The purpose of the research presented in this thesis is to analyze the civil rights protest movement in Fayetteville, North Carolina. Protest movements in other cities such as Birmingham, Greensboro and Raleigh helped to inspire the demonstrations in Fayetteville. Nonetheless, the movement in Fayetteville was primarily directed by local leadership, largely from Fayetteville State College students. Whereas small-scale sit-in demonstrations had occurred in 1960, the movement gained sustainable momentum beginning in 1963.

Large-scale demonstrations in Fayetteville began in May 1963. The actions were initiated largely by the actions of a small group of Fayetteville State Teachers College students, a group informally called the “Demonstration Committee.” This group worked to organize students to carry out orderly, peaceful protests. Fayetteville State students were motivated by their education at the college to create a society in which their education would meet opportunity. Likewise, their involvement in the demonstrations formed a crucial part of their education.

Fayetteville State students received support from pastors, barbers, physicians, attorneys, teachers, and other members of the community. Many African Americans were concerned that they would lose their jobs if they became involved in the
demonstrations. Nevertheless, several blacks supported the movement by providing bail money to protestors who had been arrested.

The actions of the protestors created a varied response from city leadership and business owners. The creation of the Mayor’s Bi-Racial Committee on June 19, 1963, represented a step toward integration in the city. Mayor Wilbur Clark and the Fayetteville City Council placed some limited pressure on business owners to desegregate services. Moral encouragement for integration also came from Governor Terry Sanford and, less directly, from President John F. Kennedy. Yet several business owners were reluctant to integrate service unless all of the businesses agreed to do so. Therefore, the protestors continued to stage sit-in demonstrations and marches to place additional pressure on the business owners.

On July 19, 1963, the Mayor’s Bi-Racial Committee reached an agreement with the local branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, which effectively ended the demonstrations. While the agreement did not force business owners to integrate services, the path toward desegregation had gained momentum. By the time of the passage of the Civil Rights Act in 1964, all downtown theaters and hotels in Fayetteville had been integrated, while nearly all of the restaurants and lunch counters had integrated service.

A variety of sources were used in the research for this thesis, including newspaper articles, Fayetteville City Council minutes, scholarly books and articles, censuses, and college catalogs and yearbooks from Fayetteville State [Teachers] College. The author
conducted eighteen interviews from participants, city leaders, and members of the community to supplement printed resources.
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INTRODUCTION

Racial anxieties in the United States reached dangerous proportions in the summer of 1963. As protest movements grew in number throughout the South, so did the reaction to them. These tensions reached a frenzied phase in Fayetteville, North Carolina, on June 14. As The Fayetteville Observer reported, “The night exploded at about 9:30 o’clock [sic] as policemen, faces showing signs of the constant strain, began hurling tear gas canisters and bombs at the feet of the Negroes and whites in front of the Carolina Theatre.”¹ June 14 highlighted the most climactic week of direct action in Fayetteville. Although tragedy was narrowly averted, the evening forced local officials into action. Although the reaction of city leaders was generally tepid, the demonstrations began to reach their desired outcome. Within weeks, several downtown restaurants and businesses began desegregating services.²

The early demonstrations (May and early June) were led almost exclusively by students from Fayetteville State College (Fayetteville State Teachers College until May 1963,³ currently Fayetteville State University). Civil rights events in Greensboro and other cities in North Carolina and the South in general provided inspiration to the demonstrators in Fayetteville. However, the movement was primarily local, with little support coming from leaders or participants in other cities. While the local NAACP supported the demonstrations, the majority of organization came from makeshift
Fayetteville State student groups. The students later received increasing support from local churches, military servicemen, and other members of the community.\(^4\)

Fayetteville State students were encouraged by their education, which inspired them to help create a society in which their education would meet opportunity. Therefore, the demonstrations formed a crucial part of their education, for many the most important. Fayetteville State students and others involved in the movement viewed their experiences in 1963 as a critical moment in their own lives which allowed them to achieve a variety of personal and societal goals during their lifetime.\(^5\)

The moral education that Fayetteville State students received was a primary reason that student leaders cooperated so effectively with church leaders in the community to help organize the protests. Religion played an important part in the demonstrations, from the strict adherence to nonviolent tactics to the singing of religious songs during protest marches. Like the students, local church leaders viewed their involvement as part of a civic duty to their community.\(^6\)

Protestors also received some support from soldiers from Fort Bragg Army and Pope Air Force bases. Some of these soldiers had served in foreign wars to defend democracy and came home only to be denied service at several places of business. The soldiers never formed a highly organized segment of the movement, but were nonetheless important. Their involvement was a symbol of the challenge to some of the contradictions of southern American society in the 1960s.\(^7\)

Fayetteville State students, church leaders, Fort Bragg soldiers, and members of the community directly challenged the racially segregated system in Fayetteville in 1963.
The response by prominent whites was varied. Several city leaders and businessmen were reluctant to make changes. In general, they waited for others to take a leadership role that they could follow to solve the problems in the city. The only prominent white in the community that actively and consistently promoted integration was former City Council member J.W. Pate. The reluctant leadership among powerful whites in the city suggested that official leadership was needed from higher places. This leadership was eventually supplied by President John F. Kennedy, and more directly, by Governor Terry Sanford. Although Sanford did not create legislation to force integration, his rhetoric provided inspiration for local leaders to accept the move toward integration.⁸
CHAPTER 1: HISTORIOGRAPHY AND HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Before analyzing the causes of the protest movement in Fayetteville and its consequences, it is useful to consider related historiography. No major works have been completed on the Fayetteville movement yet several historical and sociological studies are pertinent.

During the 1960s and 1970s, scholarly work on the civil rights movement focused on efforts aimed at securing federal legislation that would improve conditions for African Americans. Therefore, scholarship concentrated on prominent national leaders such as Martin Luther King, Jr., W.E.B. DuBois and A. Philip Randolph and the actions of key political figures such as Robert and John F. Kennedy. Research from the 1970s and 1980s emphasized the role of major organizations. August Meier and Elliot Rudwick produced the first major analysis of an organization in *CORE: A Study in the Civil Rights Movement, 1942-1968*. In 1981, Clayborne Carson’s *In Struggle: SNCC and the Black Awakening of the 1960s* exposed the rapid rise and fall of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee. Although extensive work had been completed on King, the first major work on the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC) did not come until 1987 with Adam Fairclough’s *To Redeem the Soul of America: The Southern Christian Leadership Conference and Martin Luther King, Jr.* Yet an analysis of the Fayetteville protest movement cannot focus on national implications. Established civil
rights organizations did not play primary roles in the downtown demonstrations in Fayetteville, aside from the local NAACP, which assisted the Fayetteville State-led movement.  

Barbara Ransby’s work on Ella Baker is helpful in gaining a wider perspective on the Fayetteville protest movement. Ella Baker and the Black Freedom Movement: A Radical Democratic Vision (2003) portrayed Baker as representing the ideology of many lesser-known civil rights leaders who believed local leadership was more important than national leaders. This focus has been gaining increasing attention in Civil Rights scholarship, especially since the late 1980s. Baker resented the philosophy of Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., who stated that “Leadership never ascends from the pew to the pulpit, but . . . descends from the pulpit to the pew.” This could not have been further from the way in which Baker perceived the movement. Ransby argued that Baker felt that blacks had viewed the solutions to their problems as something external. That is why many blacks looked to enlightened politicians or highly educated lawyers to solve racial problems. Baker abhorred this sort of dependency, claiming that “strong people don’t need strong leaders.” This quote not only represents Baker’s fundamental philosophy but also the orientation of several modern Civil Rights historians. It also sheds light on the way in which the Fayetteville protest movement was organized.

Baker emphasized group-centered leadership. This was a central focus of SNCC. However, group-centered leadership did not necessarily entail leadership from a particular organization. This is one of the central themes in recent Civil Rights historiography. Vincent Harding’s “Community as a Liberating Theme in Civil Rights
History” (1991) focused on the role of individual communities of activists. Harding contended that members of SNCC and other organizations “pretended that they were making decisions, but many times they were really just being together.”13 Organizations may have brought people together, but the people involved were not working primarily for the organization, but for their own sense of self and of community. In such a community, activists had to build relationships and trust, something that would influence their lives regardless of whether their actions produced measurable results in the form of legislation or improved economic opportunities. This was especially true in the case of Fayetteville State students, who were part of a rather isolated college community.14

Consideration should be given to what constitutes a community. The “community” to which Harding referred contained a loose federation of activists sympathetic to a certain cause. This internal “community” was part of a larger community such as the town or city in which organization occurred. William Chafe demonstrated the importance of that internal community in his 1981 Civilities and Civil Rights: Greensboro, North Carolina and the Black Struggle for Freedom. Chafe unveiled an indigenous leadership in Greensboro that emerged from local organization but not necessarily structured organizations.15 While Chafe did not make this argument explicit, it is important to note that the sit-in demonstrations initiated by Ezell Blair, Jr., Joseph McNeill, David Richmond and Franklin McCain in Greensboro on February 1, 1960 provided inspiration for the creation of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee in October of that year, not vice versa.16 Hence, the local action by four
college students acting independently heightened the direct action movement inside and outside of Greensboro, not the action of any organization.

_Civilities and Civil Rights_ unveiled the importance of inspirational characters that may not initially be considered critical members of the movement. Chafe’s focus on the relatively unknown figures in the movement represented a significant shift in the historiography of the movement, which reflected the general trend in the profession that focused on social history. He emphasized the importance of people such as Nell Coley, a teacher at Dudley High School, who had a profound impact on many demonstrators. It appears as though people like Coley had as much of an impact on some members of the movement in Greensboro as figures such as Martin Luther King, as King and other national leaders were not part of the community of activists in Greensboro. Franklin McCain, one of the “Greensboro Four,” asserted that what precipitated the sit-ins was “that little bit of incentive and that little bit of courage that each of us instilled within each other.”

These themes can be applied to the protest movement in Fayetteville as well. In fact, the events of the summer of 1963 in Fayetteville are something of a biography of several lesser-known characters that helped change their community. Their absence from any major work on the civil rights movement is a testament to the need for the research presented in this thesis.

Another aspect of the civil rights movement that had been largely overlooked until recently was the role that women played. Increased scholarly attention has been given to women since the 1990s, and has further increased in the new millennium. The 1998 _A Circle of Trust: Remembering SNCC_, edited by Cheryl Lynn Greenberg, offered
the perspectives of several women who had been involved in the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee. The role of women in SNCC has become a heavily debated topic in Civil Rights scholarship. Mary King presented a paper to fellow members at a SNCC staff meeting in Waveland, Mississippi in 1964 which called attention to the minimal status of women in the organization. King claimed that she was merely attempting to broaden the debate in favor of a more decentralized and democratic SNCC. King also discussed the heavily cited and seemingly chauvinistic comment made by Stokely Carmichael in 1964: “What is the position of women in SNCC? The position of women in SNCC is prone!” King defended Carmichael, stating that he was merely joking in the manner that he did so often.

Former SNCC member Jean Wheeler Smith recalled that “I was not oppressed in SNCC. I did anything I was big enough to do and I got help from everybody around me for any project that I wanted to pursue.” While some women that participated in SNCC in the 1960s claimed that women did not enjoy the same opportunities as men, most insist that SNCC was more progressive than the rest of society on the question of gender roles. This generally equal treatment of women was due to SNCC’s progressive nature. It was also because the organization was generally more egalitarian than other civil rights organizations, as evidenced in their emphasis on community based initiatives.

Steven F. Lawson’s book Civil Rights Crossroads: Nation, Community, and the Black Freedom Struggle also addressed the contributions of women in the civil rights movement. Lawson claimed that women formed the “backbone” of community life that was so critical to the movement. In addition to playing active roles in direct civil rights
work, they also played a crucial role in influencing their children to become involved.\textsuperscript{22} Lawson maintained that very few women in the civil rights movement in the early 1960s considered themselves feminists, as their concern was with race, not gender, issues. Nonetheless, women working for civil rights goals were also attempting to shatter stereotypical conceptions of black women as “promiscuous Jezebels.”\textsuperscript{23} Women involved in the protest movement in Fayetteville in 1963 reflected many of the themes presented by Lawson, Greenberg, and the former members of SNCC. While women did not take some of the highest levels of leadership in the protest movement in Fayetteville, their involvement was critical in organizing the mass demonstrations.\textsuperscript{24}

Analysis of the protest movement can not merely focus on the participants and those who inspired them. Some Civil Rights scholarship contains a lack of critical analysis of white reaction to demonstrations. This is not the case with \textit{Civilities and Civil Rights}. Chafe’s central argument is that Greensboro’s white civic and business elite believed that racial conflict was bad, and needed to be avoided whenever possible. The city prided itself on being progressive in regards to race relations. Therefore, city officials and most residents attempted to avoid major conflicts such as those that arose in Montgomery and Birmingham, in which national attention focused on the reactionary opposition to the struggle for black rights. Activists therefore needed to focus on direct action tactics to shatter Greensboro’s “progressive mystique.”\textsuperscript{25}

Elizabeth Jacoway’s “Civil Rights and the Changing South” (1982) revealed some of the themes that can be applied to the integration movement in Fayetteville and the white reaction. In general, Southern white business owners were not advocates of
meaningful desegregation. Yet the civil rights demonstrations made them realize that they had to choose between traditional race relations or progress, including their own economic progress. As several Southern business owners relented under the pressure of the demonstrations, it became clear that their priorities had changed; they began to place economic concerns above racial concerns. According to Jacoway, this was considered very “unsouthern.”26 However, some businessmen in Fayetteville used economic justifications to defend their decisions to not integrate services initially, as will be demonstrated later.

In “Toward New Histories of the Civil Rights Era” (2000), Charles Eagles argued that several histories of the Civil Rights era have emphasized the movement side of the story, while not attempting to fully understand the segregationist opposition. He claimed that too many historians have been fearful of being termed racist if they present a balanced account of the segregationist side of the story. This lack of scholarly detachment comes from the fact that many of the scholars of the Civil Rights era were participants or at least knew contemporaries that were involved. In addition, the inherent morality of the topic has made for many unbalanced accounts.27 Therefore, when analyzing the community reaction to the protest movement in Fayetteville, one must be careful not to enter with any preconceived notions or make judgments about business owners, city council members, the mayor, judges, newspaper writers or other members of the community without evidence.
In some regards, Fayetteville was ahead of many cities in North Carolina by the 1960s in terms of race relations. The city had attempted to limit the public influence of the Ku Klux Klan. In 1950, when the Klan inquired about having a parade in downtown Fayetteville, the city quickly passed an “anti-mask” ordinance, obviously directed at the Klan. Public KKK activity was only minimal in Fayetteville by the time that the sit-in demonstrations began in 1960.28

Fayetteville is a unique city in eastern North Carolina for three major reasons. The most important reason is the proximity of a major military base. Fort Bragg and Pope Air Force Base have had a tremendous influence on Fayetteville’s people. The base has made for a relatively transient population. In addition, the desegregation of the military which began in 1948 created a contradiction.29 African Americans could enter eating places and clubs on base, but not in downtown Fayetteville, less than ten miles away. Fayetteville was a different world than the integrated Ft. Bragg U.S. Army base.30

Military practices were not completely desegregated by Harry S Truman’s Executive Order 9981 on July 26, 1948, but the order did pave the way for increased integration in the military. In 1949, 2,645 blacks were assigned to previously all-white units; by 1950 that number jumped to 15,105.31 In the early 1960s, the Defense Department began to more actively promote integration in social activities on military installations. On April 28, 1961, Defense Secretary Robert McNamara issued a memorandum that stated that any recreational organizations or facilities on military property practicing segregation would not be funded by the Department of Defense.32 In June of 1961, the Defense Department stated that facilities (athletic, entertainment, etc.)
should be provided on base where no such facilities were available on a non-segregated basis in the surrounding communities. In addition, commanders were encouraged to make efforts to obtain such facilities in the community through command-community relations committees. Evidence revealing any command-community relationship aimed at securing integration in Fayetteville has proven nonexistent or at least elusive. The leadership shown by the Department of Defense in effecting integration on military installations did not have a direct impact on segregated practices in the city of Fayetteville. However, it was likely a large part of the reason that many soldiers from Fort Bragg joined the protests in the summer of 1963.

The United States Supreme Court 1954 decision *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas* was a watershed moment in the black struggle for equal rights in the United States. However, Fort Bragg schools had already become the first integrated public school system in the South under the leadership of elementary principal Mildred B. Poole in 1951. Poole believed that decision ultimately led to her losing her job in 1956. Poole had obtained approval from the fort school board and the installation commander, but not from the Pentagon’s Office of Education. By comparison, military schools in Goldsboro were not integrated until 1962, while military schools in Jacksonville, North Carolina did not desegregate until 1964. The progressive approach of the Fort Bragg schools was not mimicked by the Fayetteville city schools, which did not begin integrating until over a decade after those of the local military base. It is accurate to assert that Fort Bragg provided a model for potential school integration in the city of Fayetteville and surrounding towns. However, it is an exaggeration to contend that Fort
Bragg commanders put any real pressure on city leaders in Fayetteville to enact changes in segregated practices in the schools. The integration of schools on Fort Bragg did not apply to high school students. The Department of Defense generally did not provide high schools on military installations. Black children of military personnel stationed at Fort Bragg attended E.E. Smith High School on Seabrook Road, near the campus of Fayetteville State (Teachers) College. Although several military families argued for military high schools to no avail, the presence of military dependents at E.E. Smith contributed to the Fayetteville protest movement, as E.E. Smith students became involved in the summer of 1963.35

Military service is one of the most powerful affirmations of citizenship. Yet black soldiers were denied service at several places of business in Fayetteville and other places in North Carolina even after serving in World War II, the Korean War and other foreign conflicts. Dr. Charles A. Lyons, a Korean War veteran who eventually became the president of Fayetteville State College, recalled the paradox: “I went over to fight for democracy. I came home to enjoy that democracy, and had a rude awakening. I was thrown out of a sandwich shop in my home town of Tarboro while still wearing my uniform.”36 Sippio Burton, who eventually became the president of the Fayetteville branch of the NAACP, encountered a similar experience after serving in World War II. Burton had seen a white friend on a Fayetteville bus, and went to sit with him. Even with his uniform on, Burton was told he could not sit with his white friend. Burton recalled that “we could die in the same foxhole together in Europe, but back in America we couldn’t sit together on the bus.”37
Although the military had been slightly ahead of the rest of American society in terms of integration (especially in the South), it would be erroneous to contend that the military played a leadership role in effecting desegregation in the 1950s. A 1951 Army report concluded that “The evidence supports the belief that a segregated community and an integrated post can exist side by side without special problems.” The “special problems” that this contradiction was causing began to become more apparent in the early 1960s and became the central conflict in Fayetteville in 1963. It was in this year that servicemen from Fort Bragg played an important role in changing segregated practices in Fayetteville.

Another characteristic of Fayetteville is that it has a historically black university. Obviously, Fayetteville State Teachers College was not the only black college in North Carolina in the 1960s. Similar institutions existed in Greensboro (North Carolina Agricultural and Technical) and Raleigh (Shaw University and St. Augustine College). Yet Shaw University, St. Augustine’s College, and North Carolina A&T were just three of several schools in their urban areas; Fayetteville State stood alone as the primary institution of higher learning in the city.

Fayetteville State Teachers College experienced gradual growth during the 1950s. In 1951, 654 students attended the college, while that number grew to 714 in 1959. The number of students attending the institution rapidly expanded during the early 1960s, reaching a total of 1,122 students in 1963. The quickly expanding number of students attending Fayetteville State in the late 1950s and early 1960s mirrored the growing population of Fayetteville. Due to growing numbers of soldiers stationed at Fort Bragg
and the expanding economic opportunities in the city, Fayetteville’s population exploded between 1940 and 1950, expanding from 17,428 people in 1940 to 34,715 in 1950, an increase of 99.2 percent. The 35.2 percent increase from 1950 to 1960 brought the population to 47,106. Many cities in North Carolina had large increases in population, reflecting the state’s trend toward urbanization. However, few cities experienced the drastic increase that occurred in Fayetteville. A comparison of relatively similarly sized cities showed that Asheville’s population expanded only 3.3 percent from 1940 to 1950 and 13.6 percent in the following decade. Wilmington actually experienced a population decrease of 2.3 percent from 1950 to 1960, while Durham’s population elevated only 9.8 percent during those years.\(^4^0\)

A third unique feature in Fayetteville was that the city had a higher percentage of African Americans than North Carolina in general. In 1960, the 1,116,021 blacks made up 24.8 percent of the population of the state. Fayetteville had a population of 47,106, of which 35.9 percent were black. Of the ten largest cities in North Carolina in 1960, only Winston-Salem (37.1 percent), Wilmington (36.4 percent), and Durham (36.3 percent) had a larger percentage of African Americans than Fayetteville.\(^4^1\) Therefore, reaction to segregation in Fayetteville directly influenced a large percentage of the population. Over one-third of the people in Fayetteville were being discriminated against due to their race. By 1960, a small group of Fayetteville State Teachers College Students were ready to take the major risk of attempting to change that situation.
CHAPTER 2: AN EDUCATED DIRECT ACTION MOVEMENT

The Fayetteville direct action movement established its roots in February 1960. On February 10, approximately forty students from Fayetteville State Teachers College entered F.W. Woolworth’s lunch counter on Hay Street in groups of two and three. The students sat at the lunch counter and waited to be served. Service was denied, and Police Chief L.F. Worrell watched them closely. The students repeated the same process at McCrory’s 5&10, also on Hay Street. Henry M. Eldridge, a teacher at Fayetteville State Teachers College, joined in the protests. The events caused Woolworth’s to close their lunch counter at 4:00 P.M. and McCrory’s to close at 5:00 P.M. On February 23, Fayetteville State students renewed their protests, primarily in front of F.W. Woolworth Co. and McCrory’s. However, a protest on February 23 involved only a dozen students. Instead of expanding, the number of protestors was declining.

The protest movement in Fayetteville from 1960 to 1963 failed to maintain a steady momentum that could pressure local businessmen and city officials into action. Protests were sporadic from 1960 to 1963 and did not have a high level of organization. As with many other cities in North Carolina and throughout the South, the initial Fayetteville demonstrations in 1960 had been largely inspired by the actions of the “Greensboro Four” students from North Carolina A&T that had sparked the sit-in movement on February 1, 1960. Therefore, the slow pace of actions in Greensboro and
other cities played a role in the same trend occurring in Fayetteville. One explanation for
the inability to maintain the momentum for the movement that would eventually peak in
1963 was due to what William Chafe referred to as a “pendulum motion.” Chafe argued
that when influential whites offered small concessions, blacks would begin to show a
little more trust in the intentions of whites in regard to race relations. These actions
would lead to a temporary reduction in protest activity. Then when blacks perceived that
that trust was misguided, protest actions would increase.\textsuperscript{45}

An example of city leadership in Fayetteville offering concessions to blacks came
in late 1962. The Fayetteville City Council and Mayor Robert L. Butler approved a
request to give black applicants equal consideration for filling city jobs. However, this
was an act that was difficult to measure, and de facto discrimination continued in city
hiring practices. In addition, the motion did not address a primary concern among blacks,
the issue of discrimination at several lunch counters, restaurants, theaters and hotels in
the city.\textsuperscript{46} That problem would come to the forefront in Fayetteville and several cities in
North Carolina and throughout the South in 1963.

In 1963 the protest movement in Fayetteville gained sustainable momentum.
During the week preceding May 18, students from Fayetteville State Teachers College
met to discuss strategies for conducting downtown protests. Stanley Johnson, Willis
McLeod, Roosevelt J. Davis, Sam Dove, Aaron Plymouth, James Herring, and Elijah
Williams led this “demonstration committee.” Johnson emerged as the primary
spokesperson of the neophyte group. The group had posted signs throughout the campus,
with a seven-day notice, or “countdown to zero” culminating on May 18.\textsuperscript{47} On that first
day of demonstrations, 225 Fayetteville State students picketed in downtown Fayetteville, primarily in front of Sears Roebuck & Co., J.C.Penney Co., The Capitol department store, Fleishman’s Big Store, Belk-Hensdale Co., the Colony Theater, Miracle Theater, and the Broadway Theater. The students sang and chanted from 1 P.M. to 5 P.M., carrying signs with phrases such as “Integration Is Inevitable,” “Hire Us Now,” and “Let’s Crush Segregation.”

A desire to improve conditions for blacks in Fayetteville provided the motivation for the early protests. The inspiration for the demonstrations came largely from hearing about similar events in Birmingham, Greensboro, Raleigh and other national and regional cities. In Birmingham, the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC) began a concerted direct action movement on April 3, 1963, which concentrated on sit-in demonstrations. Reverends Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. and Ralph Abernathy came to the city, and brought with them their ability to draw national attention to a local movement. The local movement had been largely led by the Reverends Fred Shuttlesworth and Abraham Woods, Jr. Unlike the primarily student-led protests in Fayetteville, the early protests in Birmingham originated in the black churches under the leadership of black pastors. Most of the twenty protestors arrested on April 3 were members of the Alabama Christian Movement for Human Rights (ACMHR). The Birmingham sit-in movement, which effectively ended with a negotiated settlement on May 10, provided inspiration to blacks in several other cities. While strategies, organization, and leadership styles varied greatly between Birmingham and Fayetteville, protestors in Fayetteville strictly adhered to King’s nonviolent strategy.
The initiation of major protests in Fayetteville was also largely inspired by events in Raleigh and Greensboro. In Raleigh, black activists were motivated by an event in which the Liberian Ambassador to the United Nations was denied service at the Sir Walter Coffee House and the S&W Cafeteria. By May 10, over one hundred protestors, mostly from Shaw University, had been arrested on trespass charges during desegregation demonstrations. In Greensboro, the direct action movement was gaining momentum in May as well. On May 15, more than two thousand students from Bennett College and North Carolina Agricultural and Technical College protested in downtown Greensboro. In the four days leading up to the beginning of sit-in demonstrations in Fayetteville on May 18, 940 people had been arrested in Greensboro for their involvement in civil rights protests.

Therefore, Fayetteville State students were following the lead established by protestors in other cities. Yet there were several other reasons for why the protest movement developed and prospered in Fayetteville in the spring and summer of 1963. Students regarded the protest movement as both a means of improving conditions for African Americans, but also as a means of justifying the goals they were working for at college. Civil rights demonstrators throughout the South responded to a variety of sociological changes that had occurred during their lifetime. The rising standard of living and increasing numbers of high school- and college-educated blacks demonstrated growth of the black middle class. Therefore, many African Americans desired achievements being denied to them. They viewed the disparity between their goals and
achievements as the product of institutional restrictions, not the result of any personal or intellectual shortcomings.\textsuperscript{55}

There are several reasons why Fayetteville State students led the protest movement in Fayetteville. One reason was that educated blacks understood that because of the 1954 \textit{Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas} decision, segregation could be legitimately challenged. Educated people tend to be more informed and therefore more concerned with public affairs and more protective of civil rights. For Fayetteville State students and those from other educational institutions, education became a "vehicle for democratic values."\textsuperscript{56} Hence, higher education itself produced the type of individual that sought to benefit from racial integration and improved opportunities for African Americans.

An analysis of four of the primary leaders of the early protests in 1963 reveals a dedication to education common among the student demonstrators. Jesse Williams was the treasurer of the junior class when the protests gained momentum in May. He was also president of the student council. At his graduation in 1964, he was one of only four students to graduate with Cum Laude honors. His educational accomplishments also included being honored in \textit{Who’s Who Among Students in American Colleges and Universities} in 1963. This group also included Stanley Johnson, Jack Sharpe, Elsie McDougald, and Marvin Lucas, a sort of “Who’s Who” in the Fayetteville civil rights movement. Williams was also the head of the Epsilon Beta Chapter of Kappa Alpha Psi educational fraternity.\textsuperscript{57}
Another prominent member of the Kappa Alpha Psi leadership was Willis McLeod, who eventually became arguably the most critical figure in the protest movement in Fayetteville. McLeod was a representative for the Mid-Eastern Province at the Grand Chapter meeting of the fraternity in Toledo, Ohio in December 1962. The organizational skills that Williams and especially McLeod learned from their involvement in the fraternity became an asset to the civil rights protest movement in Fayetteville.

In 1963, McLeod was elected as president of the student body at Fayetteville State College. In 1964, he was honored in *Who’s Who Among Students in American Universities and Colleges*. He was also a valuable member of the Fayetteville State football team, another area of leadership which helped him take on a leadership role in the protest movement in Fayetteville. His intelligence and ability to lead in several areas were the primary reasons why he was honored in 1964 with the College Citizenship Award for the Most Outstanding Senior at Fayetteville State.

McLeod became a member of the initial “demonstration committee,” which sparked the protest movement in Fayetteville. Two other members of that committee were James Herring and Stanley Johnson. Herring was Basileus (President) of the Delta Gamma Chapter of Omega Psi Phi fraternity. It is no surprise that Herring placed third in an essay contest held at the college for National Library Week. Stanley Johnson won first place in the contest, which was based on the theme “Reading—The Fifth Freedom—Enjoy It!” Johnson’s April essay seemed to foreshadow his involvement in the demonstrations that he played a crucial role in organizing. His eloquent writing
suggested why he became the primary spokesperson of the protest movement in May. The essay did not make any mention of demonstrations or even of race relations in general. The essay focused on the idea that the four major American freedoms (speech, worship, press, and assembly) can be severely limited when combined with widespread illiteracy. Therefore, Johnson maintained that reading is the channel through which other freedoms are expressed and understood. He further argued that insecurity afflicts the illiterate, causing a dependency on those that are literate.  

Throughout the history of the American South, various white political and economic leaders forced blacks into a system of paternalism. Several powerful whites justified inequality by arguing that blacks needed guidance from whites. In 1957, North Carolina Governor Luther Hodges verified the paternalist sentiment: “If you have it in your heart to be good to people, you will bring them along as fast as they can take it.” Hodges appeared to imply that improved conditions for African Americans would have to be effected by whites. The protest movement in Fayetteville in 1963 demonstrated that blacks needed to demand that changes occur in society. In that regard, Johnson, McLeod, Williams and other Fayetteville State students proved fully capable.

Luther Hodges was not the Governor when the civil rights demonstrations reached their peak in North Carolina in 1963. Yet his racial beliefs were maintained by many citizens of the state. Hodges compared “our Negroes” to the “Laplanders” in Scandinavian countries, stating that “they are not educated and they do not have them in government.” Although Hodges’ statements were somewhat tainted with racism, they contained an element of truth. Blacks were not represented in the government in relation
to their proportion of the population in the South due to years of disfranchisement and fear. Decades and even centuries of segregation and discrimination had created an educational gap between the races. Hence, Stanley Johnson’s essay was implicitly related to the struggle for increased rights for blacks. Although Johnson was referring specifically to reading, his essay spoke more generally to the importance of education in decreasing dependency on others. The fact that he (like Jesse Williams in 1964) was one of only four students to graduate Cum Laude in 1963 was a testament to his educational focus. Intelligence prevailed in the Fayetteville State student protest leadership in 1963.

The direct action movement in Fayetteville was largely inspired by an increasingly educated group of young black men and women who had begun to shed their insecurities and call for changes that would improve their opportunities. This was not a movement of radicals or “outside agitators.” Rather, it was a local movement of students who began to see that higher education was a vehicle for expanding opportunities. In a segregated society, there were limits to those opportunities. Fayetteville State students wanted to shatter those limitations; as college students, they were in the perfect position to do so.

Another reason that Fayetteville State students led the Fayetteville protest movement was related to practical realities. Students did not merely have more youthful exuberance, but most had no jobs to lose and rarely had any real social status to maintain. Perhaps most importantly, the cohesiveness of a college campus provided organizational opportunities. Communicating with fellow students was much simpler than attempting to
mobilize citizens in the larger community. In addition, black men and women in the community feared losing their jobs if they participated in demonstrations. Most Fayetteville State students had to be concerned only with attending classes.

Fayetteville State students adapted the protests around their own educational schedules, which was a testament to the structured nature of the downtown demonstrations and the students’ commitment to education. Hence the largest demonstrations, such as those on May 18, generally occurred on weekends. In many cases in which demonstrations occurred during the week, a particular student might go downtown between classes during the day or after their classes. Yet there were some rare occasions in which students skipped their classes to participate. One such instance occurred on Wednesday, May 22, 1963, in which The Fayetteville Observer estimated that 1,100 people were involved. The events of May 22 were a testament to the ability of the Fayetteville State student leadership to quickly organize and mobilize the student body. With the newly directed movement in Fayetteville only four days old, student leaders recognized the importance of staging a major demonstration during a weekday when all businesses were open. When asked if classes were still being held on campus, a student replied “The professors are in the classroom, but the students aren’t.” This was not a typical day in the movement, as students rarely missed classes. Therefore, the students did not see the demonstrations and their education as conflicting responsibilities.

In fact, Fayetteville State students perceived the demonstrations as an extension of their education. This education not only involved traditional instruction, but also a high degree of moral training. Vespers formed part of this moral education. Students received
one credit for attending these meetings, which stressed religious and moral education. There is no evidence that civil rights demonstrations were mentioned in these meetings. However, the emphasis on promoting Christian principles tended to mix with the democratic goals of the civil rights movement. Moral education was also promoted in regular classes as well.\textsuperscript{70}

One of the most telling statements in the aforementioned essay by Stanley Johnson reads: “Freedom of worship without the ability to read consigns one to a role of passive acceptance of faith.”\textsuperscript{71} Fayetteville State students were not passively accepting their faith. Perhaps just as importantly, they were not accepting their fate as second-class citizens. Moral training and education about the principles of America provided an inspiration for the nonviolent movement to improve conditions for blacks in Fayetteville.\textsuperscript{72}

The morally principled education that Fayetteville State students received was a primary reason for the close association that student protest groups eventually established with local churches. This relationship showed not only the mutual concern for improving conditions for African Americans, but also the connection among education, religion, and the struggle for equality. Local churches played only a minimal role in the early demonstrations in Fayetteville. However, they played an increasingly important role throughout the summer of 1963. One of the most important African American churches was Mt. Sinai Baptist Church located across the street from Fayetteville State on Murchison Road. Mt. Sinai’s Reverend Aaron Johnson became one of the primary leaders of the movement in the summer of 1963. The church became one of the meeting
places for Fayetteville State students and other members of the community. Johnson was very active in the local NAACP, and therefore had extensive contact with local NAACP President Sippio Burton. Johnson provided a variety of services to the student demonstrators including offering rides to students who needed to return to classes, providing bail money, and allowing demonstrators to meet at his church. His importance to the movement expanded greatly after June 2 when several Fayetteville State students graduated and left for jobs or higher education in other cities.

Like many of the Fayetteville State students involved in the movement, Johnson viewed his involvement as an extension and a reflection of his moral education. His teachers at Raleigh’s Shaw University were one of his greatest inspirations. Johnson was not only interested in spreading the word of God, but also using his ministry to improve society. He saw his “calling into the ministry as that of a civic ministry. I was working for more than just civil rights. I was also working for civil righteousness.” Part of that “civil righteousness” was an unswerving dedication to nonviolent tactics. Johnson held occasional workshops at his church on the methods of nonviolent protest. Durham Congress of Racial Equality director Floyd McKissick made occasional visits to Fayetteville, including Mt. Sinai Baptist Church. He instructed people on the techniques and the legality of nonviolent protest. Although the basic principles put forth by McKissick were followed, local leadership provided the detailed strategy for the movement. Johnson noted that strategy “had to be tailor-made to deal with the situation here.”
Another reverend who provided assistance to the local movement was C.R. Edwards of First Baptist Church. First Baptist was located on Moore Street, which is essentially on the way downtown from Fayetteville State. Like Aaron Johnson, Edwards promoted the demonstrations to members of his congregation. And eventually the reverse was true, his congregation pushed for Edwards to become more involved. “If I had done nothing or stood back, why, they probably would have run me from the church. But I think I stayed close enough to show concern and participate, and far enough from it to negotiate.” Unlike the more radical Johnson, Edwards was a key negotiator with whites and blacks in the community. He was one of three blacks on the nine-member Bi-Racial Committee appointed by Mayor Wilbur Clark in mid-June 1963, which eventually negotiated the end to demonstrations in the city. As will be discussed in more detail later, Clark was reluctant to push changes to the segregated system in Fayetteville. “Wilbur was tough, you know, he was stubborn. But I tell you, when that crowd started coming downtown and really taking over, somebody had to do something. Wilbur said, ‘let’s talk.’ So that’s how the appointment came.” The reluctance of people like Clark to help enact changes demonstrated the need for people like Edwards to help put pressure on city leaders and the business community.

It is difficult to assert which black pastor played the most critical role in the protest movement in Fayetteville in 1963. Johnson and Edwards were very important, as was the white Reverend J.V.C. Summerell of First Presbyterian Church. Summerell was also a member of the Mayor’s Bi-Racial Committee. The importance of black pastors extended beyond Fayetteville into neighboring Spring Lake. The Reverend Fred Stanford
promoted the Fayetteville demonstrations from Bethel AME Zion Church in Spring Lake.78

The church leaders promoted the demonstrations as part of a civic ministry and as part of improving society for their congregation. But like Fayetteville State students, they also became leaders due to practical realities. Pastors held one of the few jobs in the city that were not directly tied to the largely white-dominated economic establishment. Their salaries came almost exclusively from blacks. Therefore, they did not have to concern themselves with pleasing a white employer. Blacks that owned their own businesses enjoyed some of this independence from white economic control. Therefore, some of the most important blacks that became involved in the movement and provided bail money were barbers. Sippio Burton, who was the president of the local NAACP from 1959 to 1966, headed the list of influential barbers in the movement.79

Another common profession among blacks was teaching. Many black teachers supported the movement personally, but could not give explicit support for their students to participate in the downtown demonstrations for fear of losing their jobs. One rare instance of direct support among the Fayetteville State faculty involved Henry M. Eldridge. During the initial 1960 demonstrations in downtown Fayetteville, his car was photographed after a man and a young woman left the scene of sit-ins at McCrory’s 5&10 lunch counter. The man was presumably Eldridge. He may have simply been giving a ride to the young woman, but he was nonetheless assisting the cause. Eldridge had a lot to lose, as he was chairman of the Department of Science and Mathematics.80
Offering rides, providing bail money, and giving moral support was the way in which some professors and teachers encouraged the local movement.

There is very little evidence that Fayetteville State professors discouraged the protests. Some professors adhered to a policy of punishing students for missing more than the maximum amount of courses. The policy of the college stated that students could miss as many classes per semester as the class met per week. As long as the students did not miss more than the maximum number of classes, the professors rarely questioned the reason for the absences, even though they likely knew the reason. In some classes, the demonstrations were a topic of discussion. Willis McLeod later recalled that “The movement raised the bar in terms of the kind of discussions that went on in the classes . . . There were discussions about what was happening in the movement and the impact of the movement all across the campus. And that certainly had a positive effect on the overall quality of our education and our understanding of the need to take full advantage of the educational opportunity we had.” Discussions in class were an indicator of implicit approval by the teachers.

The professors essentially encouraged their students by not discouraging them, allowing the students to continue with their actions without the professors putting their own jobs at risk. The threat of job loss was not as great at the all-black college as with other institutions in the state, but was nonetheless a concern. Yet there was one document uncovered by The Fayetteville Observer that stated “upon arrest call Dr. George and Dean Jones.” Dr. Marion C. George was a political science professor at Fayetteville State, and was also an attorney. John C. Jones was dean of students at the
college. The document does not imply that either of the men had explicitly promoted the protests, but both were considered to be resources to call in times of trouble. Dr. George did promote the demonstrations by providing bail money to students that were arrested for their role in the protests. In short, the demonstrations were discussed and at least implicitly promoted in some classrooms, while they were given little attention in others. Therefore, there appeared to be no official college policy toward how the professors should approach the issue of the protest movement that was sweeping through the college.

The presence of an African American president at Fayetteville State allowed for more confidence in organizing protests without fear of being reprimanded. Like the professors, Dr. Rudolph Jones did not give the student demonstrators his explicit support. However, some evidence exists to reveal that he implicitly supported the demonstrators. There is little doubt that Jones was aware of meetings held to organize the protests. Some informal meetings took place in dorm rooms while the larger meetings occurred at Seabrook Auditorium on campus. Certain interviewees suggested that Jones did not discourage these meetings, while others suggest he attempted to discourage them from being held on campus. It appears as though Jones may have ignored these meetings as long as he could plead ignorance of them.

Jones’s philosophy of education tended to promote social action in general. At an address to faculty to open the 1960 school year, Jones said “We must realize that no student ever got an education from a teacher. The only education that ever changes anybody is self-education. The job of the teacher is to stimulate, to inspire, and to
Professors did not need to inspire students to become involved in the protests in an official manner. Yet the dignity and self-respect students received from their education provided a great deal of the inspiration for the demonstrations.\textsuperscript{87}

Jones commonly gave speeches outside of the college that indicated support for integration efforts. These types of speeches intensified in the late summer of 1963. In August 1963, Jones gave a speech at College Heights Presbyterian Church in Fayetteville, in which he stated that North Carolina was “in the midst of a social revolution.” Jones continued by asserting that a lot of racial inequities in society could have been averted and “could still be avoided if we had leaders with more moral courage to do what they know to be right and just.”\textsuperscript{88} Jones himself appeared to be guilty of his own criticism. He gave little indication that he directly supported the events. He was in a rare position to further the movement even with only minimal involvement. Yet he made no significant speeches on the campus indicating support. His notes from a speech he gave at John Wesley United Methodist Church in November of 1963 after the height of the Fayetteville protest movement indicated Jones’s reluctance. This document revealed that Jones crossed out two sentences dealing with racism, segregation, and social action promoted to end these evils in American society. This was the only instance in the notes of the speech in which Jones crossed off more than a few words.\textsuperscript{89}

Student body president-elect (president by the fall of 1963) Willis McLeod believed that Jones discouraged the movement more than he supported it: “I can’t give you a specific quote. But I do know that what came out of his mouth were statements that were in opposition. I don’t think he supported us. I actually think he was
embarrassed that his students were acting like ‘heathens.’” Not all students perceived Jones in this manner, but he had created a situation in which the students were unclear about his position. As the unofficial leader of the movement in the summer of 1963 (after Stanley Johnson’s graduation), McLeod likely had a more informed perception of Jones than others in the movement.

In his August 1963 speech, President Jones discussed the types of morally courageous leaders that his institution had produced. This type of education tended to produce humble leaders, a characteristic evident in the student-led protest movement. There was not one clear leader of the Fayetteville protest movement, especially in the early summer of 1963. Throughout the protests, the students followed a philosophy that mirrored that of Ella Baker, the matriarch of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC). Although the students were not necessarily following Baker’s strategy, the student-led demonstration committee focused on “group-centered leadership,” as opposed to a “leader-centered group.”

Even without the presence of a famous leader, the student-led demonstrations in Fayetteville were highly organized. Students walked from Fayetteville State to the downtown area, especially targeting businesses on Hay Street. They were told by protest leaders not to block entranceways to businesses. A common strategy involved splitting into lines, with students lining up outside of segregated businesses. Each line had a leader that had been selected at one of the campus meetings. This line leader was responsible for maintaining order in the demonstrations. If for example, one of the protestors began to lose his temper or needed to leave due to an emergency, he or she
would notify the line leader. In most cases the leader appointed an alternate in case of arrest or other problems. The organization of the demonstrations was evident when students attempted to buy tickets to segregated theaters. When one was denied, another asked to purchase a seat in the white-only section, and the next student in line followed.

The demonstrations in late May forced initial action by important groups within the city. At a May 27 City Council meeting, Mayor Wilbur Clark read a report presented by Thornton Rose, Chairman of the Mayor’s Coordinating Committee. The report stated that “Our people of all races have always given leadership to our state and region in working together, in making progress to extend our prosperity and good citizenship.”

The report also presented objectives for which protestors had been working. The objectives placed a priority on desegregation of all downtown theaters and restaurants, and improving local job opportunities for African Americans. Councilman Eugene Plummer made a motion that the Council should express its “confidence and moral support” for the report and that Mayor Clark continue to work on the recommendations. The motion was seconded by Councilman Charles Holt and the vote (which included Councilmen Plummer, Holt, Ted Rhodes and Luther Packer, and Mayor Clark) was unanimous in favor.

By June 2, preliminary endorsement of the students’ four major objectives came from the Mayor’s Coordinating Committee, the City Council, and the executive committee of the Fayetteville Chamber of Commerce. It was a testament to the internal control that the students had that they temporarily suspended, or at least severely tempered demonstrations during the last week of May and into early June. The students
had given city and business leaders a short period to begin changing segregated practices without the pressure of demonstrations. By June 9, an article from *The Fayetteville Observer* read “Calm Prevails in Racial Picture in Fayetteville.”

The calm was short-lived, as protestors staged major demonstrations on June 11, which demonstrated that the preliminary endorsement of the protestors’ objectives had not effectively changed business owners’ stand toward integration. The twenty-five demonstrators arrested that day represented the first large-scale arrests of the 1963 protest movement in Fayetteville. The arrests outraged Fayetteville State students, and may have provided an impetus for larger demonstrations later in the week. The events inspired a statement from the Fayetteville Freedom Council of the NAACP, headed by Chairman Roosevelt J. Davis and Vice-Chairman Willis McLeod. The statement criticized the City Council, arguing that they had “. . . not taken any action to strengthen the mayor’s weak position as bargaining agent of the city.” The group made the message clear that “The mayor’s time has run out. Now that students have been arrested there is no need to soft pedal the situation.”

The statement issued by the Fayetteville Freedom Council represented a turning point in the protest movement in Fayetteville. Demonstrations became more common in the following weeks. The pressure being placed on downtown businesses began to grow, placing added pressure on the Mayor and the City Council to resolve the situation. Mayor Clark contended: “We have been explicit in our feelings that the major decision rests with the individual businessman. It is up to him and his allied operators to make whatever decision they deem appropriate in the light of present circumstances.”
Students therefore continued their protests in an effort to force the restaurant, theater and other business owners to integrate services. A new and more confrontational strategy was attempted on June 12. Students employed “sit-downs” in front of segregated businesses. They sat just to the side of the doors to the businesses in groups of ten to twelve with arms interlocked. This strategy did not produce arrests, as the protestors were on public property, and were not attempting to enter private places of business.

The growing momentum of the movement was largely due to leadership from Fayetteville State. However, the increased demonstrations were in some ways inspired by a changing regional and national consciousness regarding race relations. On June 11, Alabama Governor George Wallace refused to allow two black students to register at the University of Alabama, despite the presence of Deputy Attorney General Nicholas Katzenbach and other federal authorities. Robert F. Kennedy called President John F. Kennedy to ask him to federalize the Alabama National Guard. When the National Guard arrived, Wallace left the campus. The incident proved that President Kennedy was willing to use federal authority to assist integration. That very same night, Kennedy delivered perhaps his most influential civil rights speech to a national television audience. Kennedy’s speech claimed that the nation was confronting a moral issue. In reference to the sit-ins and other direct action tactics, Kennedy stated that it was “better to settle these matters in the courts than on the streets, and new laws are needed at every level, but law alone cannot make people see right.”

Perhaps Kennedy acted partially on his own moral convictions when he delivered his speech. But he also recognized the damage that was being done to the international
reputation of the United States when scenes of racial violence were broadcast on television and printed in newspapers. This concern was especially troublesome to America’s image as a defender of democracy. Segregation provided a gold mine of propaganda for Communist governments, especially in China, Cuba, and the Soviet Union. Pictures such as dogs attacking demonstrators in Birmingham were used, especially in newly independent African nations, to demonstrate how American democracy brutalized racial minorities. While there were several exaggerations, much of this “propaganda” reflected the truth about race relations in some southern cities. While Kennedy’s speech was aimed at preventing violence and building support for his civil rights bill that he submitted to Congress on June 19, it also had the unintended consequence of further galvanizing protestors.

The June 12 demonstrations in Fayetteville were among the first in which a significant number of high school students participated. As many Fayetteville State students began to leave the area for the summer and high schools began summer break, students from E.E. Smith High School (on Seabrook Road, near the Fayetteville State Campus) became more active. A small number of students had been working with students from Fayetteville State since the early protests in May, but their involvement increased in the summer. Some black students from Washington Drive Jr. High School also became involved. The involvement of high school and junior high school students was sporadic, and did not have a high level of independent organization. They generally respected the leadership of the Fayetteville State student leadership. Due to the fear of losing their jobs, most teachers did not actively promote the demonstrations. However,
like the professors at Fayetteville State, teachers taught students lessons of self-respect that translated to involvement in the movement. Dr. William T. Brown, who was the principal of Washington Drive Jr. High School from 1963 to 1971, informed his faculty in 1963 that those students who had participated in the civil rights protests “had no hesitance to be civilly disobedient. . . . They will not lose that attitude from downtown coming back to school.” Therefore, Brown warned his faculty that “whatever demands that were put on them [students] had to be intelligent demands.” Although the role of E.E. Smith and Washington Drive students in the Fayetteville direct action movement was minimal, their involvement affected their education and other aspects of their lives. Their experiences created a foundation for activism that carries on for many until this day.

The increasing involvement of high school students represented a general trend in mid-June that saw the protest participants expand to those not attending Fayetteville State. Some Fayetteville State students favored this trend, but the student leadership was wary that such a shift could lead to losing control of discipline, always a major concern among demonstration leaders. High school students were more rambunctious, less disciplined, and more prone to retaliate against verbal or physical abuse. Such fears were justified on June 17 when seventeen-year-old Earl L. Freeman was charged with assault and possession of a concealed weapon outside of the Rainbo Restaurant on Hay Street. Carrying a concealed weapon was clearly not a part of the moral education that Fayetteville State students received. High school students no doubt saw the need for
change in Fayetteville, but did not always see it in the same perspective as those from Fayetteville State.

June 14, 1963 was perhaps the tensest night of the demonstrations in Fayetteville. The protests began at around 7 P.M. with about 150 demonstrators. The tension of the night increased greatly when William Martin Brown, a white ROTC student from Western Kentucky State College, joined sit-ins on the floor at J.C. Penney Co. When the demonstrators exited the store at about 8:30 P.M. and headed toward City Hall, a crowd of white onlookers followed, and congregated around the corner on Green Street. The demonstrators and onlookers converged on the 200 block of Hay Street, and some exchanged insults. At 9:30, police began to throw canisters of tear gas at the feet of both groups in front of the Carolina Theatre. Police arrested Victor H. Lessard, a white soldier, for throwing one of the canisters back at police, cutting the hand of Detective Sergeant Jack Meckling. The crowds scattered in different directions, some heading down side streets, others out the back door of buildings. Many of the protestors and onlookers returned to their respective groups. The tension continued, but the crowds began to slowly disperse. Tragedy had been narrowly averted, but both city officials and protest leaders knew something had to be done.108

The night of June 14 revealed many of the central conflicts and ironies of the Fayetteville protest movement and the response to the movement. The protest movement rarely had a significant number of white demonstrators. Estimates from interviews of participants generally were less than 5 percent. 109 Yet it appeared that the presence of a white protesters (William Martin Brown) was what brought so much attention to the
events of June 14. This irony was compounded by the reality that the abusive and even violent reaction to the June 14 protests came at least partially as a result of Brown’s involvement.

Local whites opposed to the integration movement did not merely see Brown as white, but also as an outsider. In several cities in the South, segregationists attempted to portray civil rights protests as the work of outsiders. This was also the case with several business owners in Fayetteville, such as William Crawley, Jr, who argued that the demonstrations were the work of “outside agitators.”\textsuperscript{110} Such claims were obviously an attempt to discredit the movement, although Crawley himself likely realized that his statement was grossly exaggerated. The presence of Brown and a few outsiders may have been partially what caused the chaotic scene on the evening of June 14. However, the relatively few “outsiders” were not part of the leadership structure of the protest movement.

Leaders of the protest movement, which consisted mostly of Fayetteville State students, but also local NAACP President Sippio Burton and black reverends, steadfastly denounced violence. The majority of participants viewed Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. as the primary national role model for the movement. While a lot of King’s strategies, such as “filling the jails” were not employed in Fayetteville, student activists followed his philosophy of nonviolence very closely.\textsuperscript{111}

The adherence to nonviolent tactics was a primary reason that there were few attempts to actively enlist support from military personnel. The Fayetteville State student leadership was concerned about their lack of control over military personnel, as was the
concern with high school students. Servicemen were not involved in any significant numbers until early July and never became a highly organized group within the movement. A major concern among the students was that military participants might attempt to counteract any violence toward the demonstrators. As Willis McLeod recalled, “There were others [servicemen] who were already downtown at the bars and restaurants…they would come out of those and join in with us. I was nervous about them because we had no control over them.” The servicemen had experienced a much different type of education than Fayetteville State students. Their involvement represented a threat to the uniformity of purpose and tactics that were so vital to the student-led movement.

There were cases in which it appeared that Fayetteville State student demonstrators did lose their discipline. For example, Willis McLeod was arrested on June 13 for “assaulting” Detective Captain Earl Melvin in front of the Carolina Soda Shop. Melvin later testified in court that McLeod had taken his arm and pulled him a “half-turn around.” According to McLeod, the officer was “manhandling one of the young ladies, and I stepped in to restrain him…which was considered assault.” Whether McLeod really turned Melvin around or not, the officer admitted that he did not feel threatened or frightened, and a jury found McLeod not guilty. Hence this event could scarcely be viewed as a lack of discipline.

The very few instances of demonstrators in Fayetteville temporarily losing discipline occurred on an individual basis. In many other cities in the South, frustrations over police treatment and blatant racism caused protestors to temporarily neglect
nonviolent practices. A march in Birmingham in mid-April, 1963 to protest the arrests of Martin Luther King, Jr., Ralph Abernathy, and Fred Shuttlesworth ended with acts of violence among the demonstrators. Angered at police efforts to stop the march, some protestors threw rocks and other objects at the patrolmen. In Durham on July 20, 1963 a number of black protestors retaliated when they were attacked by white bystanders. Howard Fuller and Ben Ruffin attempted to restrain the African Americans from becoming involved in the violence. Fuller was the leader of Operation Breakthrough, while Ruffin was the director of United Organizations for Community Improvement, organizations to organize poor blacks on several issues, including civil rights. Their efforts to restrain the retaliation efforts of the marchers revealed that violence was not condoned even under extenuating circumstances. Although occasional acts of violence occurred among demonstrators in several cities, violence was rarely part of the strategy, and simply represented a temporary breakdown in discipline. In Fayetteville, such breakdowns were extremely rare due to the unity in the movement, but also due to the lack of violent reaction to demonstrations among local whites. Verbal abuse among whites in Fayetteville was relatively common, but there is no evidence to suggest concerted efforts by whites at provoking violence.

One instance of an apparent lack of discipline among demonstrators in Fayetteville involved Charles H. Bennett, who was charged with “shaking his fist” and threatening to hit Cleo Katsoudas, owner of the U.S. Cafe, on June 12. Bennett denied the charge, as did other witnesses. Another demonstrator, William H. Carver, Jr., testified that Bennett neither shook his fists nor made any threatening remarks to
Katsoudas. Carver also maintained that Katsoudas had said that if anyone came inside of his cafe, “he would hit us.” Part of Bennett’s punishment was to stay off the premises of the U.S. Cafe for two years, an ultimate irony considering he was already ostensibly prohibited from the cafe.\textsuperscript{118} The verdict in the Bennett case demonstrated that those involved were often guilty until proven innocent.

Another noteworthy aspect of the Bennett case involved two particular questions posed by prosecutor Ritchie Smith: “Did anyone tell you to picket?” Bennett replied, “Yes.” Smith then questioned, “Did anyone tell you to get arrested?” Bennett answered “No.”\textsuperscript{119} In several segregated cities in the South, “filling the jails” was a strategy to force action from local officials. This occurred in places as close as Greensboro and Raleigh. In Greensboro, North Carolina A&T student Jesse Jackson had staged a massive demonstration, at which approximately seven hundred protesters lay down in the street in front of City Hall on June 5. Like so many of the demonstrations in Fayetteville in which protesters marched back as a group to Fayetteville State, the group in Greensboro marched back to the A&T campus. Greensboro police swore out a warrant for Jackson’s arrest. Local Congress of Racial Equality leaders A. Knighton (Tony) Stanley and William Thomas notified police where they could find Jackson. CORE had staged the arrest for maximum exposure. Ten thousand leaflets had been produced notifying protesters of Jackson’s arrest, producing an event on June 6 in which three hundred protesters were arrested for blocking traffic in Jefferson Square. Police took the demonstrators away in buses. The clear attempt to “fill the jails” in Greensboro forced local officials into action.\textsuperscript{120}
The event in Greensboro highlighted some of the differences in the protest movements in Fayetteville and Greensboro. In both cities, many participants were willing to go to jail. A note uncovered by *The Fayetteville Observer* revealed an agenda for action. One of the items mentioned a “workshop with protesters [for] getting into establishments, and getting arrested,” while another item simply stated “Students want to get arrested.” Yet, interviews from student leaders reveal that getting arrested was not a primary goal of the Fayetteville demonstrations, but was something for which they were prepared. Maintaining a large number of protestors on the streets would have been difficult in a relatively small city if several demonstrators were in jail.\(^\text{121}\)

In addition, Fayetteville did not have a local chapter of CORE or SNCC to help the protestors gain exposure. The local branch of the NAACP supported the demonstrations but little tangible support came from the state or national NAACP. When the early demonstrations in Fayetteville began in May of 1963, NAACP Field Secretary Charles McLean called the demonstrations “strictly a grassroots movement” and denied that the state NAACP had anything to do with the demonstrations.\(^\text{122}\) The same was true in Greensboro, where the local branch of the NAACP supported the sit-in movement, but the national office offered little support. In fact, the national office criticized the initial sit-ins in Greensboro in 1960. But Greensboro also had a local branch of CORE, which played a major role in drawing exposure to the events, especially the overcrowded jails. The jails were sufficiently full in Greensboro, and over four hundred demonstrators were incarcerated in an old hospital at one point in 1963.\(^\text{123}\)
Fayetteville and Greensboro shared the trait of local leadership. On May 22, 1963, national CORE director James Farmer gave a speech to students primarily from North Carolina A&T and Bennett College. The visit was not necessarily a ploy to initiate action, but to encourage students to continue with the work they had already begun. A similar visit occurred in Fayetteville less than a month later. Floyd McKissick, director of the Durham Chapter (and, in 1966, national director) of CORE, spoke at Evans Metropolitan AME Zion Church in Fayetteville on June 16. This was two days after the major demonstrations of June 14 had given Fayetteville at least regional exposure. Although Farmer and McKissick may have galvanized protestors further, the initial impetus for the actions was almost exclusively homegrown in both cities.

In Fayetteville, local leadership took control of organizing the protests. While a high level of organization existed, the role of established African American organizations did not play as critical a role as in other cities in the region. For example, the Chapel Hill Council on Negro Affairs, formed after World War II, was patterned after the Durham Council on Negro Affairs. At a May 3, 1963 meeting at St. Joseph African Methodist Episcopal (AME) Church in Chapel Hill, citizens formed the Chapel Hill Committee for Open Business (COB). When the Committee folded in late 1963, another group emerged: the Citizens United for Racial Equality and Dignity (CURED). In addition, black activists formed a local unit of the Congress of Racial Equality. Members of the movement in Chapel Hill focused on structured organizations to provide leadership. In Fayetteville, however, organization came largely from Fayetteville State student groups, most of which operated with no official title, or were informally named for broad
purposes, such as the “Demonstration Committee.” Although Ella Baker did not play a role in the movement in Fayetteville, participants in Fayetteville likely agreed with Baker’s de-emphasis of organizations: “I was never working for an organization. I always tried to work for a cause. And that cause was bigger than any organization.”

Ironically, the lack of emphasis placed on arranged organizations (aside from working with the local NAACP) may have led to a more cohesive and more effective movement in Fayetteville. Tension within the movement existed in several cities. The existence of several civil rights organizations in certain communities appears to have caused decreased unity. In Chapel Hill, at an August 14, 1963 meeting, members of the Executive Committee of the Committee for Open Business voted to remove Harold Foster as the Chairman of the group. There were no such drastic purges in Fayetteville. When the class of 1963 graduated from Fayetteville State, leadership roles transferred smoothly from people like Stanley Johnson to Willis McLeod and other members of the class of 1964. Sippio Burton remained the president of the local NAACP until 1966. Arthur Lane and Sylvia X. Allen took primary responsibility for representing the demonstrators throughout 1963 with no real challenges to their leadership. Reverends Aaron Johnson (Mt. Sinai Baptist Church) and C.R. Edwards (First Baptist) inspired their congregations with little to no opposition. The Fayetteville movement experienced very little internal conflict, largely due to the absence of competing civil rights organizations.

A second reason for the low levels of dissension within the protest movement in Fayetteville was due to the lack of involvement of well-known civil rights leaders. The
Fayetteville demonstrators were not generally concerned with national media exposure, which tended to bring forth tensions in cities where external publicity was a primary concern. On April 3, 1963 SCLC’s Ralph Abernathy boasted that “the eyes of the world are on Birmingham tonight. Bobby Kennedy is looking here at Birmingham, the United States Congress is looking at Birmingham.” Largely due to the presence of Martin Luther King, Jr., the nation followed the events in Birmingham more closely. Many local civil rights leaders resented the fact that King had become the primary leader in directing the local protest movement. On May 9, King agreed to temporarily halt demonstrations in Birmingham without consulting Fred Shuttlesworth. In an intense moment of dissension within the movement, an enraged Shuttlesworth lambasted King: “Well, Martin, you know they said in Albany that you come in, get people excited and started, and you leave town. But I live here, the people trust me, and I have the responsibility after SCLC is gone, and I’m telling you it [protest march] will not be called off.” The tension between King and SCLC, and Shuttlesworth and the local leadership in Birmingham demonstrated the conflict between local and national civil rights movements. It also demonstrated the problems of a leader-centered group like SCLC. While the Fayetteville protest movement certainly had leaders like Willis McLeod, Stanley Johnson, Sippio Burton, Bill Bowser, Aaron Johnson, and C.R. Edwards, the momentum of the movement did not rely on the personal charisma of one individual.

A third explanation for why the Fayetteville protest movement was so unified was due to the absence of a predominantly white college in the city, and the overall lack of white support in organizing the protests. While there were white members of the
community sympathetic to the cause, none took a leadership role in organizing resistance to segregated practices. This was not the case in Raleigh or Chapel Hill. Patrick Cusick, a white University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill student organized a chapter of the Student Peace Union in January 1963. In April, the group asserted its anti-segregation position and announced it would boycott local segregated businesses. When the aforementioned Committee for Open Business dismantled, it split into two groups. The local unit of CORE was supported by most young blacks; the Citizens United for Racial Equality and Dignity (CURED) received its support from black moderates and white liberals. Therefore, although the intentions of whites assisting the movement were admirable, their involvement in some cases damaged movement unity.

While white involvement brought the risk of decreased unity, it also served an important purpose. Perhaps most importantly, the participation of white protestors helped to challenge the legitimacy of racial segregation. In *Communists on Campus: Race, Politics, and the Public University in Sixties North Carolina*, William J. Billingsley argued that protests could have been discredited by an emphasis on alleged inherent racial differences if no whites had become involved. In Durham, the majority of protestors were from the historically black North Carolina College. Yet they also received support from white students from Duke University. The presence of whites did not significantly increase the number of protestors, but likely had an important psychological impact on city decision-makers. While few whites took active leadership roles, their supportive role was evident in the fact that six hundred Durham residents signed “A Pledge of Support to Our Durham Merchants,” in which they vowed to
patronize integrated businesses. This pledge of moral, and perhaps more importantly, economic support was a critical factor in the rapid pace of integration that Durham experienced in June 1963. Fayetteville did not enjoy this type of involvement among white members of the community. Therefore, increased demonstrations throughout June and July were needed to place increased pressure on city leaders and white business owners.

Fayetteville State took the most responsibility for generating that additional pressure in Fayetteville. Similarly in Raleigh, Shaw University and St. Augustine’s College students provided the foundation for the protest movement. Both were historically black colleges, and Shaw enjoyed the distinction as the birthplace of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee in 1960. Yet white students from North Carolina State University also assisted the movement in Raleigh. Perhaps more importantly, a few professors from the University also contributed their support, the most influential of whom was Allard Lowenstein. Lowenstein helped organize civil rights demonstrations in Raleigh in 1963. Like many protest leaders, he was looking for an event that would truly inspire the local movement into greater action.

Gaining regional or even national exposure was a difficult task for protest leaders throughout the South. The national media generally focused on scenes of violence, and therefore nonviolent protests had difficulty drawing attention outside of their local areas. In Fayetteville, there were very few events that garnered exposure by media outside of the city. There is no indication that movement leaders in Fayetteville coveted such attention. In the state’s capital, however, events were watched more closely by the
media, but also by the state and national government. On April 31, 1963, Allard Lowenstein entered the Sir Walter Hotel Coffee House in Raleigh with Angie Brooks, the Liberian Ambassador to the United Nations. The two were accompanied by Brook’s nephew Joseph Outland, a Shaw University student, and two North Carolina State students. At the Sir Walter, Manager Arthur Buddenhagen approached the Liberian diplomat and asked “Are you looking for a job?”

Brooks replied: “No, I am looking for a place to eat.”

Buddenhagen responded, “I’m sorry we can’t serve you. It is a rule and a reasonable rule.”

The group then proceeded to the S&W Cafeteria, where Brooks was again denied service. The event provided further inspiration for a recently developing movement in Raleigh. The refusal to serve the Liberian diplomat also brought concern from the U.S. State Department. Secretary of State Dean Rusk sent his apology to the Liberian ambassador. In addition, State Department official Pedro A. Sanjuan claimed that efforts were under way to put pressure on the owners of the Sir Walter Coffee House and S&W Cafeteria to integrate services. The State Department concern was not simply a matter of principle and was not necessarily based on an interest in promoting equality. Rather, the State Department was worried about international perception. Soviet propaganda efforts in Africa focused on segregation in the American South. Scenes of discrimination like those encountered by Brooks could damage America’s image as a defender of democracy. Hence, the seemingly local action that Lowenstein and Brooks initiated contained national and even international significance.
The Brooks affair led to increasing protests in Raleigh. These protests differed from those in Fayetteville in one crucial regard; they were directed more at statewide discrimination than merely local discrimination. The Sir Walter Hotel became the target of the protestors due to its status as the primary lodging place for members of the General Assembly. Many important statewide decisions were made at the hotel, earning it the status of “unofficial capitol of North Carolina.” Black students and small numbers of white students staged sit-ins at the hotel in an effort to encourage members of the General Assembly to support integration efforts. These efforts backfired initially, as state representatives acted to quell the demonstrations. In mid-June, the Assembly passed House Bill 1311, which provided harsher misdemeanor charges for trespassing. The bill allowed local courts to determine the penalty for such violations.¹⁴⁰

The demonstrations at the Sir Walter Hotel and other restaurants and places of business sparked a conservative response in the General Assembly. State Senate President Clarence Stone and other representatives threatened cutting funding to Shaw University and St. Augustine’s College. State Representative John Kerr, Jr. of Warren County provided one of the most overtly racist statements when responding to a request for funding from North Carolina A&T President Dr. Lewis C. Dowdy: “You come down here begging the white folks to give more money to your school . . . You can strike all you please, but don’t come here and beg us . . . Sit-ins are an action that is an anticipation of antagonism between the races.”¹⁴¹ Although Kerr made this statement in February before the height of the protests, it demonstrated the depth of racism among some members of the Assembly. Through his rancorous expressions, Kerr revealed a
fundamental conflict between conservative lawmakers and black protestors. Kerr defined sit-ins as “antagonism between the races.” Yet the fact that blacks did practically have to “beg” for equal access to public and private accommodations was a primary reason for the sit-ins. Delaying action could only bring more long-term antagonism. The demonstrators were forcing lawmakers to make the choice between heightened racial tensions and resolving the disputes that may cause those tensions. In Fayetteville, the same basic approach was used to put pressure on local officials such as the Mayor and the City Council, as well as individual business owners. This method of confrontation led to many arrests in Fayetteville.

Willis McLeod faced arrest five times during the demonstrations in the summer of 1963. Like many other demonstrators, he was often charged with trespassing. Most of the arrests in Fayetteville were made under G.S. 14-126 and G.S. 1134, simple and forcible trespassing. There were many cases in which the protestors would be held in jail and released without any record of their arrest. In instances in which cases were brought to court, black attorney Arthur Lane represented the protestors. Lane came to Fayetteville in 1956 after Harold Groves, a black lawyer and member of the Fayetteville City Council, left to become dean of the law school at Texas Southern University. Lane understood the need for him to come to Fayetteville. “It was a tough decision. But the theory was that in each town there ought to be at least one black who would be willing to take civil rights cases.” As the only black attorney in Fayetteville in the late 1950s and early 1960s, Lane had a tremendous responsibility. He had learned a lot about the national civil rights movement while attending Howard Law School, from which he
graduated in 1951. At Howard, he remembered Thurgood Marshall making occasional visits. While Lane never achieved the national prominence that Marshall gained, he was extremely important to the local movement in Fayetteville. Lane generally represented the civil rights demonstrators for no charge or at least at a discounted rate. Lane was able to get the charges dropped in several cases. However, he was unhappy with the verdict in many cases. “I remember one 17-year old boy was charged with trespass. The judge said he knew he shouldn’t have been in jail, but the fine he got was bigger than one guy got for hitting a man with a shovel.” Seventy-five people, mostly Fayetteville State students, were charged with trespassing in 1963. Superior Court Judge Hamilton H. Hobgood dismissed the charges in these cases in 1965.

By 1963, Lane had made many connections with local members of the movement. He and his wife, Celesta, were members of the local NAACP, and he had close contact with NAACP President Sippio Burton. The couple also attended First Baptist Church, one of the leading institutions providing organization and financial support for the downtown protests. Therefore, Lane had contact with First Baptist’s Reverend C.R. Edwards, one of the most important figures in negotiating the move toward integrated services in Fayetteville. Lane was also aware of the importance of making connections with prominent whites in the community. Therefore, he was always at least aware of the position regarding the demonstrations of people like Police Chief L.F. Worrell, Mayor Wilbur Clark, and businessman J.W. Pate.

Although Lane was very aware of the situation regarding the protests in Fayetteville, he did not play a major role in planning the demonstrations. He did not
participate in any sit-ins or protest marches. One simple explanation for this was that Lane was extremely busy with attempting to make a living from his traditional cases while still representing the protestors for no charge. More importantly, Lane was likely concerned about the potential economic, legal or professional reprisals that may stem from being involved in the actual demonstrations. And quite simply, he needed to stay out of jail so he could defend the protestors.

Another black attorney that assisted Lane in some of the cases was Sylvia X. Allen. Allen’s impressive education included bachelor degrees in both music and psychology. She was also the first black female to receive a law degree from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. Allen and Durham attorney and eventual director of CORE Floyd McKissick were mentored on civil rights law by Jack Greenberg, an attorney for the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund in Washington, D.C. He was chief assistant to Thurgood Marshall, and eventually succeeded Marshall as director-counsel of the Fund. Allen’s education was not merely in the area of law; her brief time with Greenberg allowed her to focus on civil rights law in particular. This impressive education prepared her for the responsibilities she would face in Fayetteville. In 1963 Allen was in the awkward position of prosecuting students involved in the demonstrations in the early part of the summer, and later defending them. As a prosecutor working for Cumberland County, Allen made sure that protestors were prosecuted only when they were supposed to be. She once told the City Council she would not prosecute protestors who were protesting peacefully. Yet she had to carry out her professional duties. “You tried to be fair. You [the protestors] couldn’t just get away
with anything just because you were civil rights... And it has to be a legitimate charge to get you convicted. They [protestors] got equal representation, good representation.»\textsuperscript{151}

Later in the summer of 1963, Allen began defending civil rights demonstrators while making an ultimately unsuccessful bid for City Council. She stated that some of the cases were ruled unfairly, but that there were no gross injustices like those that occurred in other segregated cities in the South.\textsuperscript{152} One should not underestimate the importance of Allen and Lane in preventing these injustices from occurring. The two attorneys were very knowledgeable about civil rights law. Their impressive educations had prepared them for the arduous battle in which they were involved.

Allen was married to Dr. G. Wesley Allen, a prominent physician in Fayetteville. Dr. Allen attended the May 1963 meeting at Seabrook Auditorium on the campus of Fayetteville State Teachers College, which organized the first major demonstration in Fayetteville that year. At the previously mentioned May 27, 1963 City Council meeting, Allen put pressure on Mayor Clark by asking him specifically in what manner Clark intended to work with the Coordinating Committee. Allen was well-respected by blacks but also many white citizens in the community. He was a source of financial support for the student protestors, providing bail money to students who had been arrested. He also provided transportation for the demonstrators when needed. Unlike his wife, G. Wesley Allen participated in some of the actual downtown marches.\textsuperscript{153}

It is difficult to determine whether Sylvia X. Allen or G. Wesley Allen, or both, were the target of a bullet that pierced through their bedroom window and lodged above their bed in 1963. It is important to note that the home is just one street away from the
Fayetteville State campus. There is no evidence to imply that this action was Ku Klux Klan-related or part of an organized scare tactic. Yet this was likely an effort to scare others who were at the forefront of the local civil rights movement. Some blacks within the movement were aware of this near-tragedy, but did not necessarily promote it as a way of bringing injustices to the attention of the city. In fact, the Allen family did not even call the police. “This sort of thing we handled ourselves. There were some things you just sort of took in stride.” The decision not to notify local police indicated that blacks did not entirely trust local police.

However, there was another incident in Fayetteville in which police were notified. A cross was burned at the home of Arthur and Celesta Lane, on Slocumb Road north of town. Celesta Lane remembers the police being thorough in their investigation, but the perpetrators were never found. Whoever committed the crime succeeded in putting some fear into the Lane family. However, it was not enough to cause Arthur Lane to cease fighting for a cause, and carrying out his business.

Events like the shooting at the Allen household and the cross-burning at the home of the Lane family were rare in Fayetteville. Ku Klux Klan activity was rare in the city (although there were two Ku Klux Klan billboards on roads entering town), as were acts of extreme violence. Fayetteville State never became a target of vandalism nor did Mt. Sinai Baptist Church across the street. Many of the participants involved in the downtown protests indicated they only had a moderate fear for their safety and that of their family. Rank and file protestors mostly from Fayetteville State likely were less concerned than more well-known lawyers, preachers and NAACP activists. One
explanation involves their higher degree of anonymity. But it was also more risky for Ku Klux Klan members or other white racists to make attacks on a college campus, where whites were a rarity, than in a neighborhood. This may explain why the Allen household was targeted and the Fayetteville State campus, which provided the core of the local movement, was not. In addition, Fayetteville State was a state-funded institution, and therefore any acts of violence might have been investigated more fully.

One of the protestors that Arthur Lane defended was Willis McLeod. McLeod’s arrests did not inspire the sort of reaction as those of Jesse Jackson in Greensboro. Both leaders were popular students and were members of the football teams at their respective schools. Both were effective leaders who commanded the respect of those in the movement, within and outside of their respective school communities. Yet largely because Fayetteville did not enjoy the status of so-called “birthplace” of the sit-ins like Greensboro enjoyed, McLeod did not muster the kind of regional and even national attention that Jackson garnered.

McLeod was nonetheless effective as an organizer and led by example. His five arrests obviously attest to his dedication to the movement. Another man who shared those same traits was James Herring. Herring was a member of the “demonstration committee,” which was most responsible for initiating the protest movement in May 1963. He was arguably the best negotiator among the Fayetteville State leadership. He participated in many of the meetings with the Mayor and the City Council, which eventually negotiated the integration of a majority of businesses and helped to decrease discriminatory hiring practices in the city. People like Herring and McLeod helped bring
African American concerns to the forefront in 1963. Citizens of Fayetteville were forced to recognize the concerns of blacks in the city. Their concerns were impossible to ignore, as the demonstrations and the community response eventually became the leading news story in Fayetteville in 1963.158
CHAPTER 3: INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL RESPONSE TO CHANGES

A powerful medium that allowed the civil rights movement to gain increasing momentum was television. Although Fayetteville was rarely covered on television, national broadcasts of events throughout the South displayed the contradiction between liberty, and white supremacy and segregation. Violent scenes, such as those in Birmingham and Selma, gained the most national exposure. The media focused on well-known figures on both sides of the spectrum, such as Martin Luther King, Jr. and Governor George Wallace of Alabama.

Aside from actual news events, the media played an important role in molding the perspectives of many Americans. Jesse Helms was one of the most important people in shaping the views of citizens in Fayetteville and eastern North Carolina in general. Beginning in 1960, Raleigh-based television station WRAL-TV gave Helms a daily five-minute editorial titled Viewpoint. The special editorials, viewed throughout much of eastern North Carolina, ran all the way into 1972 when Helms resigned to run for the U.S. Senate. Although Helms spoke about a variety of issues, one of the most common topics involved the civil rights movement and race relations in the state. Like many other segregationists in the South, Helms continually claimed that the “God-fearing” people of North Carolina were happy until outside agitators from the North and liberals in Congress, the White House, and the Supreme Court interfered with their way of life and
provoked blacks to call for unnecessary changes. Helms was always careful not to expose himself as a blatant racist. Rather, he questioned the rapid pace of attempted integration and the strategies of civil rights groups. Helms’ assessment of outside agitators and liberals in Congress instigating the movement in North Carolina was erroneous, especially as it applied to Fayetteville. Nonetheless, the endurance of Helms’ editorials displayed the popularity of his beliefs in eastern North Carolina.

Radio also played a major role in shaping attitudes about segregation. Many white-oriented radio stations in the South avoided the topic of civil rights throughout the 1950s and into the early 1960s. In 1960, the NAACP complained to the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) that the majority of southern radio stations refused to mention the NAACP in their broadcasts because owners were afraid of politicians. For example, Georgia Governor Herman Talmadge told radio deejays to avoid discussion of civil rights activities. By 1963, however, the lack of coverage of the civil rights movement began to change. Stations could no longer avoid the movement as it became the leading domestic news story in the United States. In Savannah, Georgia, WSOK provided airtime for the local NAACP and its offshoot, the Chatham County Crusade for Voters, in a weekly half-hour show concentrated on voter registration. WSOK was one of the few exceptions, however. Many stations began to cover major national civil rights events, but often avoided detailed coverage of local movements. While coverage of the integration movement was expanding, many radio programs continued to reflect the racial prejudices that were still very common in 1963.
In Fayetteville, Johnny Joyce’s radio program “Around the Market House” echoed many of the sentiments from *Viewpoint*. On the daily news and talk show, Joyce ostensibly rejected claims for integration of downtown restaurants in 1963. Willis McLeod characterized Joyce as a “staunch racist” at that time, while others involved in the movement and in the community saw him at least as someone ardently opposed to desegregation (Joyce apparently saw the flaws in his beliefs and later changed his outlook on race relations. He even joined the predominantly black First Baptist Church for a short period). The Reverend Aaron Johnson of Mt. Sinai Baptist Church characterized Joyce as the “antithesis of Bill Bowser,” the black radioman very popular in the African-American community in Fayetteville.

While there were very few black-owned radio stations in the South in the 1960s, white-owned stations often had shows that targeted black audiences at certain times of the day. One such station was WAOK in Atlanta, Georgia. In *Radio and the Struggle for Civil Rights in the South*, Brian Ward characterized WAOK as perhaps the most important station in the South in contributing to the black struggle for equality. Part-owner and deejay Zenas Sears was legitimately dedicated to promoting rights of African Americans. His dedication went beyond the token interest shown by many radiomen in order to take advantage of black consumer spending. Evidence that Sears’ concern for blacks was not merely based on economic concerns came in the fact that Sears refused to run Coca-Cola ads due to their dreadful record of promoting black workers. Like many other white-owned, black-oriented stations, WAOK did not specifically promote sit-ins and other forms of direct action, but they reported on local demonstrations, conventions,
and voter registration drives as opposed to merely reporting well-known national events.  

In Fayetteville, a black deejay named Bill Bowser reported on local civil rights demonstrations. Few, if any, members of the Fayetteville protest movement inspire as intense of a reaction as Bowser. When asked whether she listened to Bowser’s daily radio show, Sylvia X. Allen responded, “Yes, how could you not? You didn’t live in Fayetteville, and not listen to Bill Bowser.” Bowser was the first African American in Cumberland County to have his own radio program. He was the most recognizable voice among African Americans in Fayetteville. His boisterous personality was matched by his concern for the welfare of blacks in the community. Although he was very outspoken, most interviews indicate that Bowser had to temper his language about the civil rights protests due to the radio station being owned by whites. In regards to actually promoting the demonstrations, Reverend Aaron Johnson claimed that Bowser had to “speak in codes,” but was nonetheless “our mouthpiece.” Bowser had contact with several important members within the movement, including Willis McLeod, Aaron Johnson, and Sippio Burton. He participated in demonstrations, offered transportation and bail money, and even fed some of the demonstrators at his restaurant on Murchison Road. 

Like Fayetteville State student protestors, Bowser recognized the connection between his education and the struggle for racial equality. Bowser attended the Fayetteville Normal School, which in 1939 changed its name to Fayetteville State Teachers College under the school presidency of J.W. Seabrook. Bowser graduated from
Fayetteville State Teachers College in 1942. Part of his personal education involved staying informed about civil rights events throughout the nation. Bowser’s sister, Ada (Bowser) Parker, recalled her brother’s dedication to education: “He was always an outstanding student . . . He used to do a lot of religious poetry, and speaking in churches, and speaking around.” His years attending Fayetteville State and Thaddeus Disciple Christian Church on River Road had helped him to understand the importance and veracity of racial equality.

Bowser’s vocal and practical commitment to civil rights gained him a lot of supporters, especially among young people. His close contact with Fayetteville State students allowed him to see the potential that they had in an integrated society. When asked in what ways Bill Bowser changed the city of Fayetteville, Parker responded, “He felt that everybody should have a chance. Segregation had its evils, because it kept people from doing what they could have if they had had a chance. It would have made a difference in a person’s later life.” Judging from the impressive accomplishments of so many of the 1963 protest leaders, it is clear how much of an impact that “chance” provided.

Bowser participated in several meetings at churches and other places. Protest participant Warren Dobbins recalled, “Bill Bowser has always been there for equal rights . . . when you had these backroom meetings, you go into the community into a house of one of the leaders or something like that, Bill Bowser was involved in that way.” It is clear that Bowser was the most important black in the local media. In his Black America Series book, Fayetteville, North Carolina, Fred Whitted summarized Bowser: “A natural
leader, he could rally people effortlessly and was at the forefront of the movement, working tirelessly to bring justice for blacks. Bowser’s charisma and leadership was a large part of the reason that a white member of the local media, Pat Reese, attended an occasional meeting among civil rights leaders, although it is doubtful that Reese learned of these meetings from Bowser’s show.

So much of the way a city perceives events in its own community is based on the media. The Fayetteville Observer had the power to influence the way people in the city viewed the downtown protest movement. Fortunately, the newspaper provided relatively balanced coverage of the demonstrations, a luxury that many segregated cities in the South did not enjoy. For example, in Birmingham, the Post-Herald and Birmingham News printed only short articles, and placed them in the back pages of the newspaper. Throughout part of SCLC’s Birmingham campaign, the Birmingham News merely printed the Associated Press wire reports rather than providing their own coverage of the events. In Raleigh, between 450 and 500 demonstrators protested outside of The News and Observer [Raleigh] on June 3, 1963. The demonstrators complained of unfair coverage. Shaw University student Charles Earle accused the newspaper of failing to cover events concerning the African American population. He implicitly suggested a boycott by saying, “We pay the same price as any other man . . . If the owner of this paper can run this enterprise without the Negroes’ money, let him run it without it.”

Coverage in The Fayetteville Observer appears to have been more balanced. There were very few instances of blatantly biased language. In the aforementioned “assault” case of Willis McLeod, The Fayetteville Observer mentioned that an all-white
jury decided the case.\textsuperscript{178} Obviously, the writer did not need to bring this to the attention of the reader, but chose to anyway. The generally unbiased treatment of the movement by local reporters demonstrated a commitment to their profession, not necessarily a reflection of their beliefs, which likely would have leaned to one side or the other. Willis McLeod even stated that he had become “very friendly” with reporter David Prather, and found the reporting of Pat Reese and others to be generally fair.\textsuperscript{179}

Pat Reese was a model of objectivity in his forty-plus year career with \textit{The Fayetteville Observer}. Reese responded to a series of new rules being placed on writers by Editor Charles Clay in the early 1960s by saying, “Look, if you can’t be objective, I’m sorry, but I can.”\textsuperscript{180} Reese’s objectivity in reporting the events of the protest movement in Fayetteville was extremely important. Reese may have even gone so far as to become biased on the side of the demonstrators. He admits that he was not always entirely objective, and may have been implicitly promoting the cause of the protestors.\textsuperscript{181} However, a careful analysis of his articles shows very little biased language. There are few assumptions made without support; Reese reported the events as he perceived them to have happened. In a southern city in the 1960s, such balanced coverage was considered quite liberal, and by the standards of many southern cities, radical.

Reese’s sympathies toward blacks nearly got him in trouble later in the 1960s. In May 1966, the reporter covered a Ku Klux Klan rally at the Fayetteville Drag Strip south of the city. A Klansmen escorted Reese and photographer Bill Shaw to the leader of the local Klan, who made a statement to those in attendance as he pointed at Reese: “I want you people to meet the strangest sight ever known to mankind—the white nigger.”\textsuperscript{182}
Although this event occurred three years after the downtown desegregation movement had passed, it demonstrated that racist whites in and around Fayetteville saw Reese as someone who promoted the rights of African Americans. It also offers proof of the importance of reporters like Reese and Prather, who risked unpopularity among certain whites. They also avoided the temptation to dismiss the legitimacy of the effort by blacks to achieve equal rights.

Reflecting back on the events of 1963, Reese claimed that “So much was overdone. It didn’t have to happen . . . They [Police, City Council, etc.] should have just let the kids walk. And the police were doing the best they could; they were as scared as the kids.” Whether individual policemen were frightened was largely a matter of personal assessment. Although the demonstrations were nonviolent, the demonstrators usually greatly outnumbered the police, which may have created a feeling of uneasiness. While it would be up to the business owners, City Council, the Mayor and others to attempt to solve the problems addressed by the demonstrators, the police were in charge of maintaining order on Hay Street.

The demonstrators generally found Police Chief L.F. Worrell to be fair as well. During the early demonstration period, Fayetteville State students would notify Chief Worrell of their intentions of demonstrating, a practice they would abandon as the protests became more common. One must apply a different criterion for leadership by a police chief than for a mayor or other city official. The job of the police chief is to maintain order and uphold the law, not to enact social change. As mentioned earlier, many of the demonstrators were arrested under G.S. 14-126 and G.S. 1134, simple and
forcible trespassing. Three separate North Carolina Supreme Court cases in 1961 affirmed trespass convictions, and confirmed that merchants may choose their customers and ask that those who refused to leave the premises be prosecuted.  

Therefore, the Fayetteville Police Department was lawful in arresting sit-in demonstrators who refused to leave private places of businesses after being asked by the owner or by police officers. However, a (February 10) 1963 U.S. Supreme Court Case, Edwards v. South Carolina, found that arrests of 187 students in public areas were not constitutional. The students did not block the flow of pedestrian traffic and were not in a private place of business, and were therefore able to protest peacefully. Hence, arrests made by Fayetteville Police were lawful when requested by the business owner if a demonstrator refused to leave their place of business. Arrests were not lawful when people were demonstrating peacefully on public property, providing they were not blocking traffic.

There were instances when it appears that Chief Worrell attempted to break the momentum of the demonstrations. One such instance occurred on May 22, when Worrell requested that at least one theater close its ticket windows for the rest of the day. Worrell may have asked all four downtown theaters to do so, as all four closed for the day. It remains unclear why Worrell asked the theaters to close. He may have panicked due to the fact that May 22 brought approximately one thousand demonstrators downtown. Worrell’s request may have simply been an effort to maintain order, not necessarily any type of attempt to preserve segregated facilities.

Protestors and black citizens did encounter abusive or at least intimidating treatment from police officers on some occasions. Sylvia X. Allen recalled an evening in
1963 when the City Council met with members of the community to discuss racial problems in the city. Allen looked out the window onto Hay Street and saw police lined up on one side of the street in riot gear. “I turned back to the City Council and called it to their attention . . . They were provoking anything that was going on that should not be . . . It showed their attitude right there. So that a good many of the arrests were based on that kind of attitude.”

It appears likely that the police were in fact attempting to intimidate the people who had gathered to discuss solutions to some of the racial concerns affecting the city. Like many other blacks connected with the movement in Fayetteville, Allen claimed to have had a “respectable” relationship with Police Chief Worrell. Nonetheless, she did not reject the possibility that Worrell had authorized this method of intimidation.

Intimidation by police turned into abuse in some rare cases in Fayetteville. There was a stir in the crowd of protestors outside of the Carolina Soda Shoppe on Hay Street in June 1963. Hector McEachern, a reporter for The Fayetteville Observer, began to run across the street to observe what was occurring. Fellow reporter Pat Reese recalled the police response: “Because he was black, they grabbed him—the police did—and threw him down on the street, and whisked him away to jail. And I had to go down and get him out of jail. They didn’t know he was a reporter.”

Worrell’s handling of protests in downtown Fayetteville was much more lawful and fair than that of many other police leaders in the South. The most glaring example of inappropriate conduct was the reaction of Birmingham Public Safety Commissioner Theophilus Eugene “Bull” Connor. During the 1961 Freedom Rides, Connor had
promised members of the Ku Klux Klan fifteen minutes to attack the riders. Several of the riders were beaten with lead pipes, baseball bats and bicycle chains. There were apparently no police in sight during the attack. Such blatant disregard for the integrity of the law did not occur in Fayetteville. While police arrested several blacks for trespassing and assault, white people also faced arrest in many cases in which they had broken the law during the demonstrations. For example, on the chaotic evening of June 14, a white soldier, David G. Proctor, was charged with assaulting Albert Jasper Jones, a black youth who was not even participating in the demonstrations. Police also arrested another white man that night, Albert Kendell Davis, for profanity and carrying a concealed weapon. Obviously Worrell did not make these arrests himself, but they indicate there was no intimation to police that whites should be considered above the law during the demonstrations. As for when tear gas was thrown on the evening of June 14, it was not an effort simply to curtail demonstrations, but an effort to disperse crowds on the verge of violence. Police threw the tear gas at a crowd comprised of blacks and whites.

Following the chaotic night of June 14, Worrell exhorted city officials to enact changes. He recognized that with the current practices in place, protests were only going to increase in number, and so would the reaction to them. Although the protests had been nonviolent, the reaction to them was becoming more difficult to control. Therefore a decision needed to be made by city leadership as to whether more aggressive police action should be taken or more aggressive stances toward desegregation should be promoted. At a June 17 meeting of twenty-five prominent members of the community,
including City Council members and the Mayor, Worrell warned that “there will be blood shed on the streets of Fayetteville unless something is done immediately.” With this statement, Worrell placed the pressure squarely where it belonged: on the business owners, the City Council, and the Mayor.

At any point in 1963, business owners in Fayetteville could have chosen to integrate service at their lunch counters. Simple prejudice provides one explanation for the slow pace of desegregation. But prejudice is a mindset and is therefore very difficult to prove. This is especially true based on the reality that many business owners professed to be willing to integrate but social forces prevented them. Klearchos “Cleo” Katsoudas, who owned the U.S. Cafe in downtown Fayetteville, provides an example. Katsoudas was born in Greece, and spent four years in Cuba from 1935 to 1939. His reaction to segregated practices in the South sheds light on the way in which foreigners (and immigrants) may have perceived the American South. “When I was in Cuba, I not see those things. Time I come in United States, they not let the black people in restaurants or the hotels. I said ‘What happened? We have Hitler here?’”

Katsoudas had not been brought up in the South, and therefore was not a staunch defender of some of its racial practices. However, he was operating his business in an area in which tradition meant discrimination in service and hiring practices. Katsoudas claimed that he personally wanted to integrate his lunch counter, but was concerned that his waitresses would quit. He was also afraid that he would lose business if other eating establishments did not desegregate as well. A number of business owners in the South were concerned that allowing blacks to sit with whites would cause them to lose business,
as whites would avoid their establishments. Katsoudas apparently attempted to promote integration during his time as president of the Fayetteville Area Restaurant Association in 1963. “I was agreed to open up the place, but we have three restaurant owners—two Greeks and one American—no want. They don’t want to let the black people come.”

Perhaps Katsoudas was in favor of integration. Yet there is little evidence that he attempted to actively encourage other eating establishments to accept integration. Like so many other business leaders and civic leaders in Fayetteville at the time, Katsoudas was not willing to take a leadership role in effecting desegregation. He was willing to integrate only if the restaurants acted in unison. It was a cyclical problem, because other restaurant owners took the same approach. But the restaurant owners were aware that something had to change, as the continuing demonstrations were causing a sharp decline in business. There were undoubtedly some whites who avoided the segregated restaurants out of sympathy for the demonstrator’s concerns. A more realistic reason for the decrease in business was due to the fact that white customers did not want to get caught up in the hectic scenes downtown. Katsoudas estimated that he lost $20,000 of business due to the 1963 demonstrations. Therefore, the demonstrators were putting not only moral pressure on the restaurant owners, but economic pressure as well.

Katsoudas chose to leave the pressure in Fayetteville, and took a trip to his native Greece in the summer of 1963, leaving management of the cafe to his nephew. Although Katsoudas had not taken advantage of an opportunity to provide leadership for integration, he nonetheless did not explicitly promote segregated practices. But his successor as president of the Fayetteville Area Restaurant Association was a staunch
segregationist. At a June 16 meeting of twenty-five of Fayetteville’s most prominent
citizens, including Mayor Clark and City Councilmen Ted Rhodes, Gene Plummer and
Luther Packer, Restaurant Association president William Crawley was outspoken in his
opposition to integration. John Geotas, co-owner of the Dixie Diner, also defended
segregation at the meeting. He told the group that integrating the Dixie Diner would
bring economic catastrophe for his restaurant unless all other restaurants chose to
integrate. Although Geotas appeared to have preferred segregation, he seemed willing
to make the change if all other restaurants agreed. Crawley was clearly in a position to
provide leadership in encouraging all restaurants to integrate; obviously, that did not
occur. Leadership needed to come from elsewhere.

On the afternoon of June 14, the Fayetteville City Council voted unanimously to
instruct police to make arrests for violations in the law during demonstrations. City
Manager Gilbert Ray argued that “a firmer hand has got to be used in dealing with them
[demonstrations] than there was in the beginning.” At least forty seven arrests had
already been made, but 140 additional arrests were made on June 14. Making mass
arrests only stiffened the resolve of the demonstrators and did not have the effect that Ray
had hoped. City Attorney J.O. Tally, Jr. pointed out that mass arrests in Charlotte,
Winston-Salem, Raleigh and Kinston had been ineffective. The most telling statement
at the meeting was made by Councilman Ted Rhodes: “It looks as though things will get
worse before they get better, but that should not be the case here. After waiting 100
years, as one demonstrator said yesterday, ‘We want our freedom now.’ For his or
anyone else’s information, a few more weeks or months to work out a difficult matter
will really not make a difference, as long as both sides are willing to talk and listen to the problem involved . . .”

Rhodes’s comments show an utter lack of empathy for the conditions of blacks in the segregated city. African Americans had been told to be patient for their rights for years. The intensification of the sit-in movement in Fayetteville, Greensboro, Raleigh, and other cities in North Carolina and throughout the nation was a signal that blacks were willing to wait no longer. Martin Luther King, Jr. made these sentiments clear in his book *Why We Can’t Wait*. The book was aimed at people like Rhodes who claimed they could not see why blacks just could not be patient. In essence, King argued that people like Rhodes were “asking the Negro to accept half the loaf and to pay for that half by waiting willingly for the other half to be distributed in crumbs over a hard and protracted winter of injustice . . .”

Yet, Rhodes was not a segregationist by any means. At least publicly, none of the City Council members appear to have been strictly opposed to integration. Councilmen Luther Packer and Charles Holt attempted to avoid conflict. On June 11, 1963 Holt claimed that “I don’t think that I, as an elected official, should dictate to a business what its position should be.” Holt recalled that he was not opposed to integration, but he and other council members were taking a cautious approach. “We tried not to do anything that would polarize each side or turn one side against the other. I think it paid off in the long run, even though from the black people’s point of view we weren’t moving fast enough, and from the white’s point of view we were too fast.”
Councilmen Ted Rhodes and Eugene Plummer favored a resolution offered by businessman Monroe Evans that would urge the eating places in Fayetteville to integrate. At the aforementioned June 17 meeting, Plummer spoke out in favor of immediate integration. Rhodes supported a resolution for City Council members and business leaders to patronize integrated restaurants and encourage other citizens to do the same. Rhodes was even more forceful when he later told restaurant owners that “failure to act would bring disgrace to the community.”

Mayor Wilbur Clark was not as forthcoming in supporting integration efforts as Plummer and Rhodes. Clark had pressure coming from conservative businessmen and whites in the community, and from the protestors. He hoped that extensive conflict could be avoided. He recalled a moment when a group of whites came down Person Street, heading toward the area on Hay Street where the protests were occurring. A white man asked Clark, “Can’t we march too?” Clark responded by saying, “You can march all you want to. You just turn your butt around and go the other way. Go in the other direction.” Clark’s comment demonstrated the concern that he and other city officials had concerning clashes between the races.

The demonstrations had proven that blacks were unwilling to continue to accept segregated practices. Clark maintained that “I can not let my personal feelings enter into these matters which so vitally affect the entire community.” Clark’s statement was careful not to address what his “personal feelings” were. Nonetheless, the fact that these matters did have such a vital importance on the community suggests that Clark should have provided greater leadership. In late June, Clark stated that he was “neither an
integrationist nor a segregationist . . . I am having to go down the middle.”

This statement hardly suggested great leadership. Clark later admitted that city leadership had no established plan for dealing with racial conflict. Therefore, they had to respond to events as they occurred with no firm policy. The continuation of demonstrations through late June and into July represented the failure of city and business leadership to enact changes that the demonstrators addressed. Mayor Clark, the City Council, and business leaders could no longer “go down the middle.” Therefore, external influence from outside the city would be critical in steering their positions.

Responding to events in Raleigh, Greensboro, Fayetteville, and other cities in North Carolina, Governor Terry Sanford delivered a very important radio and television address on June 18 that called for a halt to mass demonstrations. Sanford called for black leaders to meet with him in Raleigh the following week to discuss racial concerns. The speech led to a week-long moratorium on demonstrations in Fayetteville. NAACP field secretary Charles McLean told Sanford he would use his influence to temporarily curb the demonstrations. Willis McLeod verified that the moratorium was in effect: “In response to an appeal made by state officers of the NAACP we have discontinued demonstrations to force pending the outcome of the meeting of the governor with demonstration leaders next Tuesday [June 25].” This was one of the rare instances in which state leadership had a significant influence on local desegregation strategy. It also attested to the organized nature of the demonstrations which were not merely makeshift events that could not be controlled by local leadership.
Wilbur Clark was apparently relieved by Sanford’s speech. Events in Fayetteville in the weeks leading to Sanford’s speech indicated that eventual integration was inevitable. Whereas Sanford benefited from the civil rights stand of President Kennedy, Clark was similarly looking for leadership from the Governor that would influence his somewhat murky stance on local demonstrations. Clark stated that Sanford’s speech had been needed from “people in high places.” At the time of the speech, Fayetteville was one of the cities that desperately needed a calming influence. The tensions that occurred in Fayetteville on June 14 had convinced Sanford to send forty State Highway Patrolmen into the city, at the request of Mayor Clark.

The relatively liberal Sanford was more popular in Fayetteville than might be expected. He was a World War II veteran, which gave him increased support in a military-influenced city. He practiced law and lived in Fayetteville from 1948 until his election as governor in 1960. His apartment was on the ninth floor of the First Citizens Bank building on Hay Street, which overlooked the Market House, the historic symbol of downtown Fayetteville. Sanford chose the Market House as the site at which to announce his candidacy for governor in 1960. A crowd of 5,000 gathered to hear Sanford’s speech on February 4, known in Fayetteville as “Terry Sanford Day.”

February 4, 1960 was only three days after the famous sit-ins in Greensboro, and only six days before that tactic was attempted in Fayetteville. Ironically, the sit-ins throughout the state inspired some angry whites to support Sanford’s principal opponent, I. Beverly Lake. In the gubernatorial campaign in 1960, Sanford avoided the topic of civil rights where possible, but abhorred the blatant racism in the Lake campaign. Primarily in
response to Lake’s desperate attempt to spread pamphlets in Raleigh appealing to racial prejudices, Sanford stated that “I am confident that the people of North Carolina are not willing to be led to destruction by a Pied Piper of prejudice.”

Sanford had made it clear in Fayetteville and other places during his campaign that he was not a staunch supporter of segregation. Nonetheless, when he became governor, he had no comprehensive plan to change segregated practices in North Carolina. By June 1963, he had come to a point in which he had to adapt a strategy as events unfolded. Much as the case was with President Kennedy, the increased protests and violent reaction to them forced Sanford to take action, even if that simply meant rhetoric aimed at influencing mayors, city councils, and businessmen in the state to move toward integration.

At the June 25, 1963 meeting with approximately 150 black leaders in Raleigh, Terry Sanford asserted that the “device of the mass demonstration has largely served its purpose in North Carolina. It got across your message and the urgency that had not been fully understood prior to then.” Sanford was essentially asking African Americans to substitute demonstrations for negotiations. His show of concern may have been sincere, but he miscalculated the significance of the demonstrations throughout the state, arguing that the strategy had “reached the point of diminishing returns in its latter days, destroying good will, creating resentment, losing friends, and not influencing people.” Protestors in Fayetteville and other North Carolina cities, and the South in general had come to realize that the demonstrations were the one strategy that truly were influencing people.
On July 3, Sanford made a statement at a meeting of the North Carolina Good Neighbor Council, an organization that the Governor had created in January 1963 largely to initiate the end of discriminatory practices throughout the state.\textsuperscript{220} At the meeting, Sanford expressed hope that private employers would review their segregation policies and integrate willingly. “In North Carolina, we will do this, not in token degree because it is forced by law, but in full and fair degree because it is the proper and decent thing to do.”\textsuperscript{221} Sanford was ostensibly appealing to the morality of business owners. Various civil rights leaders had tried moral appeal for decades with few tangible results. The sit-ins, sit-downs, boycotts, and other forms of direct action were not merely appeals to morality, but a reaction to the general failure of that approach.

Nonetheless, Sanford had set an example for business leaders throughout North Carolina by urging the end to segregated facilities and an end to discriminatory hiring practices. He also showed his support in less obvious ways such as not reprimanding Fayetteville State President Rudolph Jones for basically allowing the students to carry on with the demonstrations. Since Fayetteville State was a state-funded institution, Sanford could have broken the momentum of the student movement by forcing Jones to take disciplinary action against the students. The response in Fayetteville to Sanford’s cautious leadership in attempting to eliminate segregation was mixed. One day after Sanford’s June 18 address, Mayor Wilbur Clark appointed a Bi-Racial Committee to study the objectives of the black protesters and to persuade businessmen to make changes in their policies. It should be noted that the committee consisted of five whites and four blacks, which demonstrated the preference given to white members.\textsuperscript{222} Mysteriously
absent from the group were any student representatives from Fayetteville State, the group
most responsible for bringing racial inequities to the forefront in 1963.

The Bi-Racial Committee was nonetheless effective, as will be demonstrated
later. This was largely due to the leadership of J.W. Pate, Jr., a local white businessman
and former City Council member. Willis McLeod recollected that among prominent
whites, Pate was perhaps the strongest supporter of improving conditions for blacks in the
city. “J.W. Pate was a real friend of ours,” McLeod recalled. “J.W. Pate recognized that
the progress of the city of Fayetteville depended on how well leadership responded to a
need for tremendous attitude change…in terms of people of different races living and
coexisting together.” According to Reverend Aaron Johnson, Pate did not merely pay
“lip service” to the movement. He legitimately attempted to promote integration, and
likely even influenced the Mayor’s position in that regard. Several members of the
protest movement regarded Pate as the most important white in the community in
promoting desegregation in Fayetteville.

As a former member of the City Council, Pate had more influence on city leaders
than other businessmen. He was involved in real estate, serving as the “controller” for
Barrett Realty. Perhaps more importantly, Pate was part-owner of the integrated Kleha’s
Steak House. Therefore, Pate’s restaurant stood as a model for others who were
contemplating integrating service at their restaurant. As a private businessman, Pate
was under no official pressure to serve on the Bi-Racial Committee or concern himself
with race relations in the city. Yet he appears to have provided more positive leadership
in improving race relations in the city than the Mayor or City Council members.
CHAPTER 4: SECURING GOALS

Despite the creation of the Mayor’s Bi-Racial Committee on June 19, demonstrations resumed in earnest on June 28 in an effort to place additional pressure on the Committee to enact changes. By July 9, the demonstrations took on a new character as rising numbers of servicemen became involved. John F. Kennedy’s June 11 speech had indicated to black soldiers that their Commander-in-Chief supported their goals, if not their means. Kennedy made the connection between the struggle for equality and democracy, which could be promoted by the military: “And when Americans are sent to Vietnam or West Berlin, we do not ask for whites only. It ought to be possible, therefore, for American students of any color to attend any public institution they select without having to be backed up by troops.” The message was clear; if blacks could serve in the military, they should be able to be served at a lunch counter or attend a public institution.

Soldiers played virtually no role in the early demonstrations in May and June of 1963 in Fayetteville. Servicemen were first reported at protests in downtown Fayetteville on July 9. Protest leaders said that ten GIs participated, seven black and three white. The number of military protestors increased over the next week. A book published by the North Carolina Mayors’ Co-operating Committee in 1964 estimated that (in July) demonstrations were comprised of about fifty percent military servicemen and fifty
percent civilians (including students), although that number seemed to be highly exaggerated. *The Fayetteville Observer* estimated that twenty-five of the approximately one hundred protestors on June 10 were servicemen, while police estimated that fifty of the two hundred protestors on July 12 were soldiers. The newspaper and police estimates appear more accurate and are closer to student protest leader Willis McLeod’s estimate of twenty percent during the height of involvement from Fort Bragg soldiers.

The actual number of servicemen was not as important as their symbolic value. Restaurant, theater and hotel owners were forced to face the ironic situation of denying service to those who were defending their nation. Earlier protest signs had general civil rights slogans, but by early July many of the signs had military related messages, such as “GI’s: We’ve fought; now let’s march for civil rights,” “GI’s and students unite for civil rights,” “First Korea—Now Fayetteville,” and “Ft. Bragg is open—Why not Fayetteville?” The signs were carefully contemplated. The soldiers were attempting to portray segregated businesses as unpatriotic. The sign that read “First Korea—Now Fayetteville” appeared to be a slap in the face of those who equated communism with civil rights demonstrations. Whether the sign was intended in this manner or not is unclear, but it seemed to suggest that segregation was an evil that needed to be fought just like communism.

Another pattern that emerged in July was the expanding role of local churches. Haymount Presbyterian Church (which was one block from downtown Hay Street) became a base point for at least three demonstrations on July 9, 11, and 12. Mt. Sinai Baptist Church across the street from Fayetteville State on Murchison Road, had been a
meeting place since early in the demonstrations and continued to be throughout the
summer. On July 14, Reverend George W. Dudley, president of the Rocky Mount
Voters and Improvement League spoke at First Baptist Church on Moore Street and
stated that “the demonstrations must continue until we have our full and complete rights
and we’re not going to stop until that day comes.” After Dudley’s speech, about six
hundred blacks marched to City Hall for a brief hymn-singing.

Churches also played a critical role in providing bail money for demonstrators
that had been arrested. The primary churches offering support included First Baptist, Mt.
Sinai Baptist, Evans AME Zion Church and Haymount Presbyterian Church. Yet the role
that churches played in the Fayetteville protest movement should not be overstated.
While they supplied moral encouragement and bail money, they were not as crucial as
student groups at Fayetteville State. In many cases, they worked as a supplement to the
student-led movement. Of course, there was a high degree of overlap among the
institutions. Many Fayetteville State students attended one of these churches. Yet, the
majority of members of the congregations that participated often did so in a “behind the
scenes” role, such as providing bail money.

Nonetheless, the spiritual background within the student-led movement was
pervasive. Church teachings coincided with nonviolent methods. Current Fayetteville
NAACP Vice President James E. Buxton explained the connection between religious
teachings and nonviolence: “That was in our teachings at church. No matter what they
said to you, whatever they did to you, you had to keep going.” Demonstrators also
sang religious songs while they were protesting. Some of the most common songs that
demonstrators sang were “Precious Lord, Take My Hand,” “Swing Low Sweet Chariot,” “We Shall Overcome,” and “On My Way to Freedom Land.” One of the most important verses was often repeated as demonstrators walked downtown in an effort to get others to join:

“Don’t you want to go to that land, where I’m bound, where I’m bound? There’s freedom in that land, where I’m bound, where I’m bound. There’s justice in that land, where I’m bound, where I’m bound. There’s equality in that land, where I’m bound, where I’m bound.”

Individuals in the black community also provided bail money for the demonstrators, whether directly or through the NAACP. This was a way in which blacks in the community could support the movement without fear of losing their jobs. It was also a reflection of the way in which some people saw religion connected with the inherent morality of the movement. Some of the primary contributors included Marion C. George, Dr. George Butler, Dr. Herbert Vick, Reverend C.R. Edwards, and local NAACP leader Sippio Burton. Vick remembered believing that “it was my responsibility. If I went to school and got an education, I should go and fight for the rest of them to do the same.” Like the Fayetteville State students, Vick was connecting his educational background with the movement.

Therefore, there were a variety of individual and organizational forces coming together in July 1963 to put pressure on local business owners to integrate their facilities. The effective end to major desegregation demonstrations in Fayetteville came on July 19 when the local NAACP Negotiating Committee agreed to a five-point plan presented by the Mayor’s Bi-Racial Committee, which included the following conditions:
1. The Mayor’s Bi-Racial Committee will become a continuing steering committee.
2. The Committee will report weekly to the local NAACP, to the City Council, Mayor, and to the community.
3. Efforts will be made for increasing employment of blacks in local department and variety stores.
4. Demonstrations will cease provided that none of the businesses return to segregated or discriminatory practices. In such cases, the Bi-Racial Committee and the NAACP Negotiating Committee will be given a reasonable opportunity to solve the situation prior to demonstrations being renewed.
5. No city or county agencies will take action against employees “who participate in this movement for human rights.”

In response to the agreement, Mayor Wilbur Clark commented, “I do not say that we have totally solved this problem, as matters of concern that have been hundreds of years developing cannot be completely wiped away in a few months, or even a few years.” Clark’s July 19th analysis showed the reality of the situation, considering the plan did not address all of the problems the demonstrators were attempting to solve. J.W. Pate warned that the greatest danger of the agreement was in “over-celebration.” He realized that there still remained stalwarts of segregation in the city. Nearly three months later, on October 2, Pate and other members of the Mayor’s Bi-Racial Committee reported to a group of Fayetteville State College students at Seabrook Auditorium on some of the progress that had been made. All four downtown theaters and the majority of restaurants, hotels and motels had been desegregated. The Cumberland County Health Department removed segregation signs and Cape Fear Valley Hospital integrated its dining rooms. At the meeting, *Fayetteville Observer* writer David Prather mentioned that the local NAACP had questioned segregated practices at the privately owned Highsmith Memorial Hospital. However, the hospital converted to an integrated public institution on Nov. 15. The list of businesses that remained segregated by late 1963 included the
Royal, the Rainbo Restaurant, the Carolina Soda Shoppe, the Deluxe Cafe, the U.S. Cafe, and the Dixie Diner. Pate told the students “Our only weapons are words and persuasion.” Yet at this point, persuasion was powerful, as the segregated businesses became the exception rather than the norm.

Business owners and city leaders began to sense the inevitability of the end of segregated practices in the city. This was largely due to the efforts of Fayetteville State students and other members of the protest movement, but also due to changing racial views in America. Former City Councilman Charles Holt recalled that “it was obvious to anyone that knew anything about history, politics on a national scale, and the things that America stood for—that segregation was not a part of that. It was going to change one way or another.”

Further inspiration for the remaining segregated businesses to integrate came when Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara issued Department of Defense Directive 5120.36 on July 26, 1963, which stated: “Every military commander has the responsibility to oppose discriminatory practices affecting his men and their dependents and to foster equal opportunity for them, not only in areas under his immediate control but also in nearby communities where they may live or gather in off-duty hours.” The July 26 Directive, combined with the Report of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights supported the option of placing cities that practiced “relentless discrimination” off-limits to military personnel.

Mayor Clark responded to the directive, claiming that “Fayetteville will not be placed off-limits as this community does not fall in the category of the order.” However,
he further stated, “Now, about individual places of business I am not sure. I would be glad to discuss with any local businessman on an individual basis his particular situation.” While Fayetteville was never placed off-limits to Fort Bragg soldiers, the directive did inspire further voluntary integration, including all four downtown theaters beginning in late July 1963.

By the end of 1963, systematic segregation in Fayetteville no longer existed. By June 1964, the following examples of desegregation had taken place:

- Five lunch counters, twenty-two restaurants and cafeterias, nine hotels and motels, and all theaters integrated services.
- The Veterans Administration Hospital and the United States Post Office desegregated services, facilities, and hiring practices.
- City employment was open to all on a merit basis. The Public Works Commission had one clerical worker.
- Two bowling lanes, one miniature golf course, and one golf range desegregated.
- Eleven variety and department stores had integrated hiring practices, all of which had black sales clerks.
- The public library was open to whites and blacks.
- Cape Fear Valley Hospital was completely desegregated, including its dining rooms.
- The public swimming pool was desegregated.
- Over fifty black students were enrolled in formerly all-white schools.
The final surge to end segregation in places of business in Fayetteville came with passage of the Civil Rights Act, which was passed in the Senate on June 19, 1964 and signed into law by President Lyndon B. Johnson on July 2, 1964. The approval in the Senate came exactly one year after John F. Kennedy had proposed the legislation, arguing that it should be enacted “not merely for reasons of economic efficiency, world diplomacy and domestic tranquility—but above all because it is right.” Violence flared in some cities as blacks attempted to test the new law. For example, in Atlanta, Georgia, restaurant operator Tommy Maddox told three black ministers to “get off my property,” while he pointed a pistol at them on July 3. The same day in Cambridge, Maryland, Dizzyland Restaurant operator Robert Feisenfield was arrested and charged with assault and battery after shoving a black integration leader who sought service. While violent reaction was generally rare, other forms of protesting the law were more common. In Durham, Adcock’s Restaurant closed for the day after the legislation was passed, as owner Frank Adcock claimed he was “not in agreement with the law.” His sentiments were echoed by Williamston, North Carolina theater operator James W. Watts, who also closed his business for the day “due to unsettled conditions.”

The response was much calmer in Fayetteville, as the remaining segregated businesses in Fayetteville integrated with little resistance. The Fayetteville Area Restaurant Association issued a statement that declared that “We are loyal Americans and we will obey the law.” The statement also maintained that “We are not in favor of the Civil Rights Act and we wish it had not been voted.” The amenable response of the Fayetteville Restaurant Association demonstrated more than just a commitment to the
federal government. It also revealed that business owners in the city realized that the
days of segregation were coming to an end. This reality had been brought to them first
hand by Fayetteville State students and later many other members of the community.
The Civil Rights Act of 1964 merely crystallized this realization.

Vestiges of segregation remained in Fayetteville after passage of the Civil Rights
Act. A lot of the problems in the mid-1960s in downtown Fayetteville came from bar
owners not wanting blacks to enter their bars. Mayor Monroe Evans used his control
over city services to address this problem. The city sent notices to all the bars that if they
were not integrated, the city would not allow the police to go into the bars to settle
disputes and fights. Evans argued that “They would just tear the place up . . . and one got
torn up.” This risky approach seemed to work, indicating the power of the Mayor and
the City Council to enact changes. Mayor Evans also forcefully promoted to the City
Council to pass a resolution to remove a Ku Klux Klan sign on the edge of the city. The
sign, which read “Join and Support the United Klans of America, Inc. Help Fight
Communism and Integration, Welcome to Fayetteville,” was removed in 1967.

As racial segregation began to crumble in Fayetteville, so did the prominence of
prejudiced attitudes among many citizens. Clearly, many citizens in the city and the
nation in general still hold racist views. Nonetheless, as the legitimacy of racial
segregation deteriorated, several whites began to recognize the reasons for why blacks
had insisted so vehemently on equality. Nellie Warren, from neighboring Cedar Creek,
called that “when they would assert their rights, [whites] thought they were being
pushy. It was shallow of us.” Ultimately Warren acknowledged that the protest
movement in Fayetteville in 1963 “really made our area better.”

Over twenty years after the 1963 protest movement, former Fayetteville NAACP
President Sippio Burton analyzed the impact of some of the changes that had occurred in
race relations in Fayetteville. Burton’s words may be as true now as they were in 1989:
“We’re proud of Fayetteville,” he claimed. “The city has come a long way. We’ve
worked hard to improve Fayetteville, but we still have a long way to go.”
CONCLUSION

The students that led the protest movement in Fayetteville, North Carolina viewed their involvement as part of their education. Their education had prepared them for a variety of jobs that they could not hold in a segregated society. Whereas the majority of Fayetteville State (Teachers) College professors did not actively promote the demonstrations, they instilled within their students a desire to improve their own conditions in society. Willis McLeod recognized the connection between education and the African American struggle for civil rights: “The basis of the movement itself lies in the fact that we are being more exposed to the educational process. Thus we are more critical in our thinking and, in view of the handicaps that plagued prior Negro generations, we are determined to get the most out of life.”

Local leadership inspired the movement for integration of public accommodations and improvements in job opportunities in Fayetteville during the summer of 1963. The key players in the movement were not Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., Stokely Carmichael, A. Philip Randolph, or even Floyd McKissick, Charles McLean or Ella Baker. Rather, the impetus for change came from local leaders such as Willis McLeod, Stanley Johnson, James Herring, Aaron Johnson, C.R. Edwards, and Sippio Burton. Makeshift organizations from Fayetteville State (Teachers) College provided the
structure for the local movement. Mayor Clark later recalled that the changing race relations in Fayetteville were due to the good judgment from all sides, beginning with the Fayetteville State protestors. “I can’t say too much good about those students, because they conducted themselves in a very proper manner. They set out to do a certain job of demonstrating and making demands. And that was all right because segregation, to the extent that is was being invoked in those days, was not right, and neither is it now.”

The student-led protest movement in Fayetteville was part of a larger statewide and national movement which helped bring about tangible changes in local and national laws. Equally importantly, the 1963 protest movement in Fayetteville helped foster a qualitative change in personal attitudes regarding race in the city. Additional scholarly research could be useful in determining the long-term impact of the 1963 protest movement on downtown Fayetteville, and on race relations in general in the city. This research could reveal the social and historical factors that have made Fayetteville one of the least segregated cities in the United States. The integration of theaters, restaurants and other places of business in the city may have provided the original impetus for increased integration in schools, housing, and better employment opportunities for African Americans.

The summer of 1963 was a defining moment in the history of the city of Fayetteville. Mayor Wilbur Clark liked to refer to Fayetteville as “The city of history and progress.” Due to their education, integration demonstrators in Fayetteville seemed discontented with such a phrase. They were more concerned with a “future of progress,” one that is still gaining momentum in the eastern North Carolina city today.
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EPILOGUE

Education played a major role in the initiation of the Fayetteville direct-action movement in 1963. Protest leaders viewed their involvement as part of a civic duty while others perceived their involvement as a means of opening opportunities being denied to blacks in the 1960s segregated South. Several leaders of that movement pursued careers in education or religion, while others became active in politics in North Carolina. The organizational skills that protest leaders learned and put into practice in 1963 proved valuable throughout their careers. The occupations they pursued allowed them to remain involved in the struggle for equality that continues to this day. Regardless of which career path they chose, the events of 1963 played a crucial role in shaping their lives. Protest participants had created drastic changes in race relations in Fayetteville in 1963. The effect of their efforts was evidenced by their later accomplishments, which reflected the changes in society they had helped create. As Marvin Lucas noted, the “revolution became an evolution.”

Stanley Johnson was arguably the most important individual in providing the initial impetus for the direct-action protest movement in Fayetteville, North Carolina in 1963. He was a very calculating, methodical leader, as evidenced in his leadership of the initial “Demonstration Committee.” As the unofficial spokesperson of the committee, Johnson was responsible for addressing concerns over strategy, and learned methods for getting groups of people to work together. The leadership qualities that Johnson
displayed in 1963 have translated well to his career as a historian and teacher. After graduating from Fayetteville State College in 1963, Johnson went on to earn a Master’s degree from Indiana University and a Ph.D. from the University of North Texas. He was a teacher at public and private schools in California and Maryland, and at Los Angeles South West College.4

In 1998, Johnson returned to the place that he influenced so greatly in 1963. He has been a history professor at Fayetteville State University since 1998. His accomplishments included serving as Chairperson of the Faculty Senate and coordinator of the Fayetteville State University Social Studies Education program.5 Johnson is a rare person who is not only a writer and teacher of history, but also a man who helped create history in his community.

Another man who had a critical impact on the protest movement in 1963 and eventually returned to Fayetteville State was Willis McLeod. McLeod was president of the student government when he was a senior at Fayetteville State. As president-elect of the student body in the summer of 1963, McLeod was in a position to lead the protest movement, a responsibility he eagerly accepted. McLeod recalled his leadership in 1963 as “an awesome responsibility.”6 McLeod’s role in the protest movement prepared him for the tremendous responsibilities he encountered in a long career in education, which began as a mathematics teacher in Richmond, Virginia in 1964. He received his Masters and Doctoral degrees from the University of Virginia. One of the highlights of McLeod’s career included a position as Superintendent of Richland County School District One in Columbia, South Carolina. McLeod returned to Fayetteville in 1995 to become the first
alumnus chancellor at Fayetteville State University, a position he held until his retirement in 2003.\textsuperscript{7}

McLeod points to his involvement in the protest movement in 1963 as an experience which gave him the confidence to achieve such remarkable accomplishments. He contends that “I probably would not have had the confidence to do all those things to the level of success that I did, had I not had that kind of experience [leading the protest movement]. You know, that was learning life. That was what real learning is all about.”\textsuperscript{8} At Fayetteville State University, McLeod was able to encourage that type of learning in the 1960s but also in the 1990s and into the new millennium. In one of his first statements after being named as chancellor, McLeod stated that the goal at Fayetteville State was to produce graduates who understood “that he/she only has control of his/her destiny; that he/she only can restore our communities and build our families; that he/she only can educate our next generation; and that the ultimate greatness of their university lies in their commitment to reach back and give back. It is only then that we can say they are truly educated.”\textsuperscript{9} Hence, McLeod’s vision of education had not fundamentally changed since he was a college student; he recognized the importance of applying education to create a better society.

A number of Fayetteville civil rights protest participants went on to have successful careers in education, while others came to political prominence. Marvin Lucas enjoyed success in both areas. As an educator, Lucas experienced the transition from segregated to integrated schools. Lucas was one of two black teachers at Cape Fear High School in the late 1960s, and witnessed the absorption of black students from E.A.
Armstrong High School. He became an assistant principal at Hope Mills Middle School in 1970, and from 1972 to 1975 served as assistant principal at Southview High School. His next assignment was truly a testament to how rapidly race relations were changing in Fayetteville. In 1975, Lucas was named principal at Sherwood Park Elementary School, a school which was comprised almost entirely of white students.

Lucas did not give up his career in education to pursue political ambitions. In 1977, he was elected to the Spring Lake Board of Alderman, a position he would hold for twenty years. During these years, Lucas returned to Hope Mills Middle School to become principal from 1981 to 1990. He then became principal at Pine Forest High School from 1990 to 1998. The dual responsibilities of educator and politician became too much to balance when Lucas became the Mayor of Spring Lake in 1997. His political career culminated in his election to the North Carolina General Assembly in 2001 to represent Cumberland County’s District 42, a position he holds to this day.

The leadership that Marvin Lucas displayed in the protest movement in 1963 played a crucial role in his later accomplishments. As a critical member in the Fayetteville State-led protest leadership, Lucas learned how to organize, but more importantly, inspire people for a worthy cause. Lucas eventually utilized these skills as an educator and politician. His impressive accomplishments attest to the realization of many of the goals sought by the Fayetteville State protestors. In 1963, he helped create a society in which he could realize the remarkable feats that he eventually accomplished. He claims he owes a lot of his success to the moral training that his parents provided, and from a quality education at Fayetteville State Teachers College. Like many other early
1960s Fayetteville State graduates, Lucas’s education was not only a cause, but also an
effect, of his involvement in the direct-action movement in downtown Fayetteville.

Several factors led to Marvin Lucas’s emergence into political prominence in
Cumberland County. One of those factors involved the increasing number of black
registered voters in the county. Although voting rights were not a primary goal of the
demonstrators in Fayetteville in 1963, the protest movement created momentum for
increasing black voter registration in Fayetteville and Cumberland County. In 1960, only
5,097 “non-whites” were registered to vote in Cumberland County. Therefore, only 24.3
percent of the eligible “non-white” population in Cumberland County was registered to
vote, falling under the state average of 31.2 percent for “non-whites” (White voter
registration in Cumberland County in 1960 was only at 40.2 percent).14 The number of
“non-white” registered voters actually decreased by 1963, when only 4,831 were
registered.15

However, by May 1965, before the passage of the 1965 Voting Rights Act, the
number of “non-whites” registered to vote in Cumberland County had increased to
6,803.16 The increase in “non-white” voter registration from 1963 to 1965 was due to a
variety of factors, not the least of which was a changing consciousness among blacks in
Fayetteville that had been largely inspired by the local protest movement in 1963. The
Reverend C.R. Edwards believed that many blacks had not registered to vote in the early
1960s because of segregation. He stated that “Not too many people here in North
Carolina were intimidated. That was more a problem in the Deep South. Here it was
more a matter of self-esteem.”17 The changes that members of the 1963 protest
movement in Fayetteville had helped create had certainly helped bolster the “self-esteem” of the participants and black citizens in the city in general.

Although encouraging blacks to register and vote was the primary concern in changing Cumberland County’s political climate, there were still some systematic ways of denying certain blacks the right to vote. One such method was the literacy test, which was still employed in North Carolina in 1965. However, literacy tests in North Carolina were banned with passage of the 1965 Voting Rights Act. Gurney Edgerton, Chairman of the Cumberland County Board of Elections, vowed to continue the tests, a position he retreated from after threats from United States Attorney General Nicholas Katzenbach. Two female Fayetteville State students took the initiative of testing Edgerton by pretending they could not read when they registered to vote in 1965. They were nonetheless allowed to register, demonstrating the power of the federal government over local election boards, but also the continuing leadership among Fayetteville State students in attempting to enact changes in unfair racial practices in the city.18

The increasing number of black registered voters paved the way for black political victories in Cumberland County. The first major example came with the election of Marion C. George, a black lawyer and former Fayetteville State professor, to the Fayetteville City Council in 1969.19 Although George was not a primary leader of the 1963 demonstrations, he did provide bail money to students who had been arrested.20 Other African Americans that rose to political prominence in Fayetteville and beyond, like Marvin Lucas, Aaron Johnson, and C.R. Edwards, had been more involved in the 1963 demonstrations.
Like Marvin Lucas, the Reverend Aaron Johnson also claims that moral education from his family, but also teachers at Shaw University, inspired his success. From 1968 to 1978, Johnson worked for the State Human Relations Commission. One of Johnson’s duties was to conceive and implement plans for school integration. Despite these duties, Johnson continued his role as Reverend at Mt. Sinai Baptist Church. Johnson’s work on the Commission and his efforts at achieving equal treatment for blacks during the 1963 demonstrations were interconnected with his religious faith. He believed in the good of all people. He maintained that that faith was vindicated when he received as many white votes as black votes in his second term on the Fayetteville City Council, a position he held from 1979 to 1985. \(^{21}\) Johnson’s victories in the City Council elections not only revealed the increasing power of black voters and politicians, but also the changing racial views of whites in Fayetteville and Cumberland County in general.

As a leader of the protest movement in Fayetteville in 1963, Johnson helped blacks in the city gain the right to eat at lunch counters previously restricted to whites, and hold jobs previously denied to blacks. His participation also helped create more opportunities for blacks in city government, as evidenced by his election to the City Council. The expanding opportunities in state government that Johnson himself had played a role in creating were manifested in 1985. In that year, North Carolina Governor James G. Martin appointed Johnson as the head of the state prison system. Amazingly, Johnson fulfilled his duties as a member of Martin’s cabinet until 1992, while continuing his work as Reverend at Mt. Sinai Baptist Church until his retirement in 2000. \(^{22}\)
The Reverend C.R. Edwards experienced similar successes as those of Aaron Johnson. Like Johnson, he was a leader in the arena of religion, civil rights, and politics. Edwards had served on the Mayor’s Bi-Racial Committee which helped negotiate the end to demonstrations, but also the end to segregated serving and hiring practices in several places of business in July 1963. In this role, Edwards had gained valuable experience in bringing together groups with diverging interests. Edwards’s used those very same abilities as a negotiator and unifier in his fifteen years as a member of the Fayetteville School Board, a position he began in 1965.23

Edwards’s involvement in the civil rights protests and his popularity as a preacher and school board member helped him get elected to the state legislature in 1982. Edwards and Fayetteville businessman Luther “Nick” Jeralds were the first blacks to achieve that position since the Reconstruction Era, when Isham Sweat and John S. Leary were elected in 1868. In 1993, Edwards was elected to the North Carolina State Senate, a position he held until 1997.24

The history of the city of Fayetteville was greatly influenced by the actions of those involved in the civil rights protest movement in 1963. They helped create a society in which they could reach their own potential. Their efforts had a profound impact on race relations in the city, and provided further momentum for school integration and black voter registration. The summer of 1963 was a defining moment in the lives of the students, pastors, teachers, military servicemen, barbers, attorneys, physicians and other
citizens of the city that became involved in the protest movement. Marvin Lucas insisted, “That experience will always be with me.”25 And also with the city of Fayetteville.
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APPENDIX
Figure 1: Students protest segregated practices on Hay Street in downtown Fayetteville in 1963.

Source: Sally Smith, “The Man, the Movement Remembered.” *The Fayetteville Observer*, 18 January 1987, 1F.
Figure 2: Demonstrators stage a sit-in at a lunch counter of a drugstore on Hay Street in downtown Fayetteville.

Figure 3: Stanley Johnson, Marvin Lucas, and Jesse Williams were among those Fayetteville State Teachers College students honored in *Who's Who Among Students in American Colleges and Universities* in 1963.

*Source:* Junetta Williams, ed., *Fayettevillian* [Fayetteville State Teachers College Yearbook], *n.p.*, 1963, 74. Fayetteville State University Archives, Fayetteville, N.C.
Figure 4: Mayor Wilbur Clark and seven of the nine members of the Mayor’s Bi-Racial Committee in September 1963.

Source: “Bi-Racial Unit Given First Honor Awards,” The Fayetteville Observer, 17 September 1963, 1B.
Figure 5: Stanley Johnson in 1963


Figure 6: Willis McLeod in 1963


Figure 7: Dr. Rudolph Jones in 1963

*Source:* *The Voice,* November 1963, 3.
Figure 8: Map of Fayetteville, 1967, showing downtown and Fayetteville State College.

Note for Tables 1 and 2: Selected interviewees were asked to complete the information contained in the following surveys. The following represents the average number given for each question. The data is comprised from eleven African American respondents in a variety of positions during the protest movement in Fayetteville in 1963. This list included five Fayetteville State College students, three teachers, one junior high school student, one attorney, and one pastor.

**TABLE 1: COMPOSITE GENERAL SURVEY RESULTS**

Please rate the following on a scale of 1-10:

1=Strongly disagree
10=Strongly agree

__7.73__1) The civil rights demonstrations in Fayetteville in 1963 were primarily local, and were not primarily reactions to events in Greensboro, Raleigh, and other cities in North Carolina.

__3.40__2) Teachers encouraged their students to take part in the demonstrations.

__5.33__3) Mayor Wilbur Clark did his best to help Fayetteville integrate restaurants, theaters, and other public accommodations.

__7.30__4) Terry Sanford provided positive leadership in the civil rights struggle in North Carolina.

__5.27__5) There was one clear local leader of the desegregation demonstrations.

__5.0__6) Leaders of the movement feared for their safety and that of their families.

__4.22__7) Demonstrators attempted to get African-American bystanders to join protests.

__2.82__8) White men and women played a significant role in the demonstrations.

__4.90__9) U.S. Military personnel (white or black) played a significant role in the demonstrations.

__5.5__10) The primary goals of the demonstrations were achieved (by the end of 1963).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City Council</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fayetteville Freedom Council, Local NAACP</td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fayetteville State Teachers College student organizations</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Bragg/Department of Defense</td>
<td>6.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Churches</td>
<td>2.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor’s Biracial Committee</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State and National NAACP</td>
<td>4.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Government of North Carolina</td>
<td>7.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 3: FAYETTEVILLE POPULATION BY AGE, SEX, AND RACE, 1960

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Non-White</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 5</td>
<td>3,374 (7.2)</td>
<td>3,206 (6.8)</td>
<td>2,027 (6.7)</td>
<td>1,833 (6.2)</td>
<td>1,347 (8.0)</td>
<td>1,323 (7.8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>2,688 (5.7)</td>
<td>2,747 (5.8)</td>
<td>1,638 (5.4)</td>
<td>1,614 (5.3)</td>
<td>1,050 (6.2)</td>
<td>1,133 (6.7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>2,225 (4.7)</td>
<td>2,228 (4.7)</td>
<td>1,351 (4.6)</td>
<td>1,330 (4.4)</td>
<td>874 (5.2)</td>
<td>898 (5.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>1,612 (3.5)</td>
<td>2,190 (4.6)</td>
<td>961 (3.2)</td>
<td>1,297 (4.3)</td>
<td>651 (3.9)</td>
<td>953 (5.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>1,872 (4.0)</td>
<td>2,400 (5.1)</td>
<td>1,334 (4.4)</td>
<td>1,602 (5.3)</td>
<td>538 (3.2)</td>
<td>798 (4.7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>1,009 (3.4)</td>
<td>1,045 (4.0)</td>
<td>1,161 (3.8)</td>
<td>1,150 (3.8)</td>
<td>533 (3.2)</td>
<td>695 (4.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>1,021 (3.5)</td>
<td>1,031 (3.9)</td>
<td>1,129 (3.7)</td>
<td>1,182 (3.9)</td>
<td>492 (2.9)</td>
<td>549 (3.9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>1,692 (3.6)</td>
<td>1,872 (4.1)</td>
<td>1,193 (4.0)</td>
<td>1,270 (4.2)</td>
<td>499 (2.9)</td>
<td>602 (3.6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>1,426 (3.1)</td>
<td>1,483 (3.1)</td>
<td>988 (3.3)</td>
<td>980 (3.2)</td>
<td>438 (2.6)</td>
<td>504 (3.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>1,196 (2.5)</td>
<td>1,207 (2.5)</td>
<td>797 (2.6)</td>
<td>784 (2.6)</td>
<td>399 (2.3)</td>
<td>423 (2.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>785 (1.6)</td>
<td>977 (2.0)</td>
<td>545 (1.8)</td>
<td>671 (2.2)</td>
<td>240 (1.4)</td>
<td>306 (1.8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>687 (1.4)</td>
<td>836 (1.8)</td>
<td>457 (1.5)</td>
<td>545 (1.8)</td>
<td>230 (1.4)</td>
<td>291 (1.7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>543 (1.1)</td>
<td>640 (1.3)</td>
<td>381 (1.3)</td>
<td>445 (1.6)</td>
<td>164 (1.0)</td>
<td>195 (1.2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-69</td>
<td>423 (.9)</td>
<td>517 (1.1)</td>
<td>276 (.9)</td>
<td>332 (1.1)</td>
<td>147 (.8)</td>
<td>182 (.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-74</td>
<td>245 (.5)</td>
<td>365 (.8)</td>
<td>166 (.5)</td>
<td>240 (.3)</td>
<td>79 (.5)</td>
<td>125 (.7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75+</td>
<td>294 (.5)</td>
<td>462 (1.0)</td>
<td>165 (.5)</td>
<td>321 (1.1)</td>
<td>84 (.5)</td>
<td>141 (.8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22,339 (47.4)</td>
<td>24,767 (52.6)</td>
<td>14,569 (48.2)</td>
<td>15,646 (51.8)</td>
<td>7,770 (46.0)</td>
<td>9,121 (54.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>