Faculty Response to Racial Tensions

AMITAI ETZIONI

The response of most faculty members to the mounting drive for black studies programs is, not surprisingly, marked by confusion: the term "black studies" encompasses programs and aspirations whose variety hardly permit an undifferentiated response. Some of the conceptions, especially those that challenge academic freedom and societal values, will likely continue to arouse broad and bitter opposition. Others that seek to enrich scholarship through research and study in such subjects as the sociology of the ghetto and the history of the Negro-American community are winning wide support. Still other programs view black studies as requiring separate black social communities on white campuses, an approach which some consider resegregation but which may also be viewed as a sociological prerequisite for ultimately successful integration at other social levels and later stages.

In short, thoughtful reaction requires a differentiated response.

The analysis here presents some of the issues faculty members must consider in four different areas: admission of students from disadvantaged backgrounds; compensatory education for those admitted without full qualifications; specialization in ethnic studies; and separate facilities for the social life of students of a minority group. Factors that will influence the directions of faculty responses in each of these areas are explored.

The analysis here is based on materials other than a study of the way faculties have reacted to these four key aspects of programs for students from disadvantaged backgrounds. In the situation of considerable flux, we doubt the usefulness of reporting a study that would show X percent of professors prefer one version of black studies while Y percent prefer another. Our analysis derives from sociological research and theory on related
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issues in the fields of race relations, social mobility, societal change, and educational reorganization. All these areas have implications for our inquiry and a fund of theoretical material and empirical findings with which to inform it.

Before we attempt to outline criteria by which one may conceptualize, differentiate, and assess the consequences of the ideas, programs, and actions of this new movement, we must stress that almost all the conceptions advanced thus far emphasize black studies rather than study by blacks. The highest priority is given to the demands of black students (and faculty) for the inclusion of certain kinds of courses in the curricula offered by predominantly white colleges and universities. Secondary attention—often at the end of a long list of curriculum demands—is given to seeking the admission of more black students to these institutions.¹ As these lines are written, students at City College of City University of New York are demanding that half of the entering class in 1970 be black and Puerto Rican. This kind of demand, which may become more widespread, has only recently reached the top of the list of demands even at this institution.

In our judgment, only a minority of the black high school graduates who enter college will major or concentrate in black studies. Rather, the main issue concerning the majority of black students will be the substance and quality of the general education they receive, not the one or two courses they may elect from the black studies program. Hence, the major need of the black community and the society is to expand considerably the numbers

¹ A typical list of the demands of black students at the University of Wisconsin, follows: ¹(1) An autonomous black studies department controlled and organized by black students and faculty which would enable students to receive a B.A. in black studies. (2) A black chairman of the black studies department who would be approved by a committee of black students and faculty. (3) That at least 500 black students be admitted to the University next fall. (4) That 20 teachers be allocated for the instruction of the black studies department with the approval of black students. (5) That amnesty, defined as no reprisal or chastisement, be given all students who participate in boycotts or other such actions in reference to our demands. (6) That a black co-director of the Student Financial Aids Office (scholarships, loans, etc.) be appointed with the approval of black students. (7) That black counselors be hired by the Student Financial Aids Office with the approval of black students. (8) That scholarships be provided for all athletes up until the time that they receive their degree. Some athletes have to go for a fifth year. (9) That the existing black courses be transferred into the black studies department. (10) That it be established that black students with the black faculty have the power to hire and fire all administrators and teachers who are involved in anything related to black students. (11) That it be established that control of the black cultural center be in the hands of black students. (12) That all expelled Oshkosh [State University] students who wish to attend the University be admitted immediately. (13) That proof as defined by black students that the above demands have been met be given to black students by the administration” (Washington Post, Feb. 14, 1969).
of black students admitted to college and to assure the effectiveness of this expansion by providing the needed bridging education. Almost none of the documents and reports of oral presentations of advocates of black studies include a demand to provide students of disadvantaged backgrounds with bridging education. Yet the need is not only that black students be admitted to colleges but also that they shall graduate and have gained an education that will be effective and meaningful in the changing society they will enter and whose transformation they will help accomplish. Bridging education is being promoted by others in the education field, and—we shall see—is a complex and difficult matter. But these factors neither explain nor justify the almost total disregard by the black studies movement of the need for such education.

Instrumental Education for Black Students

For the black studies movement, it is simpler to imply that a program designed to build black identity and pride will provide a viable education for black students than it is to confront the deeper, more complex issue. Many black students, it seems to us, both desire and need more than liberation from psychological shackles. What they may need is discussed below. What they desire is instrumental education in addition to black studies. Data from surveys on current and potential students of Federal City College show that 66 percent of the respondents said that black studies were “extremely important” and 24 percent said that they were “important.” At the same time, the report that “most of the 90% black student body were interested in pursuing careers in business, teaching, and science-related fields,” suggests that interest in the expressive aspects of education do not supplant more instrumental concerns.

Consistent with these findings are those from a study of high school

Many of these are reported in the daily press and the Chronicle of Higher Education.

Federal City College, a land-grant college which opened in the fall of 1968 in Washington, D.C., is an urban college whose student body is 90 percent black and was chosen by lot.


Instrumental education refers to education acquired as a means to other ends than the sheer acquisition of knowledge as such. Expressive education is a goal in itself. The distinction is analytic in that most courses have some elements of both but, for a given population of students, it is usually easy to tell which aspect is dominant. We here class the courses (or classes) according to the predominant element.
Seniors in Washington and applicants to Federal City College who were asked what kinds of courses and curriculum they thought FCC should develop. The results were as follows:

FCC should develop a curriculum that includes primarily traditional courses in the liberal arts and sciences, such as algebra, zoology, history, and so on.

Seniors, 22.3 percent; applicants, 31.5 percent

FCC should develop a curriculum that includes primarily courses on community needs and urban problems, such as race and cultural relations, urban legal problems, and so on.

Seniors, 14.7 percent; applicants, 15.4 percent

FCC should develop a curriculum that includes primarily courses in preparation for the world of work such as data processing, medical technology, and so on.

Seniors, 24.9 percent; applicants, 21.7 percent

FCC should develop a curriculum which includes courses on issues and problems of contemporary society as well as classically academic courses.

Seniors, 35.5 percent; applicants, 27.3 percent

FCC should develop a curriculum that includes primarily courses that emphasize African history and culture.

Seniors, 2.5 percent; applicants, 4.5 percent

Although our informal contacts and observations offer no hard evidence, they and the logic of the situation suggest that these findings are not atypical. They imply that if a student is able to choose among programs, he is more likely to opt for one which is also strongly instrumentally oriented rather than chiefly expressive.

Do black studies provide the education that is desired and needed? To what degree do they accomplish this, and through which of the varying conceptions of black studies? The following sociological criteria may serve as guidelines for reviewing and comparing various conceptions of black studies.

Education, it is often said, ought to prepare students for life in the society into which they will graduate. But our society is changing both of its own accord and in response to the pressure exerted by its underprivileged members through growing political awareness and action. Thus, the question must be asked: for which society are students to be prepared—the society that the Kerner Commission saw as “racist” and as moving toward a bifurcation?  

cation into separate and unequal parts; an Afro-American statehood; or a society closely approximating the assimilation-integration model, in which the black minority eventually blends into and becomes indistinguishable from the white majority? None of these alternatives offers either a realistic or a normatively justifiable view of the society for which current students can and ought to prepare themselves.

This is not the place to discuss in detail the near future of American society; nor would it be wise to build an educational program on highly specific assumptions about the future. Yet some remarks on this highly intricate and speculative subject will clarify a framework within which the following discussion can be assessed:

1. The society will be an affluent one. A GNP of $4.5 billion and a per capita GNP of $12,000 per year are predicted for the year 2000.¹

2. Racial and other forms of discrimination will certainly not disappear, but will probably decline, especially in the area of economic opportunity. The number of good-paying jobs available to persons from disadvantaged backgrounds will increase.

3. Most of these positions will require vocational, semiprofessional, or professional skills of the kind provided by instrumental college training. A projection for 1975 shows 88.6 million professional and technical employees in the United States (a growth of 64 percent compared to 1960), with only 13.7 million positions for clerical employees (a growth of 40 percent), 6.1 million for sales personnel (+39 percent), 15.5 million for operatives—semiskilled workers (+29 percent), and 3.8 million for laborers (+3 percent).

To some extent, the mere possession of a college degree will continue to be an advantage in the labor market. But to state that ours is a "credential society"¹ and to imply that how well one is trained matters little so long as he has a degree is a dangerous half-truth. Degrees matter, but so do competence, recommendation letters, the institution that awarded the degree, and so on. And the larger the proportion of the population having college degrees and the more that degrees are granted "automatically" to students who remain in residence or participate in a special studies department without acquiring full instrumental training, the greater the likelihood that graduate schools, civil service, corporations, and other employers will develop secondary screening mechanisms and tie their rewards to other criteria and achievements. High school diplomas as a credential underwent a simil-

lar transformation, and the beginnings of the process for college degrees are already visible. How quickly this can happen may be seen from the following:

Those who finished these courses (designed by Hutchins at Chicago) received a B.A. But other colleges, particularly graduate schools, rarely recognized this as a true B.A. and often required the Chicago College graduate to take a year, and sometimes two, of additional courses before they admitted him to graduate work.

To some extent, the development of additional screening mechanisms can be retarded by the political pressure on employers, and underprivileged groups and their allies can be expected to continue that pressure. But the prediction must remain that substantial differences in instrumental qualifications will significantly affect the allocation of resources in the future society, of which students from disadvantaged backgrounds both desire and deserve a greater share.

Instrumental Characteristics of General Education

The stress here on the instrumental function of undergraduate education may raise the question: Are not the colleges the seats of general education, with instrumental training occurring primarily in the graduate and professional schools? Undergraduate colleges do provide some straight instrumental preparation: (1) Their graduates are hired as teachers and social workers on the basis of the B.A. degrees awarded them. (2) They serve as preparatory schools for professional schools (courses in mathematics for future engineers). (3) They communicate values, information, and "discipline" that are prerequisites for success in the existing society. (4) For undergraduates who go on to graduate work, a major in philosophy, English, or French (and so forth) is preprofessional if study is continued in the same or a related area. (5) Many educationalists like to discuss the fine general education programs of Harvard, the University of Chicago, and Columbia and to imitate them; yet the instrumental aspects of the same teaching materials increase when they are used at Wayne State, Bowling Green, San Jose State, or wherever working-class students are enrolled in large numbers. The instrumental function becomes even more predominant in the case of students from disadvantaged backgrounds, especially if they have a subculture of their own.

Of course important expressive elements are included in liberal arts education, but for most students such education is much more instrumental.

than is often implied. The future society may give less weight to technological and economic considerations and be more concerned with the quality of life—culture, community relations, and leisure. It will not in any case be a society in which most citizens live like Chinese mandarins—in which those with chiefly a generalist, humanist education will be rewarded to the same extent as those also able to program a computer, run the accounting, or practice law.

Some advocates of black studies programs stress that their aim is not only to train lawyers, doctors, and other service professionals, but also to foster an intense commitment to practice one's vocation so that it is meaningful and helpful to the members of one's community. Even if the desirability of such an orientation is accepted, the community commitment must be additional to, and cannot replace, instrumental competence. (How such preparation can best be provided and kept relevant to the community needs is discussed below.) And even if a society were sought in which instrumental training were unnecessary or irrelevant, sociologically it is likely to come to pass. Thus, to prepare a subpopulation of college students only or primarily in noninstrumental ways would be to undermine the positions in the society in which they will live. And to neglect the possible of bridging education would effectively perpetuate the disadvantages it created the need for such education in the first place.

Instrumental qualifications by themselves will make a difference. A society will not suddenly begin to reward people only for merit. It may be expected that increased attention will be paid to merit and, therefore, training more people from disadvantaged backgrounds will strengthen the movement in this direction.

The Correcting of Perspective

Advocacy of instrumental preparation is no way argues against creation of black studies programs; rather, it provides a basis for assessing various conceptions of such programs. We hold as our central thesis that students from disadvantaged backgrounds need instrumental bridging education, if only in such areas as syntax and grammar and mathematics.

It has been argued that "ghetto English" is not "bad" English but rather argot with a vitality and tradition of its own, and that to attack it simply as "bad English is to sustain the image of the Negro as inferior. But if people who have grown up using a different version of the language are forced to speak only "King's" English, they may become unable to express themselves spontaneously; it may well be important to permit the use of specialized argots in business or relations and teach the "other" English in effect as a second language, to be use instrumental interactions.
do well instrumentally in the society. Many programs have attempted to provide bridging education—precollege summer classes, additional remedial classes during the semester, counseling, tutorials, and so on—and have encountered problems. As studies of Head Start (and the Coleman Report) indicate in a different context, it is not yet clear that effective techniques and formats for bridging education have been found; some programs are too regimented, and others help to instill stigma rather than overcome it. Nevertheless, redesigning, strengthening, and expanding these programs must be prime goals of any attempt to provide effective and meaningful education for students from disadvantaged backgrounds.

Although most members of the black studies movement disregard bridging education, they do focus on the expressive needs of black students. Advocates of black studies suggest, if we summarize their statements, that: (1) a corrected perspective toward self and society is essential for instrumental achievement; (2) a corrected perspective toward self and society is meaningful as an end in itself; and (3) black studies are the way to make such a correction. The validity of these positions depends to a large extent on how they are advanced. To take the first statement first, the findings and analyses of social scientists overwhelmingly support the statement that building self-confidence—overcoming an image of self as inferior, backward, or incompetent—is prerequisite to the successful development of instrumental skills. Such a correction of perspective and the education it entails do not substitute for instrumental training; both kinds of education are necessary. Since most Negroes will seek a place in American society with varying degrees of satisfaction and success, they must become prepared to live in it. Designing education based on the assumption that they will choose to retreat from the American society seems unsupported by existing evidence and indications.

Moreover, expressive and instrumental education tend to enhance each other. For instance, just as a person who defines himself as a failure will do less well on an examination than someone with self-confidence, so will a person who does well on several examinations become less likely to maintain a self-view of failure. And while one needs to be proud rather than ashamed of his heritage, it is also important for black students to be able to point to a large number of success models, like black scientists, pilots, heads of Federal agencies, and so on.

For those already committed to the view that social groups must advance on both "legs," it may be difficult to conceive of an approach that focuses on expressive (or "psychic," or symbolic) efforts. Actually, such an ap-
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proach has many roots and followers. Thus, in Maoist China there is a strong element of anti-technology, pronymism. The designing of the war against poverty in 1964-65 placed considerable emphasis on organizing and educating for community action rather than on providing jobs, houses, and income. In part, a budget squeeze necessitated an economical program (community action costs much less); in part, political theory suggested that community action would provide the power base required to advance other goals. In part, though, a social psychological theory, an "Americanization of Fanon," suggested that correcting Negroes' perspectives on self and society would provide the necessary leverage for changing self and society, and community action was to change the perspective.

Just as the development of China (or any other nation) needs commitment and technology, the American poor need autonomy and jobs, and, similarly, black students need expressive education and instrumental training, both because each is an end in itself and because each supports the other.

Some may hold that emphasis on instrumental training implies that black people must become black white men, working at meaningless jobs in bureaucratic posts or on the assembly line and subscribing to the consumer fetishism of suburban society. The reason lies elsewhere. The jobs available to the untrained or poorly trained are much tighter than those for the skilled and professional; one realistic way to be freer in our present and near-future society is to be instrumentally qualified. Nor is there any reason to suppose that a well-trained person would therefore be ashamed of his background, subculture, and community. Or that such a person would not limit his work and consumption so as to leave time and energy for cultural activities, public action, and reflection.

Thus the discussion comes to the question of the most effective sociological context for both the correction of perspective and instrumental training. So far as expressive education is concerned, the earlier the correct orientation is presented, the less damage will be produced in the first place. When correction is needed, however, the earlier it is introduced, the more effective and less painful it will be. Hence, some ethnic studies should be introduced

11 Lifton puts it thus: "The methods of the Great Leap Forward, to be sure, had a compelling external logic: putting into use the human labor with which rural China abounds as a substitute for the large machinery she lacks, and thereby creating both national and local self-sufficiency, or as the official slogan has it, 'walking with two legs.' But it turned out that the 'legs' were largely psychic, and while psychic legs are of the greatest importance, they cannot substitute for either bodily or technological ones—especially in the making of steel" (Robert J. Lifton, Revolutionary Immortality [New York: Vintage Books, Random House, 1968], p. 103).
into the high schools and even primary schools and become a standard part of the curriculum. Schools whose students are largely from disadvantaged backgrounds might devote more time to ethnic studies, while largely middle-class white schools might include this topic in classes on American history or society. (Or perhaps the same curriculum could be used throughout the educational system, with adjustments for class and ethnic variation.) The optimal situation would find the colleges needing only to "finish" a process that started much earlier. A major contribution to that end would be for teachers colleges and liberal arts colleges that train teachers to give increased attention to the preparation of teachers of and teaching materials for precollege-level ethnic studies.

Until such steps are taken, undergraduate colleges \(^\text{18}\) will have to provide this expressive education for their students. Such education can take various forms, ranging from inclusion in general liberal arts courses (such as Columbia College's Contemporary Civilization and the University of Chicago's program) to a major segment of courses on American society, to specialized courses for students interested in pursuing study in greater depth.

The need is for ethnic studies rather than solely black studies, because Spanish-Americans, Japanese-Americans, and other ethnic groups have needs similar to those of black students. Again, lower-class WASPs have some parallel needs as well, especially for bridging education, and other minorities—Jewish, Irish—may increasingly demand resources as ethnic studies come to take their place in the curriculum. It is neither practical nor desirable that all kinds of ethnic studies be provided in one set of courses, program, department, or college; the point is that the needs are broader than offerings only to black students. A general increase in such programs would, however, certainly be in accord with the American tradition of pluralism.

To protect the institutions, which are already under great financial and manpower pressures, three principles should be applied in the development of ethnic studies: priority should be given (1) to those areas of study that as yet have no ethnic program, and (2) to disadvantaged groups. (3) Resources should be allocated to any ethnic program roughly in accord with the "demand" for it on the part of students and faculty.

To return to the functions of ethnic studies, they will at best provide the cognitive bases for the needed correction of perspective. For example, a course in black history which studies precolonial Africa and the civil rights movement cannot alone be expected to have major psychodynamic conse-

\(^{18}\) On graduate studies, see below.
quences. Rather, such consequences might be achieved by such means as a whole program of black studies for undergraduates, black teachers teaching instrumental subjects to black classes, and segregated social groupings—"colleges" within the white university.

To assess these suggestions, we seek to apply two sociological principles—the limits of pluralism, and the dynamics of group integration.

The Limits of Pluralism

The often-used dichotomy between an integrated society and one in which two groups live almost completely separate from each other (a dichotomy which prevails in the discussion of this area 11) does not exhaust the possibilities. On the contrary, most modern societies are pluralistic on some levels and universalistic on others. Some differentiations among groups are highly intolerable; others are less so; and still others are not only acceptable but even valuable for the society as a whole and each of its members. Without embarking here on a general theory of society, a few highly schematic points do have direct bearing on the issues at hand.

1. Societal differentiations are the more intolerable as their magnitude becomes greater and if the cleavage is expanding. The differences among the races in the United States on these dimensions are smaller than in many Latin countries and seem to be shrinking, although rather slowly.

2. Differentiations are the more intolerable as the extent to which they are encompassing becomes greater; that is, a low position in one sector (economic, for example) supports similar positions in others (political power, education). Broad-scope, parallel differentiations render difficult both the correction of a disadvantage in one area by additional achievement in others and the blurring of group lines. Pluralism then tends to become unlimited, all-encompassing, and dangerous, and the society is divided into sharply drawn, self-conscious camps.

3. The specific sectors into which the differentiation among groups of members has penetrated are significant here. There are roughly four such areas, which will be discussed in the paragraphs that follow.

Cultural pluralism is enriching rather than damaging to the societal fabric. Progress in this area is achieved by recognizing many alternatives as

legitimate and of equal status rather than by seeking to homogenize or impose one set of cultural norms. Thus, for instance, both black and Nordic types of beauty can be recognized without inflicting psychic deprivations on either group. Robert S. Browne gives the following example, which is a good analogue for many others:

Millions of black parents have been confronted with the poignant agony of raising black, kink-haired children in a society where the standard of beauty is a milk-white skin and long, straight hair. To convince a black child that she is beautiful when every channel of value formation in the society is telling her the opposite is a heart-rending and well-nigh impossible task. [And he continues:] . . . In the American ethos a black man is not only “different,” he is classed as ugly and inferior.14

This situation can be countered by claiming that the opposite holds, that black is beautiful while white is ugly. But such an approach is not the only alternative. It can be argued even more cogently that a rich society, rich in spirit, sees beauty in a large variety of different styles, colors, foods, and so on. Thus, it does not follow that complete segregation is needed to solve this and similar problems.

A measure of social pluralism is inevitable. There is no nation, no community, in which people do not interact selectively in their interpersonal and social circles. In this area of social process, public authorities can provide little positive guidance, although legal, economic, and other barriers to free social interaction can be removed. And as we see it, a measure of voluntary social differentiation is much less damaging per se than assimilation-integration theory suggests. So long as free interaction is provided in other sectors, voluntary differentiation among friends and mates is not a serious threat to a society in which subcommunities live together peacefully and with mutual respect. Actually, during the transition from our separate and unequal to a pluralistic-integrated society, some differentiation of social circles may be needed as a source of emotional security (this point is discussed below).

Economic differentiations are far more dangerous than informal social ones, especially when they have accumulated for many decades, are based on ascription rather than achievement, and the prerequisites for achievement are concentrated in the hands of select groups. Here it is necessary both to remove the barriers based on ascriptive attributes and, to the extent that the assets needed for achievement have been accumulated, to provide

the disadvantaged with extra resources to help them catch up to equality of opportunities, a process we call "universalization." 

Finally, there is a hard core of ultimate values, national symbols, universal rules, and monopolization of the legitimate use of force which constitutes the limits of pluralism, the universal societal bonds which tie the member groups into one supra-unit or society. When differentiation significantly penetrates into this area, the society will tend toward disbanding. Such a situation led to our and other nations' civil wars.

An individual or a group may be committed to particular values which it views as having priority over membership in the nation; it may even seek to secede and form a new state in Africa or the Deep South—or the ghettos of our cities. But it is an empirical observation that such a secessionist group can hardly expect the support of the society it seeks to divide or leave. On the contrary, sharp retaliatory measures are to be expected as secessionist activities challenge the most deeply held commitments of many other citizens. It also follows that those who seek cultural and social autonomy and economic universalization weaken their positions considerably when they use the language of nationhood. Their posture of seceding, not the legitimate societal goals of subculture, equality of opportunity, and improvement of the quality of life through a transformation of the society's structure, but rather the severing of the universal societal bonds to form their own nation simply alienates most members.

This view of society as much more able to accommodate pluralism on some levels than on others, as in effect welcoming separation in some areas and insisting on integration in others, has two major levels of implication for the assessment of black studies. It has consequences for the view of the society for which students are educated, and for the view of the campus which—like a micro-society—has its own pluralisms and universal bonds. Three of the implications are illustrated here.

First, the teaching of black studies as a negation of America, a rejection of its basic values, and a legitimization of symbols which run counter to those...
of many members ("all white men are devils") is secessionist. The "positive" teaching of black studies—as advancing black values, as adding a major component to American pluralism and thus making it less constric-
tive—is in accord with the pluralistic-integration model.

The demand that all students be exposed to the same curriculum is assimilationist; the demand that any group of students be given a totally separate program of studies is secessionist. The provision of black studies with the requirement that those who "major" in them also take some courses to ensure their familiarity with the general bases of American civilization is in line with pluralistic integration.

It is easy to offer psychological and sociological explanations for the extremist positions taken by some leaders of the black studies movement. But this discussion is concerned more with the consequences of various positions than in their motivational and experiential bases. Pluralistic programs are those which aim at the limitation of interracial conflicts, the recognition of shared values and rules on the campus and in the society at large. It is hoped that the total rejection of the white world and the demand for total autonomy are only transitory stages, a step on the road from being oppressed and suppressed to that of membership in the society as a semi-autonomous community, proud of its own positive values.

Second, a group's orientation to national symbols (such as the Constitution and the flag) and core values (for example, the value of the individual) is a key indicator of its position on this general issue. Secessionist are those programs, classes, and other activities that encourage black Americans to reject summarily such values. Assimilationists demand homogeneity of commitment. Pluralist integrationists acknowledge that these values and symbols are now more accessible to some Americans than others but, rather than rejecting their universal validity, draw on strengthening the commitment to those values to further legitimate the demand that all Americans be accorded equal access. Thus, the critical orientation is not dampened by stating that we believe in the Bill of Rights and the Constitution, our critical orientation is aimed, first of all, at the existing societal institutions.

Some of the core values themselves may be challenged, for instance, the excessive emphasis on individual opportunity and material affluence. Such

---

14 We use the term "secessionist" rather than "separatist" because, although all forms of secessionism by definition challenge the unifying bonds and core values of the society, there are many forms of separatism that do not have these consequences, and could in our view be considered pluralist rather than assimilationist integration.
a challenge is in accord with membership in a society as long as it is sought for all members and not only for one subcommunity.

Brown presents a case for "two Americas—one black, one white." But typical to most, though not all, of these statements, he really seeks an equal and legitimate subcommunity status rather than a separatist state or society.

The separatist would argue that the Negro's foremost grievance cannot be solved by giving him access to more gadgets—although this is certainly a part of the solution—but that his greatest need is of the spirit, that he must have an opportunity to reclaim his group individuality and have that individuality recognized as equal with other major cultural groups in the world.10

We see no sociological reason that "a complete divorce of the two races" is necessary.

Third, the campus, like the society, has some universal rules which are morally and judicially binding on all members. The assimilationist sees no particular reason to exempt black studies from the universal rules implied in the concept of academic freedom, for example, the protection of teachers from being fired because of their views. The secessionist seeks an autonomous black program, even college, in which commitments to black values are the criteria for hiring, firing, and so on. Here is not only a demand for blacks to control programs in which blacks are studying but also to select the "correct" kind of blacks.11 This approach cannot be tolerated by a university if it is to survive as a free institution. The pluralist would say that if these rules have a discriminatory effect, they would be altered for all students, but such an effect cannot serve to justify special dispensations for any subgroup.

Dynamics of Group Integration

The preceding analysis also suggests that informal selection of blacks into segregated friendships, lunch groups, and courting is to be expected to be common, especially when class differences are added to racial ones, as when lower-class black students join a middle-class white campus.12 The campus, like the society, is not a large small-group, in which the basis of cohesion and solidarity is a close personal relationship among each and every member. On the contrary, a limited amount of interpersonal and group separation, so long as it is voluntary, may be quite useful to integra-

11 James E. Cheek, a Negro, referred to "reverse racism" in this context (Chronicle of Higher Education, May 6, 1968).
tion on the next level—the classrooms—and fuller integration later, once the educational, psychological, and economic differences between the racial groups have been reduced.

Intimate social groups are usually formed among persons very similar in many attributes; even among whites, homogeneity tends to prevail. This iron law of sociology can hardly be expected not to apply to black-white relations. We do expect some interracial intimate groups, but they will be much less common than intraracial groups at this stage.

Separate intimate relations provide a sociological foundation for the emotional security that is generally needed for student life, a life that is quite tension-provoking in our achievement-oriented society and especially so for persons from disadvantaged backgrounds who have more ground to cover. The black studies movement can be viewed as an attempt to meet the need for emotional security, and the more such security is provided in social circles, the less the likelihood that pressures for less demanding curricula or separate classrooms or “colleges” will be brought to bear. Similarly, the more that effective bridging education is provided, the less threatening the regular classroom will appear.

Last but not least, the separate black social group, under indigenous (rather than appointed) black leaders and in the framework of Afro-American or black centers, provides the most powerful vehicle for the correction of the perspectives of black students and for integration on the next level and in the next phase. Psychodynamics suggests that individuals who are isolated from their natural groups and removed from their leaders tend to rigidify their positions. Conversely, if the group’s perspectives change, especially if the change is guided by the group’s own leadership, the individual members find the necessary emotional support to “let go” of their old positions and make the transition to new ones. This transitional phase is always problematic in that once the old perspective is “unlocked,” it may be changed not in a constructive direction but rather toward a new distortion. Without group changes, however, deep changes are unlikely to occur.

It also follows that these intimate social groups are best able to provide the noncognitive elements of the needed transformation. If the university provides the buildings for such efforts or salaries for the instructors (as it does for other extracurricular activities), whether it grants no credit or some credit for these extracurricular activities—these are secondary matters that can probably be best decided on the basis of local circumstances. The

20 At Northwestern University, “Negroes, particularly those from the inner city, had long tended to stick together socially” (Chronicle of Higher Education, May 20, 1968, p. 4).
main point is keeping the classroom devoted mainly to cognitive work and as an integrated student society, while the more expressive work is carried out in the black social groups.

The U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare recently challenged the setting-up of black dormitories and threatened the withdrawal of Federal funds from colleges which allowed their buildings to be used in such a way. Yet, first, there are many ways in which a separate black social life can flourish—black social centers, a free choice of roommates, even separate subfloors—other than making race a basis for admission to a building. Second, HEW will have to re-examine its guidelines to see if they are based on assimilationist or pluralistic integrationist assumptions. Pluralism is in accord with the core values of the American traditional society as well as sociologically viable. Assimilation, which occasionally is implied in the liberal civil rights tradition, seems to have some of the normative and sociological connotations black separatists excoriate.

It follows that the shortest route toward a genuinely pluralistic, integrated society may be one which entails a step which may seem backward to the assimilationist integrationist. Namely, in accordance with the universal rules of academia (which may themselves be transformed for all students), black social centers may be created in addition to other existing ethnic ones. And within the limits of universal shared core values, a plurality of subcultures may be more fully legitimated and supported.

**Toward Black Studies**

So far, we have deliberately focused our discussion on bridging education, undergraduate black studies, and social centers. Graduate programs and research specialization in black studies should be fully supported as well. There is already a significant body of scholarship in this area. There is no need to be a purist here. Perhaps some subareas within the realm of black studies are not as rich in volumes as is, let us say, Shakespearean literature, but many other areas are not better endowed than black studies and quite a few are less so. Moreover, scholarship flourishes when scholars are available, which requires "chairs," funds, libraries, museums, and so on—resources which until recently were very scarce for black studies.

As noted earlier, not every college ought to provide the same set of courses and programs of undergraduate and graduate black studies; after all, many colleges have no graduate programs and some are much nearer

---

to the ghettos than others. We must leave to a future publication the question of the ways in which different kinds of colleges may introduce different types of black studies.

The creation of graduate and undergraduate black (and other ethnic) studies will create many jobs for persons of disadvantaged backgrounds; it must, hence, also be viewed as a step toward eliminating inequality of higher education, in which there is an increase in students from disadvantaged backgrounds but very little commensurate increase in faculty and research staff. Institutions might thus both expect and welcome a whole subsystem with its own internal differentiation of quality, variation in form (for example, instrumental versus expressive emphasis), and so forth.

Ultimately though, black studies (as distinct from social centers) will have a mainly cognitive and largely instrumental role; and the main task of introducing large numbers of students of disadvantaged backgrounds into the society and educating them to help transform it will be performed by bridging education and black social groups and not by exclusive curricula or challenging universal bases of the campus or the society. A larger increase in admissions of students from underprivileged backgrounds, effective bridging education, ethnic studies, and ethnic social centers will make universities more responsive to the underprivileged parts of the society and to the majority of the students strongly committed to social justice. These reforms may well not satisfy everybody and should not be introduced in the hope of eliminating all tensions and conflict. But the preceding sociological criteria do suggest that such reforms do not undermine any basis of the society or the academic community and, hence, may be regarded as not only responsive to legitimate needs but also in accord with a vital, self-reforming society.

Sociological factors and considerations that may influence the reactions and actions of faculty to the demand for black studies have been analyzed. They by no means exhaust the range of possible responses or the areas of involvement. For instance, there remain the questions of faculty service to the community off the campus; the role of community service in shaping university policy with regard to expansion of the campus into low-income neighborhoods; the ways universities may have to be reorganized in the faculty's view if they are to provide community services or bridging education. These and other subjects remain to be treated in a future discussion, as the dialogue continues and serves as a propelling factor in university reorganization commensurate in scope and depth with those of challenges and needs we face.