11-18-1963

Integration at the University of Mississippi

Russell H. Barrett

INTEGRATION AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MISSISSIPPI

by Russell H. Barrett

By Russell H. Barrett, Professor of Political Science, University of Mississippi. Delivered at the University of Illinois, Navy Pier, Chicago.

For Release at 1:00 p.m., November 18, 1963

Whatever else might be said about the University of Mississippi, it is true that the University was integrated last year. Subject to the qualification that no more disastrous beginning could have been planned or carried through, there were some elements of victory during that year of both physical and educational combat. Mr. James H. Meredith accurately described the situation as a battle in which neither the rules nor the weapons were agreed upon. It is inevitable that such a battle would produce damage and casualties, and the University will take some time to recover from them. There were some individuals in Mississippi and elsewhere who expected the struggle to be easier than it was, and everyone who believes in education wishes that it could be easier; but it is nonetheless essential. There must be those who will stay in the state and others who will come in spite of the difficulties if the path cleared by James Meredith is to remain open.

Most people in and out of Mississippi do not appreciate the really substantial accomplishments of Meredith's attendance at "Ole Miss." Here was a Negro who was said to be both mentally and psychologically unqualified to attend the University. After an eighteen-month court fight for admission he began classes more than a week after other students. His "student orientation" began with a riot and continued during weeks of abusive harassment. His replies to this harassment consisted of a smile and an occasional statement to the press, usually carefully worded, and many forget that he made no press statements prior to the riot and abuse. With these and other difficulties to contend with, he passed all courses but one during his abbreviated first semester and made good grades during the second semester and summer session. Faced with a demanding set of requirements in fields which included mathematics, natural science, and foreign language, he completed the requirements for graduation in the shortest time possible. James Meredith was in many ways an ideal type for our first Negro student, and I doubt whether anyone without his rather unique combination of features would have lasted until graduation or even through the first semester.

We had this different type of Negro in Mr. Cleve McDowell, who was rather inaccurately pictured as the stereotyped Mississippi "nigra." He was certainly different in some ways, having been welcomed by no riot or gubernatorial stand at the gates, having made no statements, and having emphasized in many ways that he just wanted to be a student. But his exemplary pattern of behavior produced the illusion that a Negro could attend the University without any type of guarding, and this was his undoing. McDowell actually had some student friends within the halls of the School of Law, although that friendship changed to congenial inattention once he went outside of the building. But some of the drivers on the highway between his home and the University certainly were not friendly, and neither were the off-campus law enforcement officers. His departure from the University resulted from a monumental piece of bad luck and personal indiscretion, plus an unconscious conspiracy among the Citizens Council, the NAACP,

the Department of Justice, the University, and law enforcement officers. The difference between James Meredith and Cleve McDowell is that the former would have seen to it that U. S. marshals were present before he returned to the University, probably by issuing a statement to the press. This development demonstrated that Negro students at Ole Miss need to be interested in more than "just getting an education." There are too many other people who are prepared to prevent the realization of this simple ambition.

One of the most regrettable aspects of last year's developments was that the University of Mississippi, as a single educational institution, received more than it deserved of both blame and penalties for the rioting and other forms of resistance against integration. There is no doubt that the University made mistakes, but with a state atmosphere even as favorable as that in Alabama the University would have followed a standard of conduct similar to that in other universities of the deep South. Reasonable standards of fairness should demand that the University be judged on its performance in areas over which it had control.

On the positive side there was fair treatment of Meredith by his professors, although there were suggestions from Mississippians, New Yorkers, and Californians that he should be flunked out without reference to his performance. There was active and substantial support from faculty members of his right to be treated as a human being as well as a student, and there was a smaller proportion of students who took a similar stand. This kind of support was not without cost to these faculty members and students in the form of harassment through various methods by people from Mississippi and from many other states. The treatment varied with the moral depravity of the abuser, and it included telephone calls, letters, property damage, anonymous publication of libellous material, and even some annoying of children. Those who supported Meredith were appointed as "honorary niggers" by the White Citizens Council, and the appointees considered it to be an honor. Another plus factor is that Meredith did attend public concerts and lectures, and on some occasions those who sat next to him were not U. S. marshals but were friends. He played golf as a member of the University Golf Club and frequently outplayed his white competitors, who again paid penalties not usually associated with golf. There was heavy pressure to get rid of one minister, but to the credit of an impressive group of courageous church members it did not succeed. Of course Meredith ate regularly in the cafeteria, frequently with faculty members and others joining him, sometimes in excessive numbers. After the first six weeks he was able to study in the library with no difficulty, often almost completely alone, since there were numerous white students who were not interested only in getting an education. Finally, there were administrative officials who were sincerely interested in treating Meredith the same as other students, even though their conception of equality was not always the best. They also worked in the face of abuses, and they do not deserve the blanket denunciation heaped upon them by those who do not understand the pressures they faced.

The negative factors at the University have received much more publicity than those I have just mentioned, and some of this news was simply not true. Contrary to what was reported in some media, we do have a solid academic program, a large number of good students, and an impressive extracurricular presentation of lectures and concerts, including lecturers such as Margaret Mead, J. K. Galbraith, and Clement Attlee, and artists such as Katherine Cornell, George London, the Goldovsky Opera Theater, the

American Ballet Theater, and several top symphony orchestras. It should not be necessary to even mention these and other common characteristics of American universities, but an amazing amount of bad reporting makes it necessary. We do have academic weaknesses, but the real shortcomings of the University were in other areas. First, there was the fact that the University went along with the fiction that it was not a segregated institution, one result of which was to give academic support to certain aspects of the state attitude which I will mention later. Second, and most important, the University waited too long before it adopted a strict policy on student discipline, even though the justification of this was in part the appeasement of state groups outside the University. Third, it pursued a policy of weakness in protecting the rights of the minority of students who were willing to befriend Meredith, even though those students were harassed so unmercifully by other students that most of them left the University. It added to these mistakes by its mistaken attempt to blame the riot on the marshals. Other factors could be mentioned, but these were the elements of the situation which the University could have controlled more effectively and which permitted much of the revolting behavior to take place. It is perfectly true that stronger policies on these matters would have brought additional political pressure and harassment on University officials, but this should have been considered part of the cost of upholding academic integrity. But even though there were shortcomings, the primary blame for our difficulties does not rest with internal characteristics of the University.

The primary blame for our difficulties lies in the characteristics of the "closed society" so well described by the President of the Southern Historical Association, Professor James W. Silver. The custodians of that society are the present political leadership, the Citizens Council activists, and the dominant newspapers of the state. The Governor called for all means of resistance against federal court decisions and refused to accept responsibility for upholding the law. Citizens Council publications have challenged the importance of accreditation and have suggested the evasion of court decisions by the substitution of private for public schools. They spearheaded a postcard campaign which called for the firing of the Dean of the Law School, the Vic-chancellor, and two professors at the University. The newspapers, with some notable and praiseworthy exceptions, supported the anarchist elements at the University and described as "innocuous" the anonymous "Rebel Underground" which called the Chancellor of the University a dictator and advocated the assassination of the President of the United States. Soon after the riot more than 100 top business leaders issued a statement which criticized "inflammatory statements" in the "irresponsible" state press. Associated with these causes of difficulty is the pattern of legal harassment or what might be termed "selective law enforcement." Cleve McDowell was speedily arrested and convicted on a charge of having a concealed weapon on the University campus, but there were no attempts under state law to convict those white students who violated various laws last year, including those against possession of weapons. The Negro who attempted to enter Mississippi Southern University was sentenced to seven years in the penitentiary for allegedly receiving $30 worth of stolen chicken feed, but it would take a long search to turn up similar convictions of white students. Finally there is the failure of moderates to speak out soon enough and loud enough. This is partly because so many moderates have left the state and partly because of the pressures of the closed society, but the Mississippi moderate is prone to believe that he can best win by being careful and expedient. The fact is that he has accumulated a long

history of losing by following that approach.

Where does all this leave us as part of a University in a state where it is not easy to maintain a university in the full meaning of that term? It leaves us in a weak position, in a position that has been made still weaker by criticism from outside the state which should have been directed at others. It leaves us in the inescapable role of either fighting to regain a position of academic honor or of leaving the University to be defended or ruined by others. Too many faculty members have left who should not have left, and with a few exceptions they deserted their principles. The person who says he is resigning in protest is deluding himself. Most who leave the University do so either because they want better jobs elsewhere or because they no longer feel able or willing to teach under the admittedly difficult circumstances which I have only partially described. For the same reasons there are far more professors in other institutions who would not be willing even to come to the University. In this connection there is a serious misunderstanding which needs correcting. There are those who say there is no academic freedom at the University of Mississippi. The fact is that there is academic freedom which has been better defended by the administration than at some other universities. But the exercise of such freedom is not always easy and it will not make the professor popular with all people. Academic freedom is used in a state atmosphere that does not always welcome its use, and this is no place for the fainthearted. Yet we teach what our field calls for us to teach in the classroom, we have no interference with selection of books at the University, and outside the classroom some exercise an extensive amount of freedom both professionally and as citizens.

We therefore need good faculty members who will not leave. We need good faculty members who will join us, and most of them will find the situation less difficult than they imagine. We need good students from other states, both graduate and undergraduate, partly because they produce a student body with broader and more varied interests and viewpoints. Even with a drop in out-of-state enrollment this year, more than 25 percent of our students come from other states or foreign countries, a total of 1,349. After all of the pluses and minuses are considered, the fact is that education can be and must be carried on at the University of Mississippi. There is certainly no more challenging place for the teacher; and if teachers are unwilling to face challenges, they are in the wrong field.