

Fall 2013

Racial desegregation of higher education in Virginia: Black and white, and gray?

Alexandra Jaclyn Kolleda
James Madison University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://commons.lib.jmu.edu/honors201019>

Recommended Citation

Kolleda, Alexandra Jaclyn, "Racial desegregation of higher education in Virginia: Black and white, and gray?" (2013). *Senior Honors Projects, 2010-current*. 440.
<https://commons.lib.jmu.edu/honors201019/440>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Honors College at JMU Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Senior Honors Projects, 2010-current by an authorized administrator of JMU Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact dc_admin@jmu.edu.

Racial Desegregation of Higher Education in Virginia: Black and White, and Gray?

A Project Presented to
the Faculty of the Undergraduate
College of Arts and Letters
James Madison University

in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Bachelor of Arts

by Alexandra Jaclyn Kolleda

December 2013

Accepted by the faculty of the Department of History, James Madison University, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Bachelor of Arts.

FACULTY COMMITTEE:

HONORS PROGRAM APPROVAL:

Project Advisor: Margaret M. Mulrooney, Ph.D.
Associate Professor, History

Barry Falk, Ph.D.,
Director, Honors Program

Reader: Raymond M. Hyser, Ph.D.
Professor, History

Reader: Gabrielle M. Lanier, Ph.D.
Professor, History

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	3
The Beginning of Desegregation in Public Schools	4
<i>Brown v. Board of Education to Regents of the University of California v. Bakke</i>	8
Virginia's Struggle with Desegregation in Institutions of Higher Learning	24
Madison College: Desegregation at a Southern, Women's Institution	43
Conclusion: How Far Have We Come?	69
Bibliography	73

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank Dr. Margaret Mulrooney without whom this thesis would not have been possible. She was instrumental in not only reading and critiquing this thesis, but also in providing invaluable assistance in finding research material and interviewees. Thanks also to Drs. Gabrielle Lanier and Raymond Hyser for reading and providing feedback on this thesis. Others who aided in my research are Daphyne Thomas, Ronald Carrier, Purcell Conway, Steve Smith, Arthur Dean, Sheary Darcus Johnson, and William Hall who were willing to discuss their own experiences with desegregation at Madison with me and provided invaluable information in this thesis.

The Beginning of Desegregation in Public Schools

In today's schools, *Brown v. Board of Education* is taught and celebrated as the deciding factor in school desegregation. Truthfully, *Brown* did little to end segregation in northern schools, let alone the southern ones. The southern states adopted a Southern Manifesto, espoused by Senator Harry F. Byrd, Sr. of Virginia, which promised to resist school integration by all possible means. The idea is known today as massive resistance. The goals of the *Brown v. Board* decision of 1954 would take over 20 years to achieve in Virginia, and conflict still did not end after the 1970s.

With *Brown v. Board* struggling to make an impact, the nation attempted to implement a project in the 1960s, called Affirmative Action, which worked to correct the years of unfair discrimination against not only African Americans, but other minorities as well. The project attempted to provide equal opportunity to all races in the United States. Not many regulations were outlined on how to implement Affirmative Action. In the workplace, many businesses implemented a sort of proportionality, in which the composition of their workforce was proportional to the racial mix of the host community. In higher education, the percentage of minority employees had to match the percentage of minority persons within the community. Often times, this was still unfair, considering many of these minority employees were hired as unskilled employees, not faculty. It was assumed that blacks were inferior and incapable of holding such positions. In regards to admissions processes, many universities implemented quotas in order to ensure that minority students were being accepted, regardless of their qualifications. Many students denied admission to a university and their parents began to blame these minority quotas.

Today, Affirmative Action evokes negative public sentiments of a different sort. In 1978, in *Regents of the University of California v. Bakke*, the Supreme Court ruled that Affirmative Action constituted reverse discrimination. Many blacks believed that Affirmative Action allowed minorities to integrate historically white businesses and schools; however, many whites assumed that standards were lowered allowing these minority peoples to take the spots that should go to more qualified white applicants; thus, after Bakke, schools were no longer allowed to set minority quotas. On the other hand, they were still encouraged to promote diversity on their campuses. Today, diversity is the main emphasis on college campuses, but they still manage to anger both black and white students with their wavering admissions policies.

Much has been written about the desegregation of American education, especially the backlash from white parents and school boards. This scholarship is exemplified by historian Karen Anderson's research on Central High School. Anderson claims that schools might have made an effort to comply with federal regulations in the beginning; however, fear and anger from white parents regarding the safety of their children, and the desire for state funding stalled this endeavor.¹ The desegregation of higher institutions of learning, however, is largely ignored. At this level, it would have been the university and college students, rather than parents, fighting either for or against desegregation.

This thesis will relate the popular sentiments of white Virginia university students, Madison College students in particular, regarding both the integration of their campuses in the 1960s and 1970s, as well as their feelings about reverse discrimination. Previously, historians have chosen to look at the administration and Boards of Visitors' sentiments about integration, rather than the students themselves. Both J. Rupert Picott and Robert Pratt emphasize that while

¹Karen Anderson, *Little Rock: Race and Resistance at Central High School* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010); Caroline Eick, *Race-Class Relations and Integration in Secondary Education: The Case of Miller High* (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2010).

the administration and board of visitors typically have the authority to prevent or impose integration, the popular sentiments on integration itself must come from the students that will truly be affected.² This thesis will also describe the experiences of African-American students and the environment they encountered during the beginning of integrated college education. It is important that integration is looked at from the students' point of view, because they are most often acting on behalf of their own beliefs and opinions. The administration and Boards of Visitors are normally acting on behalf of external forces and for reasons of publicity.

The thesis contains four chapters. The first chapter explains the three major events leading up to actual integration, including *Brown v. Board*, the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and Affirmative Action, specifically the case *Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education*. The second chapter examines changes on some leading Virginia campuses. Due to time constraints, not all Virginia institutions of higher education were considered; however, a close look was given to institutions, such as the Virginia Commonwealth University, the Virginia Military Institute, and the College of William and Mary from which primary sources were available. In addition to those primary sources, important secondary sources were used to round out the topic of the desegregation of institutions of higher education in Virginia. Chapter three focuses on Madison College in Harrisonburg, Virginia. In order to gauge the sentiments of these students, university and city newspapers and yearbooks were consulted as well as interviews with former Madison College students. It is important to state that this thesis has limitations, because due to time and funding, not many black or white Madison College students could be formally interviewed. The real voices of students in this paper cannot represent all of the student

²J. Rupert Picott, "Desegregation of Higher Education in Virginia," *The Journal of Negro Education* 27, no. 3 (1958): 324-331; Robert A. Pratt, "A Promise Unfulfilled: Desegregation in Richmond, Virginia, 1956-1986," *The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* 99, no. 4 (October 1991): 415-448.

body; however, they are supplemented by student voices in the *Breeze* and *Bluestone*. The final chapter takes a look at how far desegregation and diversity have come within higher education today, and whether or not Virginia has stalled or continued her commitment to providing equal education regardless of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin. It questions whether Virginia has reached a state of “full integration,” meaning that not only are students participating in the same classes and social events, but also that discussion and celebration of both cultures is available on campus and that both races have equality of opportunity.

This thesis ultimately argues that in many Virginia universities the administration and board of visitors were wary of desegregation; however, their students leaned toward some form of racial equality. At Madison College, for example, students were largely accepting of equal education by the 1970s. Indeed, Madison students made many concerted efforts to make African-American students feel at home, but it would still be unfair to say that higher education is fully integrated today. Both white and black students see themselves as residing within different realms of society, and full equality of opportunity cannot be had without complete social, as well as academic, integration.

Brown v. Board of Education to Regents of the University of California v. Bakke

In 1954, Chief Justice Earl Warren, along with a unanimous Supreme Court, decided in *Brown v. Board of Education* that *Plessy v. Ferguson*, which legalized segregation through the doctrine of “separate but equal,” could no longer be considered constitutional. Warren famously stated in his decision that “in the field of public education, separate but equal has no place,” undermining the foundation of *Plessy v. Ferguson*, and, in theory, jumpstarting the desegregation of the nation’s public schools.³ The *Brown* decision, however, provided no structure for application and vaguely instructed the schools to desegregate with “all deliberate speed.” The decision outraged the southern states, although their initial reaction was one of relief, knowing that the ambiguous verdict left them with ample time to circumvent the decision. For example, the residents of Richmond, Virginia were able to stall actual desegregation in their public schools for sixteen years, giving white parents enough time to flee “to the suburbs or [enroll] their children in private schools.”⁴ Two professors at the University of Virginia in the 1950s declared that “deliberate speed . . . must be determined community by community,” allowing Virginia to comply with the federal mandate to integrate without truly making an effort.⁵ *Brown* just did not have the local backing behind it that facilitated the enforcement of integration.

Instead of integration, most states adopted plans of desegregation, which simply meant that the states overturned laws assigning African-Americans to different institutions of learning. Many of the people leading programs of desegregation claimed that it was a gradual way of implementing integration into their school systems. Some counties did comply with this

³*The Oxford Guide to United States Supreme Court Decisions*, 2nd ed., s.v. “*Brown v. Board*;”

⁴Pratt, “A Promise Unfulfilled,” 416.

⁵J. Rupert Picott, “The Status of Educational Desegregation in Virginia,” *The Journal of Negro Education* 25, no. 3 (1956): 350.

“gradual integration” by allowing several African-American students to attend—those brave enough to apply risked total social alienation and, oftentimes, bodily harm.⁶

In 1957, three years after the *Brown* decision, Central High School, in Little Rock, Arkansas, admitted nine African-American students. The Blossom Plan, created by Superintendent of Schools Virgil Blossom, acknowledged this token desegregation as a first step towards gradual integration. Public opposition to the plan, however, frightened the school board members who largely attempted to avoid the implication of their involvement in the arrangement. This avoidance “created a political culture of buck-passing that heightened the threat of violence and retarded racial change by encouraging the beliefs that federal court decisions lacked legitimacy and that defiance could be effective.”⁷ Little Rock was destructive to the Supreme Court decision because it allowed some white supremacists to question the legitimacy of the decision as well as its enforceability. It gave them the opening they needed.

While the white administration of Central High School and the extremist parents of the white students worked to avoid desegregation, many of the more moderate students tried to welcome their African-Americans peers, rather than provoke them. The black students at Central High School were faced with discrimination, but there were other white students who understood their frustration. For example, after repeated harassment, “Minnijean [Brown] took her tray and dumped its contents, including a bowl of chili, on two boys sitting in [her] vicinity.”⁸ These two boys, however, had not been involved in her harassment. Instead they admitted that they “sympathized with her. One of them said that he ‘knew she’d been through a

⁶Pratt, “A Promise Unfulfilled,” 432-433.

⁷Anderson, *Little Rock*, 56.

⁸*Ibid.*, 94.

lot of strain recently and could be expected to pop off.”⁹ Many of the moderate white students were just as frightened of the “tough [extremist] students” as the African-Americans were.¹⁰ Although they did not mind the African-American students attending their high school, they adopted “the politics of silence and avoidance” of their parents to avoid conflict with their more radical peers.¹¹

Unfortunately, this politics of silence hurt the African-American cause. In Martin Luther King, Jr.’s, *Letter From A Birmingham Jail*, he famously stated that the white moderates were more hurtful to the cause than the radicals themselves. He condemned the white church leaders for neither prosecuting the African-American freedom fighters, nor offering a helping hand. The central obstacle for *Brown v. Board* appeared to be the white moderate as well. King’s moderates believed in integration; however, they believed the only way to achieve that integration was to sit back and wait. Waiting, however, was no longer an option for many African-Americans who realized they were getting nowhere fast.¹²

Governor Orville Faubus closed Little Rock Central High School for the 1958-59 school year in order to avoid compliance with integration; however, in 1959, the Supreme Court intervened “ruling that the school closings were unconstitutional and ‘evasive schemes could not be used to circumvent integration.’”¹³ Shortly after, Little Rock’s schools reopened and began to comply with the federal mandate to integrate. Only three of the original nine African American students graduated from Central High School—Ernest Green, Jefferson Thomas, and Carlotta Walls Lanier. Minniejean Brown, famous for dumping her chili, was expelled from the high

⁹ Anderson, *Little Rock*, 94.

¹⁰ Ibid., 96.

¹¹ Ibid., 94-96.

¹² Martin Luther King, Jr., “Letter From A Birmingham Jail,” African Studies Center-University of Pennsylvania, http://www.africa.upenn.edu/Articles_Gen/Letter_Birmingham.html (accessed January 25, 2013).

¹³ Judy L. Hasday, *The Civil Rights Act of 1964: An End to Racial Segregation* (New York: Chelsea House Publishers, 2007), 66.

school for “responding to a racial slur.” It was not until 1960 that a true process of desegregation was actually accepted in Little Rock, Arkansas. The Little Rock administration had challenged the authority of the federal government for four years until finally sinking into compliance. Its challenge was, however, taken up by others hostile to the idea of integration.¹⁴

While those African-American students brave enough to begin desegregation were faced with racial slurs from the radical whites and the acquiescence of the moderate whites, they were also in a difficult position among their own communities. Many of them were under extraordinary pressure to succeed. They believed “that the hope of future generations of black children rested with them,” but much of the time they were at a disadvantage due to their white teachers’ condescension and racial prejudice.¹⁵ While they wanted the opportunity to have an equal education to that of white children, they were also faced with almost impossible barriers to surpass. Their teachers’ prejudice often affected the grades and honors awarded black students, and they were not welcome in extracurricular activities, especially sports. While black students were subject to physical abuse within the hallways and classrooms, abuse was much more prominent on the playing fields. The constant stream of racial slurs, physical abuse, and lack of positive reinforcements significantly lowered black students’ self-esteem; therefore, their participation and achievement in school continued to suffer.¹⁶

Brown v. Board did even less to mandate a desegregation of higher institutions of learning. A few universities had begun some level of desegregation prior to the ruling. In 1950, “some graduate programs at the University of Virginia, including the law school, admitted one or two African-American students,” but this admittance occurred largely because “a federal court

¹⁴Hasday, *The Civil Rights Act of 1964*, 60-61.

¹⁵Pratt, “A Promise Unfulfilled,” 422.

¹⁶*Ibid.*, 421-422.

ordered [Gregory] Swanson admitted” into the institution.¹⁷ Originally the Board of Visitors denied his application, but “a poll of students and faculty indicated that a significant portion of the University community would not object to the presence of African American students in UVA classrooms; some students even petitioned the Board of Visitors to admit Swanson.”¹⁸ It appears that even in the largely conservative area of Charlottesville, the liberal university community had little concern with the admittance of some African-American students; however, that does not mean that the institution was in favor of mass integration, either.

J. Rupert Picott, an elementary school principal, claimed in 1958 that it was easier to attempt desegregation in the higher institutions of education than elsewhere. “Higher education,” he stated, “is, within limitations, a bright spot in the movement toward the establishment of brotherhood and provision for equality of education in a democracy.” Picott gained considerable experience through his own attempts to desegregate a Newport News elementary school. He was fired from the position of principal in the 1940s due to his support of equal pay for black and white teachers. When he wrote this article in 1958, he was struck by the defiance of primary and secondary schools to *Brown v. Board* and was hopeful at the efforts of some higher levels of education to begin desegregation. Truthfully, it is well known that, in the 1960s, college and university campuses were hotbeds of political discussion and change; therefore it is realistic to assume that the younger generation of students, old enough to be considered adults in their own right, would lead the way for integration. This 1958 source, however, was written shortly after *Brown v. Board*, meaning that Picott had not experienced

¹⁷Matthew D. Lassiter and Andrew B. Lewis, Eds., *The Moderates' Dilemma: Massive Resistance to School Desegregation in Virginia* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1998), 76, 172.

¹⁸Priya N. Parker, “Gregory H. Swanson: First African American to be Admitted to U.Va. (1950)” *Storming the Gates of Knowledge: A Documentary History of Desegregation and Coeducation in Jefferson's Academical Village*, Special Collections, UVA, <http://www.virginia.edu/woodson/projects/kenan/swanson/swanson.html> (accessed January 25, 2013).

many of the issues present in the integration of higher education. The first level of education that was forced to comply with *Brown v. Board* were the primary and secondary schools; therefore, they would experience more of the initial problems with desegregation.¹⁹

It was harder for primary and secondary schools to implement *Brown v. Board* because the schools had to deal with parental and local support. On the other hand, with the end of *in loco parentis*, college students simply may have had greater power over their own education. Similar to the University of Virginia, the University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences “voluntarily admitted blacks to its medical school program” in 1950. Likewise, in Arkansas “a few blacks had been hired on the police force, and public spaces like parks, buses, and libraries had been integrated.”²⁰ This liberality is in sharp contrast to the Central High School debacle in Little Rock, Arkansas. Unfortunately, this liberality did not spread through all institutions of higher learning. James Meredith’s application for the University of Mississippi was turned down twice because he was black. It was not until 1962 that courts ruled he had been discriminated against, and still when he attempted to enter the university, his arrival precipitated riots that killed two of the federal marshals meant to protect him. Then, in 1963, Alabama Governor George Wallace attempted to block two black students, Vivian Malone and James Hood, from registering for classes at the University of Alabama. Wallace was unsuccessful at preventing the desegregation of the institution due to the students’ accompaniment by the Alabama National Guard as well as several federal marshals.²¹

In spite of Governor Wallace’s example, Picott’s theory that desegregation was easier to implement in higher institutions of learning came true, especially during the 1950s and 1960s.

¹⁹Picott, “Desegregation of Higher Education in Virginia,” 326; Bruce J. Schulman, *The Seventies: The Great Shift in American Culture, Society, and Politics* (Cambridge: Da Capo Press, 2002), 9-11.

²⁰Hasday, *The Civil Rights Act of 1964*, 57-58.

²¹*Ibid.*, 74-76.

These decades created breeding grounds for political protest out of university campuses, even those in the South. Many young people were largely liberal and moderate, if not radical, and they championed the idea of basic rights for all. Many of these young people had traveled south, from 1964 to 1967, in order to participate in a movement that was responsible for registering black voters.²² In addition, college students were more independent, whereas students in lower levels of education, including those of Central High School, were still largely under their parents' protection. Central High School's main body of dissidents came from parents worried over their children's safety. Even moderate parents, who had no reason to prevent desegregation, aided that prevention simply through their own fear of violence and their subsequent silence. Integrating these primary and secondary schools came as a bigger challenge.²³

Despite cases of desegregation at higher institutions of learning, *Brown v. Board* dealt little with their campuses. Frankly, M. Christopher Brown's theory that "the mandate to desegregate did not reach higher education until one decade after Brown, when President Lyndon B. Johnson signed the Civil Rights Act of 1964," appears more accurate than Picott's.²⁴ Brown, however, wrote with the power of hindsight in 2001. Today, it is understood that no level of education completely embraced desegregation. Those that did begin desegregation largely did so in order to avoid student protests and riots, including the University of Virginia's acceptance of Swanson. While there were isolated pockets of desegregation in universities prior to the Civil Rights Act, it was slow going. In actuality, only 3 to 4 percent of desegregation occurred from

²²Schulman, *The Seventies*, 16.

²³Anderson, *Little Rock*, 94-95.

²⁴M. Christopher Brown II, "Collegiate Desegregation and the Public Black College: A New Policy Mandate," *The Journal of Higher Education* 72, no. 1 (Jan-Feb 2001): 49.

1954 to 1964. Any more desegregation in all levels of public schools did not occur until after 1964, ten years after *Brown v. Board*.²⁵

In order to pass the 1964 Civil Rights Act, a majority of the Senate had to vote to end the longest filibuster in congressional history, which continued for 57 days. It is telling that, despite the filibuster, “the Senate voted 73 to 27 to pass the” Act, an example of bipartisanship uncharacteristic of the civil rights movement.²⁶ While concessions were made on the bill in order to get the Republican vote, the Majority Leader appealed to the southern representatives, asking them to place their patriotism “over [their] partisanship” and help resolve “this grave national issue.”²⁷ The fact that a considerable number of Republicans voted for the bill indicates that a certain level of willingness to desegregate was beginning to permeate society. After fighting *Brown* for ten years, some of the more moderate whites were beginning to realize that extremist whites were fighting a losing battle against desegregation. Indeed, even in Norfolk, where schools had closed in order to avoid integration, the school board acknowledged that “it is now apparent . . . public education cannot be had without some measure of integration.”²⁸

In the end, the Civil Rights Act banned discrimination “based on the color of a person’s skin, his or her race, national origin, religion, or sex.”²⁹ Even with this ban, the real reason the Civil Rights Act was so successful in desegregating schools was because “Title VI of that Act provided that school districts which refused to desegregate were subject to a cutoff of Federal education monies.”³⁰ This fiscal consequence for non-compliance with desegregation did the

²⁵Faustine C. Jones, “Ironies of School Desegregation,” *The Journal of Negro Education* 47, no. 1 (1978): 9.

²⁶Hasday, *The Civil Rights Act of 1964*, 95.

²⁷*Ibid.*, 94-95.

²⁸Alexander Leidholdt, *Standing Before the Shouting Mob: Lenoir Chambers and Virginia’s Massive Resistance to Public-School Integration* (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1997), 92.

²⁹Hasday, *The Civil Rights Act of 1964*, 96.

³⁰Jones, “Ironies of School Desegregation,” 9.

trick, and “there was 30-40 per cent desegregation from 1964-69, a tenfold increase in five years over what Brown alone had produced in ten.”³¹

The threat of withdrawal of federal education monies is a very important factor in the success of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 in Virginia, because the state’s economy was suffering. Lynchburg College’s President Orville Wake spoke at a forum in Richmond supporting the desegregation of public schools because the only alternative he could see was economic stagnation. Norfolk, Virginia’s “closed public schools were costing the state \$172,000 a month” until the early 1960s, and the state could no longer support the heavy costs.³² Not only that, but industries were suffering as the students’ education was suffering. Waynesboro made more of an effort to desegregate than nearby Staunton, purely because it had recently “experienced significant new industrial development, while Staunton . . . had not.”³³ Thus, in order to support the city’s new industries, Waynesboro city leaders relied upon a force of well-educated citizens, and in order to engender this, they were encouraged, if not forced, to comply with the federal mandate to desegregate. Therefore, despite a distance of only twelve miles between the two cities, their policies of desegregation differed significantly.³⁴

Despite the financial consequences of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, many extremist whites still found ways to circumvent the decision. Prior to the Civil Rights Act, New Kent County, Virginia had maintained a segregated school system. In order to remain eligible for federal funds, they instituted a “freedom of choice plan.”³⁵ More black students were enrolled at the predominately white high school after the introduction of the plan; however, no white

³¹Jones, “Ironies of School Desegregation,” 9.

³²Leidholdt, *Standing Before the Shouting Mob*, 93.

³³Lassiter, *The Moderates Dilemma*, 112-113.

³⁴*Ibid.*, 125.

³⁵Pratt, “A Promise Unfulfilled,” 432.

students chose to attend the historically black high school, which “85 percent of the county’s black school children still” attended.³⁶ In 1968, the Supreme Court ruled that this system was not facilitating integration and was indeed unconstitutional. This is the first time a reference was made to the faulty wording in the *Brown* decision that demanded integration be undertaken with “all deliberate speed.” The Supreme Court implied that “all deliberate speed” could no longer be considered sufficient integration and placed responsibility on the local school boards for determining a solution that worked immediately. Thus, despite its financial consequences, the white majority was still able to prevent major desegregation for some time after the Civil Rights Act of 1964.³⁷

It would take heavy emphasis on Affirmative Action to truly rectify the problem of defiance to integration. *Brown v. Board* could not be enforced and the Civil Rights Act of 1964 had loopholes that could be exploited, but with Kennedy’s executive order in 1961, Affirmative Action was introduced onto the scene. Although not really embraced as federal policy until Johnson’s Executive Order 11246 in 1965, Affirmative Action prevented employment discrimination based on “race, color, religion, sex, and national origin, and [maintained] that affirmative action [guaranteed] all qualified applicants and employees the same equal employment opportunity.”³⁸ While Affirmative Action was aimed at protecting all minority applicants, it was especially important to the African-Americans, who believed that it was necessary in order “to relieve the debilitating effects of discrimination.”³⁹

Affirmative Action, however, did not just prohibit the discrimination against minorities seeking employment, but also those applying to universities and colleges. It was only after

³⁶Pratt, “A Promise Unfulfilled,” 432.

³⁷Ibid., 433.

³⁸Hasday, *The Civil Rights Act of 1964*, 111.

³⁹Schulman, *The Seventies*, 70.

Affirmative Action began that a significant increase in black enrollment was seen in institutions of higher education. According to political scientists Ronald Walters and Robert Smith, “the percentage of Blacks completing at least one year of education or more beyond high school increased by nearly 100 per cent between 1965 and 1973, moving from 14 per cent to nearly 26 per cent.”⁴⁰ Some historians go so far as to refer to the years 1964 to 1974 as the “golden age of black educational opportunity” because of the significant gains made under Affirmative Action, including a “greater Black cultural awareness” that permeated the overall student body of the newly integrated campuses.⁴¹ Indeed it does appear as if the 1970s were a Golden Age for African-American enrollment in higher education. According to Roy L. Brooks, professor of Law at the University of San Diego, “in 1976 . . . approximately 33.5% of African American high school graduates were enrolled at colleges and universities,”⁴² which exceeded the number of white high school graduates enrolled. However, despite the gains made by African-Americans, there was also a decline in the number of black students willing to attend previously all-white institutions. Many black college students faced harassments and threats that discouraged them from participating in the desegregation movement. The lack of transportation constrained others.⁴³

Particularly in Richmond, Virginia, African-American students were having trouble integrating white schools, because they had no way of getting there. In North Carolina, the *Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education* ruling in 1971 attempted to solve the transportation problem for black students by allowing “use of extensive busing to promote

⁴⁰Ronald Walters and Robert Smith, “The Black Education Strategy in the 1970s,” *The Journal of Negro Education* 48, no. 2 (1979): 158.

⁴¹*Ibid.*, 162, 165.

⁴²Roy L. Brooks, *Integration or Separation? A Strategy for Racial Equality* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1996), 34.

⁴³Pratt, “A Promise Unfulfilled,” 429.

desegregation.”⁴⁴ In Richmond, Virginia, “free city-wide transportation” was offered in order to ensure that black students could attend white schools if they so wished.⁴⁵ The same plan that instituted busing in Richmond also provided for a reassignment of pupils and teachers, “so that the ratio of black to white in each school would be approximately the same as it was in the entire school system.”⁴⁶ Robert R. Merhige, a federal judge for the district court, extended this busing plan to all the pupils in the city, even the kindergarteners. Parents in Richmond and the surrounding districts were appalled, claiming that they would rather keep their children at home than send them to integrated schools.⁴⁷

It was Virginia’s governor, Linwood Holton, who dispelled some of these tensions and encouraged busing within his own family. Holton set an example for Richmond:

On the first day of classes of the 1970-1971 school year, [he] personally escorted his thirteen-year old daughter Tayloe to predominantly black John F. Kennedy High School, the school to which she had been assigned under the court’s busing plan. Meanwhile, Mrs. Holton was taking two of their other children, Anne, twelve, and Woody, eleven, to Mosby Middle School, where they were the only whites in their respective classrooms. Many Virginians were shocked, but many others were impressed by Holton’s acts of courage and good faith, especially when it was learned that the governor’s mansion was on state, not city, property, and thus the Holton children were technically exempt from the city busing plan.⁴⁸

Holton was a moderate Republican, and it was clear that his political ideology differed from previous governors. He had opposed Massive Resistance and fought to end racial discrimination. The white people of Virginia, however, did not welcome Holton’s brave stand in support of integration with open arms. Despite Holton’s emphasis that “integration was morally right,” he was hurt significantly in the polls, and white Virginians continued their flight to the

⁴⁴Pratt, “A Promise Unfulfilled,” 433.

⁴⁵Ibid., 434.

⁴⁶Ibid., 435.

⁴⁷Ibid., 433.

⁴⁸Ibid., 437.

neighboring suburbs. Richmond public schools lost roughly 10,000 white students between the years of 1970 and 1973.⁴⁹

Regardless of contemporary claims, integration and opposition to integration were not purely based on racial prejudice. Most southern whites were simply thunderstruck by the collapse of the only social system they had ever known. White people did not know how to understand black culture, and by the 1970s, black people were no longer willing to assimilate. Whites and blacks had no idea how to coexist, and the university environment was the first place in which efforts at coexistence were attempted.⁵⁰

Diversity and coexistence, rather than integration or assimilation, became the desired products of desegregation by the late 1970s. In this stagflation economy where inflation and unemployment both skyrocketed, Americans competed for an advanced degree that would give them an advantage; thus, blacks were no longer willing to accept token spots in universities and live in the background. Instead, they wanted to celebrate their culture. Diversity and Affirmative Action also introduced peoples of other racial minorities and differing socioeconomic groups. The goal was to expand the opportunity of all people and to increase the diversity of thought within businesses and universities. Unfortunately for many universities, this introduction of minorities to campuses caused surprising backlash from both parents and students. Elementary and high schools did not require an application process; however, Affirmative Action significantly affected the admissions process of many higher education institutions. Colleges and universities had to be careful who they accepted because they received more complaints over accepting minority students who were not thought to measure up according to white standards. By the late 1970s, many prospective white students and their

⁴⁹Pratt, "A Promise Unfulfilled," 438-439.

⁵⁰Ibid., 440.

parents claimed that their rightful seats at a university had been given to minority students of lesser qualification, regardless of whether that was true.⁵¹

This anger over Affirmative Action culminated in *Regents of the University of California v. Bakke* in 1978. Allan Bakke, a white man, sued the University of California medical school on the grounds of reverse discrimination. In Bakke's opinion, he was judged by tougher standards than those minorities for whom seats had been set aside according to Affirmative Action and that these admitted minority students were less qualified for acceptance into the medical school than he was. The Supreme Court ruled "that a university may consider racial criteria as part of a competitive admissions process so long as 'fixed quotas' were not."⁵² The court thus ruled in favor of Bakke, claiming that because the medical school set aside sixteen seats purely for minorities, Bakke was denied his constitutional right under the Fourteenth Amendment; however, the court insisted that racial considerations could still be taken into account in order to promote diversity on campus. It was important that campuses have a diversified student body in order to avoid complaints of prejudice; however, efforts at diversifying focused on a diversity of thought, rather than race or ethnicity. Diversity of values and beliefs on a college campus facilitated discussion and a more well-rounded education, allowing the students to become more accepting of all backgrounds, whether racial or social.⁵³

The court's decision over Bakke gave white people the loophole they needed and forced admissions officers into formulating concrete, inarguable formulas for acceptance. Their idea of colorblindness in regards to fair admissions was born, but there was also the need to maintain the increased acceptance of minority students. Colorblindness, meaning the absence of the

⁵¹Schulman, *The Seventies*, 68; Daphyne Thomas, Harrisonburg, VA, February 11, 2013.

⁵²*The Oxford Guide to United States Supreme Court Decisions*, 2nd ed., s.v. "Regents of the University of California v. Bakke."

⁵³Schulman, *The Seventies*, 69-70; G. W. B. "Bakke v. The University of California," *Change* 9, no. 10 (October 1977): 20-21.

consideration of racial characteristics in admissions, was often unfair in itself, because many minority students were not able to attend schools of the same caliber as white children. They did not have the opportunity to become “as qualified” as those white families who had higher incomes, greater taxes, and available funding for their schools. It was necessary to avoid criticism of Affirmative Action in order to allow African Americans and other minorities to keep the gains they had made in education. To do so, universities had to accept only those people who were exemplary, only those they knew would be successful. Universities fought over black students who had scored well on their Scholastic Aptitude Tests; however, even those deemed as unqualified by the white applicants were often successful. According to G.W.B., “Black college graduates succeeded despite combined Scholastic Aptitude Test scores that averaged 200 points below those of white students. Most notable perhaps, many of them graduated with honors, though the SAT scores for some fell as much as 300 to 400 points below their college’s median.”⁵⁴ Universities may have been searching for high SAT scores, but as a former admissions counselor noted, SATs document one good or bad day, not the entire capacity of the student.⁵⁵

Professor of law, Laurence H. Tribe, wrote about the *Bakke* case shortly after it was decided. He claimed that the decision was not controversial, considering it really only halted already questionable admissions practices similar to the University of California’s. As a northern, white lawyer, however, Tribe was probably not affected by the decision at all. In the South, Affirmative Action came under awful criticism. Historian John C. Jeffries claimed that Powell’s decision in *Bakke* “allowed the continued integration of elite institutions of higher education, despite persistent deficits in the academic qualifications of many minority

⁵⁴G. W. B. “*Bakke v. The University of California*,” 21.

⁵⁵Daphyne Thomas, Lecture, Harrisonburg, VA, February 11, 2013; Laurence H. Tribe. “Perspectives on *Bakke*; Equal Protection, Procedural Fairness, or Structural Justice?” *Harvard Law Review* 92, no. 4 (February 1979): 864.

applicants.”⁵⁶ It is true that Powell included this contingency, that diversity was still a major necessity for college campuses, in the court’s decision; nevertheless, white people only needed a small loophole in order to defy affirmative action, just as in the mid-50s they only needed Little Rock to show them that defiance against the federal government was possible. Powell “embraced [the] result” of *Bakke*, but most southern whites did not. The *Regents of the University of California v. Bakke* began a conversation in 1978 that still continues today. Many white people still claim that reverse discrimination towards whites is a greater problem than racial discrimination against blacks and other ethnic minorities despite the common acceptance of integration.⁵⁷

The question remains: how did white and black college students themselves feel about integration? From *Brown v. Board* in 1954 to *University of California v. Bakke* in 1978, white parents and school boards feared the destruction of their social structure: their children had grown up in a time of transition, when this social structure was no longer as prominent. The next chapter will take a closer look at the popular sentiments of both black and white students in public institutions of higher learning throughout Virginia. It reveals the existence of an important generational gap that affects race relations.

⁵⁶John C. Jeffries, Jr., “Bakke Revisited,” *The Supreme Court Review* (2003): 1-2.

⁵⁷Tribe, “Perspectives on Bakke,” 864.

Virginia's Struggle with Desegregation in Institutions of Higher Learning

Notwithstanding Little Rock Central High School's fame, the desegregation of southern institutions of higher learning took a different shape, especially in Virginia. For instance, "the NAACP filed more school desegregation suits in Virginia than in any other state," but "violence was much less of a factor in Virginia than in Mississippi or Alabama, and a less stifling climate of intimidation faced black activists as well as white liberals and moderates" than was obvious at Central High School in Arkansas. Historically speaking, Virginia had been torn between integration and segregation. Not part of what is considered the Deep South, Virginia struggled with seceding from the Union in 1860 and in the 1950s the state showed its reluctance to participate in Massive Resistance. Opponents of integration were extraordinarily vocal, but they did not constitute the majority of Virginia citizens.⁵⁸

By the 1950s, higher education already showed a tendency towards more lenient admissions policies. Despite *Plessy v. Ferguson*, black and white institutions of higher learning before the 1960s were hardly equal. W.E.B. DuBois once asked Booker T. Washington who would teach at his Tuskegee Institute. DuBois insinuated that in order to teach at Tuskegee, these men would have had to have some kind of doctoral degree, most likely an education provided by a white institution. Without a doubt DuBois had a point, and this can be seen by the fact that in 1954 "two Virginia State College professors received their Doctorate of Education degrees at the University of Virginia."⁵⁹ As DuBois had stated, in order to provide the best education to undergraduate students, instructors, professors, and teachers all needed to have the best education, and in the 1950s the best education was at predominately white institutions. The fact that these two black professors had graduated with their degrees in 1954 goes to show that

⁵⁸Lassiter, ed., *The Moderates Dilemma*, 5.

⁵⁹J. Rupert Picott, "Desegregation of Public Education in Virginia—One Year Afterward," *The Journal of Negro Education* 24, no. 3 (1955): 363.

institutions of higher education had indeed opened their doors, however slightly, before the 1954 *Brown v. Board* decision. Interestingly enough to note, it was not only white institutions that had opened their doors to African-Americans in Virginia, but historically black colleges, including Hampton Institute and Virginia Union University, “had several white students enrolled in certain subjects and for certain specified times,” beginning in 1945, nine years prior to *Brown v. Board*.⁶⁰

The University of Virginia Law School led the way for desegregation in the state, despite being situated in a relatively conservative area. Charlottesville, Virginia was one of the original three regions in Virginia that attempted to close schools in order to avoid compliance with federal efforts at integration; however, despite the strongly conservative School Board, the mothers of public school students managed to undermine Massive Resistance due to their support of public education. Likewise, white moderates and liberals, including white students, aided Gregory Swanson’s admittance into the University of Virginia Law School in 1950. Indeed, after the enrollment of Gregory Swanson in 1950, Manassas journalist Benjamin Muse “suggested that many white Virginians now were pondering the previously unthinkable—the end of segregation in public secondary schools.”⁶¹ While primary and secondary schools largely complied with massive resistance in Charlottesville, higher education had some level of desegregation prior to *Brown v. Board*. The enrollment of African-American students at primarily white institutions prior to *Brown v. Board* would only occur under the circumstances that no “separate, but equal” educational program was made available at a historically black institution of higher learning. This is primarily why graduate programs began desegregation,

⁶⁰Picott, “Desegregation of Public Education in Virginia,” 363.

⁶¹Leidholdt, *Standing Before the Shouting Mob*, 90-91; Lassiter, ed. *The Moderates’ Dilemma*, 72-73, 172; Parker, “Gregory H. Swanson: First African American to be Admitted to U.Va. (1950),” <http://www.virginia.edu/woodson/projects/kenan/swanson/swanson.html> (accessed January 25, 2013).

with undergraduate programs following after the federal mandate. In the case of Gregory Swanson, *Plessy v. Ferguson* was still being upheld despite the small measure of desegregation and the supposed open-mindedness of the university.⁶²

Even if some measure of desegregation occurred prior to the *Brown v. Board* decision that did not mean that full integration was quick to follow. In many Virginia institutions, full integration was a lengthy process that spanned decades. For example, in Blacksburg, Virginia, the first African-American student, Irving L. Peddrew, enrolled at Virginia Polytechnic Institute in 1953; however, Virginia Tech had a strong history of racial segregation, which is exhibited throughout their campus. In the 1896 yearbook, a page is dedicated to the school's chapter of the Ku Klux Klan. Claudius Lee, a former member of Tech's KKK club, went on to teach electrical engineering at the school, and today, he has a dormitory named in his honor. It was most likely similar prejudice that caused Peddrew to drop out of Virginia Tech without graduating; however, three black men enrolled together in 1954, and their camaraderie and solidarity enabled Charles L. Yates to become the first African-American graduate from Virginia Tech in 1958. Despite Virginia Tech's history and reputation as a conservative, southern institution, the university was still "the first nonblack land grant school in the state of the former Confederacy to accept a black undergraduate," and they accepted him prior to *Brown v. Board*.⁶³

Consequently, despite Virginia's efforts at Massive Resistance, institutions of higher education had been making efforts towards desegregation prior to the 1964 Civil Rights Act, and in some cases even *Brown v. Board*. Indeed, according to M. Christopher Brown II, "higher education . . . holds the dual honor of progenitor and progeny of the famed *Brown* case." There

⁶²Guy B. Johnson, "Racial Integration in Public Higher Education in the South," *The Journal of Negro Education* 23, no. 3 (1954): 319.

⁶³"Virginia Tech Struggles with Racial Diversity," *The Journal of Blacks in Higher Education* no. 26 (1999-2000): 65.

are instances in which the desegregation of higher education came before *Brown* and created a precedent for the ruling itself, but other institutions would follow after *Brown*, and many could still be considered racially homogenous today.⁶⁴

While Irving Peddrew faced challenges that caused him to leave Virginia Tech, it appears as if there were also white students supportive of desegregation. According to a study done by Guy B. Johnson in 1956, “white students’ reactions to the Negro students have been largely favorable or indifferent. In several instances white students have taken the lead in protesting against administrative discriminations. Some of them interact with Negroes in a friendly and cordial way.”⁶⁵ “In some cases white student leaders made it their business to greet the pioneer Negro students and help them through the process of registration.”⁶⁶ Guy Johnson was a sociology professor at the University of North Carolina and an advocate of racial equality. Despite being a white man in the South, Johnson made it a point to study black culture. From his position as a university professor, he was able to best gauge the acceptance of black students onto white campuses, and he fought for their right to be there.⁶⁷

Indeed it was largely the administration, not the student body or faculty, which presented the biggest obstacle to the integration of institutions of higher education. In most cases, the administration “took the position that the basic segregation laws of the state were still in force, even on the campus, and prescribed various separate facilities for Negro students. Such arrangements were short-lived, however, as it soon became apparent that they were not only

⁶⁴Picott, “Desegregation of Higher Education in Virginia,” 328-331; Todd Fisher, “Integration: The African-American Experience in Harrisonburg, Virginia” (honors thesis, James Madison University, 1997), 17; M. Christopher Brown II, “Collegiate Desegregation as Progenitor and Progeny of *Brown v. Board of Education*: The Forgotten Role of Postsecondary Litigation, 1908-1990,” *The Journal of Negro Education* 73, no. 3 (2004): 347.

⁶⁵Guy B. Johnson, “Racial Integration in Southern Higher Education,” *Social Forces* 34, no. 4 (May 1956): 310.

⁶⁶Johnson, “Racial Integration in Public Higher Education in the South,” 322.

⁶⁷“In Memoriam: Guy B. Johnson, 1901-1991,” *Social Forces* 70, no. 1 (September 1991): 18.

unconstitutional but that nobody really wanted them.”⁶⁸ It was the students themselves, both black and white, who fought against the restrictions. While they may have remained segregated in regards to social affairs, such as at parties and clubs, they did not desire any sort of separate facilities, such as bathrooms, classrooms, or in some cases, even living arrangements. “Several Negro students are known to have inquired about rooming with whites,” and while, in 1954, that was still unlikely, it was allowed if a black and white student requested to live together. By 1959, segregation “in the use of rest rooms, library tables, dining tables, and even classrooms” was practically unheard of.⁶⁹

In fact, of all southern universities, 60 percent of public universities, 41 percent of church-supported universities, and 28 percent of private universities had been desegregated by 1959, only five years after *Brown v. Board*. According to Johnson, however, Virginia would be considered part of the Middle South, which accounted for only 30 percent of the desegregation of southern universities. On the other hand, 38 percent of public universities in the Middle South were already desegregated by 1959, much more than the 5 percent of public universities from the Deep South. Of course, saying an institution is desegregated could mean any number of things; however, here it simply means black and white students could not be relegated to particular institutions. Black students were free to attend historically white institutions, but that does not mean a large population of African-American students had applied to and enrolled at these universities.⁷⁰

After *Brown v. Board*, other programs, mainly graduate, were beginning to open their doors to African-American students. According to historian J. Rupert Picott, “very little

⁶⁸Johnson, “Racial Integration in Public Higher Education in the South,” 322.

⁶⁹Guy B. Johnson, “Progress in the Desegregation of Higher Education,” *Journal of Educational Sociology* 32, no. 6 (February 1959): 257.

⁷⁰*Ibid.*, 255.

appeared in the newspapers, editorially or otherwise, in opposition to Negroes attending in limited fashion, the schools of higher education in [Virginia]”⁷¹ by the summer of 1958. Moreover, since the admittance of Gregory Swanson “the University of Virginia, College of William and Mary, Medical College of Virginia, Richmond Professional Institute and Virginia Polytechnic Institute [had] admitted Negroes for work which [was] not offered at Virginia State College,”⁷² the traditionally African-American institution of higher education in Virginia. In addition, a 1957-58 announcement concerning Graduate Education in Extension allowed African-Americans to enroll in graduate work at any of the following institutions: Madison College, Longwood College, the College of William and Mary, Virginia Polytechnic Institute, the University of Richmond, Virginia State College, and the University of Virginia. Moreover, Eastern Mennonite College had been enrolling African-American students since 1954, and “the Broad Street Mennonite Mission located in Harrisonburg was the first to deal with the policy of integration in the country,” showing other institutions of higher learning, including Madison College, the way towards integration.

Unfortunately, despite Gregory Swanson’s acceptance at the University of Virginia Law School, he only lasted one semester before leaving. On the other hand, in 1958 the Dean of the University of Virginia Medical School declared “that ‘the difficulties foreseen by a few apprehensive individuals have simply not materialized to date, and the colored students, so far as he knows, have neither encountered nor occasioned any trouble whatsoever during their time in medical school.’”⁷³ Some white students had fought for the acceptance of Gregory, but despite their activism and the supposed absence of difficulties, the school was still a bastion of the Old

⁷¹Picott, “Desegregation of Higher Education in Virginia,” 326

⁷²Ibid., 327.

⁷³Ibid., 328.

South. For example, during World War II, the university students “started to wave the Confederate battle flag at football games against northern college teams.”⁷⁴ Symbols like the Confederate battle flag and the playing of “Dixie” at games were largely cultural symbols meant to boost the morale and emphasize the masculinity of the South in a war torn time. This tradition then carried over into the Civil Rights Movement after the war. Symbols like these, although its original emphasis was one of regional cultural pride, caused African-American students like Gregory Swanson to become uncomfortable. Indeed, despite the white pride and solidarity that came with the Confederate flag, there is no doubt that it also stood for racism. Likewise, in William and Mary’s yearbook, the *Colonial Echo*, the fraternity Kappa Alpha is shown flying a Confederate flag with a caption saying that the boys are bringing “Southern spirit to the football game.”⁷⁵ As southern institutions, the University of Virginia and the College of William and Mary struggled with desegregation, despite their initial efforts. In 1947, however, the “Cavalier team members voted unanimously to play Harvard with a black player.”⁷⁶ Cavalier football captain H. L. Frizzell said that he had “the utmost respect for any man at Harvard, regardless of his race,” implying that there were some southerners prepared for integration.⁷⁷

Similar to Virginia Tech and the University of Virginia, Mary Washington College, in Fredericksburg, Virginia, felt threatened by racial integration and took longer to come around to desegregation. The area was known for having a significant population of African-Americans; thus, the board refused to allow three African-American students to attend their institution in 1957, fearing that this would encourage a large number of minority students to enroll. Moreover, the institution was historically a women’s college, and women were seen as especially vulnerable

⁷⁴Christopher C. Nehls, “Flag-Waving Wahoos: Confederate Symbols at the University of Virginia, 1941-51,” *The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* 110, no. 4 (2002): 462.

⁷⁵*The Colonial Echo* (Williamsburg, College of William & Mary, 1968), 70:332.

⁷⁶Nehls, “Flag-Waving Wahoos,” 473.

⁷⁷*Ibid.*, 461, 468, 473, 488.

when it came to African-American men, who would undoubtedly be hanging around if black women were accepted into the institution. Indeed, many institutions of higher learning struggled between the federal mandate to desegregate and the state mandate to practice massive resistance. Despite early efforts to integrate universities and colleges across Virginia, it was not until the Civil Rights Act of 1964 that institutions such as the University of Mary Washington really began feeling the pressure. At that point, the institutions were stuck between either losing federal funding or state funding. The Board of Visitors chose whichever option hurt their funding the least.

It was the students, no longer under the policy of *in loco parentis*, who truly provided the public outcry that would lead towards full integration. For example, at William and Mary the *Colonial Echo* images illustrate that students wanted more independence on campus. There was a call to “picket against Dean Lambert’s revised Student Handbook written solely by Lambert without student or faculty participation.”⁷⁸ Students were no longer listening to curfews and other restricting rules. Thus, no longer treated as wards of the university or college, but adults in their own right, students formed their own opinions on integration, and it was their voices that paved the way for integration in universities and colleges in Virginia, as can be seen in the admittance of Gregory Swanson to UVA Law School.⁷⁹

At the College of William and Mary, in Williamsburg, Virginia, the Student Association even invited African-American entertainment for their 1968 homecoming celebrations. The Drifters, an African-American rhythm and blues group, as well as Wilson Pickett, an African-American songwriter, were invited to perform to the student body as a whole. Similar to William & Mary, the VCU *Cobblestone* shows that African-American entertainment was

⁷⁸*The Colonial Echo* (Williamsburg: College of William and Mary, 1970), 72:2.

⁷⁹Picott, “Desegregation of Higher Education in Virginia,” 331.

consistently invited by students to perform at university functions beginning in the late 1960s.⁸⁰ Efforts like these show that white students were willing to accommodate black students on their campus. It appears as if they were trying to make African-Americans feel welcome to campus by incorporating social events that they would enjoy.

Also interesting, by 1970 one member of the *Cobblestone* design staff was an African-American man, and African-Americans were depicted quite frequently in the yearbook.⁸¹ African-Americans were shown participating in Delta Sigma Pi, the Vee-Cettes drill team, the student education association, and the student government association.⁸² As the yearbook was a student creation, the allowance of an African-American on the design staff and their representation in major student organizations goes to show that students were accepting the integration of their campus. Virginia Commonwealth University, in Richmond, Virginia, was situated in an area with a concentrated African-American population. Mary Washington had been all the more willing to maintain segregation because of their large population of African-Americans; however, it appeared as if VCU was integrated relatively well compared to some other southern institutions. Along with the rest of Virginia, by the late 1960s and early 1970s full desegregation was on its way, and indeed, “polls of white student opinion . . . always showed a majority of the white respondents favoring the admission of Negroes” to their institution.⁸³

The integration of higher education did not pose as great a threat against accepted social norms because these students were beginning to be seen as adults in their own right. The universities were no longer places to add the finishing touches to what would become society’s

⁸⁰ *Colonial Echo* (Williamsburg: College of William and Mary, 1970), 72:11; *Colonial Echo* (Williamsburg: College of William and Mary, 1969) 71:119; *Cobblestone* (Richmond: Virginia Commonwealth University, 1968), 154; *Cobblestone* (Richmond: Virginia Commonwealth University, 1969), 58-59.

⁸¹ *Cobblestone* (Richmond: Virginia Commonwealth University, 1970), 116.

⁸² *Cobblestone* (Richmond: Virginia Commonwealth University, 1970), 65, 92; *Cobblestone* (Richmond: Virginia Commonwealth University, 1971), 327, 340.

⁸³ Johnson, “Racial Integration in Southern Higher Education,” 311.

great men, but instead were breeding grounds for diversity of thought and intellectualism. The admission of African-Americans “to higher educational institutions along with white people [was] certainly felt to be much less of a threat than the association of white and Negro pupils in the lower schools,” because these children were still being formed under the guidance of their parents.⁸⁴ They were not learned enough to make their own choices about what was or was not in their best interests. College students, on the other hand, were increasingly making their own choices and welcoming African-American students.

These white college students exemplified their acceptance of African-Americans in their own publications. In the *Flat Hat*, William and Mary’s student newspaper, a 1968 article describes a Department of Health, Education, and Welfare investigation of whether or not William and Mary was complying with the 1964 Civil Rights Act. While the article does not appear to investigate the full range of discrimination African-American students might face, it concludes that the relationship between black and white students is “comfortable . . . in general.”⁸⁵ While it is quite possible that African-American students hid some instances of prejudice in order to avoid increased social ostracism, it is unlikely that they would have been able to hide all occurrences of intolerance and discrimination. It appears as if a significant number of white students, largely raised in a transitional period full of demands for civil rights and increasing student activism, were beginning to speak up for what they believed in, whether it be equal educational opportunities for black and white students or increased privileges on campus.

The administration was caught between supporting massive resistance or supporting desegregation, but it is important to mention that they did provide protection for all their students

⁸⁴Johnson, “Racial Integration in Southern Higher Education, 311.

⁸⁵Mark Cole, “HEW Investigates: Race Policy Checked,” *Flat Hat*, October 25, 1968.

from outside media and authorities. Universities and colleges have extensive experience controlling publicity about their campuses, by attempting to avoid criticism of their more socially liberal students for breaking the accepted rules of society, whether they concerned style and discussion, or drinking and drugs. In order to be able to control their own communities, many campuses employed their own police force in order to keep the rest of the public out of potentially contentious issues. This system was hugely beneficial in regards to the desegregation and integration of college campuses. The local community outside the campus would have less to worry about in regards to controlling conflicts on campus.⁸⁶

The campuses' accountability was especially important, because many local communities surrounding colleges and universities were still hostile towards black students. In most cases, the local community was still heavily segregated and hostile towards both the black students and the university that facilitated their migration to the local community. Those localities and even universities previously not concerned with integration due to a low population of African-Americans grew concerned at the growing numbers attending higher institutions of learning. Despite some level of hostility from the communities, it does appear that either the liberal university environment rubbed off on the community or the need for economic stimulation caused some businesses around the campuses to begin desegregation.⁸⁷

It was not only the administration and external community that fought integration. Despite the acceptance of some white students, others proved intolerant of African-American enrollment, and "a minority [were] quite hostile toward Negroes."⁸⁸ For instance, in 1968 the student newspaper at William and Mary published an article entitled: "The Student as Nigger."

⁸⁶Johnson, "Racial Integration in Southern Higher Education," 312.

⁸⁷Johnson, "Progress in the Desegregation of Higher Education," 259.

⁸⁸Johnson, "Racial Integration in Southern Higher Education," 310.

This article describes the modern university as an institution that “conditions [all students] as inferiors.”⁸⁹ Even white students were described as enslaved, because they had separate dining halls and bathrooms from professors, and were considered politically disenfranchised on campus. This analogy severely hurt the African-American cause, and showed that William and Mary students equated their own educational opportunities with that of their black peers; however, there was also a white editor’s note calling the analogy vulgar. While the editor believed the analogy takes away from the African-American Civil Rights struggle, he implied that the article has good points and the modern student was indeed helpless within the university environment.⁹⁰ This struggle relates back to the end of *in loco parentis*. It is interesting, however, how the article both reinforces the ability of university students to think for themselves and the inferior position of black students. Normally, the end of *in loco parentis* brought about increased acceptance of minority students.

Indeed, many white students still wished to keep social activities segregated. In order to preserve peace on campuses, it was largely understood that African-American and white students would not participate extensively in “social-mingling,” meaning that many activities which could be qualified under Student Affairs were kept largely segregated. The main fear that resulted in this arrangement was interracial sex. It was thought that black men would take advantage of white women, and the mixing of races was not acceptable. Therefore, social-mingling was often not a written rule instituted by the administrators of the institution; however, both the administration and the students themselves followed this policy rather closely. Whether this

⁸⁹“The Student as Nigger,” *Flat Hat*, October 25, 1968.

⁹⁰*Ibid.*

policy was employed in order to avoid conflict from the outside community or amongst themselves is unclear, but it was probably a bit of both.⁹¹

One of the reasons black and white students chose to remain segregated in their social affairs was to surround themselves with people from similar backgrounds and interests. They joined different clubs and attended different events largely because of the experiences of African American students, such as Charles L. Yates. In the 1970s, African-American students still found it necessary to surround themselves with people who had the same experiences as them and who could help them adjust to this new environment. While separate social activities kept the peace, it helped students adjust to racial integration.⁹² Total equality might not have been obtained and discrimination was still present, but some measure of understanding and acceptance was beginning.

This is exemplified by the increase in African-American enrollment. The number of black students increased throughout the 1970s and 1980s at Madison College, and despite a slight decrease in 1979, the year after *University of California v. Bakke*, African-American enrollment jumped by 27 students between 1979 and 1980.⁹³ Also, in many cases, African-Americans did join clubs and participate in programs alongside white students. Some were even elected into authority positions that required them to instruct both white and black students. Some became president or vice president in choral or honors clubs, while others were elected as president of their interracial residence halls by 1972.⁹⁴ The social organization on college campuses today is still similar. Students join clubs and organizations based on their interests,

⁹¹ Johnson, "Racial Integration in Southern Higher Education," 312; Johnson, "Racial Integration in Public Higher Education in the South," 322.

⁹² Daphyne Thomas, Interview by author, Harrisonburg, VA, March 22, 2013.

⁹³ James Madison University Affirmative Action Plan, SC AF90-0501, Special Collections, Carrier Library, James Madison University, Harrisonburg, VA, 1978.

⁹⁴ *The Bluestone* (Harrisonburg: James Madison University, 1972), 178.

and while many of these are racially mixed, there are some interests and organizations that are divided down race lines.⁹⁵

The Cobblestone, Virginia Commonwealth University's yearbook, portrays this social segregation within its pages. In the 1968 edition, very few African-Americans are displayed in the yearbook; however, there is at least one African-American associate professor, Jeffrey M. Parker, who taught Electrical-Electronics Technology. In regards to the social scene, there was very little African-American representation within clubs and societies. There was, however, a select minority of black students who participated in social events alongside white students, such as Circle K. On the other hand, it seemed as if African-American students were beginning to coexist with white students in what appears to be student housing. Thus, while social-mingling is still a largely segregated aspect of society, by the early 70s, white and black students were beginning to warm up to each other.⁹⁶

All in all, white students reacted in the typical ways to integration in Virginia. There was a minority that was extraordinarily opposed to the beginnings of desegregation, and another minority that was eager to aid and protest on behalf of the African-American students. Most often, the campus' resistance pressured the moderate whites, as it had in lower levels of education; however, white moderate undergraduates often were braver than white moderate ministers, professionals, and parents. They were not as likely to stand by and let atrocities take place in silence, and they were not as afraid of the changing social strata. The more advanced education became, the easier it was for integration to occur. Graduate programs began integrating before *Brown v. Board* in 1954 and undergraduate programs followed, although in most cases not until after the federal regulations fell into place. It is true that many of these

⁹⁵Johnson, "Racial Integration in Public Higher Education in the South," 323, 325.

⁹⁶*The Cobblestone* (Richmond, Virginia Commonwealth University, 1968), 217.

graduate programs began integrating purely because “separate, but equal” programs were not made available to African-Americans; however, this integration was significantly aided by the fact that, as students became more educated and more independent, they began to fight for racial equality. Professor Guy Johnson exemplifies how higher education opened the minds of students to racial equality. Born in Texas, he was raised in the South and went to Baylor University; however, his education allowed him to think for himself and break free from the racial prejudice that characterized older generations in the South. All in all, white moderate students were more liberal than the rest of society and more outspoken as well.⁹⁷

Even with efforts to desegregate, Virginia Tech was still struggling with integration during the heyday of Affirmative Action in the 1970s. Daphyne Thomas, who attended Virginia Tech during the emphasis on Affirmative Action and the introduction of the idea of reverse discrimination, does not describe the university in a particularly harsh light, yet she claims that Tech still insisted on playing Dixie on campus. Marguerite Harper, an African American student, had been complaining about “the waving of Confederate battle flags and the cadet band’s playing of ‘Dixie’ after every touchdown by the Hokie football team in Lane Stadium” since her enrollment in 1966.⁹⁸ In order to survive the southern heritage, African-American students had to work together and create their own support systems on campuses, much like the one Charles L. Yates had used during his time at Virginia Tech. Thomas’ main complaint, however, was that, due to Affirmative Action, there was a perception that African-American students were accepted at Virginia Tech purely because their acceptance increased diversity. In reality, many of them were qualified and deserved their acceptance.⁹⁹

⁹⁷Johnson, “Racial Integration in Public Higher Education in the South,” 326.

⁹⁸Peter Wallenstein, “Desegregation of Higher Education in Virginia,” *Encyclopedia of Virginia*, http://www.encyclopediavirginia.org/Desegregation_in_Higher_Education#start_entry (accessed August 22, 2013).

⁹⁹Daphyne Thomas, Lecture, Harrisonburg, VA, February 11, 2013.

While Affirmative Action may have been instrumental in opening up opportunities for African-Americans in institutions of higher education, it also had a negative impact on these students. They had to try twice as hard as white students to prove their worth. Prior to Affirmative Action, there was not as much of a need to justify one's acceptance into the institution. Pioneer African-American students had "been outstanding in their academic achievements."¹⁰⁰ "Quite a few [had] been elected to membership in various honor societies," and had graduated with degrees ranging from education to law and medicine.¹⁰¹ After the introduction of Affirmative Action, black students had to make sure they performed above and beyond in order to prove they were accepted at the institution purely on their own merit, rather than the color of their skin, despite the incredible precedent their predecessors had set for them.¹⁰²

Other institutions, such as the Virginia Military Institute (VMI), took much longer than the University of Virginia or Virginia Tech to begin the process of desegregation; however, once started the process progressed at a much faster rate. The first five black cadets enrolled at VMI in 1968, but they did not face further challenges of segregation on campus. The five cadets were Harry Gore, Larry Foster, Phil Wilkerson, Richard Valentine, and Adam Randolph. These five men resented the flying of the Confederate flag and the playing of "Dixie;" however, they "reported little else in racial harassment."¹⁰³ The African-American cadets were well integrated into campus life. Electrical engineering major Richard Valentine Jr. played varsity football for the institution, and history major Phil Wilkerson Jr. commanded F Company.¹⁰⁴ Furthermore,

¹⁰⁰Johnson, "Racial Integration in Public Higher Education in the South," 324.

¹⁰¹Ibid.

¹⁰²Daphyne Thomas, Lecture, Harrisonburg, VA, February 11, 2013.

¹⁰³Susan D. Hansen, "The Racial Histories of the U.S. Military Academies," *The Journal of Blacks in Higher Education* 26 (1999-2000): 113.

¹⁰⁴*The Bomb* (Lexington: Virginia Military Institute, 1972), 130, 187.

four out of the five cadets graduated from VMI in four years. The fifth was killed in an accident before he could graduate. The Virginia Military Institute was once the Confederacy's premiere military academy, but by the early 1970s the "rats" of VMI were proud to call African-Americans their brothers. The peer-written descriptions of the African-American cadets in their senior yearbooks illustrate that these black students were seen as huge assets to the institution. Phil Wilkerson is described as belonging "to a minority group: those very few who really care," while Larry Foster is given a moving memorial after being killed in an accident.¹⁰⁵ Overall, they were seen as outstanding cadets by their professors and peers.

In regards to athletics, the institutions of higher education in Virginia that began desegregation shortly after Brown struggled with the desegregation of their sports teams. They attempted to keep black students out of varsity athletics, but beginning in the late 1960s, black students were being welcomed onto more and more teams. Institutions such as VMI that began desegregation later did not struggle as much with the desegregation of athletics, because other schools had already paved the way for them. In some instances, schools in the Deep South refused to play mixed teams; however, in the rest of the South, Virginia included, athletics were one aspect of society where athletes were chosen purely for their ability, rather than the color of their skin. For example, while black students are not largely represented in *The Cobblestone*, VCU's yearbook, they received the most attention within sports teams. With the advent of Affirmative Action, athletics became one of the few ways in which black students could emphasize their value. If a university could only afford to accept extraordinary African-

¹⁰⁵*The Bomb* (Lexington: Virginia Military Institute, 1972), 190, 195.

American students whom they were sure would succeed, then successful black athletes became a good source of publicity.¹⁰⁶

By the early 1970s, institutions of higher education across Virginia were reaching a state of “full desegregation.” The Supreme Court’s previously ambiguous statement of “deliberate speed” had introduced a 20-year process of desegregation; however, despite a deep-seeded fear and threat of violence and aggression from both the Virginia government and people, the desegregation of Virginia universities and colleges progressed relatively smoothly. Unlike in Mississippi and Alabama, there were few instances of violence that accompanied desegregation. The process was slow in Virginia, and it was accompanied by suggestions and attempts at segregated classrooms, dining tables, and library tables, but both black and white students necessitated gradual change by disagreeing with society and the administration. Graduate programs began the trend towards desegregation before *Brown v. Board*; perhaps, at first, because there were no separate, but equal facilities for African-Americans at historically black colleges. While it took undergraduate programs longer to begin the process of desegregation, this progression was not as contentious as the desegregation of secondary and primary schools. With the end of *in loco parentis*, many students, but not all, welcomed desegregation.

In contrast, it was not an entirely smooth progression. There was still prejudice against African-American students whether from a minority of fanatical students, the administration, or the off-campus community. Social affairs were still largely segregated on campus, most likely to avoid both conflict on and off campus. While academic organizations were normally opened to both black and white students, dating, dancing, and socializing were separated events. Likewise, the administration often tried to prevent African-American students from living on-campus, and

¹⁰⁶Johnson, “Progress in the Desegregation of Higher Education,” 258.

the outlying communities were often still deeply segregated. Still, the administration protected their African-American students from the communities' negative publicity and their, perhaps prejudiced, law enforcement. In addition, often communities began a slow process of desegregation, allowing African-American students into their bowling alleys, restaurants, and movie theaters. Whether this happened because they accepted these black students or because they were in need of the economical uplift is unknown. All in all, desegregation in Virginia higher education did not occur without a hitch; however, it was much less violent than in other southern states. It occurred slowly and in some cases painfully, but it did occur nonetheless, and it jumpstarted the spread of desegregation throughout Virginia as a whole.

Madison College: Desegregation at a Southern, Women's Institution

Racial desegregation of higher education in Virginia was not a fast, smooth process. It took approximately twenty years before full integration could occur and even now it can be claimed that full integration has still not been reached. Also, the Virginia institutions discussed exhibit many different characteristics and missions. They include historically men's and women's institutions as well as institutions in geographic areas with both low and high populations of African-Americans. Their only real similarity is that they are all southern, Virginia institutions. This chapter examines an institution that began as a women's teacher's college in an area with a very low population of African-Americans. It shows how the specific identity and location of an institution shaped its approach to integration.

James Madison University in Harrisonburg, Virginia, was founded in 1908, as the State Normal and Industrial School for Women. By 1938, the institution had been renamed Madison College, but it was still primarily a single-sex institution. The largely feminine campus would have been less likely to oppose desegregation, because black women were not as threatening as black men. According to Ida B. Wells-Barnett, a leading figure in the Civil Rights Movement, there was an unfounded fear among southern whites that black men would assault white women.¹⁰⁷ Desegregation was opposed in higher education partially because of this threat, but it was almost nonexistent at Madison College. Still, since 1946 men had enrolled at Madison College as day students.¹⁰⁸ While they were few in number, they attended the same classes as the Madison women. If African-Americans were accepted to the institution, would black men be included, and would they be allowed to participate in the same classes as white women? The question caused a delay in the acceptance of African-American students to the university.

¹⁰⁷Ida B. Wells-Barnett, *A Red Record* (1895; repr., London: The Echo Library, 2005), 7.

¹⁰⁸Raymond C. Dingleline, Jr., *Madison College: The First Fifty Years, 1908-1958* (Roanoke, VA: The Stone Printing and Manufacturing Co., 1959), 253.

Similarly, as a teacher's college, women at Madison College were less likely to support Massive Resistance when it led to closing schools, their future places of employment. Indeed, "a number of women's organizations such as the American Association of University Women, the League of Women Voters, and the Women's Interracial Council also opposed the closing. In general, women's groups appeared to value the public schools more than did organizations dominated by men."¹⁰⁹ In its tradition as a women's normal school, Madison College appears to have been well suited to support racial desegregation.

In addition, African-Americans made up about 2 percent of the population in Harrisonburg and Rockingham County. After *Brown v. Board* in 1954, the local Harrisonburg newspaper, *The Daily News Record*, published an article claiming that the decision "brought little reaction here," because there was "a very small percentage of colored population and school enrollment in Rockingham and Harrisonburg." Unlike the women's teacher's college in Fredericksburg, Virginia, the home of Mary Washington College, the community that surrounded Madison College was not particularly worried about a large population of African-Americans applying to the institution. If they had to accept a small minority of African-American students to comply with federal law they were willing to do so.¹¹⁰

G. Tyler Miller, third president of Madison College, assumed office in 1949. At the time, he was the perfect choice for president. A graduate of the Virginia Military Institute, the South's premier military academy, he had extensive experience in Virginia's system of public education.¹¹¹ He also encouraged expansion at Madison. Unfortunately, this expansion did not lead to an end to *in loco parentis*. While Miller allowed some leniency in regards to previous

¹⁰⁹Leidholdt, *Standing Before the Shouting Mob*, 98.

¹¹⁰"Little Comment on Opinion Here," *Daily News Record*, May 18, 1954.

¹¹¹Dingledine, *Madison College*, 255.

social rules, the institution was still very much responsible for policing the socially liberal students. He also wanted to increase the student body, but he did not want an increase in diversity. It was under G. Tyler Miller's presidency that the first African-Americans were accepted at Madison College in 1966; however, it appears as if this acceptance was in part due to a new push from Affirmative Action. Miller did little to accommodate these African-Americans, and maintained a conservative campus.

Therefore, Madison College was still primarily a southern institution. Like the University of Virginia and Virginia Tech, Madison College exhibited its southern culture and heritage on campus. Several buildings were named after Confederate officers, including Jackson Hall and Maury Hall, the first two buildings on campus, which were named in 1917. Ashby Hall was also named in 1917 after Confederate cavalry commander, Turner Ashby, who was killed in the Shenandoah Valley, only a few miles from the Madison College campus.

Nevertheless, when asked whether or not the Confederate heritage on campus made them uncomfortable, many black students claimed that they were not really sensitive to the names of the buildings. Many of the students went about their days on campus without applying any negative connotations to the buildings at all.¹¹² In many Virginia institutions, the students and administration made sure that their southern heritage was on prominent display, whether by playing "Dixie" at sporting events or flying the Confederate flag. Madison College was able to both celebrate that Confederate heritage in the names of their buildings and accommodate their African-American students. The Confederacy was not flaunted, and it appears as if the black students paid little attention to who Jackson, Maury, and Ashby Halls were actually named after.

¹¹²Sheary Darcus Johnson, Interview by author, Harrisonburg, VA, October 4, 2013; Purcell Conway, Interview by author, Harrisonburg, VA, October 2, 2013.

Additionally, Godwin Hall, dedicated in 1972, was named after former Virginia Governor, Mills Godwin. Godwin was famous for flip-flopping in his political ideologies. At first he attempted to avoid integration at all costs, but in his second term as governor, he led the increased efforts to integrate James Madison University in the 1978 Affirmative Action Plan. Still, Godwin once stood for Massive Resistance, and Godwin Hall was named after him primarily because his wife had attended Madison College and they were significant donors. Governor Linwood Holton, on the other hand, received no such recognition on the Madison College campus, despite his significant efforts to encourage the desegregation of public schools.¹¹³ It is also significant that Senator Harry F. Byrd, Jr., as son of the champion of Massive Resistance, presided over the dedication of Godwin Hall.

Initially, Madison College had trouble accepting the federal mandate to desegregate. In 1954, at the time of *Brown v. Board*, Madison College students actively participated in racially degrading events such as minstrel shows. At a Senior Plantation Party, white students performed in blackface in order to show “traditional Southern hospitality.”¹¹⁴ Clearly, these white students knew little about the African-American culture, and similarly to Virginia Tech and the University of Virginia, they were dedicated to preserving southern culture and values in the post-World War II United States.

In 1969, three years after beginning desegregation, Madison was still having trouble keeping an open mind about desegregation. In the *Breeze*, a sociology professor wrote an editorial criticizing his students for being Eurocentric in a changing world. He emphasized the

¹¹³Douglas Smith, “‘When Reason Collides with Prejudice:’ Armistead Lloyd Boothe and the Politics of Desegregation in Virginia, 1948-1963,” *The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* 102, no. 1 (January 1994): 24; Steven J. Rosenthal, “Symbolic Racism and Desegregation: Divergent Attitudes and Perceptions of Black and White University Students,” *Phylon* 41, no. 3 (1980): 258; “Godwin Hall Dedicated: Senator Byrd Delivers Ceremonial Address,” *The Breeze*, April 21, 1972.

¹¹⁴Ann Fosnight, “Senior ‘Plantation Party’ Offers Traditional Southern Hospitality,” *The Breeze*, November 5, 1954.

need for cross-cultural interactions, and he had sympathy for the students who never bothered to “understand the need for studying other cultures.”¹¹⁵ Clearly, Madison was a southern institution, and its students were brought up in a southern frame of mind; however, that does not mean they were completely reluctant to change.

Consequently, Madison College created a feminine, liberal environment in which limited desegregation was encouraged, and conversely, a southern, conservative environment in which Massive Resistance should have been supported. Indeed, it was not until 1966, twelve years after *Brown v. Board*, that the first African-American students were accepted into the undergraduate program at Madison College, showing that initially desegregation was not a priority. As a women’s, conservative institution, it is unlikely that President Miller would have encouraged the acceptance of African-Americans at the institution, especially the acceptance of black men. It is also likely that not many African-Americans applied to the institution, making it less likely that Madison College would come to the attention of the Supreme Court.

On the other hand, in 1966, when the first African-American student was enrolled, Madison College also went co-ed. Men constituted a minority on campus, and perhaps they felt a sort of solidarity with the African-American students. Likewise, men refused to abide by the archaic rules of Madison College, and they enacted changes that pulled further away from *in loco parentis*. As Madison had previously been primarily a women’s institution, they had not quite broken free of the old rules, but the introduction of full-time male students on campus allowed them to participate in more radical student movements for increased student rights.¹¹⁶ Also, like many schools that started the desegregation process later, Madison’s integration went much

¹¹⁵Dr. R von T. Napp, “Sociology Prof Reveals ‘World of Difference’ in Student Attitudes Toward Cross-Cultures,” *The Breeze*, October 15, 1969.

¹¹⁶Steve Smith, Interview by author, Harrisonburg, VA, April 2, 2013.

smoother, partly because its administration had the benefit of learning from the mistakes of other institutions.

In 1970, when student Jay Rainey led a protest through the city of Harrisonburg encouraging black rights, Miller was anything but pleased.¹¹⁷ Town-gown relations between Harrisonburg and Madison College were already strained as the conservative city attempted to control the more liberal student body. *Brown v. Board* had not scared them, because they did not expect many African-Americans to come to Harrisonburg. Conversely, they did fear the complete upheaval of their social values in a time when many university protests were turning violent. A 1970 article in the Harrisonburg *Daily News Record* condemned student activism on campus after the April 1970 revolts. After three liberal professors' contracts were not renewed for the upcoming year, Jay Rainey led a sit-in, in Wilson Hall, protesting the infringement on academic freedom.¹¹⁸ The protest was motivated by the strict *in loco parentis* rules still prominent at Madison, despite the admission of men four years earlier. Men did not want to be placed under the strict social rules that Madison women had been abiding by for 60 years. Instead, following the example of the 1960s protests of other university students, they pushed for their right to free speech. The editorial in the *Daily News Record* laughed at student attempts to "make a stand," implying that their outrage over parental rules was unfounded. It begs the student to remain the *silent* majority, using the politically motivating term to emphasize the importance of staying silent and letting things be.¹¹⁹

It was not until after 1971 that desegregation really took precedence on the Madison College campus. With Ronald E. Carrier's inauguration as president that year, the administration

¹¹⁷Jay Rainey, Interview by Jeremy Turner, Blacksburg, VA, January 30, 1998.

¹¹⁸Jeremy Turner, "Madison College Student Protest, April 1970: Background Paper to Oral History Interviews" (honors thesis, James Madison University, 1998), 10-11.

¹¹⁹J.S. Williamson II, "Fashion Comes to Madison," *Daily News Record*, April 29, 1970, 6.

started to make an active effort in the recruitment of African-American students. Most university administrators attempted to avoid too much desegregation in order to prevent negative public opinion; however, Carrier came from an extensive background of desegregation in education. President Carrier had attended East Tennessee State University as an undergrad, and as part of the Student Government Association, he invited black students to stay on campus for a conference. This was the first time that black students were allowed to stay in the dorms at East Tennessee, and Carrier had the responsibility of finding classmates to board these black students.¹²⁰ Furthermore, Carrier was teaching economics at the University of Mississippi when James Meredith, the first African-American student, was enrolled.¹²¹ Meredith's admission to the University of Mississippi was accompanied by extensive violence, and Carrier did not want that violence carried over onto Madison College's campus. He brought experiences with integration such as these to his presidency at Madison.

Carrier followed a philosophy in which he promised never to let problems fester. This way, he acted early to dissolve disagreements, thereby taking power away from radical groups.¹²² To facilitate the integration of Madison College, he listened to his students and he refused to let conflict occur between the students and administration. Carrier and his administration worked hard to ease tensions between the races:

In Carrier's second year enough African Americans had enrolled on campus to form a Black Student Alliance. Its stated purpose was 'to articulate the problems of black students at Madison College; to promote interaction and involvement in school activities; to foster continuous Afro-American pride and responsibility; and to foster black awareness among ourselves and the student body.'¹²³

¹²⁰Ronald E. Carrier, Interview by Nancy B. Jones, April 22, 2002, transcript, Special Collections, Harrisonburg, VA, 2

¹²¹Ibid, 4.

¹²²Ronald E. Carrier, Lecture, Harrisonburg, VA, March 13, 2013.

¹²³Nancy Bondurant Jones, *Rooted on Blue Stone Hill: A History of James Madison University* (Santa Fe: The Community Foundation of Harrisonburg and Rockingham County and the Center for American Places, 2004), 168.

This organization allowed African-American students to band together on campus. According to the 1975 *Bluestone*, the Black Student Alliance was open to all races and ethnicities as the Alliance hoped that this would promote integration among the student body.¹²⁴ While this club might be considered a continuation of the segregated social events characterized on other Virginia campuses, the fact that all races were invited to join shows some measure of increased social integration on Madison's campus.

The Black Student Alliance (BSA) initiated many extracurricular events designed to help African-American students adjust to Madison College. They created a Black Emphasis Week meant to celebrate African-American culture, instill pride in black students, and educate white students about African-American culture and heritage. The week included prominent African-American speakers whom students could look up to as role models.¹²⁵ The Alliance managed to provide a support group for African-American students in which they could associate with people from similar backgrounds with similar experiences, but it also allowed them to reach out to white students. Additionally, similar to the concerts sponsored by the Student Association of William & Mary, the BSA provided entertainment, such as Arthur Hall's Afro-American Dance Ensemble and the soul team Sam and Dave, that made African-Americans feel more at home.¹²⁶

In 1971, the first African-American sorority was also introduced onto Madison's campus with support from President Carrier. Delta Sigma Theta, a service sorority, worked with the NAACP and was actively involved in the recruitment of African-American students to Madison

¹²⁴*The Bluestone* (Harrisonburg: James Madison University, 1975), 67:266.

¹²⁵Deborah Tompkins & Elmore Lockley, "Black Student Alliance Attempts to Create Pride, Independence," *The Breeze*, February 18, 1975.

¹²⁶"Afro Dance Their Thing," *The Breeze*, November 6, 1970; "Big Weekend Features Concert, Parade, Sports, and Fashions," *The Breeze*, September 30, 1969.

College.¹²⁷ The sorority was concerned with “educational development, economic development, community and international development, mental health, and housing and urban development.” They participated in projects such as “a Voter Registration Drive, donating Xmas gifts to an underprivileged family, donating supplies for an aged couple’s home, [and] coordinating [their] efforts with those of the Campus Program Board in implementing a Black Emphasis Week on campus.”¹²⁸ Not only did they provide service to the Harrisonburg community, but they also worked to educate the community about black heritage and culture, and they actively recruited black students and professors with the help of the administration.

One of the main differences between other Virginia universities and Madison College was the active recruitment of black students.¹²⁹ To increase recruitment, Carrier attempted to make African-American parents feel at ease. He credits the College’s support of the campus gospel group as a powerful recruiting force. The group would travel to nearby churches, appealing to many southern mothers. Carrier understood that these mothers would have a say in their children’s choice of college, and the gospel group presented a comforting support group for African-American students.¹³⁰ It proved to black mothers that their children would not only have a place to turn, but also that this place would reinforce their religious values. Despite this effort to recruit black students, Carrier unintentionally reinforced the racial stereotype of religiously devout African-Americans—the idea of the radical Southern Baptists. This stereotype would not pertain to all black students recruited to attend Madison College.

Carrier also recruited black students through a Transition Program that he implemented on campus. The program brought 35-40 students—normally those who had not met the college’s

¹²⁷*The Bluestone* (Harrisonburg: James Madison University, 1973), 65:345.

¹²⁸Ibid.

¹²⁹Daphyne Thomas, Interview by author, Harrisonburg, VA, March 22, 2013.

¹³⁰Ronald E. Carrier, Lecture, Harrisonburg, VA, March 13, 2013.

qualifications—to campus every summer. These students would be enrolled in approximately nine credit hours, allowing them to improve their academics and acclimate to the college environment.¹³¹ This was an extremely innovative program that offered not only prospective black students, but also any student with fewer resources, an opportunity to strive towards college. Many African-American students were not presented with the same opportunities as white students. Their schools received less funding, they often had lower incomes, and they could not afford supplies, let alone tutors and other educational aid. The Transition Program gave them a chance to remedy this double standard.

Additionally, Madison College attempted to apply Affirmative Action to its campus. The first Madison College Affirmative Action Plan was released in 1973 and Carrier’s letter, which accompanied the document, stated that Madison College would go above and “beyond mere compliance with government enacted regulations.” He also called upon “each and every person” to work together in order to create an environment of equal employment on campus.¹³² With these words, Carrier is emphasizing his solidarity with the minority population of Harrisonburg; however, this first document deals purely with employment at Madison College and not student enrollment. African-Americans, especially those native to Harrisonburg and already accepted by the white population, would be hired to work at the college. Most of the positions opened to African-Americans, however, were blue-collar service jobs, not faculty positions. In this way, Madison was able to employ African-Americans native to the City of Harrisonburg and reach population parity, a requirement of Affirmative Action, without threatening white citizens afraid of both an influx of African-American migrants and African-Americans who might take more skilled jobs from the white community. Additionally, in order to reach population parity, or a

¹³¹Ronald E. Carrier, Lecture, Harrisonburg, VA, March 13, 2013.

¹³²Madison College Affirmative Action Plan, SC AF90-0501, Special Collections, Carrier Library, James Madison University, Harrisonburg, VA, 1973, 3.

“minority work force whose ethnic composition is more or less in direct relationship to the racial mix of [the] community,” Harrisonburg only needed to maintain a work force that employed a 2 percent African-American population; thus, out of 888 employees, only 18 had to be African-American. Madison already had 12 African-American employees prior to 1973; therefore, they only needed to hire six more in order to reach population parity.¹³³

The 1973 Affirmative Action Plan emphasized the negative effect Affirmative Action had on the integration of higher education. Despite Carrier’s efforts to actively recruit minority students and to make them feel comfortable in what could be considered a hostile environment, Affirmative Action and the introduction of “reverse discrimination” made obvious integration difficult. The 1973 Affirmative Action plan looked innovative at first glance, and it did provide for the increased employment of African-Americans; however, that increase in employment was far from drastic and allowed African-American access mainly to a few service positions. Furthermore, the plan simply stated that Madison College would attempt “every good faith effort” to comply with Affirmative Action.¹³⁴ Similar to the phrase “all deliberate speed” used in the *Brown v. Board* decision, “every good faith effort” provided some ambiguity to Madison’s efforts at desegregation. The phrase, used several times in the document, provided the appearance of integration, but not necessarily true compliance. After the Civil Rights Act of 1964, this phrase could be a way of receiving both federal funds and state funds without having to expend a great deal of effort on integration. While it appears that Madison was making a concerted effort to integrate, it is interesting that it still makes significant efforts to safeguard itself from attacks both from the conservative state and community. Madison might have been

¹³³Madison College Affirmative Action Plan, SC AF90-0501, Special Collections, Carrier Library, James Madison University, Harrisonburg, VA, 1973, 10, 26-27.

¹³⁴Ibid., 5.

on the side of the African-Americans, but it is possible that African-American staff and students were not always convinced of that fact.

In 1976, Madison College took another huge step towards full integration. Enrollment by the mid-1970s was approximately 7,500, with only 30 African-American students in 1976.¹³⁵ A Minority Affairs Coalition was hosted by Madison College, and it was designed to allow students, rather than administrators or parents, to discuss integration—its progresses and problems. One of the ideas introduced by the coalition was that “only the black community can be responsible for educating blacks.” This illustrates the struggle still present with desegregation.¹³⁶ African-American students had few African-American professors they could look up to. In the 1976 *Bluestone* three African-American faculty were present, including Jack H. Williams who was head of the sociology department. While it is possible that more black faculty members were not pictured, three is an insignificant number.¹³⁷ In addition, Black Studies was not yet a well-defined course, and many African-American students were disillusioned by the lack of courses pertaining to African-American heritage and culture. The best way to aid desegregation was to educate white students about that heritage and culture but few classes were being offered. While Madison College was innovative in hosting this coalition, it still struggled with implementing some important programs.

In this regard, there were several black students at Madison who believed more should be done to increase the desegregation of the campus. For instance, in 1977 the *Breeze* published an article entitled “Blacks at JMU concerned with discrimination.” The article emphasizes the idea

¹³⁵James Madison University Affirmative Action Plan, SC AF90-0501, Special Collections, Carrier Library, James Madison University, Harrisonburg, VA, 1978.

¹³⁶Tom Dulan, “Blacks Must Study Themselves,” *Breeze*, September 28, 1976.

¹³⁷*Bluestone* (Harrisonburg: James Madison University, 1976), 241.

that African-American students were discriminated against academically.¹³⁸ Black students understood that without black faculty and administrators, there was no one on their side. Nothing would change in their favor unless they had authority figures to help fight their battles. Even so, black students were not the only ones fighting battles against discrimination. At the same time, a rejected East Indian professor filed a suit against Madison, claiming that he had been denied a position based on his race.¹³⁹ Other minorities on campus were equally as annoyed by the refusal of Madison to diversify its faculty. Additionally, the department of Health, Education, and Welfare investigated a claim that admissions quotas for men were severely lowering the standards of students at the university.¹⁴⁰ Similarly to the reverse discrimination cry against black students, it was also men who threatened “truly qualified” students’ acceptance into the university. As mentioned previously, some Madison alumni believe that their transition into integration went more smoothly than that of students at other institutions because Madison went through so many changes at once. Sheary Darcus Johnson believes that the mass enrollment of white men and minorities together may have made people more open-minded in regards to integration. The university was not solely focusing on one group, but on diversity in general.¹⁴¹

It was President Carrier’s actions, combined with programs such as Affirmative Action and the Minority Coalition that jumpstarted integration at Madison. Carrier made integration seem not only inevitable, but normal as well. He attended so-called “black” events and sat down at tables in D-hall to chat with groups of black students. He sent the message that interaction

¹³⁸Tami Richardson, “Blacks at JMU Concerned with Discrimination,” *Breeze*, November 11, 1977.

¹³⁹Barbara Burch, “Discrimination Suit Filed,” *Breeze*, September 2, 1977.

¹⁴⁰“Hew Investigates Quota Use Charges,” *Breeze*, September 2, 1977.

¹⁴¹Sheary Darcus Johnson, Interview by author, Harrisonburg, VA, October 4, 2013.

was okay, “no big deal,” and because of this, those under him began to do the same.¹⁴² With a supportive administration and staff, all students at Madison were encouraged to broaden their scope of thinking and accept peers and friends from any racial background.

This acceptance of African-American students by their white peers is exemplified on Madison College’s campus. Indeed the first several African-American students on campus were prominently represented in the student-created *Bluestone*. Sheary Darcus, the first African-American to graduate from Madison in 1970, is well represented in the yearbook. She was Vice President of Concert Choir, a member of Alpha Beta Alpha, the library science honors fraternity, and a freshman counselor. She graduated with a BA in Library Science and chose to continue her education at Madison College, earning her master’s degree in 1974.¹⁴³ Likewise, Sandra Johnson participated in campus life alongside Darcus. She was Vice President and later President of Concert Choir, as well as a member of Alpha Beta Alpha. She graduated in 1972 with a BS in both Elementary Education and Library Science.¹⁴⁴

Darcus and Johnson’s representation in the *Bluestone* implies that they were adjusting well to the white campus, participating in social clubs and honors societies alongside white students, with seemingly little discrimination. Darcus’s continuation of her education at Madison College also implies that her experience there was not bad enough to discourage her from earning her Master’s. Darcus describes her time at Madison with fondness, claiming that it brought out the best in her. She emphasizes, however, that she was simply a day student at Madison, and it could be said that she was not fully integrated into the social structure on campus. While faculty made every effort to help Darcus fit in and thrive at Madison, she had

¹⁴²Daphyne Thomas, Interview by author, Harrisonburg, VA, March 22, 2013.

¹⁴³*The Bluestone* (Harrisonburg: James Madison University, 1970), 62:447.

¹⁴⁴*The Bluestone* (Harrisonburg: James Madison University, 1972), 64:339.

fewer interactions with the students. Regardless, amongst the day students Darcus held a leadership position. She was elected President of the Day Student Organization, which included both white and black members. To this day, Darcus encourages young African-American scholars to attend James Madison University.¹⁴⁵ Conversely, she mentions that another African-American woman entered Madison at the same time as her. This young woman dropped out after her second year, and Darcus raises the point that it is hard to glean the opinion of those students that never make it to graduation. While multiple students were interviewed for this thesis, they were all graduates of Madison College. They may have enjoyed their time at Madison; however, it is difficult to discover whether those who left before earning their degrees did so because of discrimination or other unknown reasons.

From the other side of the racial divide, one white student, Steve Smith, class of 1971, choose to room with an African-American student, Purcell Conway. The two had become acquaintances throughout their first semester and when their respective roommates left, Smith thought it would be a good idea to move in together. Conway was shocked when Smith asked to room with him during their second semester, but the two soon became good friends. They often went together to Smith's home in Fredericksburg on weekends, and they got to know each other's families. Today, Conway claims that he enjoyed his experience at Madison, and maintains that there was little discrimination on the college campus. While he says that there were no challenges living with Smith, he does acknowledge that there were some roommates throughout his five years at Madison that were not always happy about the situation. This minority never actively protested their situation, but they did resent living with a black man.¹⁴⁶

¹⁴⁵Sheary Darcus Johnson, Interview by author, Harrisonburg, VA, October 4, 2013.

¹⁴⁶Purcell Conway, Interview by author, Harrisonburg, VA, October 2, 2013.

Steve Smith also witnessed some of the prejudice against African-American students. Once when he was on a double date with Conway, they decided to switch dates as a social experiment. Harrisonburg residents saw what looked like two biracial couples, and the community did not accept this. Smith remembers not truly understanding the discrimination faced by African-Americans until that night. He was honestly shocked by the degrading comments aimed at what appeared to be a black man dating a white woman, and it opened his eyes to the African-American struggle.¹⁴⁷ The city of Harrisonburg was not accepting of miscegenation even if they were beginning to accept African-Americans on the campus. Smith still believes that, despite the animosity of Harrisonburg, white students at Madison were incredibly receptive to African-American students and maybe even protective of them—a characteristic that might have stemmed from Carrier’s support of desegregation.

It is important to mention, however, that Carrier was not alone in his efforts. He employed the right people in which to actively promote integration, including Daphyne Thomas in admissions, and his Vice President of Student Services, Dr. William O. Hall. Daphyne Thomas was the first African-American hired into the Office of Admissions in 1976. Thomas had gone to Virginia Tech as an undergraduate student, and she believed her peers thought she was there purely for her race. As a National Merit Scholar she had been courted by schools, because they believed she would prove an exceptional African-American student. When she went to Washington and Lee for law school, she was seen as an angry woman demanding rights. Once again, she was not wanted due to her status as an African-American woman. When she came to Harrisonburg, she faced some discrimination in finding an apartment. Her friend, Gary Beatty would negotiate with the home owners while she waited in the car. She also claims that

¹⁴⁷Purcell Conway, Interview by author, Harrisonburg, VA, October 2, 2013.

while no one refused to serve her, she received a different quality of service than her white peers at social outings around town.

Thomas was specifically hired into the Office of Admissions as the minority recruiter. Her experiences as a black student in a primarily white institution put her in the perfect position to provide the aid and support that she had never been offered to black students in similar situations. In 1978, an aggressive push in minority admissions was made, and as a result, 55 black freshmen and 14 black transfer students were admitted to the university that year.¹⁴⁸ Thomas emphasizes that Madison College was very consistent in its efforts to integrate. She credits the fact that Madison actively recruited African-American students and other minorities. She also admires the fact that Madison College made every effort to make these students feel at home. For instance, Carrier often invited black artists to campus, such as James Brown and the Temptations.¹⁴⁹ In a *Breeze* article in 1970 an Afro-American dance ensemble performing at Madison is said to have received a standing ovation from the students and was even a hit among the conservative residents of Harrisonburg.¹⁵⁰

After *University of California v. Bakke*, however, minority admissions at Madison changed. In order to avoid the white backlash of Affirmative Action, admissions recruiters like Thomas had to be sure to only accept African American students who went above and beyond the normal standards. Thomas had to make sure that rejected white students could not accuse the school of accepting minority students who were less qualified simply to increase diversity; thus, the school developed a concrete formula for acceptance, despite the fact that many African-

¹⁴⁸Daphyne Thomas, Class Lecture, Harrisonburg, VA, February 11, 2013.

¹⁴⁹Daphyne Thomas, Interview by author, Harrisonburg, VA, March 22, 2013.

¹⁵⁰“Afro Dance Their Thing,” *Breeze*, November 6, 1970.

American students were not given the same opportunities in high school as their white counterparts.¹⁵¹

Dr. William Hall, Vice President of Student Services in the mid-70s, also worked hard to provide a welcoming environment to African-American students. He remembers that the black student leaders met with him to complain about how nothing was done to accommodate black students in regards to academics. Hall tried to show the students that as Vice President of Student Services he did not have the power to introduce black studies programs on campus, but that the Vice President of Academic Affairs did.¹⁵² He struggled to show these students that he was on their side, but they did not always believe him.

Nevertheless, in the late 1970s there was a protest outside Godwin Hall led by African-American students. When they held their demonstration at a school basketball game and protested the inequality between white and black students in regards to academics, Hall protected what he refers to as “his” students. Hall would not stop the demonstration, but he posted staff by the students in order to prevent altercations with citizens of Harrisonburg, and he delivered hot chocolate to the protesting students, trying to prove that Madison College cared for them. Hall claimed that Madison was not much different from other campuses. There were some racially-motivated demonstrations, but not a significant number, and they were often rather tame. As Vice President of Student Services he was biased, attempting to emphasize his service to the African-American students; however, he was fairly blunt about the subject. Hall did imply that Dr. Carrier did not like racial concerns to become public, and often placed the responsibility of keeping racial altercations private on those such as Dr. Hall. Carrier valued a smooth transition

¹⁵¹Daphyne Thomas, Class Lecture, Harrisonburg, VA, February 11, 2013.

¹⁵²William Hall, Interview by author, Harrisonburg, VA, April 18, 2013.

to integration highly, and while he might have been aided in that transition, he did provide the initial support.¹⁵³

Importantly, Hall specifically stated that complaints from black students were not about racial discrimination against them; rather, they felt they were not receiving enough social or academic opportunities geared towards them. He believes that there were some faculty members who were racist, and black students were steered away from them by black professors and students and by Hall himself. In his view, generally, black students did not perceive faculty as discriminatory against them. In fact, the first African-American sorority on campus, Delta Sigma Theta, asked Dr. Hall to be their faculty advisor. This implies that these students at least recognized both the efforts Dr. Hall made on their behalf and his powerful position. Clearly these students believed that efforts were being made to make them more comfortable on campus.¹⁵⁴

Despite Hall's attempts to accommodate black students through student services, dealing primarily with social events, academic affairs were a different matter. The Black Student Alliance fought to provide "more courses dealing with Blacks in the historical, sociological, and political curriculums,"¹⁵⁵ and a 1977 article in *the Breeze* emphasized that more black professors were needed in order to both "serve as role models for the black students" and advise the faculty and administrators "in making decisions that will affect black students."¹⁵⁶ These students demanded that their culture and heritage be celebrated, instead of neglected. A form of discrimination that was present on Madison's campus was the marginalization of African-Americans which led to an absence of black content in academics. The lack of courses relating

¹⁵³William Hall, Interview by author, Harrisonburg, VA, April 18, 2013.

¹⁵⁴Ibid.

¹⁵⁵Tompkins & Lockley, "Black Student Alliance Attempts to Create Pride."

¹⁵⁶Carrolet I. Taylor, "More Black Profs Needed," *Breeze*, November 22, 1977.

to African-Americans implied that their historic and contemporary contributions were not significant enough to teach.

Eventually, the ambiguity of Madison's first Affirmative Action Plan and its inability to increase both black faculty and opportunity was questioned by the federal government. In 1978, another Affirmative Action study was ordered at James Madison University on account of a judgment by the federal government that some Virginia public colleges and universities had not achieved a sufficient level of integration. The 1978 study significantly dealt with African-American student enrollment on campus, because a recent court case, *Addams v. Califano*, stated that "in the mid-seventies, black colleges continue to graduate almost forty percent of all blacks who receive college degrees."¹⁵⁷ At Madison, out of 1,363 baccalaureate degrees awarded for the 75/76 year, only 10 were awarded to African-Americans, accounting for less than 1 percent.¹⁵⁸ Moreover, African-American students enrolling at Madison College in the 76/77 year accounted for only 1 percent of enrollment.¹⁵⁹

The creation of the 1978 Affirmative Action plan was spurred by the introduction of reverse discrimination in 1978 and causes black representation at James Madison University to change. In the notes included with the 1978 James Madison University Affirmative Action Plan, there is a project included that attempts to increase the representation of blacks in the *Bluestone*.¹⁶⁰ This raises the question of whether African-American representation in the yearbook was based off of their own identity as Madison students or whether Madison simply wanted to prove to white parents and students that the African-American students accepted at Madison went above and beyond the expectations of typical students. When it came to

¹⁵⁷ James Madison University Affirmative Action Plan, SC AF90-0501, Special Collections, Carrier Library, James Madison University, Harrisonburg, VA, 1978, 12.

¹⁵⁸ Ibid, 3.

¹⁵⁹ Ibid.

¹⁶⁰ Ibid.

recruitment brochures, African-American representation was also increased, showing black students studying at the library and lounging with white students. This was also probably an effort to show African-Americans who were excellent students, deserved to be at the institution, and did not cause problems. With reverse discrimination, institutions of higher education, including Madison, were forced to demonstrate that acceptance of minority students was not based on some need to reach quotas or correct past injustices, but on their own qualifications. After 1978, black representation in the yearbook and other university propaganda was relegated to those students who went above and beyond, including dual majors, athletes, and those who had adjusted to the primarily white institution; therefore, this cross-section of African-American students at Madison may not present a full picture of their integration into the community.

Thus, reverse discrimination accounted for some of the tapering off of African-American enrollment in the mid-70s. The Madison College administration, Carrier included, were forced to prove that their acceptance of African-American students was not purely for diversification reasons, but that they were qualified students. In the Reformulation of the Plan for Equal Opportunity, Madison showed its compliance with the *University of California v. Bakke* decision by stating “Virginia remains, however, convinced that numerical goals or quotas are not only illegal and unconstitutional, but are indeed potentially detrimental to higher education.”¹⁶¹ Still, Madison actively promoted diversity of thought on the campus, even if it did not categorize that diversity through racial quotas.

Indeed, foundations for an African studies minor had begun in 1976 due to the demands of African-American students, proving that diversity of thought was encouraged. Jackie Walker provided the faculty foundation needed, and during the Minority Affairs Coalition in 1976, Dr.

¹⁶¹Reformulation of the Plan for Equal Opportunity, SC AF90-0501, Special Collections, Carrier Library, James Madison University, Harrisonburg, VA, 1978, 10.

William Harris, dean of Afro-American studies at the University of Virginia, provided a sort of framework for the minor.¹⁶² In 1977, Dr. Walker offered a course on Alex Haley's *Roots*, which closely examined the dynamics of the black family.¹⁶³ By 1980, Walker's courses had garnered enough attention to create an African-American Studies minor.¹⁶⁴ This must have done something to increase African-American interest in Madison, because by 1980, black enrollment had jumped from just 30 students to 63, more than doubling in four years.

In a *Breeze* editorial, Paul A. Brown credited the amount of interest the minor received; however, he claimed that hiring more black professors was unnecessary.¹⁶⁵ Brown's editorial came around the same time as the *University of California v. Bakke* case, and he provided a good example of what white students saw as reverse discrimination. He wanted professors who were qualified, regardless of their skin color, and he believed that a black professor might be hired purely for diversification reasons, rather than for their merits. In his editorial, he stated that "the major priority of this university should be obtaining good professors and administrators and not obtaining black or white (or any other color) faculty and administrators."¹⁶⁶ Still, many black students believed that only African-American professors could teach African-American history.¹⁶⁷ Black and white students did not always see eye to eye, even if they were both interested in learning about the African-American culture.

Unfortunately, the African-American studies minor faded away in the 1986-1987 school year.¹⁶⁸ The quiet disappearance of the minor most likely had something to do with the rise of

¹⁶²"Black Students to Meet," *Breeze*, September 24, 1976.

¹⁶³Lynda Edwards, "Roots' Examined in Course," *Breeze*, December 3, 1976.

¹⁶⁴Susan Edwards, "Former Minor May be Reconsidered," *Breeze*, December 10, 1992.

¹⁶⁵Paul A. Brown, "Prof's Skin Color Irrelevant," *Breeze*, November 18, 1977.

¹⁶⁶Ibid.

¹⁶⁷Dulan, "Blacks Must Study Themselves."

¹⁶⁸Edwards, "Former Minor May be Reconsidered."

the New Right in the 1980s. The New Right was an anti-elitist, anti-intellectual political movement which fought for fewer taxes and smaller government.¹⁶⁹ Anti-intellectualism and fewer taxes coalesced into less funding for public education, including James Madison University. As a result, with the increased emphasis on reverse discrimination, it was probably easiest for the university to get rid of the African-American studies minor, especially considering the minor was supposedly not receiving much interest.

All the same, Dr. Walker had never been contacted about the minor no longer being offered; it simply disappeared from the course catalog. On December 10, 1992, however, the *Breeze* published an article stating that the minor would be reconsidered as an option. The Black Student Alliance revived the idea of the minor because of increased student interest.

Interestingly enough, Dr. Carrier was on a one-year leave of absence during the 1986-1987 year and did not know about the deletion of the minor from the course catalog.¹⁷⁰ The deletion implies that not all of the faculty and staff were comfortable with the dissemination of African-American heritage and culture; however, the power of the student body is emphasized by their placing the minor back in consideration.

Arthur Dean, currently employed at James Madison University as the Assistant to the President for Diversity, emphasizes that Madison recruited people from all backgrounds after Affirmative Action. Madison wanted a diversity of social identity, including thought, ethnicity, socioeconomic level, and more.¹⁷¹ Students of all backgrounds and perspectives allowed a compliance with *University of California v. Bakke*, but it also encouraged students to be both comfortable with and proud of their own background while learning about and appreciating the

¹⁶⁹Schulman, *The Seventies*, 200-201.

¹⁷⁰Edwards, "Former Minor May be Reconsidered."

¹⁷¹Arthur Dean. Interview by author. Harrisonburg, VA. March 26, 2013.

cultural differences of others. Those students, both white and black, who took advantage of this diversity benefited greatly, and there were those who participated in racially mixed clubs, classrooms, and dorm rooms creating pockets of integration that would spread throughout the students of the university.¹⁷² Still, after African-American admissions peaked in 1991-1992, a gradual decline began at Madison. After reaching 9 percent of the student body in 1992, African-American students only constituted 5 percent in 1997.¹⁷³ While Tieast Leverett believed that students were still open-minded and willing to accept different cultures, an article in the 1998 *Breeze* claims that James Madison University could only be granted a D in Diversity.¹⁷⁴

Madison College was not flawless in its efforts to integrate, but it presents an interesting dichotomy between conservatism and liberalism. It took 12 years after *Brown v. Board* for Madison to begin its process of desegregation; however, like the Virginia Military Institute, it reached full desegregation much faster than others, such as the University of Virginia and Virginia Tech, which started desegregation before the 1954 decision. The college combined its southern, conservative heritage with its heritage as a teacher's training school in which equal access to public education outweighed white supremacy. Lastly, Madison College was located in an area that historically had a small population of African-Americans. The Shenandoah Valley had approximately a 2 percent African-American population in the 1960s, and thus white residents believed not many black students would enroll at Madison. Local whites felt little fear compared to whites in places like Richmond or Fredericksburg, two areas known for their large black populations.

¹⁷²Arthur Dean. Interview by author. Harrisonburg, VA. March 26, 2013.

¹⁷³Jennifer Simmons, "A 'D' for Diversity," *Breeze*, January 26, 1998.

¹⁷⁴Ibid.

All in all, Dr. Carrier started desegregation at Madison, but he did so in a way that did not allow animosity or prejudice. His efforts to provide aid for organizations, such as the Black Student Alliance and Alpha Sigma Theta, and his habit of sitting and conversing with African-American students made his administration comfortable with the idea of diversity. His faculty and staff soon realized that desegregation was inevitable and perhaps even a benign chain of events. With role models such as Carrier, Hall, and Thomas, students themselves began to realize that the mixing of races was acceptable, ordinary, and surprisingly beneficial. Some, such as Steve Smith, Sheary Darcus Johnson, and Purcell Conway took advantage of the benefits that came with integrated living spaces, classes, and social events.

By the late 70s, the *Breeze* was no longer referring to African-American students as black or Negro, two terms that might seem disrespectful today, implying a sort of juvenility or inferiority. Instead the term Afro-American became more common, especially in regards to specific groups clubs or classes pertaining to African-American studies. Reverse discrimination did severely impact what Madison could do regarding the acceptance of minority students; however, a respect for diversity and culture grew out of the idea of multiplicity of thought, which blossomed after the 1978 *University of California v. Bakke* decision.

Finally, James Madison University was ranked as one of the most popular universities for African-American students to attend.¹⁷⁵ Discrimination was not eliminated, but unlike many universities, Madison actively recruited African-American students, gave them outlets in which to voice their grievances, such as the Black Student Alliance and the Minority Coalition, and attempted to both solve those problems and help these students adjust to a historically white institution. Today, the children of African-American alumni from the 1970s continue to attend

¹⁷⁵Daphyne Thomas, Interview by author, Harrisonburg, VA, March 22, 2013; Ronald E. Carrier, Class Lecture, Harrisonburg, VA March 13, 2013.

James Madison University, and Sheary Darcus Johnson, the first African-American student to graduate from Madison College, encourages young black scholars to enroll at the university.¹⁷⁶

¹⁷⁶Arthur Dean, Interview by author, Harrisonburg, VA, March 26, 2013; Sheary Darcus Johnson, Interview by author, Harrisonburg, VA, October 4, 2013.

Conclusion: How Far Have We Come?

Every school-aged child hears about Virginia's legacy of Massive Resistance; however, it appears as if Virginia higher education was not as controlled by the state policy. Some institutions began desegregation prior to the *Brown v. Board* decision, but many of these schools were simply following the *Plessy v. Ferguson* mandate of separate, but equal. They were forced to integrate their campuses because separate but equal facilities were not provided for black students. Additionally, the University of Virginia and Virginia Tech may have desegregated prior to 1954, yet neither of their first African-American students completed their degrees at the institutions. It would take twenty years for these institutions to reach what was then considered full integration.

Other institutions, such as Virginia Commonwealth University and the University of Mary Washington, struggled with desegregation because they were situated in areas with a high concentration of African-Americans. Their desegregation would certainly mean that African-American students would expect enrollment. While they suffered with discrimination, there were efforts, largely by students, to adjust to the situation. Many student bodies hired African-American entertainment, perhaps attempting to make their new peers feel at home.

Finally, institutions like the Virginia Military Institute and Madison College would not begin desegregation until well after the 1954 decision. They had precedents to look towards that made their process slightly easier and desegregation went smoother. In particular, Madison College not only had a supportive student body, but a supportive administration and faculty as well. A policy of desegregation permeated the campus, and in some cases, white students felt protective of their black peers. Discrimination was inevitably present, but unlike other institutions it was discrimination, not integration, that was frowned upon at Madison. Carrier

refused to allow any dissent on campus, but still, that dissent can be seen, especially in the case where the Afro-American studies minor was removed, coincidentally during Carrier's leave of absence from the university.

All institutions of higher education struggled between discrimination and desegregation; however, by the mid-70s, most Virginia universities were comfortable in their level of desegregation and black enrollment was at an all time high. It was not until 1978 that desegregation hit another roadblock. According to Scott Jaschick, one of the editors for *Inside Higher Ed*, desegregation has slowed significantly over time,¹⁷⁷ and indeed James Madison University only had a 4 percent African-American enrollment rate as of 2012.¹⁷⁸ This is merely a 2.5 percent increase from the 1.5 percent enrollment of African-Americans in 1972, only 6 years after their initial admittance; thus, the issues of desegregation, integration, and Affirmative Action are still incredibly relevant today. Desegregation progressed well to a certain point, but since 1992, James Madison University's African-American admissions have been declining. Integration, meaning full equality of opportunity between white and black students, is far from a reality, and it is possible that Affirmative Action has negatively impacted this integration. So how far have southern institutions really come in the 59 years since *Brown v. Board*?

Reverse discrimination certainly impacted the admissions strategies of many campuses, and it can be said that public schools were forced into accepting only the most exceptional African-American students, possibly decreasing minority admissions. Historically speaking, black students still largely come from less affluent families and do not have the same academic opportunities of white students with similar backgrounds. This is not to say that these students

¹⁷⁷ Scott Jaschick, "Measures of Segregation," *Inside Higher Ed*
<http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2013/01/04/data-presented-economics-meeting-show-extent-desegregation-higher-education> (Accessed October 7, 2013).

¹⁷⁸ Total Student Body by Race/Ethnicity, James Madison University-Statistical Summary 2012, Institutional Research.

would perform worse in higher education; however, it does make institutions less likely to accept them. Jaschick credits Affirmative Action and reverse discrimination with slowing the process of desegregation. He claims that any conscious “consideration of race and ethnicity in admissions” makes it difficult to make equal opportunity admissions decisions; therefore, he believes that states that have “banned affirmative action in admissions” have not excluded “black students from higher education but [have redistributed] their enrollment.”¹⁷⁹

William Hall would agree with Jaschick that there is a plateau in integration and adjustment at JMU today.¹⁸⁰ From his observations, he sees students sticking within their racial groupings, and it is hard for anyone to claim otherwise. The last stronghold of segregation was within the social sphere, largely because of a fear of racial mixing. Today, there are still remnants of that social segregation that have not been shaken off. It would be wrong to say that no part of the social strata is integrated; however, there is still segregation when it comes to social mingling. Arthur Dean described it best when he said that it is the responsibility of the majority to choose, not just to be supportive, but to participate as well; thus, it is up to the majority to integrate with the minority. Enrollment of African-American students has reached a plateau, and that plateau cannot be broken, nor can full integration be met, until the majority learns to participate along with the minority. As of right now, clubs and programs, such as Phi Mu or the Center for Multicultural Student Services are seen as the sanctuary of one group or another—not both—even though all races are welcomed.¹⁸¹ White students might claim that they thought an event was created specifically for black students.¹⁸² They might believe that

¹⁷⁹Scott Jaschick, “Measures of Segregation,” *Inside Higher Ed* <http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2013/01/04/data-presented-economics-meeting-show-extent-desegregation-higher-education> (Accessed October 7, 2013).

¹⁸⁰William Hall, Interview by author, Harrisonburg, VA, April 18, 2013.

¹⁸¹Arthur Dean, Interview by author, Harrisonburg, VA, March 26, 2013.

¹⁸²Daphyne Thomas, Interview by author, Harrisonburg, VA, March 22, 2013.

their presence is unwanted and vice versa. Everyone is always fully conscious of his or her place, but like Jaschick implies in his article, that consciousness will keep society from ever reaching a state of full integration.

The question then is whether or not Affirmative Action is still useful to society, or if it ever really was. Affirmative Action was meant to right the years of prejudice against African-American students, but instead it caused resentment between whites and blacks to increase. White people did not understand the remedy, but they did understand that they were being punished. Affirmative Action widened the gap between whites and blacks, and today, Affirmative Action still prevents the full integration of society. Scott Jaschick provides evidence that schools who employ Affirmative Action methods to diversify their student bodies are actually hurting minority enrollment. It creates a distinction between races that should not exist. Instead, university enrollment and practice needs to be one of colorblindness.

In conclusion, the racial desegregation of higher education in Virginia has reached a state of grayness—neither black nor white. It is not stuck in a deeply discriminatory past, nor has it reached a utopian state of integration. Instead, it is stuck somewhere in the middle: desegregated but not integrated. In other words, black and white students are free to live together, attend the same class, and even be friends, like Purcell Conway and Steve Smith, but that does not mean they have reached full equality of opportunity or even full acceptance of each other. Stereotypes still permeate society causing the two groups to misunderstand the different cultures and preventing them from taking part in celebrating that culture. In the end, black admissions has stagnated at predominantly white institutions because of Affirmative Action and a society in which equality of opportunity has still not been extended to a large portion of the black community. All in all, full integration has not been reached.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

The Bluestone. Harrisonburg: James Madison University, 1961-present.

The Bluestone is the student-produced yearbook published yearly at James Madison University. It demonstrates the students' participation in clubs and extra-curricular activities as well as their importance among the university community. The club illustrates the Black Student Alliance, showing the university's attempt to adapt peacefully to the integration of the institution. It is mentioned in the Affirmative Action plan of James Madison University that more African-American students should be presented in *The Bluestone* in order to keep up appearance of integration.

The Bomb. Lexington: Virginia Military Institute, 1972.

The Bomb is the student-produced yearbook published yearly at the Virginia Military Institute. The yearbook shows significant evidence that the first African-American students accepted at the Confederacy's premier military institute were integrated rather successfully into the social order of the institution.

The Breeze. Harrisonburg: James Madison University, 1922-present.

The Breeze is the student-run newspaper at James Madison University in which editorials, advertisements, and student activities are all published. The paper contains information about student, as well as professor, acceptance of African-American attendance at the institution. The paper also illustrates performances that celebrate the African culture coming to the university.

Carrier, Ronald E. Class Lecture. Harrisonburg, Virginia. March 13, 2013.

Dr. Carrier discusses his efforts at Madison to provide services and programs from African-American students designed to recruit and to help them adjust to a white institution.

Carrier, Ronald E. Interview by Nancy B. Jones. April 22, 2002. Transcript, Special Collections, Harrisonburg, VA.

Dr. Carrier talks about his own experiences as an undergrad which prepared him for the desegregation of Madison.

Conway, Purcell. Interview by Author. Harrisonburg, Virginia. October 2, 2013.

Conway describes his own experiences as a black student at Madison in the early 1970s. He lived with Steve Smith, a white student, and enjoyed his time at Madison. He does acknowledge that some white students were resentful of his presence; however, for the most part there was little discrimination.

The Cobblestone. Richmond: Virginia Commonwealth University, 1968-1970.

The Cobblestone is the student-produced yearbook published yearly at Virginia Commonwealth University. The yearbook exhibits both examples of discrimination and acceptance of African-American students within its pages.

The Colonial Echo. Williamsburg: College of William and Mary, 1968-1970.

The Colonial Echo is the student-produced yearbook published yearly at the College of William and Mary. The yearbook shows examples of the end of *in loco parentis* as well as efforts by the student body to accommodate African-American students.

Dean, Arthur. Interview by Author. Harrisonburg, Virginia. March 26, 2013.

Dean describes his work as Assistant to the President of Diversity. He claims that James Madison University has been dedicated to diversity programs, but that many white and black students still see social events as belonging to one group or the other.

The Flat Hat. Williamsburg: College of William and Mary, 1968.

The Flat Hat is William and Mary's student-run newspaper in which editorials and articles can be found examining desegregation at the college. Examples of discrimination are called into the open and produced for student access.

Hall, William. Interview by Author. Harrisonburg, Virginia. April 18, 2013.

Hall describes his experiences as Vice President of Student Affairs. He describes his efforts to support and aid the Black Student Alliance and other minority groups on campus; however, he claims that it was largely inequality in academics, not socially, that angered African-Americans on campus. He also claims that while Dr. Carrier was instrumental in desegregation, he often tried to avoid publicity when it came to demonstrations of African-American students.

James Madison University Affirmative Action Plan. SC AF90-0501. Special Collections. Carrier Library. James Madison University: Harrisonburg, VA, 1978.

James Madison University's second Affirmative Action plan which dealt with diversifying the student body. The plan implies that Virginia higher education has not done a sufficient job with desegregation, and that black graduates are still receiving the majority of their degrees from historically black institutions.

Johnson, Guy B. "Progress in the Desegregation of Higher Education," *Journal of Educational Sociology* 32, no. 6 (February 1959): 254-259.

Johnson, a sociology professor at the University of North Carolina, believed that desegregation in the South is an example of peaceful and rapid change in the social structure. He shows that desegregation by 1959 has already hit much of the south's public institutions. While he does allow that the Deep South still struggles with desegregation he credits the border and middle states.

Johnson, Guy B. "Racial Integration in Public Higher Education in the South." *The Journal of Negro Education* 23, no. 3 (1954): 317-329.

Johnson describes the major barriers to black enrollment at historically white institutions and ways in which they could and are being mended. He also emphasizes that little violence has actually occurred over desegregation, unlike what many feared. He believes that efforts to desegregate are going along at a reasonable pace, and that popular opinion is keeping ideas, like the segregation of living and eating quarters, from coming to fruition.

Johnson, Guy B. "Racial Integration in Southern Higher Education." *Social Forces* 34, no. 4 (May 1956): 309-312.

By this time, Johnson has lost some of his optimism over the continued progress of desegregation. He emphasizes parental fear over social mingling and the mixing of races. Despite the fact that racial mingling is not allowed, other aspects of desegregation have continued without a hitch.

Johnson, Sheary Darcus. Interview by Author. Harrisonburg, Virginia. October 4, 2013.

Johnson talks about her own experiences as an undergraduate and graduate student at Madison College. She was the first African-American student to graduate from Madison, and she claims that Madison shaped her into the person she is today. She does acknowledge, however, that as a day student she might not have faced some of the issues other African-Americans were presented with.

King, Martin Luther, Jr. "Letter From Birmingham Jail." African Studies Center-University of Pennsylvania. http://www.africa.upenn.edu/Articles_Gen/Letter_Birmingham.html (accessed January 25, 2013).

King's letter chastises the white moderates and black radicals of the civil rights movement, arguing that the movement is peaceful and working towards a greater good. The movement is protesting unjust laws, within the law, and it is being hurt by the violence of black radicals and the silence of white moderates.

"Little Comment on Opinion Here." *Daily News Record* (May 18, 1954): 1, 3.

This article found in Harrisonburg, Virginia's daily newspaper provides the city's view on *Brown v. Board*. They are not concerned with the decision, because it will take a long time to put into practice, and there are not enough African-Americans in the area to pose a threat.

Madison College Affirmative Action Plan. SC AF90-0501. Special Collections. Carrier Library. James Madison University: Harrisonburg, VA, 1973.

James Madison University's first Affirmative Action plan calls mainly for equal employment opportunities. It presents the idea of population parity; however, that meant Madison College only had to maintain a 2 percent African-American staff. Additionally, the plan says Madison will give "every good faith effort" to the endeavor, implying that they might not be truly doing so.

Picott, J. Rupert. "Desegregation of Higher Education in Virginia." *The Journal of Negro Education* 27, no. 3 (1958): 324-331.

Picott emphasizes the effort of Virginia teachers to desegregate schools starting in 1937, long before *Brown v. Board*. He goes on to illustrate the schools currently open to African-American attendance, and believes that it is higher education that has truly furthered desegregation although it was not mandated in *Brown v. Board*.

Picott, J. Rupert. "Desegregation of Public Education in Virginia—One Year Afterward." *The Journal of Negro Education* 24, no. 3 (1955): 361-370.

Picott claims that compliance with *Brown v. Board* has not occurred within Virginia. Picott credits historically black institutions with their acceptance of several white students, but believes not much has been done at historically white institutions. He sees Virginia as stuck in a wait and see attitude where nothing is getting done.

Picott, J. Rupert. "The Status of Educational Desegregation in Virginia." *The Journal of Negro Education* 25, no. 3 (1956): 345-351.

Picott believes that Virginia, by employing massive resistance, has reached backwards into a dying era. He criticizes their efforts to close public schools, emphasizing that black students are hung out to dry while whites are educated in private institutions. He also shows that many teachers are against the closing of schools.

Rainey, Jay. Interview by Jeremy Turner. Blacksburg, Virginia. January 30, 1998.

Rainey discusses the liberalizing student body at Madison College thanks to the admission of men as full time students. He discusses the end of *in loco parentis*, and the student protests for increased social rights, including a demonstration for racial equality.

Reformulation of the Plan for Equal Opportunity. SC AF90-0501. Special Collections. Carrier Library. James Madison University: Harrisonburg, VA, 1978.

This plan shows Madison's compliance with *University of California v. Bakke* by showing that Virginia schools felt quotas were detrimental to the learning experience.

Smith, Steve. Interview by Author. Harrisonburg, Virginia. April 4, 2013.

Smith discusses his experiences as a white student at Madison College in the early 1970s. He lived with a black student, Purcell Conway. He also worked in the Office of Admissions along with Daphyne Thomas, and he believes that his experiences with Conway aided him in his recruitment of minority students.

Thomas, Daphyne. Class Lecture. Harrisonburg, Virginia. February 11, 2013.

Thomas talks about her experiences as a student at Virginia Tech and her efforts to recruit African-Americans to James Madison University.

Thomas, Daphyne. Interview by Author. Harrisonburg, Virginia. March 22, 2013.

Thomas describes her experiences as a minority recruiter in the Office of Admissions during the late 1970s. She credits Dr. Carrier with actively recruiting black students and providing them with outlets to help them adjust. On the other hand, she claims that Harrisonburg itself was hostile towards African-Americans moving to the city and attending the school.

Wells-Barnett, Ida B. *A Red Record*. 1895. Reprint, London: The Echo Library, 2005.

Wells-Barnet credits the fear of racial mixing on white man's reluctance to allow white women near black men. She claims that their fear causes them to see what they want and believe what they want with little regard to how white women are actually treated by black men.

Williamson, J.S., II. "Fashion Comes to Madison." *Daily News Record* (April 29, 1970): 6.

This editorial from Harrisonburg's daily newspaper shows how conservative the city was compared to the liberal college campus. When student protests came to Madison, those in the city felt that a ridiculous fad was consuming their community.

Secondary Sources

Anderson, Karen. *Little Rock: Race and Resistance at Central High School*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010.

Anderson provides an account of the Blossom Plan and the attempted desegregation of Central High School in Little Rock, AK in 1957. The desegregation of Central High School was one of the earliest attempts to comply with *Brown v. Board*. Anderson believes that the people of Little Rock were successfully able to plant doubt in the minds of the people over the legitimacy of the federal ruling.

B., G. W. "Bakke v. the University of California." *Change* 9, no. 10 (October 1977): 18, 20-21.

The author claims that the court case has drawn attention to the roles institutions of higher education play in righting past wrongs regarding race; however, the case might inhibit rather the help right those wrongs. Still, the author believes African-Americans should be glad that the case is calling attention to their cause.

Brooks, Roy L. *Integration or Separation?: A Strategy for Racial Equality*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1996.

Brooks concludes that many African-American students see higher education similarly to their experiences in primary and secondary education. They are faced with racial hostility, low enrollments, and high attrition rates, and they are constantly plagued by low self-esteem. Very few African-American students are encouraged to continue on at a historically white institution.

Brown, M. Christopher II. "Collegiate Desegregation as Progenitor and Progeny of *Brown v. Board of Education*: The Forgotten Role of Postsecondary Litigation, 1908-1990." *The Journal of Negro Education* 73, no. 3 (2004): 341-349.

Brown believes that higher education both led to *Brown v. Board* and was educated by the case as well. While some schools began desegregating prior to the decision, they did so largely because historically black colleges did not offer certain programs. It proved that separate but equal was impossible; however, higher education is still having trouble desegregating today.

Brown, M. Christopher II. "Collegiate Desegregation and the Public Black College: A New Policy Mandate." *The Journal of Higher Education* 72, no. 1 (Jan-Feb 2001): 46-62.

Brown discusses the efforts to desegregate higher education as futile. Opposing Picott, he claims that *Brown v. Board* made no requirements for higher education to desegregate, and that mandate did not reach higher education until the Civil Rights Act. He sees this as detrimental to African-American higher education, which leads to colleges and universities that are still largely representative of one race today.

Dingledine, Raymond C., Jr. *Madison College: The First Fifty Years, 1908-1958*. Roanoke, VA: The Stone Printing and Manufacturing Co., 1959.

Dingledine describes the first fifty years of Madison College, including the roles of the presidents, the changing student body, and the growth of the campus.

Fisher, Todd. "Integration: The African-American Experience in Harrisonburg, Virginia." Honors thesis, James Madison University, 1997.

Fisher conducts several oral histories of African-Americans living in Harrisonburg, Virginia, and their experiences with integration. Fisher looks at African-Americans who have lived in Harrisonburg their entire lives and those who have recently migrated to the area and concludes that white Harrisonburg natives were much more accommodating to African-Americans who had lived in the city their entire lives.

Hall, Kermit L. and James W. Ely, Eds. *The Oxford Guide to United States Supreme Court Decisions*, 2nd ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 2009.

This reference text provides an explanation of all the major Supreme Court decisions. The editors attempt to provide both the backing behind the Supreme Court's decisions as well as the public sentiments involved. The editors also provide the reader with an understanding of the flaws and strengths behind the rulings.

Hansen, Susan D. "The Racial History of the U.S. Military Academies." *The Journal of Blacks in Higher Education* 26 (1999-2000): 111-116.

Hansen describes the racial desegregation present in the armed forces until Truman issued his executive order in 1948. Hansen describes the military as the most thoroughly integrated institution in the United States and describes what the nation's military institutes are doing to follow that legacy.

Hasday, Judy L. *The Civil Rights Act of 1964: An End to Racial Segregation*. New York: Chelsea House Publishers, 2007.

Hasday describes the process of full school integration starting with *Brown v. Board* all the way through *University of California v. Bakke*. She argues that it is the Civil Rights Act of 1964 that truly gets the ball rolling on integration, but that there will still be tensions between white and black people even today involving school integration.

"In Memoriam: Guy B. Johnson, 1901-1991." *Social Forces* 70, no. 1 (September 1991): 18.

This memoriam provides a brief account of Johnson's life, his work, and his support of racial equality in education.

Jaschik, Scott. "Measures of Segregation." *Inside Higher Ed*.
<http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2013/01/04/data-presented-economics-meeting-show-extent-desegregation-higher-education> (Accessed October 7, 2013).

Jaschik illustrates how desegregation today has reached a point of stagnation. He claims that the only way to break out of this rut is to drop all conscious efforts to enroll racial quotas. If schools drop affirmative action quotas, Jaschik believes that a redistribution of race will occur, jumpstarting another bout of desegregation.

Jeffries, John C., Jr. "Bakke Revisited." *The Supreme Court Review* (2003): 1-25.

Jeffries claims that Powell saved Affirmative Action in the 1978 decision. While the decision banned quotas, Powell still allowed universities to consider race and diversity in regards to admissions, allowing the increased acceptance of those who might not have been given the same opportunities as the more affluent.

Jones, Faustine C. "Ironies of School Desegregation." *The Journal of Negro Education* 47, no. 1 (1978): 2-27.

Jones attempts to illustrate the ineffectiveness of *Brown v. Board* by showing how its implementation did little to lead to desegregation. It is not until the Civil Rights Act is passed in 1964, twelve years later, that any true desegregation comes about. Jones believes that it is only

the threat of cutting of federal money that truly instigates a step towards desegregation and eventually full integration.

Jones, Nancy Bondurant. *Rooted on Blue Stone Hill: A History of James Madison University*. Santa Fe: The Community Foundation of Harrisonburg and Rockingham County and the Center for American Places, 2004.

Jones gives an overall account of the history of James Madison University from its founding in 1908 through the presidency of Dr. Ronald Carrier. She provides accounts of many of the major traditions associated with James Madison University as well as accounts of construction and faculty changes. The book is simply an overview and contains little analysis about the goings on at James Madison University.

Lassiter, Matthew D. and Andrew B. Lewis, Ed. *The Moderates' Dilemma: Massive Resistance to School Desegregation in Virginia*. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1998.

Lassiter and Andrews discuss the reactions to *Brown v. Board* in Virginia. They discuss the Southern Manifesto and Virginia's push for Massive Resistance. Their interpretation of Virginia's actions is rather understanding, as they emphasize that resistance in Virginia was largely peaceful within the courtrooms rather than violence. They also heavily emphasize the faltering economy as the main reason for Massive Resistance's failure in Virginia.

Leidholdt, Alexander. *Standing Before the Shouting Mob: Lenoir Chambers and Virginia's Massive Resistance to Public-School Integration*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1997.

Leidholdt looks at Lenoir Chambers, who in the 1960s was editor of the Virginia-Pilot in Norfolk, Virginia. His publications supported school desegregation in Virginia. Chambers was heavily influenced by his liberal professors at the University of North Carolina and challenged the school closings in Warren County, Charlottesville, and Norfolk. The piece focuses on the devastation of the school closings as well as the opposition presented by Chambers' papers, teachers, and women. Leidholdt presents public opinion as the main downfall of Massive Resistance.

Nehls, Christopher C. "Flag-Waving Wahoos: Confederate Symbols at the University of Virginia, 1941-51." *The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* 110, no. 4 (2002): 461-488.

Nehls analyzes the use of Confederate symbols at southern institutions during the second world war. He believes that the symbols were largely a means of reestablishing southern power and

pride after the Civil War in a way which encouraged the soldiers fighting in WWII. Still, he allows that Confederate symbols held some racism no matter how they were consciously used.

Parker, Priya N. "Gregory H. Swanson: First African American to be Admitted to U. Va. (1950)." *Storming the Gates of Knowledge: A Documentary History of Desegregation and Coeducation in Jefferson's Academical Village*, Special Collections, UVA.
<http://www.virginia.edu/woodson/projects/kenan/swanson/swanson.html> (accessed January 25, 2013).

This short article provides information on how Gregory Swanson became the first African American to be admitted to the University of Virginia's medical school. The article implies that student acceptance of Swanson was widespread and, originally, his application was turned down solely by the Board of Visitors, while the rest of the campus protested.

Pratt, Robert A. "A Promise Unfulfilled: Desegregation in Richmond, Virginia, 1956-1986." *The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* 99, no. 4 (October 1991): 415-448.

Pratt describes the reluctance to busing in Richmond, Virginia. Massive resistance stalled desegregation at great length. Pratt claims that the schools are still not fully integrated, and that black students have now been joined by poor white students in schools with fewer resources and fewer opportunities.

Rosenthal, Steven J. "Symbolic Racism and Desegregation: Divergent Attitudes and Perceptions of Black and White University Students," *Phylon* 41, no. 3 (1980): 257-266.

Rosenthal believes that symbolic racism can reveal more about the public's policy towards racial desegregation than any sort of poll. People might not necessarily be in favor of legal segregation, but that does not mean that racism has disappeared. Blacks still feel overwhelmingly discriminated against, and more desegregation is still needed.

Schulman, Bruce J. *The Seventies: The Great Shift in American Culture, Society, and Politics*. Cambridge: Da Capo Press, 2002.

Schulman provides a survey of the changes occurring in the United States in the 1970s. He believes that the 70s are a time when many people become disillusioned with their government and the social order. People no longer live in an idealistic world, but in a realistic one, and they are no longer willing to keep silent on the subject.

Smith, Douglas. “‘When Reason Collides with Prejudice:’ Armistead Lloyd Boothe and the Politics of Desegregation in Virginia, 1948-1963.” *The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* 102, no. 1 (January 1994): 5-46.

Smith describes the origins of the Byrd Organization and its efforts to prevent desegregation in Virginia. Smith credits Armistead Boothe with opposing the Byrd Organization when necessary, although he allows that Boothe was a politician at heart and did what was politically beneficial to himself, perhaps not aiding desegregation in the ways that it deserved.

Tribe, Laurence H. “Perspectives on Bakke: Equal Protection, Procedural Fairness, or Structural Injustice?” *Harvard Law Review* 92, no. 4 (February 1979): 864-877.

Tribe believes that the *University of California v. Bakke* did little to actually change policy. Instead the case just affirmed what was already occurring on most college campuses. The court’s decision was largely political, attempting to avoid criticism about both quotas and constitutionality. Quotas would have been criticized by the public and forbidding any sort of consideration of race would have been found unconstitutional by Congress.

Turner, Jeremy. “Madison College Student Protest, April 1970: Background Paper to Oral History Interviews.” Honors thesis, James Madison University, 1998.

Turner provides a historical overview of the April 1970 Protests held by Madison College students on behalf of the free speech movement.

“Virginia Tech Struggles with Racial Diversity.” *The Journal of Blacks in Higher Education* no. 26 (1999-2000): 65.

This short article describes Virginia Tech’s Confederate heritage and its inability to end discrimination even today. The school may have begun desegregation before *Brown v. Board*, but remnants of KKK and Confederate relics still hang around.

Wallenstein, Peter. “Desegregation of Higher Education in Virginia.” *Encyclopedia of Virginia*. http://www.encyclopediavirginia.org/Desegregation_in_Higher_Education#start_entry (accessed August 22, 2013).

Wallenstein provides a brief overview of the desegregation of higher education in Virginia, including VMI and VT.

Walters, Ronald and Robert Smith. “The Black Education Strategy in the 1970s.” *The Journal of Negro Education* 48, no. 2 (1979): 156-170.

Walters and Smith believe that black students have been the primary movers in the civil rights movement, and that it is their success that the movement hinges upon. Walters and Smith imply that higher education should make every effort to accommodate black students, because they will foster hope. If they do not, they will bring only alienation which will hinder social advancement.