

CHAPTER 1

STUDENT MOVEMENT FOR RACIAL EQUALITY

Under the tree...blood on the limbs and blood at the roots, black bodies swinging in the breeze...Bulging eyes and the twisted bowels and then the sudden smell of burning flesh...Here is a strange and bitter fruit.

-Billie Holliday

THE EARLY STUDENT SIT-INS

In the spring of 1960, black students (and some whites) around the South began a militant extra-legal struggle for racial equality and justice. Eventually the students were at the forefront of a grassroots movement of southern blacks. Although the civil rights struggle had begun earlier in the 1950's with the NAACP-led legal battles for desegregation and the mass action of the Montgomery bus boycott of 1955, the Greensboro sit-in heralded in a new era which broke dramatically from the past.

"It is hard to overestimate the electrical effect of that first sit-in in Greensboro, as the news reached the nation on television screens, over radios, in newspapers. In his Harlem apartment in New York City, Bob Moses, a former Harvard graduate student and mathematics teacher, saw a picture of the Greensboro sit-inners. 'The students in that picture had a certain look on their faces,' he later told writer Ben Bagdikian, 'sort of sullen, angry, determined. Before, the Negro in the South had always looked on the defensive, cringing. This time they were taking the initiative. They were kids my age, and I knew this had something to do with my own life....'" (Zinn, 1965, p. 17). Moses later became one of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) leaders.

The Greensboro sit-in struck a chord among southern black students. The idea of nonviolent direct action spread quickly throughout the South, spurring thousands of students and later others to action. Nashville, Tennessee became one center of sit-in activity. Nashville students displayed a level of dedication which was to set the tone for the movement. Those arrested there refused to pay bail, choosing to remain in jail instead. By this, they denied the legitimacy of the legal system in their struggle. In February of 1961, the 'jail, no bail' strategy was adopted as SNCC policy.

Marion Barry, a Fisk University graduate student and later the first chair of SNCC, took a leading role in the Nashville sit-ins. "I came to Fisk...inquired about forming a chapter of the NAACP...but we didn't do much.... We had not at any time thought about direct action. In the meantime in Greensboro, N.C., the student movement began on February 1, 1960. So we in Nashville decided we wanted to do something about it.... I remember the first time I was arrested, about February 27.... I took a chance on losing a scholarship or not receiving my Master's degree. But to me, if I had received my scholarship and Master's degree, and still was not a free man, I was not a man at all," said Barry (ibid., p. 19). Not only did the students risk their academic careers, they braved incarceration and violent reaction to their nonviolent sit-ins. It was not long before they had to prepare themselves to sacrifice their blood and even their lives.

The sit-in movement was soon characterized by skillful organization, creative and sophisticated tactics, and highly principled and disciplined participants. The fundamental

nature of the discrimination they were attacking and the level of dedication of the sit-inners earns them the title of social revolutionaries. Though they were unarmed, they were at war with white supremacy, one of the basic tools used by American business to divide and rule the workers in this country. Impatient with the slow pace of desegregation, the legal system, concessions, and traditional black organizations like the NAACP, they turned to the use of the extraparliamentary tactic of civil disobedience and were soon quite successful in the upper South and peripheral southern states. By addressing their grievances illegally and victoriously, they posed an enormous threat to the American political system, delegitimizing it in the eyes of many of its citizens.

At the April 1960 Raleigh conference, which brought 126 student delegates together, the students decided to remain independent of adult organizations (like the Southern Christian Leadership Conference and the Congress of Racial Equality) but to maintain friendly ties. At the conference, a keynote speaker Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr. articulated the movement's rejection of the NAACP and other "old" black middle-class groups. King characterized the sit-in movement as a "revolt against those Negroes in the middle class who have indulged themselves in big cars and ranch-style homes rather than in joining a movement for freedom," (West, 1984, p. 47).

This desire for autonomy distinguishes the student movement from the 1930's movement and from their white contemporaries of SLID who didn't break from their parent organization until 1962. This mood has characterized the student movement in the U.S. ever since and forms the beginnings of the New Left movement.

In the statement of purpose adopted at the Raleigh Conference, the students declared:

We affirm the philosophical or religious ideal of nonviolence as the foundation of our purpose, the pre-supposition of our faith, and the manner of our action. Nonviolence as it grows from Judaic-Christian traditions seeks a social order of justice permeated by love. Integration of human endeavor represents the first step towards such a society.... (Cohen and Hale, 1967, Appendix).

They decided to set up an office, hire a secretary to staff it, print a newsletter called *The Student Voice*, raise funds, plan nonviolent training for the summer and coordinate the various activities in the South. Their goals were to end segregation and discrimination, assure southern blacks of the right to vote, and to seek fair employment laws among others.

For the most part, the participants in the sit-ins were "not middle class reformers who became somehow concerned about others. They come themselves from the ranks of the victims,...[in general] they are young, they are Negro, they come from the South, their families are poor and of the working class, but they have been to college. Northern middle class whites and Negroes are a minority," (Zinn, 1965, pp. 9-10).

Black students first began to confront the UT Regents around this time.⁴ After months of discussion, on March 11, 1960 a group of students held the first civil rights protest conducted by students at UT. They demonstrated on the fringe of the campus

⁴ Although there had been protests during the 1950's on the UT campus, the participants in these demonstrations were members of the community demanding that the university be opened to African-American students.

calling for university integration. The following day, they wrote a letter in response to a public statement made by UT President Logan Wilson the previous day. Wilson had stated that:

In response to queries to [UT] regarding the policy of integration, it should be pointed out that there is complete integration with reference to all educational opportunities and facilities... [and] forced integration in social and extracurricular areas has not yet been established. In view of our known achievements in meeting what is everywhere a difficult situation, I am surprised that our institution should be made a target for **provocative** demonstrations (*Daily Texan*, March 13, 1960, p. 1 - emphasis added).

The group of less than 50 students picketed a regents meeting which was being held on the campus that weekend. A group of black women presented a petition to be read at the meeting. These women wrote:

Be it resolved that we, the undersigned Negro women of the University of Texas deem the designation of certain specific living units for the exclusive use of Negro women, or the restriction of Negro women to certain specified dorms a deprivation of our recognized right as University students to select the living facilities of our choice, (Duren, 1979, p. 7).

The student demonstrators also wrote a letter to UT President Logan Wilson citing housing, sports and public performance restrictions as areas which needed to be opened up to blacks. In part the letter read:

We recognize the University of Texas was one of the first universities in the South to take significant action toward integration with the admission of Negro undergraduate students in 1956. However, significant advances in this direction have ceased. Our present concern is for a resumption of this policy of leadership and for desegregation in all areas of University life, (ibid.).

Despite Wilson's earlier derogatory statement about the demonstrators, that weekend the UT administration decided to convert International House into a dormitory for black women at a cost of \$30,000 and to open other dorm space for black men. At this time the administration was only bound by the "separate, but equal" doctrine; it had no intention of desegregating further. The concession was called "only a token answer to the urgent question of 'When?'.... A satisfactory answer doesn't seem likely for quite a while. For it is probable that the public relations-conscious university will continue to move just as slowly as in the past - in spite of the protests of the Negro students who desire only to be first class students in a University of the First Class," (*Daily Texan*, March 13, 1960). The student protesters echoed these sentiments when they walked out of a meeting with UT Vice President Harry Ransom on March 15 after their demands for integration of housing, athletics and drama productions were not seriously considered (*Daily Texan*, March 15, 1960).

The March protest was the first student action since the Rainey incident and signalled the beginning of the UT student movement for civil rights. It is significant that the black enrollment at UT was very low at this time and the character of protest was different at the predominantly white university than it was in other areas of the South where much of the protest activity was led by students at black colleges. UT students were, however, quite aware of student activities around the South as some UT students

went to centers of sit-in activity throughout the early 1960's to support other activists and to learn from them.

Students from UT and Huston-Tillotson (a predominantly black college in East Austin) actively sought desegregation in the Austin business community in the late spring. They began picketing restaurants on the Drag in April and started sitting in at downtown lunch counters in May. They also sought to integrate Drag theaters, holding stand-ins and pickets.

That fall, a new student group was formed which reflected the spirit of SNCC. The organization was called Students for Direct Action and its concern was that "integration is practically at a standstill in the university area. Most of the students are not even aware of the segregation tactics employed by the university and by business firms in the area," according to Chandler Davidson, a leader of the group (Duren, 1979). The Students for Direct Action maintained ties with SNCC, continued with sit-ins and pressured the university for change.

During the fall semester the first violent reaction to the student movement occurred. White supremacists exploded a bomb in the stairwell of the YMCA while students involved in desegregation efforts were holding a meeting in the building. Fortunately no one was injured and two of the terrorists (who were UT students) were later charged with involvement in the incident (Duren Papers, Barker Texas History Center). The students used the University area YMCA as a place to conduct orientation sessions for black students and held their meetings there.⁵

The UT students who participated in the civil rights movement in 1960 were primarily motivated by self interest. As in other areas of the South, the participants were mostly black and poor; they were confronted with physical segregation both at school and in the community, as well as the reality of racial hatred. Their political rhetoric was rooted in both the American tradition of Judeo-Christian morality and an appeal to national political symbols (like the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution), espousing equality and freedom.

It was this appeal to traditional moral and political beliefs which attracted the participation of white middle class students whose self-interest was not so directly effected by the civil rights movement. The participation of these white middle class students alongside the black students was crucial for the civil rights movement locally simply because of demographic differences between Texas and other areas of the South. While the populations of states like Mississippi and Alabama are around 50% black, Texas blacks compose about 12% of the state's population. Thus, the ability to mobilize white and middle class students through the appeal to traditional American beliefs was an important trait of the local movement.

Initial participants in the student movement for racial equality at UT were few in number. They were mostly black, poor and very dedicated. They were not only UT students but also Huston-Tillotson students who participated in the early sit-ins. The actions during 1960 by this relatively small group of committed activists had earned them a following of many whites in the university community by Spring of 1961.

⁵ The 'Y' became the center for radical student groups later in the 1960's and early 1970's.

GROWING MILITANCY AMONG BLACK STUDENTS

As previously mentioned in February 1961, SNCC adopted the "jail, no bail" strategy as policy. Ten students had been arrested in Rock Hill, South Carolina and refused bail. SNCC sent four people to join the others for the purpose of dramatizing the injustice. The fourteen young people spent a month in prison. 'Jail, no bail' spread quickly, first to Atlanta where 80 students from black colleges went to jail. As public opinion increasingly swung in their favor and more desegregation victories were achieved, the students became even more militant that summer with their involvement in the bloody Freedom Rides.

The northern civil rights group CORE organized the first Freedom Ride in May of 1961 to draw attention to the southern failure to enforce a Supreme Court decision to outlaw segregation in interstate travel. The thirteen Freedom Riders (some of whom were students) began the bus ride in Washington, D.C. with New Orleans as their destination. Although they encountered some harassment and a few arrests in the upper South, their passage through the Deep South (Mississippi and Alabama) proved the greatest obstacle. In Anniston and Birmingham, Alabama the Riders braved bombs, bus-burnings and beatings by white mobs. Police protection was almost nil. They decided to fly from Birmingham to New Orleans to participate in a mass rally there on May 17.

Students from Nashville and Atlanta refused to accept this victory for white supremacy. Although the student Freedom Riders went farther and received more protection than the first convoy, they too faced violent mobs, this time in Montgomery, Alabama. While they treated their wounds, they were met by more student Riders there and continued to Jackson, Mississippi where the 27 were arrested. They refused to pay their fines and spent two months on a penal farm where many of them were beaten.

The adult organization SCLC conceded to the federal government a temporary lull in the Freedom Rides, but the Attorney General had negotiated with the wrong group. A pilgrimage of students to Jackson continued throughout the summer. By August, over 300 had been arrested. The guards at the Parchman penitentiary used electric shocks, "wristbreakers,"⁶ and other forms of torture on the students, but were unable to break their spirits. If the students had not remained so strong in their determination, it is probable that they would not have achieved the victory of September 22, 1961 when the Interstate Commerce Commission decided to desegregate bus and train stations.

After the Freedom Riders were released from prison in August, SNCC held a meeting at Highlander Folk School in Tennessee. At the Highlander meeting, the conflict between those supporting concessions to the political establishment (i.e. to the Kennedy administration) and those supporting a continuation of the uncompromising tactics of SNCC. "In the eyes of many SNCC members, the 'Establishment' against which they were struggling began to encompass both the Democratic Party's liberals and the SCLC's black activist liberals. This slow rupture would result in some glaring defeats in the civil rights movement, most notably the Albany, Georgia Movement in December 1961, and also led to the gradual breakaway of SNCC from the techniques of nonviolence," (West,

⁶ The term "wristbreakers" refers to a long metal tool used by police to more easily pin a person's arm behind her/his back. They are functional in arresting or quieting an inmate, because they allow increased leverage and thus application of pain to the victim's wrist and arm. They are sometime used to aid in police interrogation.

1984, p. 48). The student factions compromised, deciding to continue the direct action strategy and also to pursue voter registration of blacks in the Deep South. The activists then headed south.

Meanwhile at UT, the controversy over segregated university facilities was heating up. In January 1961, students began picketing the segregated theaters on the Drag in increasing numbers following scuffles between hecklers and picketers. By February, the stand-in crowd had grown to over 500 students. Faculty members began to support the protesters at this time, with 260 signing an *Austin American Statesman* advertisement for theater integration (Duren, 1979).

Segregated university housing was increasingly opposed by students during the spring. In May, the regents received petitions from the Student Assembly and the Faculty in favor of integration of housing and athletics; over 7000 signed the pro-integration petition. However opposition continued; 1300 students signed a petition opposing the integration of dorm (ibid.). The majority of students did support integration by this time. A poll conducted in May 1961 indicated that roughly 60% of the students favored "equal access to all University-owned facilities," (ibid.).

The Board of Regents ignored the opinions of the faculty and students by unanimously adopting a policy opposing integration at its July meeting. They issued a statement saying:

Whether or not we agree with the decisions of the Supreme Court on racial integration, we shall in good faith proceed and have heretofore proceeded along this path with all deliberate speed.... We have a heavy responsibility to perform, and we respectfully ask you to trust our judgment. **We do not feel that any substantial changes should be made in the immediate future**, but we shall continue to move forward with due and deliberate speed as we think advisable under all the circumstances which exist from time to time (ibid. - emphasis added).

This statement reflects the paternalism, arrogance and intransigence on the part of the regents which has been a characteristic attitude of the body toward social change. The decision was a slap in the face to the university community and demonstrated the lack of democracy within the university structure.⁷ The fact that they reached this decision during the summer months when most students were not on campus reflects their fear of opposition to this undemocratic move.

When the students returned to campus in the fall of 1961, they resumed their efforts to integrate university housing. At the time, black women were housed in Whitis Dorm and Almetris Co-op under much poorer living conditions than those enjoyed by white co-eds. The housing for black men was also inferior to that of Anglo men.

Black students were enraged when they found out about an incident at Kinsolving Dormitory. Student advisers had briefed the female residents on the rules of race relations within the dorm. They told the students that black women visiting in Kinsolving could not use water fountains or restrooms and that black men should not be inside the white women's dorm unless they were workers (Duren Papers, Barker Texas History Center).

⁷ In my opinion, the ambiguous language of this statement reflects a premonition on the part of the regents that opposition to segregation among the students would increase.

On October 13, three young black women tested the rules by visiting a white student. No confrontation resulted. So the women organized a larger scale violation of the dorm's rules for the following week. On October 19, approximately 55 black students (men and women) went into the dorm's parlor and held a sit-in. When dorm supervisors told them to leave, they refused. As had been predetermined, they left of their own volition after one hour. Thirty of these Kinsolving sit-inners were targeted by the UT administration for disciplinary procedures. Their "crime" was failure to obey "properly constituted authority" when asked to leave the dorm.⁸

More demonstrations followed. White students joined the picketing of Kinsolving. The picketers received national media attention because they pointed out that the Vice President's daughter Lynda Bird Johnson (a Kinsolving resident) was living in segregated housing (Embree interview). The General Faculty voted 308-34 against disciplining the students and in favor of integration of dorms and eating facilities. Students turned out in record numbers to vote in an election referendum favoring integration. The Students for Direct Action agreed with UT President Joseph Smiley to a cooling-off period in exchange for amnesty for the protesters. Despite all of this, the thirty black students were placed on yearlong disciplinary probation (Duren, 1979).

In addition to the unpopular disciplining, the university formalized the previously informal rules against racial interaction on November 6. The statement of rules for university-owned housing declared:

The social and dining areas of Whitis Dormitory and overnight privileges for women guests in the dormitory are available only to Negroes. The social and dining areas of other [white] women's residence halls and overnight privileges in these dormitories are not available to Negroes. Students living in these residence halls may invite other girls to their rooms as personal guests, but are expected to respect the rights of their fellow residents at all times. Students living in men's residence halls may invite other men to their rooms, but are expected to respect the rights of their fellow residents at all times.

These residence halls are not public buildings, but are reserved by contract with the occupants for their use and enjoyment subject to dormitory rules and regulations. All persons entering these dormitories are expected to observe all university rules and regulations...and to respect duly constituted authority vested in University personnel (ibid).

The students, not a little disheartened by the administration's refusal to be swayed by the mandate of the students and faculty, decided to seek recourse through the legal system. Three black students filed a federal lawsuit against the university seeking a court order to abolish dormitory segregation. To support the legal effort, student activities switched from demonstrations to fund raising.

This decision on the part of the Students for Direct Action presents an obvious contradiction to the actions of students throughout the South who opposed taking their struggle to the legal system. Obviously, black students at UT did not subscribe to this rejection of the judicial system. Why not? I conjecture that the black students, who

⁸ This was the first incident (which I encountered in my research) of administrative persecution of students for political protesting.

numbered less than 200 at the time, could not afford to pursue the militant "jail, no bail" strategy which had worked in desegregating other areas of the South. Had they done so, the university could have pressed criminal charges against them and kicked them out of school, defeating the entire purpose of integrating the dorms by purging the school of most of its black students.

It must also be said that although the militancy of students was increasing during this period, UT students were more conciliatory than were the majority of student civil rights activists. This can be partially explained by their absorption into the academic community. Comparatively, a large number of the SNCC militants had taken leave or dropped out of school in order to participate in the activities of the civil rights movement, especially when the emphasis of their activities shifted to the Deep South in late 1961. The UT activists, for the most part, remained in school to pursue both desegregation and their own education. By being enrolled in school during their struggle for racial equality, they were subject to the numerous rules and regulations of the school in addition to the institutionalized racism of the university. The fact of their education by white professors and the ubiquitous whiteness of all authority figures within the institution certainly played a role in mitigating their militancy.

In immediate response to the students' legal action, UT bypassed regular legal procedures by hiring three special attorneys to plead its case. Normal procedure would have been for the state attorney general to argue UT's case for segregation of housing. However, power and money enabled UT to circumvent the usual course of action.

At the end of the fall 1961 semester, a federal action occurred which had a big impact on the political situation at UT. The Peace Corps, which had planned to conduct a multi-million dollar training program at UT, decided to transfer the project to the University of Oklahoma instead, following its realization of the university's policy of segregating dormitories. This was the first act of federal intervention at UT; it served to galvanize faculty support in favor of desegregation (Duren papers, Barker Texas History Center).

In January of 1962, the lawsuit for integrated housing was threatened when the Texas Attorney General filed motions for the suit to be dropped; despite repeated delays in the case, the students continued to support it, but began to turn back to the confrontational tactics previously used. One of their targets was the Forty Acres Club, a newly opened private 'whites-only' faculty club often used for university meetings and entertaining official university visitors (Vertical File - Minority Groups UT, Barker Texas History Center). Students for Direct Action began picketing the club, much to the chagrin of the faculty members who supported integration of the students' dorms but were much less vocal about integrating their own club.

Students actions in the community received a good deal of publicity during 1962. The sit-ins and pickets of segregated businesses in the campus area continued. Students challenged racial segregation off-campus more during this period and achieved a victory in desegregating the two campus-area theaters. In the fall semester, the Students for Direct Action found out that a UT ice-skating class was to be taught at a segregated ice-skating rink. They picketed and held stand-ins at the Austin Ice Palace and were able to have the class cancelled. During the summer of 1962, a token change was made allowing blacks of the same sex visiting privileges in white dorms.

In the Fall of 1962, Rev. Martin Luther King of SCLC came to Austin. His aid was enlisted by the students in planning non-violent activities to achieve total UT integration. At the time, they listed the activities to be integrated as housing, intercollegiate athletics, faculty, student teaching, Longhorn Band, drama productions, student employment in all areas, the Brackenridge Apartments and the university Queen competition. In the form of the newly organized group Negroes for Equal Rights (NER), they also asked King for moral and financial support for the housing lawsuit (ibid.).

The Campus Interracial Committee (CIC) made a presentation at a Board of Regents meeting in late September. The CIC called for immediate and full integration of university housing, athletics and employment. (Duren, 1979). Although the regents refused to change their policy, they did approve a provisional admissions program, a plan to admit students in the summer who did not qualify for admission in the long session. The stipulation was that the students could qualify for fall admission if they did satisfactory work in certain courses over the summer. The program was not designed for minority students but enabled many to enter the university. The main reason the program did help minority students enter the school is because the cultural and social bias of the SAT and ACT tests required for admission had prevented many qualified minorities from matriculating (McMillan interview).

Later in the semester, the Student Assembly rescinded a previously passed bill calling for a referendum on integration of university housing and athletics (Duren, 1979). The student government of the university has often been characterized as an impotent body of yes-men which serves only to pad the resumés of those who enjoy holding powerless political positions. As indicated by the two previous incidents wherein students voted for integration to no avail, the referendum likely would have made no difference to the intransigent regents.

In the spring of 1963, the NER staged numerous non-violent activities. It also focused some of the students' efforts on the Austin community. In February, the NER began pressuring the Austin City Council to pass legislation outlawing discrimination practices in restaurants, motels, hotels, and recreational facilities. When their proposal was rejected, they began picketing of segregated businesses in the downtown area with vigor. In April the students staged a parade depicting the burial of Uncle Tom in protest of segregation in the downtown area. An increasing number of whites were participating in the protests. The students in May targeted the campus area restaurants persistently holding several sit-ins and frequent pickets (Duren Papers, Barker Texas History Center).

THE WALLS COME TUMBLING DOWN

The UT civil rights movement finally tasted victory in the fall of 1963. After two days of picketing a regents meeting by the CIC for the removal of all racial bars at UT, the Board ruled on November 9 to "remove all student restrictions of every kind and character based on race or color," (Duren, 1979) permitting widespread integration in student activities at the school. Because of UT's participation in southwest regional athletics, the ruling also opened up Southwest Conference intercollegiate sports to black athletes.⁹

⁹ *De facto* desegregation of university athletics would not take place until the coaches were pressured by the Afro-Americans for Black Liberation in the late 1960's.

However, the ruling left untouched the university-owned dormitories, boarding houses and dining halls because these "are auxiliary enterprises which do not constitute part of the educational process of the university." At this time the lawsuit over university housing integration was still pending. Therefore, on December 19, 1963 the CIC held a demonstration at Kinsolving. They sang, marched and protested the segregated housing policy (*Daily Texan*, December 20, 1963).

In January, the Forty Acres Club served a black newsman working as associate press secretary to President Johnson. The club, which had practiced a strict "whites-only" policy up until this point, began systematically admitting black guests the day following this incident. The club did not allow black members however until March of 1965.

STUDENT VICTORY: UT-OWNED HOUSING INTEGRATED

During the Spring of 1964, the CIC and the Students for Direct Action continued their protests against dormitory segregation. Due to these protests and the fact that UT wanted a federal agency to underwrite a construction contract for new accommodations for married students, the regents approved integration for the proposed married students' dormitory as well as for summer seminar participants at all dorms.

In May of 1964 after years of legal stalling and a lack of financial support for the plaintiffs, the students who had filed suit against UT housing integration dropped their case. In response, the regents voted 6-1 (with two abstaining) to remove all racial barriers in housing. Also the first black faculty member was hired at this time - Dr. Ervin Perry, an assistant professor in the engineering department.

Although the housing integration policy had been made known in May following the regents' meeting, its institutionalization began on June 1, 1964 when UT President Norman Hackerman sent out a memo representing both capitulation to pressures for integration and a clever move to maintain the status quo. The memo resulted from a decision of the regents to integrate student housing and activities. It read:

With respect to the admission and education of students, with respect to the employment and promotion of teaching and nonteaching personnel, with respect to student and faculty activities conducted on premises owned or occupies by the university, neither the University of Texas nor any of its component institutions shall discriminate **either in favor of or against any person on account of his or her race, creed, or color.** (Duren, 1979 - emphasis added).

This ruling signaled capitulation on the part of the regents to student and faculty demands for racial equality within the institution. The victory followed ten years of difficult struggle on the part of southern blacks and five years of student protest at the university. The factors leading up to this change of heart on the part of the regents include widespread student and faculty support for complete integration, the publicity-grabbing protest tactics of black and white UT students, the building momentum of the civil rights movement, President LBJ's humiliation over Texas' segregated university¹⁰

¹⁰ See *Texan* and *Rag* articles regarding scheduled Johnson speech at graduation ceremonies.

and the threat of federal intervention (as exemplified in the annulment of the Peace Corps contract).

However, the ruling effectively outlawed minority recruitment and resulted in a decrease in black enrollment in 1965 and 1966. It served to maintain the status quo by making no positive statement favoring the increase of minority enrollment. The ruling also violated Title VI of the Civil Rights Act (which was passed a month later), which stated that "previously discriminatory recipients must take affirmative action to overcome the effect of prior discrimination." It would be another eleven years before UT was forced to comply with Title VI.

SIGNIFICANCE - NATIONAL CIVIL RIGHTS MOVEMENT It is significant that the university decided to integrate student activities before the Civil Rights Act was passed. Although the decision to integrate can be partially attributed to the fact that President LBJ was scheduled to speak at the May 30, 1964 commencement ceremonies and security concerns related to this presidential speaking engagement, the decision also demonstrates the effectiveness of the civil rights movement in 1963 as the previously middle class student movement was drawing in the participation of the black working class. The civil rights movement culminated in the 1963 Birmingham protests where mass nonviolent direct action led to the arrests of over 3000 people and televised newscasts aroused the sympathy of many Americans. One civil rights leader Bayard Rustin wrote about Birmingham:

It was the loss of all fear that produced the moment of truth in Birmingham: children as young as six paraded calmly when dogs, fire hoses and police billies were used against them.... Thousands of teenagers stood by at the churches through the whole country, waiting their turn to face the clubs of Bull Connor's police, who are known to be among the most brutal in the nation.... Day after day the brutality and arrests went on. And always, in the churches, hundreds of well-disciplined children awaited their turns. (Zinn, 1973, p. 207).

As the movement was broadening its demands to encompass the needs of its new participants, change occurred among the movement's leaders some of whom were willing to make concessions to the federal government. As the victory of black enfranchisement was becoming a reality, there was some hesitation on the part of the movement's middle class leaders to incorporate the demand of economic justice for the black underclass.

The March on Washington in 1963 (when King made his famous "I-have-a dream" speech) reflected a central dilemma: "the existence and sustenance of the civil rights movement neither needed nor required white aid or allies, yet its success required liberal support in the Democratic Party, Congress and the White House.... With white liberal support, the movement would achieve limited success, but slowly lose its legitimacy in the eyes of the now more politicized black petit bourgeois students, working poor and underclass. Without white liberal support, the movement could raise more fundamental issues of concern to the black working poor and underclass, yet thereby render the movement marginal to mainstream American politics and hence risk severe repression," (West, 1984, p. 49). An example of this conflict can be seen in King and other civil rights leaders' censoring of SNCC activist John Lewis' prepared speech in the 1963 March on Washington. Lewis' original speech had lashed out at the Kennedy

administration for its slow pace of change and failure to ensure that the constitutional rights of blacks in the Deep South were upheld.

Middle class blacks were the ones who would benefit from the civil rights movement; their ability to address the economic issues which affected most of the new black working class participants¹¹ posed a threat to the American status quo. As black unity strengthened and became more radicalized, the government realized it would have to make concessions to avoid a revolution; thus the 1964 Civil Rights Act. With its passage, the first stage of the black freedom movement ended because it had achieved its liberal goals.

The student civil rights movement did not end at UT in 1964 with the integration of dormitories. Many Austin businesses remained segregated in 1964, as did some university-owned housing. However, the movement did begin to change at this time. Working class and poor black involvement in the civil rights movement necessitated a transformation. The gains of 1964 threatened to divide educated students and middle class leaders from the poor blacks involved. After 1964, blacks in the ghettos began rioting and were brutally repressed. Black power began to emerge in the mid-1960's and served to unify members of the black freedom movement who were beginning to be separated by socio-economic status. This black power movement also served to continue the demand for change in the status of blacks. To their credit, the SNCC activists continued in their dedication to the black underclass through voter registration drives and the Freedom Schools in the mid-1960's. The student struggle against racism will be discussed further in detail in Chapter 3: From Civil Rights to Black Liberation (1964-8) as well as in subsequent chapters.

¹¹ Poor blacks, who could not afford to sit at a desegregated lunch counter or see a movie in an integrated theater, did not gain much by this social change which did not include any redress of economic inequality.