hands. It’s a terrible situation. We have really got our hands full with this.”³¹ Because of its radical challenge to traditional southern values and its perceived threat to Cold War ideology, the UFO was labeled a den of drugs and revolutionary communist thought. Although no drugs would be discovered on the premises, on January 13, 1970, Foard was able to shut down the UFO and arrest its five owners on several misdemeanor charges that alleged that the establishment was a public nuisance by maintaining a “disorderly, ill governed place ... [with] rowdy persons of evil name, fame, and conversation ... [and that the] persons [charged] did possess, sell, or use unlawful drugs.”³²

Shortly following the closure of the UFO, many counterculture activists, which included both students and nonstudents, started to organize their activities in the Russell House, which was the main student center on the campus of USC. This group, which had close affiliations with AWARE, referred to itself as the “UFO in Exile” and began to be targeted by local police, who began regular drug raids, using blank warrants that the students called “John Doe warrants.”³³ When a student was arrested in early April on a questionable drug possession charge, a group of 250 students demonstrated in front of President Jones’s university home to protest the oppressive tactics of the school and local law enforcement officials in their attempts to repress dissident groups and freedom of expression.³⁴

On April 27, 1970, the trial of the UFO concluded. While Foard had provided no direct evidence that the defendants were involved with any illegal drug sales, the accused were found guilty of the common law misdemeanor of maintaining a public nuisance and were sentenced to six years in prison.³⁵ Following the trial, Foard stated that he intended begin to investigate the actions of the “UFO in Exile” on the USC campus. Foard also blasted many of the university’s faculty members who had testified for the defense in the UFO trial, stating, “I feel from this trial that there are professors who don’t belong at the university.”³⁶ Because of the mounting pressures from local government officials, the administration at USC consequently banned all unapproved nonstudents, including former UFO personnel, from campus. In addition, campus police stepped up patrols and randomly checked students’ identification cards to curb the alleged influence of “outside agitators” from manipulating the student body.

Both students and faculty members vocally protested the actions of Foard and the school's administration. On May 1, a group of university professors released a statement that characterized Foard's tactics as a "witch-hunt ... [that is a] threat to the academic freedom of both faculty and students."³⁷ The newly formed Student Emergency Coalition for Academic Freedom, which represented a wide variety of student political ideologies, such as the conservative Student Senate and the liberal radical group known as FREAK (Freedom to Research Every Aspect of Knowledge), also released a statement, which declared that the student body was "disturbed by the brazen attempts by a few ill-informed local politicians to exercise unjust and dictatorial control over the University of South Carolina."³⁸

When the events at Kent State occurred on May 4, tensions on the USC campus were at a high due to the seeming repressive nature of the actions of the administration and local officials regarding personal liberties. On May 5, a Strike Committee was formed that was represented and backed by various elements of student society, such as the Student Senate, FREAK, the Inter-Fraternity Council, the Association of Afro-American Students, the Student Mobilization Committee (SMC), the American Association of University Professors, former members of AWARE, and numerous concerned apolitical students. The meeting called for a peaceful voluntary student strike of classes on May 7 and 8 to protest the events of Kent State and perceived threats to academic and personal freedoms.³⁹

Although university records show that class attendance was at near normal levels on May 7, a group of more than 500 protestors met for a noon rally on the Horseshoe.⁴⁰ During this demonstration, many students carried signs that expressed their rage. Brett Burse recalls a sign that stated:

Strike because there are cops in the Russell House, Strike because they invaded Cambodia, Strike because your classes are obscene in the face of death, Strike against Foard's witch hunt, Strike against dorm hours, Strike against NARC's on campus, Strike against the ROTC, Strike against John Doe warrants, Strike against repression ... STRIKE!⁴¹

According to Cantey Wright, a student protestor at the Horseshoe, students were allowed to speak and voice their opinions regarding numerous issues, including racism, civil rights, free speech, repression of rights on campus, and the Vietnam War.⁴² While the protest began that

morning as a peaceful rally, tension within the group quickly erupted when a faction of conservative students, who were largely represented by the Young Americans for Freedom, angrily decried and resisted the allowance of flags across campus to fly at half-staff in remembrance of the Kent State victims. Fearing the outbreak of violence, President Jones ordered campus police officers to lower the flags to half-staff and monitor the escalating scene.⁴³ Around 2:00 p.m., a group of over 400 students marched to the Russell House to stage a “teach-in” session. According to official records, the University Union had reserved the Russell House as an “available space” for all students to come to for student-related activities. Wright recalls that this action was done in order to have a safe forum for students to voice their concerns on specific issues.⁴⁴

When the students arrived at the Russell House, confusion and disagreement over tactics furthered tensions among the various groups involved. While many students were filing into the Russell House, a group of several dozens of students, many who had been involved with the SMC and AWARE, performed a peaceful sit-in directly in front of the information desk of the Russell House to show their disapproval of the university’s rules regarding the restricted use of the building. According to Cantey Wright, who was also a participant at the sit-in, the protestors stated that the Russell House was built by student funds; thus, students should be able to determine how to use and who should be allowed to use the building. Yet, university records indicate that members of this group demanded keys to the building and asked all university officials to leave the premises.⁴⁵ Wright contends that no such action occurred to his knowledge; rather, he remembers that Russell House officials, who saw a large contingent of students coming toward the building, feared that a building takeover might occur and asked many of the students to leave the area in front of the information desk. The students refused to relent. Because of the ensuing confusion, Wright claims that Russell House officials mistakenly informed the administration that the building was being taken over.⁴⁶

When student government heard of the supposed takeover, they angrily denounced the act and quickly removed their support of the voluntary strike, which caused concern and dismay among the protestors who felt they had been abandoned and alienated. The students within the Russell House nonetheless remained peaceful and continued their contention that they had every right to remain in a public building of the university. University officials, fearing the loss of control over the situation, began ordering the student activists to leave the Russell House

or face arrest. Many students left the interior of the building and gathered outside to continue the protest effort. However, the removal of support by the student government and the continuance of the protest activities in the Russell House fueled confusion and tensions of the large crowd of curious students gathering outside the building, which over a period of several hours had grown to an estimated size of more than 1,000. With the administration growing more impatient, police officers eventually arrived on the scene and demanded that the demonstrators vacate the premises. Although several of the activists left the inside of the building, a group of 41 students refused to relent. As a result, the administration informed the participating students that they were suspended until further notice.⁴⁷

Consequently, police moved in to end the standoff. However, the show of force by the arresting police officers seemed to greatly anger the crowd of students outside the Russell House. According to Jim Bradford, the arrival of the local police officers, who came on campus in full riot gear, led to irritation among the general student population.⁴⁸ With the external crowd growing more disorderly, Governor Robert McNair also ordered the local National Guard to end the demonstration and to aid in the arrest of the protestors within the building. In resistance, many demonstrators outside the building formed a human chain in the hopes of blocking the efforts of the guardsmen. Eventually, the police and the guardsmen were able to forge a path into the Russell House, where they quickly arrested the 41 students and loaded them on a police bus outside. Several members of the external demonstration refused to leave and surrounded the transport vehicle in order to block its path. Numerous more local police moved into the area and arrested several dozen additional students for interfering with the arrests. Eventually, the police were able to disperse the crowd without using violence or tear gas.⁴⁹ However, the next day, a group of 1,000 students marched in front of the state house and called for a pardon for all those arrested in connection with the Russell House incident. While local officials refused to respond to the demands, the demonstration ended peacefully but tensions remained high.⁵⁰

After this incident, the campus remained virtually quiet during the ensuing weekend. On Monday, May 11, the Board of Trustees of USC met to discuss disciplinary actions for the arrested students. By 3:00 p.m., a group of 300 demonstrators, angered by the appearance of outside police on campus and fearing the possibility that the activist students would receive an unfair hearing, assembled directly outside the administrative

building where the inquiry was being held. The protestors had several demands, which included that the accused students be reinstated until their trials were complete and that the trials be held in a more open format.⁵¹

University officials rejected this proposal and continued their meeting. However, the crowd outside the building continued to grow in size and irritation. Around 4:00 p.m., a group of 250 students entered the building. According to Rita Fellers, a student protestor present in the administration building, the majority of the activists engaged in a peaceful sit-in of the bottom floor of the building. However, a few angered students began to vandalize several offices on the lower floors. The administrators, who were concerned for their own safety and the integrity of the university records office on the first floor of the building, remained locked inside a second floor conference room that was protected and occupied by several police officers. Many activists on the first floor area seemed confused about what was taking place. Fearing the further outbreak of violence due to the chaotic situation, Fellers claims that she was able to help calm the students and to convince them to peacefully leave the building before anyone was hurt.⁵²

Bewilderment over what had occurred in the administration building led to tension outside among the large assembly of the student body. With the local police outnumbered and fears of a full-scale riot mounting, the governor ordered the National Guard to subdue the crowd. When the guardsmen finally arrived on the scene at 8:00 p.m., the riotous crowd of demonstrators, which had reached a size of over 2,000 protestors, began throwing rocks, bottles, and vandalizing cars. In order to break up the rowdy crowd, the guardsmen fired tear gas at the protestors. The gas unintentionally infiltrated the ventilation systems of several nearby dormitories, which caused more students to flood the streets in order to evacuate the residence halls. This situation further added to the chaos and resulted in numerous instances in which guardsmen and police officers mistakenly clubbed and/or arrested vacating students. While the riots continued throughout the night, by the next day order had been reestablished and the university's students were placed under a strict 9:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. curfew.⁵³

Conflict would escalate again the following day when an on-campus rally of several hundred students once again exploded in violence following the Governor's refusal to acknowledge the demands of several hundreds of students that amnesty be granted for those involved in the Russell House and administration building takeovers. When frustrations erupted in rock and bottle throwing at several of the campus dorm

facilities, Governor McNair declared a “state of emergency” and called upon the National Guard to use tear gas and force to dispersal the crowds. In the end, many more students were either arrested and/or seriously injured.⁵⁴

At this point, President Jones and numerous members of the faculty took bold actions to calm the tensions of the students. Over a period of a week, several professors held numerous meetings in the dormitories to hear student concerns. Likewise, Jones and McNair agreed to eliminate the police presence in the Russell House; thus, the USC student government was now empowered to regulate activities in the university buildings. These actions proved successful as calm descended over the campus. Ultimately, on May 19, McNair ended the state of emergency and lifted the curfew.⁵⁵ Yet, before the beginning of the following fall semester, 29 students had been suspended for the Russell House incident and 22 more students were suspended for their roles in the administration building takeover. Most of the students involved in the riots were only charged with misdemeanors and avoided jail by paying fines that ranged from \$25 to \$300 dollars. Following May 1970, protest activities at USC remained very small and virtually nonvisible.⁵⁶

Although the previously described events show that local and national issues played a major role in many of the protests that erupted following the shootings at Kent State, the interplay between the various groups involved further shows the complexity in the development of the protest movements at USC. As the actions of local and university officials became more repressive regarding individual liberties, diverse groups of students, such as the conservative student government, the leftist AWARE group, and the majority apolitical student body, became loosely united in a quest to retain power and control over their daily lives. Differences between the student factions would eventually lead to anxiety and confusion that further escalated tensions on campus. In the end, the stressed situation at USC would result in numerous instances of protest, civil disobedience, and riotous activities, such as those seen at the Russell House standoff and the subsequent administration building takeover. Even though the events of May 1970 are typically viewed as isolated blemishes on South Carolina’s history, the legacy of student protests at USC in the 1960s and 1970s shows that not all southerners, especially in the state universities, quietly accepted the dictated norms of their surrounding society. Like at many other major universities across the country, local authorities treated dissidents in a swift, harsh, and arbitrary manner.

The involvement of numerous factions of student society at USC also further complicates traditional arguments of earlier scholars who claim that massive confrontations were solely the result of a few “radical students” who were solely motivated to provoke violent outbreaks. Almost all the student groups at USC supported free speech and civil liberties; yet, each group held differing standards as to which actions were acceptable to bring about change. Moreover, other ideological concerns, including the supposed communist influence of local New Left groups, caused many local officials to use Cold War rhetoric to limit the appeal of activist groups, which further heightened local fears. Consequently, the protest activity at USC not only presents scholars with a chance to examine the development of dissident movements within the previously ignored region of the American South, but it also presents an opportunity for scholars to further focus on the roles that divergent ideologies and group dynamics played in the maturation and outcomes of protest movements across the country.

NOTES

1. Melvin Small, *Antiwarriors: The Vietnam War and the Battle for America's Hearts and Minds* (Wilmington, DE: Scholarly Resources Inc., 2002), 121–122.
2. Jeffery Drobney, “A Generation in Revolt: Student Dissent and Political Repression at West Virginia University,” *West Virginia History* 54 (1995): 105.
3. In many works, authors have focused their attention almost solely on the North and West. In some cases, the authors have acknowledged this omission and justified it by portraying the southern campus as acting distinctly different from the rest of the nation's schools. For an example of this, see Kenneth Heineman, *Campus Wars: The Peace Movement at American State Universities in the Vietnam Era* (New York: New York University Press, 1993), 4–5. For other examples of work that focus upon the North and West while ignoring the South, see Todd Gitlin, *The Sixties: Days of Hope, Days of Rage* (New York: Bantam Books, 1987); Adam Garfinkle, *Telltale Hearts: The Origins and Impact of the Vietnam Antiwar Movement* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1995); Nancy Zaroulis and Gerald Sullivan, *Who Spoke Up? American Protest against the War in Vietnam, 1963–1975* (Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1984). There is a growing scholarly literature that examines the topic of southern campus dissent movements during the Vietnam War era. See, for instance, Craig Keeney, “Resistance: A History of the Anti-Vietnam War Protests in Two Southern Universities, 1966–1970” (MA Thesis, University of South Carolina, 2003); Stan Marshall, *The Tumultuous Sixties: Campus Unrest and Student Life at a Southern University*

(Tallahassee, FL: Sentry Press, 2006); and Gregg Michel, *Struggle for a Better South: The Southern Student Organizing Committee, 1964–1969* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004).

4. Henry Lesesne, *A History of the University of South Carolina, 1940–2000* (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 2001), 212–221.

5. Craig Keeney, “Resistance: A History of the Anti-Vietnam War Protests in Two Southern Universities, 1966–1970” (MA Thesis, University of South Carolina, 2003), 34–35.

6. Lesesne, 198.

7. Jim Bradford, interview with author, September 30, 2005.

8. Ibid.

9. Lesesne, 200.

10. “Passivity is Problem at USC,” *The Gamecock* (April 11, 1969), 2.

11. Mike Spears, interview with author, September 9, 2005.

12. “Statement of Rights: What Does It Say,” *The Gamecock* (November 8, 1968), 1.

13. Spears, interview with author, September 9, 2005.

14. “Bill Would Allow Beer to Be Sold on Campus,” *The Gamecock* (September 27, 1968), 1; “Coeds Affected By New Rules,” *The Gamecock* (September 20, 1968), 1.

15. “Rights Bill Is Approved,” *The Gamecock* (December 13, 1968), 1.

16. Board of Trustees Minutes, University of South Carolina, May 13, 1969.

17. “Memo from AWARE,” Presidential Papers of Thomas Jones (1966–1967), South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Box 5.

18. “White Awareness Week Begins,” *The Gamecock* (February 4, 1969), 1.

19. “White Problem Criticized,” *The Gamecock* (February 11, 1969), 1.

20. “Rally Marred,” *The Gamecock* (September 22, 1969), 1.

21. Brett Burse, interview with author, September 18, 2005.

22. “Report of the Committee to Investigate Communist Activities in South Carolina,” Papers of Provost William H. Patterson (1970–71), South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Box 2.

23. Ibid.

24. Lee Bandy, “FBI Files Tell of Work Against USC Left, UFO,” *The State* (December 16, 1977), A-1.

25. Ibid., A-11.

26. Letter from Thomas Jones to G. A. White, Papers of President Thomas Jones (1967–1968), South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Box 10.

27. “Committee Accepts AWARE’s Letter,” *The Gamecock* (March 14, 1969), 1.

28. Claudia Smith Brinson, "A Villain and a Hero," *The State* (September 29, 1988), A-1; "AWARE to Face Charges," *The Gamecock* (February 18, 1970), 1.
29. Claudia Brinson, "UFO Coffeehouse Typified Clash of Wills in the 1960's," *The State* (September 28, 1988), A-1.
30. Donald Janson, "Antiwar Coffeehouses Delight G.I.'s but Not Army," *New York Times* (August 12, 1968), L-41.
31. Ibid.
32. Brinson, "UFO," A-1.
33. Ibid.
34. Lesesne, 213.
35. Brinson, A-1; Keeney, 63.
36. Ginny Carroll, "Foard May Seek Probe of UFO in Exile," *The State* (April 29, 1970): A-6.
37. John David Spade, "USC Group Says Foard Threatens Freedom," *The State* (May 1, 1970): B-1.
38. "The Months of May," *The University of South Carolina Magazine* 5/2 (Summer 1970): no page.
39. "Strike Planned Thursday," *The Gamecock* (May 6, 1970): 1; "The Months of May," no page.
40. "The Months of May," no page.
41. Brinson, "A Time to Cast Stones," A-1.
42. Cantey Wright, e-mail correspondence with author, October 4, 2005.
43. Ibid.; "The Months of May," no page.
44. Wright, e-mail correspondence with author, October 4, 2005.
45. "The Months of May," no page.
46. Wright, e-mail correspondence, October 4, 2005.
47. Ginny Carroll, "Over 40 Arrested at USC Protest," *The State* (May 8, 1970), A-1, A-6; "The Months of May," no page.
48. Jim Bradford, interview with author, September 30, 2005.
49. Carroll, "Over 40 Arrested at USC Protest," A-6; "41 Arrested during Union Takeover," *The Gamecock* (May 8, 1970), 1.
50. Lesesne, 216.
51. Brinson, "A Time to Cast Stones," A-1.
52. Rita Fellers, interview with author, October 3, 2005.
53. John Spade, "Most Trouble Due to Only Handful," *The State* (May 12, 1970), A-1; Lesesne, 216–217; Keeney, 69–70.
54. Keeney, 70; "Arrests, Violence Plague Campus after Second Building Taken Over," *The Gamecock* (May 13, 1970), 1.
55. Lesesne, 218–219.
56. Brinson, "A Time to Cast Stones," A-1.