

INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

UMI

A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor MI 48106-1346 USA
313/761-4700 800/521-0600

/

AFRICAN AMERICAN IMAGES OF EDUCATION IN THE UNITED
STATES

by

JERRY N. WOODS

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty in
Sociology in partial fulfillment of the requirements for
the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, The City University of
New York

1996

UMI Number: 9707166

**Copyright 1996 by
Woods, Jerry N.**

All rights reserved.

**UMI Microform 9707166
Copyright 1996, by UMI Company. All rights reserved.**

**This microform edition is protected against unauthorized
copying under Title 17, United States Code.**

UMI
300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, MI 48103

© 1996

JERRY N. WOODS

All Rights Reserved

This manuscript has been read and accepted for the Graduate Faculty in Sociology in satisfaction of the dissertation requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

9/19/96
Date

William Korblum
Chair of Examining Committee

9/19/96
Date

Julia Wrigley
Executive Officer

David Lavin

Roscoe C. Brown, Jr.

Supervisory Committee

THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

Abstract

AFRICAN AMERICAN IMAGES OF EDUCATION
IN THE UNITED STATES

by

Jerry N. Woods

Adviser: Professor William Kornblum

The purpose of this research is (1) to examine twelve African American social scientists' images of education, especially how those images place them on different sides of critical issues facing educational institutions and the education of African American youths and (2) to explain their contrary perspectives by seeking the social determinants of those perspectives/the social roots of their ideas. The study's field of sociological inquiry is the sociology of knowledge. Its critical issues and their different sides are: (1) class versus race and (2) racial desegregation/integration versus racial segregation/separation/nationalism.

Available written data reveal that those social scientists who believed that class was more critical than race were born and/or reared in the North. Those who held the opposing view were born and/or reared in the South and attended predominantly African American colleges in the

South as undergraduates. The different social environments of the North and South are interpreted as having influenced the scholars to develop contrary positions.

On the integration versus separation/nationalism issue, the study found that only age fully differentiated the two groups of scholars. The integrationists were older than the separatists/nationalists. A dominant ethos of integration among the older scholars and of nationalism among the younger ones is interpreted as having the primary influence on their development of different educational images.

The author argues that race is more critical than class. He contends that both integration and separation are less significant for African Americans' educational development and equality than their avoidance of discrimination by whites and establishment of unity among themselves.

Importantly, the author also contends that an adequate understanding of the study requires that it be placed in a broader context than one or the other of the social scientists' differing positions and the causes of their differences. That broader context, the author insists, must posit all the issues, not one or some, as critical ones and white supremacy/white racism as an historical and contemporary destructive problem in

American society, a destructive force from which all the study's critical issues emanate and derive their educational/race relations significance.

Dedication

This work is dedicated to my family and friends. It is especially dedicated to the deceased members of my family--my mother, Pearl Woods, my father, Garfield Woods, and my youngest brother, Joe Louis Woods; to my seven living brothers and sisters; to my wife, Dr. Chrisita Joyce Davis Woods; and to my daughter, Ericka Cherise Woods.

Although having less than an elementary education and becoming a widow when I was nine years old, my mother reared my siblings and me and taught us the importance of achieving an education, of demonstrating concern and respect for other people, and of assisting anyone in need. A coal miner, my father worked diligently to support his family under difficult circumstances. My deceased brother, who died at the age of thirty-seven, was a good friend; his many witticisms brought joy to himself and others. All of my living brothers and sisters demonstrated their love and support in myriad ways. My wife's unconditional love and assistance reduced the burden of this task and helped sustain me. A doctoral candidate, my daughter, through her achievement, has encouraged and inspired me.

To the unnamed persons who have supported me in any

way, I thank you. I appreciate your encouragement,
friendship, and love.

Acknowledgements

My journey of study, research, and writing, which culminates in the completion of this dissertation, leaves me indebted to many people. Those people gave me all or some of the following: direction, support, advice, guidance, encouragement, kindness.

I express my gratitude to my committee members: Dr. William Kornblum, chair, one of the nation's leading sociologists in community and urban studies, an esteemed professor in the Ph.D. Program in Sociology at the Graduate School of the City University of New York, a highly regarded author of several books, including an introduction to sociology textbook, and a contributor to journals in the social sciences; Dr. David Lavin, an expert/a leading authority on Open Enrollment in the City University of New York, a professor of sociology at Lehman College and in the Ph.D. Program in Sociology at the Graduate School, both in the City University of New York, and a respected author; and Dr. Roscoe C. Brown, Jr., a former president of Bronx Community College of the City University of New York, a recipient of the Distinguished Flying Cross and Air Medal as one of the "Tuskegee Airmen," a group of racially segregated African American pilots in the Army Air Force during World War II, and an

author. Particularly, I am grateful to Dr. Kornblum, whose guidance and support enabled me to complete this work.

Acknowledgement, appreciation, and thanks are offered to the African American social scientists, whose writings are the focus of this study, and to the other African American scholars, whose ideas are used for descriptions, analyses, and/or interpretations. I am aware that it is only due to the scholarship and wealth of information that African American scholars have contributed to this nation on African American education, history, and culture/the African American experience that this study is possible.

The African American social scientists and their alma maters that responded to my inquiries for biographical information on the scholars are acknowledged with deep appreciation. Their replies were beneficial to me, whether or not they were able to provide any of the requested biographical data. I am especially grateful to Dr. Nathan Hare, formerly (1968-1969) the first Chairperson of a Department of African American Studies in the United States at San Francisco State College in San Francisco, California, and , presently, Chairman of the Board of the Black Think Tank in San Francisco, and to the Melvin B. Tolson Black Heritage Center at Langston University, Hare's Alma Mater, in Langston, Oklahoma. In

response to my combined letter and questionnaire, Dr. Hare telephoned me from San Francisco and, in a cordial manner, wished me success in this task and agreed to provide the requested information. Subsequently, Dr. Hare mailed thorough and extensive answers to my questions. The Melvin B. Tolson Black Heritage Center mailed me a biographical summary on Hare, including his place and date of birth; his universities of attendance, the degrees he earned, and the years he received them; his organizational membership; and his awards through the 1960s. In addition, the Tolson Black Heritage Center provided several articles by and about Dr. Hare which had appeared in various publications, as well as the entire text of a speech which Dr. Hare delivered at Langston University's "'Cultural Renaissance' Rally" in August of 1975.

Sincere appreciation is extended to the administrators and fellows of the MAGNET Program of the Graduate Center of the City University of New York for their encouragement during the 1992-1993 academic year, when I was a President's Dissertation year (Magnet) Fellow. Especially, I express appreciation for the enthusiasm, concern, and support for the Magnet Program and MAGNET Fellows exhibited by Dr. Pamela T. Reid, Associate Provost (Acting) and Mr. Matthew Schoengood, Executive Director of Student Services at the Graduate

Center.

I thank Mr. Matthew Schoengood, who, also, during the 1992-93 academic year, requested of Colton Clark, Dean of the New York City University Law School at Queens College, that I be allowed to use the Law School's Library anytime that the law library was open to the Law School's students. For making appropriate arrangements with the library's security personnel and for otherwise facilitating my random visits to the library, I equally thank Dean Clark.

Gratitude is expressed to Mr. Dean K. Harrison, former Director of the Office of Expanded Educational Opportunity, who provided much assistance to me.

I am grateful to Mr. Jose Hernandez and Ms. Cézanne Gray for typing portions of this work. Their significant contributions will continue to be valued.

Words of gratitude are inadequate to express my feelings for two strong, highly moral and ethical African American women--my mother ("Mom"), Mildred Pearl Dalton Woods, and my wife, Dr. Chrisita Joyce Davis Woods--and their positive influence on my life and positive contributions to my completion of this dissertation. Although my mother died before I began my doctoral study, she had a profound impact upon me, and, therefore, upon this work, its progress, and its completion. By example, primarily, she taught me pride in my race, as well as

determination and perseverance, even during life's most distressing periods and circumstances. My mother constantly admonished me to "get an education" because, in her view, a good education would allow me to avoid many of the difficulties and hardships that she had experienced in her life. My wife has assisted me in myriad ways: supplied love, companionship, and friendship, relieved me of many time-consuming and exhausting chores, provided encouragement, typed the initial draft of several chapters of the dissertation, and edited the entire document, among other helpful contributions. Without her love, companionship, and incomparable assistance, completion of this treatise would have been a much more difficult task. This effort to recount the contributions of my mother and wife to this project and to my life and work, generally, is inadequate to express my full appreciation and thanks.

Above all, I thank God. It is that Divine, Omnipotent, and Omnipresent Spirit, which leads and directs my life.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

African American Images of Education in the United States

Chapter	Page
1. EDUCATION FOR AFRICAN AMERICANS: CONFLICTING HISTORICAL IMAGES.....	1
Purpose of the Study.....	1
Historical Overview of Differences and Debates Between African Americans and Whites and Among African Americans Over Education for African Americans.....	3
Methodology and Procedures.....	13
Relationship Between Education and Social Class and Education and Race, and Interrelationship Among Education, Social Class, and Race.....	26
NOTES.....	40
2. W.E.B. DUBOIS: RACE, CLASS, AND EDUCATION....	51
Race.....	53
Class.....	59
Education.....	65
DuBois's Shift in Emphasis: From Race to Class.....	71

DuBois's Changing Emphasis: A Sociology of Knowledge.....	76
NOTES.....	81
3. AFRICAN AMERICAN SOCIAL SCIENTISTS WHOSE IDEAS PLACE THEM IN SUPPORT OF SOCIAL CLASS AS MORE CRITICAL THAN RACE FOR THE EDUCATION AND PROGRESS OF AFRICAN AMERICANS.....	90
Thomas Sowell (Economist).....	92
Walter Williams (Economist).....	97
William Wilson (Sociologist).....	99
Summary.....	109
NOTES.....	117
4. AFRICAN AMERICAN SOCIAL SCIENTISTS WHOSE IDEAS PLACE THEM IN SUPPORT OF RACE AS MORE CRITICAL THAN SOCIAL CLASS FOR THE EDUCATION AND PROGRESS OF AFRICAN AMERICANS.....	127
Charles Willie (Sociologist).....	127
Alphonso Pinkney (Sociologist).....	139
Bartholomew (Bart) Landry (Sociologist)...	147
Summary.....	155
NOTES.....	164
5. CLASS VERSUS RACE: A SOCIOLOGY OF KNOWLEDGE..	171
Comparative Dimensions.....	172
Class Versus Race: Differentiating Characteristics.....	178

Interpretation of the Differentiating Characteristics: A Sociological Explanation.....	180
Author's Comments.....	190
NOTES.....	199
6. AFRICAN AMERICAN SOCIAL SCIENTISTS WHOSE IDEAS PLACE THEM IN SUPPORT OF DESEGREGATION/INTEGRATION AS MORE CRITICAL THAN SEGREGATION/SEPARATION/NATIONALISM FOR THE EDUCATION AND PROGRESS OF AFRICAN AMERICANS.....	210
E. Franklin Frazier (Sociologist).....	212
Kenneth B. Clark (Psychologist).....	214
Charles V. Willie (Sociologist).....	220
Summary.....	225
NOTES.....	227
7. AFRICAN AMERICAN SOCIAL SCIENTISTS WHOSE IDEAS PLACE THEM IN SUPPORT OF SEGREGATION/SEPARATION/NATIONALISM AS MORE CRITICAL THAN DESEGREGATION/INTEGRATION FOR THE EDUCATION AND PROGRESS OF AFRICAN AMERICANS.....	232
Nathan Hare (Sociologist).....	235
Maulana Ron Karenga (Political Scientist/Linguist).....	259
Abdul Alkalimat (Gerald McWhorter) (Sociologist).....	278
Summary.....	314
NOTES.....	318

8. DESEGREGATION/INTEGRATION VERSUS SEGREGATION/SEPARATION/NATIONALISM: A SOCIOLOGY OF KNOWLEDGE.....	336
Comparative Dimensions.....	338
Desegregation/Integration versus Segregation/Separation/Nationalism: Differentiating Characteristics.....	350
Interpretation of the Differentiating Characteristics: A Sociological Explanation.....	361
Author's Comments.....	379
NOTES.....	412
9. CONCLUSION: DIFFERENT IMAGES, CAUSES OF DIFFERENCES, AND A BROADER AND NECESSARY CONTEXT.....	429
Different Images.....	429
Causes of Differences.....	451
A Broader and Necessary Context.....	457
NOTES.....	471
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	478

CHAPTER 1

EDUCATION FOR AFRICAN AMERICANS: CONFLICTING HISTORICAL IMAGES

Purpose of the Study

This study examines the ways African American social scientists, who were alive in 1954 when the United States Supreme Court ruled segregated public schools unconstitutional and who have had some or all of their images of/ideas on education published/reported since that watershed in education and race relations, think about education in the United States, especially the way their ideas place them on different sides of the critical issues facing educational institutions and the education of African American youth. Importantly, the study seeks a sociological explanation (social and/or cultural determinant(s), such as age, social class position, historical and/or social circumstances, schools and colleges attended, dominant ethos, and so on) for the differences among African American social scientists in interpretation of the critical issues. In other words, its aim is to determine the social and cultural factors which influence the ideas that place the African American social scientists on different sides of the critical

issues, thereby offering a sociological explanation for their differences. In this study, the critical issues facing educational institutions and the education of young African Americans, and the different sides of those issues are: (1) class and race, and (2) desegregation/integration and segregation/separation/nationalism.

For each set of critical issues, the study presents the ideas of African American social scientists on each issue. The major concerns of the study are what African American social scientists think about education in the United States, what level of significance they attach to each side of the study's critical issues for the education/achievement/progress of African Americans, and what social and/or cultural factor or factors determine, influence, or account for the differences in their ideas/images of the issues.

In this investigation, education is considered as a dimension of political, economic, and social achievement and status, and of personal enhancement and satisfaction. It is viewed as a primary determinant of one's life chances. A student's race and class position, or attendance in a desegregated/integrated or segregated school, program, or classroom, are assumed to influence the type of education the student receives, and, consequently, his/her future prosperity and happiness.

Historical Overview of Differences and Debates Between
African Americans and Whites and Among African Americans
Over Education for African Americans

My interest in the ways African American social scientists think about education in the United States is inspired and motivated by a long and continuing history of debate, controversy, and differences both between African Americans and whites and among African Americans themselves over the type of education that should be received by African Americans. Differences between African Americans and whites over education began during slavery. In the nineteenth century before the Emancipation Proclamation in 1863, laws were adopted by the slave states in the South prohibiting the education of slaves, except in a manner and to the extent necessary to serve whites.¹

Although the laws and the slave system prohibited the vast majority of slaves from attending school or receiving a formal education, numerous individual slaves engaged in various efforts to become literate, some with the knowledge and consent of their owners.² Also, there were courageous African Americans (and whites), who despite the prohibitive state laws, risked legal prosecution and social disapproval to operate and/or attend schools established to educate African Americans.³

After the Emancipation Proclamation and during Reconstruction (1867-1877), African Americans saw

education as a "great panacea."⁴ Also, they perceived it as a means to "defend and extend their emancipation."⁵ With this vision of education, the ex-slaves pursued it vigorously and established schools throughout the South which they controlled.⁶ C. Erick Lincoln, an African American historian, explains that during Reconstruction, African American state legislators in the southern states made education of African Americans a priority and passed legislation to improve their educational opportunities.⁷ Several colleges were established. In addition, the number of African American students who attended schools increased dramatically during that period.⁸

The election of Rutherford B. Hayes as President in 1876 and his removal the following year of the last federal troops from the South, who were protecting the rights of African Americans, effectively ended Reconstruction and restored control of the South to whites.⁹ James D. Anderson notes that from the end of Reconstruction until the latter part of the 1960s, southern African Americans remained politically and economically oppressed, and their education developed within the context of that oppression.¹⁰

During that long period of oppression, African Americans in the South were "virtually denied [their] citizenship, the right to vote, and the voluntary control of their labor power."¹¹ They were segregated from whites

in nearly every area of life, perceived and treated as inferior, and provided with inferior facilities and services.¹²

African Americans were not only oppressed in the South, but in the North as well.¹³ John Henrik Clarke, the noted African American historian, has pointed out that "northern and southern whites [mounted a determined drive] to reduce blacks to a degraded second class status."¹⁴ In reference to the oppression of African Americans after Reconstruction and its effect on their education around the turn of the twentieth century, Clarke stated: "Institutional racism with its roots in the nineteenth century had already become an obstacle to the education of black Americans in both the North and South."¹⁵ Continuing his comments concerning racism throughout the nation during that period, Clarke explained: "Ideas of racial superiority were intensified and a whole body of 'scientific' literature was produced to support this attitude."¹⁶

Following Reconstruction, the American social system, which included segregated and inferior schools, was, in effect, sanctioned by the United States Supreme Court in the Plessy v. Ferguson case in 1896. The Court ruled that segregation was constitutional so long as African Americans were provided equal accommodations.¹⁷ That decision is known as the "separate but equal doctrine."¹⁸

In actuality, it upheld institutionalized racism and inferior accommodations for African Americans.¹⁹

Throughout the twentieth century African Americans have remained concerned about the education provided to them by whites. In his book A Black Elite (1986), Daniel C. Thompson, an African American sociologist, stated that "a primary concern of all effective black leaders [is] that the intellectual potential and talents of far too many blacks will remain undiscovered, underdeveloped, and wasted because of undereducation and miseducation."²⁰ Thompson noted that William Edward Burghardt (W.E.B.) DuBois, the "towering" intellectual and first African American sociologist, on several occasions during his long "career as a scholar and activist," which covered much of the period from the end of Reconstruction through the first half of the twentieth century, expressed "concern about the amount and quality of education provided black children."²¹ Referring to DuBois's concerns about the quality of education that African American children received in white controlled public school systems, Thompson explained:

DuBois . . . expressed . . . fear that white-controlled public school systems were not providing the kinds and quality of education black children must have in order to overcome the generations of personal and racial restrictions and disesteem to which they had been brutally subjected. He protested that "as a race we are still kept in ignorance far below the average standard of this nation, and of the present age, and the ideals set

before our children in most cases are far below their possibilities and reasonable promise."²²

In 1986, Thompson, commenting on DuBois's opinion of public schools in the United States and their failure to provide adequate education to African American students, stated:

Unfortunately, DuBois' scathing criticism of the relatively low quality of public education provided black children seven decades ago is still apropos today.²³

In a speech delivered to the student body at State University College at New Paltz, New York, in November, 1971, Kenneth Clark, the distinguished African American psychologist, made the following statement concerning public schools:

Study after study has shown that those schools attended by predominantly black . . . students are criminally inefficient in providing these students with the type, quality, and effectiveness of education that will make them able to compete with more privileged youngsters at any public, parochial, or private school in this country.²⁴

In 1987, Charles Willie, another African American sociologist, criticized the spate of reports on educational reform in the United States, including A Nation at Risk (April 1983), which was prepared by the National Commission on Excellence in Education.²⁵ The Commission was established by Terrel Howard (T.H.) Bell, United States Commissioner of Education, with the approval and support of Ronald Reagan, the conservative, Republican President. Willie noted that the various commissions,

committees, councils, and task forces that studied education in the 1980s were composed primarily of middle class, middle aged, white men.²⁶ He contended that these "white" groups showed little concern for the education of African American students and were wrong both in their assessment of the contemporary educational system, particularly as it applies to African American students in colleges, and in their recommendations for reform.

Commenting on the National Commission's description of the education system as being mediocre and in a declining trend, Willie argued that the trend in colleges was certainly not declining for African Americans, but that the college system had become more inclusive for them.²⁷ He pointed out that the proportion of African Americans enrolled in college "increased substantially from 18.4 percent in 1960 to 28 percent in 1982 of all black high school graduates" and that their proportion of the total college population increased from 5 percent in 1970 to 10 or 11 percent in 1987, while, at the same time, the proportion of African Americans in the total population remained virtually unchanged at 10 to 12 percent.²⁸ Willie noted that in higher education in recent years it was not the proportion of African Americans in higher education that had declined, but the proportion of white males. This led Willie to ask: "Could it be that the National Commission, overwhelmingly white and male,

classified the current educational system as mediocre and in a declining state because it no longer caters exclusively or in a disproportionate way to the interests and concerns of white males?"²⁹

In reference to the recommendations of the reports on education, Willie contended that they were "more concerned with excluding all sorts of conditions of people in all levels of the educational system."³⁰ He suggested that the reports' focus on "excellence in education" was a code term for "exclusiveness in education," and that recommendations by the National Commissions on Excellence in Education that college admissions standards be raised and that standardized tests be administered nationwide between high school and college and at other educational transition points are examples of the exclusive nature of the excellence movement in education.³¹ In Willie's view, these recommendations would work to exclude some African American students from the education system.

Willie felt that "[r]ather than viewing education with alarm, as do most of the contemporary reports, we should be celebrating the achievement of an inclusive and universal system of education in this nation where all sorts and conditions of people are served."³² Although Willie recognized that in the 1980s, race remained a barrier to full participation in education for African Americans, he felt that it was less a barrier at that

time, than it had been in the past.³³

Willie maintained that since African Americans--and other persons commonly referred to as racial minorities, but which Willie called "subdominants"--were absent in significant numbers on the various groups that studied the education system in recent years, those study groups incorrectly assessed the education system due to a lack of necessary input from the "subdominants" in the population.³⁴ Due to the lack of participation of subdominants on the commissions, he concludes that African Americans and the other groups must question "the universal applicability of some of their recommendations."³⁵

These accounts reveal a long history of disagreement and conflict between African Americans and whites over the type of education African Americans have been and should be receiving. There has also been a long history of debate among African Americans themselves over how they should be educated.

Differences among African Americans has existed at least since Booker T. Washington, the educator and most influential African American from 1895 to his death in 1915, and W.E.B. DuBois debated this issue during the early years of the twentieth century.³⁶ Washington emphasized industrial education, racial segregation, hard work, and economic self-sufficiency for African Americans,

rather than social and political equality.³⁷ DuBois, in contrast to Washington, insisted that the most promising African American youth, the "talented tenth"/the gifted elite, have an opportunity to attend higher education. He felt that this college-educated group, acting as leaders, was necessary for the advancement of African Americans.³⁸ DuBois demanded political, civil, and social rights for African Americans and advocated that they agitate and protest in order to obtain them.³⁹ He was more supportive of integration than Washington.⁴⁰ On the dispute between Washington and DuBois, and their respective supporters, Clarke states: "At the base of the conflict was the still unanswered question, 'What kind of education is most relevant for black Americans?'"⁴¹

Just as DuBois and Washington disagreed on the best education for African Americans at the turn of the twentieth century, African American social scientists differ today on key issues facing educational institutions in the United States and the education of African American youth. For example, as the content of this paper reveals, Charles Vert Willie, Alphonso Pickney, and Bartholomew ("Bart") Landry, sociologists, disagree with William Wilson, sociologist, and Thomas Sowell and Walter Williams, economists, that class has become more significant than race in determining the life chances of African Americans.⁴² Willie, Kenneth Clark, psychologist,

and Edward Franklin Frazier, sociologist, also, are stronger supporters of desegregation/integration than Maulana Ron Karenga, a political scientist and linguist, and Nathan Hare and Abdul Alkalimat (Gerald McWorter), sociologists, all of whom have been identified as "black nationalists"/"cultural nationalists" and advocates of some degree of separation or autonomy of African Americans from white Americans.⁴³

The evidence seems clear that throughout much of the history of African Americans in the United States, they have disagreed with whites and among themselves on the type of education they should receive. The determination of African Americans to obtain an education during slavery despite laws forbidding it has been noted by Henry Allen Bullock and John Hope Franklin, among others.⁴⁴ Anderson documents the inferior education provided African Americans from the dawn of the Civil War through the first third of the twentieth century.⁴⁵ Clarke and Thompson point out that African Americans still receive an inferior and inadequate education, and indicate, along with other writers, that white racism has been, and is, in large part, the reason for African Americans being denied equal educational opportunities, or being given substandard education.⁴⁶ Clarke notes that in addition to "formalized racism" the poor education provided African Americans has been due to "the long sore of the slave trade [and]

colonialism."⁴⁷ Racism, slavery, and colonialism, then, are perceived by some prominent and respected African American social scientists as being the root causes for the differences between African Americans and whites on educational issues.

While the effects of racism, slavery, and colonialism may account for differences in the ways African Americans and whites think about education, as well as their differences on the type of education that African Americans should receive, it does not seem that it could logically explain or account for/influence differences in the images/ideas held by African American social scientists today concerning the critical issues facing educational institutions and the education of African American youth. This study will describe how they think about the critical issues facing institutions of education and the education of African Americans, and especially how their thoughts place them on different sides of those issues. It will also present the social roots of their ideas, that is, how the social scientists came to hold ideas that place them on different sides of the issues.

Methodology and Procedures

Field of Inquiry (The Sociology of Knowledge)

Since this study seeks a sociological explanation of the ideas of African American social scientists about the

education of African Americans, a problem with a long history in the United States, it falls within the "field of sociological inquiry" known as the sociology of knowledge, as explained by sociologist, Robert Merton, in his book, Social Theory and Social Structure.⁴⁸ Merton states that the falling within "the main currents" of this field are studies with "enormous differences in scope--from the all-encompassing categorizing of intellectual history to the social location of the thought of Negro scholars in the last decades" (p. 514). He also reports that the sociology of knowledge includes studies with "diverse methods of validation--from plausible but undocumented imputations to meticulous historical and statistical analysis" (p. 514).

Merton describes the sociology of knowledge as follows:

[It] is devoted to digging up the social roots of knowledge, to searching out the ways in which knowledge and thought are affected by the environing social structure. The chief focus here is the shaping of intellectual perspectives by society. In this discipline . . . knowledge and thought are so loosely construed that they come to include almost all ideas and beliefs. At the core of the discipline, nevertheless, is a sociological interest in the social context of that knowledge which is more or less certified by systematic evidence. That is to say, the sociology of knowledge is most directly concerned with the intellectual products of experts, whether in science or philosophy, in economics or political thoughts (pp. 494-495).

In this discipline, then, "above all, the sociologist of knowledge seeks the social determinants of the

intellectual's perspectives, how he came to hold his ideas" (p. 504).

Merton points out that in the sociology of knowledge "the term 'knowledge' must be interpreted broadly . . . since studies in this area have dealt with virtually the entire gamut of cultural products (ideas, ideologies, juristic and ethical beliefs, philosophy, science, technology)" (p. 510). However, he emphasizes:

. . . whatever the conception of knowledge, the orientation of this discipline remains largely the same: it is primarily concerned with the relationship between knowledge and other existential factors in the society and culture (p. 510).

Merton states: "Manifestly, then, the sociology of knowledge is concerned with the problems which have had a long history" (p. 510).

Commenting on the relationship between knowledge and other existential factors Merton explains that "mental productions" (thoughts, ideas, knowledge) have an existential basis. He states: "A central point of agreement in all approaches to the sociology of knowledge is the thesis that thought has an existential basis in so far as one or another of its aspects can be derived from extracognitive factors" (p. 516). The existential basis (extracognitive factors) is both social and cultural. Among the social bases of mental productions are the following:

social position, class, generation, occupational role, mode of production, group structures (university, bureaucracy, academics, sects, political parties), 'historical situations, interests, society, ethnic affiliation, social mobility, power structure, [and] social processes (competition, conflict, etc.) (p. 514).

The cultural bases of mental productions include "values, ethos, climate of opinion . . . type of culture, [and] culture mentality" (p. 515).

In the sociology of knowledge, the statements by experts are accepted as adequate data and facts. Actually, a statement by an expert may often be accepted as an "empirical datum" (p. 496). Merton elaborates:

An impression derived from a few documents, particularly if these documents refer to a time and place sufficiently remote, will pass muster as fact about widespread currents of thought about generally held doctrines. If the intellectual status of an author is high enough and the scope of his attainment broad enough, his impression, sometimes his casual impressions of prevailing beliefs, will be typically taken as reports of sociological facts. Or, a generalization stated positively enough and generally enough will be taken as an empirical datum" (p. 496).

In addition to accepting the statements of experts as adequate empirical data and facts, the sociology of knowledge "almost disdains to establish the very facts it purports to explain" (pp. 497-498). In this study, although I will seek an explanation for the ideas of African American social scientists that place them on different sides of the critical issues facing American education and the education of African American youth, I

have not made an attempt to establish that the issues on which this study focuses are, in fact, the critical ones.

In reference to research techniques and procedures, Merton notes: "It is considered almost intellectually debasing to set forth the prosaic details on how an analysis in the sociology of knowledge was conducted" (p. 500). He also points out that in this discipline "reliability, by which is meant roughly, the consistency between independent observations of the same material, is almost entirely absent as a problem" (p. 501). Merton maintained:

The very notion of reliability of categorization (i.e., the extent to which independent categorization of the same empirical materials coincide) has seldom found expression in the design of researches by the sociologist of knowledge (p. 501).

Merton indicates that the sociologist of knowledge may have inherited this "systematic neglect of the problem of reliability" from the "historians among his antecedents" (p. 501). He implies that the sociologist of knowledge, as the historian, "awaits with happy resignation different interpretation of the same data" (p. 502). Merton seems to summarize his discussion of research techniques and procedures in the sociology of knowledge in the following statement:

There is a very substantial orientation toward the humanities which persists in the sociology of knowledge and with this, an aversion to standardizing observational data and the interpretation of the data (p. 503).

I believe that Merton's statements concerning reliability are applicable to this study. Another scholar, utilizing the same data, might arrive at a different interpretation of them. It seems to me unlikely that a different interpretation of the same empirical materials used in this study would invalidate my interpretation. It could, possibly, offer an increased understanding of the issues.

Population

The African American social scientists in this study are scholars, who have lived since the 1954 ruling by the Supreme Court making segregated public schools unconstitutional; earned a doctorate degree in one or more fields of social science (i.e., sociology, psychology, history, economics, political science); had substantial academic training or teaching experience in colleges and/or universities in the United States; written about education and/or one of the studies' critical issues in the United States; and/or had their words and/or ideas on any of these issues presented in written form (e.g., their published books, chapters or sections from them included in edited or compiled works by others, articles published in professional journals, newspapers, and magazines, published speeches and interviews, excerpts from or summaries of any of their writings, and quotations) since

the Supreme Court's school desegregation decision (1954), regardless of the sources, and even if presented by someone other than themselves.

Twelve African American social scientists were chosen for the study. W.E.B. DuBois was selected because of his prominence among African Americans and intellectuals as an intellectual, scholar, social scientist, and writer on both class and race. Thomas Sowell, Walter Williams, and William Wilson were chosen for their declarations that class was more significant than race for the education and progress of African American youth. The selection of Charles Willie, Alphonso Pinkney, and Bartholomew Landry resulted from their arguments that race was more significant than class, placing them in opposition to the viewpoints of Sowell, Williams, and Wilson, and from their critiques of Wilson's ideas in The Declining Significance of Race (1978, 1980). E. Franklin Frazier, Kenneth Clark, and Willie, selected again, were chosen for their advocacy of racial integration. The choice of Nathan Hare, Maulana Ron Karenga, and Abdul Alkalimat was due to their involvement and prominence in, as well as promotion of, the "Black Studies" movement at its inception in the late 1960s, to their continuing research and commentary on African Americans' education and on America's race relations, and to their nationalistic views which depict them as insisting on African Americans having some degree

of autonomy/separation from white people.

It is not the intent of this study to be exhaustive of the writings of African American social scientists on education or the critical issues facing it. The author is aware that no females are included among the chosen scholars. Presentation and analysis of the ideas of female social scientists are left for future research. Readers may feel that other African American social scientists are more influential in a given field of social science or have written more significant or larger numbers of works. It is hoped that this study will present: (1) the ideas held by some of the most prominent African American social scientist on the critical issues of race and class and desegregation/integration and segregation/separation facing educational institutions and African American youth; (2) the different sides of the critical issues on which the social scientists are placed as a result of their ideas; and (3) the social and/or cultural determinants of the social scientists' differences.

Location and Identification of African American Social Scientists

1. African American bibliographer Mary Mace Spradling identifies African Americans by name and type of social scientist (e.g., anthropologist, economist, historian,

psychologist, sociologist) in her two volumes, In Black and White: A Guide To Magazine Articles, Newspaper Articles, and Books Concerning More than 15,000 Black Individuals and Groups (1980).⁴⁹ A supplement (1985) to the two volumes contains 6,700 African American individuals and groups, including some social scientists who were not named in the initial two volumes.⁵⁰

2. Spradling's works also lists some African Americans under the headings of Teachers or Educators, but provides brief descriptions elsewhere in the texts, which, in some cases, identifies their specific academic/professional areas.
3. Some African American social scientists identify themselves as African American (black, Afro-American), or indicate clearly that they are members of this racial group, and name their academic/professional field.
4. Some editors identify or reveal the racial classifications and social science categories of the contributors to their publications.
5. I have seen and know personally that several of the social scientists (e.g., sociologists Kenneth B. Clark), whose writings were studied,

are African Americans.

6. The jacket cover on a book (if it has one) provides comments on or descriptions of the book's contents, background of the author, and sometimes a photograph of the author. For example, Bart Landry, author of The New Black Middle Class (1987), is identified as a sociologist on the inside of the jacket cover of this book. A photograph reveals that he is African American.
7. Serendipitous discoveries. Locating and identifying some African American social scientists was unintentional or accidental, as in the case of Landry, who is noted above, whose book, initially, was simply found on the library shelf.
8. Any combination of the ways discussed above.

Location of Publications by African American Social Scientists

Publications by African American social scientists were located in the following ways:

1. Searching the library name catalog for all publications that appear related to African American education and the study's critical issues for all scientists identified as African American.

2. Searching the table of contents to all issues of The Black Scholar since its initial publication in 1969 for articles by African American social scientists that appear to be related to the topic and issues of this study.
3. Searching the table of contents of Ebony magazine for articles by or about African American social scientists, and on the study's critical issues.
4. Noting the references that the social scientists make to other African American social scientists and to their publications.
5. Discovering publications serendipitously (e.g., finding a book or article unintentionally or being told of one of which I had no previous awareness).

Location of Biographical, Social, and Cultural
Information Related to the Social Scientists
and/or Their Ideas

Biographical, social, and cultural information pertaining to the social scientists in this study and to their ideas was located in several ways. Among them are: those listed above under "Location and Identification of African American Social Scientists," the social scientists' own writings, biographical information provided by editors of the social scientists' works,

biographical sketches in various publications of Who's Who Among Black Americans, almanacs and encyclopedia on African Americans, and other written materials (e.g. books) which provide accounts of historical, social, and cultural events since the Supreme Court decision in 1954 desegregating public schools.

Sources of Data

Only written sources (e.g., books, professional journals, magazines) are utilized in this study. The social scientists' own words (e.g., in books and articles they have written, chapters or sections of books edited by others, excerpts or quotations from their works reported by other writers) are the primary sources of their ideas on and images of the critical issues, including their critiques, criticism, and comments on other social scientists on the same or opposite side of the issue. Any appropriate sources, including books and articles by the social scientists, publications containing biographical information about them, and works offering descriptions and/or analyses of social and historical events and circumstances are used to determine what influenced/accounted for their ideas.

Data Analysis and Writing the Study

The data are analyzed and the study written by critical issue. For example, on the issues of class and

race, the study first analyzes and reports the ideas of the social scientists who indicate that class is more critical than race to the education, or progress, or achievement of African Americans. The same occurs with those social scientists who feel that race is more critical than class. Images/ideas of the social scientists on the issues of desegregation/integration and segregation/separation are treated in a similar manner.

Based on the available data, the ideas of each African American social scientist on each side of the critical issues were recorded and the contents analyzed, as well as demographic information and social and cultural factors associated with each of the social scientists. Where necessary or appropriate, explanatory or descriptive notes were formulated to show/indicate the relationship between their ideas and the social (e.g., social, or political, or historical situation) and/or cultural (e.g., ethos, "climate of opinion") factors which appear to have determined, influenced, or accounted for them. Those factors which appeared most often among the social scientists on the same side of the issue, those that were accorded significance by the social scientists themselves in the development of their ideas, and those that were known or believed to have influenced or dominated political and social thought during a particular period (e.g., the civil rights movement of the late 1950s and

1960s which encouraged and promoted racial integration, and the black nationalist ideology which increased in prominence beginning in the late 1960s, which encouraged and promoted segregation or separation), are interpreted as having influenced their ideas.

Relationship Between Education and Social Class and
Education and Race, and Interrelationship Among
Education, Social Class, and Race

Education and Social Class

Since the seventeenth century when England established a state system of education in the American colonies, type and level of education have been related to social class.⁵¹ R. Freeman Butts in The Education of the West: A Formative Chapter in the History of Civilization (1973) indicated that boys who were not from privileged homes (the majority of boys) were trained for the skilled vocations through apprenticeships. It is likely that these boys learned only to read. Butts noted that "[a]ll the American colonies in the seventeenth century made some provision for teaching children to read in the vernacular tongue" and that "by the end of the seventeenth century it was not uncommon for writing schools (including arithmetic) to exist alongside reading schools."⁵² Referring to the book reading materials and vernacular tongues at that time, Butts wrote:

The book reading materials were a hornbook, a primer Bible, the catechism, and the psalmbook. With minor variations, the same story applied to

the Dutch school masters in New Amsterdam who taught in Dutch, the Anglican school masters and tutors of the South who taught in English, the Huguenots who taught in French, and the Lutherans who taught in German or Swedish.⁵³

He pointed out, however, that "[i]f a child was exposed to more than reading and the catechism, he was lucky."⁵⁴

In contrast to the minimal level of instruction in reading and apprenticeship training provided the less privileged boys of the seventeenth century, Latin grammar schools were "set up as the proper form of school for privileged boys to attend."⁵⁵ The education of the boys in these schools consisted, primarily, of "the study of classical language and literature" which was "shaped to serve the purpose of piety, the pietas litterata."⁵⁶ Butts explained that this type of education emanated from "humanism" which was "entrenched in the grammar schools of America from the beginning", and that the humanists taught that it was the proper type for "those who would rule in church and state."⁵⁷ In America, the main purpose of the grammar schools was "preparation for college, although the ideal was also to prepare boys for public service and for occupations into which they might go, especially the ministry, the magistracy, and teaching."⁵⁸

These privileged boys were the only ones who were prepared to advance to Harvard College after its establishment in 1636. Butts noted that Harvard was virtually a copy of Cambridge University in England. The

curriculum, with Latin as the basic language of instruction, was totally prescribed. Of the curriculum content, Butts explained:

Here were six of the seven medieval liberal arts: grammar, rhetoric, logic, arithmetic, geometry, and astronomy; music had disappeared. Here were some of the studies of Aristotle's moral philosophy (ethics and politics) and his natural philosophy (physics). Here was a strong infusion of renaissance humanist learning in the emphasis upon Greek, Hebrew, and "Eastern tongues" (Aramaic and Syrian). The Reformation concern with religion was reflected in the study of "Divinity Catechetical" on Saturday mornings and the worship services on weekdays and on Sundays.⁵⁹

This clearly indicates that the level and type of education in early colonial America was determined by social class.

In volume three ("The Modern West: Europe and the New World") of A History of Western Education (1981), James Bowen explained that the first successful movement to educate the masses of people in western societies occurred from about 1800 through 1850 in England.⁶⁰ The central figure in that movement was Joseph Lancaster, a Quaker who organized a school in London in 1798 using a monitorial system of educating students.⁶¹ Lancaster became the target of attack for his efforts to educate those persons who were not the elites of the society. Referring to the leader of Lancaster's attackers, Sarah Trimmer (1741-1810), who had expressed her views on charity schools and the education of the poor in 1792, Bowen stated:

[I]n her Reflections upon the Education of Children in

Charity Schools [1792]. . . she wrote that it would be wrong to educate the 'lower kinds of people' since that might make them socially mobile 'and disqualify them for those servile offices which must be filled by some member of the community', and that 'The children of the poor should not be educated in such a manner as to set them above the occupations of humble life, or so as to make them uncomfortable among their equals.'⁶²

Reserving the higher levels of education for the privileged few in society was prevalent during the 1800's in the United States as well. As Bowen explained:

American education in the nineteenth century, like European, was dominated by the colleges and universities, and the emergence of a system of popular education was a slow and difficult process, harassed on all sides by privileged intransigence and deliberate obstruction. In the early decades of the nineteenth century the United States had only the beginnings of a system of higher education, and it was in building this that most energy was expended; those who laboured to create popular provisions were a tiny minority.⁶³

Bowen pointed out that at the end of the first decade of the twentieth century "[u]niversities and colleges remained the preserve of the privileged classes, mostly white males."⁶⁴ He further noted that at the "outbreak of the First World War" when the "overwhelming majority of the population went to public schools," the powerful and wealthy members of the society, who comprised a "tiny minority" of the United States' population, but had more than half of the nation's income, "sent their children to private, highly privileged schools."⁶⁵

Referring to social class discrimination, education, and life chances in more recent years, Patricia Cato

Sexton (1961) in Education and Income: Inequality of Opportunity in Our Public Schools, explained that both white Americans and African Americans "suffer from class discrimination," which affects their educational achievement and overall life chances, although African Americans are affected to a far greater degree than whites.⁶⁶ (The historical relationship between education and race and the interrelationship between education, class, and race are discussed below). Ann Bastian, Norm Fruckner, Marilyn Gittell, Colon Greer, and Kenneth Haskins, the authors of Choosing Equality: The Case for Democratic Schooling (1985), a report published by The New World Foundation, summarizes the relationship between education and social class, both historically and at the present time. They concluded that the argument by today's neoconservatives that there once was a "golden age" in American education when "our schools use to work well" is a myth.⁶⁷ Specifically, they state:

The myth is that today's school failures represent a recent development, in contrast with a "golden age" of public schooling which once served well both the elite and mass of students. But in our view, The gulf between elite and mass goals and methods of education has been a constant feature of our education system; today's failures express a tradition of a historically stratified system.⁶⁸

Elaborating on the differences in schooling for the elite and the masses of students since 1900, the authors explain that there has been a two-tiered system of education.⁶⁹ In their view, free public schools, which have included

elementary schools since the last half of the nineteenth century and high schools ("a reform largely stimulated by the middle class need to acquire secondary education and to defray its growing cost through the public treasury") since the early decades of the twentieth century, have served the needs of the privileged, but not the poor.⁷⁰ Referring to the first half of the twentieth century, the authors note that [t]he public schools of the privileged were "decent and well endowed institutions... [and are] the models which today's myths universalize to prove past school success."⁷¹ However, in contrast, they explain that "[t]he schools of the masses. . . were little more than holding pens, promoting high failure rates among the children of the lower strata."⁷² Working class and poor students could not gain wide access to "high school, and certain academic high school programs."⁷³ These students received poor academic training in elementary school and high school entrance was selective.⁷⁴ Assessing these circumstances, the authors concluded:

In effect, the high school diploma upped the educational ante, with the result that elementary education became more truly universal and, at the same time, more devalued.⁷⁵

The authors feel that the establishment of the free public high schools was a pattern of school reform that has held throughout the twentieth century. The poor are allowed to gradually gain access to established levels of schooling while new, higher layers are established for the middle

class. This preserves the elite status of the latter. "In the process, the lower levels are universalized and devalued, both in terms of the range of instruction and in terms of the labor market value of educational attainment"⁷⁶

Education and Race

The historical and traditional relationship between education and race is discussed earlier in this Chapter. Some of the differences between education for African Americans and whites are related there. From that discussion, it is evident that since their arrival in this country in the early part of the seventeenth century, African Americans have received an inferior education when compared to that received by whites. Here, I will simply make a few additional comments on this issue.

In a discussion of education of African Americans after they gained emancipation (1863), obtained citizenship (1868), and received enfranchisement for males (1870), Bowen (1981) wrote:

It was now legally impossible to prevent [African Americans from] seeking to become educated, but, given the nature of community organization of schools, the white power elite was able to gerrymander school-board boundaries to keep white and black populations separate; the latter, being economically weak, had poorer schools.⁷⁷

Bowen explained that the poorer education and higher levels of illiteracy for African American continued

throughout the last half of the nineteenth century.⁷⁸ This was true despite the enactment into law of compulsory education which began with Massachusetts in 1852⁷⁹ and ended with the southern states from 1906-1918, Mississippi being the last.⁸⁰

Although it took America more than six decades to fully implement compulsory education--the southern states not doing so until the first and second decades of the twentieth century--and its "impact was chiefly upon white, middle-class males",⁸¹ at the time the southern states implemented compulsory education, "literacy and a basic education" had already spread "among the bulk of the white population."⁸² This was not the case with African Americans. They were "largely ignored and had to depend on charitable, federal and self-help agencies."⁸³ The South, where the vast majority of African Americans lived during slavery and through the first few decades of the twentieth century, "intended to disadvantage blacks" by opposing educational compulsion.⁸⁴ Southern states advanced "[r]acist and elitist arguments. . . cent[er]ing on an assumption that blacks are inferior in intelligence, cognitive ability and industrious application."⁸⁵

In A Common Destiny: Blacks and American Society, Gerald David Jaynes and Robin M. Williams (1989) discuss the status of blacks in America over the last five decades (1939-1989). Summarizing their main finding on the status

of African Americans in the late 1980s, they point out that over that period, whether aggregate statistical measures of educational opportunity or other indicators ("income and living standards, health and life expectancy, occupational and residency opportunities, [or] political and social participation") of well-being are used, both African Americans and whites have made significant advancement. However, they also note that "[b]y almost all the same indicators, blacks remain substantially behind whites."⁸⁶

Interrelationship Among Education, Social Class, and Race

There are two reasons why it is necessary in this study to discuss the interrelationship among education, class, and race. First, one of the study's primary aims is to examine whether African American social scientists consider social class or race as more critical/significant for educational opportunities and achievement of African Americans. Second, and a more central issue here, some of the social scientists in this analysis do not discuss education directly, but do analyze and interpret the effects or relationships of social class and/or race to economic, social, and political opportunities and advancement, to life chances, to levels of success, or to well-being. Therefore, due to the high correlation among social class, race, and education, any analysis or

discussion of the relationship among social class and/or race and these outcomes is also an analysis of the relationship between education and these same outcomes.⁸⁷

Patricia Cayo Sexton in her book, Education and Income: Inequality of Education in our Public Schools (1961), noted that there is a "very high correlation" among the many indices of social class (i.e., family income, occupation of father, type of housing, educational levels). She wrote:

[A] "lower class" family will tend to have a low income, lower-status (and lower-paying) occupations, poor housing, and low educational levels. A family possessing any one of these characteristics will tend to possess all of them.⁸⁸

Sexton points out that while there are exceptions, in general, "income tends to increase with educational levels."⁸⁹

Of the social class position of African Americans, Sexton explained that it is "generally much worse than that of whites and much more 'frozen' by prejudice."⁹⁰ She reported that the prejudice restricts "their job opportunities and income levels and provided "inferior segregated education and housing in overcrowded, neglected ghetto areas."⁹¹ Sexton argued that in the United States there is a "social class problem, but one that is seriously aggravated and complicated by racial discrimination."⁹²

A clear, concise discussion of the relationship among

education, class, and race is presented in this paragraph by African American sociologist, Alphonso Pinkney:

America's black population has always placed a special importance on acquiring formal education. For them it is seen as a means of both social and economic advancement, and although significant gains were made in the 1960's and 1970's, the gap between blacks and whites in educational achievement is still wide, and it affects both income and occupational level. Black people frequently lack access to quality education, thereby relegating them to low occupational status and consequently low incomes. These three variables -- education, occupation, and income -- are intertwined in American society, and although some manage to advance themselves on one or two of these, it is usually education that determines one's status in the larger society.⁹³

There is evidence to indicate that even when education and family background are controlled, African Americans have lower income than whites.⁹⁴ There is also research to suggest that a college education is a good investment for both African Americans and whites, but even more so for the former than latter. Robert S. Pepper (1975) reported:

[B]lacks with college educations have the highest incomes of all blacks. College seems to assure not only high status to blacks, but the most money they can earn as well. If a black man wants to earn as much as he can, in other words, he has no other choice but to go to college.⁹⁵

Pepper noted that this was not true for the "lower-class [white] man." He explained that while college education assured lower-class white men "high social status," it was "[v]ocational training and employment in a craft [that seemed] to offer the highest earnings."⁹⁶

Summary of Chapter Contents

The study consists of nine chapters. Chapter 1 includes a statement on the subject of the study, an overview of some of the historical differences between African Americans and whites and African Americans themselves over what type of education African Americans should receive, a description of the study's methodology, a discussion of the correlation between social class, race, and education, and a summary of the chapters' contents. Chapter 2 discusses the ideas of W.E.B. DuBois, an African American who has been recognized as one of the most outstanding social scientists, scholars, social activists, and intellectuals in the history of the United States, on the issues of social class, race, and education. This chapter also notes an apparent shift by DuBois during his lifetime from race to social class as the more critical variable in the education and life chances of African Americans, and presents an explanation for the shift by suggesting determinants for it. Chapter 3 presents the ideas of Thomas Sowell (economist), Walter Williams (economist), and William Wilson (sociologist), three African American social scientists whose ideas place them in support of social class as more critical than race for the education and progress of African Americans. Similarly, Chapter 4 provides the ideas of Charles Willie, Alphonso Pinkney, and Bartholomew (Bart) Landry, all

African American sociologists whose ideas place them in support of race as more significant than social class for the education and advancement of African Americans. Chapter 5 compares the social scientists in Chapter 3 with those in Chapter 4 on age, place of birth, place and period of college attendance, historical events and circumstance, ethos, and other relevant variables, identifies their similarities and differences, and offers an interpretation of those findings, including the determinants for their choice of social class or race as more critical for African Americans' education and success.

The ideas of Edward (E.) Franklin Frazier, a sociologist; Kenneth B. Clark, a psychologist; and Charles V. Willie, a sociologist, all who strongly support racial integration in education and in society, are presented in Chapter 6. Chapter 7 provides the ideas of three African American cultural nationalists--Nathan Hare, a sociologist; Maulana Ron Karenga, a political scientist and linguist; and Abdul Alkalimat (Gerald McWorter), a sociologist--on African American Studies; those ideas reveal that the social scientists are supportive of some degree of separation/autonomy of African Americans from white Americans. In Chapter 8, the integrationists in Chapter 6 are compared with the separatists/nationalists in Chapter 7 on relevant variables, such as

age/generation, place and years of college attendance, historical and social circumstance, and ethos. The chapter also reports apparent determinants for the different positions held by the social scientists. Chapter 9 (1) reiterates the different images that are held by the African American social scientists concerning the critical issues of race and class and integration and segregation, (2) summarizes the cause of the differences and (3) argues that the study must be placed in a broader context than simply the differences between or among African American social scientists on the issues of class and race, or integration and segregation to be fully understood. The chapter contends that the broader context must include an emphasis on all, not just some, of the issues as critical ones and on white supremacy and its inextricable companion--white racism--as the controlling influence in the rise of class and race, integration and segregation as significant issues among African Americans.

NOTES

1. James D. Anderson, The Education of Blacks in the South, 1860-1935 (Chapel Hill, North Carolina: University of North Carolina Press, 1988), 2; Diane Ravitch, The Schools We Deserve: Reflection on the Educational Crises of Our Times (New York: Basic Books, 1985), 198; John H. Clarke, "Education and the Making of the Black Urban Ghetto," in Black Manifesto for Education, ed. Jim Haskins (New York: William Morrow and Company, Inc., 1973), 17; Carter G. Woodson, The Education of the Negro Prior to 1861, reprinted 2d ed. (Salem, New Hampshire: Ayer Company, Publishers, Inc., 1968), 205-206.

2. Ravitch, Schools We Deserve: Reflections on Educational Crises, 198; John Hope Franklin, From Slavery to Freedom: A History of Negro Americans, 5th ed. (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1980), 145; Henry Allen Bullock, A History of Negro Education in the South (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1970), 6-11; Woodson, The Education of the Negro Prior to 1861, 205-228.

3. Anderson, Education of Blacks in the South, 7; Ravitch, Schools We Deserve: Reflections on Educational Crises, 198; Franklin, From Slavery to Freedom, 146-147; Woodson, The Education of the Negro Prior to 1861, 215-219.

4. Clarke, "Education and the Making of the Black Urban Ghetto," 23.

5. Anderson, Education of Blacks in the South, 3.

6. Ibid.

7. C. Erick Lincoln, The Negro Pilgrimage in America (New York: Bantam Books, 1967), 68.

8. Ibid.

9. Clarke, "Education and the Making of the Black Urban Ghetto," 22.

10. Anderson, Education of Blacks in the South, 2.

11. Ibid.

12. Juan Williams, Eyes on the Prize: America's Civil Rights Years, 1954-1965 (New York: Viking Penguin, Inc., 1987), 9-13; Lerone Bennett, Jr., Before the Mayflower: A History of the Negro in America 1619-1966, 3d ed. (Chicago: Johnson Publishing Company, Inc., 1966), 224-236.

13. Clarke, "Education and the Making of the Black Urban Ghetto," 31.

14. Ibid.

15. Ibid., 32.

16. Ibid.

17. Williams, Eyes on the Prize, 9.

18. Ibid.

19. Williams, Eyes on the Prize, 9-10; Bennett, Before the Mayflower, 225-226, 231.

20. Daniel C. Thompson, A Black Elite: A Profile of Graduates of UNCF Colleges (New York: Greenwood Press, 1986), 35.

21. Ibid.

22. Ibid., 36.

23. Thompson, A Black Elite: A Profile of Graduates of UNCF College, 36.

24. Kenneth B. Clark, "Issues in Urban Education," in Black Manifesto for Education, ed. Jim Haskins (New York: William Morrow and Company, Inc., 1973), 76.

25. Charles V. Willie, Effective Education: A Minority Policy Perspective (New York: Greenwood Press, 1987), 12.

26. Ibid., xi.

27. Ibid., 14.

28. Ibid.

29. Ibid.

30. Ibid., 12.

31. Ibid., 12-13.

- 32. Ibid., 13.
- 33. Ibid.
- 34. Ibid., xi-xii.
- 35. Ibid., xii.

36. Clarke, "Education and the Making of the Black Urban Ghetto," 33-35. In this article, Clarke points out that 1895 marked the year that Frederick Douglass, the unchallenged African American leader during the latter half of the nineteenth century and militant advocate of agitation for total freedom, died (p. 26-27). Also, it was the year that Washington delivered the well-received keynote address before a biracial audience at the Atlanta Cotton States and International Exposition (p. 24). As a result of the address, "the white press literally anointed . . . Washington and made him the spokesman for black America for the next two decades." (p. 26).

Clarke notes that although the fortunes of African Americans declined during the last quarter of the nineteenth century, Washington, who was the first African American to address such a large group of white Southerners, chose "'not to say anything that would give undue offense to the South'." (p. 24-25). Commenting on Washington's views, Clarke wrote:

Booker T. Washington never took a public stand against the rising tide of Jim Crow, lynchings, and the mass disenfranchisement of black voters. In the Atlanta Cotton Exposition speech he had asserted that the leaders of his people had shown poor judgement in beginning at the political top as freedmen rather than at the bottom of life working up by proving to be substantial citizens. He said, "Agitation of questions of social equality is the extreme folly" because an "opportunity to earn a dollar in a factory just now is worth indefinitely more than the opportunity to spend a dollar in an opera house" (p. 32).

37. Phillip S. Foner, ed. The Voice of Black America: Major Speeches by Negroes in the United States, 1797-1971 (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1972), 578.

38. Dan S. Green and Edwin D. Driver, eds. W.E.B. DuBois on Sociology and the Black Community (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978), 18.

39. Foner, Voice of Black America, 664-65.

40. Harold Cruse, The Crisis of the Negro

Intellectual: A Historical Analysis of the Failure of Black Leadership (New York: William Morrow and Company, 1967), 6.

41. Clarke, "Education and the Making of the Black Urban Ghetto," 35.

42. Charles V. Willie, "The Inclining Significance of Race," Society 15 (July/August 1978): 10-15; Charles V. Willie, The Caste and Class Controversy (New York: General Hall, 1979), 50-68; Charles V. Willie, A New Look at Black Families, 2d ed. (Bayside, New York: General Hall, 1981), 27-45; Charles V. Willie, Race, Ethnicity, and Socioeconomic Status: A Theoretical Analysis of Their Interrelationship (Bayside, New York: General Hall, 1983), 2-9; Alphonso Pinkney, The Myth of Black Progress (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1984), 13-15, 82-97; Bart Landry, The New Black Middle Class (Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1987), 91-93, 193-233; William J. Wilson, "The Declining Significance of Race: Revisited But Not Revised," Society 15 (July/August 1978): 11-21; William J. Wilson, The Declining Significance of Race: Blacks and Changing American Institutions, 2d ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980); William J. Wilson, "Race, Class, and Public Policy," The American Sociologist 16 (1981): 125-134; Thomas Sowell, Knowledge and Decision (New York: Basic Books, 1980), 173-76, 256-59, 264-65; Thomas Sowell, Assumption Versus History (collected papers), (Stanford, California: Hoover Institute Press, 1986), 39-53; Walter Williams, The State Against Blacks (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1982), xv-xvi, 39.

43. Willie, The Sociology of Urban Education (Lexington, Massachusetts: Lexington Books, 1978), xi-xv; Charles V. Willie, School Desegregation Plans That Work (Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1984), 4-5, 11-13; Charles V. Willie, "The Future of School Desegregation," in The State of Black America 1987, Janet Dewart, ed. (New York: National Urban League, 1987), 37; Charles V. Willie, "The Future of School Desegregation," in The Education of African-Americans, Charles V. Willie, Antonine M. Garibaldi, and Wornie L. Reed, eds. (New York: Auburn House, 1991), 51, 63, 181; Kenneth Clark, "Alternative Public Education Systems," in Equal Education Opportunity, ed. Harvard Education Review (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1969), 173-177; Kenneth B. Clark, "A Charade of Power: Black Students at White Colleges," in New Perspectives on Black Studies, John Blassingame, editor (Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1971), 116; Kenneth B. Clark, "Issues in Urban Education," in Black Manifesto for Education, ed. Jim Haskins (New York: William Morrow and Company, Inc.,

1973), 74-94; Kenneth B. Clark, "Some Personal Observations on Black Separatism," in the introduction to Black Separatism: A Bibliography, in Betty Lanier Jenkins and Susan Phillis (Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1976), xiii-xv; Clark's observations on black separatism in the introduction to this work were presented separately, along with the observations of these other scholars/intellectuals: Ralph Ellison, Adelaide Cromwell Gulliver, William H. Hastie, Hylan Lewis, J. Saunders Redding, Bernard C. Watson, and Robert C. Weaver; Kenneth B. Clark, "Unfinished Business: The Toll of Psychic Violence," Newsweek, 11 January 1993, 38; E. Franklin Frazier, "The Failure of the Negro Intellectual," in The Death of White Sociology, ed. Joyce A. Ladner (New York: Vintage Books, 1973), 53; Among the sources which present biographical information and/or the position and ideas of Maulana Ron Karenga are Maulana Ron Karenga, "From the Quotable Karenga," in The Black Power Revolt (A Collection of Essays) ed. Floyd B. Barbour (Boston, Massachusetts: Extended Horizons Books, 1968), 162-70, 250-51; Maulana Ron Karenga, "The Black Community and the University: A Community Organizer's Perspective," including the "Question Period," in Black Studies in the University: A Symposium, eds. Armstead L. Robinson, Craig C. Foster, and Donald H. Ogilvie (New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1969), 37-54; Addison Gayle, Jr. ed., The Black Aesthetic (Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1971), 421; Ron Karenga, "Black Cultural Nationalism," in The Black Aesthetic (Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1971), 32-38; James Haskins, Profiles in Black Power (Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1972), 204-212; Dictionary of Black Culture, 1973 ed., s.v. "Karenga, Maulana Ron"; Maulana Ron Karenga, "Which Road: Nationalism, Pan Africanism, Socialism?" Black Scholar 2 (October 1974): 21; Manning Marable, Race, Reform and Rebellion: The Second Reconstruction in Black America, 1945-1982 (Jackson, Mississippi: University Press of Mississippi, 1984), 124, 152; Maulana Karenga, "Political Culture and Resurgent Racism in the United States," Black Scholar (May/June 1985): 21; "Contributing Authors," Black Scholar 21 (March-May 1990): 79; and The African American Encyclopedia, 1993 ed., vol. 4, s.v. "Karenga, Ron Ndabetta." For sources on Nathan Hare, see Nathan Hare, "How White Power Whitewashes Black Power," in The Black Power Revolt, ed. Floyd B. Barbour (Boston, Massachusetts: Extending Horizons Books, 1968), 182-88; Nathan Hare, "The Case for Separatism: 'Black Perspective,'" in Black Power and Student Rebellion, eds. James McEvoy and Abraham Miller (Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing, Inc., 1969), 233-35; Nathan Hare, "The Challenge of A Black Scholar," Black Scholar (December 1969), 58-63; Nathan Hare, "A Radical Perspective on Social Science Curricula,"

in Black Studies in the University: A Symposium, eds. Armstead L. Robinson, Craig C. Foster, and Donald H. Ogilvie (New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1969), 104-121; Nathan Hare, "Will the Real Black Man Please Stand Up?" Black Scholar 2 (June 1971), 32-35; Nathan Hare, "What Should Be the Role of Afro-American Education in the Undergraduate Curriculum?" in New Perspectives in Black Studies, ed John W. Blassingame (Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1971), 3-15; Dictionary of Black Culture, 1973 ed., s.v. "Hare, Nathan, Jr."; Joyce A. Ladner, The Death of White Sociology (New York: Random House, 1973), xxxiii; Nathan Hare, "Text of a Speech to Be Delivered by Nathan Hare, Ph.D., Ph.D. To His Alma Mater, Langston University, on the Occasion of Their 'Cultural Renaissance' Rally, August 30, 1975, 6:00 O'clock P.M.," Speech delivered by Nathan Hare, the keynote speaker, to his alma mater, Langston University, Langston, Oklahoma, at its "Cultural Renaissance" Rally on August 30, 1975, received on September 3, 1993 by the author, Jerry Woods, from Mr. Ronald Keys, curator of the Melvin B. Tolson Black Heritage Center at Langston University; Contemporary Authors: A Bio-Bibliographical Guide to Current Writers in Fiction, General Nonfiction, Poetry, Journalism, Drama, Motion Pictures, Television, and Other Fields, New Revision Series, vol. 24, (1988), s.v. "Hare, Nathan 1934-"; Nathan Hare, "Solutions: A Complete Theory of the Black Family," in Crisis in Black Sexual Politics, eds. Nathan Hare and Julia Hare (San Francisco, California: Black Think Tank, 1989), 157-173; Nathan Hare and Julia Hare, "The Crisis in Black Sexual Politics," in Crisis in Black Sexual Politics, eds. Nathan Hare and Julia Hare (San Francisco, California: Black Think Tank, 1989), 4; The Negro Almanac: A Reference Work on the African American [1989], 6th ed., s.v. "Nathan Hare"; Who's Who Among Black Americans [1992/93], 7th ed., s.v. "Hare, Nathan"; and The African American Encyclopedia, 1993 ed., vol. 3, s.v. "Hare, Nathan." For information on and/or the views of Alkalimat, see Gerald A. McWorter, "Deck the Ivy Racist Halls: The Case of Black Studies," in Black Studies in the University: A Symposium, eds. Armstead L. Robinson, Craig C. Foster, and Donald H. Ogilvie (New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1969), 55-74; "Abd-l Hakimu Ibn Alkalimat, "The Ideology of Black Social Science," in The Death of White Sociology, ed. Joyce A. Ladner (New York: Vanguard Books, 1973), 173-189; Joyce A. Ladner, ed. The Death of White Sociology (New York: Vanguard Books, 1973), xxxi; "Contributing Authors," Black Scholar (March-April 1984): 56; Manning Marable, Race, Reform and Rebellion: The Second Reconstruction in Black America, 1945-1982 (Jackson, Mississippi: University Press of Mississippi, 1984), 152; Gerald A. McWorter and Ronald W. Bailey, "Black Studies Curriculum Development in

the 1980s: Patterns of Consensus, Conflict, and Change," paper number 17 in a series titled Afro Scholars Working Papers (Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, AfroAmerican Studies and Research Program, [1984?]), 1-58, microfilm; Although the computer reference information states that this article by McWorter and Bailey was published in "[1982?]," the authors note on the first page stated that "since [1981], over the last three years, four major national curriculum projects have been developed at [four different] institutions," making 1984 the most probable year that McWorter and Bailey wrote the article; This article by McWorter and Bailey was located at the Schomburg Center for Research in Black Culture on microfilm, call number Sc Micro R-4102 no. 14, ZZ-24767, Master Negative (of Sc Micro R-4102); Abdul Alkalimat, review of Eurocentricism, by Samir Amin, in Black Scholar 21 (Fall 1991): 43-44; "Contributing Authors," Black Scholar 21 (March-May 1990): 79; Gerald McWorter, review essay, "The Fighting Spirit of Our Fallen Warrior--Malcolm X," of Malcolm X: The Last Speeches, by Bruce Perry, ed., in Black Scholar 21 (March-May 1990): 61-62; and Who's Who Among Black Americans[,] 1990-91, 6th ed., s.v. "McWorter, Gerald A."

Since the late 1960s, as shown in the notes above, various sources have either Alkalimat or McWorter as the last name to identify the third of the cultural nationalists. This study refers to him as Alkalimat. Alkalimat's first name has been spelled differently in some sources. This study uses "Abdul" as his first name.

44. Bullock, A History of Education in the South, 6; Franklin, From Slavery to Freedom, 145. Among the other writers who have discussed the determination of African Americans to obtain an education despite laws prohibiting it is James D. Anderson, who, in The Education of Blacks in the South, 1860-1935, wrote:

During the three decades before the Civil War slaves lived in a society in which for them literacy was forbidden by law and symbolized as a skill that contradicted the status of slaves. As former slave William Henry Heard recalled: "...it was against the law for any person to teach any slave to read; and any slave caught writing suffered the penalty of having his forefinger cut from his right hand; yet there were some who could read and write." Despite the dangers and difficulties, thousands of slaves learned to read and write. By 1860 about 5 percent of the slaves had learned to read. Many paid a high price for their literacy. (p.16).

45. Anderson, The Education of Blacks in the South,

1860-1935, entire book.

46. Clarke, "Education and the Making of the Black Urban Ghetto," 16-40; Thompson, A Black Elite, 36-37.

47. Clarke, "Education and the Making of the Black Urban Ghetto," 17.

48. Robert Merton, Social Theory and Social Structure (New York: The Free Press, 1968), 493-552. All additional references in this section on the sociology of knowledge as the field of sociological inquiry are from this source and are indicated in the text by page number only.

49. Mary Mace Spradling, ed., In Black and White: A Guide to Magazine Articles, Newspaper Articles, and Books Concerning More than 15,00 Black Individuals and Groups, 3d ed., vols. 1, 2 (Detroit, Michigan: Gale Research Company, 1980).

50. Mary Mace Spradling, ed., In Black and White: A Guide to Magazine Articles, Newspaper Articles, and Books Concerning More than 6,700 Black Individuals and Groups, 3d ed. supplement (Detroit, Michigan: Gale Research Company, 1980).

51. R. Freeman Butts, The Education of the West: A Formative Chapter in the History of Civilization (New York: McGraw Hill, 1973), 275-91.

52. Ibid., 287.

53. Ibid.

54. Ibid.

55. Ibid.

56. Ibid.

57. Ibid.

58. Ibid., 288.

59. Ibid., 289.

60. James Bowen, "The Modern West: Europe and the New World", vol. 3, A History of Western Education (1981), 286-95.

61. Ibid., 291-95.

Quakers, a religious sect founded around 1668

by George Fox . . . considered themselves guided by an 'inner light' to do compassionate social acts; consequently, they were pacifists, refused military service concentrated upon philanthropy, especially in education. By the year 1800 they were known formally as the Society of Friends, and had several famous members, including Joseph Lancaster (1778-1836) who organized and personally conducted a charity school in London (p.292).

Lancaster's school was in the Borough Road, Southwork, in London; it opened in 1798 (p. 292).

Pointing out that Lancaster described his monitorial system in "his first publication of 1802, Improvements in Education," (p.292) Bowen wrote:

The school taught only reading, writing and arithmetic, with the addition of needlework for girls, and while not promoting 'the Religious Principles of any Particular Sect' it sought to instruct Youth in useful learning, in the leading and uncontroverted principles of Christianity, and to train them in the practice of moral habits, conducive to their future welfare, as virtuous men and useful members of society. Instruction was organized in classes, defined as 'any number of boys whose proficiency is on a par' but not exceeding ten per class; a monitor was assigned to each, the word monitor, in this institution, [meaning] any boy that has a charge either in some department of tuition or of order'. There were a large number of monitors (Latin monere, to advise or counsel) all wearing embossed badges of rank, usually suspended from a collar chain. Monitors were the brightest pupils; they came earlier in the day to receive instructions and were ready to teach their classes when the day began. The monitors themselves were stimulated by an elaborate system of rewards . . .

Like most schools of the period it was conducted in a single large hall, down the center of which were rows of benches and up to 100 long desks, each providing space for a class of ten . . . (p.293).

62. Ibid., 295.

63. Ibid., 351.

64. Ibid., 357.

65. Ibid., 447. Bowen explained:

Power and wealth remained concentrated in the hands of a tiny minority: at the outbreak of the First World War 2 percent of the population had 60 percent of the income of the nation; just two men, John Pierpoint Morgan and John Rockefeller, between them had 20 percent of the nation's wealth, and the wealthy, the stratum termed the 'power-elite' by C. Wright Mills, sent their children to private, highly privileged schools.

66. Patricia Cayo Sexton, Education and Income: Inequalities of Opportunity in our Public Schools (New York: Viking Press, 1961), 16-17.

67. Ann Bastian, Norm Fruckner, Marilyn Gittell, Colon Greer, Kenneth Haskins, Choosing Equality: The Case for Democratic Schooling (A report of the New World Foundation, 1985), 5, 20-44.

68. Ibid., 4, underline mine.

69. Ibid.

70. Ibid., 22-23.

71. Ibid., 22.

72. Ibid.

73. Ibid., 23.

74. Ibid.

75. Ibid.

76. Ibid.

77. Bowen, 446.

78. Ibid.

79. Ibid., 361, 444.

80. Ibid., 442-43.

81. Ibid., 361.

82. Ibid., 445.

83. Ibid., 361.

84. Ibid., 443.

85. Ibid.

86. Gerald David Jaynes and Robin M. Williams Jr., A Common Destiny: Blacks and American Society (Washington D.C.: Academy Press, 1989), 6.

87. See Patricia Cayo Sexton (1961), Alphonso Pinkney (1984), and Robert S. Pepper (1975) for discussions of the high correlation between education, class, and race. Patricia Cayo Sexton, Education and Income: Inequality of Education in our Public Schools (New York: Viking Press, 1961), 10-17; Alphonso Pinkney, The Myth of Black Progress (New York: Cambridge University Press 1984), 135; Robert S. Pepper "Education is Not Enough." Ph.D. Dissertation, Graduate Center, City University of New York, 1975.

88. Patricia Cato Sexton, Education and Income: Inequalities of Opportunity in Our Public Schools (New York: Viking Press, 1961), 11. underline mine.

89. Ibid.

90. Ibid., 16.

91. Ibid.

92. Ibid.

93. Alphonso Pinkney, The Myth of Black Progress, (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1984), 135; underline mine.

94. Robert S. Pepper, "Education Is Not Enough" Ph.D. dissertation, Graduate Center, City University of New York, 1975), 22-27. In discussing this point, Pepper cites Milner (1964:155), Siegal (1965:45), Blau and Duncan (1967:209), Duncan (1968:96-97), and Milner (1972:76-78).

95. Ibid. 122.

96. Ibid.

CHAPTER 2

W.E.B. DUBOIS: RACE, CLASS, AND EDUCATION

This chapter reports the ideas of W.E.B. DuBois, the first and, perhaps, most prominent African American sociologist,¹ on race, class, and education, which, in addition to racial integration and segregation/separation, are the critical issues of this study.² Also, the chapter notes his apparent shift from an emphasis on race to class as the more critical variable in the education and progress of African Americans. In addition, it interprets the cause of the change by explaining how DuBois's perception of the society in which he lived seems to have influenced his thoughts. In other words, regarding this final point, DuBois's ideas on race and class are examined by utilizing the sociology of knowledge, which, as described by Robert Merton and noted in Chapter 1, searches out the social roots of knowledge, thought, and ideas and focuses on society's shaping of the intellectual's perspectives.³ DuBois's perspectives on race, class, and education are reported and analyzed in this study, primarily, because of his prominence, stature, and longevity as a social scientist, social activist, and scholar.⁴

W.E.B. DuBois was born in Great Barrington, Massachusetts on 23 February 1868. His family was poor. He earned a B.A. degree from Fisk University (Nashville, Tennessee) in 1888 and another one from Harvard University (Cambridge, Massachusetts) in 1890. In 1895, he earned a Ph.D. in history from Harvard, becoming the first African American to receive a doctorate from that University. DuBois served as professor of Latin and Greek at Wilberforce University (Wilberforce, Ohio) from 1894 through 1896 and at the University of Pennsylvania (Philadelphia, Pennsylvania) from 1896 through 1897, and as professor of economics and history at Atlanta University (Atlanta, Georgia) from 1897 through 1910. He was an active participant in the first Pan African Conference held in London, England in 1900; an organizer of the Niagara Conference in 1905; a co-founder of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (N.A.A.C.P.) in 1909 and 1910; the editor of the Crisis, the official magazine of the N.A.A.C.P., from 1910 to 1934; and the author of numerous books, articles, and speeches which concentrate on the life and problems of African Americans. In 1961 at the age of 93, DuBois joined the Communist Party of the United States. He became a citizen of Accra, Ghana in Africa, in 1963. On 27 August of that year, DuBois died in Accra at the age of 95.⁵

DuBois has been recognized by some scholars as one of the eminent American intellectuals, perhaps, preeminent intellectual, of the twentieth century, even in the entire history of the United States. For example, in W.E.B. DuBois: A Reader (1970), editor Meier Weinberg called DuBois "one of the greatest intellectuals America has ever produced."⁶ Herbert Aptheker, editor of The Autobiography of W.E.B. DuBois (1968), referred to DuBois's entire life, not merely its longevity, as "Promethean". He continued by proclaiming that "[a]s editor, author, lecturer, scholar, organizer, inspirer, and fighter, [DuBois] was among the most consequential figure of the [twentieth] century."⁷ In his introduction to DuBois's An ABC of Color, John Oliver Killens, while noting DuBois's academic background and some of his many accomplishments, asserted: "He was the greatest intellectual of the twentieth century."⁸ In large part, recognition of DuBois as an intellectual was/is based on his large volume of writings, much of it in/as editor of the Crisis magazine for nearly a quarter century (1910-1934), which presented his thinking and concerns on issues related to the plight and progress of African Americans. Here, I address briefly and separately some of DuBois ideas on race, class and education.

Race

Race/racism was the central issue/focus of DuBois's

life and writings. Although DuBois wrote about other issues, including class and education, it was always with an awareness, knowledge, and experience/from the perspective of a man of color, who, along with others of his race, was denied equality and deprived of opportunities simply because of race and/or color. While DuBois recognized the interrelationship of race, class, and education,⁹ and moved from criticism and rejection of American socialism as a viable structure for the economic and social mobility of African Americans to a greater acceptance and advocacy of socialism and communism, even to joining the Communist Party of the United States in 1961,¹⁰ the centrality of race in DuBois's thinking throughout his life was clearly evident in this passage from a speech he delivered on the African American and communism in Prague, Czechoslovakia on 23 October 1958 at the age of 90:

If now we turn to the place which Americans of Negro descent must seek to occupy in the future, conclusions are difficult. Problems of race, class, income and education cross each other and complicate decisions. I have in the last fifty years found myself repeatedly changing my point of view, not so much because of the change in facts as in the importance of the facts and the consequent necessity for change of emphasis. For instance, as a boy under sixteen, my anxiety was to prove that in the past, despite the teaching of text books and despite then present surroundings, Negroes were folk like other folk. Then in my youth from about 17 to 25, I was intent to secure opportunity for black folk, despite color and poverty. In my working manhood from 25 to 45, I was fighting race discrimination in work, income and recreation and seeking legal and moral redress. It was not until

after the Russian revolution that my main interest began to center in economic change as fundamental to the rise of American Negroes.¹¹

Other statements by DuBois during his long and productive life help to define the significance of race for his thinking, writing, and general view of the United States and the world.

DuBois explained that he first became aware that whites viewed him as a "problem" in the United States simply because of his race, when as a boy and during the exchange of "gorgeous visiting cards" among his school mates in New England,

one girl, a tall newcomer, refused my card--refused it peremptorily with a glance. Then it dawned upon me with a certain suddenness that I was different from the others; or like, mayhaps, in heart and life and longing, but shut out from their world by a vast veil.¹²

DuBois noted that African Americans were not only "born with a veil" (darker skin color) that shut them out of the white world, but that they also had to contend with the deprivation of self-consciousness. They were forced to see themselves "through the revelation of the [white] world."¹³ In reality, DuBois argued, an African American had double consciousness--a "sense of always looking at [himself/herself] through the eyes" of whites, and "of measuring [his/her] soul by the tape of a world that looks on in amused contempt and pity."¹⁴ As one who was born of African descent in the United States, had experienced and contended with racism, and had given serious consideration

and study to the plight of people of his race, DuBois explained, as likely only one with these credentials could, the double consciousness conflict within African Americans:

One ever feels his twoness--an American, a Negro; two souls, two thoughts, two unreconciled strivings; two warring ideals in one dark body, whose dogged strength alone keeps it from being torn asunder. The history of the American Negro is the history of this strife--this longing to attain self-conscious manhood, merge his double self into a better and truer self. In this merger he wishes neither of the older selves to be lost. He does not wish to Africanize America . . . he does not wish to bleach his Negro blood in a flood of white Americanism He simply wishes to make it possible for a man to be both a Negro and an American without being cursed and spit upon by his fellows, without losing the opportunity of self-development.¹⁵

In his first autobiography, DuBois indicates that when he entered Fisk University in Nashville, Tennessee in 1884 at the age of 17, he was aware of racism and its affect on African Americans, and at that institution he replaced his Americanism, from that time forward with "[a] new loyalty and allegiance" to his race.¹⁶ DuBois's intense allegiance and loyalty to African Americans was no doubt influenced and shaped both by his experiences at Fisk University and the brutal and inhumane treatment of African Americans by whites in the South in the 1880's when he attended school there. Recalling his years at Fisk, DuBois wrote:

The net result of the Fisk interlude was to broaden the scope of my program of life, not essentially to change it; to center it in a group of educated

Negroes, who from their knowledge and experience would lead the mass. I never for a moment dreamed that such leadership could ever be for the sake of the educated group itself, but always for the mass.¹⁷

Again, providing an indication of the influence of Fisk, DuBois proclaimed:

At Fisk I began my writing and public speaking. I edited the Fisk Herald. I became an impassioned orator and developed a belligerent attitude toward the color bar.¹⁸

Commenting on the South in which Fisk University was located and with which he had to contend and survive daily, DuBois explained:

Murder, killing and maiming Negroes, raping Negro women in the [18]80's and in the southern South, this was not even news; it got no publicity; it caused no arrests; and punishment for such transgression was so unusual that the fact was telegraphed North.

Lynching was a continuing and recurrent horror during my college days: from 1885 through 1894, 1,700 Negroes were lynched in America. Each death was a scar upon my soul. . ."¹⁹

It was probably events and experiences such as these during DuBois's early life which stimulated his racial pride and influenced him, while still a student at Fisk, to declare: "I am a Negro; and I glory in the name! I am proud of the black blood that flows in my veins. . . [I] have come here. . . to join hands with my people."²⁰

At the turn of the twentieth century, DuBois had concluded that the central problem in the United States was, and would continue to be, the problem of color/race.²¹ In an article titled "To the Nations of the

World" which DuBois wrote as Chairman of the Resolutions Committee of the first Pan-African Conference held in London, England in 1900 and included in his book, An ABC of Color (1963), he proclaimed:

The problem of the twentieth century is the problem of the color line, the question of how far differences of race--which show themselves chiefly in the color of the skin and texture of the hair--will hereafter be made the basis of denying to over half the world the right of sharing to their utmost ability the opportunities and privileges of modern civilizations.²²

Utilizing different words, DuBois repeated that prophetic proclamation in his book, The Souls of Black Folk, published in 1903:

[T]he problem of the twentieth century is the problem of the color line--the relation of the darker to the lighter races of men in Asia and Africa, in America and the islands of the sea.²³

After nearly a third of the century had past (in 1933), DuBois, continuing his concern about the color line, noted that white Americans deprived African Americans of equality simply because of their color/race. He wrote: "There seems no hope that America in our day will yield in its color or race hatred any substantial ground."²⁴ In 1935, DuBois indicated that he considered race to be more critical than class for the progress of African Americans. He offered these comments on white laborers and labor unions:

Today it is white labor that keeps Negroes out of decent low-cost housing, that confines the protection of the best unions to "white" men, that often will not sit in the same hall with black folk

who already have joined the labor movement. White labor has to hate scabs; but it hates black scabs not because they are scabs but because they are black. It mobs white scabs to force them into labor fellowship. It mobs black scabs to starve and kill them.²⁵

The above statements by DuBois, including the one in Prague, Czechoslovakia in October of 1958, the initial year of his ninth decade of life, demonstrate his lifetime attention to and concern with the problem of the color line. He was, however, also concerned about the issue of class.

Class

As with race, DuBois, throughout much of his life, wrote about socioeconomic class. In The Autobiography of W.E.B. DuBois, DuBois noted that in the summer of 1885, before entering Fisk University and while working as a timekeeper on a construction project in Great Barrington, Massachusetts, with an additional responsibility of handing the "discharged workers their last wage envelopes," he began to understand how hard the stonecutters worked and to empathize with those workers who were discharged from their jobs without organized support of fellow workers or unemployment insurance funds to help sustain them.²⁶ Although this initial awareness and concern for the plight of the working class appears to have been with workers in general, throughout his life, DuBois concentrated on the African American in his discussion and analysis of the laboring class/proletariat

as he did in all other areas.

During the first third of the twentieth century, DuBois, advocated and supported the establishment of consumers' co-operative organizations among African Americans to promote their economic progress, and, in fact, to serve as a means to set them free.²⁷ Although DuBois promoted consumers' cooperation, he questioned and rejected American socialism/the level of commitment and plans of American "theoretical Socialists" as a way to end racism and the economic, political, and social woes of African Americans. In other words, DuBois did not believe that socialism was the answer to the "Negro problem."²⁸

Commenting in 1913 on the program of the theoretical Socialists, DuBois pointed out that it, peculiarly, was concerned with and focused on improving the conditions of the 90,000,000 white citizens of the United States, who had experienced "extraordinary development," while ignoring the 10,000,000 African Americans, who were the most excluded/exploited group.²⁹ DuBois charged:

Many socialists have acquiesced in this program. No recent convention of Socialists has dared to face fairly the Negro problem and make a straight forward declaration that they regard Negroes as men in the same sense that other persons are. . . The general attitude of thinking members of the party has been this: We must not turn aside from the great objects of Socialism to take up this issue of the American Negro; let the question wait; when the objects of Socialism are achieved, this problem will be settled along with other problems.³⁰

Noting that there is a flaw in this logic, DuBois asked

these questions. "Can the problem of any group of 10,000,000 be properly considered as 'aside' from any program of Socialism? Can the objects of Socialism be achieved so long as the Negro is neglected? Can any great human problem 'wait'?"³¹

Of the socialists' program for the 10,000,000 African Americans and 90,000,000 whites in the United States in 1913, DuBois argued:

. . . they are going to permit the continued exploitation of these 10,000,000 workers. So far as these 10,000,000 workers are concerned, there is to be no active effort to secure for them a voice in the Social Democracy, or an adequate share in the social income. The idea is that ultimately when the 90,000,000 come to their own, they will voluntarily share with the 10,000,000 serfs.

Does the history of the world justify us in expecting any such outcome? Frankly, I do not believe it does.³²

It appears obvious from the above argument that in 1913 DuBois did not accept Socialism as the answer to the problems of the African American.

In 1921, DuBois, while supporting the general principles of Socialism and Communism, did not think that it was possible to implement them at that time to address the problems of African Americans. He explained that the adoption of Socialists' and Communists' proposals could not be successful through revolution, that is, could not "come through war or force or murder," because the "sudden attempt to impose a new industrial system and new ideas of industrial life", would lack the requisite "long training

of human beings."³³ At that time, DuBois believed that "Socialism must be evolutionary, not in the sense that it must take 50,000 years, but in the sense that it does mean hard work for many generations."³⁴

DuBois continued to offer critiques of Socialism and Communism in the United States in the 1930's. In 1933 DuBois commented:

Parties of reform, of socialism and communism beckon us [African Americans]. None of these offer us anything concrete or dependable . . . the face of reform has been set to lift the white producer and consumer, leaving the black man and his peculiar problems severely alone.³⁵

In 1935, DuBois complained that although three-fourths of African Americans were disfranchised, none of the democratic reform writers or third party movements, including the Socialists, addressed the problems of African Americans. Socialists still kept African Americans in the background, noted DuBois.³⁶

By 1948, DuBois had adopted a position supporting/strengthening the socialistic tendencies in the United States, which began to develop in the 1930s, due in large part, to president Franklin Roosevelt's establishment of social welfare programs after the Great Depression. DuBois explained:

We are a socialistic state, not entirely or completely, but sufficiently so as to take our stand with the leading states of the world in planning and controlling industry, and regulating private profit for the interests of the mass of American citizens.³⁷

Continuing his discussion and obvious support of nations around the world, including the United States, that were adopting socialistic methods, DuBois wrote:

All this [the adoption of socialistic methods] means is that instead of regarding the state as we used to, as a limited field of narrow control, which was to have small part in the general life of men, we are increasingly convinced that government must plan and to a certain degree control industry, that we have got to own a considerable part of capital, that we have got to limit profits, and limit individual initiative and private enterprise, whenever they interfere with the common good.³⁸

Meyer Weinberg in the introduction to W.E.B. DuBois: A Reader (1970) noted that by the early 1950s, DuBois had revised his thoughts concerning his 1903 proclamation that the color line was the problem of the twentieth century. Weinberg pointed out that in 1953 when DuBois was asked whether he still subscribed to that view, he responded:

I still think today as yesterday that the color line is a great problem of this century. But today I see more clearly than yesterday that back of the problem of race and color, lies a greater problem which both obscures and implements it; and that is the fact that so many civilized persons are willing to live in comfort even if the price of this is poverty, ignorance and disease of the majority of their fellow men; that to maintain this privilege men have waged war until today war tends to become universal and continuous, and the excuse for this war continues largely to be color and race.³⁹

Weinberg explained that this statement indicated that DuBois had altered his position from seeing the color line as "the" problem of the twentieth century, as he declared a half century earlier, to viewing it as "a great" problem. Continuing his explanation and interpretation of

DuBois's views at that time, Weinberg noted that "DuBois now insisted" that "the class conflict was fundamental" due to the fact that "conflicting class interests" [a class conflict] might possibly be portrayed as a color conflict.⁴⁰

Although DuBois saw class as "a greater problem" than color at mid-century, he had not abandoned, nor reduced in any way, his belief that color/race/racism remained a serious problem in American society. It was not that color and racial conflict were less important, but rather that they could be better understood and resolved through an understanding and resolution of conflicts among economic classes. As Weinberg explained:

On a national and world scale, DuBois saw racism more as the occasion than as the cause of social and political conflict. His newer respect for Marx led him to formulate world-wide conflicts in economic class terms. This . . . was more a shift of emphasis than of substance.⁴¹

As noted in the quotation above in the discussion of race, this inclination to change emphasis, even when the facts may have remained the same, was acknowledged by DuBois in his speech in Prague, Czechoslovakia in 1958. Repeating that quotation in part, DuBois stated: "I have in the last fifty years found myself repeatedly changing points of view, not so much because of the change of fact as in the importance of the facts and the consequent necessity for change of emphasis."⁴² DuBois shifted emphasis from race and the rejection of socialism as an acceptable method for

African Americans to progress and achieve upward mobility in the 1930s to economic class and the acceptance of socialism as the best method by which African Americans could gain economic, political, and social success in the 1950s. In that same address in Prague in 1958, DuBois declared pointedly: "It is clear today that the solution of American Negroes lies in Socialism."⁴³

Education

Although DuBois concluded in 1958 at the age of ninety that African Americans would be saved/would achieve freedom and equality through socialism and, in effect, defined their salvation in terms of class conflict rather than racial/color conflict, he noted even at the time he announced that conclusion, the critical importance of education for African Americans and the inextricable relationship between race and education in the United States. DuBois wrote: "Problems of race, class, income and education cross each other and complicate decisions."⁴⁴

From the early years of the twentieth century, DuBois's writings on education for African Americans focused on them, not as a class group, but as a racial group with a distinct history and culture, as well as unique experiences. He argued that African Americans should make every necessary sacrifice to attain the highest and best education possible and that their education must address and focus on their specific needs,

history, and culture.⁴⁵

In 1906, DuBois, author of the resolution for the Niagara Movement, which was organized by DuBois as a protest organization in 1905 and held its most important meeting in Harper's Ferry, West Virginia, August 15 to 19, 1906, included a demand concerning education of African Americans among the demands he made to the United States:⁴⁶

We want our children educated. The school system in the country districts of the South is a disgrace and in few towns and cities are the Negro schools what they ought to be . . . either the United States will destroy ignorance or ignorance will destroy the United States.

And when we call for education, we mean real education. We believe in work, but work is not necessarily education. Education is development of power and ideal. We want our children trained as intelligent human beings should be, and we will fight for all time against any proposal to educate black boys and girls simply as servants and underlings, or simply for the use of other people. They have a right to know, to think, to aspire.⁴⁷

It is clear from these statements that at the beginning of the twentieth century, DuBois did not believe that education for African Americans was either adequate or equal.

Several years later (1912), DuBois expressed the view that the poor education of African Americans was due to racist white people who used the public school system to produce laborers to do the work they wanted done. In essence, noted DuBois, these people wanted a caste: "a place for everybody and everybody in his father's place, with themselves [whites] on top and 'niggers' at the

bottom where they belong[ed]."⁴⁸ With this caste spirit "rampant in the land" and "laying hold of the public schools," DuBois offered this advice to African American parents, advice which also presented his views on the necessity for African Americans to educate their children to the highest and fullest extent of their abilities.

Beware of [the poor education your children are receiving in public schools], my brothers and dark sisters, educate your children. Give them the broadest and highest education possible; train them to the limit of their ability, if you work your hands to the bone in doing it . . . remembering that our recognition as common folk by the world depends on the number of men of ability we produce--not great geniuses, but efficient thinkers and doers in all lines.⁴⁹

These statements reveal that DuBois felt that African Americans should receive levels of education according to their abilities, and that some, those whom he had referred to as the "talented tenth," should be given college and university training.⁵⁰ "The Talented Tenth rises and pulls all that are worth the saving up to their vantage ground," declared DuBois.⁵¹ Although DuBois knew that all African Americans could not go to college (as all of any group could not), he insisted that some--the talented few--must go. For these few, there should be "centers of training"/institutions of higher education "where men are not so mystified and befuddled by the hard necessary toil of earning a living, as to have no aims higher than their bellies, and no God greater than Gold."⁵²

Not only was race, not class, the focus and content

of DuBois's writings about the deprivation of education of African Americans in public schools and about the need for the more talented of this group to attend colleges and universities where they could achieve the broadest and highest level of education their abilities would permit, but also his discussion of the education they should receive in a university. In 1933, a time when DuBois, an advocate and supporter of integration under ideal circumstances, was abandoning integration in favor of segregation as a more practical method to achieve progress for African Americans in a society, especially in the South, that remained rigidly segregated, intensely discriminatory, and deprived African Americans of equal educational and other opportunities, he offered these views about the need for African Americans to receive African American/African centered university training. He wrote:

It has been said many times that a Negro University is nothing more and nothing less than a university. . . . [I] insist that there can be no college for Negroes which is not a Negro college .
 . . .⁵³

Continually aware of the effects of race and color in America, DuBois explained:

. . . the American Negro problem is and must be the center of the Negro American university. It has got to be. You are teaching Negroes. There is no use pretending that you are teaching Chinese or . . . white Americans or . . . citizens of the world. You are teaching American Negroes in 1933, and they are the subject of a caste system . . . and their life problem is primarily this problem of caste.⁵⁴

DuBois argued that just as a Spanish university is "founded and grounded in Spain" and a French university in France, an African American university "is founded or should be founded on a knowledge of the history of their people in Africa and in the United States and their present condition."⁵⁵

DuBois seems to summarize his views on the African American university program in these words:

. . . starting with present conditions and using the facts and knowledge of the present situation of American Negroes, the Negro university expands towards the possession and the conquest of all knowledge. It seeks from a beginning of the history of the Negro in America and in Africa to interpret all history; from a beginning of social development among Negro slaves and freedmen in America and Negro tribes and kingdoms in Africa, to interpret and understand the social development of all mankind in all ages.⁵⁶

This, according to DuBois, is a different program than one found in any other nation (i.e., Russia or England) or group, including white Americans, "because it starts from a different point."⁵⁷ The African American university, in DuBois's opinion, can not function in any other way.⁵⁸ It must focus on and show concern for African Americans--their race, conditions, experiences, history, and culture.

Although it appears that DuBois's views on education were more extensive and clearly defined during the first third of the century than during the second third, one may assume that at the time of his death in 1963, nine years after the Brown decision which desegregated the nation's

public schools, he still held many, if not all, of the views about education as it related to African Americans that he expressed in the earlier years. The primary reasons for this assumption are: (1) The United States was still a capitalist state, not a socialist one, which DuBois championed as the system in which African Americans could achieve equality; (2) African American children were still more poorly educated than white children, which is an indication that race/color differences, not just class differences, remained a hinderance to their progress; (3) Since, in DuBois's analysis the education of African Americans must begin with their present conditions and expand to a knowledge of their history and culture and, then, to a knowledge of the universe, the education required for African Americans would always be different to some degree from that for whites, due to differences in race/color, history and culture, and by necessity be defined, at least partially, in terms of their race/color; and (4) DuBois, even in the waning years of his life and after pronouncing that he perceived socialism as the means to salvation for African Americans, discussed their education in terms of their race rather than their class. For example, in 1960, in a speech given at the University of Wisconsin titled, "Socialism and the American Negro," DuBois, after noting, in his view, the superiority of the Soviet Union over the United States in modern science--for

launching Sputnik, the first man-made satellite, in orbit around the earth in 1957 and being more proficient in the education of children--and challenging America "to let youth know" and American students to "dare study the Soviet Union and China as carefully as they study Great Britain and France,"⁵⁹ delivered this imperative to African Americans:

But especially American Negroes must know what is going on in the world today, and learn for themselves, what this has to teach them, in order that they may preserve their culture, get rid of poverty, ignorance and disease, and help America live up to at least a shadow of its vain boast as the land of the free and the home of the brave.⁶⁰

Obviously, in 1960, DuBois perceived that there was a critical and specific need for African Americans to obtain the broadest and highest education possible, just as he had from the turn of the century, and that their level of education was directly related to their knowledge of themselves and the world, and their prosperity. In essence, their education was related to their freedom and equality.

DuBois's Shift in Emphasis: From Race to Class

DuBois, who was born in Great Barrington, Massachusetts in 1868, only five years after President Abraham Lincoln issued the Emancipation Proclamation on 1 January 1863,⁶¹ and died in Accra, Ghana, Africa, at the age of 95 in 1963, wrote on the issues of race and class (among others) throughout his adult life. During DuBois's

life--as a student at Fisk University in the 1880's, a participant in Pan African activities, a co-founder and, subsequently, an official of the NAACP and editor of its magazine (the Crisis) from 1910 to 1934, a writer and speaker analyzing social/racial issues and problems, a supporter and advocate of socialist and communist ideals and principals, and a performer in other roles and activities--his focus/central theme was the plight of African Americans. At the dawn of the twentieth century, he proclaimed that the color line was the problem of the century in the United States. DuBois was acutely aware that white people treated and thought of African Americans as inferior, and deprived them of their constitutional rights. He condemned that oppressive treatment and attitude all his life.

Although DuBois's focus was African Americans and their struggle for total freedom in a racist society, that is, on the problem of race and racism, his point of view changed over time on what methods or activities were required for African Americans to achieve/advance toward equality. As reported above, in a speech in Prague, Czechoslovakia in 1958 DuBois recalled that in his boyhood, he wanted to prove that African Americans were folk like other folk. Later he was determined to secure opportunity for them. Still later, he concentrated on fighting race discrimination and seeking "legal and moral

redress." Finally, during the second decade of the twentieth century, which was around both the time of the Russian Revolution (1917) and the mid-point of his life, DuBois concentrated on "economic change as fundamental" to the success and progress of African Americans.⁶² In other words, during the second half of DuBois's life, more so than during the first half, he directed his attention toward the economic condition/class position of African Americans as the key to their freedom.

In 1918, DuBois held a meeting to promote consumers' cooperation among African Americans.⁶³ He believed that consumers' cooperative organizations were the best means to freedom for African Americans. At the same time that DuBois was actively promoting and encouraging the establishment of consumers' cooperative organizations, he criticized American socialists/socialism as being neglectful of the plight of African Americans.⁶⁴

By the 1950s, DuBois had concluded that behind the problem of race and color (race and color conflict) was the greater problem of class (class conflict) which both obscured and implemented the race and color problem.⁶⁵ DuBois perceived the class problem as being inextricably tied to the race and color problem, and only by eliminating the class problem could African Americans hope for a resolution of the race and color problem and a realistic opportunity for equality and freedom. It

appears that this reasoning guided DuBois's unequivocal statement in 1958 supporting socialism as the means to salvation for African Americans.⁶⁶

DuBois was not only aware of the interrelationship between race and class, but of the interrelationship of race and class with education as well. Although DuBois concluded in the latter years of his life that African Americans would be saved through socialism/by addressing their problems at the level of class conflict rather than at the level of race and color conflict, and had probably recognized that social/economic class was extremely important during his entire life, he addressed their education in terms of their race and color rather than their class.

In DuBois's view, education was so important for African Americans that they should make the necessary sacrifices to assure that their children receive the best quality and highest level possible. He felt that education for African Americans should focus on their history, culture, and needs.⁶⁷ DuBois was critical of the inferior/inadequate public education provided African American children. He felt that the inferior education received by African Americans was due to white racists, who used the public schools to train African Americans only to do the work the racists wanted done. DuBois argued that African Americans' education should develop

within them power and ideals, not simply train them to hold menial jobs and to be subservient to whites.⁶⁸ DuBois believed that the most capable African Americans (the "talented tenth") should receive college/university training. He reasoned that this talented group would lift up the entire race.⁶⁹

In the 1930s, DuBois expressed the view that the education/training that African American colleges and universities provide African American students should focus on their race, culture, and conditions; it should be African American/African centered. The African American college and university should start with the facts and knowledge of the present conditions of African Americans and expand toward universal knowledge. DuBois reasoned that African Americans, as other groups, could not attain universal knowledge or hope to interpret all history unless they began by understanding their own condition, and, then, their own history, both in Africa and in America as slaves and freedmen. According to DuBois, this higher education program is similar to that of any other group in the sense that it begins with the group and its conditions and, then, broadens the scope of the training to the universe, but it is also different from that of any other group because African Americans have a different starting point (different present condition.)⁷⁰ The starting point (present condition) for African Americans

is different from that of white Americans because they have arrived at it from a vastly different history and experiences. DuBois's argument, when applied to today's society and education, calls for an education for African Americans that includes, first, facts about their present condition, followed by a knowledge of their history and culture, whether they are in predominantly African American or white schools, and, then information that prepares them to better understand the broader society, world, and universe.

To summarize DuBois's shift in emphasis from race to class, for most of his life, he proclaimed that race was the United States' most significant problem, that, in fact, race was the problem for the nation during the entire twentieth century. During the last few years of his life, while continuing to focus on race as a problem, but not the problem in the United States, a racist society, and to perceive African Americans' race and culture as critical to their education, DuBois indicated that class was more important. He reasoned that African Americans could reduce/ameliorate their problems only through socialism/communism, which would eliminate class privilege and exploitation of the majority of citizens regardless of color and race.⁷¹

DuBois's Changing Emphasis: A Sociology of Knowledge

Earlier explication of DuBois's ideas revealed that

he, by his own admission, repeatedly changed points of view or emphasis (even when the facts may have remained the same) when he felt that the importance of the facts at different times in his life necessitated the change. Marable Manning, historian, reports that Herbert Apthaker, DuBois's close friend and colleague, made this statement regard DuBois and his tendency to change points of view as circumstances changed: "[DuBois's] political affiliations and affinities varied as times changed, as programs altered, and as he changed."⁷² Here, the aim is to seek and specify the social determinants of DuBois's change of emphasis from race to social class as the more critical problem for African Americans and their progress and success in the twentieth century. Such an inquiry--one that searches out the social roots of knowledge, the social determinants of the intellectual's ideas, or the social structure's influence on the intellectual's perspective--is known as the sociology of knowledge.

DuBois's choice of race as the problem of the twentieth century and his central concern throughout his life, appears, for the most part, to have been influenced by his experiences and heightened awareness of the plight of African Americans while attending Fisk University, an African American school, in Nashville, Tennessee, during the 1880s. At that time, according to DuBois, African Americans in the South were lynched, murdered, maimed, and

raped by white people, who were rarely punished for such transgressions.⁷³ According to DuBois, it was at Fisk that he developed/acquired a new loyalty and allegiance to his race, replacing his Americanism⁷⁴, broadened his life's scope,⁷⁵ "began [his] writing and public speaking[,]...became an impassioned orator[,] and developed a belligerent attitude toward the color bar."⁷⁶

It was through his experiences as an African American and observations of the plight of African American people, who remained deprived and oppressed throughout DuBois's long life, as well as his analyses of capitalist and socialist/communist governments and the principles governing capitalism and socialism/communism that DuBois concluded by the beginning of the last decade of his life (1953) that class, while related to race and color, was the greater problem. By this time in DuBois's life, he perceived class to be the greater problem in the United States and other capitalists nations because capitalism allowed a powerful and wealthy (and willing) minority of people to enjoy privileges even when those privileges were detrimental to the prosperity, education, and health of the majority of citizens, regardless of their race and color.⁷⁷

In addition, DuBois argued that capitalism permitted the privileged minority to continuously wage wars around the world to maintain its advantaged position, while the

excuse for the wars has been, to a large extent, race and color.⁷⁸ Expressing his opinion of capitalism in his autobiography published in 1968, DuBois explained:

After earnest observation I now believe that private ownership of capital and free enterprise are leading the world to disaster. I do not believe that so-called "people's capitalism" has in the United States or anywhere replaced the ills of private capitalism and shown an answer to socialism. The corporation is but the legal mask behind which the individual owner of wealth hides . . . We are ruled by those who control wealth and who by that power buy or coerce public opinion.⁷⁹

Commenting on capitalism in his letter of application for membership in the Communist Party of the United States in 1961, DuBois stated: "Capitalism cannot reform itself; it is doomed to self-destruction. No universal selfishness can bring social good to all."⁸⁰

DuBois's perception of the failure of capitalism to meet the needs of the mass of citizens in the United States led him to believe that socialism/communism was an acceptable alternative. In 1948, DuBois indicated that he supported the trend toward socialism that had developed in the United States.⁸¹ For DuBois, socialism meant using government to plan and to some degree control industry so that both government and industry functioned for the benefit of the mass of people rather than for the accumulation of wealth for a minority of individuals.⁸² In explaining his belief in communism, DuBois stated that he thought "that all men should be employed according to their ability and that wealth and services should be

distributed according to need."⁸³ After living nearly a century under capitalism and studying "socialism and communism long and carefully," DuBois concluded that these ends could be achieved under communism, but were not possible under capitalism.⁸⁴

NOTES

1. See John Bracy, August Meier, and Elliot Rudwick, "The Black Sociologists: The First Half Century," in the Death of White Sociology, ed. Joyce A. Ladner (New York: Random House, 1973), 3, 6-8, 14-15, 22; Dan S. Green and Edwin D. Driver, introduction to W.E.B. DuBois on Sociology and the Black Community by [W.E.B. DuBois], edited and with an introduction by Dan S. Green and Edwin D. Driver (Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press, 1978), 1-48; Green and Driver, preface and acknowledgements to W.E.B. DuBois on Sociology and the Black Community by [W.E.B. DuBois], vii-viii; E. Franklin Frazier, "The Failure of the Negro Intellectual," in The Death of White Sociology, ed. Joyce A. Ladner (New York: Vanguard Books, 1973), 52; In her introductory remarks to Frazier's article, Ladner, while not discussing DuBois's pioneering work as a sociologist or his longevity, either of life or as a scholar and writer on various social issues, noted that he rivaled Frazier as the most outstanding African American sociologist produced in America.

2. Although this chapter discusses DuBois's ideas concerning the issues of race, class, and education, he wrote on many other issues, including racial integration and segregation, which are the focus of later chapters in this work. DuBois's view on integration and segregation, however, are not presented and analyzed in those chapters.

Two sources which include some of the various topics on which DuBois wrote are W.E.B. DuBois, W.E.B. DuBois: A Reader (1970) and W.E.B. DuBois, The Seventh Son: The Thought and Writings of W.E.B. DuBois (1971). For some understanding of DuBois's views on integration and segregation, see W.E.B. DuBois, W.E.B. DuBois: A Reader, edited, and with an introduction by Meyer Weinberg (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1970), 265-88 and W.E.B. DuBois, The Seventh Son: The Thought and Writings of W.E.B. DuBois, vol. 2, edited, and with an introduction by Julius Lester (New York: Random House, 1971), 209-31, 408-19.

3. Robert Merton, Social Theory and Social Structure (New York: The Free Press, 1968), 494-95.

4. Bracy, Meier, and Rudwick, "The Black

Sociologists," 3, 6-8, 14-15, 22; Green and Driver, introduction to W.E.B. DuBois on Sociology and the Black Community by [W.E.B. DuBois], 1-48; Green and Driver, preface and acknowledgements to W.E.B. DuBois on Sociology and the Black Community by [W.E.B. DuBois], vii-viii.

5. For biographical information on DuBois see Arthur P. Davis and Michael W. Peplow, The New Negro Renaissance: An Anthology (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1975), 521; W.E.B. DuBois, The Autobiography of W.E.B. DuBois: A Soliloquy on Viewing My Life from the Last Decade of its First Century, ed. Herbert Aptheker [City of publication not given] (International Publishers, 1968); Encyclopedia Britannica, 1972 ed., s.v. "DuBois, William Edward Burghardt," 726-27; The introductory comments to [W.E.B. DuBois], "To the Nations of the World" in W.E.B. DuBois, An ABC of Color, with an introduction by John Oliver Killens (New York: International Publishers, 1963), 20; Manning Marable, W.E.B. DuBois: Black Radical Democrat (Boston, Massachusetts: Twayne Publishers, 1986), 219-222; Harry A. Ploski and James Williams, The Negro Almanac: A Reference Work On the African American, 5th edition (Detroit, Michigan: Gale Research, Inc, 1989), 209, 290.

6. W.E.B. DuBois, W.E.B. DuBois: A Reader, ed. Meir Weinberg (New York: Harper and Row, 1970), p.xiii.

7. W.E.B. DuBois, The Autobiography of W.E.B. DuBois, ed. Herbert Aptheker ([U.S.A.:] International Publishers Co., Inc., 1968, 6.

8. W.E.B. DuBois, An ABC of Color (New York: International Publishers, 1963), 12.

9. W.E.B. DuBois, Against Racism: Unpublished Essays, Papers, Addresses, 1887-1961, ed. Herbert Aptheker (Amherst Massachusetts: University of Massachusetts Press, 1985), 295.

10. For some of DuBois' thoughts and comments on socialism and communism see [W.E.B. DuBois], "A Negro Nation Within A Nation", in W.E.B. DuBois, W.E.B. DuBois Speaks: Speeches and Addresses 1920-1963, ed. Philip S. Foner (New York: Pathfinder Press, 1970), 78, an article which in its entirety consists of pages 77-86 and which Foner documents as appearing in Current History, June 1935, Vol. XLII, pp. 265-69; W.E.B. DuBois, "The Right to Work", 211-14 in W.E.B. DuBois, The Seventh Son: The Thought and Writings of W.E.B. DuBois, ed. Julius Lester (New York: Random House, 1971), 211, which Lester documents as appearing in the Crisis, April 1933, vol. XL,

No. 4, pp. 93-94; W.E.B. DuBois, ed. Herbert Aptheker (U.S.A.: International Publishers, 1968) 57-58; W.E.B. DuBois, "Letter of Application for membership in the Communist Party of the United States," (which DuBois states was written 1 October 1961), in W.E.B. DuBois, The Seventh Son: The Thought and Writing of W.E.B. DuBois, vol. 2, ed. Julius Lester (New York: Random House, 1971), 721-23; W.E.B. DuBois, "The American Negro and Communism: Address Following the Investment Ceremony, Charles University," Prague, Czechoslovakia, 23 October 1958 in W.E.B. DuBois Against Racism: Unpublished Essays, Papers, Addresses, 1887-1961, ed. Herbert Aptheker (Amherst, Massachusetts: University of Massachusetts Press, 1985), 294-98; W.E.B. DuBois, "Socialism and the American Negro (May 1960)", a speech which editor Herbert Aptheker documents as having been delivered by DuBois at the University of Wisconsin in 1961 and is available on Folkways Record 1972 (FH 5514), in Against Racism: Unpublished Essays, Papers, Addresses, 1887-1961, ed. Herbert Aptheker (Amherst, Massachusetts Press, 1985), 303-15.

11. W.E.B. DuBois, Against Racism: Unpublished Essay, Papers, Addresses, 1887-1961, ed. Herbert Aptheker (Amherst, Massachusetts: University of Massachusetts Press, 1985), 295.

12. W.E.B. DuBois, "The Strivings of the Negro People (1897)", in W.E.B. DuBois, W.E.B. DuBois: A Reader, ed. Meyer Weinberg (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1970), 19; Weinberg documented this article as appearing in the Atlantic in August, 1897 and that in 1903 it became Chapter One of The Souls of Black Folk written by DuBois.

13. Ibid., 20.

14. Ibid.

15. Ibid.

16. W.E.B. DuBois. The Autobiography of W.E.B. DuBois, 108.

17. Ibid., 123.

18. Ibid., 125.

19. Ibid., 122.

20. W.E.B. DuBois, W.E.B. DuBois Speaks: Speeches and Addresses 1920-1963, ed. Philip S. Foner (New York: Pathfinder Press, 1970), 3; This quotation appears in

Foner's introductory comments to an article by DuBois titled "On Being Black" which Foner documents as follows: "In 1920, The New Republic published 'On Being Black' which was shortly to appear in DuBois's Book, Darkwater."

21. W.E.B. DuBois, "To the Nations of the World" in W.E.B. DuBois, An ABC of Color, with an introduction by John Oliver Killens (New York: International Publishers, 1963), 20; This work (An ABC of Color) consists of selections chosen by the author (DuBois) from over a half century of his writings; Introductory comments to "To the Nations of the World" in DuBois's An ABC of Color states that DuBois, who was made Chairman of the Resolutions Committee of the first Pan-African Conference held in London, England in 1900, wrote an address titled, "To the Nations of the World" in which he expressed the view that the problem of the twentieth century was the problem of the color line.

22. DuBois, An ABC of Color, 20.

23. W.E.B., DuBois, The Souls of Black Folk, with an introduction by Truman Nelson (New York: Washington Square Press, 1970), 11.

24. W.E.B. DuBois, The Seventh Son: The Thought and Writings of W.E.B. DuBois, vol. 2, ed. Julius Lester (New York: Random House, 1971), 228; This statement comes from an article titled "On Being Ashamed of Oneself: An Essay On Race and Pride" (pp. 225-229), in The Seventh Son, which Julius Lester, editor, documents as appearing in The Crisis, volume XL, September, 1933, pages 199-200.

25. W.E.B. DuBois, W.E.B. DuBois Speaks: Speeches and Addresses 1920-1963; ed. Philip S. Foner with a tribute by Dr. Kwame N. Krumah (New York: Pathfinder Press, 1970), 81; This quotation comes from an article titled "A Negro Nation Within a Nation" in W.E.B. DuBois Speaks, which Philip S. Foner, editor, documents as being published in Current History, volume XLII, June 1935, pages. 265-69.

26. DuBois, The Autobiography of W.E.B. DuBois, 104-105.

27. W.E.B. DuBois, Against Racism: Unpublished Essays, Papers, Addresses, 1887-1961 (Amherst, Massachusetts: University of Massachusetts Press, 1985), 296; In the above source, a speech at Charles University in Prague, Czechoslovakia on 23 October 1958, DuBois explained: "In August, 1918, I held a meeting of those persons interested in the idea of consumers' co-operation

and its spread and adoption among colored people. Among those present was B.M. Roddy of Memphis, Tennessee, who returned home and entered upon an active campaign for the introduction of co-operation throughout the South. By February, 1919, a charter of incorporation for the state of Tennessee was secured and a co-operative organization founded. Within ninety days after receiving the charter the organization had sold the entire \$5,000 worth of stock and was obliged to amend the charter and capitalize anew at \$15,000. By August 30, 1919, \$10,000 worth of stock had been sold and five grocery stores with meat markets were operating." In The Seventh Son: The Thought and Writings of W.E.B. DuBois (1971), edited by Julius Lester, DuBois explained on page 214 that African American consumers' cooperation would "mean inner subordination and obedience . . . call for inflexible discipline . . . mean years of poverty and sacrifice . . . and invite ridicule, retaliation and discrimination," but if African Americans were successful, no revolution could ignore them, no nation could oppress them, and no capital could enslave them. In DuBois's opinion, with successful consumers' cooperation, African Americans, and, in fact, people of African decent throughout the diaspora, would "become in truth free." These views were documented as having appeared in The Crisis, April 1933, pages 93-94.

28. [W.E.B. DuBois], W.E.B. DuBois: A Reader, edited and with an introduction by Meyer Weinberg (New York: Harper and Row, 1970), 337-40.

29. Ibid., 337.

30. Ibid., 337-38.

31. Ibid., 338.

32. Ibid.

33. Ibid., 345.

34. Ibid.

35. DuBois, The Seventh Son, 211; This statement by DuBois was documented by the editor, Julius Lester, as having been taken from the Crisis, April 1933, 93.

36. W.E.B. DuBois, W.E.B. DuBois Speaks: Speeches and Addresses 1920-1963 (New York: Pathfinder Press, 1970), 77-78; This complaint about socialists by DuBois in W.E.B. DuBois Speaks was in an article titled "A Negro Nation Within a Nation", pages 77-86, which Philip S. Foner, the editor, documents as having appeared in Current

History, June 1935, XLII: 265-69

37. DuBois, W.E.B. DuBois: A Reader, 352; This statement is from an article titled "Socialism," which Meyer Weinberg, the editor of W.E.B. DuBois: A Reader, documented as having appeared in the Chicago Defender, 14 February 1948.

38. Ibid.

39. Ibid., xv.

40. Ibid., xv-xvi.

41. Ibid., xvi.

42. DuBois, Against Racism, 295.

43. Ibid., 298.

44. DuBois, Against Racism, 295.

45. See [W.E.B. DuBois], A W.E.B. DuBois Reader, ed. Andrew Paschal (New York: Macmillan Company, 1971), 31; W.E.B. DuBois, The Seventh Son: The Thought and Writings of W.E.B. DuBois, ed. Julius Lester, 414-415, 215-220; W.E.B. DuBois, W.E.B. DuBois: A Reader Meyer Weinberg, and with an introduction by Meyer Weinberg (New York: Harper and Row, 1970), 177-86.

46. [W.E.B. DuBois], An ABC of Color with an introduction by John Oliver Killens (New York: International Publishers, 1963), 30-33; DuBois discussed five demands for African Americans in this article titled "The Niagara Movement" (pp. 30-33) which is documented as an excerpt from the "Resolutions Niagara Movement, 1906"; The demands were: (1) the right to vote, (2) elimination of discrimination in public accommodations, (3) freedom of association, (4) equal enforcement/administration of the laws, and (5) education that trained African American children as "intelligent human beings" and was not inferior to that received by white children; the introductory comments to this article states:

In 1905 the author [DuBois] organized the Niagara Movement to agitate for Negro rights. It held its most important meeting at Harper's Ferry, [West Virginia] August 15 to 19, 1906 "to commemorate the 100th birthday of John Brown* and the jubilee of the Battle of Osawatomie."

*John Brown (1800-59): martyred abolishist, leader of

Negro rebellion.

47. Ibid., 33.

48. W.E.B. DuBois, The Emerging Thought of W.E.B. DuBois, comp. Henry Lee Moon, with an introduction, commentaries, and personal memoir by Henry Lee Moon (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1972), 121.

49. Ibid.

50. [W.E.B. DuBois], A W.E.B. DuBois Reader, ed. Andrew Paschal (New York: Macmillan Company, 1971), 31-37; The editor, Andrew Paschal, indicates that the article containing these pages titled "The Talented Tenth" was written by DuBois in 1903; W.E.B. DuBois, W.E.B. DuBois on Sociology and the Black Community, eds. Dan S. Green and Edwin D. Driver (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978), 18.

51. DuBois, A W.E.B. DuBois Reader, 36.

52. Ibid., 37.

53. DuBois, The Seventh Son, 214; This and the following statements from this source by DuBois on university education for African Americans is documented by the editor, Julius Lester, as being printed in the Crisis magazine, of which DuBois was the editor, in August 1933, Volume XL, pages 175-77.

54. Ibid., 216.

55. Ibid., 217.

56. Ibid., 218.

57. Ibid.

58. Ibid.

59. W.E.B. DuBois, Against Racism, 314-315; Herbert Aptheker the editor of the book, Against Racism, notes that this speech "Socialism and the American Negro" was delivered at the University of Wisconsin in 1960 and is available on Folkways Record 1972 (FH5514).

60. Ibid., 315.

61. Lerone Bennett, Jr., Before the Mayflower: A History of the Negro in America 1919-1966, 3r ed. (Chicago, Illinois: Johnson Publishing Company, 1966),

169-74; This was a proclamation issued during the American Civil War freeing the slaves in those territories still in rebellion against the Union. Since the nation was in a state of war and the territories were in rebellion, Lincoln had no real power to assume that those territories would obey his proclamation or that the slaves would be set free.

62. [DuBois,] Against Racism, 295.
63. Ibid., 296.
64. [DuBois,] W.E.B. DuBois: A Reader, 337-40, 345; [DuBois,] The Seventh Son, 211; [DuBois,] W.E.B. DuBois Speaks, 77-78.
65. [DuBois,] W.E.B. DuBois: A Reader, xv.
66. [DuBois,] Against Racism, 298.
67. [DuBois,] The Seventh Son, 215-20, 414-15.
68. [DuBois,] An ABC of Color, 33]; [DuBois,] The Emerging Thought of W.E.B. DuBois, 121.
69. [DuBois,] A W.E.B. DuBois Reader, 31-37.
70. [DuBois,] The Seventh Son, 215-219.
71. [DuBois,] W.E.B. DuBois: A Reader, xv.
72. Marabel Manning, W.E.B. DuBois: Black Radical Democrat (Boston, Massachusetts: Twayne Publishers, 1986) ix.
73. DuBois, The Autobiography of W.E.B., 122.
74. Ibid., 108.
75. Ibid., 123.
76. Ibid., 125.
77. [DuBois,] W.E.B. DuBois: A Reader, xv.
78. Ibid.
79. DuBois, The Autobiography of W.E.B. DuBois, 57.
80. [DuBois,] The Seventh Son, 722.
81. DuBois, W.E.B. DuBois; A Reader, 352-353. The

specific source of this information in this book edited by Meyer Weinberg is an article titled "Socialism (1948)," the source given for that article was the Chicago Defender, February 14, 1948.

82. Ibid.

83. DuBois, The Autobiography of W.E.B. DuBois, 57.

84. Ibid.; DuBois defined Communism as "a planned way of life in the production of wealth and work designed for building a state whose object is the highest welfare of its people and not merely the profit of a part." He defined capitalism as "the means of production privately owned."

CHAPTER 3

AFRICAN AMERICAN SOCIAL SCIENTISTS WHOSE IDEAS PLACE
THEM IN SUPPORT OF SOCIAL CLASS AS MORE CRITICAL THAN
RACE FOR THE EDUCATION AND PROGRESS OF AFRICAN AMERICANS

In 1984, Alphonso Pinkney, an African American sociologist, indicated that the issue of whether social class or race is the more significant/critical variable in race relations, and by implication, in education and other areas of life in this nation, has been discussed and argued throughout much of the twentieth century. He stated:

The question of whether class or race is the more salient variable in race relations in the United States has plagued scholars since the early part of the twentieth century. Initially class was assumed by the more progressive scholars and organizations to be the more crucial factor, for class was considered to be a Marxist concept. In the 1980, however, class as a concept has been championed by conservative scholars, both black and white.¹

The coming to prominence in the 1980's of conservative African American scholars who promoted class as a more salient variable than race in race relations, and the continuing acceptance of their ideas, writings, and opinions by many persons in the United States, has been due in large part, to the defeat of President Jimmy Carter, a liberal Democrat, by Ronald Reagan, a conservative Republican, in 1980, and to the election of

George Bush, Reagan's Vice President, to succeed Reagan in 1988. Reagan was forbidden by the United States Constitution from running for a third four-year term as President in 1988.

According to Pinkney, studies showed that Reagan's victory over Carter was due more to the "pervasive mood" in the United States that a change was needed than to a shift to conservatism.² Reagan's victory, however, was aided greatly by the efforts of conservative groups--the New Right, the religious Right, and the neoconservatives--that had organized in the 1970s and worked during the 1980 national political campaigns to help elect him and other conservatives (e.g., United States senators) to national office and to help defeat liberal democrats.³

When Reagan became president, he developed and promoted conservatism/a conservative policy/agenda, which included eliminating or greatly reducing federally funded programs that benefitted African American. It appears that many of his policy and programs were racist and based on an ideology or philosophy that special assistance for African Americans was unnecessary and that race was not a barrier to their progress.⁴ President George Bush, Reagan's successor, continued Reagan's policies regarding programs that could provide assistance to African Americans.⁵

Perhaps, the conservative African American scholars,

who gained the most prominence in the 1980s and who continue to receive a high level of recognition today with their arguments that class is more significant than race in race relations, are Thomas Sowell and Walter Williams, two economists, and William Wilson, a sociologist.⁶ Wilson, however, has referred to himself as a social democrat rather than a conservative.⁷

Thomas Sowell (Economist)

Sowell in his book Knowledge and Decisions (1980) indicates that "affirmative action" laws and policies as well as advocates/supporters of affirmative action err when they assign the "cause" of lower average performance of African American schools compared to white schools to intentional explanations ("segregation," "discrimination," etc.)⁸ while discounting "systematic explanations", such as age⁹ and "locational differences."¹⁰ He points out that the intentional explanation for the differences in academic performance between African Americans and whites has not been "historically unique either in kind or degree."¹¹ Sowell supports his view that variables other than race account for African American-white difference in school performance by stating: "High statistical disparities existed among school performances of children from different cultural groups in the past, even when all the groups were white."¹²

Referring to age and locational/regional

differences, which he calls "non moral, non societal variables", Sowell indicates that these are greater determinants of the economic (income, unemployment rate) differences between African Americans and whites than are the moral variables of race, discrimination, and exploitation.¹³ He contends that "[i]t is. . . arbitrary to assume that those variables that are morally most important are [also] causally most important."¹⁴

Sowell also argues that government interference in open competition in the market place has a greater influence on the lower wages and higher unemployment rate experienced by African Americans than racism.¹⁵ One such interference by the government, according to Sowell, is the enactment and enforcement of minimum wage laws "which prevent transmission of knowledge of labor available at costs which would induce its employment."¹⁶ In other words, the minimum wage law establishes a wage for many workers higher than employers are willing to pay. This results not in a minimum wage, but in no wage for those who are "most disadvantaged." Sowell reasoned that since the "worst-off workers tend to be the most adversely affected by minimum wage laws [, this] suggests that what is typically involved is not unconscionable 'exploitation' but the payment of wages commensurate with their desirability as employees."¹⁷

To support his contention that it has been minimum

wage laws, not racism, that account for the low labor participation rates of African Americans in recent decades, Sowell points out that, historically, African Americans have had higher labor participation rates when minimum wage laws (and other "wage fixing arrangements" such as "labor unions [and] civil service pay scales") did not exist.¹⁸ Sowell states:

Historically, lower skill levels did not prevent black males from having labor participation rates higher than that for white males for every U.S. Census from 1890 through 1930.¹⁹

He felt, however, that the government's fixing of wages "has reversed that and made more and more blacks 'unemployable,' despite their rising levels of education and skill, absolutely and relative to whites."²⁰ Sowell notes that "no one is employable or unemployable absolutely, but only relative to a given pay scale."²¹ In Sowell's view, it is in large part the minimum wage that has priced African Americans, particularly teenaged African Americans, who have enormously high unemployment rates, out of the market.²²

Further bolstering his argument that it is the fixing of wages by, government, rather than racism that is responsible for high unemployment among African American teenagers, Sowell states:

The alternative explanation of high black teenage unemployment by "racism" collides with two very hard facts: (1) black teenage unemployment in the 1940's and 1950's was only a fraction of what it was in the 1960's and 1970's (and was no different

from white teenage unemployment during the earlier period), despite the obvious fact that there was certainly no less racism in the earlier period, and (2) unemployment rates among blacks in their mid twenties drops sharply to a fraction of what it was in their teens, even though the workers have not changed color as they aged, but only become more experienced. The intentional explanation--"racism" --may be more moralistically satisfying, but the systemic explanation fits the facts.²³

Sowell's argument that race is not a significant variable in explaining differences between African Americans and whites in level of income and unemployment rates is consistent with his position on educational differences as well.

In his book Education: Assumptions Versus History, specifically in the section titled "Assumptions Versus History in Ethnic Educations," Sowell, while recognizing "that the segregated black schools long traditional in the South generally had educational results inferior to those in the white schools in the same communities," appears to set out to refute any assumptions that race or racism is responsible for educational differences between African Americans and whites.²⁴ He points out that the two "best-publicized assumptions guiding judicial education policy today"--(1) "that segregated school are inherently inferior (Brown v. Board of Education)" and (2) "that the equalization of per-pupil expenditures is essential to an equalization of education (Serrano v. Priest)"--are encompassed in "[a] more general assumption": "[T]hat the large disparity in school performance among racial or

ethnic groups (1) are unusual and suspicious, and (2) reflect differences in the way those groups are treated by the schools and/or the society."²⁵ To dispute these assumptions, Sowell presents evidence to show that the intellectual and educational performance (e.g., I.Q. test scores) of African Americans have been closely approximated by some other groups,²⁶ that some groups who lived in the same neighborhoods and attended the same schools have demonstrated educational and intellectual differences equal to those of African Americans and whites in the segregated South,²⁷ and that there have been performance differences within segregated African American schools comparable to those between African Americans and whites in the segregated South.²⁸

Sowell indicates that the focus of his discussion was to present the hypothesis: "What would we expect to see if [racial] segregation were not a significant cause of educational differences?"²⁹ as an alternative to the one that says that "rigid racial segregation" causes "large differences in academic performances", which he contends was contained in the Supreme Court's Brown v. Board of Education (1954) ruling.³⁰ His conclusion that segregation is not a significant cause of educational differences between African Americans and whites, suggests that he also does not consider educational differences to be caused by the discrimination and racism which accompanies

segregation. In other words, race/racism does not appear to be a crucial factor for Sowell in the differences in educational performances between African Americans and whites in the United States. Sowell was not alone in the 1980s as an African American social scientist or African American economist who held the position that class is more salient than race for African Americans' progress.

Walter Williams (Economist)

As presented in his book The State Against Blacks (1982), economist Walter Williams's views on race/racism as an explanation for differences between African American and white conditions in the United States are similar to those held by Sowell. He wrote:

[F]or the last twenty years, race has been a major focus of public debate and public policy. What is reducible to racism, bigotry and callousness on the part of whites is most often featured as the cause of the current condition of many blacks. The assumption is made that since blacks do not differ biologically from whites in ways that should affect socioeconomic status, the different status of blacks in the society reflects racism and mistreatment by whites.³¹

Williams, as Sowell, while admitting that "in the past gross denial of basic rights and gross discrimination against blacks [existed] in the U.S." and that "[r]esidual discrimination remains," argues against the assumption of racism and mistreatment of African Americans by whites as an adequate explanation for the socioeconomic differences between African Americans and whites in American society.³²

He states:

[T]he basic premise of this book is that racial bigotry and discrimination is neither a complete nor a satisfactory explanation for the current condition of many blacks in America.³³

Williams explained that rather than racial discrimination, it is the state's/government's interference in/prevention of a free and open market, which he calls the "rules of the game," that accounts for socioeconomic differences between African Americans and whites in this nation. He wrote:

We will see that instead of racial discrimination and bigotry, it is the "rules of the game" that account for many of the economic handicaps faced by blacks. The rules of the game are the many federal, state and local laws that regulate economic activity. Game rules can, and do, influence the outcome of the game. As such, there are many laws in the United States that systematically discriminate against the employment and advancement of people who are outsiders, latecomers and poor in resources. It is important to point out that these laws or rules discriminate against certain people irrespective of race. However, because of their history in the U.S., blacks are disproportionately represented in the class of people described as outsiders, latecomers and resourceless.³⁴

These statements clearly reveal that Williams, as Sowell, does not consider race to be a critical determinant of the social and economic mobility of African American youth.

Williams does not address in as much length or offer as much detailed discussion on the effects of social class on social mobility as he does on the effects of race on social mobility. In his analysis of minimum wage laws and their detrimental effects on people with low skills, among

whom a high percentage of African American youth are represented, however, Williams reveals that he considers social class and educational attainment levels as critically important to the employment rate and social mobility of African American youth. He explains:

When wages are legislated that exceed the productivity of some workers, firms will make adjustment in their use of labor. One adjustment is to hire not only fewer youths, but to seek among those youths hired the more highly qualified youths. It turns out for a number of socioeconomic reasons that white youths, more often than black youths, have higher levels of educational attainment and training. Therefore any law that discriminated against low-skilled people can be expected to confer a disproportionate burden on black youths compared with white youths.³⁵

There does not appear to be any doubt based on these statements that Williams believes that being in a low social class position hinders one's opportunity for social mobility/life chances, whereas being African American does not. For Williams, class seems to be of major significance for the success of African American youths, but race, although he admits that African American youths have lower levels of educational training and attainment and are, therefore, hindered more than white youths by laws that discriminate against people with low skills, does not.

William Wilson (Sociologist)

The third African American social scientist, who gained prominence in the 1980s and who argued that social

class position was more significant than race as an influence on African Americans' opportunities, achievement/progress, and life chances in the United States was sociologist, William Wilson, who presented his thesis in his controversial book, The Declining Significance of Race: Blacks and Changing American Institutions (1978,1980).³⁶ In the opening sentence of the preface to this work, Wilson states: "This book is a study of race and class in the American experience."³⁷ As a result of the study, Wilson makes this statement concerning his view on black and white relations in America: "I now feel that many important features of black and white relations in America are not captured when the issue is defined as majority versus minority and that a preoccupation with race and racial conflict obscures fundamental problems that derive from the intersection of class with race."³⁸ The first sentence of the first page of Wilson's book states his conclusion which he attempts to support throughout this work. He pronounces:

"Race relations in America have undergone fundamental changes in recent years, so much so that now the life chances of individual blacks have more to do with their economic class position than with their day-to-day encounters with whites."³⁹

In elaborating on his conclusion that there has been a change in the relationship between blacks and whites in America, Wilson notes that in the antebellum period and the period from the Civil War through the first half of

the twentieth century, "blacks were denied access to valued and scarce resources through various ingenious schemes of racial exploitation, discrimination, and segregation, [which] were reinforced by elaborate ideologies of racism."⁴⁰ Wilson points out that today, however, these "[t]raditional patterns of interaction between blacks and whites, particularly in the labor market, have been fundamentally altered,"⁴¹ and "they do not [now] provide a meaningful explanation of the life chances of black Americans."⁴²

Explaining how the relationship between blacks and whites today differs from that of previous periods, Wilson states:

As the nation entered the latter half of the twentieth century ... many of the traditional barriers have crumbled under the weight of the political, social, and economic changes of the civil rights era. A new set of obstacles has emerged from the basic structural shifts in the economy. These obstacles are therefore impersonal but may prove to be even more formidable for certain segments of the black populations. Specifically, whereas the previous barriers were usually designed to control and restrict the entire black population, the new barriers create hardships essentially for the black underclass; whereas the old barriers were based explicitly on racial motivation derived from intergroup contact, the new barriers have racial significance only in their consequences, not in their origins. In short, whereas the old barriers bore the pervasive features of racial oppression, the new barriers indicate an important and emerging form of class subordination.⁴³

This statement outlines much of Wilson's views in The Declining Significance of Race.

Wilson explains that his basic thesis is that "[A]merican society has experienced three major stages of black-white contact."⁴⁴ He identified stage one as the preindustrial stage. This stage "coincides with antebellum slavery and the early postbellum era," and is designated as "the period of plantation economy and racial-caste oppression."⁴⁵ Stage two is identified as the industrial stage. It begins "in the last quarter of the nineteenth century and ends at roughly the New Deal era" and is called "the period of industrial expansion, class conflict, and racial oppression."⁴⁶ Stage three is the modern industrial stage. It is "associated with the ... post-World War II era, which really began to crystallize during the 1960s and 1970s," and is designated as "the period of progressive transition from racial inequalities to class inequalities."⁴⁷ Wilson notes that each of the three stages "embodies a different form of racial stratification structured by the particular arrangement of both the economy and the polity."⁴⁸

After designating his three historical periods, or stages, Wilson makes a specific effort to emphasize the importance of both the economy and polity in shaping race relations in American society. He states: "although this abbreviated designation of the periods of American race relations seems to relate racial change to fundamental economic changes rather directly, it bears repeating that

the different stages of race relations are structured by the unique arrangements and interactions of the economy and the polity."⁴⁹ Wilson continued his emphasis on the importance of the unique arrangements and interactions of both the economy and polity on racial change by reporting:

Although I stress the economic basis of structured racial inequality in the preindustrial and industrial periods of race relations, I also attempt to show how the polity more or less interacted with the economy either to reinforced patterns of racial stratification or to mediate various forms of racial conflict. Moreover, for the modern industrial period, I try to show how race relations have been shaped as much by important economic changes as by political changes. Indeed, it would not be possible to understand fully the subtle and manifest changes in race relations in the modern industrial period without recognizing the dual and often reciprocal influence of structural changes in the economy and political changes in the state.⁵⁰

Wilson's "central argument is that different systems of production and/or different arrangements of the polity have imposed different restraints on the way in which racial groups have interacted in the United States, constraints that have structured the relations between racial groups and that have produced dissimilar contexts not only for the manifestation of racial antagonisms but also for racial group access to rewards and privileges."⁵¹

While Wilson argues that social class is more critical than race for the progress/success of African Americans, as do Sowell and Williams, the two economists, and that their unemployment rate has worsened since 1954 compared with whites,⁵² he presents a different explanation

than they for the economic (e.g., employment/unemployment rates) differences between African American and whites. Whereas Sowell and Williams emphasize government interference in/restrictions on a free market economy through legal devices, such as the minimum wage, as the reason for the lower economic progress of African Americans, Wilson points to changes in the structure of American society since about the middle of the twentieth century to explain the poor economic conditions of African Americans compared with whites at the present time.⁵³

Wilson explains that the high official unemployment rates for African Americans, since 1954, particularly the rates for African American youth, whose unemployment has reached disastrous proportions, do not describe fully the joblessness of black teenagers. He reports that a United States Department of Labor study in 1971 showed that as unemployment rates among African American teenagers increased "by ten percentage points from the first quarter of 1970 to the second quarter of 1971," their labor force participation rate "declined by more than seven points (51.2 to 43.8 percent)" suggesting "that the higher the unemployment, the more that black teenagers give up looking for work altogether."⁵⁴

There are several specific changes in the United States economy which Wilson says has had a detrimental effect on the employment and progress of African

Americans. One of the factors which contributed to high teenage joblessness was the sharp and substantial rise in the black teenager population in the central-city areas.⁵⁵

Wilson reports that in the central-city the number of "black youths aged sixteen to nineteen increased by almost 75 percent in less than a decade (1960 to 1969), compared with an increase of only 14 percent for white teenagers of the same ages. Furthermore, black young adults (aged twenty to twenty four) increased in number by two-thirds, three times the population increase for their white counterpart."⁵⁶ At the same time that this population explosion of young blacks occurred, structural changes in the economy posed "serious problems for unskilled Negroes in and out of the labor force."⁵⁷

A second change was a shift in the economy from one with "a basis in goods-producing industries (manufacturing, construction, mining, and agriculture) to a concentration on service-producing industries (transportation, service, government, public utilities, trade, and finance)."⁵⁸ According to Wilson, in 1947, slightly more than a majority (51 percent) of American workers were employed in the goods-producing (manufacturing) sector of the economy, but by 1968, a sizeable majority (64 percent) were working in the service-producing industries, and that by 1980 the percentage in these industries would increase to 68

percent.⁵⁹ The most pronounced shift from goods to services occurred in the central cities.⁶⁰

This shift in the economy from manufacturing to service industries has been especially detrimental to African Americans. Wilson notes that African Americans have a "disproportionately high representation in the category of low-skilled and poorly educated workers."⁶¹ These workers are better prepared for the declining manufacturing jobs than for the expanding service occupations. Wilson points out that low skilled workers are employed in some service industries in jobs "ranging from hospital orderly to dishwasher," and that the service industries which employ these workers have, like other service industries, "seen considerable growth."⁶² He seems to summarize the job possibilities for the low-skilled and poorly educated workers, whether they have been squeezed out of the decreasing manufacturing sector or are employed in the expanding service industries, in this manner.

...both the lack of job expansion in the manufacturing sector and the fact that desirable jobs in the service industries require education and training mean that the better paid and more desirable positions into which workers can enter without special skills and/or higher education are decreasing in central cities not only in relative terms but sometimes in absolute numbers.⁶³

Further discussion of the importance which Wilson attaches to education for African Americans and their progress is addressed at the end of this review of Wilson's ideas.

A third change in American society during the modern

industrial period that Wilson discusses, is the growth of corporate industries and the relationship of that growth to a surplus African American labor force.⁶⁴ Wilson states that corporate industries represent "the very center of the new American economy."⁶⁵ He points out that the growth of corporate industries has resulted in technological expansion, greater productive capacity, and higher unemployment.⁶⁶ Wilson emphasizes that for African Americans, growth in the corporate sector has not created barrier to employment for those in "low-paid, menial and casual jobs," but rather for those in the "more desirable, higher-paying jobs in the larger manufacturing, wholesale trade, construction, and finance industries, representative industries of the corporate sector."⁶⁷ According to Wilson, these barriers are due to the relationship between labor unions and employment of blue-collar workers. He explains that in the corporate sector, unions "tend to be dominated by an elite labor force which, through effective organization, has solidified its hold on the higher paying and respectable blue-collar jobs."⁶⁸ Commenting further on this elite labor force of unions in the corporate sector, Wilson wrote:

[It] has successfully pressed for consistent wage hikes, increased fringe benefits, and has generated a protective welfare system financed in part by management. The net effect is the virtual elimination of the employability of a floating, transient labor force.⁶⁹

It is likely that this floating, transient labor force

included a higher percentage of African Americans than whites. Continuing his discussion of the influence of labor unions, Wilson notes that during periods where there is an increased demand for additional workers, employers who hire them "find themselves penalized because of changes in compensation and work rules promoted by trade unions and supplemented by legislation."⁷⁰

It is Wilson's view that these employment patterns by corporate industry "have all but eliminated the importance of race in labor-management strife."⁷¹ He believes this is true because now, unlike in the past, "management does not exacerbate tensions between white and black workers by creating a split-labor market--split in the sense that black labor was considered cheaper than white labor, regardless of the work involved."⁷² After outlining the changes in corporate America in recent years, Wilson concludes that the problem that African Americans face now in finding blue-collar employment in corporate industries is due more to difficulties in being hired than to discrimination in rate of pay.⁷³

A fourth change in the United States economy during the modern industrial period which Wilson examined was the expansion of the government sector. Wilson reports that during the 1960's and 1970's, the growth of the government sector was probably a more important reason than expansion of the corporate sector for the greater proportion of

African Americans in white-collar positions.⁷⁴ He emphasizes, however, that in the government sector, as in the corporate sector, "the increased higher-paying job opportunities for qualified blacks...has little significance for the occupational advancement of the black underclass."⁷⁵

The discussion above indicates that Wilson feels that education is critical to the economic progress of African Americans. He articulates further his views on how educational level is related to occupational mobility in this statement: "Access to the means of production is increasingly based on educational criteria ... and thus threatens to solidify the position of the black underclass."⁷⁶ In Wilson's analysis, poorly educated/trained African Americans, particularly the increasing number of teenagers and young adults of the inner city, see their condition worsening. He reported, however, that the likelihood of economic mobility for educated and talented African Americans is much more promising. Of this group Wilson wrote: "[T]alented and educated blacks are experiencing unprecedented job opportunities in the growing government and corporate sector, opportunities that are at least comparable to those of whites with equivalent qualification."⁷⁷

Summary

Thomas Sowell, an economist, argued that systematic

explanations or non moral variables, such as age and region of the country, are greater determinants of differences between African Americans and whites in school performance, income, and unemployment rates than intentional explanations or moral variables, such as race, segregation, discrimination, and exploitation. Regarding African Americans' lower school performance, Sowell explained that race was not an adequate explanation since intellectual and performance differences comparable to those between African Americans and whites have been found among white cultural groups, even some from the same neighborhoods and same schools. He contended that the differences in school performance between African Americans and whites were not unique to these two groups and, therefore, could not be a sufficient explanation for those differences.

Sowell believed that government interference in open competition in the market place, not racism, was the major influence on the lower wages and higher unemployment rates experienced by African Americans. According to Sowell, government interference in open competition in the market place manifests itself in minimum wage laws and civil service pay scales, among other "wage fixing arrangements." These arrangements, in his opinion, result in higher unemployment rates for workers, particularly the most disadvantaged ones, because they set wages higher

than some employer are willing to pay. He perceives minimum wage laws as being particularly detrimental to African Americans, who are disproportionately represented among the most disadvantaged workers, because African Americans had higher labor participation rates before the government's establishment of minimum wage laws or the existence of the other pay scale adjustments. According to Sowell, since African Americans' labor participation and employment rates did not improve, but declined, with interference in open competition in the market place, it was that interference, not racism or exploitation by white employers, that was responsible for the poor employment and income levels of many African Americans.

Concerning the relative importance of class and race to African Americans' life chances, the ideas of Walter Williams, like Sowell, an economist, seem to be in agreement with those of Sowell. Williams, while admitting that in the past, white Americans denied basic rights to and practiced discrimination against African Americans and that at the present time "residual discrimination" continues to exist, holds the position that racial discrimination and bigotry are not satisfactory or complete explanations for the inferior conditions which African Americans presently experience. According to Williams, the primary cause of African Americans' current economic condition is the large number of federal, state,

and local laws that regulate economic activity which he calls the "rules of the game."

Williams argued that the government laws or rules discriminate against the employment and advancement of people who are outsiders, latecomers, and resourceless, regardless of race. He explained that it is the disproportionate representation of African Americans among the people in these marginal categories or economic, social, and political influence and power, not their race, that is responsible for their economic condition being worse than that of whites. It appears evident that Williams is aware that people who are outsiders, latecomers, and poor in resources had low levels of educational attainment and social class, two variables which he considered as critically important to African American youths' employment rates and social mobility.

Clearly, Williams believed that social class, but not race, is a major influence on the economic progress of African Americans. In taking this position, he inferred that race is, also, not important in their educational attainment.

William Wilson, a sociologist, like Sowell and Williams, the economists, reported that African Americans' life chances are influenced more by economic class position than by race. He announced in The Declining Significance of Race: Blacks and Changing American

Institution (1978, 1980) that class became more significant than race during the modern industrial stage of black-white contact which began around the middle of the twentieth century. Wilson noted that during the previous two stages--preindustrial and industrial--race was more significant than class for African Americans.

Wilson, like Sowell and Williams, conceded that in the past white Americans engaged in discrimination, segregation, and exploitation of African Americans and that these "traditional patterns" of interaction were reinforced by elaborate racist ideologies. His conclusion that racial discrimination, segregation, and exploitation do not at the present time provide a meaningful explanation of life chances for African Americans also places him in agreement with Sowell and Williams. Wilson emphasized that these old barriers to African Americans' life chances, which usually served to restrict and control all African Americans, were replaced by a new set of barriers, resulting from a shift in the economy. Wilson interpreted the new set of barriers as being impersonal, creating hardship essentially for the African American underclass, having racial significance in their consequences, but not in their origins, and indicating the emergence and importance of class subordination.

While Wilson, like Sowell and Williams, believes that class has a greater influence on African Americans'

life chances than race and that African Americans' unemployment rates, when compared with those of whites has worsened since 1954, he differs with those social scientists on why class is now more significant than race. As noted above, Sowell and Williams believe that government interference in/restrictions on open competition in a free market economy through minimum wage laws, and the other arrangements, such as union and civil service pay scales, set pay rates higher than some employers were willing or able to pay, and as a result, priced some African Americans, particularly, the poor, poorly educated, and poorly trained ones, out of the labor market. Contrarily, Wilson attributed the economic advantage of white Americans over African Americans, since about the middle of the twentieth century, to changes in the structure of American society. The changes which Wilson identified were: (1) a sharp and substantial rise in the African American teenage population in the central-city areas which contributed to high African American teenage joblessness; (2) a shift in the economy from goods-producing industries, such as manufacturing, construction, mining, and agriculture to service-producing industries, such as transportation, service, government, public utilities, trade, and finance, the latter industries requiring more formal or academic education and training than the former for which low-skilled and/or

poorly educated African American workers are better prepared; (3) the growth of corporate industries and the barriers to African Americans' employment in manufacturing, wholesale trade, construction, and finance jobs in those industries, chiefly resulting from organized labor unions' hold on desirable, respectable, and high paying blue-collar position; and (4) the expansion of the government sector, which more than the expansion of the corporate sector is responsible for the greater proportion of African Americans in white-collar jobs, but probably no more significant than the corporate sector for the occupational advancement of poorly educated and poorly trained African Americans.

Wilson indicates that education is critical to the life chances of African Americans. He notes that educational criteria are related to economic mobility. In essence, he believed that in the late 1970s, when he wrote The Declining Significance of Race (1978), educated and talented African Americans were experiencing job opportunities that were comparable to, if not greater than, those of whites with equivalent qualifications, whereas poorly educated and poorly trained African Americans, especially the expanding teenage and young adult populations of the inner city, were confronting deteriorating conditions.

It is apparent from the above discussion of the

three African American social scientists--Thomas Sowell, Walter Williams, and William Wilson--that all believe strongly that social class is more significant than race for educational attainment, progress, and life chances of African Americans. Other social scientists, however, as the next chapter reveals, argue that race is more critical than social class.

NOTES

1. Alphonso Pinkney, The Myth of Black Progress, (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1984), 46.

2. Ibid., 44.

3. Ibid., 30-45. Pinkney describes the New Right as the "political arm" among the conservative groups, which emerged in 1974 after President Gerald Ford, a Republican, nominated Nelson Rockefeller to be his vice president (p.34). The New Right's "principal targets were liberal senators, including Frank Church of Idaho, Burch Bayh of Indiana, John Culver of Iowa, Alan Cranston of California, and Thomas Eagleton of Missouri" (p.34). Of these senators, only Cranston and Eagleton were reelected. The others were defeated by New Right senators. Pinkney notes that it is "widely estimated that at least half of the sixteen Republican newcomers elected [to the senate] in 1980 were there because of the efforts of the political and religious far right" (p.34). Along with the incumbent senators, the newly elected ones introduced "legislation or amendments on abortion, busing, school prayer, sex education in schools, and chastity among teenagers" (p.34). Included in the introduced legislation was the "Family Protection Act," which among other concerns, would "exclude corporal punishment methods applied by parents from child abuse laws" and withhold federal funds from schools that failed to allow parents to review textbooks before they were used in the classrooms of public schools (p.34). Republican senators also initiated congressional hearings on whether affirmative action was constitutional (p.34).

The religious Right, according to Pinkney, was the "religious evangelicals, which included the moral majority, [the major group among them], the Religious Roundtable, and the National Christian Action Coalition." The religious right supported many of the issues championed by the New Right. White ministers who were not active in the "civil rights movement of the 1960s" became enthusiastically "involved in politics in the 1970s." They were particularly concerned with what they perceived to be "secular morality" and deterioration of the nation's values (p.35).

As identified by Pinkney, the third group, the neoconservatives, a label coined by Michael Harrington, a

socialist writer, to describe "former liberals who had moved to the right and embraced conservative ideas," were the intellectuals (p.37). Compared with the New Right, the neoconservatives were "older, better known, and less strident in the crusade for conservative change"(p.37). Included in the list of persons identified as neoconservatives were Daniel Bell, Robert Nisbet, and Nathan Glazer, sociologists, James Q. Wilson, political scientist, Daniel Moynihan, United States senator and social and political analyst, and Jeanne Kirkpatrick, United States ambassador to the United Nations and political scientist (p.37). In noting the significance of the neoconservatives, Pinkney refers to the book, Neo-Conservatives (1979), by Peter Steinfels, who analyzed the ideas and personalities of the leading neoconservative men. Steinfels explains that the neoconservatives are not noteworthy and deserving of their special position and attention simply because they are a "'party of intellectuals,'" but rather because they are a "'powerful party of intellectuals'"(p.37).

4. Implications that the Reagan Administration's policies and programs were racist and had a devastatingly negative impact on African Americans are found in the April, 1984 issue (Volume 91) of The Crisis magazine, the official publication of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (N.A.A.C.P.) which had as its general topic "Reaganomics." Three articles, particularly, explained the views of the N.A.A.C.P. in the last year of Reagan's first term as president. The first article was "The Reagan Years and Black America" by Benjamin L. Hooks, editor of The Crisis and executive director of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (pp.4-5). Hooks asked whether President Reagan was "attempting to negate the civil rights gains of recent decades" and "trying to use the Federal apparatus--traditionally a source of hope for disenfranchised blacks--to weaken this and others of the less powerful of this nation's ethnic and social groups."(p.4) He indicated that Reagan was attempting to do both, placing African Americans in trouble and saying to them that the Reagan Administration did not like them at all. Hooks argued that in the spring of 1984 to deny that Reagan was trying to negate recent civil rights gains and weaken African Americans and other social and ethnic groups that possessed little power in the United States "would seem, clearly, to be a lie, a gross failure to look with clarity at the history of the Reagan regime"(p.4).

Hooks discussed the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, created by the Civil Rights Act of 1957 during the Eisenhower Administration and with Eisenhower's support to "help the nation correct civil rights problems," to show

what the Reagan Administration thought of African Americans and other ethnic groups. According to Hooks, the Reagan Administration fought successfully to reshape the Commission that had been critical of its "civil rights policies, or lack of them" (p.4). The commission was changed from an independent five-member group to an eight-member group, four appointed by President Reagan and four by Congress, with a "majority of what its black chairman, Clarence Pendleton, called 'neoconservative attitudes'" (p.4). The new Commission rejected the views of the old Commission which "had supported 'goals' and 'time-tables' for bringing blacks and other minorities into schools and workplaces" and affirmative action "as necessary to make up for generations of discrimination" (p.4).

Hooks noted the efforts of the Reagan Administration to reshape the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights presented "a dramatic confrontation over a relatively short period of time" and allowed for "a comparatively easy look at a Ronald Reagan attack on institutions and systems that have aided American blacks and other minorities" (p.5). This, in Hooks views, was one of many attacks by Reagan on institutions that have assisted African Americans, "some of which [would] probably not be seen clearly until [the Reagan Administration had] long ceased to be" (p.5). Hooks referred to an article in the National Leader, written by Milton Coleman, a Washington Post reporter, to show that Reagan's budgetary cuts had a severe impact on African Americans. He points out that Coleman "noted that a 'program by program analyses'" showed that African Americans were greatly affected by Reagan's cuts in funds for government programs because of their high level of dependency on the government. Hooks quoted Coleman:

One of every four blacks in the nation is enrolled in Medicaid, the largest Federal Welfare program; and one of every four gets food stamps. One of every five receives Aid to Families with Dependent Children, the largest program that pays cash. One of every seven lives in federally-subsidized housing (p.5).

For Hooks, the impact of the Reagan Administration's budgetary cuts on African Americans was sufficient proof for many of this group that Reagan's claim that the "'social safety net of programs that they depend[ed] on [was] exempt from any cuts'" was in fact untrue, and that the safety net was not actually meant to catch African Americans (p.5).

The second article in the April, 1984 issue of the Crisis which indicated that the Reagan Administration's policies were racist and had a particularly negative

impact on African Americans was "1984: The Crucial Vote . . . Civil Rights and Reaganomics" by Althea T.L. Simmons, Director of the N.A.A.C.P. Washington Bureau (pp. 8-10). Referring to the Reagan Administration's civil rights and economic records and programs, Simmons stated:

The Administration has set upon a multi-faceted attack designed to roll back civil rights protections and destroy economic, educational and unemployment opportunities for black and other low-income people (p.8).

On the issue of civil rights, Simmons noted that from its first day in office the Reagan Administration used Federal agencies, such as the Office of Civil Rights (O.C.R.) at the Department of Education, and the Office of Federal Contract Compliance, in an effort to restrict enforcement of civil rights laws. One of her criticisms of the O.C.R. was its move toward a requirement of "proof of 'intent to discriminate' rather than the effect or results of discrimination," the previous standard. Simmons noted that the Department of Labor had attempted "to narrow the number of Federal contractors required to meet the affirmative action requirements of the Office of Federal Contract Compliance (O.F.C.C.P.) and to weaken the requirements for goals and timetables in affirmative action plans" (p.8). Perhaps, Simmon's strongest criticisms of the Reagan Administration was its successful effort to replace independent members of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights with "its own mouthpieces" "to echo policy," thereby destroying the independence of the Commission (p.9).

In her critique of the Reagan economic program, Simmons argued that it had aggravated existing economic differences between African Americans and whites (p.9). She pointed out that the budget cutbacks of programs that served the poor had a disparate impact on African Americans because of the large proportion who lived in poverty. Simmons pointed out that more than 40 percent of African Americans earned less than \$10,000 per year and that it was households in this income category, according to the Congressional Budget Office (C.B.O.), that had the greatest benefit reductions in 1984. Those households earning below \$10,000 had an average benefit reduction of \$430 that year (p.9).

In explaining how the Reagan economic policies served to worsen the economic condition of African Americans and widen the economic gap between African Americans and whites, Simmons noted that while the Administration cut funds for programs designed to benefit the poor, which consisted of a disproportionately high percentage of African Americans, it implemented a tax

program that "provided more tax relief as income increased." (p.9). Still referring to how the Reagan administration policies served to benefit whites more so than African Americans, Simmons reported that the C.B.O. estimated that "in 1983, 4 out of 5 tax dollars forgiven through the 1981 Reagan tax cut went to households earning above \$20,000 a year" (p.9). She noted that two-thirds of white families compared to one-third of African Americans fell into that category.

Among the government social programs listed by Simmons as having their funds reduced due to the Reagan Administrations budget cuts, resulting in fewer benefits or services to African Americans, or fewer persons eligible to receive them, were:

- Aid for Families with Dependent Children (A.F.D.C.). A.F.D.C. funding was reduced 13 percent. Nearly one-half of all AFDC recipients were African Americans. AFDC and Food Stamp benefits provided to families of three and four were below the poverty line in each of the 50 states.
- Food Stamps. The Food Stamp program which provided "47 cents per person per meal" was cut 10 percent. One-third of the persons receiving Food Stamp benefits were African American. "Two-thirds of the Food Stamp reductions were achieved by cutting benefits to poverty households."
- Child nutrition programs. These programs were cut 29 percent. One in every six participants in these programs were African American. Reagan's cuts in these programs resulted in three million fewer children receiving school lunches.
- Chapter 1 (formerly Title 1). Spending for Chapter 1, on education aid program for disadvantaged elementary and high school students, had been reduced by 19 percent. Congress rejected even deeper cuts proposed by the Reagan Administration. Thirty-five percent of the students affected by cuts in Chapter 1 were African Americans.
- Higher Education Student Aid Programs. The administration reduced funding for Guaranteed Student Loans 26 percent. One-third to one-half of the students participating in the higher education student aid programs were African

Americans (p.10).

Cuts in the programs listed above among others (e.g., a five percent cut in Medicaid and a 72 percent reduction in funding for housing programs for the poor) which resulted in greater economic hardships for African Americans, and the Reagan Administration's general assault on their civil rights, lead Simmons to conclude:

[The Reagan] Administration has demonstrated a profound insensitivity to the needs of blacks and has set upon a malicious, systematic efforts to weaken civil rights protections and deny equal opportunity (p.10).

"Reagan's Record on Civil Rights Retrenchment" (pp.28-37) by Michael H. Sussman, an Assistant General Counsel for the N.A.A.C.P. Special Contribution Fund, and formerly a trial lawyer in the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice, was the third article in the April 1984 edition of The Crisis that indicated that the policies of the Reagan Administration were racist. Sussman stated:

[M]y contention [is] that [the Reagan] Administration has made the reversal of critical civil rights gains a central agenda item. In many concrete legal cases, when faced with specific choice, the Administration, its lawyers and policy makers have sided against Black America. But, just as important. . . the Administration has provided no leadership as the nation seeks to leave behind it the tragedy of racial/ethnic discrimination (p. 28).

Sussman noted the appointments of people such as William French Smith and William Bradford Reynold to the positions of Attorney General and Assistant Attorney General for Civil Rights, respectively, and surveyed several legal cases and positions taken by the Administration in the areas of school integration, housing, employment, and voting rights to support his argument that the Administration's choices were against the interest of African Americans and exacerbated rather than eliminated racial and ethnic discrimination (pp. 28-37).

5. Harry A. Ploski and James Williams, eds., The Negro Almanac: A Reference Work on the African American, 5th ed. (Detroit, Michigan: Gale Research, Inc., 1989), 257; Encyclopedia of African-American Civil Rights: From Emancipation to the Present, 1992 ed., s.v. "Civil Rights Bill of 1990," by Charles D. Lowery.

6. See Harry A. Ploski and James Williams, eds., The Negro Almanac: A Reference Work on the Afro-American (New York: John Wiley and sons, 1983), 656; Pinkney, The Myth of Black Progress (1984), 11-15, 170-71; and Harry A. Ploski and James Williams, eds., The Negro Almanac: A Reference Work on the Afro-American, 5th ed. (Detroit, Michigan: Gale Research, Inc., 1989), 255-56.

7. Robert Pear, "His Heroes are Social Democrats," New York Times, 25 October 1987, Book Review Section, p.47.

8. Thomas Sowell, Knowledge and Decisions (New York: Basic Books, 1980), 264.

9. Ibid., 257.

10. Ibid., 258.

11. Ibid., 264.

12. Ibid., 264-65.

13. Ibid., 256-59.

14. Ibid., 257.

15. Ibid., 173-76.

16. Ibid., 173.

17. Ibid., 174.

18. Ibid.

19. Ibid.

20. Ibid.

21. Ibid., 174-75.

22. Ibid., 175.

23. Ibid.

24. Thomas Sowell, Education: Assumptions Versus History (collected papers), (Stanford, California: Hoover Institute Press, 1986), 40.

25. Ibid., 39.

26. Ibid., 41-42.

27. Ibid., 42-48.
28. Ibid., 48-53.
29. Ibid., 41.
30. Ibid., 40.
31. Walter Williams, The State Against Blacks (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1982), xv.
32. Ibid., xvi.
33. Ibid.
34. Ibid.
35. Ibid., 39.
36. At this date there have been two published editions of the Declining Significance of Race by Wilson, the first in 1978 and the second in 1980, both by the University of Chicago Press. In this paper, I have utilized the 1980 edition. The extent and nature of the controversy concerning Wilson's book and some of the arguments against his position are indicated in the works of African American sociologists Charles Willie, Alphonso Pinkney, and Bart Landry. Specifically, the views of these social scientists and their contention with Wilson and his thesis, analysis, and conclusion in the Declining Significance of Race are contained in Charles V. Willie, "The Inclining Significance of Race," Society 15 (July/August 1978): 10-15; Charles V. Willie, The Caste and Class Controversy (New York: General Hall, Inc., 1979); Charles V. Willie, A New Look at Black Families, 2d. ed. (Bayside, New York: General Hall, 1981), 28, 40-41; Charles V. Willie, Race, Ethnicity, and Socioeconomic Status: A Theoretical Analysis of Their Relationship (Bayside, New York: General Hall, 1983); Alphonso Pinkney, The Myth of Black Progress (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1984); and Bart Landry, The New Black Middle Class (Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1987).
37. William Julius Wilson, The Declining Significance of Race: Blacks and Changing American Institutions, 2d. ed., (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980), ix.
38. Ibid.
39. Ibid.; 1; underline mine.

40. Ibid.
41. Ibid.
42. Ibid.
43. Ibid., 1-2; underline mine.
44. Ibid., 2.
45. Ibid.
46. Ibid., 3.
47. Ibid.
48. Ibid., 1.
49. Ibid., 3.
50. Ibid.
51. Ibid.
52. Ibid., 89.
53. Ibid., 89-103, 114-16, 151.
54. Ibid., 92.
55. Ibid.
56. Ibid.
57. Ibid.
58. Ibid., 93.
59. Ibid., 93-94.
60. Ibid., 94.
61. Ibid., 95.
62. Ibid.
63. Ibid.
64. Ibid., 96.
65. Ibid.

- 66. Ibid., 97.
- 67. Ibid.
- 68. Ibid., 98.
- 69. Ibid.
- 70. Ibid.
- 71. Ibid.
- 72. Ibid.
- 73. Ibid., 99.
- 74. Ibid., 102.
- 75. Ibid.
- 76. Ibid., 151.
- 77. Ibid., underline mine.

CHAPTER 4

AFRICAN AMERICAN SOCIAL SCIENTISTS WHOSE IDEAS PLACE
THEM IN SUPPORT OF RACE AS MORE CRITICAL THAN
SOCIAL CLASS FOR THE EDUCATION AND
PROGRESS OF AFRICAN AMERICANS

In recent years, among the African American social scientists who have presented arguments that race, not social class, is more critical for African Americans' education and life chances are Charles Vert Willie, Alphonso Pinkney, and Louis Bartholomew (Bart) Landry, all sociologists. Inherent in their arguments is the view that both class and race are important issues for African Americans, but that race is the more significant/critical/salient one. Each of these social scientists has challenged William Wilson's contention that class is now more significant than race for African Americans.

Charles Willie (Sociologist)

Willie's first critical comments on Wilson's conclusion that there has been a decline in the significance of race in American society might be his article titled "The Inclining Significance of Race" in the July/August edition of Society, 1978. In that article Willie indicates that he was responding to Wilson's "article on 'The Declining Significance of Race' that

appeared in the January/February edition of Society" that same year.¹

Willie began his commentary on Wilson by stating that Wilson's conclusion that race has declined in significance "is all a matter of perspective."² He accused Wilson of using "the perspective of the dominant people of power in his article."³ Willie describes this perspective as follows:

From the perspective of the dominant people of power, inequality exists because of the personal inadequacies of those who are less fortunate they assert that poverty is not a function of institutional arrangements but a matter of individual capacity. From the perspective of the dominant people of power, the social stratification system in the United States is open and any who has the capacity can rise within it. This orientation toward individual mobility tends to mask the presence of opportunities that are institutionally based such as attending the "right" school, seeking employment with the "right" company or firm, and being of the "right" race [and] to deny the presence of opposition and oppression that are connected with institutions. According to the perspective of the dominant people of power, opportunity is a function of merit.⁴

Willie believes that it is from this perspective of the dominant people of power, with its focus on "individual traits rather than a complex of characteristics," that Wilson attempts his analysis of the relationship between African Americans and whites in the United States.⁵

Willie is also critical of Wilson's statement that "'class has become more important than race in determining black life chances in the modern industrial period.'"⁶ He accuses Wilson of trying "to disassociate himself from the

individualism of the dominant people of power by calling for 'public policy programs to attack inequality on a broad class front--policy programs, in other words, that go beyond the limits of ethnic and racial discrimination by directly confronting the pervasive and destructive features of class subordination.'"7 Willie feels that the action called for by Wilson "ignores the interconnection between race and social class as a complex of interrelated characteristics and further does not take cognizance of the fact that there may be a serial pattern to the solution to social problems."8

Instead of accepting the perspective of the dominant people of power, Willie contends that it is possible to understand social phenomena/problems, and by implication the relationship between African Americans and whites, "'by using a method that analyzes complexes of characteristics.'"9 He notes that Wilson acknowledges that race relations in the modern industrial period have been shaped as much by important political changes as by important economic changes, but then denies the significance of this complex. According to Willie, Wilson denies the significance of complexes of characteristics by claiming that "'ingenious schemes of racial exploitation, discrimination, and segregation....however significant they were in the creation of poverty-stricken ghettos and a vast underclass of black proletarians . . . do not

provide a meaningful explanation of the life chances of black Americans today.'"¹⁰

Referring to a serial pattern to the solution to social problems, Willie points out that Wilson focused on the economic sphere, but that intervention in the areas of racial discrimination and oppression in other institutions and social arrangements may be required first.¹¹ Willie explains that there is an ordering of social events into a sequential pattern and that the solution to one problem makes possible the solution of another.¹²

In his discussion of income and education, the importance of which is implicit in his earlier description of the perspective of the dominant people of power, Willie indicated that there is inequality between African Americans and whites in income and that race is the critical issue.¹³ He noted that this was true for both the low income and poorly educated and the more highly educated and talented segments of these races. Willie reports that in 1975, African Americans and other minorities earned only two-thirds as much income as whites, and that this ratio was the same at both the poor and affluent ends of the income scale.¹⁴ In reference to these rates, Willie wrote:

In general, the proportion of high-income blacks is far less than what it would be if there was no racial discrimination. The 1977 report, All Our Children, by the Carnegie Council on Children of which Kenneth Keniston was senior author states that "90 percent of the income gap between blacks

and whites is the result . . . of lower pay for blacks with comparable levels of education and experience".¹⁵

The findings of All Our Children was not the only evidence of the inequality in income at the same educational levels.

Willie also demonstrates the critical importance of race in education and income differences between African Americans and whites by presenting some of the finding of Herman Miller in his book Rich Man, Poor Man (1971).¹⁶ Willie points out that Miller found that while 80 percent of African Americans with only an elementary education or less were likely to be employed as service workers and laborers, which were at the bottom of the occupational ladder, only 50 percent of whites with that low level of education were likely to be working in these kinds of jobs. These findings indicated to Willie that "disproportionate number of blacks in low-paying jobs" cannot be explained by education alone.¹⁷ It appears obvious that Willie attributes the difference in types of jobs to differences in race. Willie also notes that Miller, using 1968 data, found that the median income gap between the two races widened with increases in education.¹⁸ With the availability of the findings in the report, All Our Children, and Miller's book, Rich Man, Poor Man, when Wilson wrote his article "The Declining Significance of Race" (and his book with the same title)

in 1978, Willie questioned why Wilson would still state that "'many talented and educated blacks are now entering positions of prestige and influence at a rate comparable to or, in some situations, exceeding that of whites with equal qualifications.'"¹⁹

Willie argued that Wilson's assertion that historically, the experience of African Americans has moved from one of "'economic racial oppression'" for nearly all of them to "'economic subordination for the black underclass'" eliminates racial discrimination as a significant cause of their poverty. Willie reasoned that if one assumes that there are not extraordinary biological differences between African Americans and whites in the United States, then it is difficult to explain why, at the time he wrote the "The Inclining Significance of Race" in 1978, the proportion of poor African Americans with an annual income under \$5,000 was two and one-half times greater than the proportion of poor whites.

The above criticisms of Wilson by Willie which appeared in Willie's 1978 article "The Inclining Significance of Race" in the July/August edition of Society were in response to Wilson's argument in "The Declining Significance to Race" printed that year in an earlier edition of that publication. In his article, Wilson utilized excerpts from his book, The Declining Significance of Race (1978). Willie's critique in his

article was, therefore, based on excerpts from Wilson's book, not on the book itself.

While Willie's commentary in "The Inclining Significance of Race" was based on excerpts from Wilson's book, his discussions in his book, The Caste and Class Controversy (1979), in Chapter 3 of his book, A New Look at Black Families (1981), and in Chapter 1 of Race, Ethnicity, and Socioeconomic Status (1983) were based on the content of the book. In all three of these works by Willie, his criticisms of Wilson and argument that race is more critical than class for equality and progress for African Americans are consistent.

In chapter 3 ("Relative Effect of Race and Social Class on Family Income") of The Caste and Class Controversy (1979), Willie reports that race is significant as it relates to income.²⁰ Referring to a report entitled Social Indicators of Equality for Minorities and Women issued by the United States Civil Rights Commission in 1978, which was based on a survey of 15,170 households and which "used the statistical technique of multiple regression analyses" to determine whether African Americans and other minorities received less pay than whites because of their "different characteristics" or "unequal pay for equal work,"²¹ Willie stated:

On the basis of this study that was conducted in 1976, one may conclude that even when all things

are equal (including age, education, and occupation) black and other minority males receive an annual income that is 15 to 20 percent less than that received by majority white males . . . These findings indicate that racism is alive and well in the United States.²²

Other social scientists have presented more recent findings, some based on data as late as 1990, which show that even when other factors, including education and occupational levels, are accounted for, race seems to influence income levels.²³

Again using the Civil Rights Commission report as his source, Willie reported that for all occupations, when differences were statistically controlled and only males were analyzed, "blacks paid a 15 percent tax in less income received for not being white."²⁴ This analysis, according to Willie, is "contrary to William Wilson's conclusion that 'the equal employment legislation in the early sixties have virtually eliminated the tendency of employers to create a split labor market in which black labor is deemed cheaper than white labor regardless of the work performed.'"²⁵

This and other information reported by Willie reveal that African Americans earn significantly less income than whites, even when their educational and occupational levels, two of the major indicators of social class position, are equivalent.²⁶ Based on Willie's argument, it is evident, therefore, that race is detrimental to the earning power and, consequently, to the life chances of

African Americans at all social class levels when compared to whites. Also, it is apparent that since income, occupation, and education are highly correlated, as noted in chapter 1, if race is an obstacle to African Americans receiving equal income with whites, it is also detrimental to their obtaining equally prestigious and high paying jobs and receiving equivalent levels and quality of education as whites.

Expressing the relative impact of race and social class on income, Willie states: "Race depresses black family income more than social class for blacks."²⁷

Apparently referring to William Wilson's conclusion that "the more talented and highly educated blacks are experiencing unprecedented job opportunities in the corporate and government sector because of the expansion of salaried white collar positions and the pressures of demonstrated affirmative action,"²⁸ Willie offers this contrary conclusion:

The greatest negative effect [on family income] for the race [African Americans] is experienced at the top rather than at the bottom of the social class (or occupational) hierarchy. This occurs precisely because of the absence of affirmative employment practices that are designed to achieve equity in the proportion of white and black or other minority professional and managerial workers.²⁹

It is obvious that Willie, in The Caste and Class Controversy, holds the view that race is more significant than class for African Americans' life chances and, certainly, their education. His conclusions are in direct

opposition and contradictory to those presented by William Wilson in his book The Declining Significance of Race.

In A New Look at Black Families (1981), Willie discusses the continuing significance of race. He "begins with a statement of social practice reported in newspapers rather than with a series of propositions derived from sociology studies."³⁰ Willie states that he is not suggesting that the methods of journalism and sociology are the same, but points out that "a careful and critical reading of what is currently happening to black and brown populations in this country might have caused William Wilson to be more cautious in his conclusions."³¹

Race relations, according to Willie, is one of the best indicators of how near the United States has come to fulfilling its basic commitment of justice for everyone. Using race relations as an indicator, Willie concluded that race is of continuing significance rather than declining in significance.³²

Willie also presents findings from more systematically gathered data which indicate that race continues to be significant. In reference to one of his own studies, he writes:

Despite the increase in education of blacks, the data revealed that only 3 percent of the managers and administrators came from black or other minority household heads in 1976; that there were two-thirds fewer than there should have been; and that, collectively, they earned \$9.5 billion less than they would have earned had there not been any discrimination in the number of minorities employed

in these occupations and in the salaries that they received.³³

Willie also reports:

With reference to poor blacks and poor whites who are employed in low-status occupations of service work, there was little, if any, difference in the education of blacks and whites who were, for example, barbers, cooks, hairdressers, practical nurses, and waiters (Newman 1978:90). Yet the median family income for black and other minority household heads employed in these and other service occupations in 1976 was one-third less than the median income of whites in these same low-prestige jobs.³⁴

These statements from his book, A New Look at Black Families reveal, as did those from his works discussed above, that Willie feels there was discrimination against African Americans in both high-status and low-status occupations and at both high levels and low levels of education.

In his book, Race, Ethnicity, and Socioeconomic Status, Willie reports that in a previous book, The Caste and Class Controversy which he edited, he introduced a counterhypothesis to Wilson's declining significance of race. Willie's counterhypothesis was that the significance of race is increasing and that it is increasing especially for middle class blacks who are coming into contact with whites for the first time for extended interaction.³⁵

Willie disagrees with Wilson's claim that public law that prohibits discrimination "has been fully effective and that limited education is the prevailing basis for

employment discrimination."³⁶ While Willie acknowledges that the law was responsible for creating new opportunities for African Americans in a less segregated society, he feels that the law was, at the same time, responsible for exposing some of those who experienced the new opportunities to prejudices that were absent when the society was more segregated.³⁷ Here, Willie is evidently referring to middle-class African Americans who for the first time were coming into contact with whites for extended interaction. In a more segregated society, middle class African Americans had less contact with whites and, therefore, less exposure to their prejudices.

Willie argues that Wilson, in The Declining Significance of Race, (1) never clearly states why in the modern industrial period "economic class becomes most important as black-white contact becomes largely social and political," (2) does not provide evidence of the "extent of intergenerational poverty that is assumed to exist among blacks," and (3) "does not identify [racial] discrimination as a contemporary structural barrier in employment."³⁸ In Willie's view, Wilson places too much emphasis on historical structures and too little on human actors. Willie states:

Wilson's analysis, which emphasizes historical structural barriers as impediments to human fulfillment, eliminates psychological discomfort and denies social discrimination as a real problem. Wilson's analysis of the human condition of poor blacks ignores some of their fundamental human

experiences as if these were better explanations of their circumstances.³⁹

Willie accuses Wilson of placing "humanity at the disposal of history."⁴⁰ He believes that Wilson, in his analysis of the association between race and life chances of African Americans, "lets his humanistic ideas drift to a social determinism," as Karl Marx did, and, in effect, "sacrifices thinking, feeling, and acting humanity to an ideology."⁴¹ Regarding this point, Willie asserts: "Blacks are pictured as passive individuals caught in the tentacles of a process that is beyond their control."⁴² Willie believes that Wilson's ultimate goal is to help poor African Americans, but that his world view denies the humanity of this group.

Alphonso Pinkney (Sociologist)

Alphonso Pinkney, in his book, The Myth of Black Progress (1984), argues as strongly as Willie against African American social scientists who support the position that social class is more significant than race for the life chances of African Americans.⁴³ He is as forceful as Willie in his contention that in race relations between African Americans and whites, race, not social class, is, and has been, the more salient issue.⁴⁴ On the issue of educational achievement, Pinkney points out that there continues to be a wide difference between African Americans and whites.⁴⁵

Pinkney is highly critical of Thomas Sowell and William Wilson who appear to minimize the importance of race in American society and/or to present social class as a more significant influence than race for the educational achievement and life chances of African Americans. He labelled "strange" both Sowell's opposition to "affirmative action in employment (especially in colleges and universities)" and to preferential treatment for African Americans as a way of compensating them for past injustices.⁴⁶ Pinkney attached this label to Sowell's opposition to affirmative action programs because Sowell "condemns affirmative action programs in principle" and "at the same time . . . blames such programs" for the "widening income gap between black and white workers," but does not consider the lack of enforcement of the affirmative action law.⁴⁷ Referring to Sowell's rejection of preferential treatment of African Americans, Pinkney notes that various groups in the United States have received special preference, among which have been the handicapped and veterans. He felt that to deny preference to African Americans, who have been the victims of oppression in this society for centuries, could "only be considered a gross act of cruelty."⁴⁸

Wilson's book, The Declining Significance of Race, was the object of and impetus for strong criticism from Pinkney. He felt that this work provided an inaccurate

picture of the plight of African Americans. Pinkney disagreed with Wilson's thesis that in recent years race relations in America have undergone fundamental change to the extent that "'now the life chances of individual blacks have more to do with their economic class position than with their day-to-day encounters with whites.'"⁴⁹ He felt that the book contains "many faulty (even naive) interpretations" and called it "an amazing piece of work coming from a black sociologist."⁵⁰

Pinkney notes that some of Wilson's statements were not supported and that the majority of African Americans must be shocked by them.⁵¹ Wilson's statements cited by Pinkney claim, in essence, that in our modern industrial society, economic class had become more important than race in determining job placement and life-chances for African Americans. Wilson also holds the position that in both the expanding government and corporate sectors, African Americans are experiencing job opportunities which they had never experienced before and that those opportunities are at least equal to, and likely greater than, those of whites whose qualifications are equivalent.⁵² Pinkney points out that when The Declining Significance of Race was published in 1978, the Association of Black Sociologists passed a resolution objecting to the recognition given Wilson and his book and criticizing its findings.⁵³ Indicating that there was a

continuing significance of race, Pinkney emphasized in The Myth of Black Progress, which was published in 1984, six years after Wilson's book, that there was evidence that the "economic gap between black and white workers [was] widening rather than narrowing, and [that] discrimination against blacks regardless of class continue[d] to be widespread."⁵⁴ The Association of Black Sociologists included a similar statement in its 1978 resolution.⁵⁵

In his chapter titled "Class and Race in America," Pinkney leaves no doubt that for him race, not class, is the critical issue for the progress and success of African Americans. Placing the significance of class and race for African Americans in an historical context, Pinkney states:

Historically American white workers have seized on their whiteness as a means of keeping blacks exploited. For them it was their race that elevated them to a position over blacks, not their skills. Although they may have been encouraged by white employers who were mainly interested in keeping all workers oppressed, the white workers were more concerned with race consciousness than class consciousness while many lynch mobs were organized and abetted by members of the ruling class, lynch mobs were made up largely of members of the working class, who appeared to enjoy their barbaric activities.⁵⁶

Again, stating his position on the relative significance of class and race for the advancement of African Americans in the United States, Pinkney writes:

The class struggle might explain some of the antipathy of whites toward black people in the United States, but it is insufficient to explain race relations. Black people are the victims of

racial oppression because of their racial heritage, not because they are separated from whites by class differences.⁵⁷

Continuing this argument, with an obvious reference to Wilson's claim that talented and educated African Americans were now enjoying unprecedented economic opportunities that were at least equal to those of whites and that only uneducated and poorly trained African Americans were unable to progress, Pinkney emphasizes: "Indeed, in matters involving the two races upper-class blacks fare no better than do poor blacks. In the eyes of white Americans, race is the salient factor in relations with blacks."⁵⁸

For Pinkney, the oppression of African Americans and the disparity between them and whites in the United States has always been due primarily to racism.⁵⁹ He explains that racism in the United States is a "rationalized ideology that . . . posits blacks and other people of color as innately inferior."⁶⁰ Since their alleged inferiority is innate, it is genetically determined and unrelated to history and environment. Being innate, differences between people of color and whites are seen as permanent.⁶¹ While recognizing widespread class prejudice, Pinkney insists that race prejudice is more pervasive and penetrating. He emphasizes that "[e]arly on in American history color became the badge of inferiority" and that African Americans were, and continue to be, the only group

in the nation designated innately inferior.⁶²

Pinkney contends, contrary to Wilson's position, that while the most obviously fragrant cases of discrimination and segregation have diminished, basic racism remains. In his opinion, it is not likely that racism has declined in the United States. Pinkney suggests that since African Americans in the upper-class have no advantage over those who are poor in their relations with whites, arguments that the significance of race in African American-white relations has declined and that the possibility of class warfare between middle-class and poor African Americans presents a greater cause for concern than that of race conflict, ignore the basic historical role of racism in this nation.⁶³

On the issue of education, Pinkney explains that African Americans have always emphasized the importance of acquiring formal education.⁶⁴ He notes that the importance African Americans attach to the acquisition of formal education is due to their belief that it is the means to advancement, both economic and social. As pointed out by Pinkney, African Americans often do not have access to quality education, resulting in their being consigned to both lower occupational status and lower incomes than whites. Education, occupation, and income are intertwined in American society and one or more of these variables may serve as a means of advancement, according to Pinkney. In

his view, however, in the larger society, education is usually the determinant of one's status.⁶⁵

Although acknowledging that there were significant gains made in education by African Americans in the 1960s and 1970s, after a long history of educational deprivation, including slavery in which education was forbidden, decades of rigidly segregated and inferior education prior to the Brown school desegregation decision in 1954, and nearly a decade thereafter of insignificant progress in desegregating the nation's schools, Pinkney argues that in the 1980's there were indications that some of those gains had dissipated and a wide gap remained between the educational achievement of African Americans and whites.⁶⁶ Among the measures of educational attainment discussed by Pinkney to show the disparity between African Americans and whites were number of years of school completed and enrollment in post secondary education.

On number of years of school completed, Pinkney reports that in 1978, for the entire population of the country, slightly more than one-third (34 percent) of adults had failed to complete high school compared to a little over one-half (52.4 percent) of all adult African Americans. The portion (3.6 percent) of all Americans who had achieved less than five years of school was only about one-third the portion (9.7 percent) of African Americans who completed so few years. However, the proportion (15.7

percent) of all Americans who completed four or more years of college more than doubled the figure (7.2 percent) for African Americans in this category.⁶⁷ From these comparisons, Pinkney concluded that they indicate a substantial educational gap between African Americans and whites.⁶⁸

The second area--African American enrollment in post secondary education--is recognized by Pinkney as one in which advances had been made in recent decades. He explains that African American enrollment in colleges and universities increased from 234,000 in 1964 to more than one million in 1981.⁶⁹ This increase was probably due in part to the "black rebellions" of the 1960s and 1970s which motivated the nation's colleges and universities to change their discrimination policies.⁷⁰

Notwithstanding the vast increase in numbers of African Americans enrolled in post secondary education, it does not tell, in Pinkney's view, the full story. Part of the story not revealed in the increase in enrollment totals is the disproportion of African Americans attending two-year community colleges. Pinkney reports that nearly one-half of all African American college students in 1979 were enrolled in community colleges compared with approximately one-third of all white college students.⁷¹ Also, he pointed out that fewer than three-fifths (58 percent) of the African American students who received an

associate degree from a two year community college in 1976 were able to transfer the credits to a four year college for work toward the bachelors degree.⁷² Considering the overrepresentation of African American students at the community college level and their inability, in many instances, to transfer credits earned in these colleges to four-year colleges, Pinkney warns:

If the community colleges are viewed by black students and their families as the beginning of higher education for themselves and their children, the reality is that they often mean the end of their education and the beginning of marginal occupational careers. And attrition rates are often disproportionately high.⁷³

Pinkney concludes that in the middle 1980s, at the time of the publication of his book, The Myth of Black Progress, "community colleges [did] not provide egalitarian, low-cost, high quality education on the post secondary level."⁷⁴

Bartholomew (Bart) Landry (Sociologist)

In his book, The New Black Middle Class (1987), Bartholomew Landry, like Willie and Pinkney, addresses Wilson's argument that there has been a decline in the significance of race in the economic sector to such an extent that now African American job placement and life chances are determined more by economic class than by race.⁷⁵ Included in Landry's discussion, which is a general disagreement with Wilson's position, are challenges to several of Wilson's assertions. Among those

assertions are: (1) That an already existing African American underclass has become permanent due to "'economic segmentation'" among African Americans, and that this segmentation, "'together with enacted civil rights laws,'" has given "'middle class blacks the same opportunities as whites with similar qualifications,'"⁷⁶ (2) "'that talented and educated blacks are experiencing unprecedented job opportunities in the growing government and corporate sectors...that are at least comparable to those of whites with equivalent qualifications,'"⁷⁷ and (3) that even "'during the serious recession of the 1970's trained and educated blacks continued to improve their position vis-a-vis whites in terms of income and occupational advancement.'"⁷⁸

Landry argues that "Wilson presents little or no solid evidence to support [such] assertions."⁷⁹ In Landry's opinion, Wilson's assertions, which are not accompanied by adequate data to support them, represent "quite a leap...from the [mere] recognition that the most blatant patterns of racial oppression and racial strife in the labor market have diminished substantially."⁸⁰

Comparing the African American and white middle classes, the groups which contain the talented and educated individuals referred to by Wilson, Landry contends that African Americans lagged behind whites in occupation and income.⁸¹ On the relative occupational

positions of African Americans and whites during the 1970s and 1980s, Landry states:

My analyses of occupational data for the 1970s and 1980s clearly demonstrate that, contrary to Wilson's argument in the Declining Significance of Race, educated blacks did not continue to "improve their positions vis-a-vis whites" during recessions as far as occupational achievement is concerned.⁸²

Landry notes that during the recessions of 1973-1975 and 1980-1982, trained and educated African Americans not only did not improve their occupational position vis-a-vis whites "they actually lost ground relative to whites."⁸³

Landry's statement about losing ground to whites during the recession of the middle 1970s and early 1980s applied to income as well as occupational attainment.⁸⁴ Included in Landry's discussion of the relative income of middle class African Americans and whites during the 1970s and 1980s is this statement which indicates clearly that the income of African Americans declined in general:

Between 1974 and 1981, the average income of black middle class males who had year-round, full-time employment increased by 53.5 percent. What at first appears to be impressive progress pales somewhat when compared to an income gain of 68.2 percent among employed whites males during this period. As a result of the greater gains of white males, the income gap between black and white middle-class males widened rather than narrowed in the 1970s and early 1980s.⁸⁵

According to Landry, between 1974 and 1981, even African American males at the professional level, "where educational credentials are closest to being equal," earned less than white males at the same level.⁸⁶ Over

that period, income of African American professionals increased "38.7 percent, compared to 66.7 percent among whites," and the income gap, which also favored white professionals, increased "from \$3,976 in 1974 to \$10,418 in 1981."⁸⁷ Landry also presents evidence to show that during the 1974 through 1981 period, African American females lost ground to white females, both in occupational and income attainment, as African American males did to white males, although the gap was not as great among females as males.⁸⁸ The average income advantage for white females over African American females in the professional stratum increased from \$544 to \$1,017 from 1974 to 1981.⁸⁹

In the area of education, Landry, while not discussing directly the relative impact of economic class and race on the education and/or the life chances of African Americans, indicates that socioeconomic class is less significant than race. Economic/social class position is not as closely related to attainment of a college education, which is the primary qualifying measure for a middle-class job, among African Americans as among whites. Landry explains that in 1976, African American middle-class males "came almost equally from the unskilled working class, the skilled working class, and the middle class."⁹⁰ In contrast, white males, who attained an educational level to qualify for employment in middle class occupations, were primarily from middle class

families. Their acquisition of this level of education, as noted by Landry, "depended primarily on their father's class position and their parents' educational levels."⁹¹

On the issue of race and its relationship to education and progress for African Americans, Landry explains that African American families place greater emphasis than white families on education.⁹² He notes that this concern of African American families with educational achievement is due to their belief that education is the only means to occupational advancement in the United States, which discriminates against them because of their color.⁹³ In other words, African American families believe that racism exists in the society and prevents their children from achieving occupational success, and that education is the best way for them to combat racial discrimination and reach their occupational goals. Therefore, African American "parents of all classes...encourage their children to strive for a college education as a means of pursuing the American dream of material and social success."⁹⁴

Landry presents research evidence which reveals that racial discrimination exists even among comparably qualified African American and white college graduates and serves to benefit whites and hinder African Americans seeking to enter middle-class jobs.⁹⁵ While emphasizing that a college education is important for anyone to

qualify for and obtain a middle-class job, and that it is particularly critical for the advancement of African Americans, Landry argues that African Americans "had greater difficulty [than whites] translating a college education into a middle-class job when first entering the labor force after school."⁹⁶ Also, he provides information which shows that middle-class African Americans after entering middle-class jobs earned less income than whites even when they had equivalent qualifications.⁹⁷

The lower success rate in translating a college education into a middle-class job by African Americans had in the past been attributed to their attendance in "predominantly black schools which provided an education inferior to that of schools attended by whites."⁹⁸ Landry notes that this assumption--that African Americans' inferior college education can explain their lower job success--"has been proven false" when put under "rigorous statistical analyses."⁹⁹ In Landry's view, the research studies he cites, including his own, conclude that the advantage enjoyed by white middle-class graduates in their ability to enter middle-class jobs as their first employment after completing school can only be attributed to racial discrimination.¹⁰⁰ Landry seems to summarize his views on the discrimination of African American college graduates who are qualified for middle-class jobs in this manner:

For blacks, the difficulty of acquiring a college degree is frequently followed by the frustration of not being able to find a job for which they have acquired the credentials. The college degree does not automatically open the door to the good life.¹⁰¹

The inequity which exists between African American and white college graduates in finding a middle-class job is also evident in salary difference after they acquire middle-class employment.

Referring to findings from his own study conducted in 1976, Landry demonstrates that there was a wide income gap between African Americans and whites in the middle class and the gap was due to a large degree to racial discrimination. In Landry's sample, the average income of middle-class African Americans in 1976 was \$14,700 compared to \$19,300 for whites. This was an advantage of nearly \$5,000 for whites.¹⁰² Included in Landry's findings, which indicate that income differences between African Americans and whites in middle-class jobs are the result of racial discrimination and not composition of the two groups, are the following: (1) African American males received lower returns than white males on each of seven different factors known to be associated with income;¹⁰³ (2) African American males with the same job as whites received on the average only half the increase in salary as whites, \$306 to \$611, with each additional year of education;¹⁰⁴ (3) African American males received less additional income than white males, \$72 to \$93, for each

addition point on an occupational scale measuring upward mobility;¹⁰⁵ (4) African American males gained much less in salary than white males from supervisory responsibility--no significant change for African Americans from this factor compared with an addition of \$2,375 for whites;¹⁰⁶ (5) African American males, although possessing slightly more seniority than white males, received less than one fourth as much added income as the whites for each additional year on the job;¹⁰⁷ (6) African American females earned average salaries of \$122 more than whites females in Landry's 1976 sample, (\$9,843 to \$9,721), but if the same process had been used for both group to allocate income, that is if both groups had received equal rewards for factors (e.g., age, seniority, work experience, education) associated with income, they would have received an average income of about \$1,700 higher than white females;¹⁰⁸ (7) African American females benefitted \$720 additional income for each year of education compared to no statistically significant return for whites, after the effects of the other factors had been accounted for, but the higher return for education did not mean that African American females were favored, since, on the average, white females could earn equal income with less education;¹⁰⁹ (8) African American females could expect to increase their income only half as much as white females (\$93 to \$185) for each year on the

same job, although averaging two more years of seniority as a group;¹¹⁰ (9) African American females experienced no significant effects of supervisory status on their incomes after the effect of other factors has been taken into account whereas white supervisors earned over \$3,000 more than whites who were not supervisors;¹¹¹ and (10) African American females would have had an average increase of \$2,000 if they had received the same income return as white females for their responsibilities as supervisors, and had continued to receive the current return on all other characteristics.¹¹²

Summary

This chapter presented arguments and data from the writings of Charles Willie, Alphonso Pinkney, and Bartholomew Landry, all sociologists, which refute William Wilson's claim in the Declining Significance of Race that socioeconomic class is now more significant than race for African Americans' progress. It also notes some of Pinkney's disagreement with the ideas of Thomas Sowell, the economist. The scholars' ideas reveal that they believe that race is more significant/influential than class for African Americans' educational achievement, types of occupation, income levels, and life chances.

Willie argues that race is more critical than class for determining African Americans' life chances at both low and high levels of income and low and high levels of

education. He notes that in 1975, the income of African Americans and other minorities was only two-thirds as much as that of whites, and that this ratio was the same for both the low and high income people. Utilizing research evidence from the late 1960s, Willie notes that African Americans with low levels of education, when compared with whites with equivalent levels, were disproportionately represented in low-paying jobs, indicating that education alone could not explain the racial differences in occupations and income.

Willie notes that in the late 1970s, the proportion of poor African Americans earning an annual income of \$5,000 was two and one-half greater than the proportion of white Americans earning this low level of annual income. Indicating an apparent significance of race, Willie explained that a study of African Americans and white males in 1976 revealed that even when education, occupation, and age were equal, African American males received 15 to 20 percent less in annual income than white males. He believed that the lower level of income that African Americans received for the same occupations amounted to a 15 percent tax on them for not being white. Willie reports that it is race, not class, that has the greater influence on income. He supported this conclusion by citing studies that have controlled education and/or occupation.

Pinkney is critical of both Thomas Sowell and Wilson for their minimization of race and promotion of class as an influence in African Americans' education and progress. He finds it difficult to understand why Sowell both rejects affirmative action in employment and blames affirmative action programs for the widening income gap between African Americans and whites. He finds Sowell's position especially disturbing since Sowell does not take into consideration the lack of enforcement of the affirmative action law. Pinkney believes that Wilson arrived at many faulty and even naive interpretations in The Declining Significance of Race and that some of his statements were not supported by evidence. To note the extent to which the African American sociological community objected to Wilson's conclusions, Pinkney, in The Myth of Black Progress (1984), included the entire resolution passed by the Association of Black Sociologists. The resolution criticized Wilson's findings and objected to the recognition that white people gave him and his book.

Pinkney argued that, historically, African Americans have been exploited and oppressed, primarily, because of their racial heritage, not their class differences. According to Pinkney, in matters involving African Americans and whites, upper-class and poor African Americans are perceived and treated in a similar manner,

signifying that to white people in the United States, race is the more critical factor in African American-white relations.

Speaking specifically of education, which he identified as usually more of a determinant of one's status than income or occupation, Pinkney acknowledges that African Americans made significant gains in the 1960s and 1970s. He indicated that in the 1980s, a decade of conservative Republican national political administrations, some of those gains had dissipated and there remained a wide gap between African Americans and whites in educational achievement.

Pinkney discussed two areas of educational disparity between African Americans and whites--completed years of schooling and African American enrollment in higher education. He noted that in 1978, slightly more than one-half of adult African Americans had not completed high school compared to only one-third of adult white Americans. Pinkney reports that at that time, almost one-tenth of all African Americans had completed fewer than five years of schooling, which was three times the proportion of whites, and seven percent of African Americans had completed four or more years of college, which was less than one-half the percentage of whites with this high level of schooling.

Pinkney acknowledged that the United States made

advances in enrollment of African Americans in colleges and universities from fewer than a quarter of a million in 1964 to more than one million in 1981. He believed that this increased enrollment of African Americans was probably due in part to the rebellions of African Americans in the 1960s and 1970s which prompted many of the nation's colleges and universities to alter their policy of discrimination against African Americans. Although admitting that the enrollment of African Americans in post secondary education had increased by a large number in less than two decades, Pinkney felt that the pattern of enrollment assured a continuous and wide disparity between the education of African American and white college and University students. Pinkney emphasized that African Americans were disproportionately enrolled in two-year community colleges (the lowest level in the hierarchy of post secondary education institutions). He explained that nearly one-half of all African American college students in 1979 were enrolled in community colleges compared to only one-third of all white college students. Citing statistics from 1976, Pinkney explained that only 58 percent of the African American recipients of associate degrees from two year community colleges were able to transfer the credits to a four year college and a bachelor's degree program.

The overrepresentation of African American students

in two year colleges and the inability of a large proportion of those students to transfer credits earned in those schools to four year colleges led Pinkney to warn African American students and parents that community college enrollment often means a terminal degree program and low level occupational careers. He noted that African Americans in two year colleges often have disproportionately high attrition rates. Overall, Pinkney did not believe that the post secondary education received by African Americans in community colleges was egalitarian, low cost, or high quality.

Landry, like Willie and Pinkney, disagreed with Wilson's interpretations and conclusions regarding race relations between African Americans and white Americans. Landry's primary concerns were Wilson's claims that middle class, educated, trained, and talented African Americans were experiencing the same or comparable opportunities as whites with the same or equivalent qualifications and that these African Americans continued to improve their position in terms of income and occupational advancement relative to that of whites even during the recession of the 1970s. Of these assertions, Landry argues that Wilson presents little or no solid evidence to support them.

According to Landry, African Americans did not gain, but lost ground relative to whites during the 1970s and 1980s, including the recessions of 1973-1975 and 1980-

1982. Landry provides evidence to show that between 1974 and 1981 the gap in income and occupational attainment between African Americans and whites expanded for both males and females. Contrary to Wilson's findings, Landry discovered that the gap also increased at the professional level where the education credentials between African Americans and whites were most equivalent.

Although Landry noted that a middle class family background is much less a determinant of an African American's than a white person's attainment of a college education, that African American families emphasize the importance of education more than white families, and that African Americans do not receive equal occupations or equal income as whites for equivalent education and training, he does not specify the relative impact of race and class on education for African Americans and whites. He does, however, state that African Americans have difficulty acquiring a college degree. Also, one may infer from Landry's statements concerning discrimination against African Americans in occupational attainment and income that race, when compared with social class, is more significant for educational advancement.

According to Landry, African American college graduates are discriminated against even when their qualifications are comparable with white college graduates. In his view African American college graduates

had greater difficulty than white college graduates obtaining a middle-class job when first entering the labor force after graduation. Landry explained that African Americans, even after entering middle-class jobs and possessing equivalent qualifications, earn less income than whites. He provided research evidence, including his own, that refuted previous arguments that failure of African American graduates to find middle class jobs was due to their inferior college education. That research attributed the inequity to racial discrimination. Also, Landry cited his own research to show that racial discrimination was to a large extent responsible for the wide average income gap between African Americans and whites, a gap which in Landry's 1976 study was an advantage of nearly \$5,000 for whites.

The writings of Willie, Pinkney, and Landry clearly reveal that they believe that race is more significant than social and economic class for African Americans' educational progress and life chances. Their views are in contrast with those of Thomas Sowell, Walter Williams, and Julius Wilson, who, as presented in the previous chapter, consider social and economic class to be more significant than race. The following chapter reports on the social determinants of these scholars' perspectives, on how one of these groups came to hold ideas that place them in support of class as more significant than race for

educational advancement and life chances of African Americans while the other group came to hold ideas that place them in support of race as more significant than class.

NOTES

1. Charles V. Willie, "The Inclining Significance of Race," Society 15 (July/August 1978): 10.
2. Ibid.
3. Ibid.
4. Ibid.
5. Ibid.
6. Ibid.
7. Ibid.
8. Ibid.
9. Ibid.
10. Ibid.
11. Ibid., 12.
12. Ibid.
13. Ibid., 12-14.
14. Ibid., 12-13.
15. Ibid., 13.
16. The source used by Willie was Herman P. Miller. Rich Man, Poor Man (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1971).
17. Ibid., 14.
18. Ibid.
19. Ibid., 13.
20. Charles V. Willie. The Caste and Class Controversy (New York: General Hall, 1979), 50-68.

21. Ibid., 54.
22. Ibid., 55; underline mine.
23. See Andrew Hacker, Two Nations: Black and White, Separate, Hostile, Unequal (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1992), 93-106; Bart Landry, The New Black Middle Class (Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1987), 105-106.
24. Willie, The Caste and Class Controversy, 56.
25. Ibid.
26. Ibid., 50-68.
27. Ibid., 59; underline mine.
28. Ibid., 50.
29. Ibid., 59.
30. Charles V. Willie. A New Look at Black Families, 2nd ed., (Bayside, New York: General Hall, 1981), 28.
31. Ibid.
32. Ibid.
33. Ibid., 40.
34. Ibid., 41.
35. Charles V. Willie, Race, Ethnicity, and Socioeconomic Status: A Theoretical Analysis of Their Interrelationship, (Bayside, New York: General Hall, 1983), 2.
36. Ibid., 3.
37. Ibid.
38. Ibid., 4.
39. Ibid.
40. Ibid.
41. Ibid., 5.
42. Ibid.

43. Alphonso Pinkney, The Myth of Black Progress (New York: Cambridge University Press), 1984), 11-15.

44. Ibid., 46-57, 81-98; Pinkney makes clear his position that race is more significant than class position in Chapter 3 of The Myth of Black Progress, "Class and Race in America," pp. 46-57. He provides evidence of the importance of race in income, occupation, and unemployment levels in Chapter 5, "Income, Occupation, and Unemployment," pp. 81-98.

45. Ibid., 135-49; Pinkney addresses educational issues in Chapter 8, entitled "Some Educational Issues," pp. 135-49.

46. Ibid., 11-12.

47. Ibid., 12.

48. Ibid.

49. Ibid., 13.

50. Ibid.

51. Ibid.

52. Ibid., 14.

53. Ibid., 14-15. The resolution passed by the Association of Black Sociologists, at its annual meeting in San Francisco in September 1978, as quoted by Pinkney, stated:

The Association of Black Sociologists is concerned that the book by Professor William Julius Wilson entitled The Declining Significance of Race was considered sufficiently factual to merit the Spivack award from the American Sociological Association.

The book clearly omits significant data regarding the continuing discrimination against blacks at all class levels. It misinterprets even facts presented in the volume, and draws inferences that are contrary to the conclusion that other black and white scholars have reached with reference to the salience of race as a critical variable in American society.

It is the consensus of this organization that this book denies the overwhelming evidence regarding the significance of race and the literature that speaks to the contrary.

We certainly do not deny the freedom of any scholar to publish his or her work. However, it is the position of this organization that the sudden national attention given to Professor Wilson's book obscures the problem of the persistent oppression of blacks. There is an abundance of evidence that documents the significance of race as a critical variable in the denial of opportunities for blacks. For example, the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development has recently published a study which systematically and carefully documents that blacks of all social classes experience pervasive discrimination. Even within the discipline of sociology discrimination has been rampant. In the seventy-three year history of the American Sociological Association only one black person has been elected president, and that was more than three decades ago.

In the past reactionary groups have seized upon inappropriate analyses as a basis for the further suppression of blacks. We would hope that this is not the intent of the recent recognition that has been given to Professor Wilson's book. It must be underscored that the life chances of blacks (e.g., employment, housing, health care, education, etc.) are shocking and that discrimination in some areas is so pervasive that the income and employment gaps between blacks and whites have widened.

The Association of Black Sociologists is outraged over the misrepresentation of the black experience. We are also extremely disturbed over the policy implications that may derive from this work and that, given the nature of American society, are likely to set in motion equally objectionable trends in funding, research and training.

54. Ibid., 14.

55. Ibid., 15.

56. Ibid., 51; underline mine.

57. Ibid., 53; underline mine.

58. Ibid., underline mine.

59. Ibid., 49-56.

60. Ibid., 49.

61. Ibid., 49-50.

62. Ibid., 53.
63. Ibid.
64. Ibid., 135.
65. Ibid.
66. Ibid., 135-138.
67. Ibid., 136.
68. Ibid.
69. Ibid
70. Ibid.
71. Ibid.; 137.
72. Ibid.
73. Ibid.
74. Ibid.
75. Bart Landry, The New Black Middle Class
(Berkeley California: University of California Press,
1987), 92.
76. Ibid., 92-93.
77. Ibid., 93.
78. Ibid., 195.
79. Ibid., 93.
80. Ibid.
81. Ibid., 194, 195, 209, 210.
82. Ibid., 209.
83. Ibid., 195.
84. Ibid.
85. Ibid., 209.
86. Ibid., 210.

87. Ibid.
88. Ibid., 210-11.
89. Ibid., 210.
90. Ibid., 97.
91. Ibid.
92. Ibid., 99.
93. Ibid.
94. Ibid.
95. Ibid., 105-06.
96. Ibid., 105.
97. Ibid, 122-32.
98. Ibid.
99. Ibid.
100. Ibid., 105-06.
101. Ibid., 106.
102. Ibid., 123.
103. Ibid., 124. Landry states:

Seven different factors known to be associated with income were examined in this analysis: level of education, type of occupation, supervisory status, sector of the economy, age, time on the job, and region. Through the use of the statistical technique of multiple regression, separate equations were calculated for blacks and whites to determine the return in dollars blacks and whites received for each of these seven characteristics.

104. Ibid.
105. Ibid.
106. Ibid.
107. Ibid., 125.

- 108. Ibid., 129.
- 109. Ibid., 131.
- 110. Ibid.
- 111. Ibid., 130.
- 112. Ibid., 132.

CHAPTER 5

CLASS VERSUS RACE: A SOCIOLOGY OF KNOWLEDGE

This chapter seeks to determine how Thomas Sowell, Walter Williams, and Julius Wilson, the social scientists whose ideas were reported in Chapter 3, came to hold ideas that placed them in support of class as more significant than race for the education and life chances of African Americans and Charles Willie, Alphonso Pinkney, and Bartholomew Landry, the social scientists whose view were discussed in Chapter 4, came to hold ideas that place them in support of race as more significant than class. This inquiry is a sociology of knowledge; it focuses on the ways in which these scholars' perspectives are affected by their environment and/or society. The ways in which their perspectives on the relative significance of class and race to education and success of African Americans are shaped by their environment is determined by comparing them on certain dimensions, identifying the differentiating characteristics of the two groups of social scientists, and interpreting those differentiating characteristics. The chapter concludes with the author's comments and position on the relative significance of class and race on African Americans' education and life

chances.

Comparative Dimensions

Adequate data were available on several dimensions to compare the social scientists who supported class as more significant for African Americans with those who supported race. Those dimensions were their years of birth and ages; state or region of their birth or rearing; socioeconomic background of their families; their higher education, including the name, type, and locations of their colleges and universities, their earned degrees, and the years they received them; and their organizational participation and/or affiliation.

Years of Births and Ages

Thomas Sowell and Walter Williams, economists, and William Wilson, sociologist, who argued that class is more critical than race for African Americans' education and success, were all born in the early to middle 1930s (June 1930-March 1936). The difference in the ages between Sowell (the oldest) and Williams (the youngest) is slightly under six years. In the present year (1996), Sowell will become 66 years old, Wilson 61, and Williams 60.¹

Charles Willie, Alphonso Pinkney, and Bart Landry, all sociologists, who contended that race is a more critical/significant/salient variable than class for African Americans' education and progress, were born

between October, 1927 and March, 1936. This is a range of approximately eight and one half years between the oldest (Willie) and the youngest (Landry). This year (1996) Willie, Pinkney, and Landry will become 69, 66, and 60 years old, respectively.²

The social scientists holding these two different viewpoints were contemporaries. All, except Willie, were born from the early to middle 1930's, the period of the Great Depression (which began in October 1929) and generally low business activity and high unemployment in the United States.³ Although Willie was born in 1927, two years before the start of the Great Depression, his early years of life, like those of the other social scientists, were during this period in which the nation's economy was extremely depressed and millions of people experienced unemployment and severe economic hardships.⁴

State and Region of Birth or Rearing

Sowell, Williams, and Wilson were born or reared in the North. Williams and Wilson were born in Philadelphia and Derrytown, Pennsylvania, respectively. Sowell, although born in the South (Gastonia, North Carolina), moved to Harlem in New York City with his family when he was nine years old. He attended the public schools there.⁵

Willie, Pinkney, and Landry were born in the South. Willie was born in Dallas, Texas; Pinkney in Tampa,

Florida; and Landry in Milton, a rural area of Louisiana. When Landry was seven years old, he moved to Lafayette, Louisiana, with his family.⁶

Families' Socioeconomic Background

Sowell and Wilson grew up in poverty.⁷ Williams, who was born in Philadelphia, was reared there by his mother, "a day servant, after his father deserted the family when [Williams] was three."⁸ Pinkney's father was a school teacher, indicating that he was reared in a middle class family.⁹ Landry's father, who had a third grade education, was working class. In Milton, his father worked at an agricultural water-pumping station. When Landry was seven, his father moved with him, his mother, and two older siblings to Lafayette so the older Landry "could take a more stable job as a semiskilled laborer for the Southern Pacific Railroad."¹⁰ Willie was the son of "a former pullman porter and real estate broker."¹¹

Names, Types, and Locations of Their Colleges and Universities

Each of these social scientists--Sowell, Williams, and Wilson--earned bachelor's (B.A./baccalaureate), master's (M.A.) and doctoral (Ph.D.) degrees. All of the higher education degrees earned by these social scientists, except for the bachelor's degree received by Wilson, were earned at large, or very large, and

predominately white universities. Wilson earned his baccalaureate degree at Wilberforce University, a very small, predominately/historically African American school, in Wilberforce, Ohio. Wilson's baccalaureate degree, however, like the degrees of the other social scientists, was earned in a school outside the South. All were received from universities in the Northeast, middle west, and on the West coast. None attended a university or received a higher education degree from a college or university located in a southern state.¹² All received their baccalaureate degree during the Civil Rights years (1954-1965).¹³

Willie, Pinkney, and Landry earned bachelor's degrees from historically/predominantly African American colleges/universities, all located in the South. The graduate degrees (masters and doctorates) earned by these social scientists, were all from large, predominantly white universities, and, except for the master's degree Willie received from Atlanta University in Atlanta, Georgia, all were from universities in New York State.¹⁴

Charles Willie received his bachelor's and master's degrees in 1948 and 1949, respectively, and Alphonso Pinkney earned his in 1951 and 1952, all before the Brown vs. Board of Education ruling of 1954, the watershed Supreme Court decision which ordered the desegregation of public school and, in essence, ended legal racial

segregation in the United States, and which, also, marked the beginning of the Civil Rights Movement. Willie and Pinkney earned their Ph.D. degrees in 1957 and 1961, respectively. This was during the years of the Civil Rights Movement. Bartholomew Landry, received two bachelor's degrees, one in 1961 and another in 1966, but no master's degree. He earned his Ph.D. in 1971.¹⁵ The years in which Landry was earning his bachelor's degrees was the period of the Civil Rights Movement. He earned his Ph.D. as the Civil Rights Movement, characterized by a commitment to integration and nonviolent protest/civil disobedience, declined in influence among African Americans, and "black nationalism", characterized by black pride, unity, and some degree of autonomy and racial separatism, increased in influence.¹⁶

Organizational Participation and Affiliation

The African American social scientists who believe that class is more significant than race for African Americans' education and success--Sowell, Williams, and Wilson--were involved in/members of various organizations and institutions. It appears, however, that only Wilson, who is a member of the Board of Directors of both the Chicago Urban League and Spelman College (Atlanta, Georgia), is affiliated with organizations directly related to African Americans and their education and/or

progress.¹⁷ These social scientists have taught at several colleges and universities.¹⁸ Only Sowell has taught at a predominately/historically African American higher educational institution. From 1963 to 1964, he was an economics instructor at Howard University (Washington, D.C.), where he first entered college as an undergraduate. Sowell was also an assistant professor of economics at Cornell University (Ithaca, New York) from 1965-1969, a period in which "black nationalists"/"black nationalist" ideologies were gaining influence in American society and on white college campuses, Cornell being noteworthy among them.¹⁹

Willie, Pinkney, and Landry, the advocates of race as more significant than class for African Americans, also are/have been members and/or participants in several and diverse organizations/activities. Each is (or has been) involved in organizations or activities that appear to be directly related to the education and/or progress of African Americans. For example, since 1974, Willie has served as a "court appointed master expert witness/consultant [in] school desegregation cases" in at least a dozen cities throughout the United States;²⁰ Pinkney reports that he is a member or contributor to all major civil rights and civil liberties organizations;²¹ and Landry is a member of the African Studies Association and Caucus of Black Sociologists.²²

These three social scientists, who support race as more important than class for educational achievement and life chances, are college and/or university professors. Each has taught in more than one higher educational institution since earning a doctoral degree. All of the colleges/universities have been large and located in states outside the South.²³ Only Pinkney has been an instructor in a predominantly African American higher educational institution. For one year (1972-73) he was a visiting professor at Howard University in Washington D.C.

Class Versus Race: Differentiating Characteristics

Several available factors--year of birth; generation; size or type of community (city, town, or rural area) of birth and/or rearing; socioeconomic class/background of parents; size, location, or racial composition of the graduate school attended--had no apparent influence on the six social scientists' choice of race or class as more critical for African Americans. They were from the same generation. All were born from the late 1920s to the middle 1930s, a period that included the Great Depression and was characterized by economic decline or slow growth and high unemployment. Those on the side of race had birth places represented both by large urban communities and small towns or rural areas. Their families' socioeconomic statuses did not offer either a pattern to distinguish the two groups or a

possible explanation for the social scientists' different views and ideas. All earned their graduate degrees (master and doctorates) in large, predominantly white universities. Except for one of the universities (Atlanta University in Atlanta, Georgia, where Charles Willie earned his master degree) all of them were in the northeast (New York, Massachusetts), midwest (Illinois and Ohio), and west (California and Washington).

Two factors differentiate the two groups of scholars and, therefore, may be assumed to have influenced their different views. (1) Each of the social scientists who argued that class is more critical was born or reared outside the South, while each who contended that race is more significant was born or reared in the South. (2) Each of the social scientists whose ideas revealed that he supports class as the more critical variable received a bachelor's degree in a university located in a state outside the South, while each whose views indicated that he believes that race is the more significant variable earned a bachelor's degree in a college or university in a state located in the South. It is significant to note that the social scientists who believe that race is more critical than class, did not simply attend and graduate from colleges or universities in the South, but historically/predominantly African American college and universities.

The social scientists' differences on these two factors suggests that whether or not they were born or reared in the South and received a bachelor's degree from an African American college or university located in the South, accounts for their views that place them on the side of social/economic class or on the side of race as the more significant variable in the education and life chances of African Americans. In the following section, the differentiating characteristics of the two groups are analyzed.

Interpretation of the Differentiating Characteristics:
A Sociological Explanation

Social Scientists Who Chose Class

African Americans who lived outside the South during the first two-thirds of the twentieth century had migrated from the South to the North by the millions. Between 1910 and the middle 1960s--the period in which the three social scientists who chose class as more critical than race for African Americans (as well as those who chose race) in this study were born, reared, and educated--over five million African Americans left the South.²⁴ This mass migration from the South was due to both to factors that pushed them from the South and to factors that pulled them to the North and other areas.²⁵ Both the push from the South and pull to the North and other regions fell under two categories: (1) citizenship rights/equal justice and

(2) economic survival/improvement.

Concerning citizenship rights/equal justice, African Americans were pushed from the South by the "Jim Crow" system of white supremacy, "a two-track system of citizenship--separate and unequal."²⁶ Under "Jim Crow" laws which established racial segregation in nearly every area of public life in the South, "African-Americans had to sit in the back of the bus and up in the 'buzzard's roost' in theaters; had to drink from separate water fountains, use ramshackle 'colored' waiting rooms in train stations and attend inferior schools."²⁷ Segregation and unequal treatment for African Americans were not only required by law, or at least supported by legal authorities and the white populace generally, but also enforced, in part, by threats of violence and acts of violence, including lynchings.²⁸

While African Americans were "pushed" from the South by the desire to escape the oppressive conditions of "Jim Crow," they were, at the same time, "pulled" to the North by the hope of finding freedom denied them in the South.²⁹ In the North, although African Americans experienced segregation and were denied equal rights and equal educational opportunities,³⁰ the "system of racial controls [was] less obvious than the South's Jim Crow."³¹ African Americans, upon migrating from the South to the North, immediately observed and were "impressed by the absence of

obvious signs of segregation."³² For example, African Americans and whites "mingled on the sidewalk and sat together on streetcars."³³ There were few if any 'colored' or 'white only' signs on drinking fountains or in restaurant windows.³⁴

There were several factors which affected the economy of the South and the livelihood of southern African Americans and pushed large numbers of that group from the region. Pettigrew noted in his book, Racially Separate or Together? written in 1971, that the significant "push" factors were the high birth rate among the rural people in the South, the increase in the use of machinery in southern agriculture, "government programs limiting agricultural production," the spread of the bollweevil, an insect that destroyed cotton, the major crop, and the "shift of cotton cultivation to the Southwest and West." Pettigrew concluded that during the previous "half century[,] these factors nearly starved Negroes off farms in the South."³⁵ African Americans were also pushed from the South by the sharecropper system that, in reality, made them slaves to white landlords on the property on which they lived and worked and by the poor harvests due to natural disasters, such as major floods.³⁶

The economic "pull to the North was the prospect of "new job opportunities,"³⁷ "higher wages, [and] better

hours."³⁸ Significant migration of African Americans from the South began "during World War I, when manpower shortages induced northern industries to turn to southern blacks to supply the needed work force."³⁹ Labor recruiters went into the South to encourage African Americans to take jobs in the North.⁴⁰

African Americans outside the South did not live in an environment where they were constantly reminded of their race/color and "inferiority" by overt signs of segregation enforced by laws, violence, and threats of violence, or of their lack of power and rights by whites who frequently and brutally attacked, maimed, and murdered them without justification or provocation. Even though the denial of equal rights was an important factor that pushed African Americans from the South and the possibility of receiving equal rights was an equally important factor that pulled them to the North, the issue of racial equality does not appear to have been the paramount factor.⁴¹

African Americans had been abused due to their race and color and had endured economic hardship since Reconstruction (1867-1877). They had not left the South in large numbers, nevertheless, before World War I. The war caused manpower shortages in northern industries creating job opportunities for African Americans willing to migrate.⁴² This opportunity for new jobs with higher

pay and better working conditions appears to be the preeminent factor which, initially, both pushed African American from the South and pulled them to the North.⁴³ Of course proscription and the factors related to the South's declining economy noted above, which made it increasingly more difficult for African Americans to find work and survive there, helped in "pushing" a steady and large flow of African American migrants to the North and other regions for half a century after World War I. It seems apparent, then, that the primary reason that African American migrants in the North and other regions had come to these areas from the South was not the greater freedom and less racial oppression which existed outside the South, although these were, certainly, important factors, but rather the South's declining agricultural economy, which made it difficult, if not impossible, for African Americans to find work and forced them to leave, and the North's expanding industrial economy, which promised them new and higher paying jobs with better working conditions.

For African Americans in the North, having been both pushed from the South by proscription and the declining economy and pulled to the North by the growing industrial economy, and, at the same time, experiencing less racial oppression than they had encountered in the South's caste system, race became a less dominant issue and economic advancement (e.g., new and higher paying jobs and better

working conditions) a more dominant issue in their daily lives than they had been in the South. This latter point was due to the inability of the society and economy of the South to offer substantial improvement in types of occupations or amounts of income that African Americans could obtain. In essence, in the North, the issue of race, while remaining very important, became less critical, and the issue of class, due to the better job and higher income opportunities, more critical for African Americans.

The education system of the North also served to deemphasize race and to enhance the importance of those issues related to class/economic progress. Gunnar Myrdal appears to convey this message in his analysis of the education of African Americans in the North in An American Dilemma: The Negro Problem and American Democracy written in 1944. He noted:

There [in the North] Negroes have practically the entire education system flung open to them without much discrimination. They are often taught in mixed schools and by white teachers; some of the Negro teachers have white pupils. Little attempt is made to adjust the teaching specifically to Negroes' existing status and future possibilities. The American Creed permeates instruction, and the Negro as well as the white youths are inculcated with the traditional American virtues of efficiency, thrift and ambition. The American dream of individual success is held out to the Negro as to the other students.⁴⁴

Myrdal implied that this was the state of education at all levels, which included the undergraduate level in predominantly white colleges and universities.⁴⁵

Commenting further on the "ideals implanted" by northern schools, Myrdal noted that the ideals were not in agreement with how African Americans actually experienced life. He reported, for example, that employment opportunities were to a great extent, closed to them.⁴⁶ According to Myrdal, the difference between the ideals taught and promoted in the schools and the life experiences of African Americans created conflicts in their minds. Elaborating on the conflict, Myrdal explained:

Often they [African Americans] become cynical in regard to the official democratic ideals taught by the schools. But more fundamentally they will be found to have drunk of them deeply. The American Creed and the American virtues mean much more to Negroes than to whites.⁴⁷

In other words, African Americans were taught that they could succeed if they were ambitious, efficient, and saved their money, and that their race/color would not prevent them from achieving their goals. Even though their lives contradicted the ideals taught them, they held on to the ideals even more firmly than whites who enjoyed far more privileges and much more success.

It is at the undergraduate college level that these teachings would be particularly significant and critical.

This is the level at which students usually begin to seriously analyze and interpret information as well as to formulate and organize many of their ideas about their society and the world. These analytical, interpretive, formulative, and organizational processes/exercises guide students' thoughts and writings in graduate school and later in their lives.

It is in this climate/environment--(1) reduced racial segregation, less violence (legal and otherwise) against African Americans, greater concentration by African Americans on finding employment with higher pay and more pleasant working conditions than they had experienced in the South, and (2) enthusiastic presentation and promotion of the ideals of equality and justice embodied in the American Creed and of American virtues, such as ambition and thrift (which carried with them the implication that individual merit determined success and that race was insignificant) by schools at all levels, and which African Americans accepted and believed in more strongly than whites--that the African American social scientists in this study grew up, went to school, and developed their ideas about American education and society. This environment promoted issues related to class as more important than race for educational, social, and economic mobility. It was an environment conducive to each of these social scientists' conclusion that class is

more significant than race for the educational achievement and life chances of African Americans.

Social Scientists Who Chose Race

The social scientists--Charles Willie, Alphonso Pinkney, and Bart Landry--who supported the position that race is more significant than class for educational advancement and success, generally, lived their early years and earned their bachelor's degrees in the South. The South was very different from the North during the middle third of the twentieth century when these social scientists were born, reared, and educated, as it had been, historically. Although vastly different from the North, the South was as likely, if not more so, to have influenced these social scientists to develop the belief that race is more critical than class as the North was to those social scientists who argued the opposite position.

From 1877 to the late 1960s, African Americans in the South were rigidly segregated from whites, ostracized, brutalized, and provided inferior educational facilities.⁴⁸ During these nine decades, as noted by James Anderson in The Education of Blacks in the South, 1860-1935, African Americans in the South remained oppressed and their "education developed in [the] context of political and economic oppression."⁴⁹

In the South, the issue of race controlled the lives of African Americans. As noted earlier in this chapter,

African Americans and whites were segregated in every area of public life. Signs directed them to where they could and could not go and instructed them in what they could and could not do. Violence, and the threat of violence, supported by law, assured that the signs were obeyed. African Americans were continually reminded of their race and color and of their inferiority to whites. Also, they were in continual fear of insult and physical harm, even death, for transgression of the South's white supremacy laws and customs.

Schools in the South, like the southern society in general, were organized around race. African Americans were segregated from whites in all places and at every level of education through undergraduate study. It was not possible for African American students in the South to attend integrated schools and have access to the same facilities as white students, as it was for African American students in many places in the North. In the southern society, including the schools, where segregating African Americans and treating them as inferior and different was prevalent, race controlled African Americans' thoughts and actions. It is likely, also, that at the college level, African American presidents and professors, who exercised some independence on the campuses, although constrained by whites (white liberals in the region, Northern white philanthropists, and other

whites holding political power in the region) who held ultimate control of education,⁵⁰ heightened the conscience of their students about the suffering and needs of the African American community and about the students' responsibility, as the most educated, talented, and capable of their race, to do what they could to improve the conditions of African American people.⁵¹

This was the social milieu that influenced the lives and thoughts of African Americans in the South from the end of Reconstruction through the Civil Rights movement of the 1960s. The issue of race was the dominant issue in their lives. Evidently, race was also the dominant issue of the social scientists in this study who argued that race was more critical than class for African Americans' progress in education and life in general. Given the social conditions and structure of education in the South during the early years of their lives, their conclusion that race is more critical than class to African Americans' educational progress and life chances would be expected and logical, particularly when, in their view, there is substantial empirical evidence to support that conclusion.

Author's Comments

Some of the social scientists in this study argued that class (or factors other than race, which had an impact on social and/or economic mobility), was more

critical than race for the education and success of African Americans. Others contended that race was more significant. DuBois concentrated his attention on race during the first half of the twentieth century but, while continuing to recognize that African Americans were more oppressed than whites, changed his emphasis by the middle of the century from race to socialism/communism. He perceived socialism/communism as the means by which African Americans (and the masses of white Americans, as well) could achieve equality which had been denied them and which was not possible under capitalism.

While I am not certain that DuBois was correct in his conclusion that a complete system of socialism, or even communism, is the only means by which African Americans, and the vast majority of whites, can achieve, or at least move substantially toward, equality, I think he is accurate in his analysis of capitalism as a system that functions for the benefit of a powerful, privileged, and wealthy minority of people, almost exclusively white, and not for the welfare of the mass of citizens, regardless of race. I also believe that DuBois is correct in his argument that the United States government must take a larger role in directing the nation's economy and assuring a more equitable distribution of resources/wealth and privileges among all citizens, if African Americans

(or any group) hope to achieve, or even move significantly closer to, equality.

After examining the individual and relative influences of class and race on the progress of African Americans, I am compelled to conclude that both race and class are important for African Americans' educational advancement and life chances, but race is more significant than class. Charles Willie, Alphonso Pinkney, and Bart Landry, sociologists, provide substantial evidence and strong and logical arguments that African Americans have lower achievement/income than whites even when they are from equivalent socioeconomic class levels. This difference appears to be due exclusively, or at least, primarily, to racism, not to social and/or class differences. The fact that African Americans continue to lag behind whites in income, even when there is no apparent difference in other measures of social and economic class, including educational level and occupation, lends support to the truth of DuBois's proclamation at the turn of the century that African American-white relations (the color line) was the problem of the twentieth century and to his arguments in the 1930s that race and color were the reasons that white Americans deprived African Americans of equality and that white workers treated African American scabs more brutally than white scabs. Also, the lower achievement for African

Americans with equivalent socioeconomic status as white Americans supports Pinkney's contention that historically it has been the race of white workers, not their skills, that has lifted them to positions over African Americans.

Although racism is a critical problem in the United States, white America does not appear to want to address or attack it directly. Too often whites ignore or fail to seriously examine problems affecting African Americans (e.g., poor education, inadequate health care, police brutality, and high unemployment), as race problems, although they are apparently caused or, in large part, influenced by racism. For example, in recent years, the administrations of Presidents Ronald Reagan and George Bush reduced funds for welfare/social programs and took other actions which exacerbated the conditions of African Americans and, then, apparently ignored the worsening plight of this group.⁵²

The latest presidential election campaign (1992) is an excellent example of how white America continues to ignore African Americans, although this group, historically, has been and remains uniquely deprived and oppressed and occupies an inferior status in the United States. According to Charles V. Hamilton, an African American professor of political science at Columbia University in New York City, "the issues of racism and civil rights" were practically ignored during that

campaign between the Republican President, George Bush, and his democratic challenger and Governor of Arkansas, William (Bill) Clinton, who later won the election. Hamilton noted that this was the "first time since 1944 that the civil rights of African Americans was not dealt with in some overt form."⁵³ He explained that both the Republican and Democratic Parties concluded, for different reasons, that it was not advantageous to them to discuss the issue of racism. Republicans, he noted, avoided addressing the issue of racism because they feared (1)"alienating decent White voters" who deplored "the despicable Willie Horton-race-baiting [advertising] tactics of 1988" and (2) activating some antiRepublican Black voters in strategic electoral college states."⁵⁴ Hamilton pointed out that Democrats, on the other hand, chose not to discuss race, civil rights, and affirmative action because they (1) wanted to win back the "Reagan Democrats" (Democrats who initially supported Ronald Reagan, a Republican, for President in the 1980 election and had continued to support the Republican Party) and felt that discussing issues of racism/race was not the way to do it,⁵⁵ and (2) thought that they were "losing White votes because the party was being perceived as too much under the dominance of 'special [read minority] interests' and especially of leaders such as the Rev[erend] Jesse Jackson."⁵⁶

Andrew Hacker, a white professor of political science at Queens College of the City University of New York, in an article titled "Blacks and Clinton" in the New York Review, dated 28 January 1993, reached conclusions similar to those of Hamilton.⁵⁷ Hacker explained that for thirty years or more after the 1954 Brown decision, the idea that "government could do something to improve racial equity in America" was an accepted one, but that this idea was rejected during the twelve years (1980-1992) of the Republican Administrations of Presidents Ronald Reagan (1980-1988) and George Bush (1988-92).⁵⁸ According to Hacker, the reason both the Republicans and Democrats refused to discuss the problems and plight of African Americans during the 1992 presidential campaign was racism. "Republicans were mainly concerned to assure white voters that their favored status would not be jeopardized and that blacks would get less public support than in the past."⁵⁹ Based on the reduction of funds for programs which benefitted African Americans, this seems to have been the concern and policy of the Republican Party, not only during the 1992 presidential campaign, but also during the entire dozen years that party held the presidency. Democrats/Clinton "campaign strategists," possessing information which indicated that the democratic "party's losses were to a large extent" due to what white voters perceived to be "an excessive attention" to African

Americans, "sought to show that theirs was a party in which white voters would not feel that black claims were competing with their own."⁶⁰ Consequently, Clinton did not highly publicize his African American supporters nor did he appear often before African American groups. Clinton did not offer Reverend Jesse Jackson a major role in the campaign, although Jackson had been a strong challenger for nomination for President among Democrats in both 1984 and 1988, which qualified him as a national political leader and the preeminent African American politician. The role that Clinton assigned to Jackson was one which suggested to whites that Clinton and his Vice Presidential selection, Albert Gore of Tennessee, did not have a close relationship with Jackson, that Jackson did not have a major influence on his campaign, and that Jackson would not have any influence on him and his policies if he were elected president.⁶¹

Hacker reports that Clinton's decision to deemphasize race during the 1992 campaign was influenced greatly by William Julius Wilson, the African American sociologist.⁶² He states that Wilson in his book, The Truly Disadvantaged, acknowledged that while it was a fact that, historically, African Americans had been subjected to slavery, subordination, and discrimination, "programs confined to a 'race specific' solution would. . . 'have difficulty sustaining widespread public support.'"⁶³

According to Hacker, Wilson presented evidence "showing that granting blacks a special status" both "heightened 'racial antagonisms between the different racial groups in central cities . . . [and] 'deepened the divide between cities and suburbs,'"⁶⁴ Considering that evidence, Wilson recommended a shift in the approach to solving the nation's problems from one that is based specifically on race to one that emphasizes "'programs to which the more advantaged groups can positively relate.'"⁶⁵ According to Hacker, of Wilson's book, The Truly Disadvantaged, Clinton stated:

[This book is] the best brief description of why the urban areas of this country are in the shape they're in that I have ever read. And it gives us some guidance about what we ought to do about it.⁶⁶

In Hacker's view, Clinton adopted Wilson's general strategy.

I believe, and it appears to me that substantial evidence presented in this chapter supports my belief, that America's dominant ethos in race relations has always been white supremacy/white racism; that America has never acted in accordance with its creed of equality and justice, as it relates to African Americans; that white America has always treated African Americans as inferior and subordinate solely because of their race/color, and that that treatment has been detrimental to African Americans' educational achievement and success, generally; that even when African Americans' education or class

levels have been equivalent to those of whites, African Americans have received substantially lower income; and that as the twentieth century approaches its end, the dominance of the white supremacy/white racism ethos in America is revealed in the recent actions and policies of America's political leaders, specifically the Republican Party during the 1980's and the Republican and Democratic candidates for President, and their advisors, during the 1992 presidential campaign. In that campaign the contestants, George Bush, the President, and Bill Clinton, the Governor of Arkansas, were, perhaps, following their own inclinations concerning social policies pertaining to African Americans, but it seems evident, that they also acquiesced to pressures, attitudes, and wishes of white racists to avoid both appearing too friendly with/helpful to African Americans and losing white votes. As a result of their actions, Bush and Clinton helped to assure that whites retain their superordinate status in the nation. All of these characteristics of American society and race relations indicate that race/racism/color has always been and continues to be unmatched in significance by any other factor or issue, including socioeconomic class, for educational progress and life chances of African Americans.

NOTES

1. For biographical data on Thomas Sowell see Thomas Sowell, Black Education: Myths and Tragedies (New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1972), biographical summary in the back inside book cover/jacket flap; W. Augustus Low and Virgil A. Cliffs, eds., "Sowell, Thomas," in Encyclopedia of Black America, 1981 ed., 806; Thomas Sowell, Education: Assumptions Versus History (Stanford, California: Hoover Institution Press, Stanford University, 1986), biographical summary on outside back cover, with an inscription at the bottom which reads, "Cover designed by P. Kelley Baker"; Harry A. Ploski and James Williams, eds., The Negro Almanac: A Reference Work on the African American, 5th ed. (New York: Gale Research Inc., 1989), 255, 1013; and Who's Who in America [1990-91], 46th edition, vol. 2 (Wilmette, Illinois: Marquis Who's Who, Macmillan Directory Division, 1990), 3092-93.

For biographical data on Walter Williams see William C. Matney, ed. Who's Who Among Black Americans, 4th edition (Lake Forest, Illinois: Educational communications Inc., 1985), 912; Hal May and Susan M. Trasky, eds., Contemporary Authors: A Bio-Biographical Guide to Current Writers in Fiction, General Non-fiction, Poetry, Journalism, Drama, Motion Pictures, Television, and Other Fields, vol.123 (Detroit, Michigan: Gale Research Company, Book Towers, 1988), 470; Barbara Carlisle Bigelow, Contemporary Black Biography: Profiles from the International Black Community, vol.4 (Detroit, Michigan: Gale Research Inc., 1993), 274-77.

For biographical data on William Wilson see Kenneth Clark, Dark Ghetto: Dilemmas of Social Power, 2d edition (Middletown, Connecticut: Wesleyan University Press, 1965), brief biographical summary on the last page (unnumbered) with the heading "About the Authors" which included Wilson who wrote the forward to this edition; Robert Goldstein, "Prisoners of the Economy," New York Times, 25 October 1987, Book Review section, (section 7), pp. 1, 46-48; (This Times article was a review of Wilson's book, The Truly Disadvantaged: The Inner City, the Underclass, and Public Policy published in 1987 by the University of Chicago Press); Gerald David Joyner and Robin M. Williams, Jr. eds., A Common Destiny: Blacks and American Society (Washington D.C.: National Academy Press, 1989), 584; Robert Pear, "His Heroes Are Social

Democrats," New York Times, Book Review section (section 7) 25 October 1987, p. 47; Harry A. Ploski and James Williams, eds., The Negro Almanac: A reference Work on the African American, 5th edition (Detroit, Michigan: Gale Research Inc., 1989), 255-56; Iris Cloyd, ed., Who's Who Among Black Americans 1990-91, 6th edition (New York: Gale Research, Inc., 1990), 1392; Who's Who in America [1990-91], 46th edition, vol. 2 (Wilmette, Illinois: Marquis Who's Who, Macmillan Directory Division, 1990), 3506.

2. For biographical data on Charles V[ert] Willie see Ann Evory, ed., Contemporary Authors: A Bio-Bibliographical Guide to Current Authors and Their Works, first revision, vols. 41-44 (Detroit, Michigan: Gale Research Company, Book Towers, 1979), 778-79; August W. Low and Virgil A. Cliff, eds., "Willie, Charles V.", in Encyclopedia of Black America, 1981 ed., 860; Janet Dewart, ed., State of Black America 1987 (New York: National Urban League, Inc., 1987), 5; Who's Who Among Black Americans, 5th edition (Lake Forest, Illinois: Educational Communications, Inc., 1988), 761; Harry A. Ploski and James Williams, eds. The Negro Almanac: A Reference Work on the African American, 5th edition (New York: Gale Research, Inc., 1989), 1020; Iris Cloyd, ed., Who's Who Among Black Americans, 1990-91, 6th edition (New York: Gale Research Inc., 1990), 1381-82; Jeffrey Franz, ed., Who's Who in American Education 1989-90: Educators in Professional Schools of Education and School Administrators and Support Staff, 2d. edition, vol. 2 (Owings Mills, Maryland: The National Reference Institute, 1990), 745; Who's Who in America [1990-91], 46th edition, vol. 2 (Wilmette, Illinois: Marquis Who's Who, Macmillan Directory Division, 1990), 3092-93.

For biographical data on Alphonso Pinkney see Alphonso Pinkney, Red, Black, and Green: Black Nationalism in the United States (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1976), biographical note on the outside back cover;

Christine Nasso, ed., Contemporary Authors: A Bio-Bibliographical Guide to Current Authors and Their Works, first revision, Vol. 25-28 (Detroit Michigan: Gale Research Company, Book Tower, 1977), 558; Who's Who Among Black Americans, 1988, 5th edition (Lake Forest, Illinois: Educational Communications, Inc., 1988), 554; Iris Cloyd, ed., Who's Who Among Black Americans 1990-91, 6th edition (New York: Gale Research, Inc., 1990), 1012.

For biographical data on Bartholomew Landry see Iris Cloyd, ed. Who's Who Among Black Americans 1990-91, 6th edition (New York: Gale Research, Inc., 1990), 754. Biographical data on Landry was also obtained from Mr. Paul Keith, Director, University Relations, Xavier University of Louisiana (New Orleans), in a letter dated 14 July 1992 and other material to Jerry Woods (author) in

response to a letter from the author to Xavier University, dated 29 June 1992, requesting biographical data on Bartholomew Landry; Mr. Keith noted in his letter that he was "enclosing notes from his [Landry's] folder from the Office of Alumni Relations" . . . [and] "a copy of a feature article from the Baltimore Sun (January 13, 1988)." Specifically, Mr. Keith provided (1) a sheet (undated) titled "Louis Bartholomew Landry", which lists biographical information (e.g., academic discipline; place and date of birth, colleges attended, level of degrees and years they were earned, year of marriage, colleges where he worked and positions he held, membership in organizations, fellowships and research funds received, and office address); (2) a "Curriculum Vita" of L. Bartholomew Landry dated October 1977; (3) an article relating to Landry's book The New Black Middle Class (1987) by Abby Karp, "Gauging the Ascent," Baltimore Sun, 13 January 1988, morning edition, sec. D, pp. 1, 5; and (4) [Author unnamed], "Grad's Book on New Black Middle Class Acclaimed, First Printing Goes Fast," This Week at Xavier, [Xavier University, New Orleans, Louisiana, Newsletter, edited by Paul Keith] 17, no 6 (15 March 1988).

3. Lerone Bennett, Jr. Before the Mayflower: A History of the Negro in America 1619-1966, 3r ed. (Chicago: Johnson Publishing Company, Inc., 1966), 298-300. Encyclopedia Britannica, 1972 ed., s.v. "Business Cycle (Major Depression)" Encyclopedia Britannica, 1972 ed., s.v. "Depression"; Encyclopedia Britannica, 1972., "United States (of America)" (see pp. 673-680, from "The Stock Market Crash" through "The 'Recession' of 1937"); Random House College Dictionary, unabridged ed. (1973) s.v. "Great Depression"; The 1972 edition of Encyclopedia Britannica under the major heading of "Business Cycle" (pp. 473-475) indicates that the "Great Depression" was from 1929-1932 and that a shorter, but also, severe depression was from 1937-38; The 1973 unabridged edition of the Random House College Dictionary includes in its definition of the Great Depression that it was an "economic crisis . . . in the United States and other countries, roughly beginning with the stock market crash in October, 1929, and continuing through the 1930's."

4. Ibid.; the 1972 edition of the Encyclopedia Britannica reveals that in the Fall of 1932, during the campaign for President between President Herbert Hoover and Franklin Roosevelt, these conditions existed:

Banks were failing by the hundreds. Mills and factories were shutdown. Estimates of the number of unemployed ranged as high as 13,000,000--one

worker in four--and many of those who were at work were receiving only subsistence wages" (pp. 674-75).

5. See biographical information on Sowell, Williams, and Wilson, as cited in note 1 above.

6. See biographical information on Willie, Pinkney, and Landry, as cited in note 2 above.

7. Sowell, Black Education, 26; Pear, "His Heroes are Social Democrats," New York Times, p.47.

8. Bigelow, Contemporary Black Biography, 274.

9. Christine Nasso, Contemporary Authors, first revision, vols. 25-28, 558.

10. Karp, "Gauging the Ascent," Baltimore Sun, 13 January 1988, morning edition, sec. D, p. 5; this article was in materials from Paul Keith, Director of University Relations at Xavier University of Louisiana to the author; the letter accompanying the materials was dated 14 July 1992.

11. Ivory, Contemporary Authors, first revision, vols. 41-44, 1979, 778.

12. See sources cited in note 1 above.

13. See sources cited in note 1 above; Thomas Sowell received his B.A. degree from Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts, in 1958, A.M. from Columbia University, New York, New York in 1959, and Ph.D. from the University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois, in 1968; Walter Williams received his B.A. from California State University (a consortium of institutions throughout the state of California) with headquarters in Long Beach, California, in 1965, and M.A. and Ph.D. from the University of California (UCLA) in 1967 and 1972, respectively; William Wilson earned his B.A. from Wilberforce University, Wilberforce, Ohio, in 1958, M.A. from Bowling Green University in Bowling Green, Ohio, in 1961, and Ph.D. from Washington State University in Pullman, Washington, in 1966; for materials supporting the view that 1954 through 1965 marked the Civil Rights years, characterized by non-violent direct action protests/demonstrations to obtain equal rights and by an integrationist ethos, which waned after the middle of the 1960s due to challenge to the leadership of the Civil Rights Movement and their ideology and methods by a portion of the African American community that

supported/advocated a black nationalist ideology of race unity, pride in cultural heritage, and some degree of autonomy from the larger society to achieve self-determination and liberation from oppression, see Julian Bond, Introduction to Eyes on the Prize: America's Civil Rights Years, 1954-1965 by Juan Williams (New York: Viking, 1987), xi-xv; Herbert H. Haines, Black Radicals and the Civil Rights Mainstream, 1954-1970 Knoxville, Tennessee: University of Tennessee Press, 1988), 29-76; Alphonso Pinkney, Red, Black, and Green: Black Nationalism in the United States (Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1976), 3-7 61-64; and the entire text of Juan Williams, Eyes on the Prize: America's Civil Rights Years, 1954-65 (New York: Viking, 1987).

14. See biographical sources on Willie, Pinkney, and Landry, as cited in note 2 above.

15. Ibid.

16. Bond, Introduction to Eyes on the Prize: America's Civil Rights Years 1954-1965, by Juan Williams, xi-xv; Haines, Black Radicals and the Civil Rights Mainstream, 1954-1970, 29-76; Pinkney, Red, Black, and Green: Black Nationalism in the United States, 3-7, 61-64; Williams, Eyes on the Prize: America's Civil Rights Years, 1954-1965.

17. See biographical information on Thomas Sowell, Walter Williams, and Julius Wilson, as cited in note 1 above.

18. See biographical information on Thomas Sowell, Walter Williams, and William Wilson, as cited in note 1 above.

19. For a discussion of "Black power" and "black nationalists" see Mary Frances Barry and John W. Blassingame, Long Memory: The Black Experience in America (New York: Oxford University Press, 1982) 418-423; Commenting on black nationalist on college campuses, Barry and Blassingame note:

On college campuses, militant black student groups became common place. They insisted on courses in black studies, admission of more black students, employment of more black students, employment of more black faculty and staff, and separate living and extracurricular facilities on some campuses. (p.423).

For a report on an incident of campus unrest at Cornell University see Harry A. Ploski and James Williams, eds., The Negro Almanac: A Reference Work on the African American, 5th ed. (New York: Gale Research Inc., 1989), 51; This work explains that on April 19-20, 1969, armed "student members of the campus Afro-American Society seize[d] a student center at Cornell . . . protesting, among other things, the alleged harassment of black coeds and the burning of a cross on campus," and as a result forced the school's administration to "yield to their demands."

20. Cloyd, Who's Who Among Black Americans, 1990-91, 6th ed., 1381.

21. Ibid., 1012.

22. Ibid., 754.

23. Willie has taught at Syracuse University in Syracuse, New York, Upstate Medical Center of the State University of New York at Syracuse, Syracuse, New York, and Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts; Pinkney at Hunter College of the City University of New York, New York, New York, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois, and Howard University, Washington, D.C.; Landry at Purdue University, West Lafayette, Indiana, and the University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland.

24. "Life in the 'Promised Land': African American Migrants in Northern Cities 1916-1940," Art and Zoo (News for schools from the Smithsonian Institute, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, Washington, D.C.), January 1992, 1; Thomas F. Pettigrew, Racially Separate or Together? (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1971), 2. The article "Life in the Promised Land" stated:

In 1916, the number of African Americans migrating from the South to northern cities swelled from a trickle to a torrent. Between 1910 and 1940, over 3 million blacks--men, women, and children--uprooted themselves and made their way northward in hope of building better lives.

In Racially Separate or Together?, Pettigrew explained:

. . . migration increased to enormous proportions in the 1920s. During the depression years, the pace slowed, but it accelerated rapidly again with the entry of the United States into World War II and continued during the 1950s and 1960s. Between 1950 and 1966, over two million Negro Southerners

broke their home ties and left the South. During this period total Negro population in the North and West increased by almost four million. Now . . . virtually as many Negroes live outside the South as in it . . .

25. Harold M. Baron, "The Web of Urban Racism," 134-76, in Institutional Racism in America, edited by Louis L. Knowles and Kenneth Prewitt (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1969), 140-41; "Life in the 'Promised Land,'" 1; Pettigrew, 2.

26. "Life in the 'Promised Land,'" 1.

27. Ibid.

28. Lerone Bennett, Before the Mayflower: A History of the Negro in America 1619-1966 (Chicago, Illinois: Johnson Publishing Company, Inc., 1966), 221. Commenting on Jim Crow in the South during the latter decades of the nineteenth century and the early decades of the twentieth century, Bennett noted:

The cornerstone of the great wall ["Jim Crow"] were two taboos: interracial eating and intermarriage . . . One led to a hundred. One fear became a nightmare. Out came the rope. Out came the signs: WHITE[,] COLORED[,] NEGROES AND FREIGHT[.] (Underline mine)

"Life in the 'Promised Land,'" 1; This article notes that between 1910 and 1940 African Americans in the South were both threatened with violence and had violence committed against them by whites. Malefi Kete Asante, "The Afrocentric Idea in Education," The Journal of Negro Education 60 (Spring 1991): 177; Asante noted that the "Jim Crow" period extended from 1877 to 1954 and that African Americans "saw only slight improvement" in their condition during that period. He described this period as follows:

This era was characterized by the sharecropper system, disenfranchisement, enforced segregation, internal migration, lynchings, unemployment, poor housing conditions, and separate and unequal facilities. (underline mine)

29. "Life in the 'Promised Land,'" 2.

30. The article "Life in the 'Promised Land'" indicates that segregation was less rigid/complete in the North than in the South, but that a high level of

segregation and racism did exist in the North depriving African Americans of their full citizenship rights. The article explains:

Migrants quickly learned that they were not welcomed everywhere, even in the North. True, the races mingled in the street, on public transportation, on the job, and in many stores and eating places. Yet residential areas, as we have seen, were either black or white. And beaches, dance halls, and skating rinks--even hospital and social service facilities--were separated by race.

In some northern communities, the schools system was officially segregated. In others this was not so. But even where schools were supposed to be integrated, segregated residential patterns led to predominantly black and white schools. And the black schools, almost always in poorer neighborhoods, were housed in buildings with more limited facilities, and received less funding (p.2).

31. Baron, "The Web of Urban Racism," 141.

32. "Life in the 'Promised Land,'" 2.

33. Ibid.

34. Ibid.

35. Pettigrew, 2; The article "Life in the 'Promised Land'" also notes that the bollweevil was partially responsible for pushing African Americans from the South (p.1).

36. "Life in the 'Promised Land,'" 1.

37. Pettigrew, 2.

38. "Life in the 'Promised Land,'" 1.

39. "Life in the 'Promised Land,'" 1.

40. Ibid,; Pettigrew, 2.

41. "Life in the 'Promised Land'," 1; This article notes that neither difficult economic times nor violence or threats of violence induced African Americans to leave their homes in the South and start new ones in the North. Pettigrew, 2; Pettigrew does not name racial oppression, "Jim Crow," or inequality as a factor which pushed African Americans from the South.

42. "Life in the 'Promised Land,'" 1; Pettigrew, 2.

43. "Life in the 'Promised Land,'" 1; Pettigrew, 2.

44. [Gunnar Myrdal,] "Gunnar Myrdal on Negro Education (1944)," 3000-3006, in Education in the United States: A Documentary History, editor, Sol Cohen, vol. 5 (California: University of California Press, 1974), 3001; (underline mine) This source documents this information as coming "from Gunnar Myrdal, An American Dilemma: The Negro Problem and Modern Democracy (New York, 1944) [,]" and indicates that it can be found between pages 879 and 884; Arnold Rose, author of The Negro in America: The Condensed Version of Gunnar Myrdal's An American Dilemma referred to the "American Creed" as a "definite and clearly expressed system of ideals in reference to human relations" (p.1). Of the Creed's ideals, he stated:

These ideals of the essential dignity of the individual, of the basic equality of all men and of certain inalienable rights to freedom, justice, and fair opportunity, represent to the American people the meaning of the nation's early struggle for independence. These principals were written into the Declaration of Independence, the Preamble to the Constitution, the Bill of Rights, and into the constitution of the states. The ideals of the American Creed have thus become the highest law of the land (p.2).

African Americans, he notes, while recognizing that they are the most oppressed group and that "the Creed is not lived up to in America," nevertheless maintain "faith in the creed." That faith does not result simply from their belief that the creed serves as a means for them to plead for their rights. African Americans "like the whites, believe, with one part of themselves, that the Creed is ruling America." (p.2) Faith in the Creed by American citizens from all races, classes, colors, regions, and national origins is the result of their minds being inculcated with the Creed's ideals. As Rose explained:

All means are used to stamp [the Creed's ideals] into everybody's mind. The schools teach them, the churches preach them. The courts pronounce decisions in their terms (p.1).

The source for the above discussions of the American Creed is: Arnold Rose, The Negro in America: The Condensed Version of Gunnar Myrdal's An American Dilemma (New York: Harper and Row, 1948); the specific location of materials

used from this source is noted only by the page number enclosed within parentheses.

45. [Myrdal,] "Gunnar Myrdal on Negro Education (1944)," 3001-02.

46. Ibid., 3001.

47. Ibid.; underline mine.

48. Anderson, The Education of Blacks in the South, 1860-1935, 2; Bennett, Before the Mayflower, 225-236, 311-323, 327-356. In these pages, Bennett discusses racial segregation and the brutalization and oppression of African Americans. From his account, African Americans were oppressed and denied equal rights from the late 1800s to the 1960s. Reconstruction ended in 1877. That year marked the beginning of a reign of terror against African Americans which continued through the Civil Rights Movement of the 1960s.

49. Anderson, The Education of Blacks in the South, 1860-1935, 2.

50. [Myrdal,] "Gunnar Myrdal on Negro Education (1944)," 3001-3002.

51. Charles V. Willie, "Racism, Black Education, and the Sociology of Knowledge," in Black Colleges in America: Challenge, Development, Survival, ed. Charles V. Willie and Ronald R. Edmonds (New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University, 1978) 12-13. Willie explains that Benjamin Mays, former president of Morehouse College, who may not have been representative of all African American college presidents but who qualified as the "ideal type," felt that Morehouse had to do more than simply teach its students "to be astute in communicating and calculating skills," which it certainly was obligated to do. Mays stated in 1945 that Morehouse College also had to teach its men (Morehouse was/is an all men's school) to be honest, trustworthy, and "'sensitive to the wrongs, the sufferings, and the injustices of society and . . . willing to accept responsibility for correcting the ills.'"

52. Benjamin L. Hooks, "The Reagan Years and Black America," Crisis, April 1984, 4-5; Althea T.L. Simmons, "1984: The Crucial Vote. . . Civil Rights and Reaganomics," Crisis, April 1984, 8-10; Michael H. Sussman, "A Sorry Story . . . Reagan's Record on Civil Rights Retrenchment," Crisis, April 1984, 28-37.

53. Charles V. Hamilton, "Promoting Priorities: African American Political Influence in the 1990s," New York Amsterdam News, 13 February 1993, 3.

54. Ibid.

55. Ibid.

56. Ibid, 3, 31.

57. Andrew Hacker, "Blacks and Clinton," New York Review, 28 January 1993, 12-15.

58. Ibid, 14.

59. Ibid.

60. Ibid.

61. Ibid.

62. Ibid.

63. Ibid.

64. Ibid.

65. Ibid.

66. Ibid.

CHAPTER 6

AFRICAN AMERICAN SOCIAL SCIENTISTS WHOSE IDEAS PLACE
THEM IN SUPPORT OF DESEGREGATION/INTEGRATION AS MORE
CRITICAL THAN SEGREGATION/SEPARATION/NATIONALISM
FOR THE EDUCATION AND PROGRESS OF AFRICAN AMERICANS

The focus of this chapter is the ideas of three African American social scientists--E. Franklin Frazier, sociologist, Kenneth B. Clark, psychologist, and Charles V. Willie, sociologist--who, in accordance with the historically dominant integrationist ideology of African Americans, advocated racial desegregation/integration rather than segregation/separation/nationalism as necessary for African Americans' educational and general progress and success. It seems appropriate here, however, to discuss briefly the context in which African Americans chose integration over segregation/separation, since racial integration, which these scholars supported, developed as the dominant ideology among African Americans, particularly through the first two-thirds of the twentieth century, while segregation was the dominant ideology in the United States, generally.

From the end of Reconstruction (1877) to at least 1954 when the Supreme Court ruled that segregated schools were unconstitutional in the Brown v. Board of Education

case, education--and life in general--for African Americans was based on an ideology of segregation according to race, white supremacy, and African American inferiority and subordination.¹ Although this was the dominant ideology in education and other institutions throughout the United States, and was adopted, supported, and promoted by some African Americans, notably Booker T. Washington, the educator,² president of Tuskegee Normal and Industrial Institute in Tuskegee, Alabama, from 1881 to his death in 1915,³ and most prominent and influential African American from 1895 until his death,⁴ it was not, and did not become the dominant ideology among African Americans. W.E.B. DuBois, Washington's chief critic and antagonist, William Monroe Trotter, an African American and "fiery editor of the 'Boston Guardian,'" and African Americans generally, opposed Washington and the prevailing racist ideology and supported/promoted an ideology of equality and integration for African Americans, in education and every other area and institution in the United States.⁵ Not only did the vast majority of African Americans advocate integration and equality, both in education and the broader society, during the latter decades of the nineteenth century and the early years of the twentieth century when DuBois and Trotter were criticizing Washington and his supporters for promoting separate and inferior schools and second class citizenship

for African Americans, but their advocacy for desegregation/integration and racial equality continued for more than a century after the Civil War. As historians Mary Francis Berry and John W. Blassingame noted in their book Long Memory: The Black Experience in America (1982), African Americans advocated racial desegregation/integration of schools from the close of the Civil War until the 1970s as a requirement for equality in the United States.⁶

Below is a separate review and discussion of the ideas of E. Franklin Frazier, Kenneth B. Clark, and Charles V. Willie. Each is categorized as a social scientist with a racial integrationist/desegregationist viewpoint, placing them among the African Americans who have supported the historically dominant ideology in race relations/race matters in the United States, the ideology of integration/desegregation. These three social scientists and their ideas, particularly as those ideas relate to African Americans' education and progress, as noted earlier in this chapter, are the chapter's foci.

E. Franklin Frazier (Sociologist)

E. Franklin Frazier, described by sociologist Joyce A. Ladner as "the most outstanding Black sociologist America has produced, rivaled only by W.E.B. DuBois,"⁷ wrote in 1962 in an article entitled "The Failure of the Negro Intellectual" that "there can be no question at the

present time that the Negro must be integrated into the American community."⁸ Frazier felt that integration promoted economic progress for African Americans. He noted that African Americans had "always been forced to depend upon the economic institutions in the American community [or general community which is dominated by whites] for employment and a living."⁹ Although in "The Failure of the Negro Intellectual," Frazier did not address the issue of integration in education, one may infer that he supported racial integration in that institution, also.

Frazier emphasized that integration did not simply involve individual African Americans, nor was it limited to merely increasing individuals' "participation in the economic and social and political organization of American society," which he called "superficial aspects" of integration.¹⁰ He noted that these "superficial aspects" of integration were, nevertheless, the ones which were the primary concern of African American intellectuals.¹¹

For Frazier, however, integration involved, in addition to individuals, "the organized life of the Negro community vis-a-vis the organized life of the white community."¹² It is apparent that Frazier thought that African Americans and whites should be integrated into all of the institutions in the United States, including educational institutions, and experience equal rights and

opportunities with all other groups within those institutions.

Although Frazier supported racial integration, he opposed assimilation. According to him, assimilation would mean that the distinct and unique culture and heritage of African Americans would become merged/fused with that of other groups. Frazier was strongly against African Americans' assimilating into American society and losing their culture and heritage.¹³

Kenneth B. Clark (Psychologist)

Kenneth Clark, a highly respected psychologist¹⁴ and an expert witness for the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (N.A.A.C.P.), a civil rights organization, on the deleterious effects of segregation on the psychological health of African American--and white--children during the 1954 Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka school desegregation case¹⁵ is, as Frazier was, a strong advocate for racially desegregated/integrated public education. Also, Clark has been a consistent critic of America's education system, particularly of its failure to educate African American and other minority children, and an uncompromising opponent of persons, both African American and white, who are advocates, or whom he perceives to be advocates, of racial segregation/separation.¹⁶

In the late 1960s, Clark complained that schools

attended by African American children were characterized by "pervasive and persistent inefficiency" resulting in "marked and cumulative academic retardation," high dropout rates, and "a pattern of rejection and despair and hopelessness."¹⁷ According to Clark, for these students, public schools had become instruments in blocking economic mobility, rather than fulfilling their historic role of facilitating such mobility.¹⁸ Perceiving this as the status of education in the latter half of the 1960s and attributing it, in large part, to racist school boards and public school officials, who resisted both "developing and implementing programs designed to improve the quality and efficiency of education" for these students in segregated schools and rejected plans and programs to effectively desegregate schools, Clark admonished African American organizations and parents, who wanted African American children to receive a higher quality of education, to "accept and plan their strategy" with an awareness that enemies in the fight to acquire higher quality education for African American children would be as "numerous and formidable" as the enemies in the fight for "nonsegregated schools."¹⁹

Although encouraging African American parents to develop strategies to force school officials to improve the quality of education in the segregated schools where African American children attended--and obviously aware of

(1) the disenchantment of many African Americans with the slow implementation of or outright resistance from whites to integration in public schools, more than a decade after public schools were legally desegregated,²⁰ and (2) the growing influence of "Black Power" and "Black Nationalism" movements which he felt promoted racial separation²¹--Clark steadfastly supported/promoted racial integration. He stated unequivocally:

In developing an appropriate strategy and the related flexible tactics, it must be clearly understood that the objective of improving the quality of education provided for Negro children is not a substitute for or a retreat from the fundamental goal of removing the anachronism of racially segregated schools from American life.²²

Clark opposed segregated public schools whether the advocates for such school were African American or white.

Commenting on the growing and increasingly influential Black Power Movement, which had begun to develop and gain recognition in the African American community in the middle 1960s with the waning of the Civil Rights Movement, Clark wrote:

Within the past two years another formidable and insidious barrier in the way of the movement toward effective, desegregated public schools has emerged in the form of the black power movement and its demands for racial separation.²³

Clark noted that Black Power advocates who had "addressed themselves" to education problems had "explicitly or implicitly argued for Negroes' control of 'Negro schools'."²⁴ According to Clark, some of the supporters of

Black Power asserted that schools in all-African American residential areas should be controlled by separate, and implicitly, all-African American school districts, specifically organized for such control, and that boards of education, superintendents of schools, faculty, curricula, and materials should be African American. Challenging these views, Clark argued:

[C]learly [these demands are] a rejection of the goals of integrated education and a return to the pursuit of the myth of an efficient "separate but equal"--or the pathetic wish for a separate and superior--racially-organized system of education.²⁵

While attributing the request for segregated education by some African Americans to their frustration resulting from continued resistance by whites to public school desegregation since the Supreme Court's Brown v. Board of Education ruling in 1954 and to their reaction to the continuing deterioration of the quality of education in both the African American schools in the South and the "de facto segregated" schools in the North under the system of white control, Clark rejected these as legitimate explanations for separate or segregated schools, and he did not accept such schools as alternatives to integrated ones. He believed that "the demands for segregated schools can be no more acceptable coming from Negroes than they are coming from white segregationists."²⁶

In 1976, Clark, offering his observations on the demands and activities of African American students on

white campuses in the late 1960s and early 1970s for "racially separate residential, social and in some cases, academic facilities," attributed their thoughts and activities to their "racial insecurities resulting from past segregation."²⁷ Clark concluded that at that time, African American college students had begun "to question their own role in the reinforcement of racism on the college campuses."²⁸ Admitting that he was not certain of the reason for the change in the demands and activities of African American students regarding racial segregation on campuses, but suggesting that the decline in the "wave of black separatist activity and ideology" was inevitable because (1) "not more than 15 per cent of a representative sample of Negroes ever expressed any sustained rejection of the goals of racial integration" and (2) the vast majority of African Americans did not believe that black separatism was an acceptable approach to racial justice in the United States, Clark concluded that they began "to examine their own motives for demanding that they be segregated" from white students.²⁹ Clark explained:

[African American college students] started by acknowledging that their desire for separate facilities reflected personal and collective insecurities, fear of rejection and, more specifically, the fear of competing with whites who were more privileged economically and academically.³⁰

Clark argued that after the students admitted their fears and anxieties, which had been obscured by militant

rhetoric and expressions of pride in race, serious discussions of racial issues could begin, discussions that in Clark's view had been hindered by the students' rhetoric, name calling, threats, and coercion.

Clark implied that when the African American students acknowledged their anxieties and fears and curtailed their threatening speech and actions, they could, then, see that "solid bases for pride could only be found in specific personal achievement based on a single standard of intellectual, academic, social and moral qualities."³¹ Also, Clark noted that the students could, then, understand that one could not achieve security through racial isolation and that "in a modern world one must be prepared to communicate with and to interact with others who differ in such superficial characteristics as color, religion, nationality or culture."³²

In the middle 1970s, Clark felt that the demand by African American college students for racially separate facilities was an absurd position, particularly when considered in the context of the historic struggle that their parents/ancestors had made against American oppression and segregation. Clark argued that "racial progress" had always depended upon some individuals with courage to reject "arbitrary exclusions" and to contend "all the flagrant and subtle forms of the superstition of racism--whether these were initiated by whites or

blacks."³³

An article, "Unfinished Business: The Toll of Psychic Violence," published in the 11 January 1993 edition of Newsweek, revealed that Clark remained a strong advocate for desegregation. Clark believed in the 1990s as he had in 1954, when the Supreme Court ruled that segregated schools were unconstitutional, and in the subsequent decades, that racial segregation and racism were both physically and psychologically damaging to school children, white children as well as black ones.³⁴

Charles V. Willie (Sociologist)

Sociologist, Charles Vert Willie, presently a professor of education and urban studies at Harvard University, and having various former occupations and activities, among which are vice president of Syracuse University and expert witness on legal cases involving school desegregation in several states,³⁵ was as forceful as Clark in the promotion of desegregation/integration as beneficial for African American students.³⁶ In 1978, in his book entitled The Sociology of Urban Education, Willie included his testimony on issues pertaining to school desegregation which were given at a public hearing of the United States Civil Rights Commission in Rochester, New York.³⁷ In that testimony, Willie supported integrated schools³⁸ and saw no negative effects on children as a result of their being bused outside their neighborhoods.³⁹

Responding to a question on whether African American children's learning would increase when they were placed in an integrated classroom, Willie stated that it was not only the integrated schoolroom that "contributes to increased learning," but, also, the probability that "the school system will increase spending on all its schools."⁴⁰ Commenting further on integrated classrooms, Willie stated that in a pluralistic society, such as that of the United States, people have to integrate to understand and trust each other. He added that "all of our schools, in order to provide the best education for knowledge as well as character" had to establish and maintain a policy of "mixing up our children."⁴¹

On the issue of using buses (or busing) to transport children out of their neighborhoods for the purpose of integrating schools, Willie informed the Commission that he could not see any correlation "between learning and the nearby location of a school." According to Willie, the "important thing" in learning is the kind of school students attend, and the most important qualities for a school, in descending order of importance, are the attitude of the school superintendent, the attitude of the principal, and the attitude of the teachers. Willie noted that these people provide a school's "atmosphere" and "determine what kind of education the children get."⁴² Willie has, also, expressed support for desegregation

and/or busing in more recent years. In his book entitled School Desegregation Plans That Work, published in 1984, Willie argued that since the Supreme Court's Brown decision in 1954, the educational attainment of both African Americans and whites had increased.⁴³ Utilizing data reported in the United States Bureau of the Census for 1982-83 as evidence that school desegregation had helped, not harmed, the entire population of the United States, Willie emphasized that at least 90 percent of all children 5 through 17 years of age were in school, that two-thirds of the adult population over 25 years of age had graduated from high school, that one-third of the adult population that was 25 years old and older had attended college, that one-sixth of the adults in this age category had graduated from college, and that less than one percent of the population over 14 years old was illiterate.⁴⁴ Willie noted that these "achievements were substantially different [that is, less positive] in 1950 before school desegregation" became law. Also, as explained by Willie, the disparity between African Americans and whites in educational opportunity was much greater at mid-century than it was in the early 1980s, three decades later.⁴⁵

As an example of educational progress for African Americans between 1950 and 1980, Willie explained that in the former year white adults over 25 years of age

completed 9.7 median school years, which was 40 percent greater than the 6.9 median years completed by African Americans, but by the latter year, the difference in medians for the two racial groups was less than one percent. In large part, Willie attributed this "reasonable degree of parity" between African Americans and whites in the number of median years of school completed to school desegregation. He also believed that school desegregation had played a major role in "virtually wiping out illiteracy and providing universal education."⁴⁶

Willie strongly rejected the arguments of people who were critical of the busing of children to aid in school desegregation. Referring to data which showed a "high level of educational attainment" which he believed was "directly associated with desegregation efforts," Willie stated:

[I]t is difficult to understand why some people insist on tarnishing the victory of nearly universal education that the United States has achieved with the propaganda that busing has failed.⁴⁷

Willie expressed particular difficulty in understanding why opponents of desegregation were obsessively preoccupied with busing, since one-half of all children in the United States used a bus for transportation to and from school. This ratio of one out of every two students using a bus to get from home to school and back home again would not change substantially with the cessation of

desegregation, noted Willie.⁴⁸

In 1987 in an article entitled "The Future of School Desegregation," published by the National Urban League in its book, The State of Black America 1987, Willie referred to desegregation as a "noble goal," and while noting retrenchment in desegregation efforts in the 1980s following the momentum experienced by such efforts in the 1960s and 1970s, made the following statement regarding school desegregation efforts since the United States Supreme Court's Brown v. The Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas decision in 1954, in which the court ruled that racial segregation in public schools was unconstitutional:

While it is difficult to isolate totally the impact of school desegregation within the total context of social change, a reasonable assessment of school desegregation efforts confirms that school desegregation has contributed to the enhancement of education in this nation probably more than any other experience in recent years: it has resulted in changes that have been beneficial to the nation as a whole, white America as well as Black America.⁴⁹

Willie explained that despite the benefits to the nation derived from school desegregation, various categories of people--pupils, parents, professionals, and politicians--have been puzzled/uncertain concerning its accomplishments. He reminded the American people that they tended to forget that before the Brown decision, the nation was "a segregated system of unequal opportunity."⁵⁰

Again in 1991, Willie repeated his contention that school desegregation has been unsurpassed by any other

experience in recent years as a contributor to educational enhancement in the United States and despite its benefits to all citizens, many people remain ambivalent about its accomplishments.⁵¹ Willie identified both direct and indirect benefits of desegregation. Among the direct benefits of school desegregation, he listed the reduction in the dropout rate for African American students and "the increase in the high school graduation rate for all students."⁵² Willie included as indirect benefits "the Education of All Handicapped Children Act, government requirements for transitional bilingual education for children who cannot benefit from instruction in English, and the educational amendments prohibiting exclusion of persons from educational programs on the basis of sex."⁵³ Apparently considering the large number and various categories of people who have had their educational opportunities improved/enhanced by school desegregation, Willie noted in the following statement desegregation's contribution to education, and advocated its continuance:

[O]ne must conclude that the school desegregation movement has been the greatest contribution in this century to educational reform. We therefore should press on with school desegregation and its spirit of inclusiveness for the direct and indirect benefits it promises for majority as well as minority children in the years to come.⁵⁴

Summary

It is obvious from the above statements by Willie, as well as earlier descriptions of the positions of Kenneth

Clark and E. Franklin Frazier, that each of these social scientists strongly advocate and support the highest possible level of racial desegregation/integration in education and in society as a whole. Although these scholars strongly support desegregation/integration, the following chapter reveals that the high regard which these social scientists hold for the benefits of desegregation/integration has not been shared by some other African American social scientists.

NOTES

1. Thurgood Marshall, "The Opinion of Justice Marshall," in "Bakke Decision: Supreme Court of the United States: Regents of the University of California v. Bakke" in Sourcebook of Equal Education Opportunity, 3rd edition (Chicago: Marquis Academia Media, 1979), 123; James D. Anderson, The Education of Blacks in the South, 1860-1935 (Chapel Hill, North Carolina: University of North Carolina Press, 1988), 3, 98-99.

2. Lerone Bennett, Jr., Before the Mayflower: A History of the Negro in America 1619-1966, 3rd ed. (Chicago, Illinois: Johnson Publishing Company, Inc., 1966), 274-87.

3. Alton Hornsby, Jr., The Black Almanac: From Involuntary Servitude (1619-1860) to the Age of Disillusionment 1964-1971 (Woodbury, New York: Barron's Educational Series, 1972), 38, 49; Anderson, 33-36, 51-52.

4. Bennett, 275-76.

5. Anderson, 104-109.

6. Mary Francis Berry and John Blassingame, Long Memory: The Black Experience in America (New York: Oxford University Press, 1982), 266.

7. Joyce A. Ladner, ed. The Death of White Sociology (New York: Vanguard Books, 1973), 52.

8. E. Franklin Frazier, "The Failure of the Negro Intellectual," in The Death of White Sociology, ed. Joyce A. Ladner (New York: Vanguard Books, 1973), 53.

9. Ibid., 54.

10. Ibid., 54.

11. Ibid.

12. Ibid.

13. Ibid., 54-65.

14. In a 1986 study by Charles V. Willie, a sociologist, African American scholars in several academic disciplines were "ranked as outstanding by a random sample of minority and of majority persons in their professional associations" (Willie, 1986: 5); Clark was chosen as the most outstanding African American psychologist; For this study, see Charles V. Willie, Five Black Scholars: an Analysis of Family Life, Education, and Career (Lanham, Maryland: Abt Books, 1986); The chapter on Clark (Chapter 4, pages 41-58) provides information on his family, early life, career, and contributions. For other sources that provide biographical data on Clark, see Ted Poston, "Kenneth Clark: Civil Rights Front-Runner," New York Post, 22 March 1964, magazine sec., p. 2; John W. Blassingame, ed., New Perspectives on Black Studies (Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1971), 116; Jim Haskins, ed, Black Manifesto for Education (New York: William Morrow and Company, Inc., 1973), 74; Joyce A. Ladner, ed., The Death of White Sociology (New York: Random House, 1973), xxxi; W. Augustus Low and Virgil A. Cliff, eds., "Clark, Kenneth Bancroft," in Encyclopedia of Black America, 1984 ed., 273; Harry A. Ploski and James Williams, eds., The Negro Almanac: A Reference Work on the African American, 5th edition (New York: Gale Research, Inc., 1989), 1403.

15. Ted Poston, "Kenneth Clark: Civil Rights Front-Runner," New York Post, 22 March 1964, magazine. p. 2; Kenneth B. Clark, "A Charade of Power: Black Students at White Colleges, in New Perspectives on Black Studies, John W. Blassingame, editor (Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1971), 116; Kenneth B. Clark, "Unfinished Business: The Toll of Psychic Violence," Newsweek, 11 January 1993, 38.

16. See Kenneth Clark, "Alternative Public Education Systems," in Equal Education Opportunity, ed. Harvard Education Review (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1969), 173-177; In this article, Clark lists some of the major failures of the education system in the United States as it relates to African Americans, indicates his support for desegregated schools, and proclaims his disagreement with both African Americans and whites who propose, promote, or support segregation in education; The continuing discussion of Clark's ideas in the text and the sources cited in support of those ideas demonstrate his long and consistent advocacy for racial desegregation/integration in education.

17. Ibid., 174; A note on the first page of this article (page 173) stated that it "appeared originally in the Winter 1968 issue of the Harvard Educational Review."

It was first presented as a paper at the National Conference on Equal Educational Opportunity in America's Cities, sponsored by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, November 16-18, 1967."

18. Ibid.

19. Ibid., 178-79.

20. Ibid., 176, 178.

21. Ibid., 176.

22. Ibid., 179; underline mine.

23. Ibid., 176.

24. Ibid.

25. Ibid.

26. Ibid.

27. Kenneth B. Clark, "Some Personal Observations on Black Separatism," in introduction to Black Separatism by Betty Lanier Jenkins and Susan Phillis (Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1976), xiii.

28. Ibid., xiv.

29. Ibid.

30. Ibid.

31. Ibid.

32. Ibid.

33. Ibid.

34. Kenneth B. Clark, "Unfinished Business: The Toll of Psychic Violence," Newsweek, 11 January 1993, 38.

35. These and other data on Willie can be found in the following sources: Ann Evory, ed., Contemporary Authors: A Bio-Bibliographical Guide to Current Authors and Their Works, 1st revision, vols. 41-44 (Detroit, Michigan: Gale Research Company, Book Tower, 1979), 778-79; August W. Low and Virgil A. Cliffs, eds., "Willie, Charles V.," in Encyclopedia of Black America, 1981 ed., 860; Janet Dewart, ed., State of Black America 1987 (New York: National Urban League, Inc., 1987), 4; Who's Who

Among Black Americans, 5th ed. (Lake Forest Illinois: Educational Communications, Inc., 1988), 761; Harry A. Ploski and James Williams, eds., The Negro Almanac: A Reference Work on the African American, 5th ed. (New York: Gale Research, Inc., 1989), 1020; Iris Cloyd, ed., Who's Who Among Black Americans, 1990-91, 6th ed. (New York: Gale Research, Inc., 1990), 1381-82; Jeffrey Franz, ed., Who's Who in American Education 1989-90: Educators in Professional Schools of Education and School Administrators and Support Staff, 2d edition, vol. 2 (Owing Mills, Maryland: The National Reference Institute, 1990), 745; Who's Who in America [1990-91], 46th ed., vol. 2 (Wilmette, Illinois: Marquis Who's Who, Macmillan Directory Division, 1990), 3092-93.

36. The narrative on Willie, which follows in the text of this paper, discusses Willie's ideas on the benefits of desegregation and/or integration for African Americans, and subsequent notes identify the sources of those ideas.

37. Charles Vert Willie, The Sociology of Urban Education (Lexington, Massachusetts: Lexington Books, 1978), xi-xv; both the questions by Commission Chairman, Eugene Patterson, and Dr. Willie's responses are presented; in a note at the bottom of page xi, Willie identified this as his testimony to the Commission.

38. Ibid., xiv.

39. Ibid., xii-xiii.

40. Ibid., xiv.

41. Ibid.

42. Ibid., xiii.

43. Charles V. Willie, School Desegregation Plans That Work (Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1984), 4-5, 12.

44. Ibid., 4-5.

45. Ibid., 5.

46. Ibid.

47. Ibid., 12.

48. Ibid.

49. Charles V. Willie, "The Future of School Desegregation," in The State of Black America 1987, Janet Dewart, ed. (New York: National Urban League, 1987), 37.

50. Ibid.

51. Charles V. Willie, "The Future of School Desegregation," in The Education of African-Americans, Charles V. Willie, Antonine M. Garibaldi, and Wornie L. Reed, eds. (New York: Auburn House, 1991), 51.

52. Ibid., 181.

53. Ibid., 63.

54. Ibid.

CHAPTER 7

AFRICAN AMERICAN SOCIAL SCIENTISTS WHOSE IDEAS PLACE
THEM IN SUPPORT OF SEGREGATION/SEPARATION/NATIONALISM AS
MORE CRITICAL THAN DESEGREGATION/INTEGRATION FOR THE
EDUCATION AND PROGRESS OF AFRICAN AMERICANS

Clearly, the African American social scientists discussed in Chapter 6 are advocates of racial integration in education and in all institutions throughout the society in the United States. Other African American social scientists, however, have supported some degree of segregation/separation from whites. This chapter presents the ideas of three social scientists in this category--Nathan Hare, Maulana Ron Karenga, Abdul Alkalimat (Gerald McWorter). Hare and Alkalimat are sociologists; Karenga is a political scientist/linguist.

Although some persons might classify these scholars as racial segregationists or separatists due, as revealed below, to their having supported (1) the physical segregation or separation of African Americans from whites as appropriate or necessary under certain conditions or for certain purposes and (2) the mental segregation or separation of African Americans from whites, in the sense that it is necessary for African Americans to free their minds from the influence of the racist ideas of white

people to attain their goal of liberation, they are perceived in this study to be "Black Nationalists." This percept--"Black Nationalists" as the appropriate identification for these social scientists--is informed by two observations. First, the content of their writings/ideas includes/corresponds with the fundamental elements of the ideology of "Black Nationalism," as identified by Alphonso Pinkney, an African American sociologist, in 1976, in his book, Red, Black, and Green: Black Nationalism in the United States.¹ According to Pinkney, the "three elements [which] form the basis of contemporary black nationalist ideology" are (1) "the notion of unity or solidarity," which is probably the "most essential and elementary" one, (2) "pride in cultural heritage and its component, black consciousness," and (3) "some degree of autonomy," which is essential for African Americans to free themselves from oppression by white Americans.² Second, some scholars have directly and specifically, or by implication or inference, identified Hare, Karenga, and Alkalimat as nationalists.³

Each of these scholars became prominent in the academic community during the late 1960s and early 1970s as the Civil Rights Movement of the early and middle 1960s declined and the "Black Power" movement gained greater acceptance in the African American community.⁴ Each was active in the promotion and/or establishment of African

American studies programs,⁵ (established initially on white college campuses, but later extended to African American colleges, also), which evolved from the "Black Power" movement.⁶ In his book, Black Students (1970), African American sociologist, Harry Edwards, noted that the demands of African American college students were "decidedly separatist in nature."⁷

The prominence of Hare, Karenga, and Alkalimat in the struggle to persuade administrators on white college campuses to establish African American studies programs is evidenced by the fact that in the spring of 1968, they were invited to a conference on African American studies at Yale University, sponsored by that school's Black Student Alliance.⁸ Nathan I. Huggins in his book, Afro-American Studies (1985), explained that the Black Student Alliance "decided to sponsor a conference that would draw nationally upon white and black intellectuals having something to say about the subject."⁹ As quoted by Huggins, Armstead Robinson, one of the student organizers, perceived the purpose of the conference in this manner:

We view this symposium as an opportunity to create an atmosphere in which those persons who were in pivotal positions...could engage in active and open intellectual exchanges on questions related to Afro-American studies.¹⁰

According to Huggins, the symposium, whose aim was to "educate the educators," brought together a wide range of opinion "all favorable to some form of Afro-American

studies."¹¹

Nathan Hare, Maulana Ron Karenga, and Abdul Alkalimat participated in that symposium. They have continued to advocate/promote African American studies and contribute their knowledge and ideas on this issue and on the appropriate and adequate education of African Americans to the intellectual/academic community, the African American community, and the whole United States society. Below, separate presentations of the views of each of these social scientists explicate their positions and ideas on African American education and racial separation/nationalism.

Nathan Hare (Sociologist)

Nathan Hare, who was born in Slick, Oklahoma, on April 9, 1933, was not an idealized separatist in racial relations. The physical separation of African Americans and white Americans was not fundamental to his advocacy of African American studies programs and his demand for African Americans' complete liberation. This position is apparent from his comments during the African American studies symposium at Yale University in 1968. He did not support separatist movements, either those which called for African Americans to immigrate to another country or those which forbade them to associate with any white persons.¹² While rejecting separatist movements, Hare nevertheless felt that both separatism and integrationism

were possible means for African Americans to achieve progress. He explained:

I don't believe in any kind of absolutism--I think integrationism and separatism are both means for possible elevation of a people, but when the thing becomes the end in itself, then it loses its effectiveness.¹³

Obviously, Hare believed that it was appropriate for African Americans to separate themselves from white Americans, if it was for the purpose of enhancing their condition/position in American society--for example, improving their education, reducing their level of oppression, and moving them closer to equality with whites--but did not reject integration as a possible method for African Americans to achieve their goals.

One example of Hare's apparent support of racial separatism under certain conditions or circumstances appeared in "A Radical Perspective of Social Science Curricula," his contribution to the book, Black Studies in the University: A Symposium (1969), edited by Armstead Robinson and associates. In this work, it is apparent that Hare, a professor at San Francisco State College in the Spring of 1968 when the content of this article was first presented at a symposium at Yale University, offered greater empathy and support for the school's African American students than for the administrators of the white department of history during their contention over which of two candidates was qualified and should be selected to

teach African American history. The African American students wanted an African American man with no college or university degrees, but with considerable knowledge of African American history obtained through personal research. Contrarily, the administrators of the white department of history wanted a white historian "with a Ph.D. from a major university and a string of scholarly publications in 'learned journals,'" but, by his own admission, with less knowledge of African American history than the African American applicant.¹⁴

Presenting the African American students' position, Hare explained:

The black students felt that if a white professor of history couldn't understand that it's anachronistic in the present day--just now anyway at this point in the black-consciousness movement, though maybe not ten or twenty years from now--for a white professor to teach black militant students black history, then this white professor doesn't understand the recent black movement.¹⁵

Hare continued: "Consequently he doesn't understand black history, and therefore he's unqualified to teach black history, regardless of how many Ph.D.s and publications he has in the learned journals."¹⁶

In the late 1960s, Hare, evidently, felt that only African American scholars were qualified to teach African American history; they were the only ones who could and should be accepted by African American students. Apparently, white scholars were not rejected as teachers of African American history at that time simply because

they were white--they might be accepted at a later period--but rather because African American scholars at that stage in the "Black Power" and "Black Studies" movements could better serve to educate and elevate African American students than white scholars.

Just as Hare did not accept either separatism or integrationism as absolute means for African Americans to make progress and reach their goals, advocating instead either method depending on the circumstances, he held a similar opinion regarding nonviolence and violence. In his article, "How White Power Whitewashes Black Power," published in 1968 in The Black Power Revolt, a book edited by Floyd B. Barbour, Hare explained that "[n]onviolence under proper circumstances can be a good, if not the best, strategy."¹⁷

However, while believing that nonviolence could be an acceptable, even exceptional, strategy for African Americans, Hare rejected nonviolence as it was utilized during the Civil Rights struggle of the 1960s. He emphasized that he was "against the lopsided belief in nonviolence which Rev[erend] Martin Luther King [, Jr.] popularized to black folk."¹⁸ "Ludicrous," he said in derision, was the only word he knew that began to "describe the hypocritical way in which nonviolence [was] undemocratically infused into the black man's thinking by his enemies and 'friends' alike."¹⁹

In the same article, Hare, an advocate of "Black Power," which he defined as the "exercise of influence [by African Americans] over the behavior of white oppressors to the benefit of blacks--by any methods which seem desirable," included violence, if necessary, among those means and methods of defeating oppression by whites.²⁰ Undoubtedly, Hare was willing to accept civil war, if necessary, as a means to force whites to cease their oppression of African Americans, if they did not do so voluntarily. Plainly and pointedly, he offered this warning to white America, which he did not believe could justly correct its inequities "given the nature of its existing institutions, belief systems and practices."²¹ Despite his doubts that white America could correct its unjust treatment of African Americans, Hare insisted:

...[C]hange it must, and if a civil war is necessary, then let it happen.... Black men must bring an irresistible black power force to clash with the immoveable object of white oppression with such velocity that America will either solve her problems or suffer the destruction she deserves.²²

This demonstrates clearly that Hare believed that African Americans should engage in violence, if required, to gain equality, just as the discussion above revealed that he felt that they should separate themselves from whites, when necessary, for the same purpose.

Although Hare encouraged African Americans to utilize both separatism and violence under certain conditions/circumstances to achieve full equality with

whites, neither violence nor separatism was the focus or essence of his advice to African Americans for accomplishing this goal. His primary concern was for African Americans to free their thinking/their minds from white domination and control.²³ Hare's focus on the need for African Americans to free their minds from the influence of whites and the benefits that would derive from it are revealed in several of his writings.

In his article, "The Case for Black Separatism: 'Black Perspective,'" published in a book edited by James McEvoy and Abraham Miller and titled Black Power and Student Rebellion (1969), Hare began with a discussion of separatism. However, the general focus of his comments was not the integration or segregation/separation of African Americans and white students, but a specific perspective (a "black perspective") of education and race relations which he believed would benefit and elevate African American students.²⁴ In essence, Hare argued that the critics of African American students and African American professors on white college campuses in the late 1960s had a misunderstanding and misinterpretation of the concept of separatism as it related to what was happening on those campuses. Hare noted that the efforts of African American professors and students at white colleges and universities had led to greater numbers of African Americans at those institutions "in two years than decades

of whimpering for 'integration' ever did."²⁵

Hare implied that critics of African American professors and students at white colleges accused them of being racial separatists, but did not make the same accusation regarding African American administrators at African American colleges. He further implied that the criticism was based on illogical reasoning, because African American administrators at African American colleges were "physically separated" from whites while African Americans at white colleges remained physically associated with whites. Continuing his exposition, Hare noted that African American administrators at African American colleges, although physically separated from whites, were "accommodated to their dependence on white racism as well as the establishment's remote control of their black destiny."²⁶ In contrast, he explained, African American professors and students in white colleges and universities, although experiencing a closer association with whites, sought "social and psychological independence from their oppression."²⁷ It appeared, in other words, that Hare believed that African Americans in African American colleges were physically separated from whites, but mentally integrated with whites/comfortable with having their minds controlled by white racists, whereas African Americans in white colleges were physically more integrated with whites, but striving to get control of

their minds, so that their thoughts, ideas, perceptions, interpretations, and analyses were separated/free from influence, domination, and control by whites.

In Hare's argument, a black perspective could provide the social and psychological independence sought by African Americans at white colleges. This perspective was a kind of separatism, (more accurately and specifically, "Black Nationalism"), a deliberate and conscious separation by African Americans from social interaction with whites and from white racist influence and control, although they were in close physical proximity, even contact, with whites.²⁸

Explaining the "black perspective" in education and in "black studies programs," Hare wrote:

In the search for educational relevance, black today is revolutionary and nationalistic. A black-studies program which is not revolutionary and nationalistic is, accordingly, quite profoundly irrelevant. The black revolutionary nationalist, aware and proud of his blackness, demands the right to exist as a distinct category, to be elevated as such by any means necessary. The Negro, contrarily, would just as soon be white. He longs to escape his blackness and, in the search for integration achieves disintegration.

Thus, the key to the difference between a black-studies program and a Negro-studies program is a black perspective.²⁹

Hare believed that a black perspective was necessary for an African American studies program/an effective education program for African Americans. It could regenerate the African American child's/student's "mortified ego," an ego battered and shattered by a "whitewashed education" and a

severance of the African American child's/student's descendants and, therefore, the child/student "from their attachment to land, culture and nation (or peoplehood)."³⁰

Continuing his discussion of what an education with a "black perspective" could do for African American children, Hare explained that "a proud black history [could] restore and construct" in African American children a sense of their past and a "collective destiny," which would lead them to seek a "new collective future." This, he felt, could be "potentially therapeutic" for African American youths "crippled by defeatist attitudes, hardened by generations of exclusion."³¹ Hare identified this potential for rebuilding African American childrens'/students' damaged egos as the "expressive phase" of the "black studies" program.³²

According to Hare, African American studies programs also needed to be academically sound and effective. In his view, these programs should be comprised of comprehensive, integrated, and interdisciplinary courses, which are also what constituted the "long-established departments of social science and American studies." He indicated that the comprehensive, interdisciplinary courses would be the "pragmatic component" of African American studies programs and should include economics, science, and mathematics.³³ Hare insisted that a suitable, adequate, and appropriate educational program for African

American students required a "black perspective" and must be "based on the principle of self-control."³⁴

In his article, "The Challenge of A Black Scholar," published in the December 1969 issue of the Black Scholar, Hare again discussed a type of social separation. It pertained, specifically, to African American scholars. Hare argued that the African American scholar not only had to contribute "original ideas, new insights, and information" to the knowledge fund, which is, in large part, the measure of all scholars, but he also bore the enormous task of having to separate himself--not, necessarily, his body, but his mind--from the influence of colonialization and white scholarship.³⁵

As explained by Hare, the African American scholar had to de-colonize his mind, because "the white colonial ruler...distorted and destroyed [African Americans'] educational development," and that of colonized peoples, generally, and in the process, "miseducated himself."³⁶ According to Hare, it was apparent to African Americans--and to other people victimized by white colonialism--that there was a "connection between white colonialism and its scholarship."³⁷

It would appear, based on Hare's argument, that the scholarship of white colonialism was embodied in the Western concepts of scholarship, concepts to which African American scholars had become enslaved and from which they

had to free themselves.³⁸ Two concepts to which Hare directed his attention were "objectivity" and "neutrality." He accused white Western scholars of treating these concepts as synonymous, obviously meaning that they perceived and used them as being alike in meaning and significance. Rejecting white scholars' perception and use of these concepts in this manner, Hare stated: "[O]bjectivity and impartiality are neither synonymous nor mutually inclusive."³⁹ In Hare's analysis, white scholars' treatment of objectivity and neutrality as synonymous concepts allowed them to "remain ostensibly impartial while catering to the wishes of the status quo."⁴⁰ Hare reasoned that the African American scholar had to analyze white scholarship and whenever appropriate and necessary, oppose its biases, destroy its "obsolescent norms and values and create new ones to take their place," refuse to follow its "alleged 'value free' approach," and reject its notion that an African American scholar (or, in fact, any other scholar), who becomes emotional or angry for whatever reason, is somehow acting/behaving unprofessionally or improperly, because there is a mutual exclusiveness between emotion and reason.⁴¹

In conclusion, Hare explained that the African American scholar's primary task was "to cleanse his mind-- and the minds of his people--of the white colonial attitudes toward scholarship and people as well."⁴² This

cleansing of African Americans' minds included "the icons of objectivity, amoral knowledge and its methodology, and the total demolition of the antisocial attitudes of ivory-towerism."⁴³

In his article, "What Should Be the Role of Afro-American Education in the Undergraduate Curriculum?" published in New Perspectives in Black Studies (1971), a book edited by the historian, John W. Blassingame, Hare, although expressing that there was a "separatist flavor" to African American students' "compensatory response to black exclusion," asserting that the predominantly separatist quality of their response was, for the most part, a surface one, and indicating that neither African American students nor he were separatist ideologues,⁴⁴ focused on the type of education that he felt would be relevant for African American students on white college campuses in the closing years of the 1960s and on the impact it would have on their thoughts and progress.⁴⁵ As in the articles discussed above, Hare was more concerned with whether African American students freed their minds than their bodies from whites.

Hare argued that the type of education African Americans received was a decisive element in the solution to both their and America's problems. African Americans could solve their problems, he noted, only if their education "produced persons capable of solving the

problems of a contagious American society."⁴⁶ He believed that African Americans could solve the problems of American society only if they first "blackwash[ed]"/"revamp[ed]" the education system and "revolutionized America's youth" of all colors and races.⁴⁷ In Hare's opinion, African American education during the early years of the "Black Power" and "Black Studies" movements (late 1960s) had to be revolutionary or it was irrelevant and useless, a point of view he also expressed in the previously discussed article, "The Case for Black Separatism: 'Black Perspective.'" From Hare's viewpoint, it was essential that African American studies "be taught from a black perspective," pervaded by a "spirit of blackness," and "based on both ideological and pedagogical blackness."⁴⁸

In this discussion of the role of African American education in the undergraduate curriculum as in the article, "The Case for Black Separatism: 'Black Perspective,'" Hare, also, perceived African American studies as consisting of two phases: an "expressive" phase and a "pragmatic-positivistic" phase. The expressive phase was therapeutic because it involved courses in African/African American history and culture which would revitalize African Americans' collective ego. In contrast, the pragmatic-positivistic phase was utilitarian, but complementary, because it provided skills

with which students could effectuate desired change in their life circumstances.⁴⁹

Hare believed that African American education had to "activate and energize the black intelligentsia toward giving greater direction to the people of the black nation."⁵⁰ He explained that African American education had to prepare African American youth for power in both their community and the nation; it had to eliminate African American youths' plight and sense of powerlessness and infuse those youths with confidence in their race and in themselves. Such an education, Hare perceived, would enable African American students "to regenerate and construct their own communities, break the deadly grip of poverty, and build a productive black future."⁵¹

Included in Hare's conception of education for African Americans, and consistent with his requirement that their education be based on ideological and pedagogical blackness, was a necessary and reciprocal relationship between the African American college student and the African American community.⁵² Hare contended that a relevant African American education had to be centered in the African American community, to involve the African American community, and to transform the African American community, while it educated and trained the African American student. For example, students in courses in African American history, politics, or economics "might be

required to organize/present panel discussions for younger children in church basements."⁵³ Other courses in an African American studies program, noted Hare, might also design class projects that required the students' involvement in the African American community. Such a program, in Hare's view, "would tend to increase the commitment of black students to the community while simultaneously permitting them to 'learn to do by doing.'"⁵⁴ This educational program would also provide role models for African American youth in the community.⁵⁵

Hare's views expressed in these articles of the late 1960s--in which he emphasized the necessity for African Americans to free their minds/thinking from the influence or control of whites and advocated or supported their self-selected separation from whites in circumstances where they felt it would move them closer to freedom--are also found in his later writings. In a speech that he delivered to his alma mater, Langston University (Langston, Oklahoma) on August 30, 1975, during its "Cultural Renaissance Rally," Hare encouraged the students of that school to resist the efforts by some white persons of Oklahoma to close it or to merge it with some white school or schools.⁵⁶ Hare argued for the retention of Langston University as an African American school. Seemingly, Hare's desire to retain Langston University was not because he supported racial separation, but because of

the school's importance in transmitting an African/African American culture of which the students could and should be proud. In essence, he was concerned about how the students thought about their history, their heritage, and themselves.⁵⁷

Hare perceived Langston University as having an historic role, as "a black cultural island, a black oasis in a white world of trouble."⁵⁸ He believed that whites, in trying to close or merge the school, wanted "to eliminate Langston and its impact on black educational and cultural development."⁵⁹ In his view, the Langston University students' efforts to keep the school open and retain it for African American students was part of their solution; it was "a black oasis in a confused and morally decadent society."⁶⁰ Langston was, noted Hare, "a cultural renaissance...a renaissance for black culture and black people, a renaissance for America."⁶¹

While encouraging the students at Langston to create a cultural renaissance, Hare reminded them that "[culture] is a psychic phenomenon, not biological...[and it] is the thread that connects and preserves the essence of a people." He explained that culture "must be acquired through some educational process" and inferred that an appropriate cultural renaissance at Langston required the students to move forward with a "two fisted [educational] attack"--for the preservation of model black colleges and

for [African Americans'] fair access to all that is salvageable in the general American educational bonanza."⁶²

In this speech at Langston University in 1975, Hare, as in earlier years (late 1960s), revealed an inclination to both support separation and to recognize the necessity and benefits of integration under certain circumstances.

He informed his audience:

Understand--and understand well--that [African Americans] want to enter fully and uninhibited into American life and culture, according to our own discretion--to correct the white majority and its moral decadence...but we also want to preserve all that is good in black culture and black values, to take the best of American culture and leave the rest alone.⁶³

Continuing, Hare reinforced his demand for African Americans to have the right to make their own choices. He noted that African Americans should reject racial fusion and by doing so would "help to preserve their own integrity" and "protect American pluralism," that is, "the right to exist as a distinct [racial] category."⁶⁴ By rejecting the fusion of races, African Americans, according to Hare, would also be assisting in protecting "the right to the freedom of choice."⁶⁵ He emphasized that African Americans wanted freedom of choice and that they had to "take advantage of all educational and cultural developments whether in a black or white context."⁶⁶

Although interest in having African Americans utilize all appropriate and available cultural and educational opportunities, which included those that

existed in both African American and white institutions and communities, Hare perceived that they derived particular advantages from attending African American colleges and universities. Hare noted that outstanding, even renowned, African American leaders such as W.E.B. DuBois, Martin Luther King, Jr., Kwame Nkrumah, and Jesse Jackson attended African American colleges. He emphasized that the graduates of these colleges would become the leading African Americans, if not the African American leaders; the graduates of these institutions would also be the African American "professionals with a social conscience, a black consciousness, the generators of a roaring flame of black thought and culture."⁶⁷ In contrast, he noted that the white curriculum at that time [middle 1970s] taught African American students not to divulge or disclose their differences and to blend, if possible, "into a barren white world." This resulted, Hare maintained, in the "whitenization" of African American children,⁶⁸ which was "a kind of psychological genocide, a destruction of the black child's[/student's] ego and self[-]esteem."⁶⁹

According to Hare, integrated education would not be sufficient to serve the educational goals of African Americans, even if American society were fully integrated, which, certainly, was not the case. Also, he continued, African Americans' demands for equality of education was

inadequate for their needs. Fundamentally, Hare argued that equality of education could not be attained in America," a racist, oppressive society," because equality of education could not exist in such a society. "Education," he explained, "has the function of preserving the status quo, of transmitting the norms and values, the aspirations of the dominant forces in society."⁷⁰ In essence, Hare concluded in his analysis that in America, whose educational system functioned to preserve racism and oppression, equality of education was impossible, and therefore, African Americans, in large part, had to educate themselves.⁷¹

While presenting his Langston University audience with the imperative that African Americans must provide their own cultural education and reminding them that Langston and other African American colleges and universities were one means to accomplish that goal, Hare informed them that the "white power structure [was] growing resistant and hostile to the black college" and that their resistance and hostility was due to their having begun "to suspect that [African Americans were] seizing back the power over [their] own black minds."⁷² Commenting specifically on the white power structures' hostility to the existence of Langston University, Hare enlightened his audience:

They're afraid that you may revive a lost black consciousness...harness the restless energy...will

to resist, and ...ominous power of thirty million black voices strong in the battle for justice and human rights.⁷³

The fears of white racists were so strong, noted Hare, that they were trying to persuade, even force, African American students/schools to accept/promote a doctrine of integration. At that time, school integration meant to Hare the "disintegration" of African American schools--the disintegration of African American public schools through "bussing" and of African American colleges and universities through "consolidation and elimination."⁷⁴

Hare believed that African Americans themselves had to determine the course of their integration. He contended that they could not correctly decide that course until they had both "captured the right to exist as a free and equal though distinct people" and integrated with themselves. The primary and fundamental right for African Americans, according to Hare, was the right to define things for themselves, to make their own decisions, for only they could make the decision to free themselves.⁷⁵

Hare encouraged Langston University students and staff to integrate with themselves, to fight to retain the school as an African American school, to "return [it] to the black-minded spirit of [its] founding fathers," and to make it an African American oasis," and he discouraged them from allowing Langston to become "integrationist" (merged with white schools), which would lead to its

becoming an African American educational plantation.⁷⁶ He believed that if Langston's faculty and students integrated with themselves and the school became an African American oasis, with a spirit of blackness, the students would "embody and exemplify the goals of intellectual worth, of honor and social responsibility."⁷⁷ The students, faculty, and alumni of Langston, and, by implication, those of similar institutions across the United States, would be instrumental in helping African Americans free themselves.

Specifically, Hare indicated that they could assist in this endeavor by taking their skills to the African American community. In other words, he felt that African American college graduates/intellectuals could, and had an obligation to, transform the African American community by making it "relevant to the educational endeavor" and simultaneously making "education relevant to the [African American] community."⁷⁸ According to Hare, African American college graduates had an obligation to bring the campus to the community and the community to the campus because "education belongs to the people" and it should be given back to them. Hare admonished his Langston University audience to do the following:

Follow the advice of Nkrumah. Go to the people.
Live among them. Learn from them. Love them.
Serve them. Plan with them. Start with what they
know. Build on what they have.⁷⁹

Clearly, Hare believed that the students and faculty

at his alma mater, Langston University, should resist the efforts by whites to close or merge the school. He, also, felt that they should first integrate with themselves before becoming overly concerned about integrating with whites. At the same time, however, he informed them that he thought that African Americans should have the right, without restriction or discrimination, to attend white schools, if they felt it was beneficial to them and if they chose that option.

It seems that in his speech at Langston University, Hare's primary concern was neither separation/segregation nor integration, but the transmission of African/African American culture. He noted that the African American college was critical to this cultural transmission, that it could be satisfactorily accomplished only by African Americans themselves, and that it required African Americans to think for themselves/seize control of their minds.

Finally, in this review of Hare's ideas on African Americans and their education, his book, Crisis in Black Sexual Politics, co-authored with his wife, Julia Hare, and published in 1989, revealed that after two decades, he remained concerned, primarily, with whether African Americans had control of their minds and were able to develop an appropriate culture for themselves and their progeny.⁸⁰ Hare was critical of the role/influence of

white society in the socialization of African American youth, revealing that it led to their insufficient motivation, improper discipline, and inadequate education and educational opportunities.⁸¹ He was also displeased with the African American intellectual class which unchallengingly accepted and promoted white norms and practices (which define and regulate the process of socialization) and, consequently, white socialization of young African Americans.⁸²

A more explicit explanation of Hare's argument is that he believed, apparently, that white society's socialization of African Americans did not fulfill, or could not fulfill, his conception/definition of socialization. Hare maintained:

Socialization is the key dimension of human perpetuity and intergenerational transmission, whatever that may entail, including children's possibilities of gaining a clear core of personality and identity, to know what they want to become, to be able to become the person that they and their elders wish them to be.⁸³

Hare implied that two primary functions of socialization for African American children were to prepare them for the task of trying to remove "the restrictions and prohibitions of prejudice and discrimination" and to motivate them to higher achievement. He noted that "the key obstacle to achievement is derailed and distorted motivation."⁸⁴

Hare contended that the present time is the "nadir

of the socialization and motivation" of African American youth, a time when "alien [by which he apparently means white] concepts and practices" are capturing the minds of an increasing number of young African Americans. While this is occurring, he complained, white American society chooses to repeat "scholarly rationalization" (e.g., lack of appropriate role models, low self esteem, and self hatred) as the causes of African American children's improper motivation, rather than "confronting the breakdown of socialization."⁸⁵ According to Hare, a specific and important area in which socialization has broken down is parental rights and authority to discipline their children. "The socialization and parental efficacy of Afroamerica is being continually undermined and denigrated with hardly a whimper from the black intelligencia," noted Hare.

Elaborating on this position, he explains that African American children in increasing numbers are being forcibly removed from their homes and placed in foster homes/"in the multimillion dollar child abuse bonanza." Such agencies as those involved in foster care and child abuse, he continued, are administering "white-defined and directed" rehabilitation and punishment, usurping African American parents' and teachers' authority/right to discipline and punish children, and increasingly undermining the "very idea of discipline," "including the

simple right to spank, which is gradually becoming the preserve and special privilege of affluent whites."⁸⁶ Hare emphasized that white and government defined and directed discipline, which undermines and denigrates the authority of African American parents and teachers, is detrimental to the welfare and education of African American children. For example, he explains that white society, by prohibiting African American parents from disciplining their children, consigns them to later watching those children "brutalized and incarcerated by white police" and by preventing African American inner city teachers from administering appropriate discipline, compels them to "spend most of their time in the quest of an elusive discipline, so that little of anything else [obviously, not effective education] goes on in too many inner city public classrooms."⁸⁷

Maulana Ron Karenga (Political Scientist/Linguist)

According to available data, Maulana Ron Karenga, whose original name was Ronald Everett, was born in Maryland in 1941; educated in California, at least from the junior college level through his completion of a masters degree in political science and his doctoral studies in linguistics; founded, served as chairman, and remains affiliated as chairman emeritus of US, the African American Nationalist Cultural Organization, which was established after the Watts, California riots in 1965;

and, as noted earlier, regarded in the late 1960s and early 1970s among militant African Americans as the leading expositor of African American cultural nationalism.⁸⁸ This last biographical item--Karenga's ideas as a cultural nationalist--is the one given specific and extensive attention and review in this discussion of Karenga.

As evident in the works of Nathan Hare, Karenga's writings indicate that he, too, was not a racial segregationist or a rigidly ideological separatist. Floyd B. Barbour in an article titled "From the Quotable Karenga" in his book, The Black Power Revolt, published in 1968, quoted Karenga as follows: "[African Americans] can live with whites interdependently once [they] have Black Power."⁸⁹ Although Barbour does not provide a quotation by Karenga that defines Black Power, Karenga apparently believed that African Americans could not become interdependent with whites until they achieve equal power with whites, or, minimally, much greater power than they had in the 1960s relative to whites. Another of Karenga's quotations stated: "We're not for isolation but interdependence--but we can't become interdependent unless we have something to offer."⁹⁰ This statement revealed that Karenga and US, his cultural organization, were not committed to permanent and inflexible racial isolation or segregation. The statement strongly suggested that

isolation from whites was an acceptable, preferable, or even necessary position for African Americans in race relations, until African Americans achieved greater economic, social, and political power.

In the late 1960s, when the demand by African Americans for "Black Power" became more popular and prevalent and the "Black Power" and "Black Nationalism" movements were expanding in the United States, and the "Black Studies" movement on college campuses was initiated and increasingly plagued by racial contention and violence,⁹¹ Karenga did not appear to be against African Americans waging a violent revolution to change United States society, achieve liberation, and gain power.⁹² Karenga's immediate concern and primary advice to African Americans at that time was for them to wage a cultural revolution. He felt that there had to be "a cultural revolution before the violent one" because the cultural revolution would give "identity, purpose and direction."⁹³ According to Karenga, identity, purpose, and direction would tell African Americans who they were, what they must do, and how they could do it.⁹⁴ (Below, in the discussion of other articles written by Karenga, the concepts of identity, purpose, and direction receive further explication.) In Karenga's view, the "revolution being fought" in the latter half of the 1960s, in fact, was a cultural revolution, "a revolution to win the minds of

[African American] people."⁹⁵ He warned them that if they failed to win the cultural revolution, they would not "wage the violent one."⁹⁶

Obviously, Karenga perceived a cultural revolution for African Americans to be a nationalist revolution. He indicated by his statements that there is an inescapable interrelationship between "Black" Culture and Black" Nationalism. "Nationalism," he noted, "is a belief that Black people in this country make up a cultural nation."⁹⁷ He defined a cultural nation as "a people with a common past, a common present and, hopefully, a common future."⁹⁸

It is apparent that in 1968 when these statements appeared in Barbour's book, The Black Power Revolt, Karenga was a cultural nationalist. Reviews of several subsequent articles by Karenga either reveal or strongly suggest that while cultural nationalism was his ideology through the 1960s, during various periods, thereafter, he shifted ideological positions, although continuing to focus on the plight of African Americans.

In an article titled "The Black Community and the University: A Community Organizer's Perspective," which Karenga delivered at the previously noted Yale University Symposium on African American Studies in 1968, and in Karenga's response to questions at the same symposium, both published in Black Studies in the University: A Symposium (1969), a book (consisting of articles presented

at that symposium and of questions asked of the participating social scientists and their responses), edited by Armstead L. Robinson, Craig C. Foster, and Donald H. Ogilvie, Karenga expressed nationalist views. Although it seems to the writer, as the earlier assessment of Karenga's various statements revealed, that he did not hold an inflexible, separatist position regarding race relations between African Americans and whites, the tenor and substance of this article, which outlined his views of the role of the white university, as well as white people, generally, relative to African Americans, was decidedly in support of some level of racial separation, both physical and mental/cultural.⁹⁹

At the physical level of racial separation, Karenga's discussion of the three roles--nonintervention, foreign aid, and civilizing societies--which he perceived as the only ones for white people and white universities relative to the African American community, are informative of his thinking at the close of the 1960s. Regarding nonintervention, Karenga believed that white people and the white university did not have any role to play in the African American community and, therefore, should not intervene in that community.¹⁰⁰ He emphasized that the white university's "basic role [was] outside the [African American] community, external to it."¹⁰¹ Karenga perceived the university to be an institution maintained

by the power structure, "in order to reinforce [the power structure's] position."¹⁰² Therefore, in his view, the university was basically a political, rather than an educational institution and the white university in the United States inculcated its students, including its African American students, with white people's values.¹⁰³

According to Karenga, the African American community was a colony ruled by another/the mother country (the white community). He advised the colony (the African American community) to fight against efforts by the mother country to impose its authority and values on the colony, values and authority which were communicated best through the university system. Perceiving this to be the social and political realities of the late 1960s, Karenga felt that African Americans would have greater control of their community, if white people and the white university did not intervene in the African American community in political terms/in terms of imposing their authority.¹⁰⁴

In Karenga's analysis, the second role for the white university (and the white community), relative to African Americans, was to provide "foreign aid," since the African American community was a foreign country. In his view, there were two types of aid: financial aid (or reparation) and technical aid. Financial aid should be given directly to the African American community "without strings," that is to say, with no political pressure or

obligation to support any individual or institution, or the political climate of the country.¹⁰⁵ Technical aid should be research data collected by the university and given to the African American community for that community's interpretation.¹⁰⁶

The role of "civilizing committee," the final role which Karenga assigned to the white university, like those of nonintervention and foreign aid, had to occur outside the African American community. He believed that white people were uncivilized and that the white university could communicate a "new" ideology to whites, both inside and outside the university. Included in Karenga's discussion of the white university as a civilizing committee was his assertion that the white university should work to civilize white people, since "to civilize is the university's first real duty."¹⁰⁷ Karenga noted that white universities that "have the money, personnel, equipment and technical know-how" should be able to devise a way "to inform those white people in this country who don't have the views that they are supposed to have--that is, humanitarian views."¹⁰⁸ Karenga had little, or no, confidence that white universities, which, in his view, functioned to maintain the existing power structure, would succeed in civilizing whites in the United States.¹⁰⁹

At the mental level of racial separation, Karenga's emphasis was on the necessity for African Americans to

seize control of their minds/thinking from white people. In his presentation at the Yale University Symposium, Karenga identified "three basic things[--]identity, purpose, and direction"--which African Americans apparently had to receive before they could gain control of their minds.¹¹⁰ Karenga asserted that African American people would not be able to function as African Americans, but would continually be "servants of white people," unless they were provided identity, purpose, and direction.¹¹¹ As noted earlier, Karenga defined identity, as telling African Americans who they were; purpose, as telling them what they must do; and direction, as telling them how to do it.

Karenga believed that even white universities could assist in providing African Americans appropriate identity, purpose, and direction, but only if those institutions experienced a "change of frame of reference, change of definition, and change of interpretation."¹¹² He suggested, for example, that white colleges and universities could change their frame of reference and, by doing so, help produce African American students who would think of their heritage positively, rather than refer to "Marcus Garvey as a 'Black Moses'" or call "King Shaka a 'Black Napoleon.'"¹¹³ Karenga explained that one using these white schools' unaltered frame of reference was saying that Moses and Napoleon were "really [what was]

happening" and that Garvey and Shaka were at best, either second, or simply black. As he implied, when African Americans used a white frame of reference, all they were doing was "getting inferiority in a concentrated structure."¹¹⁴

Changing the frame of reference was critically important for Karenga. He explained:

I'm for changing the frame of reference, because psycho-linguistically I could deal with definitions and interpretations in which "white becomes that which is not really happening and "black" becomes something beautiful.¹¹⁵

Karenga believed that psycho-linguistically the failure of African Americans to have positive definitions of blackness had "destroyed" them.¹¹⁶ He offered as evidence of the lack of positive definition of blackness "the white man's use of his language in which everything associated with black was inferior--'black market,' 'blackmail,' 'black nigger,'" and so on.¹¹⁷ Also, Karenga noted that people were "still integrating things as whites [had] written them."¹¹⁸

In concluding his comments on the white university and its development of a curriculum that would provide identity, and direction for African Americans, Karenga declared that if the white university did not change its frame of reference, definition, and interpretation, he would prefer that it not have an African American studies program.¹¹⁹ Obviously, as noted above, Karenga felt that

African Americans in universities without these changes would come out of them thinking an acting "white."

Karenga contended that white universities, in addition to changing their frame of reference, definition, and interpretation to develop relevant curricula for African Americans, should also change their methodology. He noted that educational institutions teach that "methodology is very important in instructions" and indicated that their methodology should reflect an understanding of education as "more than just the communication of ideas for political effect," that is, as more than the provision of information. As Karenga explained, education, in addition to being the provision of information, was, also, and more importantly, the provision of inspiration.

He argued that inspiration had priority and greater significance than information in education and methodology as they related to African Americans, because African Americans were an emotional people whose first commitment was an emotional one. An implication in his discussion was that African American students needed African American teachers, because they could not become emotionally committed to white teachers, who were not images with whom the students could identify. Continuing, he noted that white teachers were neither personification of the students' images nor of the images projected by the

teachers themselves.¹²⁰

In addition to the issue of attitude and values (e.g. change of frame of reference, definition, and interpretation and preeminent position of inspiration when contrasted with information in methodology/education for African American students) discussed earlier, Karenga recommended several courses which he thought were most important for an African American studies curriculum. They were: (1) history (African American history and African history); (2) Swahili, which would psycholinguistically move African Americans to a "language [that could] communicate collective values;" (3) cultural philosophy, which would consist of a syndrome of seven basic values beneficial to African Americans; and (4) political philosophy, of which the primary concern would be historical political trends in the experiences of African Americans (e.g., David Walker's early nationalism, Frederick Douglass's abolitionist philosophy, Marcus Garvey's "Black" Nationalism, the Honorable Elijah Muhammad's religious nationalism, Malcolm X's religio-political nationalism, [Stokeley] Carmichael's and Rap Brown's Black Power Politics, and Karenga's own cultural nationalism.¹²¹

While it is evident that in the 1960s Karenga espoused "black nationalism" as the means to African Americans' liberation, in the 1970s, he proposed and

promoted socialism as the only way to effectuate that outcome.¹²² An examination of Karenga's article titled "Which Road: Nationalism, Pan Africanism, Socialism?," which was published in the October 1974 issue of the Black Scholar, makes his ideological shift apparent. He argued that African American nationalism as it was practiced in 1974 had contradictions and conflicting tendencies within it. He specified four tendencies of African American nationalists. In his discussion of each tendency, he seemed to specify a weakness of the ideology of African American nationalism. He described the first tendency as follows:

...[I]n trying to correct the erroneous and destructive images rooted in slavery and racism, nationalists tend to mystify the nature of our identity as a people, emphasizing its organic or racial character rather than stressing its social basis.¹²³

Continuing, Karenga acknowledged that African Americans were oppressed at the level of color/race, but that their racial identity was connected to their social or class position. Commenting on the critical significance of African Americans' social or class position to their liberation, Karenga wrote:

It is the recognition of and political response to this class position which allows us to recognize our enemies and allies and insure the victory of struggle for liberation.¹²⁴

The second tendency of African American nationalists, Karenga noted, was their inclination to

conceal contradictions among African American people "in pursuit of an illusive ideal unity."¹²⁵ Karenga argued that there were conflicting differences among African Americans and that those differences were class differences. In other words, the differences among African Americans which would lead to conflict were those based on their "different relationships to the means of production and capacity to exploit the labor of others." ¹²⁶

Promotion of the "Back to Black" movement was the third tendency which Karenga attributed to the African American nationalists. According to Karenga, this effort by nationalists meant that they often got "bogged down in traditional culture and eccentric and archaic lifestyles" which Africans in Africa had ceased to attach significant importance. Karenga felt that African American nationalists' "Back to Black" movement often served as a replacement for real struggle against oppression and exploitation." ¹²⁷

The final tendency of African American nationalists, in Karenga's analysis, was their confusion about precisely what national liberation was and how to achieve it.¹²⁸ He accused some nationalists of that period (middle 1970s) of believing that community control was national liberation. Karenga, however, explained that community control never resulted in the control of the economic life of a

community and was, in reality, simply a "compromise and concession of the oppressor on one level so he [could] continue his exploitation and oppression on another level."¹²⁹

In what could be classified as his summary of nationalism, Karenga explained that nationalism was merely a stage in African Americans' development. He did not believe that they could have a separate liberation or separate peace within American society. For African Americans (or any group) to control their communities, he observed, control of the country itself would have to change hands. Karenga declared:

National liberation is not community control, separation or secession, but a fundamental socialist question, raised and resolved by a profound, broad and thorough-going socialist transformation of society and ourselves. Any other solution is absurd or incomplete--or both.¹³⁰

Clearly, in 1974, when Karenga wrote this article, "Which Road: Nationalism, Pan Africanism, Socialism?," he had shifted his position from seeing African Americans as a racial group that could achieve national liberation through development of unity among themselves, cultural transformation (where emphases was placed on the benefits of their own culture and the damaging effects of white culture), and some degree of autonomy from control by whites to discussing African Americans as a group belonging to an oppressed social class that could attain national liberation only by joining with other groups and

individuals in the same social class position, regardless of racial classification, in struggle against their common oppressor--capitalism. Karenga noted that all liberation (e.g. national liberation, women's liberation) of necessity meant socialist liberation. He warned that it would not be an easy task for African Americans to either "merge their struggles or to defeat capitalism," but that they had no other choice, if they ever hoped "to end [their] oppression and exploitation and become--free and productive humans again."¹³¹

In their book, Long Memory: The Black Experience in America (1982), Mary Francis Berry and John Blassingame, historians, revealed that in the 1970s, Karenga was not the only prominent African American nationalist to shift from a traditional nationalist ideology to a socialist ideology. They identified Angela Davis, Imamu Amiri Baraka, S.E. Anderson, and Howard Fuller (Owusu Sadawki) as nationalists who by 1974 had become advocates/promoters of a socialist/"Marxist-Leninist" philosophy.¹³² Manning Marabel noted in his book, Race, Reform and Rebellion: The Second Reconstruction in Black America, 1945-1982, that by 1970, sociologist and African American nationalist, Abdul Alkalimat (Gerald McWorter), whose ideas on the relative significance of separation and integration to African Americans in education and in society, generally, are

discussed later in this chapter, was advocating socialism, and had organized a "Marxist institute, 'Peoples College,' in Nashville [, Tennessee], and was decisive in moving many former cultural nationalists to the left."¹³³

Berry and Blassingame contended that those African American nationalists who changed ideological direction did so because of threatening government actions and activities.¹³⁴ These authors reported that by 1970, whites had begun to perceive African American nationalist organizations as "dangerous and subversive." Berry and Blassingame noted that members of the Black Panther Party were "systematically attacked and killed" by the police and Federal Bureau of Investigation (F.B.I.). The authors emphasized that the F.B.I. and police "harassed the Black Muslims...and increased surveillance, wiretapping, and infiltration of other groups." Berry and Blassingame concluded that these government organizations' "concerted effort to destroy the effectiveness of [African American nationalist] organizations was successful."¹³⁵

Continuing, Berry and Blassingame noted that due to the activities of the F.B.I. and police, African American "intellectuals began to search for a new ideological direction and a new base from which to operate."¹³⁶ They reported that by 1974, Karenga and other African American nationalists "were espousing Marxist-Leninist philosophy and accusing traditional black nationalists of being

unscientific in neglecting the primary causes of black oppression--economic and class exploitation."¹³⁷

Based on the content of his article, "The Black Male/Female Connection," published in 1989 in Crisis in Black Sexual Politics, a book edited by Nathan and Julia Hare, Karenga's ideas at the close of the 1980s seemed to fall again within a traditional nationalist ideology, as they had in the 1960s, rather than within the socialist ideology, which he advocated and promoted in the 1970s.¹³⁸ Although in this article, Karenga acknowledged and discussed the problems of male/female relationships among African Americans, his ideas for solving those problems were similar to those he applied during the fight to establish African American studies programs in the 1960s. One would logically assume that Karenga would still apply his ideas and reasoning to problems in education and race relations to the later date as well. His advice to African Americans in the late 1980s for resolving problems in their male/female relationships, as it had been in the late 1960s regarding their education and the establishment of an appropriate and relevant African American Studies program, was that they develop a culture (views and values) different from that of white Americans/the white American culture.¹³⁹ Karenga argued that African Americans needed to change their views and values (their culture) because those views and values (as well as those of white

people) had been shaped by the "negative characteristics" of United States society--characteristics which were "defined by and derived from three major structural and value systems: capitalism, racism and sexism."¹⁴⁰

Karenga's solution to changing the negative African American male/female relationships, and presumably African Americans' inadequate, ineffective, and inappropriate education, also, was for African Americans to change themselves, such as their "views and values and the negative and non-productive ways [they have] organized and live [their] daily lives."¹⁴¹ He reasoned and suggested that African Americans (and other Americans, also) could eventually change and even destroy the structural and value systems of capitalism, racism, and sexism if they changed themselves to "create the social force" needed to "defy and defeat [their] oppressor."¹⁴² Karenga asseverated:

Regardless of what dogmatists of the left and right declare, real social change will not be a product of new institutions, but new men and women to shape those institutions [,including, obviously, educational institutions] in their own interest and image.¹⁴³

Emphasizing the importance he has continually attached to this necessity for African Americans to change themselves and the way they think (in other words, to undergo a cultural transformation) in preparation for effectuating appropriate and beneficial social change (which, undoubtedly, was his "Black Nationalism" ideology),

Karenga declared: "This is why I argued in the 60's [during the "Black Studies" movement in the universities] and continue to maintain that the key crisis in Black life is the cultural crisis, i.e., a crisis in views and values." Karenga further defined African Americans' crisis in views and values as their "lack of a system of views and values"¹⁴⁴ which gave them "a moral, material and meaningful interpretation of life on the seven basic levels of culture--religion (or spiritual value system), history, social, economic and political organization, creative motif and ethos."¹⁴⁵ These seven basic cultural levels correspond with the seven basic values which Karenga identified in 1968 at the Yale University Symposium as essential for a cultural philosophy course, a course he felt was required for a relevant African American Studies curriculum.¹⁴⁶

In "The Black Male/Female Connection," Karenga indicated that the quality of African Americans' views and values dictates the quality of their relationships. He supported the notion that "a cultural revolution which overturns [African Americans'] current conception of [themselves] and breaks the monopoly the oppressor has on [their] minds is the first step toward [their] full liberation."¹⁴⁷ Clearly, in the final year of the 1980s, Karenga implied, as he had indicated in the late 1960s, that in race relations between African Americans and white

Americans, including in educational institutions, it was more critical for African Americans to extricate their minds/thinking from control and domination by whites, certainly as the initial requirement, than to separate their bodies from the presence of whites.

Abdul Alkalimat (Gerald McWorter) (Sociologist)

Abdul Alkalimat (Gerald McWorter), who was born in Chicago, Illinois, on November 21, 1942,¹⁴⁸ is the third and final African American nationalist whose images of/ideas about African Americans' education and progress in the United States are reported in this study. Here, Alkalimat's ideas concerning African Americans' education are derived from relevant comments in four of his articles, the first in the late 1960s and the last in the early 1990s. Specifically, the articles are (1) "Deck the Ivy Racist Halls: The Case of Black Studies," published in Black Studies in the University: A Symposium (1969), a book comprised of papers delivered at a symposium on "Black Studies," held at Yale University in 1968 and edited by Armstead L. Robinson, Craig C. Foster, and Donald H. Ogilvie; (2) "The Ideology of Black Social Science," which appeared in The Death of White Sociology (1973), a book edited by Joyce A. Ladner, an African American sociologist; (3) "Black Studies Curriculum Development in the 1980s: Patterns of Concensus,

Conflict, and Change" (1984?), a paper on curriculum development in African American Studies which listed Alkalimat's name as the first of two authors; and (4) a book review which was published in 1991 in the Black Scholar.¹⁴⁹

Each of these articles, as those by Dr. Hare and Professor Karenga, generally, discussed earlier in this chapter, focused on African American Studies--in other words, on education of African Americans at the college and university levels. In the first article, "Deck the Ivy Racist Halls: The Case of Black Studies," his presentation at the 1968 Yale University symposium on African American Studies, Alkalimat began by leaving no doubt that he believed that the "black experience is worthy of intellectual inquiry." He indicated that this was a contrary position to that expressed by some of the participants at that conference. Alkalimat felt that any intelligent human being would "recognize that if any human experience is relevant for intellectual consideration--the black experience has to be included."¹⁵⁰ Continuing, he argued that for persons at such a conference to question the relevancy of studying the African American experience was "too grotesque to be amusing."¹⁵¹

Alkalimat attested that African Americans and whites rationalized their various positions (for example, whether or not the experience of African Americans is worthy of

intellectual inquiry) on the basis of their assumptions. He indicated that African American and white social scientists/intellectuals had different sets of assumptions due to the influence of a racist nation--the United States. Yet, in Alkalimat's view, despite their different sets of assumptions, African Americans were asked by white people to "make rationalizations of positions based on the assumptions that white people hold," rather than "on basic assumptions black people hold."¹⁵²

Commenting specifically on white social scientists, Alkalimat noted that, generally, they functioned as racists and had racist theories. Alkalimat maintained that African Americans had reacted to racist white scientists/intellectuals on the basis of African Americans' needs for survival. He, therefore, explained that African American social scientists were not greatly concerned, if concerned at all, with whether [African American social scientists spoke] ideologically or as 'detached scientists.'¹⁵³ Alkalimat argued that African American social scientists were not much concerned with whether what they said was based on ideology or derived from "detached" science, but rather "with survival...with prospering...[and] with living the life" that probably "all human beings in human communities want[ed] to live."¹⁵⁴

In his exegesis of the white university in the

United States, that is, his explanation and interpretation of what its function was and should be, Alkalimat was highly critical of it as he reflected on five statements: (1) "[T]he university has functioned as an agent of racism"; (2) "The university can be conceptualized as a manifestation of focused power, a set of powers"; (3) The university "must be committed to creative change" and become involved in that change in "whatever community it finds itself"; (4) The African American community in the United States "has matured in unanticipated ways necessitating a re-examination of the peculiar historical dynamics of the [African American] community"; and (5) "If the University is to be relevant for the [African American] community, it must be honest," both within itself and within society, and use its powers "for the kind of positive change that it must be involved in."¹⁵⁵

The University Functions as an Agent of Racism

Regarding his first statement, that the university functioned as an agent of racism, Alkalimat did not believe that there could be any doubt. He perceived the university in the United States as functioning like a table with one leg. That leg represented "an extension of the dominant community, white America, the WASP."¹⁵⁶ As perceived by Alkalimat, that leg was grounded in the white community, not the African American community. In Alkalimat's critique, while the table's (the university's)

only leg represented the white community, the top of the table, even without the additional legs, was "identified as being 'universal principals that apply to all human behavior.'" ¹⁵⁷ Alkalimat called this representation/presentation fantasy, because a university--as a table--with any size or scope, can not stand without the additional legs.

Obviously, one of the missing legs to the university was its exclusion of African Americans, which thereby exposed it as an agent of racism. Alkalimat noted that the university had systematically excluded African Americans "in admissions" and "in devising standards of evaluation" that did not take into consideration the "styles of life" and "indigenous culture" of the African American community. ¹⁵⁸ He explained further that the university, in effect, excluded African Americans from the body of knowledge to which they were exposed, a body of knowledge which not only excluded them, but also defined "them as being evil, illiterate, and not capable of taking over in this society." ¹⁵⁹

The University Should Be Conceptualized as a Set of Powers

In a discussion of his second statement--that the university should be conceptualized as a set of powers--Alkalimat identified and elaborated on three powers of the university. The first power was that which the university

possesses as a reservoir of knowledge, the second as a social and political institution, and the third as an institution of socialization/an institution that produces certain kinds of people.¹⁶⁰

The University: A Reservoir of Knowledge

Alkalimat explained that the university is a reservoir of knowledge in two ways: (1) it maintains a tradition and (2) it engages in research. In his estimation, the university as the maintainer of tradition had been guilty of racism. He contended that in the university, until very recently (Alkalimat made this presentation on the university and African American Studies in 1968), African Americans had been presented/depicted as having "no meaningful history" and as being "simply a reflection of white people [who had] had them under their control."¹⁶¹ In his opinion, the traditional body of knowledge of the university was the research of white scientists, academicians, and scholars who had been "apologists for whatever racist practices" that existed in the United States society at that time. Alkalimat perceived those white scientists as persons operating to maintain the status quo, and in doing so, excluding African Americans from full equality and participation in society and working against their interest. Finally, in terms of the traditional body of knowledge, he criticized white scientists for defining

African Americans in pathological terms. Whites, he noted, used their standards and values as normative ones and imposed them on African Americans.¹⁶²

Alkalimat noted that on the second way in which the university was a reservoir of knowledge, that is, as a creator of new bodies of knowledge and/or a revealer of new knowledge about the world and the world's inhabitants, the university did not think of African Americans as a group that "warranted any kind of empirical research" until approximately the 1930s.¹⁶³ He explained that this research occurred at the University of Chicago, which also produced the "first really serious generation of black social scientists."¹⁶⁴ Alkalimat emphasized that while empirical research on African Americans started around the 1930s, it fell "far short of what the black community [in the late 1960s] would accept as being respectable."¹⁶⁵

Alkalimat reported that there had been the beginning of some basic research done by African American scholars, principally, E. Franklin Frazier, W.E.B. DuBois, Charles Johnson, and Carter G. Woodson. He explained that these scholars, who were trained at the University of Chicago and Harvard University, rejected white academic life--in part because white society rejected them--but "decided to create a body of knowledge....[which] for the most part...[had] not been included in any significant way in social science curricula that [had] been used in

universities or public school systems."¹⁶⁶

In addition to criticizing the university for its failure to seriously engage in empirical research on African Americans until around the 1930s, Alkalimat also criticized white social scientists and researchers for the type of research on which they focused in the 1960s. Specifically, he was concerned with their focus (and findings) on riots. He accused Morris Janowitz, whom he identified as chairman of the Department of Sociology at the University of Chicago at that time (and a member of a group called the Center of Policy Studies also at that university--a group which published an article titled "the Social Control of Escalated Riots"), of mentioning only "in passing" the interest of the [African American] community," and focusing mainly on the question, "how in the hell can police departments stop [this community] from raising hell?"¹⁶⁷

Alkalimat included the report by the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders (Kerner Commission) in his criticism of white scholars' studies and analyses of riots. According to Alkalimat, the Kerner Commission's report concluded that the United States was a racist/racially divided society, but offered integration as an alternative. In his opinion, that report did not "significantly accept" the African American community's insistence on being recognized and treated as a viable, or

potentially viable, community. Alkalimat suggested that even though the African American community wished to be recognized by whites as a viable community, and, in fact, was saying to America that to achieve that end, it would, if necessary, destroy America or America would have to destroy it, the Kerner Commission, even its liberal members, were interested in/concerned about "how to invest the black community in the white community." He emphasized that the Commission did not "raise the question of how to invest resources in the black community."¹⁶⁸

It is important to note here that in 1969, the year after Alkalimat made these comments about white social science and social scientists while attending the Yale University Symposium, he wrote an article titled "The Ideology of Black Social Science." In it, Alkalimat described white social science as being based on a white ideology that served the interest of white people.¹⁶⁹ He, also, accused African American social scientists/intellectuals of "acquiescing to white social science" by accepting "the implicit ideological assumptions really used to guide history with white interest" and of seemingly not actually knowing "the extent to which science is inevitably a handservant to ideology, a tool for people to shape, if not create, reality."¹⁷⁰ In addition, Alkalimat advocated the development of an African American social science, guided

by a revolutionary Pan-African Nationalist ideology, which would replace terms used in white social science to depict reality (e.g., Negro or non-white, segregation, and integration) with more appropriate ones (e.g., African or black, colonization, and liberation, respectively) and lead to African American liberation.¹⁷¹

In his discussion of an ideology of black social science, which was a revolutionary Pan-African Nationalist ideology, Alkalimat did not envision segregation (meaning separation of African Americans and whites on the basis of race) as the major concept to describe race relations in the United States. He felt that the fundamental problem for African Americans did not result from their being kept separate from whites, whether whites separated themselves from African Americans or African Americans from whites.¹⁷² Although Alkalimat (1) named prejudice (prejudging a person or group on the basis of certain characteristics such as color) and discrimination (treating one person or group differently than another person or group simply on the basis of differentiating characteristics) as the two models or concepts used by white social scientists to study and analyze African Americans and their institutions and problems, which undoubtedly, included those concerned with education, and (2) interpreted "these two approaches [as being] really two different profiles of the same face, the hideous face of white racism," he did not call racism

(nor segregation) the "real" problem in African American-white relations.¹⁷³

Colonization was the authentic race-relations problem for African Americans, according to Alkalimat. He explained that the real problem was not that African Americans were "being segregated from white people in the West," but that they were "in the West in the first place (and most regrettably of all, the U.S.A.)."¹⁷⁴ Colonization, he argued, is a concept that refers to two interacting communities "by which one community attempts to colonize the other and make it inferior." Alkalimat stated: "Colonization is a total attempt at subordination, involving a peoples' values, beliefs, rituals, norms, institutions, myths, and its history."¹⁷⁵

Alkalimat, obviously, believed that in the United States, whites comprised the colonizing community and African Americans, the colonized community. Also, he felt that African Americans had to decolonize themselves (that is, reject the colonial oppression and colonial dependency) to gain control of their minds. An important step in this process, in his view, was for African Americans to replace the self-hatred, which had been instilled into them by whites, with self-love.¹⁷⁶ Alkalimat proposed that the decolonization process would move African Americans "toward liberation, that process of becoming independent and completely positive about one's

self and one's community."¹⁷⁷ Continuing, he explained that decolonization would allow African Americans to have complete control over the political, social, and economic institutions in their community and, thereby, their destinies.¹⁷⁸

A critical element in Alkalimat's decolonization/liberation process was "Africanization." He asserted that African Americans had to become committed to Africanization, which to him meant a cultural transformation from the American/European culture to an African culture. To emphasize the importance of culture, he agreed with and quoted Maulana Karenga: "'We stress culture because it gives identity, purpose, and direction. It tells us who we are, what we must do, and how we can do it.'"¹⁷⁹ Explaining the value of Africanization, Alkalimat wrote:

[O]ne real manifestation of Africanization is the reorientation of our cultural values, a process utilizing all of ancient Africa, both as the source of inspiration as well as the source of truth by which our ultimate judgements are made concerning the present; indeed, Africa before the white man will be our prophetic vision of Africa's children after the white man.¹⁸⁰

Noting that Africanization was essentially the same for people of African descent throughout the diaspora--in the United States, on the African continent, or elsewhere, Alkalimat then elaborated further on its meaning and benefit to African Americans:

The basis for our social, political, and economic

systems can better be found among the communal traditions of our people rather than among those who have used their system to oppress if not annihilate us.¹⁸¹

In Alkalimat's opinion, it was important for African Americans to "actively pursue concepts like the African Personality, Negritude, African Socialism, Ujamaa, and Pan-Africanism" in the manner, at that time (1969), of their "kin folk" on the continent of Africa.¹⁸²

Another important component of decolonization/liberation of African Americans, in Alkalimat's analysis, was its requirement that African Americans reject whites' (the colonizers') solutions to racial problems. Since Alkalimat did not think that segregation was the primary race relations problem in the United States, he rejected what he saw as the white society's only logical "two alternative solutions" to segregation: integration or annihilation.¹⁸³ Alkalimat believed that white people perceived of integration, which meant that African Americans had the same life chances as they, as almost synonymous with equality. He opposed white people's integration and equality for African Americans because white people had "been the standard for all of [African Americans'] goals." ¹⁸⁴ Obviously, Alkalimat opposed African Americans' annihilation, which he felt would result from their assimilation with white people. He described assimilation as the "ultimate form of progress in the white liberal analysis," and defined it

as "a process that more accurately should be called 'anglo-conformity.'" ¹⁸⁵ Alkalimat was clear and emphatic in his view that if the United States became a society of anglo-conformity/assimilation, the "social coercion" of its institutions would serve the "norms and values of white people." ¹⁸⁶ Consequently, he felt that any changes that would occur would inevitably be those by African Americans and all other non-white people, resulting in their becoming more like white people. The following statement is a clear indication that Alkalimat preferred decolonization and liberation for African Americans, as described above, over integration, equality, and assimilation: "Our essential goal must be one of Freedom from white people and their oppressive, dying system, and not equality with them." ¹⁸⁷

The University: A Social and Political Institution

Returning to the article, "Deck the Ivy Racist Halls: The Case of Black Studies," the second of the powers of the university was as a social and political institution. Alkalimat indicated that as a social institution, the university was concerned with maintaining itself and often engaged in activities which it felt helped it achieve that goal, rather than its original goals of educating students and developing a cooperative relationship with its community. ¹⁸⁸ He, also, noted that as a social institution, the university was concerned with

community service. He seemed to indicate, however, that the university provided service by imposing its views, ideas, and programs on communities, rather than by developing cooperative relationships with communities near it.¹⁸⁹

Alkalimat disagreed strongly with what he described as the university's definition of itself as a social institution. In his opinion, it was, also, and apparently to a greater degree, a political institution. He castigated the university for continuing to define itself as apolitical or nonpolitical when, in reality, it functioned "for the establishment."¹⁹⁰ Continuing this criticism, he argued that the university's relationship with consultant and research organizations which wanted to maintain the status quo was closer than its relationship with various communities which were committed to radical change.¹⁹¹

The University: An Institution of Socialization

Regarding the third power of the university--that of agent of socialization--Alkalimat believed that it supported those things which were beneficial to or associated with whites. He stated:

The campus reality of role models, admissions policies, peer groups on campus, and other aspects of student experiences have been completely white-oriented.¹⁹²

The implication in this statement is that white

universities socialized African American students to come out of those institutions thinking and acting like white students and perceiving themselves as inferior.

The University Must Be Committed to Change

The third statement on which Alkalimat reflected was that the university must be committed to change and become involved in that change. In his view, the university must not only be committed to what "is" in society, but also what "ought to be." In his discussion of the necessity of the university to be committed to what is and what ought to be in society, Alkalimat identified three principles that the university must follow. First, he noted, it was imperative that the university "'go to the thing itself'...to the experience that one talks about, free of assumptions, facing it, confronting it."¹⁹³ Second, "in going-to-the-thing-itself, the university must be concerned not only with knowledge, but with the utility of knowledge."¹⁹⁴ Regarding this principle, Alkalimat inferred that the university must use the knowledge it possesses or acquires to help resolve the problems of society. Third, "the university, in being committed to change and becoming involved, must conceive of itself as a servant of the community."¹⁹⁵ He explained that the servant relationship that the university has with the community has to be a cooperative one, implying that the university can not impose its will on the community and

remain a servant to it. According to Alkalimat, only through a cooperative relationship with the community could the university "maintain a balance between relating to what is and relating to what ought to be."¹⁹⁶

The African American Community Has Matured

To explicate his fourth statement--that the African American community had matured in unanticipated ways, requiring a re-examination of the historic dynamics of that community--Alkalimat identified three changes in the African American community which demonstrated the unanticipated ways that African Americans had moved toward maturity. The first change was the desire by African Americans to be called "'African Americans," 'Afro-Americans,' or 'blacks,' rather than "'Negroes'" and to use terms like "Black Power" for practicality and communication of ideas.¹⁹⁷ This change was one in which African Americans were clearly trying to separate themselves from whites, to separate themselves in terms of their culture, not, necessarily, their physical proximity, so they could gain control of their minds. According to Alkalimat, this cultural change/emphasis represented a problem for white people in the United States, a problem not simply of the use of these terms for their practicality in language and communication of ideas, but also for "the crying demands of an experience, a communal and historical experience."¹⁹⁸ This experience, contended

Alkalimat, was one that "white America [had] to come to grips with, [had] to listen to--and [had] to listen to with open ears and closed mouth."¹⁹⁹

The second change in the African American community which Alkalimat identified was its "fantastic move toward new unity."²⁰⁰ In his opinion, that new unity resulted from the realization by African Americans, particularly young African Americans, that both Martin Luther King, Jr. and Malcolm X met the same fate--assassination--despite their ideological differences, or at least their differences, real or assumed, reported in the white press.²⁰¹ That unity manifested itself in young African American men seldom offering serious criticism of one another. African Americans did not criticize one another, Alkalimat explained, "for the simple reason that to make or appeal to 'truth' as a value makes little difference, makes no difference when you're dead."²⁰²

Alkalimat indicated that the third change in the African American community which revealed that community's move toward maturity was its challenge to the truthfulness or accuracy of certain positions held or promoted by the United States government and white people, with the support of white social scientists. Specifically, Alkalimat implied that African Americans rejected the notion, based on the census--which Alkalimat defined as being like the Bible to secular America--that they were

only ten percent of the nation's population, located in ghettos, and therefore, too impotent to change their circumstances. He emphasized that the census finally agreed with African Americans that the census statistics were not true.²⁰³

According to Alkalimat, another position held by white people from white Western nations, but rejected by African Americans and non-/less industrialized nations of the world, was the concern by white people about nuclear holocaust. Alkalimat expressed agreement with the non-/less industrialized nations that "the whole business about nuclear holocaust was a Western myth, that basically white people want[ed] to use the notion that they [had] bombs that [they were] threatening each other with to prevent people from participating in movements toward national liberation."²⁰⁴ He explained that, in essence, the African American community and people of the darker race from the non-/less industrialized countries said to white Western nations, "if you want to exterminate us, then you'll just have to do that because we're moving toward liberation."²⁰⁵

How the White University Could Be Relevant For African Americans

The fifth and final statement concerning African American Studies and the university on which Alkalimat reflected was how the university could be relevant and use

its powers for positive good. Alkalimat felt that the university could be relevant to African Americans in two ways. The first way was concerned with the "problem of knowledge;"²⁰⁶ the second way related to its role as a socialization agent.²⁰⁷

The Problem of Knowledge

In addressing the knowledge problem, Alkalimat discussed two issues--courses and research.

The University Could Make Courses Relevant

Alkalimat believed that universities could make courses relevant to African Americans by organizing the courses to address the questions being raised by African American people. For example, he felt that in the area of economics, the university could structure a full-year course treating "two questions: Why don't black people have any money? and, How can black people get some money?"²⁰⁸ Such questions, in his view, would require a discussion of the myth of "forty acres and a mule," which would also require some talk about how "Southern racists and their Northern kin" stole money from the Freedman's Bank and "then, tricked Frederick Douglass into taking the leadership position in it before it folded."²⁰⁹

Alkalimat, also, noted that a discussion of these things would lead to "talk about the failure of entrepreneurial spirit or delayed gratification becoming

a factor in the values and life style" of African American people. In addition, he continued, talk about how African Americans could get some money would raise the question of how African American insurance companies, such as Atlanta Life, North Carolina Mutual, and Metropolitan, and Johnson Publications survived against great odds.²¹⁰ Finally, Alkalimat thought that an economics course structured to answer questions which concerned African American students was relevant to white students, also. He reasoned that the children of the "captains of industry" had probably not been informed of the "body of knowledge relating to the experiences of white oppression." Alkalimat also indicated that it was unlikely that such students had "heard lectures about how [white] people [had] systematically excluded black people from the economy, or excluded black people from having access to resources to develop economic institutions."²¹¹

The University Could Make Research Relevant

On the issue of research, Alkalimat expressed the view that at that time (1968) sufficient data on the African American experience simply did not exist to create an adequate African American Studies curriculum.²¹² Therefore, he believed that the university could be relevant to African Americans, if it provided African American social scientists "a few million dollars [which in Alkalimat's estimation was "not a lot of money"]..."to

investigate the whole question of the black experience and the body of knowledge" that would be generated in that effort.²¹³

The University's Role as a Socializing Agent

As analyzed by Alkalimat, the second way in which the university could be relevant pertained to "socialization, the 'is' and the 'ought.'" He noted that the university's role in socialization involved not only the inside of the university, but also its relationship with the community.²¹⁴ Alkalimat argued that the "is" function required that the university create on campus a "microcosm of the society."²¹⁵ He, therefore, believed that since African Americans lived in segregated situations in the society, African American students should also have segregated situations on university campuses. To express his support for the creation of a microcosm of the larger society/of segregated situations in the United States on university campuses, he stated:

I would fully support the demand by black students at Northeastern University to have their own living quarters, to have cultural events that speak to their own needs, etc.²¹⁶

It is apparent that Alkalimat envisioned the university as a relevant socializing institution for African Americans, but only if it first created a microcosm of the larger society on the campus, including that society's racial segregation/separation.

According to Alkalimat, the university in 1968 could not become seriously concerned with what "ought" to be on campus or in society until it dealt with what was already there (the "is").²¹⁷ "Fantasy" is the word he used to label the notion that the university could recruit some special types of African American and white students, get them together and create a "new model of man" who could go out of the university and relate to the world. His contention was that in the general social environment and on the college and university campuses of the late 1960s, African Americans had to relate to the African American community.²¹⁸ He proclaimed that only after the university created the "is" could it confront the "creative challenge of how to mold a man, a universal man."²¹⁹

Overall, the content of this article, "Deck the Ivy Racist Halls: The Case of Black Studies," indicates that in the waning years of the 1960s, Alkalimat believed that people in the United States--both at the larger society level and at the university campus level--lived in a racist environment and had to relate to each other on the basis of their race and color. He felt that the circumstances of the time required that African Americans separate themselves from whites absolutely in cultural terms, so they could control how and what they thought, and circumstantially in physical terms, that is, greater or lesser degrees of integration depending on the

perceived benefits. While Alkalimat thought that race and color dominated race relations in the late 1960s, his expressions that the white university could be relevant to the education of African Americans by providing a curriculum that focused on questions that concerned African Americans, by giving African American social scientists an adequate sum of money to study the African American experience, and by providing a microcosm of the larger society on the campus, while suggesting that the university might be helpful in endeavoring to mold/create a universal man, indicate that Alkalimat, like Hare and Karenga, did not, at that time, hold an inflexible, ideologically separatist position regarding racial relations.

During the 1980s, in his article, "Black Studies Curriculum Development in the 1980s: Patterns of Consensus, Conflict, and Change," Alkalimat, unlike during the late 1960s, no longer perceived African American Studies to be lacking in research and findings for an adequate/appropriate curriculum for African American students.²²⁰ He noted that there was even standardization of a core curriculum,²²¹ although the content of each course might not be the same on various campuses.²²² It was not that the courses were identical, but that "the current state of course content in Black Studies [reflected] trends in the Black Liberation movement, as

well as trends in academic circles more generally."²²³

An Adequate African American Studies Curriculum

Alkalimat believed that in the 1980s, sufficient and appropriate data existed for a meaningful African American Studies Curriculum, a position he did not hold in earlier years of the African American Studies movement. He seemed to focus his discussion of African American Studies on African American Nationalism, as he had done during the previous period.²²⁴ His nationalistic perspective in the 1980s, as that of other nationalists who emerged from the African American Studies movement of the 1960s and 1970s, appeared to be more inclusive of African Americans from varying "ideological and political positions in the Black Liberation movement"²²⁵ and less exclusive of whites than in earlier decades. He wrote:

The test of how adequate our framework is must be based on the criteria of comprehensiveness and universality, covering all topics and being useful for all people.²²⁶

According to Alkalimat, an adequate African American Studies curriculum/framework development--one that was comprehensive and universal--rested on two sources: (1) library literature relating to the African American experience and (2) "practical experience from the society."²²⁷ Stated more succinctly, he believed that a sufficient African American Studies framework had to be built on theory and practice. As a test for adequate

African American curriculum development, Alkalimat "developed a list of alternative foci in Black Studies courses," three under the heading "Theoretical Review of Literature" and three under "Summation of Practical Experience."²²⁸

Theoretical Review of Literature Foci in Black Studies Courses

Alkalimat explained that the three intellectual focal points under the topic "Theoretical Review of Literature"--critique of mainstream (white) scholarship, review of radical thought, and black intellectual history--were central to African American Studies in the 1960s and remained equally relevant in the 1980s.²²⁹

Critique of Main Stream (White) Scholarship

In his discussion of "mainstream scholarship," he quoted several African American social scientists who had made critical comments on an analysis of the body of mainstream work on African Americans and their experience.²³⁰ Since the content of their comments were similarly critical of mainstream social science, excerpts from the critiques by St. Clair Drake, sociologist, and Johnetta Coles, anthropologist, are offered here as representative of the social scientists quoted by Alkalimat.

From an address titled "Black Studies: Toward an Intellectual Framework" and delivered by Drake at Brooklyn

College in Brooklyn, New York, in 1969, Alkalimat offered this quotation:

The very use of the term Black Studies is by implication an indictment of American and Western European Scholarship. It makes the bold assertion that what we have heretofore called 'objective' intellectual activities were actually white studies in perspective and content....the present body of knowledge has an ideological element in it, and a counter-ideology is needed. Black Studies supply that counter-ideology.²³¹

Alkalimat noted that Coles, in her review of anthropology syllabi in 1982, made the same point about mainstream social science as Drake. Alkalimat quoted Coles as follows:

In summary form, the fundamental charge of Black Studies was that the mainstream discipline of western bourgeoisie science, arts and humanities, was pregnant with racism, as reflected in who the overwhelming majority of disciplinaries are, where they come from, and to whom they are accountable....Now in the 1980s as I work...in the revision of our undergraduate curriculum and the strengthening of that part which constitutes general education, I am no less convinced than I was in the 1960s that Black Studies can be an essential corrective scholarship for certain biases in mainstream academics.²³²

Apparently, Alkalimat agreed with these and the other social scientists' critiques/assessments of mainstream social science.²³³ Also, he emphasized that African American Studies should "critically examine the strengths and weaknesses" of mainstream scholarships' "substance and methodology."²³⁴

Review of Radical Thought

On the second point under theory, "Review of Radical

Thought," Alkalimat explained that African American Studies, "was aimed at institutionalizing an academic experience with 'education for liberation' as a central goal."²³⁵ This political statement by the African American Studies movement was a direct challenge to the "apolitical" claims of colleges and universities, claims made although they and/or their professors were engaged in war related research, involved with the Central Intelligence Agency (C.I.A.), and employed as "consultants for multinational corporations with questionable activities," both in the United States and abroad.²³⁶ Alkalimat noted that such activities were proof to university students that the university was not "'neutral,'" but rather a "politically-oriented institution" that simply projected a "'value free'" image.²³⁷

According to Alkalimat, the Watts, California, riots of the middle 1960s and subsequent rebellions by African Americans in cities throughout the United States; the release of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders' (the Kerner Commission's) report on March 1, 1968, which proclaimed that the United States was "'moving toward two societies, one black, one white--separate and unequal'"; and the assassination of Martin Luther King, Jr. on April 4, 1968, were the three events that had a major impact on the emergence of African American Studies,

as well as the rise of African American scholars with a different perspective of education and race relations than that evident in the white social scientists.²³⁸ Alkalimat stated:

It was precisely within this context that a new generation of Black scholars emerged and sought to shape Black Studies so that it took up "the liberation task," to quote Dr. [St. Clair] Drake, that were so much on both the national and Black community agenda of that period.²³⁹

As analyzed by Alkalimat, this move toward shaping African American Studies to take up the liberation struggle occurred almost simultaneously with the emergence of radical movements in higher education in nearly all social disciplines. He stressed that the African American Studies movement had "historically been close allies with a developing radical tradition in U.S. scholarship."²⁴⁰ By "radical" Alkalimat meant "a critique of U.S. society which focused on the unequal distribution of economic, political, and social power, and the resulting patterns of exploitation and oppression."²⁴¹ Apparently, the alliance between African American Studies and the radical tradition in United States scholarship to which he referred was in large part the shift toward Marxism/socialism, described earlier in this paper as having been made by African American Nationalist intellectuals including Alkalimat, from the late 1960s to the middle 1970s, when the F.B.I. and police forces across the United States worked to destroy African American Nationalist organizations and

harassed, jailed, and/or killed their leaders. Alkalimat and Bailey reported in their article that "radicals encouraged an activist-orientation." "Radicals," they emphasized, "recognized, in the words of Alkalimat, that 'science is inevitably a hand servant to ideology, a tool to shape if not create, reality.'"²⁴²

Finally, in his discussion of the review of radical thought, Alkalimat explained that the "radical tradition of social science" derived its strength, both in the 1980s and in the earlier period, from "exposing the political essence of current and prevailing trends."²⁴³ Further explicating the radical tradition of social science, which also revealed his Marxist/socialist orientation as well as the relationship between the radical tradition and African American Studies, he continued:

The radical tradition of social science points one's analysis toward class forces, and anchors all analysis in the very structure of the capitalist system of imperialism. It serves to politically re-orient scholarship and provide a working class basis for a partisan social science. Black Studies approaches these matters on a moral and expressive basis; the radical tradition can help it develop a set of concepts that is in synchronization with universal tools of a progressive social science and focused on the particularity of the Black experience.²⁴⁴

Black Intellectual History

The third point under the topic, "Theoretical Review of Literature,"--Black Intellectual History--was a key one for Alkalimat. He noted that historically African

American scholars, including DuBois and Carter G. Woodson, had provided important research and writings and "adopted the 'scholar-activist' stance central to Black Studies," but that the young African American scholars during the early years of the African American Studies movement had developed with inadequate "grounding" in those works.²⁴⁵ As a result, he emphasized, those young scholars "often ended up polemicizing against what [they] considered biased, racist treatment of the Black experience, but without the ability to stand on the shoulders of their intellectual and academic forerunners."²⁴⁶ In summary, it seems that the central point that Alkalimat wanted to make was that African American scholars had created a "rich body of work" that "represents an indispensable component of Black Studies courses."²⁴⁷

Summary of Practical Experience Foci in Black Studies Courses

The three topics under the heading, "Summation of Practical Experience," were Empirical Data Analysis, Policy and Contemporary Issues, and Black Liberation Movement. Alkalimat thought that they should be components of African American Studies courses.

Empirical Data Analysis

In his discussion of empirical data, Alkalimat concurred with DuBois's admonition to historians to collect and accurately record facts, regardless of

personal desires, wishes, or beliefs, but to spurn concealing and/or distorting facts.²⁴⁸ As reported by Alkalimat, DuBois felt that the important thing was for people to know the facts/"'what actually happened in the world'" and only then could they have an opportunity to interpret the facts.²⁴⁹ Agreeing with DuBois's high standards for scientific research and emphasizing African American Studies' close conformity with them, Alkalimat wrote: "This canon of rigorous attention to facts--the collection of concrete things--is an important component of Black Studies."²⁵⁰

While supporting the need to give attention to facts, he felt nevertheless that African Americans had to guard against social sciences' drive toward quantification of data. He believed as he had in 1969 that although empirical research had "'resulted in progress toward having access to more incidence of social reality,'" it had also led to the "'falsification of our understanding.'"²⁵¹ Continuing, he clarified this point:

The challenge of organizing vast amounts of data under manageable theory has resulted in low-level theory like concepts of prejudice and discrimination (instead of racism).²⁵²

He had reminded social scientists, in 1969, that they had "'been looking at the trees and ignoring the essential nature of the forest.'"²⁵³

Although concerned about the possibility of excessive attention to quantitative data and their

analyses leading to invalid interpretations and faulty understanding, Alkalimat specified that his caution in this matter was not an indication that he was against the utilization of the most advanced methods in empirical research. His criticism was against mainstream social science in the United States and its tendency "to let empirical data become the proverbial tail that wags the dog."²⁵⁴

Policy and Contemporary Issues

In his report on the second aspect in summing up concrete practices--"Policy and Contemporary Issues"--Alkalimat noted that government policy and prevailing and relevant issues had been a concern to African American Studies in its initial stages, the late 1960s, and remained a concern in the 1980s.²⁵⁵ Perceiving that the problems for African Americans and American society were as urgent in the middle 1980s as they had been in the late 1960s, he asserted that "every field within Black Studies" bore a "continuing responsibility...to understand the contemporary situation of Black people and to explore the policy implications of the knowledge produced in the field of study."²⁵⁶ Contrasting the two periods, he declared that there was "a real increase, not a decrease, in the significance of racism in the recent period."²⁵⁷

It is important for one to remember that in the middle 1980s when Alkalimat wrote this article, many

African Americans felt that Ronald Reagan, the conservative President, and his administration had promoted and instituted policies that were detrimental to/destructive of the progress they had made during the previous two decades. Apparently, Alkalimat's awareness of the effect of these policies on African Americans is what led him to remind African Americans and scholars in every field within African American Studies that the knowledge produced might affect them. He warned them that "there [was] a major shift in the country that [was] having a big impact on Black people."²⁵⁸

"Black Liberation Movement"

Finally, Alkalimat argued that the study of the "Black Liberation Movement," the third focal point under the topic, "Summation of Practical Experience," should be included in African American Studies (and also in other social sciences). The two most salient points in his discussion of the "Black Liberation Movement" were (1) that African American scholars had constantly tried to contribute to an understanding of the solution of problems such as racism, poverty, and discrimination²⁵⁹ and (2) that, historically, African American scholars had been both scholars and activists, and that it had been the scholar-activists--men such as DuBois and Woodson--who held the highest stature.²⁶⁰ Alkalimat suggested that these and other African American social scientists,

generally, as well as African American Studies, had two primary concerns: truth and power. He indicated that truth about social phenomena and nature had to be addressed by science, but power, which involved changing the world, was a matter for the Black Liberation Movement.²⁶¹

In this work on curriculum development in the 1980s, it appears that Alkalimat was concerned with building a curriculum which incorporated the concepts of "Black Nationalism" and "Black Liberation," concepts which inherently include some level of racial separation. It seems apparent from his discourse in this article that the level of separation was primarily cultural/mental, not physical.

The final publication by Alkalimat which this study examines is his review in 1991 in the Black Scholar (21: 1991) of a book titled Eurocentrism (1989) by Samir Amin.²⁶² Here, the concern and focus is not his critique of the book, but his ideas on African American education, specifically on African American Studies, and on whether those ideas identify him as a nationalist/separatist or integrationist.

Alkalimat identified two major aspects of African American Studies, indicating that they were prominent ones when the African American Studies Movement began in the late 1960s and remained so in the early 1990s. One aspect

of African American Studies was its "critique of the white racist deformity of conventional higher education."²⁶³ This critique generally focused on the omission of African Americans and their history from the higher education curriculum. Another major aspect of African American Studies "called for affirming a black perspective, approaching the universal human experience from the universal particularity of a black point of view."²⁶⁴ According to Alkalimat, in the first case, African American Studies "defined and legitimated a new object of study;" in the second, it "defined and legitimated a new object to do the studying."²⁶⁵ Apparently, the new subject of study was higher education and the new subject to do the studying were African Americans.

It appears that from Alkalimat's viewpoint, the essential purpose and contribution of African American Studies is to challenge the untruths and inaccuracies in the education that colleges and universities provide their students and to work to correct the institutions by providing accurate and truthful information. He felt that one of the ways that African American Studies could help correct the inaccurate and untruthful information provided by higher educational institutions was to challenge the myth of Eurocentrism. Alkalimat declared:

The fundamental and intellectual critique that Afro-American Studies must make is to challenge the myth of Eurocentrism [Europe as the center of the social universe] from the particularity of the

black experience and contribute to the construction of a new paradigm that is authentically universal, that overthrows every racist myth from John Wayne's cowboy movies in the popular culture to the so called eternal glory of Greece reproduced in the higher intellectual circles.²⁶⁶

In this statement, it appears that Alkalimat's point of view is one of anti-racism and cultural nationalism, which requires African Americans to grasp control of their minds from whites.

Summary

The writings of Nathan Hare, Maulana Ron Karenga, and Abdul Alkalimat (the three social scientists whose works are reviewed in this chapter) reveal two common and fundamental characteristics: (1) They were primarily involved in/concerned with African American Studies in colleges and universities and (2) They were cultural nationalists.

Regarding the first of these characteristics, each of these scholars directed his attention and efforts toward the implementation and institutionalization of African American Studies in colleges and universities. They believed that colleges and universities had failed to provide a curriculum that included and/or accurately depicted African Americans' culture, history, heritage, accomplishments, and contributions. Also, these social scientists felt that higher educational institutions had not become adequately involved in or made significant,

even sufficient, contributions to the African American community.

Examining the second common characteristic of Hare, Karenga, and Alkalimat, that of cultural nationalists, it seems that all believed in some level of racial separation. A position of support for any degree of segregation/separation was contrary to that of E. Franklin Frazier, Kenneth B. Clark, and Charles V. Willie, who, as reported in Chapter 6, were ardent advocates and promoters of racial integration. It must be noted that while Hare, Karenga, and Alkalimat were apparently supportive to some degree of racial segregation/separation, particularly during the early years of the "Black Studies" movement (late 1960s) and/or in certain circumstances or cases, such as the retention of predominately or all African American colleges and universities, none of them explicitly rejected association, or even integration, with white people as a permanent or unalterable race relations position.

Hare, Karenga, and Alkalimat were not concerned, primarily, with racial segregation/separation, that is, with African Americans' physical separation from whites, but rather with their cultural separation. All of them believed that African Americans had to wage a cultural revolution, which, as explained by Karenga, was inseparable from a "black nationalist" revolution. In

other words, an African American cultural revolution would necessarily be an African American nationalist revolution. An African American cultural/nationalist revolution would be based on their African/African American culture, heritage, and history and, as noted by Karenga, provide identity, purpose, and direction, which would tell African Americans who they were, what they needed to do, and how they could do it.

A central message, if not the central message, of these cultural nationalists was that a cultural revolution for African Americans would result in their seizing back control of their minds from white people. In the estimation of these scholars, this seizure would lead to African Americans' condemnation and rejection of white values and white social science, with its racist interpretations and analyses of issues and data pertaining to African Americans, and of their own colonial status and treatment, resulting in the adoption and promotion of their African culture. Hare, Karenga, and Alkalimat envisioned that African Americans, by seizing control of their minds, would see themselves positively, integrate with themselves, before becoming greatly concerned with integrating with white people, and, in essence, liberate themselves from white control and domination.

It is apparent from the content of this chapter that Nathan Hare, Maulana Ron Karenga, and Abdul Alkalimat were

cultural nationalists who, both physically and culturally, supported separation of African Americans and whites to a much greater degree than E. Franklin Frazier, Kenneth B. Clark, and Charles V. Willie, the three social scientists whose ideas are presented and discussed in the previous chapter. The latter three scholars strongly advocated racial integration and vigorously condemned separation and segregation. The following chapter identifies and analyzes the determinants of the difference in view between the integrationists in the previous chapter and the nationalists/separatists in the present one.

NOTES

1. Alphonso Pinkney, Red, Black, and Green: Black Nationalism in the United States (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1976), 6-7; Pinkney identified unity or solidarity among African Americans, pride in cultural heritage and its constituent element, black consciousness, and some degree of autonomy from the larger/white society as the three components of contemporary "black nationalist ideology"; the discussion of the writings of Nathan Hare, Maulana Ron Karenga, and Abdul Alkalimat in this chapter indicate clearly that each of these social scientists supported these elements which comprise the "black nationalist ideology."

2. Ibid.

3. David Brion Davis, "Reflections," in Black Studies in the University: A Symposium, eds. Armstead L. Robinson, Craig C. Foster, and Donald H. Ogilvie (New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1969), 218; In his reflections on the conference on African American Studies at Yale University in the Spring of 1968, Davis implied that Nathan Hare was a nationalist; James Haskins, Profiles in Black Power (Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1972), 209; In this book, Haskins noted that Karenga was regarded in "militant black circles as the chief exponent of cultural nationalism;" Manning Marable, Race, Reform and Rebellion: The Second Reconstruction in Black America, 1945-1982, (Jackson, Mississippi: University Press of Mississippi, 1984), 152; In this source, Marable identifies Alkalimat as a nationalist.

4. The following sources are among those which note the decline of the Civil Rights Movement and the emergence of the Black Power Movement: Mary Francis Berry and John W. Blassingame, Long Memory: The Black Experience in America (New York: Oxford University Press, 1982), 418; Gale T. Tate, "Black Power Movement," in The African American Encyclopedia, vol. 1, ed. Michael W. Williams, 1993, 174.

5. See Armstead L. Robinson, Craig C. Foster, and Donald H. Ogilvie, eds. Black Studies in the University: A Symposium (New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University

Press, 1969), xi; The editors of this book, which contained the presentations and responses to questions of participants at the Yale University "Black Studies" Symposium, expressed their gratitude to the participants for the contributions they made to the conference's success; Hare, Karenga, and Alkalimat, who was identified in this source as Gerald McWorter, were listed among the conference's sixteen contributors; the complete list of contributors were McGeorge Bundy, President, Ford Foundation; Lawrence W. Chisolm, History Department, State University of New York at Buffalo; Harold Cruse, Writer in Residence, University of Michigan; David Brion Davis, History Department, Cornell University; Nathan Hare, Director of Black Studies, San Francisco State College; Maulana Ron Karenga, Founder-Chairman of US, Watts, California; Martin Kilson, Jr., Department of Government, Harvard University; Gerald A. McWorter (Abdul Alkalimat), Sociology Department, Spelman College; Sidney W. Mintz, Anthropology Department, Yale University; Boniface Obichere, History Department, University of California at Los Angeles; Donald H. Ogilvie, Student, Yale University, Dr. Alvin Poussaint, Department of Psychiatry, School of Medicine, Tufts University; Edwin S. Redkey, History Department, University of Tennessee; Armstead L. Robinson, Student, Yale University; Charles H. Taylor, Jr., Provost, Yale University; and Robert Farris Thompson, Department of History of Art, Yale University.

6. Harry Edwards, Black Students (New York: Free Press, 1970), 61.

7. Ibid.

8. Nathan I. Huggins, Afro-American Studies (A Report to the Ford Foundation, 1985), 26.

9. Ibid.

10. Ibid.

11. Ibid.

12. Nathan Hare, "A Radical Perspective on Social Science Curricula," in Black Studies in the University: A Symposium, eds. Armstead L. Robinson, Craig C. Foster, and Donald H. Ogilvie (New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1969), 120.

13. Ibid.

14. Ibid., 105.

15. Ibid.

16. Ibid.

17. Nathan Hare, "How White Power Whitewashes Black Power," in The Black Power Revolt, ed. Floyd B. Barbour (Boston, Massachusetts: Extending Horizons Books, 1968), 184.

18. Ibid.

19. Ibid.

20. Ibid., 188.

21. Ibid.

22. Ibid.

23. Among Hare's writings which delineate or explicate his views are: Nathan Hare, "The Case for Black Separatism: 'Black Perspective,'" in Black Power and Student Rebellion, eds. James McEvoy and Abraham Miller (Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc., 1969), 233-35; Nathan Hare, "The Challenge of A Black Scholar," Black Scholar (December 1969): 58-63; Nathan Hare, "What Should Be the Role of Afro-American Education in the Undergraduate Curriculum?" in New Perspectives on Black Studies, ed. John W. Blassingame (Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1971), 3-4, 13-14; Nathan Hare, "Will the Real Black Man Please Stand Up?" Black Scholar 2 (June 1971): 32; and Nathan and Julia Hare, Crisis in Black Sexual Politics (San Francisco: Black Think Tank, 1989), 170-71.

24. Hare, "The Case for Separation," 233-35.

25. Ibid., 233.

26. Ibid.

27. Ibid.

28. Ibid., 33-35.

29. Ibid., 234, underline mine.

30. Ibid.

31. Ibid.

32. Ibid.

33. Ibid.

34. Ibid., 235, underline mine.

35. Nathan Hare, "The Challenge of A Black Scholar," Black Scholar (December, 1969), 58; Hare defined a scholar as "a man [/woman] who contributes original ideas [and] new insights and information to the existing fund of knowledge," whether or not he[/she] possesses academic degrees or follows the "traditions and conventions of the existing world of scholarship" in executing his "scholarly activities."

36. Ibid.

37. Ibid.

38. Ibid., 61.

39. Ibid.

40. Ibid.

41. Ibid.

42. Ibid.

43. Ibid., 63.

44. Nathan Hare, "What Should Be the Role of Afro-American Education in the Undergraduate Curriculum?" in New Perspectives in Black Studies, ed. John W. Blassingame (Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1971), 12; concerning the publication of this article, the editor provides this note: "Reprinted by permission from Liberal Education LV (March, 1969), 42-50."

45. Ibid., 3-15.

46. Ibid., 3.

47. Ibid.

48. Ibid., 13.

49. Ibid.

50. Ibid., 4.

51. Ibid.

52. Ibid., 14.

53. Ibid.

54. Ibid.

55. Ibid.

56. The Melvin B. Tolson Black Heritage Center of Langston University, Langston, Oklahoma, Mr. Ronald Keys, Curator, after being informed by Ms. Beverly H. Smith, the school's Public Relations Director, of the author's request for information on Dr. Nathan Hare, mailed the author the text of a speech which Dr. Hare delivered as the keynote speaker at Langston University's Cultural Renaissance Rally on August 30, 1975. The speech was accompanied by other materials relevant to Dr. Hare and his activities and accomplishments, and was received on September 3, 1993. The heading of the speech is the following:

TEXT OF A SPEECH TO BE DELIVERED BY NATHAN HARE, PH.D., PH.D., TO HIS ALMA MATER, LANGSTON UNIVERSITY, ON THE OCCASION OF THEIR "CULTURAL RENAISSANCE" RALLY, AUGUST 30, 1975, 6:00 O'CLOCK P.M.

In the speech, Hare informed his audience that he was aware of the actions taken by some persons to close Langston University or discontinue it as an African American institution. In the second and third sentences of the first page of the speech, he stated: "...I want to congratulate you for not letting them close down Langston. Out in San Francisco we keep hearing some curious talk about closing Langston and about the idea of merging Langston."

57. Nathan Hare, "Text of A Speech to Be Delivered by Nathan Hare, Ph.D., Ph.D., to His Alma Mater, Langston University, on the Occasion of Their 'Cultural Renaissance' Rally, August 30, 1975, 6:00 P.M." Speech delivered by Nathan Hare, but it is not obvious from the title whether the title was given to the speech by Dr. Hare, or assigned to it by someone else, Received by the author from the Melvin B. Tolson Black Heritage Center, Langston University, Langston, Oklahoma, Mr. Ronald Keys, Curator, on September 3, 1993, 1-19.

58. Ibid., 4.

59. Ibid., 5.

60. Ibid.

61. Ibid.

- 62. Ibid., 6.
- 63. Ibid., 7.
- 64. Ibid.
- 65. Ibid.
- 66. Ibid.
- 67. Ibid., 8.
- 68. Ibid.
- 69. Ibid., 9.
- 70. Ibid., 11.
- 71. Ibid.
- 72. Ibid., 12.
- 73. Ibid., 13.
- 74. Ibid.
- 75. Ibid., 14.
- 76. Ibid.
- 77. Ibid.
- 78. Ibid., 17.
- 79. Ibid.

80. Nathan Hare and Julia Hare, Crisis in Black Sexual Politics (San Francisco, California: Black Think Tank, 1989), 170-71.

- 81. Ibid.
- 82. Ibid., 170.
- 83. Ibid., 170.
- 84. Ibid.
- 85. Ibid.
- 86. Ibid., 171.

87. Ibid., 170.

88. Among the sources with biographical information on Maulana Ron Karenga are the following: Floyd B. Barbour, ed., The Black Power Revolt (Boston, Massachusetts: Extended Horizons Books, 1968), 250-51. These sources provided different meanings for "US," Karenga's cultural organization. The African American Encyclopedia (1993) indicates that US meant "United Slaves," whereas James Haskins in Profiles in Black Power (1972) states that US "was the pronoun 'us,' and it meant 'us' [African Americans] as opposed to 'them,' the whites."; Addison Gayle, Jr., ed., The Black Aesthetic (Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1971), 421; James Haskins, Profiles in Black Power (Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1972), 204-212; Dictionary of Black Culture, 1973 ed., s.v. "Karenga, Maulana Ron"; Maulana Ron Karenga, "Which Road: Nationalism, Pan Africanism, Socialism?" Black Scholar 2 (October 1974): 21; Manning Marable, Race, Reform and Rebellion: The Second Reconstruction in Black America, 1945-1982 (Jackson, Mississippi: University Press of Mississippi, 1984), 124; Maulana Karenga, "Political Culture and Resurgent Racism in the United States," Black Scholar (May/June 1985): 21; "Contributing Authors," Black Scholar 21 (March-May 1990): 79; and The African American Encyclopedia, 1993 ed., vol. 4, s.v. "Karenga, Ron Ndabetta."

89. Maulana Ron Karenga, "From the Quotable Karenga," in The Black Power Revolt (A Collection of Essays) ed. Floyd B. Barbour (Boston, Massachusetts: Extended Horizons Books, 1968), 164.

90. Ibid.

91. A source which provides a brief history and summary of the "Black Power Movement," which emphasized nationalism, and "Black Studies" is: The African American Encyclopedia, 1993 ed., vol. 4, s.v. "Black Power Conference"; "Black Power Movement"; and "Black Studies." Several books which discuss "Black Power," "Black Nationalism," and/or "Black Studies" are Black Students (1970) by Harry Edwards; Red, Black, and Green: Black Nationalism in the United States (1976) by Alphonso Pinkney; and Afro-American Studies (1985) by Nathan I Huggins.

92. Karenga, "From the Quotable Karenga," 166-170.

93. Ibid., 168.

94. Ibid., 165.
95. Ibid., 166.
96. Ibid.
97. Ibid., 165.
98. Ibid.
99. Maulana Ron Karenga, "The Black Community and the University: A Community Organizer's Perspective," including the "Question Period," in Black Studies in the University: A Symposium, eds. Armstead L. Robinson, Craig C. Foster, and Donald H. Ogilvie (New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1969), 37-54.
100. Ibid., 37.
101. Ibid.
102. Ibid., 37-38.
103. Ibid., 38.
104. Ibid.
105. Ibid., 39.
106. Ibid., 40
107. Ibid.
108. Ibid.
109. Ibid., 40-41.
110. Ibid., 42-45.
111. Ibid., 42.
112. Ibid., 43.
113. Ibid.
114. Ibid.
115. Ibid., 43-44.
116. Ibid., 44.
117. Ibid.

118. Ibid., 42.

119. Ibid., 44

120. Ibid.

121. Ibid., 53; The seven values comprising Karenga's cultural philosophy syndrome were: (1)"black" mythology; (2)"a value for history," based on the frame of reference consisting of positive values for African Americans and presented earlier in this discussion of Karenga's ideas; (3)a model for social organization; (4)a model for economic organization (cooperative economics); (5)a model for political organization (which would provide African Americans a standard or an example for imitation or comparison of "how to gain, maintain and use power"); (6)a creative motif ("developed...in terms of functional, collective, and committed art"); and (7)an ethos "based on achievement of the other six" values.

122. Maulana Ron Karenga, "Which Road: Nationalism, Pan Africanism, Socialism?" Black Scholar 21 (October 1974): 21-30; In this article, Karenga noted the weaknesses of "black nationalism" and "Pan Africanism" and extolled the strengths of socialism to lead to national liberation; The article reveals that at that time (1974), Karenga had shifted his ideological position from that of nationalism, with its racial separatist character, to that of socialism, with its emphasis on class unity among the masses of people regardless of race, as a means to oppose and defeat capitalists/owners and controllers of the means of production.

123. Ibid., 24.

124. Ibid.

125. Ibid.

126. Ibid.

127. Ibid., 25.

128. Ibid.

129. Ibid.

130. Ibid.

131. Ibid., 30.

132. Mary Francis Berry and John Blassingame, Long Memory: The Black Experience in America (New York: Oxford University Press, 1982), 423.

133. Manning Marable, Race, Reform and Rebellion: The Second Reconstruction in Black America, 1945-1982 (Jackson, Mississippi: University Press of Mississippi, 1984), 152.

134. Berry and Blassingame, Long Memory, 423.

135. Berry and Blassingame, 423.

136. Ibid.

137. Ibid.

138. Maulana Karenga, "The Black Male/Female Connection," in Crisis in Black Sexual Politics, eds. Nathan and Julia Hare (San Francisco, California: Black Think Tank, 1989), 45-48d.

139. Ibid., 48.

140. Ibid., 47.

141. Ibid., 48 c.

142. Ibid.

143. Ibid., underline mine.

144. Ibid.

145. Ibid.

146. Karenga, "The Black Community and the University: A Community Organizer's Perspective," including the "Question Period," 53.

147. Karenga, "The Black Male/Female Connection," 48d.

148. Iris Cloyd, ed. Who's Who Among Black Americans, 1990-91, 6th edition (New York: Gale Research, Inc., 1990), 874-75; Christa Brelin, ed. Who's Who Among Black Americans, 1992-93, 7th edition (Detroit, Michigan: Gale Research, Inc., 1992), 975.

149. Gerald A. McWorter, "Deck the Ivy Racist Halls: The Case of Black Studies," in Black Studies in the University: A Symposium, eds. Armstead L. Robinson, Craig

C. Foster, and Donald H. Ogilvie (New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1969), 55-74; "Abd-l Hakimu Ibn Alkalimat, "The Ideology of Black Social Science," in The Death of White Sociology, ed. Joyce A. Ladner (New York: Vanguard Books, 1973), 173-189; Gerald A. McWorter and Ronald W. Bailey, "Black Studies Curriculum Development in the 1980s: Patterns of Concensus, Conflict, and Change," paper number 17 in a series titled Afro Scholars Working Papers (Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, AfroAmerican Studies and Research Program, [1984?]), 1-58, microfilm (Schomburg Center for Research in Black Culture, New York, New York, call number Sc Micro R-4102, no. 14, ZZ-24767, Master Negative (of Micro R-4102); and Abdul Alkalimat, review of Eurocentricism, by Samir Amin, in Black Scholar 21 (Fall 1991): 43-44.

150. McWorter, "Deck the Ivy Racist Halls: The Case of Black Studies," 55.

151. Ibid.

152. Ibid., 56.

153. Ibid.

154. Ibid.

155. Ibid., 56-57.

156. Ibid., 57.

157. Ibid.

158. Ibid.

159. Ibid., 58.

160. Ibid.

161. Ibid.

162. Ibid., 59.

163. Ibid., 59-60.

164. Ibid., 60.

165. Ibid.

166. Ibid., 61.

167. Ibid.

168. Ibid., 62.

169. Abd-l Hakim Ibn Alkalimat, "The Ideology of Black Social Science," in The Death of White Sociology, ed., Joyce A. Landner (New York: Vanguard Books, 1973), 175-178; While this discussion of "The Ideology of Black Social Science" is based on its publication in The Death of White Sociology (1973: 173-189), a book edited by Joyce A. Ladner and published by Vanguard Books, Alkalimat (Gerald A. McWorter) and Ronald W. Bailey reported in footnote 16 of their article, "Black Studies Curriculum Development in the 1980s: Patterns of Consensus, Conflict, and Change," paper number 17, in a series titled Afro-Scholars Working Papers (Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Afro-American Studies Research Program, [1984], p.#, Microfilm), that "The Ideology of Black Social Science" appeared in the Black Scholar in December 1969.

170. Ibid., 173-74.

171. Ibid., 179-89.

172. Ibid., 180.

173. Ibid., 175.

174. Ibid., 183.

175. Ibid.

176. Ibid., 183-84.

177. Ibid., 184.

178. Ibid.

179. Ibid., 187.

180. Ibid.

181. Ibid.

182. Ibid. According to Molefi K. Asante and Mark T. Mattson in The Historical and Cultural Atlas of African Americans (1991), ujaama means cooperative economics; They explain that ujaama is one of the seven principles of familyhood, which in conjunction with the other six-- "umoja, unity; kujichagulia, self-determination; ujima, collective work and responsibility...nia, purpose; kumba,

creativity, and imani, faith--are the centerpiece of the [Kwanzaa] celebration," which was founded by Maulana Karenga in 1966: Molefi K. Asante and Mark T. Mattson, The Historical and Cultural Atlas of African Americans (New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1991), 123.

183. Alkalimat, "The Ideology of Black Social Science," 180.

184. Ibid., 181.

185. Ibid.

186. Ibid.

187. Ibid., 185.

188. Alkalimat, "Deck the Ivory Racist Halls," 62.

189. Ibid., 63.

190. Ibid.

191. Ibid.

192. Ibid., 64.

193. Ibid.

194. Ibid.

195. Ibid.

196. Ibid.

197. Ibid., 65.

198. Ibid.

199. Ibid.

200. Ibid.

201. Ibid.

202. Ibid., 65-66.

203. Ibid., 66.

204. Ibid., 67.

205. Ibid.

206. Ibid., 67-72.

207. Ibid., 72-74.

208. Ibid., 67.

209. Ibid., 67-68.

210. Ibid., 68.

211. Ibid.

212. Ibid., 68-69.

213. Ibid., 71.

214. Ibid., 72.

215. Ibid.

216. Ibid., 72-73.

217. Ibid., 74.

218. Ibid.

219. Ibid., underline mine.

220. McWorter and Bailey, "Black Studies Curriculum Development in the 1980s: Patterns of Consensus, Conflict, and Change," [1984?], 6-12.

221. Ibid., 11.

222. Ibid., 13.

223. Ibid.

224. Ibid.; The thrust of Alkalimat's remarks on African American Studies in this article in the middle 1980s was nationalistic, as it had been in the late 1960s, despite his evident shift from a "Black Nationalist" to a Marxist/socialist ideology by the early 1970s. Evidence of Alkalimat's shift from a nationalist to a Marxist ideology is found in Manning Marable's book, Race, Reform and Rebellion (1984:152). Commenting on nationalists and the nationalist movement of the 1960s and 1970s, Marable stated that during the early years of the movement, Alkalimat was "one of the founders of the Institute of the Black World" and "had been among the most dogmatically narrow nationalists." Continuing, he noted the ideological shift: "By the early 1970s, Alkalimat had

become a Leninist, establishing a Marxist institute, 'Peoples College,' in Nashville, [Tennessee,] and was decisive in moving many former cultural nationalists to the left" (p. 152).

225. Ibid., 10.

226. Ibid., 13.

227. Ibid.

228. Ibid.

229. Ibid., 14.

230. Ibid., 14-18. The social scientists who Alkalimat quoted as making critical comments or analysis of mainstream social science were St. Clair Drake (pp. 14-15), Johnetta Coles (p. 15), Lucius Outlaw (p. 16), Manning Marable (pp. 16-17), Tom Shick (pp. 17-18) and Lloyd Hogan (pp. 17-18).

231. Ibid., 14-15. Alkalimat (McWorter) and Bailey reported in footnote 17 on page 53 of this article, "Black Studies Curriculum Development in the 1980s: Patterns of Consensus, Conflict, and Change," that the source of this quotation was "St. Clair Drake, 'Black Studies: Toward an Intellectual Framework,' Address at Brooklyn College, 1969."

232. Ibid., 15. In footnote 18 on page 54 of their paper, "Black Studies Curriculum Development in the 1980s: Patterns of Consensus, Conflict, and Change," Alkalimat (McWorter) and Bailey identify the source of this article as follows: "Johnetta Coles, 'Overview and Evaluation of Anthropology Syllabi,' Black Studies Curriculum Development Course Evaluation, Conference II: Culture and Social Analysis (Institute of Black World, 1982)."

233. The assumption that Alkalimat agreed with the social scientists' critiques of mainstream social science is derived from (1) a general understanding of his views, (2) the statement by the authors (Alkalimat and Bailey) in "Black Studies Curriculum Development in the 1980s" that their paper was a "contribution to a project being carried out by the Institute of the Black World, and a statement of the ongoing work in Black Studies carried out by...Peoples College" (see page 2), both organizations which Manning Marable (see W.E.B. DuBois: Black Radical Democrat, 1984: 152) identifies as having been established by Alkalimat, (3) the fact that the social scientists' criticisms were presented at either Conference I or

Conference II of the Institute of Black World in 1982 (see footnotes 18-22 on page 54), and (4) Alkalimat's and Bailey's revelation that the critical approach to mainstream social science taken by Coles in her review of anthropology syllabi was the same as that taken by the Institute of Black World in its charge to its syllabi reviewers, of which Coles was one.

234. McWorter and Bailey, "Black Studies Curriculum Development in the 1980s, 18.

235. Ibid., 19.

236. Ibid.

237. Ibid.

238. Ibid., 19-20. In addition to stating that the United States was moving toward two separate and unequal societies based on race, the report by the Kerner Commission informed white people that they lacked knowledge concerning their implication in the African American ghetto and accused white institutions of creating and maintaining that ghetto, and white society of condoning it.

239. Ibid., 20.

240. Ibid.

241. Ibid.

242. Ibid.

243. Ibid., 24.

244. Ibid., 24-25.

245. Ibid., 25-26. Biographical information on DuBois is presented in Chapter 2 of this dissertation. Carter G. Woodson (1875-1950) was an African American, a recipient of a doctorate from Harvard in 1912, and an historian who in 1915 founded the Association for the Study of Negro Life and History (ASNLH), an organization which attempted to properly portray the role of African Americans in United States history. Biographical information on Woodson can be found in the following sources among others: Alton Hornsby, Jr., The Black Almanac: From Involuntary Servitude (1619-1860) to the Age of Disillusionment 1964-1971 (Woodbury, New York: Barron's Education Series, Inc., 1972), 49, 76;; Encyclopedia Britannica, 1972 ed., s.v. "Woodson, Carter Goodwin."

- 246. Ibid., 25.
- 247. Ibid., 27.
- 248. Ibid., 28-29.
- 249. Ibid.
- 250. Ibid., 29.
- 251. Ibid., 30.
- 252. Ibid.
- 253. Ibid.
- 254. Ibid.
- 255. Ibid., 31.
- 256. Ibid., 32.
- 257. Ibid.
- 258. Ibid.
- 259. Ibid., 33.
- 260. Ibid., 34.
- 261. Ibid., 33.

262. In this review, Alkalimat does not define Eurocentrism. Molefi Kete Asante discusses "Eurocentricity" and "Eurocentrism" in the following article: Molefi Kete Asante, "African American Studies: The Future of the Discipline," Black Scholar 22 (Summer 1992): 22, 24; Defining Eurocentricity, Asante wrote:

Eurocentricity...is an arrogant imposition of a particular view as if it is a universal view. Such a position is ethnocentric and leads to racism when it is enforced by custom, law, or physical force. It degrades other views and valorizes the European viewpoint. (p.22)

Of Eurocentrism, Asante stated:

Eurocentrism with all its potential for asserting its particular self as universal becomes the repository for race, class, and gender conflict (p.24).

263. Abdul Alkalimat, review of Eurocentrism, by Samir Amin, in Black Scholar 21 (Summer 1992): 43.

264. Ibid.

265. Ibid.

266. Ibid.

CHAPTER 8

DESEGREGATION/INTEGRATION VERSUS
SEGREGATION/SEPARATION/NATIONALISM: A SOCIOLOGY OF
KNOWLEDGE

The aim of this chapter is to determine how Edward (E.) Franklin Frazier, Kenneth Clark, and Charles Willie, the racial integrationists discussed in Chapter 6, and Nathan Hare, Maulana Karenga, and Abdul Alkalimat (Gerald McWorter), the nationalists reviewed in Chapter 7, who advocated that African Americans separate themselves from white people, especially in terms of their culture, came to hold one or the other of these differing perspectives as more appropriate, beneficial, and significant for African Americans' education and progress. This chapter is structured in a manner similar to that of Chapter 5, which sought to discover the social determinants of the differing positions of African American social scientists who were discussed in Chapters 3 and 4. Chapter 3 presented scholars who insisted that social class was more significant than race for the educational advancement and life chances of African Americans and Chapter 4 offered scholars who argued the contrary position. As the content of Chapter 5 is classified under the field of inquiry known as the sociology of knowledge, due to its search for

the determinants of the social scientists' choice of class or race as more critical in education and advancement, this chapter, also, is classified under the sociology of knowledge, due to its search for the determinants of the social scientists' differing views on the relative significance of integration and nationalism.

This means that the chapter is concerned with the ways in which the perspectives of the integrationists and nationalists on African Americans' education and success in the previous two chapters, respectively, were influenced by their society and environment. The same methodology utilized in Chapter 5 to determine the relative significance which the social scientists in Chapter 3 and 4 attached to social class and race for African Americans' education and life chances is utilized in this chapter to analyze the images/ideas of the integrationists in Chapter 6 and the separatists/nationalists in Chapter 7. The search for the determinants of the social scientists' different ideas on the relative significance of integration and nationalism to African Americans' education and life chances is effectuated by comparing the scholars on several dimensions (e.g., years of birth and ages, state or region of birth and rearing), identifying the two groups' different characteristics, and interpreting those differences. At the end of the chapter, the author offers

a personal opinion on the relative significance of integration / desegregation and segregation/separation/nationalism on the education of African Americans.

Comparative Dimensions

The integrationists and nationalists were compared on the following dimensions: years of birth and ages; state or region of birth or rearing; socioeconomic status of family/parents' occupation; higher education, including names and locations of colleges and universities of attendance, and levels and years of earned degrees; and participation and affiliation in organizations. Below, there is a comparison of the integrationists and nationalists on each of these dimensions.

Years of Birth and Ages

E. Franklin Frazier, Kenneth Clark, and Charles Willie, who believed that racial integration was more significant than segregation, separation, or nationalism for the education and life chances of African Americans, were born in 1894, 1914, and 1927, respectively, a span of 33 years between the birth of Frazier, the oldest, and Willie, the youngest. At the present time (1996), Frazier, if still alive, would become 102 years old. Clark and Willie will become 82 and 69 years old, respectively.¹

Nathan Hare, Maulana Karenga, and Abdul Alkalimat, the nationalists, were all younger than any of the three integrationists. Hare, the oldest of the nationalists, was born in 1933, six years after the the birth of Willie, the youngest integrationist. Karenga was born in 1941 and Alkalimat in 1942. In the present year (1996), Hare, Karenga, and Alkalimat will become 63, 55, and 54 years old, respectively.²

State and Region of Birth

Two of the three integrationists--E. Franklin Frazier and Charles Willie--were born in southern states, Frazier in Baltimore, Maryland, and Willie in Dallas, Texas. The other integrationist, Kenneth Clark, was born in the Panama Canal Zone, but his mother brought him and his sister to New York City when he was four years old. Frazier received his early education and completed high school in the public schools of Baltimore. Clark attended and completed elementary and high school in the public schools of New York City. There is no available published information of Willie's education before he attended college.³

Hare, Karenga, and Alkalimat, the advocates and promoters of nationalism as more critical than integration for African Americans' educational and general success, were all born in different regions of the country. Hare's birthplace was Slick, Oklahoma, Karenga's was someplace in

Maryland, and Alkalimat's was Chicago, Illinois.⁴ Except for Hare, who discussed some of the experiences of his early life in a letter to the author in response to a letter/questionnaire from the author in 1993,⁵ available information reveals little or nothing about the elementary and secondary education or other activities or experiences of these scholars during their childhood.⁶ In his letter to the author, Hare explained that he was "born in 'Badman's Territory,' three stones-throw from the hideout cave of the Dalton Boys outlaw gang, on a farm less than a mile from Slick, Oklahoma, and "soon moved to a sharecropper's farm three miles in the opposite direction" (p. 2). He noted that the population of Slick, Oklahoma, was registered in the 1950 United States Census as 301 people and in the 1960 Census as 151 people. Hare lived and worked on the sharecropper's farm until he was eleven, when his mother took her "four remaining siblings," of which Hare was the oldest male, "to San Diego, California, to join her oldest daughter working in the World War II Navy yard" (p.2). According to Hare, when he was thirteen years old, his mother moved back to Slick to a farm which she purchased in part from the money she earned and saved in San Diego.

After the age of nine, when Hare's father left home, his mother fostered the notion that Hare, the oldest male, was "'the man of the family'" and should act that way.

For Hare, being the man of the family meant that he had to "do the chores, plow or cultivate the crops, harness the mules and, perhaps the most formidable of all, procure and cut the wood necessary to keep everybody else warm in the winter in which [his] father disappeared" (p. 2).

In Slick, Okalahoma where Hare lived during most of his childhood, he attended L'Ouverture Elementary and L'Ouverture High School.⁷ Both schools were "all black, as it was against the law... 'to teach, aid or abet the teaching of Negroes and whites in the same school'" (p.2). Hare graduated from L'Ouverture High School. During the nearly two years that Hare's family lived in San Diego, from age nine to eleven for Hare, he attended Memorial Junior High School for about three months and, then, transferred to the Richard Henry Dana Junior High School. These schools were predominantly white (p. 3).

Families' Socioeconomic Background

E. Franklin Frazier's father, who had five children, was a bank messenger.⁸ Kenneth Clark's mother, who was separated from her husband, moved from the Panama Canal Zone to Harlem in New York City with her two children--Kenneth and Beulah--in 1918 and worked there as a dressmaker in the garment district to support her family. Although Clark's mother worked in the sweatshops of New York City's garment area during the day to support her family, she motivated herself to attend school at night

and earn a diploma from the evening division of George Washington High School, one of the city's public schools and the same one from which her son, Kenneth, later graduated at the age of sixteen as a student in the daytime program.⁹ As reported in Chapter 5, Willie's father worked as a pullman porter and real estate broker.¹⁰ Based on the occupations of their parents, it seems that each of these scholars who believed that integration is more influential than nationalism in the education and success of African American youth, could be categorized as having been reared in a working class family.

Available published sources do not provide information on the socioeconomic status or occupations of the parents of Nathan Hare, Maulana Karenga, and Abdul Alkalimat, who promoted nationalism, not integration, as an imperative for African Americans' success in education and in all other areas of life. In his response in a letter to questions from the author, requesting biographical information, Hare stated that his father was a sharecropper.¹¹ As sharecroppers, Hare's parents "borrowed the money to buy the seeds to plant the crop [cotton] from the bank or owner about ten miles away in the town of Bristow, [Oklahoma]. The crops basically brought in enough to pay the bank and the bill at the grocery store" (p.5). Hare noted that his family grew most of the food that they ate. They bought flour in

large bags by the bulk; the women canned vegetables, fruit, and berries which family members picked. His family "managed to raise and kill and cure a hog or two and sometimes a calf for the winter months" (p.5). If this source of meat was not available, Hare's father shot and killed cottontail rabbits or, infrequently, a squirrel.

The Hare children worked in the field from the age of five and as fieldhands or hired cotton pickers to earn money to help buy their winter clothes. In the summer, they went barefoot. During the fall, they stayed out of school to pick cotton, going to school three days one week and two another, alternately, but, "when the going got rough," dropping out for as long as six weeks at a time (p. 5).

Hare recalled that in the "post-Depression late 1930s the federal government's agriculture department decided there was a surplus of cotton" and required Hare's family and other African American families to plow up their cotton crop above a designated amount. Hare's father and other African American "men switched to bootlegging to support their families" (p. 5). When Hare was five years old, his father was arrested and put in jail for two months for making bootleg liquor (p. 5).

According to Hare, his father went to the seventh grade (p. 5) and his mother, to the eighth grade, but

remained "in school being tutored a couple more years" (p. 6). He believed that both [his] parents were literate for their education and social station" and that his mother did an excellent job and "seemed to gain gratification...in her often painful struggle to make ends meet and 'provide for [her children]'" (p. 6). Apparently, Hare grew up in a poor farming family.

Due to the lack of any available and direct information on the social and economic background of Karenga's and Alkalimat's families, other than a statement that Karenga's father was a Baptist minister,¹² which might indicate middle-class status, this study can only make assumptions about these scholars' family backgrounds based on an allusive statement about the socioeconomic backgrounds of "Black Power" spokespersons of the 1960s and 1970s in Manning Marable's book, Race, Reform and Rebellion: The Second Reconstruction in Black America, 1945-1982, (1984). Marable, implying that the United States government had no logical or legitimate reason to be alarmed at the "black nationalist upsurge" at that time due to their working-class or middle-class family backgrounds, wrote:

Most Black Power spokespersons came from upwardly mobile working-class or middle-class backgrounds, were trained at universities, and had been groomed for ultimate assimilation into the existing system....Karenga was the first black student body president at his junior college in Los Angeles, and was at work on a master's degree in politics at the University of California....Only a small fraction of

the major proponents of Black Power had the gritty background of Malcolm X, whose ordeal as part of the ghetto underworld served as a crucible for his ultimate political trajectory.¹³

One might assume from this limited information on Karenga's background and general statement on the family backgrounds of African American nationalist spokespersons that Karenga and Alkalimat were reared in working-class or middle-class families.

Higher Education

E. Franklin Frazier, Kenneth Clark, and Charles Willie, the advocates of integration, earned bachelor's degrees from predominately/historically African American colleges/universities. Frazier and Clark received their bachelor's degrees from Howard University in Washington, D.C. (1916, 1935). Willie earned his bachelor's degree from Morehouse College in Atlanta, Georgia (1948). Frazier received his master's degree from Clark University (1920), a white institution in Worchester, Massachusetts. Howard University awarded Clark this graduate level degree in 1936, the year after he received his bachelor's degree from that same institution. Atlanta University, an African American school in Atlanta, Georgia, was the institution in which Willie earned his master's degree (1949). Each of these scholars earned their doctoral (Ph.D.) degrees from large, predominately white institutions. Frazier's doctorate was conferred by the University of Chicago in

Chicago, Illinois (1931), Clark's by Columbia University in New York City (1940), and Willie's by Syracuse University in Syracuse, New York (1949).¹⁴ Except for Willie's doctorate which he received in 1957, all of these scholars' college and university degrees were earned during the first half of the century, which was before the United States Supreme Court declared segregated public schools unconstitutional in the Brown v Board of Education decision (1954) and the Civil Rights years (1954-1965).¹⁵

Of the three nationalist scholars--Hare, Karenga, and Alkalimat--only Hare earned his bachelor's degree from an African American school. He received that degree from Langston University in Langston, Oklahoma in 1954,¹⁶ the year that racially segregated public schools in the United States were ruled unconstitutional by the nation's Supreme Court, a ruling which, in effect, initiated the decline of overt racial segregation throughout the United States. Karenga received a bachelor's degree from the University of California in Los Angeles (UCLA),¹⁷ probably in the early 1960s.¹⁸ In 1963, Alkalimat completed the requirements for his undergraduate degree from Ottawa University in Ottawa, Kansas.¹⁹

Hare and Alkalimat earned their master's and doctorate degrees from the University of Chicago, Hare in 1957 and 1962, and Alkalimat in 1966 and 1974, respectively.²⁰ Karenga received his master's degree by

1968 from UCLA in Los Angeles where, at that time, he was a "doctoral candidate."²¹ Available sources indicate that Karenga attained a doctorate, but do not specify the school or year in which he received it. However, it is apparent from those sources that he earned his doctorate degree between 1975 and 1985.²²

Organizational Participation and Affiliation

Each of the three scholars who believed that racial desegregation/integration was significant for African American youths' educational and general success participated in/affiliated with several institutions and organizations.²³ Those institutions and organizations were primarily racially integrated ones, and included regional and/or national associations. The 1982 edition of the Dictionary of American Negro Biography makes the following statement concerning Frazier's involvement and leadership role in sociological professional associations:

He was a founding member and later president of the District of Columbia Sociological Society (1943-1944), president of the Eastern Sociological Society (1944-1945), a vice president of The African Studies Association, and president of the American Sociological Society (now the American Sociological Association). His election to the presidency of the American Sociological Society in 1948 marked the first time that a Negro had been elected to head a predominately white national professional association in this country.²⁴

Clark was a former president of both the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues and the American Psychological Association.²⁵ Among other sociological

associations, Willie was a member of the Social Science Research Council from 1969 through 1976 and on the board of directors of that organization from 1969 through 1974, a council member of the American Sociological Association from 1979 through 1982, and a past president (1974-75) of the Eastern Sociological Society.²⁶

Although Frazier, Clark, and Willie, the integrationists, were active members and even officers in some of the dominant professional associations and societies in their particular areas of social science in the United States, available published sources indicate that of the three advocates of African American nationalism--Nathan Hare, Maulana Karenga, and Abdul Alkalimat--only Hare has held membership in any of the professional societies of their respective disciplines. The African American Encyclopedia (1993, vol. 3: 711) reports that Hare held memberships in both the American Sociological Association and the American Psychological Association. None of the available sources reveal that any of these three nationalist scholars has achieved, or even sought, high elective or appointive positions in any of their disciplines' professional associations/societies.²⁷ It appears that these scholars have held memberships or been involved, primarily if not exclusively, in professional organizations and activities that have focused on African Americans and their unity and liberation.

Hare's activities have included teaching sociology at Howard University in Washington, D.C. from 1961 through 1967, from 1961-63 as an instructor and from 1964-67 as an assistant professor, and working as chairperson of the department of Black Studies at San Francisco College (now University) from 1968 through 1969. He was chairperson of a workshop on education at the National Conference on Black Power (1968); the founder and publisher (1969-75) of the Black Scholar, a scholarly publication that focuses on African American culture and the African American community; the founder and president of the Black World Foundation (1970); a member of the board of advisors of the San Francisco Black Exposition (1972); and a member of the board of directors of the North American Committee of the Second World Black and African Festival of Arts and Culture in Lagos, Nigeria (1974). Since 1982, Hare has been president and /or chairman of the board of the Black Think Tank in San Francisco, California.²⁸

Karenga, who is known by the Swahili title of "Maulana" or master-teacher, founded US, an African American nationalist cultural organization, in 1965, shortly after the riots in the Watts area of Los Angeles. At that time, he was "a doctoral candidate in African Studies at the University of California at Los Angeles (UCLA)."²⁹ In 1967 and 1968, Karenga served on five-man committees that organized Black Power conferences.³⁰

Karenga is the "creator of the Kwanzaa holiday and founder of the Kaiwaida movement which stressed seven 'principles of blackness.'"³¹ He was the executive director of the Institute of Pan-African Studies in Los Angeles, California in the 1980s.³² Presently, Karenga is an associate professor and chairman of the Department of Black Studies at California State University, Long Beach, California.³³

At different times since the middle 1960s, Alkalimat has taught in the sociology and/or African American Studies departments at several institutions of higher education. Included among those institutions are the Fisk University Center for Afro American Studies, the Institute of the Black World, the University of Illinois at Chicago, the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, and the State University of New York at Stony Brook. Alkalimat was the founder and chair of the Organization of Black Culture from 1965 through 1967. In 1984, he founded and became the director of the Cooperative Research Network in Black Studies. Additionally, Alkalimat has been a member of the editorial board of several professional publications--the Black Scholar, the Western Journal of Black Studies, the Afro Scholars Newsletter, and the Malcolm X Studies Newsletter.³⁴

Desegregation/Integration Versus
Segregation/Separation/Nationalism: Differentiating
Characteristics

Biographical evidence shows that neither the state or

region of their birth, the socioeconomic background of their parents, the type and location of their colleges and universities, nor the organizations in which they were members or employees was a dimension which differentiated all of the social scientists who felt that desegregation/integration was more significant than segregation/separation/nationalism for the educational advancement and life chances of African Americans from all of the social scientists who held the opposite view. There is some evidence to suggest, however, that the schools attended by Charles Willie, an integrationist, and Nathan Hare, a nationalist, might have had some effect on these two scholars' ideological development. Explication of the possible influence of Morehouse College on Willie and Langston University on Hare appears later in this section with the discussion of the characteristics of the colleges and universities where the two groups of social scientists achieved their degrees.

There appears to be nothing common among the advocates of integration or nationalism to suggest that either the region of the country, state, or type or size of the city in which these social scientists were born influenced their ideas. While Frazier and Willie were born in southern states, Maryland and Texas, respectively, Clark was born in the Panama Canal Zone. Hare, Karenga, and Alkalimat were all born in different regions of the

country, different states, and different municipalities, ranging in size from Slick, Oklahoma, a small town of a few hundred people³⁵ to Chicago, Illinois, one of the largest cities in the United States.

The socioeconomic backgrounds of the families of the two groups of social scientists do not appear to provide explanation for their different images/ideas of education. While Frazier's father was a bank messenger; Clark's mother, a dress maker; and Willie's father, a pullman porter and real estate broker; all of which can be classified as working class occupations, Hare's parents were poor farmers; and available sources suggest, based on reasonable and logical speculation that Karenga's and Alkalimat's families could be classified as either working-class or middle-class.

The two groups of social scientists--integrationists and nationalists--do not appear to have earned their bachelor's, master's, and doctoral degrees from colleges and universities with differentiating and common racial compositions or regional locations which could explain the group's contrary beliefs concerning the relative significance of integration and nationalism for the education and success of African Americans. Although Frazier, Clark, and Willie, the three integrationists, earned their bachelor's degrees from predominantly African American colleges and universities, Hare, one of the

nationalists, also received this undergraduate degree from a predominately African American institution. The other two nationalists, Karenga and Alkalimat, received their bachelor's degree from white schools.

One would expect Frazier, Clark, Willie, and Hare to have received their baccalaureate degrees from predominately African American colleges and universities, because each of them had entered and graduated from their respective schools before the implementation of the 1954 ruling by the United States Supreme Court, making racial segregation in public schools unconstitutional.³⁶ Before the Supreme Court's ruling, the vast majority of African American students at the pre-college and undergraduate college levels of education attended segregated schools.

Clark and Willie graduated from master's degree programs at Howard University in Washington, D.C., and Atlanta University in Atlanta, Georgia, respectively, both African American universities; Frazier completed his master's degree studies at Clark University, a predominantly white university in Worcester, Massachusetts. The master's degree was conferred upon the three nationalists, Hare, Karenga, and Alkalimat, by predominantly white universities: Hare and Alkalimat, by the University of Chicago in Chicago, Illinois, and Karenga, by the University of California (UCLA) in Los Angeles, California. All of the scholars, both

integrationists and nationalists, earned their doctorates from predominantly white institutions.

While the schools attended by the advocates of integration and by the supporter of nationalism at all levels of higher education do not appear to have any common or differentiating characteristics that influenced all of the members of each group of scholars to develop contrary positions and ideas, there is evidence to suggest that some of the undergraduate schools where the social scientists received their degrees, might have inspired some of the scholars to develop ideas supportive of racial integration or nationalism, or reinforced their already established ideas, favorable to one or the other positions. For instance, Morehouse College and Langston University, the undergraduate schools of Charles Willie and Nathan Hare, an integrationist and a nationalist, respectively, had professors/personalities who seem to have had some measure of influence on these scholars' adoption and/or development of their respective ideological positions on race relations between African Americans and whites. Willie admired and respected Benjamin Mays, the president of Morehouse College from 1940 through 1967, and president emeritus from 1967 to his death in 1984.³⁷ His perception of Mays was as an "'ideal type'" for African American college presidents. He dedicated his book, Black Colleges in America: Challenges, Development, Survival (1978), which he edited with Ronald

R. Edmonds, to Mays. In this book, in commenting favorably on Mays's philosophy of education, Willie wrote: "Mays define[d] education as a moral experience that motivates one to be concerned about others, especially those who are oppressed and treated unjustly."³⁸

Willie's admiration for Mays as a college president and educator might also have extended to Mays's ideas on race relations, resulting in Willie's being influenced by Mays's views. Mays was a leader in the fight against segregation and actively engaged in the civil rights movement of the 1950s and the 1960s.³⁹ In Black Colleges in America: Challenge, Development, Survival, which Willie, as noted above, dedicated to Mays, Chapter 2 which was titled "The Black College in Higher Education," was a contribution from Mays. In that chapter, Mays, implying that his position on desegregation and integration had not changed from that which he presented in a speech at Livingston College in 1954, shortly after the United States Supreme Court handed down its decision outlawing segregation in public schools, quoted from that speech to restate his position:

I hope to develop the thesis that desegregation and integration are not ends in themselves but means to ends....

We strive to desegregate and integrate America to the ends that this great nation of ours, born in revolution and blood, conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created free and equal will truly become the lighthouse of freedom where none will be denied because his skin is black and none favored because his eyes are blue;

where the nation is militarily strong but at peace; economically secure but just; learned but wise; where the poorest will have a job and bread enough and to spare, and where the richest will understand the meaning of empathy. For if democracy cannot function interracially as well as intraracially in the United States, I fear for its survival in the world.⁴⁰

Although Willie had graduated from Morehouse before 1954 when Mays made this statement, it is reasonable to assume, given Mays's opposition to segregation and Willie's admiration for Mays, that Willie was influenced, while attending Morehouse, to develop ideas supportive of desegregation and integration, or if such ideas were already held, encouraged, intentionally or unintentionally, to maintain them.

It is likely that Langston University in Langston, Oklahoma, Hare's undergraduate alma mater, influenced his development of a "black" consciousness and nationalistic views, which later contributed to his fight for African American Studies programs for the nation's colleges and universities. In 1993, Hare noted that while at Langston, he "came under the influence of two main professors," Dr. Edwin R. Edmonds and Melvin Tolson. Of Dr. Edmonds, a "sociologist...[and] recently Chairman of the Commission on Racial Justice of the United Methodist Church," he stated:

In the first semester of my sophomore year, Dr. Edmonds also taught me introductory anthropology, in which we learned some of the things today's black intellectuals appear to think, and many do think, that they have recently invented. For instance, the properties and implications of melanin, the African origins of civilization and humanity, etc.⁴¹

Describing and expressing his admiration for Melvin Tolson, Hare, who earned his undergraduate degree in sociology, but minored in English, wrote:

Melvin Tolson [was] the great black poet now recognized in elite poetry circles as the most accomplished black poet of all time, though his fame falls short of his eminence. He taught us more about society and blackness than he did English, though he was an incredible master of English and Literature. He probably had more of an intellectual impact on me than anybody else.⁴²

The impact of Langston University on Hare's development of an ideology of African/African American cultural nationalism is also evident in a speech he delivered at that school's "Cultural Renaissance" Rally on August 30, 1975. Hare noted that on March 12, 1897, the Oklahoma "Territorial Legislature decreed that the school that is now Langston University was" established "in or convenient to the town of Langston," a town which "as late as 1890...had been 'the only distinctly black city in America.'"⁴³ Hare surmised that both the white Territorial Legislators and the African American founders of Langston had motives for wanting Langston University located "within a convenient distance from [the town of] Langston."⁴⁴ He explained that since the white Territorial Legislators could "see that [the town of] Langston was isolated thirteen miles from nowhere," they had a "hidden" motive to also isolate Langston University, and felt that by doing so, the school "could at best be a black educational reservation that was too isolated to flourish."⁴⁵ The

motive of "the black founders of the town of Langston" was, in Hare's opinion, the more important one; their motive was "their vision for the black race."⁴⁶ Hare perceived that vision to be the survival of African Americans and the preservation of African American culture.⁴⁷ He implied that Langston's citizens fulfilled that vision by isolating or separating themselves from white people and at the same time, separating whites from themselves. Hare believed that the early citizens of Langston created a university that was "a black cultural island, a black oasis in a white world of trouble."⁴⁸ In 1975, at the time of Langston University's Cultural Renaissance Rally, Hare felt that Langston University continued to be "a black oasis in a confused and decadent society."⁴⁹

Certainly, as Hare stated, he was influenced by Dr. Edwin R. Edmonds and Melvin Tolson, two of his professors at Langston University, who emphasized African Americans' culture, history, and race in their courses, an emphasis which signifies an orientation toward and support of "black nationalism." One can also surmise, based on Hare's speech at Langston University in 1975, that he was probably influenced in his development of a nationalist viewpoint regarding African American-white relations by Langston University's long history and culture of isolation and separation from whites, and freedom from white control and domination.

The membership of Nathan Hare in prestigious, integrated professional organizations does not permit the two groups to be differentiated on the dimension of organizational membership. Nevertheless, it appears evident that Frazier, Clark, and Willie held memberships and were more actively involved in integrated professional organizations and activities than Hare, Karenga, and Alkalimat, whose membership and participation in professional organizations would appear to have as their primary purpose the promotion of unity and pride among African Americans and the liberation of this group from white domination and control, not racial integration and acceptance by their white peers and colleagues. The author assumes that since these social scientists, both the advocates of integration and of nationalism, either founded their own organizations, chose to gain membership in other organizations, and/or participated in activities that promoted their particular perspective on race relations, it was their already established perspectives which influenced their choice of organizations and not the organizations which influenced their different perspectives. In other words, these scholars did not choose integration or nationalism as more beneficial for African Americans because they were persuaded to do so by their respective employers and organizations, but rather because they felt that integration or nationalism was more significant for this

group prior to their becoming founders, members, or employees of their respective institutions, organizations, and associations.

The only dimension that differentiated all members of the group who revealed that desegregation/integration was more significant than segregation/separation/nationalism for African Americans' educational advancement and general progress from all members of the group who held the opposite viewpoint was age/date of birth. All members of the former group were older than all members of the latter group. The advocates of racial integration were born between the 1890s (a decade of brutality and cruelty against African Americans by whites that has, perhaps, been unsurpassed since 1863 when President Abraham Lincoln signed the Emancipation Proclamation for the purpose of freeing African Americans from legal slavery) and the Great Depression of 1929. Those members of the group who argued that some degree of physical and/or cultural separation from whites was necessary for African Americans to develop unity and pride among themselves and that this development was more important than racial integration were born after the Great Depression and before the end of World War II. The difference between the ages of the scholars in the two groups suggests, and this study assumes, that age/date of birth is related to the scholars' contrary positions and ideas on the significance of racial integration and

nationalism for the educational, as well as the overall, advancement of African American youths. While there is an assumption here that age/date of birth is related to the ideological differences on race relations between members of the two groups, there is also an assumption that age/date of birth is not the only, and perhaps, not even the primary, factor related to the difference between the positions and ideas of Charles Willie and Nathan Hare. This assumption is based on the fact that the former is only six years older than the latter, making these two scholars contemporaries, and the undergraduate schools they attended probably encouraged/influenced them to embrace their respective ideological positions of racial integration and "black nationalism." The following section analyzes age/date of birth as the differentiating characteristic of the two groups.

Interpretation of the Differentiating Characteristics: A Sociological Explanation

Social Scientists Who Chose Desegregation/Integration

As noted above, E. Franklin Frazier, Kenneth Clark, and Charles Willie, the desegregationists/integrationists in this study, were born between the middle 1890s and the beginning of the Great Depression in 1929, making each of them older than Nathan Hare, Maulana Karenga, and Abdul Alkalimat, the nationalist scholars. The integrationists reached adulthood and completed their formal education,

including the doctorate earned by Willie, by 1957. This span of years--between Frazier's birth and Willie's earning a doctorate--corresponds roughly with two prominent United States Supreme Court rulings: Plessy v. Ferguson in 1896 and Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka in 1954. Both decisions had a major impact on race relations in the United States. The Plessy v. Ferguson decision sanctioned racial separation and is known as the "separate but equal" doctrine.⁵⁰ This doctrine actually enforced separate and inferior facilities and treatment for African Americans.⁵¹ In the Brown v. Board of Education case, the Court ruled that racially segregated schools were unconstitutional and inherently unequal. In effect, the Brown decision overturned the separate but equal doctrine of the Plessy v. Ferguson case.⁵²

During this period--from the middle 1890s to the middle 1950s--and, in fact, from the beginning of Reconstruction in the 1860s to the end of the Civil Rights Movement in the 1960s, the underlying sentiment that informed the beliefs, and where possible the practices, of the majority of African Americans relative to race relations was desegregation and/or integration.⁵³ In other words, over that period of approximately a century, the dominant ethos in race relations for African Americans was desegregation/integration.

Various sources have noted an ethos of

desegregation/integration among African Americans during that one hundred years duration. For example, in Long Memory: The Black Experience in America, Mary Francis Berry and John Blassingame, historians, noted that the refrain that "segregation is not equality" and that "the very assignment of certain schools to certain children on the ground of color...is a distinct violation of the first principle of equality" continued in the African American community from the late 1860s until the 1970s.⁵⁴ James D. Anderson in The Education of Blacks in the South, 1860-1935, reported, as revealed in the discussion of Frazier, Clark, and Willie in Chapter 6 of this text, that from the end of Reconstruction to the 1954 Brown v. Board of Education decision and beyond, the dominant ideology among African Americans was desegregation/integration; the majority of African Americans rejected racial segregation both as it was imposed by whites and as it was accepted and promoted by accommodating statements and actions of African Americans, such as Booker T. Washington, the prominent educator.⁵⁵ Kenneth Clark, in the introduction to Black Separatism: A Bibliography by Betty Lanier Jenkins and Susan Phillis, explained that in 1969, he and a small group of African American writers, social scientists, and public officials, all prominent and established people in their respective fields and who "shared the conviction that racial integration was essential to racial progress and

justice in America," met for the first time at Haverford College in Pennsylvania to discuss "the precipitous rise of black separatist thought and activity among Negro college students"/"the changing role of the Negro intellectual."⁵⁶ Writing in Red, Black, and Green : Black Nationalism in the United States in 1976, Alphonso Pinkney stated: "It might be said that integration was the dominant ethos of the black movement between 1930 and 1965."⁵⁷

The dominance of the ethos of desegregation/integration during the time that Frazier, Clark, and Willie were born, reared, and educated, and developed ideas about African Americans' education and success is assumed to have influenced them to believe that desegregation and/or integration were necessary for equality of education and life chances for African Americans and to promote that belief. Apparently, the strong sentiment for desegregation/integration in the African American community was in large part responsible for these scholars' adoption of an ideology of desegregation/integration.

While it is evident that the ethos of desegregation/integration was the dominant one for these integrationists, it changed to one of nationalism among young African Americans, particularly African American scholars, in the 1960s, or certainly by 1970.⁵⁸ That was the time when Nathan Hare, Maulana Karenga, and Abdul

Alkalimat, the younger group of scholars in this study, advocated and promoted nationalism as the means by which African Americans could gain freedom from white control and achieve equality in the United States. We turn, now, to a discussion of that younger group of scholars.

Social Scientists Who Chose Segregation/Separation/Nationalism

Although Hare, Karenga, and Alkalimat, the younger group of social scientists and those who believed that nationalism was more significant than desegregation or integration for African Americans' education and life chances, were born when the dominant ethos among African Americans was integration (between the beginning of the Great Depression in 1929 and the end of World War II in 1945), they were, unlike Frazier, Clark, and Willie, college/university students in the 1950s and/or 1960s, when nationalist sentiments/nationalism began to grow, then challenge, and, by the latter half of the 1960s, replace desegregation/integration as that race's dominant ethos.⁵⁹ The change in the dominant ethos among African Americans during the decade of the 1960s probably influenced the views of each member of this younger group of social scientists (even those of Hare, who, as reported earlier in this chapter, was evidently affected by the advice and instruction of some of his professors and his experiences at Langston University (his undergraduate alma mater) to

adopt and/or promote an ideology of nationalism/separation.

Although the ethos of nationalism among African Americans did not supplant the ethos of desegregation/integration until the latter half of the 1960s,⁶⁰ the condition, events, and circumstances which apparently had some impact on that change and can explain it, in large part, began earlier, some probably before the middle of the century.⁶¹ Based on the views of John Herbers in his discussion of the emergence of "Black Power" in The Black Dilemma (1973), it appears that the transformation in the African American ethos from desegregation/integration to nationalism can be explained by three things: (1) the social and economic conditions of African Americans from before mid-century to 1965, (2) the limitations of the nonviolent movement, which was a central part of the integration effort of the 1950s and 1960s, and (3) the experience of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC), an organization of college/university students which underwent a radical transformation from one which demanded integration and practiced nonviolence in the first half of the 1960s to one which promoted nationalism and insisted on separation to some degree by the beginning of the second half of that decade.⁶²

Regarding the social and economic conditions of African Americans, Herbers explained that over the decades prior to the "Black Power," "Black Nationalism," "Black

Studies" movements of the middle and late 1960s, African Americans had migrated in large numbers from the South to the cities of the North. In part, this migration occurred, because in the South, "mechanization and mass production on the farms replaced sharecroppers and the family farm" and in the North, "there was some promise of employment."⁶³ Herbers noted that those migrants were not likely to gain employment in the Northern cities, however, since they did not have the training and education required for work in the cities. Instead, without employment and a means of survival, those families would obtain welfare, and the male members "would drift away and be drawn into crime and delinquency."⁶⁴

According to Herbers, by 1950, there were fewer unskilled jobs that African Americans who had migrated to the urban cities of the North could have performed. Those types of jobs, which had sustained white immigrant minorities, had been eliminated by mechanization. The trade unions, which had been open to a large number of whites and had been a means for their upward mobility, were closed to African Americans. "The inner city" where the majority of the African Americans lived was becoming increasingly "economically depressed" as whites fled to the suburbs, taking "much of the economy with them."⁶⁵

Between 1955 and 1957, of the experienced African American workers, slightly over two in ten (22 percent) did

not have a job at some time during that period. In the years from 1961 through 1963, that proportion had risen to nearly three in ten (29 percent). In these early years of the 1960s, it appears that African Americans, generally, had concluded that whites in the United States would not allow them to receive equal status and opportunity, resulting in their feeling, expressing, and exhibiting indignant displeasure toward white people. C. Eric Lincoln, an African American historian, expressed this viewpoint in 1961 in The Black Muslims in America, when he wrote:

There is general agreement among American Negroes...that the white man has failed to demonstrate any real capacity for genuine brotherhood and equal justice. There is a widespread belief that the white man will never of his own accord accept nonwhites as his equals in status or opportunity, in America or elsewhere. There is surprisingly broad conviction that...the white man has deliberately "written the Negro out of history," refusing to recognize the Black Man's contribution to the great Afro-Asian civilization and, especially, to the development of America....Of this cultural snub, whether intentional or not, [the African American] is increasingly resentful.⁶⁶

The depressing unemployment rate for African Americans continued through the first half of the 1960s. By 1965, the unemployment rate for African Americans, as expressed by President Lyndon Johnson in an address at Howard University in Washington, D.C. in June of that year, was twice the rate for whites, whereas thirty-five years earlier, at the time of the Great Depression, the unemployment rate was about the same for the two races.⁶⁷

The limitations of the nonviolent movement, the second thing which apparently influenced the change from an ethos of desegregation/integration to one of nationalism among African Americans, consisted, primarily, of that movement's inability to organize African Americans in the North, as it had in the South; to gain and maintain the support and loyalty of members of this group in the Northern region of the nation, as it had in the Southern region; and to retain its effectiveness, even in the South.⁶⁸ In noting the limitations of the nonviolent movement, Herbers (1973) wrote:

It was rarely effective outside the South. In that region the religious beliefs and traditions, which most Negroes shared, sustained the kind of dedication and self-sacrifice needed for large-scale nonviolent actions. In virtually every community, the movement was organized around the church. And hope and redemptive love was always present.⁶⁹

In the Northern cities, where African Americans had settled in large numbers throughout most of the previous decades of the twentieth century, after migrating from the South, there was a vastly different social structure than that which existed in the South. According to Herbers (1973), that structure was not conducive to the organization of a mass of African Americans into a nonviolent movement. He explained that the difficulty in organizing African Americans in Northern cities into a mass, nonviolent movement was due to that group being divided into many diverse factions, to the weaker and less

viable religious tradition among African Americans in the North, to the less visible targets of the movement, to the more subtle discrimination which had not often been protected by law, and to the impersonal nature and unresponsiveness of big cities.⁷⁰

By the middle of the 1960s, as Herbers noted, the nonviolent movement had lost much of its effectiveness, even in the South.⁷¹ Herbers identified three changes in the nation which contributed to the greatly reduced effectiveness of the nonviolent movement in the South. One, during the 1950s and 1960s, national laws and Supreme Court decisions removed most of the legal restrictions on African Americans. Those legal barriers were the central target of the movement, and in effect, the primary reasons for its strength and effectiveness. Two, Southern officials learned not to strengthen the movement by blatantly opposing and brutally attacking nonviolent protesters in a manner symbolized by James Clark, Sheriff of Selma, Alabama, and Eugene (Bull) Connor, Police Chief of Birmingham, Alabama. Three, the Vietnam War began in 1965, resulting in a reduction in funds for domestic programs that were vital to poor African Americans. Many of the nonviolent movement's workers left it to protest the war.⁷²

The experiences of SNCC is the third important condition in explaining how the ethos for African Americans

changed from desegregation/integration to nationalism/separation. This organization of students is perhaps the most critical of the civil rights organizations for gaining an understanding of this change in ethos due to its radical ideological transformation from integration, with its technique of nonviolence as a strategy and as a response to attacks by whites, in the early 1960s, to nationalism, with its technique of fighting back against such treatment, in 1966 and beyond.⁷³

SNCC was organized in the early 1960s by civil rights leaders, including Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., to give young people, who wanted to participate in the civil rights movement, a vehicle for participation in several kinds of protests. At first, it was an integrated and nonviolent organization. The organizations's field workers were dedicated youths who lived among the people whom they tried to help, receiving only a small allowance for their work.⁷⁴

"In the early 1960s, SNCC became the cutting edge of the nonviolent movement,"⁷⁵ Herbers asserted. Many of the participants in the big-city crusaders led by King and others were supplied by SNCC. Not only did members of SNCC participate in the demonstrations and protest that occurred in the major cities, but they were also the first to go into "the rural areas of the South, where the resistance was strongest, the organizing most difficult, and the physical danger the greatest."⁷⁶ Herbers noted that while

John Lewis, then president of SNCC, and other members, such as James Farmer, Stokely Carmichael, Ivanhoe Donaldson, and Bob Moses were often beaten "without benefit of ceremony or publicity" in the rural towns of the South, with Lewis probably holding "the record...for having been beaten more than anyone else in the movement," some of the other civil rights leaders with higher name recognition and prominence, "were appearing on national television."⁷⁷ In Herbers view, in the early years of the 1960s, even while undergoing this harsh treatment from whites, members of SNCC had not lost faith in America.⁷⁸

In 1964, SNCC undertook the Mississippi Summer Project; its major effort was to help African Americans in the state of Mississippi achieve full equality with whites. Herbers reported that the project was organized by Bob Moses, an African American mathematics teacher from Harlem, who had gone South and helped bring the civil rights movement to several rural areas. "The project was ambitious, idealistic, and was set up with all of the nonviolent movement's faith in a shared society," noted Herbers.⁷⁹ Moses recruited hundreds of students to work on the project. Their activities consisted of teaching in freedom schools, conducting voter registration drives, building community centers, setting up health clinics, establishing African American cooperatives, providing legal assistance, staffing day-care centers, and conducting free

theater.⁸⁰

For all persons involved in the project, there was the continually present threat of death, injury, and arrest. Several of the youths who were recruited for the project and African Americans in Mississippi suffered violent deaths. Of the persons who were murdered, perhaps the ones receiving the most notoriety were Michael Schwerner, Andrew Goodman, and James Chaney, three youths--two white and one African American--who were kidnapped and killed on the opening day of the project. Injuries to persons involved in the project numbered into the scores and arrests into the hundreds.⁸¹

In Herbers's view, even with the high level of violence and intimidation against members of the Mississippi Summer Project by whites in Mississippi, in some ways, the project could be seen as a success. It attracted the attention of the nation, gave SNCC additional national support and prestige, and increased the probability of further civil rights advancement in Mississippi.⁸²

As reported by Herbers, notwithstanding these seemingly positive effects of the Mississippi Summer Project, SNCC was not fully satisfied with the project's results. It had attracted persons with many different ideologies and some of the literature and teachings of those "of the New Left" ideology were introduced into the

freedom schools. The local African American leaders were displeased with this activity. They felt that the African American "protest should be made, for practical reasons, only within the framework of traditional American democracy."⁸³ This difference among African American leaders created a division. SNCC perceived the division to be a foreboding one.⁸⁴

Many African American leaders also felt that whites had played too large a role in the Mississippi Summer Project. Although an African American, Bob Moses, organized the project, recruited people to work in it, and directed it, whites had virtually taken control of some areas.⁸⁵ This circumstance created in African Americans throughout the civil rights movement a new racial awareness. Of this new awareness, Herbers wrote:

There was a new awareness throughout the movement of the need for blacks to find their own identity and manage their own affairs, and the presence of white organization and management was considered by some black leaders to be a new form of "colonialism."⁸⁶

Herbers noted that in 1964, the same year that SNCC organized the Mississippi Summer Project, it also founded the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party. The aim of the Freedom Party was "to extend the ballot to blacks, who had been barred from the polls for generations."⁸⁷ The Freedom Party trained African Americans in the process of voting and demonstrated how they had been denied political representation. In addition, at the Democratic National

Convention in Atlantic City, New Jersey, the Freedom Party challenged the regular Mississippi delegation for the state's seats. The Freedom Party argued that the regular delegates, who represented the established Mississippi party, held their positions by not permitting African Americans to participate in that party.⁸⁸

The Convention's credentials committee offered a compromise that was approved by the White House under President Lyndon Johnson, but criticized by the leaders of SNCC.⁸⁹ Describing the compromise, Herbers (1973) wrote:

The compromise would have required that the regulars take the loyalty oath in support of the national platform and candidates, that two delegates from the Freedom Democrats be seated with the regulars, and steps be taken to assure that thereafter the state party process would be open to all eligible regardless of race.⁹⁰

Herbers saw this compromise as an effort by the national Democratic Party "to achieve a traditional political solution that would retain both black and white support for the Democrats in Mississippi."⁹¹

For SNCC leaders, who believed that they had shown the Mississippi regular party to be "racist and corrupt," the compromise, which allowed that party to retain most of its power, was an outrage. Herbers explained that Stokely Carmichael and Charles V. Hamilton wrote three years later in Black Power, the Politics of Liberation that the Freedom Party's experience with the Mississippi regulars, the national Democrats, and the White House did not merely

demonstrate that there was a generally unreliable national conscience, but specifically, that African Americans in Mississippi and elsewhere in the United States could not rely on white people, even those who were called, and were supposed to be, allies.⁹²

In 1965, African Americans were further dismayed by actions of the national government. According to Herbers, at mid-summer of that year, President Johnson "announced the first large commitment of resources and manpower to the war in Vietnam."⁹³ Johnson made that commitment despite a speech that he had given earlier on June 4 at Howard University, the historically/predominantly African American institution in Washington, D.C., in which he called "for a renewed national effort to help blacks secure those rights promised them by law."⁹⁴ It soon became apparent, however, as President Johnson's attention, the government's best talent, and the billions of dollars that African American leaders anticipated for social programs were diverted to the war in Vietnam, that winning the war, not African Americans' rights and welfare, was the higher priority of Johnson and his administration. African American leaders, both moderates and militants, were also dissatisfied with the Johnson administration for what they perceived as its failure to enthusiastically enforce the new civil rights laws; one such law was the provision of the 1964 Civil Rights Act that banned racial discrimination in any program

assisted by the federal government.⁹⁵

At the same time that the Johnson administration was directing the government's attention, resources, and manpower to the war in Southeast Asia and being cautious, generally, in its enforcement of civil rights laws, but also as the Justice Department was beginning to enforce the Voting Rights Act of 1965, which promised political power to the large mass of African Americans in the South, violence was breaking out in the Watts section of Los Angeles and in the economically depressed areas of many other cities outside the South.⁹⁶ According to Herbers (1973), the riots had an influence, both on the nation and on African American leaders. He noted that even the moderate civil rights leaders, including those who had participated in the nonviolent movement, acknowledged that although the nonviolent movement had achieved much in the South, it had done little to change the conditions of African Americans in the urban economically depressed areas of the North.⁹⁷

By the summer of 1966, Stokely Carmichael, then the Chairman of SNCC, and other young African American leaders, began chanting "Black Power" while participating in marches through the South.⁹⁸ The slogan as defined later by the SNCC leadership called for whites to withdraw from the organization and for African Americans, as "'exploited colonials,'" to become nationalists. SNCC believed that

African Americans "should develop their own businesses, cooperatives, and power bases."⁹⁹ It abandoned the technique of nonviolence and advised African Americans to fight against whites who attacked them.¹⁰⁰ During that summer, the NAACP and the Urban League continued with nonviolence and integration, but CORE, like SNCC, rejected these and became a nationalist/separatist organization.¹⁰¹

These are the events and circumstances which define the transformation of SNCC from an organization with an ideology of integration in the early years of the 1960s to one with an ideology of nationalism in the latter half of that decade. They also define, to a large degree, the change from a dominant ethos of integration, which had existed and informed the ideas and attitudes of African Americans from at least the end of Reconstruction (1877) to the middle of the 1960s, to a dominant ethos of nationalism in the latter half of the 1960s and in the 1970s. It is that ethos of nationalism among African Americans in the 1960s and 1970s, particularly among college students and young faculty, which apparently directed the beliefs and behaviors of many of them. Evidently, it had an influence on Nathan Hare, Maulana Karenga, and Abdul Alkalimat, who were attending and/or teaching in colleges and universities as nationalism became the dominant ethos for young African American scholars and intellectuals, leading them to adopt, advocate, and promote nationalism as more critical than

desegregation/integration for African Americans' education and success.

The two previous discussions--the first of an older group of social scientists, who chose desegregation/integration as more critical than separation/nationalism for African Americans' education and life chances, and the second of a younger group of scholars who chose the contrary position--leads this writer to conclude that both the older and younger groups of African American scholars were affected by the contemporary, prevalent, and dominant ethos among African Americans. Apparently, the ethos which was prevalent in the lives of these two groups of scholars--desegregation/integration for the older group and separation/nationalism for the younger group--determined their respective ideological choices of integration or nationalism as more important for the advancement of African Americans, including improvement in their education and their race.

Author's Comments

In Chapter 6, E. Franklin Frazier, Kenneth Clark, and Charles Willie were unequivocal in their insistence that integration was necessary and that segregation or separation was detrimental to African Americans' education and life chances. Chapter 7 revealed that Nathan Hare, Maulana Karenga, and Abdul Alkalimat, a younger group of scholars/intellectuals and nationalists, who became

prominent in the 1960s and 1970s, believed that cultural separation from whites was unavoidably necessary and physical separation could be beneficial for African Americans to gain equality in education and in all other institutions and areas of life in the United States. These younger scholars encouraged African Americans to adopt a nationalistic point of view and criticized integration. Although critical of integration, they did not propose or demand its absolute and permanent rejection. Their contention was that African Americans should first integrate with themselves, which included gaining a certain degree of unity and pride among members of their own racial group; taking control of their own minds; and managing, owning, and controlling their own organizations and institutions, before giving any consideration to integrating with whites.

The position which I hold on the relative advantage or disadvantage of desegregation/integration for African Americans' education and life chances when compared with segregation/separation/nationalism is that a society or setting of either type can be helpful or harmful to African Americans. This position, which might suggest or signify some degree of equivocation, emanates from a belief that both integration and separatism can be beneficial or detrimental to African Americans.

Not Integration or Separation
But Equality and Liberation

There is nothing inherently helpful or harmful in either integration or separatism. The benefit which African Americans derive from either integration or separation is dependent on the degree to which it facilitates African Americans' equality and liberation, that is, makes easier or less difficult their mental and physical independence from white influence and control. It seems to me, therefore, that to argue for or against racial integration or racial separation would obscure more critical issues and would not be a significant contribution or benefit to anyone--not to African Americans, not to whites, and, certainly, not to the author.

The premise that choosing between integration and separation would not be helpful to African Americans appears to be similar to that espoused by Lerone Bennett, Jr., the African American historian, as recounted by John Herbers in The Black Dilemma (1973), from an article by Bennett in the August 1970 issue of Ebony magazine. Bennett felt that the real issue for African Americans was not integration or separation but liberation.¹⁰² According to Herbers, Bennett maintained that "trying to decide between integration and separation was 'abstract, false and diversionary.'"¹⁰³

From Bennett's perspective, both the integrationists' and the separatists' philosophies were inadequate. He

concluded, therefore, that African Americans needed a philosophy of liberation that rose above integration and separation. As quoted by Herbers, Bennett wrote:

The philosophy of liberation calls for a transcendence of the either/or dilemma which has had such a disastrous impact on African-American policy. The liberationist concedes the power of the integrationist's dream but points out that black power is necessary to accomplish it. He concedes the desirability of some African-Americans returning to Africa but says that most African-Americans are going to triumph or die here. He estimates there are more than 100 million people of African descent in the New World; and he says that the historical task of these people, who can never go home again en masse, is to link up with the Indians, the disadvantaged and the alienated and assimilate instead of being assimilated....If every African takes care of business where he is, then every place will be a correct place for Africans.¹⁰⁴

Further comments here are not intended to present, support, or analyze Bennett's philosophy of liberation. Rather, the focus is on the motivation for my decision not to choose between integration and separation. It is possible, even probable, however, that in this process, some elements of Bennett's liberation philosophy will emerge.

Beliefs Which Inform My Views

The decision not to choose between integration and separation is informed by three beliefs. One belief is that there is no necessary opposition between integration and separation. A second belief is that both integration and separation have been both beneficial and detrimental to African Americans' education and progress and, actually or

potentially, continues to represent these different possibilities. The third belief which has guided my decision is that the primary concern for African Americans regarding race relations in the United States is not the degree to which there is integration or separation, but the degree to which there is both the absence of interracial discrimination and the presence of intraracial nationalism. By intraracial nationalism, I mean the acquisition and exercise of authentic pride, unity, and power--political, economic, social, and so on--by a racial group for the advancement of that group. In other words, the achievement of equality and liberation by African Americans in education and other areas will be determined more by whether they are discriminated against by whites and by whether they can effectuate a nationalistic point of view among themselves than by whether they live in a racially integrated or separated setting or society. The social environment in which African Americans can achieve educational and total equality and liberation, or at least move substantially further in that direction, is one which will allow them to both avoid or defeat discrimination by whites and foster pride, unity, and power among themselves. Such an environment can be one of racial integration or racial separation.

What I Mean By Racial Separation/Segregation

It should be noted that the kinds of racial

separatism which I support are cultural separation or autonomy and voluntary separation. I strongly reject enforced segregation/separation, either by the government, groups, or individuals. This type of racial separation was the nature of race relations, and the preference of the vast majority of white Americans, during slavery and continuing, generally, to the Supreme Court's school desegregation ruling in 1954. For African Americans, disastrous consequences ensued from enforced racial separation. Whites, the majority group, supported and assisted by the United States government, ascribed to African Americans, the minority group, an inferior status and imposed inhumane treatment on them, brutalizing their bodies and damaging their spirits. A return to legally sanctioned racial segregation would not, in my view, be beneficial to African Americans or to the nation. Also, I do not believe that physical separation, as represented by the occasional back-to-Africa movements¹⁰⁵ and by black nationalists' demands for a state or large area of land from the United States government for African Americans to inhabit,¹⁰⁶ is a feasible option. It seems to me that any effort to transport African Americans en masse to Africa or to acquire land from the United States government in sufficient quantity and with adequate resources for the needs of the entire African American population as a means of resolving the race relations problems in the United

States, has been in the past, is at the present time, and will likely be in the foreseeable future, an unrealistic and ineffective one for most African Americans. I must emphasize, however, that I am in support of the United States government providing reparations to African Americans for the oppression that they have endured and the opportunities that they have been denied by that government, and reparations can not be seriously discussed unless the provision of land is a consideration.

Integration and Separation Are Not Necessarily In Opposition

My first belief--that integration and separation do not necessarily have to be in opposition in American society--corresponds with the point of view of Paul Kurtz in the preface to The Black Man in America: Integration and Separation (1971), which was edited by James A. Moss. In answering his own question of whether there was a "necessary opposition...between integration and black power, or integration and separation," Kurtz wrote:

One answer is that a democratic society should allow for both the ideals of integration and separation--defined as cultural autonomy--to flourish. All those who wish to live in an integrated open society without discrimination--whether Italians, Hungarians, Episcopalians, Mexicans, Irish, Jews, Indians, blacks, or humanists--should be permitted to do so, but those who wish cultural, religious, ethnic, or racial autonomy should be granted freedom of choice. The key point, however, is that the black man recognizes that he is impotent unless he has economic, political, and social power, unless he can control his own destiny, and unless he has autonomy in choosing how he shall

live.¹⁰⁷

I believe, as Kurtz, that a democratic society should, and can, allow for the ideals of integration and separation/autonomy; a central issue is whether or not there is discrimination.

Both Integration and Separation Can Be Both Beneficial and Detrimental

My second belief, which is that both the systems of integration and separation have been and have the potential to be, both helpful and harmful to the education and life chances of African Americans, finds support among African American scholars.

Beneficial Effects of Desegregation/Integration

In reference to integration, Charles Willie, as noted in Chapter 6, reported some of its positive effects, both for African Americans and all Americans.¹⁰⁸ According to Willie, school desegregation was responsible, in large part, for the narrowing of the difference in median school years between African Americans and white students, from nearly three median years in 1950 to less than one median year in 1980.¹⁰⁹ Writing on the future of school desegregation in 1991, Willie proposed that among the direct benefits of school desegregation to African American students were a reduction in African American students' dropout rate and an increase in their graduation rate.¹¹⁰ The benefits which Willie believes African American

students (and white students as well) have derived, and will continue to derive, from the school desegregation movement, with "its spirit of inclusiveness," have led him to call it "the greatest contribution in this century to educational reform" and to advocate its continuation.¹¹¹

W.E.B. DuBois, although forcefully arguing in the Crisis in 1935 that segregated schools were necessary for African American students, due to their greater effectiveness than mixed schools in teaching African American students and to the refusal of white Americans to accept racial integration or to adequately educate African American children, indicated that integrated schools might potentially be the more beneficial ones for African Americans, if African Americans and whites were equal as citizens. DuBois wrote:

Other things being equal, the mixed school is the broader, more natural basis for the education of all youth. It gives wider contacts; it inspires greater self-confidence; and suppresses the inferiority complex. But other things seldom are equal, and in that case Sympathy, Knowledge, and the Truth, outweigh all that the mixed school can offer.¹¹²

A comment by Gerald Anthony Foster, an African American and a university administrator and professor, in "The Ills of Integration: A Black Perspective," a chapter in Dream and Reality: The Modern Black Struggle for Freedom and Equality, a book edited by Jeannine Swift and published in 1991, suggests that at the present time African American scholars, even those who, like Foster,

have been critical of integration and believe that integration has cost African Americans too much in lost pride, patronage, and self-confidence, recognize and acknowledge that African Americans have made political, economic, and social progress in the present era of integration.¹¹³ Foster stated:

More than twenty-five years after the historic March on Washington there is little disagreement regarding the widespread progress blacks have made in this country in terms of narrowing the gap between themselves and their white counterparts in social, economic, and political arenas.¹¹⁴

The statements by these African American scholars suggests that desegregation and integration can be beneficial to African American students and non-students, in education and other areas.

Detrimental Effects of Desegregation/Integration

African American social scientists have also noted some detrimental effects of desegregation and integration. In the late 1960s and early 1970s, Nathan Hare, Maulana Karenga, and Abdul Alkalimat felt that integration would weaken, not strengthen, the African American Community (see chapter 7). To use Hare's description, integration to these scholars meant "disintegration." In their view, efforts by African Americans to integrate with whites was unwise and harmful until after African Americans had integrated with themselves.

During the 1930s, when DuBois insisted on racially

separate schools for African American students but, at the same time, welcomed a "time when racial animosities and class lines [would] be so obliterated that separate schools [would] be anachronisms," he gave this disparaging assessment of the usefulness of integrated schools for African American students:

I know that race prejudice in the United States today is such that most Negroes cannot receive proper education in white institutions. If the public schools of Atlanta, Nashville, New Orleans, and Jacksonville were thrown open to all races tomorrow, the education that colored children would get in them would be worse than pitiable. It would not be education. And in the same way, there are many public school systems in the North where Negroes are admitted and tolerated, but they are not educated; they are crucified.¹¹⁵

It should be noted that DuBois believed that the object of education for African Americans and, in fact, for all people, was not to develop workers or money-makers, but men. Writing on the object of education in 1903, DuBois stated:

If we make money the object of man-training, we shall develop money-makers but not necessarily men; if we make technical skill the object of education, we may possess artisans but not, in nature, men. Men we shall have only as we make manhood the object of the work of the schools--intelligence, broad sympathy, knowledge of the world that was and is, and of the relation of men to it--this is the curriculum of that Higher Education which must underlie true life. On this foundation, we may build bread winning, skill of hand and quickness of brain, with never a fear less the child and man mistake the means of living for the object of life.¹¹⁶

A third of a century later (1935), DuBois, arguing that success for African Americans in industry and in life would

occur only if they developed "intelligent leadership and far-reaching ideals," reiterated that the "object of education...was not 'to make men artisans but to make artisans men.'"¹¹⁷ It is apparent, based on his views of the role and responsibility of the African American college and university, that DuBois believed that the development of African American men--intelligent men, broadly sympathetic men, knowledgeable men of the history of the world and its peoples--included teaching them to be conscious of their race and of their history and culture.¹¹⁸

In DuBois's opinion, not only did African American students receive an improper and inappropriate education in integrated public schools, but also in white colleges and universities, those in which they were allowed to enroll in the middle 1930s. Among those institutions of higher education which he identified as not providing an adequate education for African Americans were some of the nation's most prestigious ones: Harvard, Yale, Columbia, and the University of Chicago.¹¹⁹

Like DuBois, Foster, in "The Ills of Integration: A Black Perspective," discussed the detrimental effects of desegregation/integration in both the American society and education, his critique of desegregation and integration Foster seems to be in agreement with the assessment of integration found in the writings of Hare, Karenga, and Alkalimat--that for African Americans, integration means

disintegration. He complains:

...[T]he cost of desegregation and integration was much too high in that it has drained the black community's vitality that historically sustained its black families in the worst of times. Central to that vitality was a sense of black pride and black patronage, both of which seem absent today. In the great push for integration and assimilation blacks have all but lost that which was so important to the race for hundreds of years, a positive sense of self in relation to the external environment.¹²⁰

Foster contended that desegregation and integration weakened rather than strengthened the African American community by causing African Americans "to venture into a hostile white world that from the outset had no intention of truly pursuing and supporting racial integration."¹²¹ For Foster, "integration in large part has proven to be the bane of black life in America today."¹²²

Foster cited Nancy Levi Arnez's book, The Struggle for Equality of Educational Opportunity (1970), to identify what he felt were "perhaps the most devastating effects of the attempts at integration."¹²³ Utilizing information obtained from a National Education Association (N.E.A.) Task Force Survey conducted in 75 school districts in Louisiana and Mississippi during the months of January and February of 1970, and presented in a report entitled School Desegregation: Louisiana and Mississippi, Arnez reported that the African American principals were demoted to administrative assistants and classroom teachers in disproportionately large numbers. She stated that African American principals were dismissed on fabricated charges or

for insufficient knowledge of teaching, in spite of the fact that the majority of the African American principals had higher academic qualifications than the white ones.¹²⁴ Foster quoted Arnez as having concluded that African Americans lost 31,000 or more teaching and administration jobs in the South "through dismissals, demotions, or displacements," resulting in an estimated loss of approximately "\$200 million" to the African American community.¹²⁵

Beneficial Effects of Separation

Karenga, Alkalimat, DuBois, and Foster, whose ideas on the harmful impact of integration/desegregation on education and progress are presented above, imply in their views that some degree of racial separation would benefit African Americans, students and others; that they would receive a more effective and appropriate education, gain a greater and healthier sense of pride in themselves and in their race, increase their self-confidence, and achieve unity among themselves. In the 1930s, DuBois addressed these themes in an article entitled, "A Negro Nation Within the Nation," which was written in support of racial separation in education and in the society, generally, and based on a perception that racial separation was the most prudent and beneficial approach to race relations for African Americans in an already intractable system of racial segregation.¹²⁶

Commenting specifically on education, DuBois stated:

Control of their [African American's] own education, which is the logical and inevitable end of separate schools, would not be an unmixed ill; it might prove a supreme good. Negro schools once meant poor schools. They need not today; they must not tomorrow.¹²⁷

Referring to racial segregation, generally, he wrote: "Separate Negro sections will increase race antagonism, but they will also increase economic cooperation, organized self-defense and necessary self-confidence."¹²⁸

DuBois's position on the positive effects of racial separation is further explicated in his suggestion that African Americans establish organizations, such as African American schools, churches, and retail businesses, which had "logical and reasonable standards" and which attracted that group's "finest, most vigorous, and best educated" people.¹²⁹ DuBois was convinced that if African Americans accomplished these things, more and more of them would come to understand that they might,

through voluntary and increased segregation [and] by careful autonomy and planned economic organization[,]...build so strong and efficient a unit that [the entire African American population could] no longer be refused fellowship and equality in the United States.¹³⁰

Detrimental Effects of Separation

While some African American scholars/intellectuals have argued that racial separation in schools and in the general American society could be beneficial to African American students and the entire African American community, others have viewed racial separation/segregation

and, possibly, cultural autonomy as having a detrimental effect on this group. I do not attempt to determine or infer the degree to which African American scholars accept or reject autonomy--thought of here as ownership, management, and control of their own political, economic, and social institutions, including education which stresses African and African American culture and history, racial pride, and racial unity.

Kenneth Clark, the noted African American psychologist, opposed racial segregation of any kind, whether it was initiated by African Americans or whites.¹³¹ In opposing the demand by African American college/university students for racially separate facilities during the "Black Power Movement" of the late 1960s and early 1970s, Clark argued that America's system of racial segregation had influenced African American students to develop "racial insecurities."¹³² According to Clark, African American students' insistence on separate facilities reflected both their "personal and collective insecurities," among which were the "fear of rejection...and ...[the] fear of competing with whites."¹³³ Even DuBois, who had a more nationalistic viewpoint, felt that enforced racial segregation caused African Americans to develop an inferiority complex and to lose self-confidence.¹³⁴

In the opinion of Martin Luther King, Jr., as

expressed in his book, Stride Toward Freedom: The Montgomery Story (1958), racial segregation had instilled in the African American citizens of Montgomery, Alabama, a "corroding sense of inferiority, which often expressed itself in a lack of self-respect."¹³⁵ Continuing his analysis of the destructive nature of segregation, King wrote:

It not only harms one physically but injures one spiritually. It scars the soul and degrades the personality. It inflicts the segregated with a false sense of inferiority, while confirming the segregator in a false estimate of his own superiority. It is a system which forever stares the segregated in the face, saying: "You are less than..." "You are not equal to..."¹³⁶

Half a decade later (1963) in his "Letter from Birmingham Jail," King discussed the damage which segregation inflicted upon African Americans.¹³⁷ King explained that under segregation, African Americans were lynched and drowned by vicious mobs; cursed, kicked, and killed by "hate-filled policemen"; consigned and confined, in the greater portion, to "smothering in an airtight cage of poverty in the midst of an affluent society"; forced to construct or concoct logical and sensible answers for children who asked why they could not attend public facilities or why white people were so mean to African Americans; humiliated by signs "reading 'white' and 'colored'"; mortified by being called "nigger" as a first name, "boy" as a middle name, and "John" as a last name; plagued with constant inner fears and outer resentments

against whites; and required to continually fight "a degenerating sense of 'nobodiness.'" ¹³⁸

Of segregation laws, King declared:

All segregation statutes are unjust because segregation distorts the soul and damages the personality. It gives the segregator a false sense of superiority and the segregated a false sense of inferiority. Segregation...[relegates] persons to the status of things. Hence segregation is not only politically, economically and sociologically unsound, it is morally wrong and sinful. ¹³⁹

I believe that the statements and viewpoints of the social scientists/intellectuals presented above, when considered collectively, are supportive of my position that either racial integration or separation could, possibly, help or hinder the education and life chances of African Americans. The views of some of the scholars suggest that African Americans have moved, or could move, closer to parity with whites in educational attainment and general prosperity in either a racially integrated or separated system or setting. Therefore, it is apparent to me that the critical issues in African Americans' quest for and achievement of equality with whites in education and in other areas, as well, are not whether they are mixed with or separated from whites.

Primary Concerns: Discrimination and Unity, Not
Integration and Separation

My third belief is that African Americans' primary concern regarding race relations and equality, educational and general, is not whether they attend an integrated or

segregated school or live in an integrated or segregated society, but whether they are discriminated against by whites and whether they can create and maintain unity among themselves.

Discrimination by Whites

My views on integration and voluntary separation and on the critical importance of discrimination for African Americans in either an integrated or separated school or society is similar to that expressed by W.E.B. DuBois in the 1930s. In 1935, on the subject of whether African Americans needed integrated or segregated schools, DuBois wrote:

Theoretically, the Negro needs neither segregated schools nor mixed schools. What he needs is Education. What he must remember is that there is not magic, either in mixed or in segregated schools. A mixed school with poor and unsympathetic teachers, with hostile public opinion, and no teaching of truth concerning black folk, is bad. A segregated school with ignorant placeholders, inadequate equipment, poor salaries, and wretched housing is equally bad.¹⁴⁰

In 1934, in an article entitled "Segregation," DuBois advised African Americans not to fear the word "segregation," warning them that the real threat to their liberation was not racial segregation, but discrimination.¹⁴¹ DuBois noted that in the United States, racial discrimination usually accompanied racial segregation, although there was no necessary relationship between the two things. In DuBois's opinion, "the opposition to segregation is an opposition to

discrimination."¹⁴² Elaborating on his position concerning racial segregation and its relationship to discrimination, DuBois explained: "The opposition to racial segregation is not or should not be any distaste or unwillingness of colored people to work with each other, to cooperate with each other, to live with each other."¹⁴³

DuBois applied this same reasoning to his discussion of segregation in schools. He argued that there should not be any objection to schools simply because they were attended by African American students and taught by African American teachers. DuBois emphasized that African American students could be as "fine human beings" as students of any other race or group and "trained" African American teachers were unsurpassed in ability and performance by any teachers.¹⁴⁴ Opposition to such a school, DuBois contended, should not be based on the fact that it was composed of African American pupils and teachers, but on whether it was "made reason and cause for giving it worse housing, poorer facilities, poorer equipment and poorer teachers" than schools composed of white teachers and students. DuBois stressed that if schools for African Americans were provided inferior housing, facilities, equipment, and teachers, then African Americans should object, but that the objection under such conditions would not be "against the color of the pupils' or teachers' skins, but against the discrimination."¹⁴⁵

While these views of DuBois reveal that he felt that racial discrimination, not racial integration or separation, was the primary hindrance to African Americans' educational progress and overall success two decades before the end of legal segregation,--a period in which discrimination had been made an inherent component,--I believe that discrimination continues to be a major obstacle to equality for African Americans in the present desegregation/integration era, which began with the outlawing of segregated schools by the United States Supreme Court in its Brown ruling in 1954. Expressing a similar point of view in his article, "The Ills of Integration," published in 1991, Foster explained that although individual African Americans "enjoyed unprecedented gains and progress," African Americans as a group were "still struggling with the same tentacles of racism and discrimination that Martin Luther King [Jr.] and others forcefully attacked in the 1950s and 1960s."¹⁴⁶ Although conceding that African Americans could "now work, live, and recreate in places" that were not open to them before this time, Foster felt it was evident that "these blacks do not significantly participate in the decision-making and policy-oriented deliberations that affect mainstream America."¹⁴⁷

It is evident that to a large extent, Foster attributed African Americans' lack of participation in both

the making of decisions and in the deliberations relating to policies which affect mainstream America to racism and discrimination. Foster concurred with the admonition which Benjamin Mays, the African American former president of Morehouse College, educator, and devotee of desegregation/integration, gave to African Americans in a Centennial Commencement Address at Howard University in 1967. According to Foster, Mays warned African Americans that in the interim between desegregation and integration, which Mays thought could possibly be a century, discrimination would continue, although in a different form from the discrimination of the earlier segregated society.¹⁴⁸ Mays, as quoted by Foster, offered this warning:

[The new] kind of discrimination...will be subtle and will be administered not by the [Lester] Maddoxes, the [George] Wallaces, and the [Ross] Barnetts, but by [African Americans'] liberal friends in Congress, in education, and in industry.¹⁴⁹

In other words, Mays warned African Americans that the new, subtle form of discrimination would not be administered only by conservatives, whom African Americans viewed as their enemies, but also by liberals in Congress, in education, and in industry, whom African Americans perceived as their friends.

I am convinced that there can be no serious challenge to the concerns/arguments by African Americans that discrimination has been harmful to their progress in both a racially segregated and desegregated society and

environment. For African Americans to achieve liberation and equality, or make necessary progress, there must be an elimination, or, at minimum, a major reduction in discrimination.

Unity Among African Americans

Finally, I believe that African Americans must create and demonstrate genuine unity among themselves to move substantially closer to, or possibly achieve, equality with whites. As I perceive the creation and demonstration of unity among African Americans, it will be necessary for African Americans, individually and collectively, to acquire a nationalistic point of view whether their society/environment is a desegregated/integrated or segregated/separated one. Approaching their plight from a nationalistic point of view, African Americans would study and learn of their history and culture in Africa and America, create and/or support their own institutions and enterprises, though neither with the intent to harm nor to avoid utilizing other groups' institutions and enterprises, and assist one another in myriad ways.

This approach would not only lead to unity among African Americans, but would also give them pride and power. They would have pride in themselves, as individuals and as a group, based on a knowledge of their culture, history, heritage, and accomplishments. As a result of assisting and supporting themselves and their institutions,

African Americans would create and/or enhance their political, economic, social, and all other types of power. With a nationalistic point of view and the resultant increase in pride, unity, and power, African Americans would be in a much stronger position, to challenge each other to desist from self-destructive and self-deprecating thought and behavior; to demand that the nation's education system, which some African Americans have called a "miseducation" system, provide an adequate and appropriate education for African Americans; and to put pressure on all relevant, American institutions, including education, and enterprises to eliminate racism and racial discrimination, with an expectation, in all of their actions, of achieving positive responses and results.

While these ideas are not likely to be in total agreement with those of other African American social scientists or intellectuals, the themes of African American unity and power for the purpose of fighting racism, discrimination, and oppression, and of achieving legitimate goals, are found in the writings of various African American scholars, whether one classifies them as integrationists or nationalists, or places them in some other race relations category. E. Franklin Frazier, whose advocacy of racial integration was discussed in Chapter 6 of this text, indicated in a 1962 article entitled "The Failure of the Negro Intellectual" that African Americans

should free their minds/thinking from influence and control by whites.¹⁵⁰ Frazier argued that the first task of African American intellectuals, most of whom he felt were integrationists when he wrote the article in the early 1960s, should be the "mental, moral, and spiritual rehabilitation" of African Americans, whose capture in Africa and enslavement "in the United States stripped them of their African culture and destroyed their personality."¹⁵¹ Although Frazier believed that the rehabilitation of the culture and personality of African Americans was necessary and that it was the responsibility of African American intellectuals to effectuate that rehabilitation, he did not think that African American intellectuals were prepared or inclined to accept and fulfill that obligation.

Frazier noted that the African American intellectual had failed to seriously examine the experience of the African American and "bring about a transvaluation of that experience so that [the African American] could have a new self-image of himself."¹⁵² In Frazier's view, the African American intellectual failed to "provide [African Americans with] a positive identification [of themselves] through history, literature, art, music, and the drama."¹⁵³ Frazier emphasized that for the African American intellectual, "integration and eventual assimilation [meant] the annihilation of the Negro--physically, culturally, and

spiritually."¹⁵⁴ Realizing that African Americans had a positive cultural identity that must be preserved, Frazier warned African American intellectuals to abandon their "obsession with assimilation" and "realize that integration should not mean annihilation--self-effacement, the escaping from [ones] identification."¹⁵⁵

Kenneth Clark, who, as reported in Chapter 6, was a strong advocate of integration, admonished African American organizations and parents in the late 1960s to unite to fight racist school officials who he believed were responsible for the persistently and pervasively inefficient schools attended by African American students. Clark felt that African American organizations and parents could secure a higher quality of education for African American children by demonstrating unity, developing a strategy, and displaying a commitment to fight for that purpose and result.¹⁵⁶

In June of 1966, during the Freedom March through Mississippi, Martin Luther King, Jr., the most renowned civil rights leader and, perhaps, the most prominent integrationist during the Civil Rights Movement of the 1950s and 1960s, supported the concept of "Black Power," although he opposed that slogan and one of its central elements, racial separation.¹⁵⁷ King rejected the "Black Power" advocates' demands for racial separation during the Mississippi Freedom March, as he opposed separation,

generally, because he saw integration as involving morality and conscience, due, in large part, to whites having "suffered, bled and died in the cause of racial justice."¹⁵⁸ He envisioned "Black Power," nevertheless, as being a call to African Americans to create and maintain unity among themselves;¹⁵⁹ "to amass the political and economic strength to achieve their legitimate goals"; to elect African Americans to key positions; to use the "bloc vote to liberalize the political climate and achieve their just aspirations for freedom and human dignity"; to pool their "financial resources to achieve economic security" (although King felt that African Americans' economic dilemma would ultimately be found in "a massive federal government program for all the poor"/in "a kind of Marshall Plan for the disadvantaged"); to develop "habits of thrift and techniques of wise investments"; and to realize that slavery and racial segregation had scarred their souls and wounded their spirits, but had not rendered them worthless or inferior to anyone.¹⁶⁰

As reported in Chapter 7, the central theme in the writings of Nathan Hare, Maulana Karenga, and Abdul Alkalimat, all cultural nationalists, was the necessity for African Americans to seize back control of their minds from whites. In their view, African Americans could gain control of their minds through a knowledge and understanding of their culture and history. To use

Karenga's logic, cultural and historical knowledge would inform African Americans of who they were, what they had to do, and how they could accomplish it. These scholars believed that African Americans' acquisition of cultural and historical knowledge and seizure of control of their minds from whites would lead them to condemn and reject racist white values and their own colonial plight, and to develop a positive self-image.

According to Gerald Anthony Foster, in 1967, Stokely Carmichael and Charles Hamilton, who were African American nationalists at that time, included in their book, Black Power: The Politics of Liberation in America, a discussion of the concept of "Black Power" which outlined what they believed African Americans must do to liberate themselves from white influence and make progress in the United States. Carmichael and Hamilton, as quoted by Foster, stated:

The adoption of the concept of Black Power is one of the most legitimate and healthy developments in American politics and race relations in our time...It is a call for black people in this country to unite, to recognize their heritage, to build a sense of community. It is a call for black people to begin to define their own goals, to lead their own organizations. It is a call to reject the racist institutions and values of this society. The concept of Black Power rests on a fundamental premise: Before a group can enter the open society, it must first close ranks.¹⁶¹

Carter G. Woodson and W.E.B. DuBois, renowned men, held high in esteem among African Americans, who were "Black Power" advocates many decades before that

term/slogan was used and popularized in the United States, argued that the progress of African Americans was inseparable from a knowledge of their history and culture. Mary Francis Berry, describing Woodson as "a race man...but not the intellectual separatist that his critics charged," noted that "Woodson's work involved modifying history curricula to pay greater attention to the contributions, deficiencies, problems and experiences of groups [among which is the African American] that had been subordinated in American society."¹⁶² As quoted by Berry, John Hope Franklin, the noted historian, in commenting on Woodson's work, wrote:

It was a remarkable attempt to rehabilitate a whole people, to explode racial myths, to establish a secure and respectable place for the Negro in the evaluation of the American social order, to develop self-respect and self-esteem among those who had been subjected to the greatest indignities known in the Western world.¹⁶³

The importance which Woodson attached to the study of African American history was noted in a March 1993 article in the New York Amsterdam News entitled "The Study of Black History: The Challenge to Be of the Race and For the Race."¹⁶⁴ The article stated that Woodson saw the study of African American history as "a weapon to break the shackles of Eurocentric education that bound the minds of African people" and to challenge the system of white supremacy.¹⁶⁵

Woodson's emphasis on the importance of history and culture for African Americans is also noted by Molefi Kete

Asante, an African American professor at Temple University, in an article entitled "The Afrocentric Idea in Education," which was published in the Journal of Negro Education in 1991. In that article, Asante reported that "[m]any of the principles that govern the development of the Afrocentric idea in education were first established by Woodson in Woodson's book, The Mis-education of the Negro, written in 1933.¹⁶⁶ Woodson, according to Asante, argued that "African Americans have been educated away from their own culture and traditions and attached to the fringes of European culture," resulting in their being "dislocated from themselves" to the extent that they "often valorize European culture to the detriment of their own heritage."¹⁶⁷

In the same year (1933) that Woodson's book, The Mis-education of the Negro, was published, DuBois, in a speech at Fisk University, also emphasized the necessity for African Americans' education to include their history and culture.¹⁶⁸ DuBois argued that a college or university for African Americans must be an African American college or university. He contended that it was an imperative for the African American college or university to start with the "present conditions" of African Americans, and, "using the facts and knowledge" of their "present situation," expand "toward the possession and conquest of all knowledge."¹⁶⁹ The African American college/university must, DuBois informed, seek to interpret all history by beginning with

the history of African Americans and "black" Africans in Africa and to understand and interpret the "social development of all mankind in all ages" by beginning with the "social development among Negro slaves and freedmen in America and Negro Tribes and and Kingdoms in Africa."¹⁷⁰

In 1935, DuBois admonished African Americans to study their history and culture and to place themselves at the center of their pursuit of that knowledge. He wrote:

[African Americans] ought to celebrate Negro Health Week and Negro History Week. They ought to study intelligently, and from their own point of view, the slave trade, slavery, emancipation, Reconstruction, and the present economic development.

Beyond this, Negro colleges ought to be studying anthropology, psychology, and the social sciences from the point of view of the colored races.¹⁷¹

It is evident that across a wide spectrum of ideological beliefs and positions on race relations, African American scholars and intellectuals, ranging from uncompromising integrationists, such as Kenneth Clark and Martin Luther King, Jr., to equally unyielding cultural nationalists, such as Nathan Hare, Maulana Karenga, and Abdul Alkalimat, have admonished African Americans to unite with themselves to fight racism and discrimination. It is equally apparent that the African American scholars' and intellectuals' advice focused on some or all of several specific points which they felt should occupy the attention and efforts of African Americans: the study of their history and culture, the development and maintenance of pride in their heritage, and the establishment and exercise

of power, in fact, "Black Power," through control of their own education and/or other institutions--political, economic, and social. The statements by these scholars provide support for my argument that among the major concerns of African Americans should be the degree to which they have established unity among themselves, pride in themselves and their race, and power to create and control their own institutions, for the purpose of gaining liberation, progress, and equality in American society.

As a conclusion to my views on the relative significance of desegregation/integration and segregation/separation/nationalism for the education and progress of African Americans, I offer these reiterant statements. I am in accord with Lerone Bennett, Jr., that one who tries to decide between or engage in a debate on the two positions would "expend needed energies" on a discussion that would divert one from the central or critical issues in race relations in the United States. While it is a fact that some African American social scientists have argued that racial integration is necessary for African Americans to achieve equality with whites, or to substantially reduce the inequity, and others have insisted that some degree of racial separation--cultural separation, certainly, but even voluntary physical separation--is, or might be, required to achieve these ends, my position is that the degree to which African

Americans are integrated with or separated from whites is not the critical concern for African Americans, either in race relations or in their education and life chances. The critical concern is their liberation and equality, which African Americans will be able to attain only if they are able to (1) avoid discrimination, or greatly reduce the degree to which it hampers their progress and (2) acquire a nationalistic point of view for the purpose of developing unity among themselves, acquiring knowledge of and pride in their history, culture, and heritage, and achieving political, economic, and social power through ownership, management, and/or control of their own institutions, educational institutions being primary among them. Aspects of these ideas find support among African American social scientists, from advocates of racial integration to supporters of separation.

NOTES

1. For biographical data on E. Franklin Frazier, see John Bracy, August Meir, and Elliott Rudwick, "The Black Sociologists: The First Half Century," in The Death of White Sociology, ed. Joyce A. Ladner (New York: Vanguard Books, 1973), 5, 7-8, 14; E. Franklin Frazier, "Failure of the Negro Intellectual," in The Death of White Sociology, ed. Joyce A. Ladner (New York: Vanguard Books, 1973, 52; Dictionary of American Negro Biography, 1982 ed., s.v. "Frazier, E[dward] Franklin"; Hal May, Contemporary Authors: A Bio-Bibliographical Guide to Current Writers in Fiction, General Nonfiction, Poetry, Journalism, Drama, Motion Pictures, Television, and Other Fields (Detroit, Michigan: Gale Research Company, The Book Tower, 1983), 164; Harry A. Ploski and James Williams, eds., The Negro Almanac: A Reference Work on the African American, 5th ed. (New York: Gale Research Inc., 1989), 992; and Encyclopedia of African-American Civil Rights: From Emancipation to the Present, 1992 ed., s.v. "Frazier, Edward Franklin." For biographical data on Kenneth Clark, see Ted Poston, "Kenneth Clark: Civil Rights Front Runner," New York Post, 16 March 1964, magazine, p.2; Kenneth Clark, "A Charade of Power: Black Students at White Colleges," in New Perspectives on Black Studies, ed. John W. Blassingame (Urban, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1971, 116-17; Kenneth B. Clark, "Issues in Urban Education," in Black Manifesto for Education, ed. Jim Haskins (New York: William Morrow and Company, Inc., 1973), 74; Joyce A. Ladner, The Death of White Sociology (New York: Random House, 1973), xxxi; Encyclopedia of Black America, 1984 ed., s.v. "Clark, Kenneth Bancroft"; Charles V. Willie, "A Psychologist Committed to Justice and Equality," chap. in Five Black Scholars: An Analysis of Family Life, Education, and Career (Lanham, Maryland: Abt Books, 1986), 41-58; Harry A. Ploski and James Williams, eds., The Negro Almanac: A Reference Work on the African American, 5th ed. (New York: Gale Research, Inc., 1989), 1403; Kenneth B. Clark, Dark Ghetto: Dilemmas of Social Power, 2d ed. (Middletown, Connecticut: Wesleyan University Press), page of the book following the index, an unnumbered page with the heading, "About the Authors"; Who's Who Among Black Americans, 1990/91, 6th ed. s.v. "Clark, Kenneth Bancroft"; Who's Who in America, 1990-91, 46th ed., s.v. "Clark, Kenneth Bancroft"; and Encyclopedia of African-American Civil

Rights: From Emancipation to the Present, 1992 ed. s.v. "Clark, Kenneth Bancroft"; For biographical data on Charles Willie, see Ann Evory, ed., Contemporary Authors: A Bio-Bibliographical Guide to Current Authors and Their Works, first revision, vols 41-44 (Detroit, Michigan: Gale Research Company, Book Towers, 1979), 778-79; Encyclopedia of Black America, 1981 ed., s.v. "Willie, Charles V."; Janet Dewart, ed., State of Black America 1987 (New York: National Urban League, Inc., 1987), 5; Who's Who Among Black Americans, 1988, 5th ed., s.v. "Willie, Charles Vert; Harry A. Ploski and James Williams, eds., The Negro Almanac: A Reference Work on the African American, 5th ed. (New York: Gale Research Inc., 1989), 1020; Who's Who Among Black Americans, 1990-91, 6th ed., s.v. "Willie, Charles Vert"; Who's Who in America, 46th ed., s.v. "Willie, Charles Vert"; and Who's Who in American Education 1989-90: Educators in Professional Schools of Education and School Administrators and Support Staff, 2d ed., vol. 2, s.v. "Willie, Charles V."

2. For biographical data on Nathan Hare, see Floyd B. Barbour, ed. The Black Power Revolt (Boston, Massachusetts: Extended Horizons Books, 1968), 249; Nathan Hare, "The Challenge of a Black Scholar," Black Scholar (December 1969): 59; Nathan Hare, "What Should Be the Role of Afro-American Education in the Undergraduate Curriculum?" in New Perspectives on Black Studies, ed. John W. Blassingame (Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1971), 3; Dictionary of Black Culture, 1973 ed., s.v. "Hare, Nathan, Jr."; Joyce A. Ladner, The Death of White Sociology (New York: Random House, 1973), xxxiii; Nathan Hare, "The Challenge of A Black Scholar," in The Death of White Sociology, ed. Joyce A. Ladner (New York: Vanguard Books, 1973), 67; Deborah A. Staub, ed., Contemporary Authors: A Bio-Bibliographical Guide to Current Writers in Fiction, General Nonfiction, Poetry, Journalism, Drama, Motion Pictures, Television, and Other Fields. New Revision Series, vol. 24 (Detroit, Michigan: Book Tower, Gale Research, Inc., 1988), 224; Harry A. Ploski and James Williams, eds., The Negro Almanac: A Reference Work on the African American, 5th ed. (New York: Gale Research, Inc., 1989), 1408; Who's Who Among Black Americans, 1990/91, 6th ed., s.v. "Hare, Nathan"; Who's Who in America, 46th ed., vol. 1, Marquess Who's Who (Wilmette, Illinois: MacMillan Directory Division, 1990), 1389; Who's Who Among Black Americans, 1992/93, 7th ed., s.v. "Hare, Nathan"; and The African American Encyclopedia, 1993 ed., s.v. "Hare, Nathan"; Nathan Hare, Chairman of the Board, The Black Think Tank, to Jerry Woods (author), 4 September 1993, Hare's responses to questions on a questionnaire mailed to him in a letter dated 22 July 1993 and on another questionnaire mailed to

the Alumni Office of Langston University in Oklahoma, his alma mater, in a letter dated 23 July 1993; For biographical data on Maulana Ron Karenga, see Floyd B. Barbour, ed., The Black Power Revolt (Boston, Massachusetts: Extended Horizons Books, 1968), 250, 251; Addison Gale, Jr., ed., The Black Aesthetic (Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1971), 421; James Haskins, Profiles in Black Power (Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1972), 204-212; Dictionary of Black Culture, 1973 ed., s.v. "Karenga, Maulana Ron"; Maulana Ron Karenga, "Which Road: Nationalism, Pan Africanism, Socialism?" Black Scholar 2 (October 1974): 21; Manning Marable, Race, Reform and Rebellion: The Second Reconstruction in Black America, 1945-1982 (Jackson, Mississippi: University Press of Mississippi, 1984), 124; Maulana Karenga, "Political Culture and Resurgent Racism in the United States," Black Scholar (May/June 1985): 21; "Contributing Authors," Black Scholar 21 (March-May 1990): 79; and The African American Encyclopedia, 1993 ed., vol. 4, s.v. "Karenga, Ron Ndabetta"; For biographical data on Abdul Alkalimat (Gerald A. McWorter), see Joyce A. Ladner, The Death of White Sociology (New York: Random House, 1973), xxxi; Black Scholar (March/April 1984): 56; Manning Marable, Race, Reform and Rebellion: The Second Reconstruction in Black America, 1945-1982 (Jackson, Mississippi: University Press of Mississippi, 1984), 152; Black Scholar 21 (March-May 1990): 79; Who's Who Among Black Americans, 6th ed., s.v. "McWorter, Gerald A."; and Who's Who Among Black Americans, 7th ed., s.v. "McWorter, Gerald A."

3. See biographical information on Frazier, Clark, and Willie, as cited in note 1 above.

4. See biographical information on Hare, Karenga, and Alkalimat, as cited in note 2; while several available sources noted that Karenga was born in Maryland, none reveal the city of his birth.

5. Nathan Hare, Chairman of the Board, The Black Think Tank, to Jerry Woods, author, 4 September 1993, Hare's letter with responses to questions on (1) a questionnaire from the author, mailed to him in a letter dated 2 July 1993 and (2) another questionnaire from the author mailed to the Alumni Office of Langston University, his alma mater, in Langston, Oklahoma, in a letter dated 23 July 1993. Information on Hare's childhood experiences is obtained from his letter and responses to my questionnaires and is documented in this section, "State and Region of Birth," generally, by the page number of the letter in parentheses.

6. None of the available biographical sources on Karenga and Alkalimat, which are listed in note 2, provide any information on these social scientists before they entered college; Letters from the author to Karenga and Alkalimat at the college/university where they are employed or were last known to have been employed and to their alma maters did not elicit a reply from these social scientists or any biographical information on them, including that which related to the early years of their lives; In a discussion of Karenga and his activities in the 1960s and 1970s, James Haskins in Profiles in Black Power (1972: 204) noted: "Little information about Karenga's early life is available to the public, for he does not care to talk about himself as much as about his programs and his ideas on black liberation."

7. Hare noted in his letter to the author, dated 4 September 1993, the derivation of the name of the schools:

[L'Ouverture] was the namesake of Touissant L'Ouverture, the Haitian general who stood up to Napoleon's bluff and thereby set the scene and otherwise uncertain purchase of the Louisiana Territory spearheaded by Thomas Jefferson. It also would lead to Haiti getting its name back and the fact that today they speak French there instead of Spanish. (p.3).

8. Dictionary of American Negro Biography, 1982 ed., s.v. "Frazier, E[dward] Franklin."

9. Tom Poston, "Kenneth Clark: Civil Rights Front-Runner," New York Post, 22 March 1964, magazine, p. 2; and Charles Willie, "A Psychologist Committed to Justice and Equality," chap. in Five Black Scholars: An Analysis of Family Life, Education, and Career (Lathan, Maryland: Abt Books, 1986), 45.

10. Ivory, Contemporary Authors, first revision, vols. 41-44, 1978, 778.

11. Nathan Hare, Chairman of the Board, The Black Think Tank, to Jerry Woods, author, 4 September 1993, letter with responses to questions from the author, p. 5; Subsequent references to this source in this section is indicated in the text by the page number of the letter in parentheses.

12. Haskins, Profiles in Black Power, 1972, p. 204.

13. Manning Marable, Race, Reform and Rebellion: The Second Reconstruction in Black America, 1945-1982

(Jackson, Mississippi: University Press of Mississippi, 1984), 123-24.

14. See sources cited in note 1 above.

15. For a discussion of the Civil Rights years, see Julian Bond, Introduction to Eyes on the Prize: America's Civil Rights Years, 1954-1965 by Juan Williams (New York: Viking, 1987), xi-xv; This work identifies the Civil Rights years as extending from 1954 to 1965.

16. See biographical source on Hare as cited in note 2 above.

17. Maulana Ron Karenga, "Which Road: Nationalism, Pan Africanism, Socialism?" Black Scholar 6 (October 1974): 21.

18. Floyd Barbour, ed., The Black Power Revolt (Boston, Massachusetts: Extended Horizons Books, 1968), 250; The African American Encyclopedia, 1993 ed., vol. 4, s.v. "Karenga, Ron Ndabetta"; The biographical summary on Karenga in The Black Power Revolt revealed that in 1968, the date of publication, he held "a master's degree in political science and African Studies from the University of California at Los Angeles, and [was] a doctoral candidate"; The 1993 edition of the African American Encyclopedia stated that Karenga was "a doctoral candidate in African Studies at the University of California at Los Angeles (UCLA)" in 1965. It is a logical assumption that Karenga earned his bachelor's degree in the early 1960s.

19. See the biographical source for Alkalimat cited in note 2 above.

20. See the sources cited in note 2 above.

21. Barbour, The Black Power Revolt, 250.

22. See Maulana Ron Karenga, "Which Road: Nationalism, Pan-Africanism, Socialism?" Black Scholar 6 (October 1974): 21; Maulana Karenga, "Political Culture and Resurgent Racism in the United States," Black Scholar (May/June 1985): 21; African American Encyclopedia, 1993 ed., s.v. "Karenga, Ron Ndabetta"; The biographical summary on Karenga in "Which Road: Nationalism, Pan-Africanism, Socialism?" revealed that in October of 1974, Karenga had been in prison for over three years at the California Men's Colony in San Luis Obispo, California, had previously earned his B.A. and M.A. degrees from UCLA, and had done work toward, but not completed his doctorate; The entry on Karenga in the 1993 edition of African

he had not received his doctorate; By 1985, Karenga had earned his doctorate and was identified in "Political Culture and Resurgent Racism in the United States" as "Dr. Maulana Karenga."

23. For the names of institutions and organizations in which E. Franklin Frazier participated or was affiliated, see Dictionary of American Negro Biography, 1982 ed., s.v. "Frazier, E[dward] Franklin"; Ploski and Williams, eds., The Negro Almanac, 5th ed., 1989, 992. For the names of institutions and organizations in which Kenneth Clark has been affiliated or participated see Encyclopedia of Black America, 1984 ed., s.v. "Clark, Kenneth Bancroft"; Who's Who Among Black Americans, 1990-91, 6th ed., s.v. "Clark, Kenneth Bancroft." For the names of institutions and organizations in which Charles Willie has been a participant/is participating, see Ann Evory, ed., Contemporary Authors, first revision, vols. 41-44, 1979, 778-79; Who's Who Among Black Americans, 1988, 5th ed., s.v. "Willie, Charles Vert"; Who's Who in American Education 1989-90, 2nd ed., 1990, 745; Who's Who Among Black Americans, 1990-91, 6th ed., s.v. "Willie, Charles Vert."

24. Dictionary of American Negro Biography, 1982 ed., s.v. "Frazier, E[dward] Franklin."

25. Jim Haskins, ed., Black Manifesto for Education (New York: William Morrow and Company, 1973), 74; Who's Who Among Black Americans, 1990-91, 6th ed., s.v. "Clark, Kenneth Bancroft."

26. Ann Evory, ed. Contemporary Authors, first revision, vols. 41-44, 1979, 778-79; Who's Who Among Black Americans 1990-91, 6th ed., s.v. "Willie Charles Vert."

27. For sources on Hare, see Deborah A. Staub, ed., Contemporary Authors, New Revised Series, vol. 24, 1988, 224; Poloski and Williams, eds., The Black Almanac, 5th ed., 1989, 1408, Who's Who Among Black Americans, 1990-91, 6th ed., s.v. "Hare, Nathan"; Who's Who in America, 46th ed., vol.1, 1990, 1389; Who's Who Among Black Americans, 1992-93, 7th ed., s.v. "Hare, Nathan." For sources that provide biographical information on Karenga, see James Haskins, Profiles in Black Power, 1972, 204; Maulana Karenga, "Political Culture and Resurgent Racism," Black Scholar (May/June 1985): 21; Black Scholar "Contributing Authors," 1990, 79; and The African American Encyclopedia, 1993 ed., vol. 4, s.v. "Karenga, Ron Ndabetta." For a source which lists professional organizations in which Alkalimat (McWorter) has held membership or been employed, see Who's Who Among Black Americans, 6th ed., s.v.

source which lists professional organizations in which Alkalimat (McWorter) has held membership or been employed, see Who's Who Among Black Americans, 6th ed., s.v. "Mc Worter, Gerald A."

28. Staub, Contemporary Authors, 224.

29. The African American Encyclopedia, vol. 4, s.v. "Karenga, Ron Ndabetta." This source reveals that in 1971, Karenga was charged with assaulting a female member of his organization, found guilty, and given a sentence of six to ten years. It reports that without Karenga to lead it, his US organization disbanded in 1974. Karenga was paroled in 1975.

30. Haskins, Profiles in Black Power, 203.

31. African American Encyclopedia, vol. 4, s.v. "Karenga, Ron Ndabetta."

32. Karenga, "Political Culture and Resurgent Racism," 21.

33. Black Scholar, "Contributing Authors," 21 (March-May 1990): 79.

34. Who's Who Among Black Americans 1990-91, 6th ed., s.v. "McWorter, Gerald A."

35. Nathan Hare, Chairperson of the Board, The Black Think Tank, Los Angeles, California, to Jerry Woods, author, Howard Beach, New York, letter dated 4 September 1993; Hare noted that "the 1950 U.S. Census registered [Slick, Oklahoma's] population as 301; by 1960, it was 151," p.2.

36. Hare received his baccalaureate degree in 1954, the same year as the Supreme Court's ruling, but before the implementation of that order which began in the 1954-55 academic year.

37. Hal May and Deborah A. Staub, eds., Contemporary Authors: A Bio-Biographical Guide to Current Writers in Fiction, General Non-fiction, Poetry, Journalism, Drama, Motion Pictures, Television, and Other Fields, New Revision Series, vol. 25 (Detroit, Michigan: Gale Research Inc., Book Tower, 1989, 317.

38. Charles V. Willie and Ronald R. Edmonds, eds., Black Colleges in America: Challenge, Development, Survival (New York: Teachers College Press, 1978), 13.

39. Orville Vernon Burton, foreword to Born to Rebel: An Autobiography by Benjamin E. Mays (Athens, Georgia: University of Georgia Press, 1987, xii.

40. Charles V. Willie and Ronald R. Edmonds, eds. Black Colleges in America: Challenge, Development, Survival (New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University, 1978), 23-24.

41. Nathan Hare, Chairman of the Board, The Black Think Tank, San Francisco, California, letter dated 4 September 1993 to Jerry Woods, author, Howard Beach, New York, p. 7.

42. Ibid.

43. Nathan Hare, a speech delivered at Langston University's Cultural Renaissance Rally on August 30, 1975, the heading on the speech read: "Text of a Speech to be Delivered by Nathan Hare, Ph.D., Ph.D., to His Alma mater, Langston University, on the Occasion of Their 'Cultural Renaissance' Rally, August 20, 1975, 6:00 O'clock P.M."; This speech was received by the author in September, 1993, from Mr. Ronald Keys, curator of the Melvin B. Tolson Black Heritage Center of Langston University, in response to the author's request for biographical information on Nathan Hare from that institution, p. 2.

44. Ibid.

45. Ibid., 4.

46. Ibid.

47. Ibid., 3.

48. Ibid., 4.

49. Ibid., 5.

50. Juan Williams, Eyes on the Prize: America's Civil Rights Years, 1954-1965 (New York: Viking Penguin, Inc., 1987), 9.

51. Ibid.

52. Ibid., 33-34.

53. Several sources which have commented on this period or some portion of it and revealed African Americans' sentiment for desegregation and/or integration

are: Nathan Wright, Jr., Black Power and Urban Unrest (New York: Hawthorne Books, Inc., 1967), 117-124; Kenneth B. Clark, introduction to Black Separatism: A Bibliography, by Betty Lanier Jenkins and Susan Phillis (Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1976), xiii-ix; Alphonso Pinkney, Red, Black, and Green: Black Nationalism in the United States (Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1976), 62; Mary Francis Berry and John Blassingame, Long Memory: The Black Experience in America (New York: Oxford University Press, 1982), 266; and James D. Anderson, The Education of Blacks in the South, 1860-1935 (Chapel Hill, North Carolina: University of North Carolina Press, 1988), 104-109.

54. Mary Francis Berry and John Blassingame, Long Memory: The Black Experience in America (New York: Oxford University Press, 1982), 266.

55. James D. Anderson, The Education of Blacks in the South, 1860-1935 (Chapel Hill, North Carolina: The University of North Carolina Press, 1988), 104-109.

56. Kenneth B. Clark, introduction to Black Separatism: A Bibliography, by Betty Lanier Jenkins and Susan Phillis (Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1976), xiii-ix.

57. Alphonso Pinkney, Red, Black, and Green: Black Nationalism in the United States (Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1976), 62.

58. Alphonso Pinkney, Red, Black, and Green: Black Nationalism in the United States, 62, ix.

59. Chapter 7 reported biographical data on Hare, Karenga, and Alkalimat; the chapter noted that these scholars were active in the fight to implement African American Studies programs on college and/or university campuses in the late 1960s; that each of them received higher education degrees in the 1950s and/or 1960s, and that Karenga and Alkalimat earned their doctorates in the 1970s; sources which have reported or strongly indicated that nationalism replaced desegregation/integration as the dominant ethos for African Americans during the 1960s are: John Herbers, The Black Dilemma (New York: The John Day Company, 1973), 37; Alphonso Pinkney, Red, Black, and Green: Black Nationalism in the United States (London, England: Cambridge University Press, 1976), ix.

60. Herbers, The Black Dilemma, 37; Pinkney, Red, Black, and Green, ix.

61. Herbers, The Black Dilemma, 31-46.
62. Herbers, The Black Dilemma, 31-46; subsequent discussion of these three things in this section of the paper is based on Herbers's views.
63. Ibid., 32.
64. Ibid.
65. Ibid., 33.
66. C. Eric Lincoln, The Black Muslims in America (Boston, Massachusetts: Beacon Press, 1961), 253.
67. Herbers, The Black Dilemma, 33.
68. Ibid., 29-30.
69. Ibid., 29.
70. Ibid., 29-30.
71. Ibid., 30.
72. Ibid.
73. Ibid., 39-45.
74. Ibid., 39.
75. Ibid.
76. Ibid., 39-40.
77. Ibid., 40.
78. Ibid.
79. Ibid.
80. Ibid.
81. Ibid., 40-41.
82. Ibid., 41.
83. Ibid.
84. Ibid.
85. Ibid.

86. Ibid.
87. Ibid.
88. Ibid.
89. Ibid., 42.
90. Ibid.
91. Ibid.
92. Ibid.
93. Ibid., 42-43.
94. Ibid., 43.
95. Ibid.
96. Ibid., 43-44.
97. Ibid., 44.
98. Ibid.
99. Ibid.
100. Ibid., 45.
101. Ibid.
102. Herbers, The Black Dilemma, 96-98.
103. Ibid., 97.
104. Ibid., 97-98.

105. Alphonso Pinkney, Red, Black, and Green: Black Nationalism in the United States (Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1976), 13; Pinkney explained that throughout the history of African Americans in the United States, some African American nationalists have believed that African Americans had to return to Africa to achieve liberation from their oppression; He noted, however, that beginning in the 1960s, "The back-to-Africa movement gave way to other forms of nationalist sentiment." Two of the most prominent advocates of the repatriation of African Americans to Africa have been Martin R. Delany, who worked to help African Americans return to Africa in the late 1850s and Marcus Garvey, who made similar efforts between 1916 and 1923; For Delany,

see Alton Hornsby, Jr., The Black Almanac (Woodbury, New York: Barron's Educational Series, Inc., 1972), 12 and Abiola Sinclair, "Martin R. Delany, Father of Black Nationalism," New York Amsterdam News, 19 February 1994, pp. 26, 36; For Garvey, see Hornsby, Jr., The Black Almanac, 54.

106. The call for the establishment of an all-African American state, rather than a call to return-to-Africa, was made by the Black Muslims, a nationalist organization, and other supporters of African American nationalism during the 1960s; see Hornsby, Jr., The Black Almanac, 87 and Pinkney, Red, Black, and Green, 13.

107. Paul Kurtz, preface to The Black Man in America: Integration and Separation by James A. Moss, ed. (New York: Dell Publishing Company, Inc., 1971, ix.

108. Charles V. Willie, School Desegregation Plans That Work (Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1984), 4-5, 12; Charles V. Willie, "The Future of School Desegregation," in The State of Black America 1987, Janet Dewart, ed. (New York: National Urban League, 1987), 37; Charles V. Willie, "The Future of School Desegregation," in The Education of African-Americans, eds. Charles V. Willie, Antonine M Garibaldi, and Wornie L. Reed (New York: Auburn House, 1991), 51.

109. Willie, School Desegregation Plans That Work, 5.

110. Willie, "The Future of School Desegregation," 1991, 51.

111. Ibid., 63.

112. [W.E.B. DuBois], "Does the Negro Need Separate Schools?" in The Seventh Son: The Thought and Writings of W.E.B. DuBois, vol. 2, ed. Julius Lester (New York: Random House, 1971), 418.

113. Gerald Anthony Foster, "The Ills of Integration: A Black Perspective," in Dream and Reality: The Modern Black Struggle for Freedom and Equality, ed. Jeannine Swift (New York: Greenwood Press, 1991), 77; In a brief biography of Dr. Foster (p. 154), Swift noted that Foster was "presently Vice President for Academic Affairs at Virginia Union University in Richmond," had "held the position of Dean of the School of Arts and Letters at Hampton University in Hampton, Virginia," and in addition to Hampton, had taught and worked as an administrator at Pace, Fordham, and City University of New York; In the preface (p. vii), Swift noted that her book was composed

of essays first presented at a conference entitled "Dream and Reality: The Modern Black Struggle for Freedom and Equality" held at Hostra University in Hostra, New York, in February 1988 and, were, then revised for publication.

114. Foster, "The Ills of Integration," 77.

115. [W.E.B. DuBois], "Does the Negro Need Separate Schools?" in The Seventh Son: The Thought and Writings of W.E.B. DuBois, vol. 2, ed. Julius Lester (New York: Random House, 1971), 409.

116. [W.E.B. DuBois], A W.E.B DuBois Reader, ed. Andrew G. Paschal (New York: MacMillan Co, 1971), 31.

117. [W.E.B. DuBois], "A Negro Nation Within the Nation," in W.E.B. DuBois Speaks: Speeches and Addresses 1920-1963, ed. Philip S. Foner (New York: Pathfinder Press, 1970), 81.

118. [W.E.B. DuBois], "The Negro College," in The Seventh Son: The Thought and Writings of W.E.B. DuBois, vol. 2, ed. Julius Lester (New York: Random House, 1971), 214-23.

119. Ibid., 409.

120. Foster, 77.

121. Ibid.

122. Ibid.

123. Ibid., 83.

124. Ibid.; In The Myth of Black Progress (1984), Alphonso Pinkney noted that a report by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights entitled Twenty Years After Brown: Equality of Educational Opportunity found that desegregation of the dual systems of education in the South led to "the displacement or demotion of black school staff" and the employment of few black administrators by school systems: Alphonso Pinkney, The Myth of Black Progress (Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1984), 3.

125. Ibid.

126. DuBois, "A Negro Nation Within the Nation," 85-86.

127. Ibid., 85; underline mine.

128. Ibid.
129. Ibid., 86.
130. Ibid.
131. Kenneth B. Clark, "Some Personal Observations," in introduction to Black Separatism by Betty Lanier Jenkins and Susan Phillis (Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1976), xiv.
132. Ibid., xiii, xiv.
133. Ibid., xiv.
134. [DuBois], "Does the Negro Need Separate Schools?," 411, 418.
135. Martin Luther King, Jr., Stride Toward Freedom: The Montgomery Story (New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1958), 37.
136. Ibid.
137. Martin Luther King, Jr., Why We Can't Wait (New York: New American Library, 1964), 81-82; In this book, King included as Chapter 5 a letter he wrote while confined in the Birmingham, Alabama jail; it was titled: "Letter From Birmingham Jail," dated: April 16, 1963, and addressed: "My Dear Fellow Clergymen" (see page 76).
138. Ibid., 81.
139. Ibid., 82.
140. [DuBois], "Does the Negro Need Separate Schools?" 417-18; On page 417, DuBois noted that he was writing the article in 1935.
141. [W.E.B. DuBois], "Segregation," in The Seventh Son: The Thoughts and Writings of W.E.B. DuBois, vol. 2, ed., Julius Lester (New York: Random House, 1971), 229-31. This article was documented as having appeared in the Crisis "(January, 1934. Vol. XLI, No. 1, p. 20)."
142. Ibid., 229.
143. Ibid.
144. Ibid.
145. Ibid., 230; underline mine.

146. Foster, "The Ills of Integration," 83.
147. Ibid.
148. Ibid., 84.
149. Ibid., 84.
150. E. Franklin Frazier, "The Failure of the Negro Intellectual," in The Death of White Sociology, ed. Joyce Ladner (New York: Vanguard Books, 1973), 62-66; Ladner reported on page 52 that Frazier wrote the article in 1962.
151. Ibid., 64.
152. Ibid., 65.
153. Ibid.
154. Ibid.
155. Ibid., 66.
156. Kenneth Clark, "Alternative Public Education Systems," in Equal Education Opportunity, ed. Harvard Education Review (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1969), 174, 178-79.
157. Martin Luther King, Jr., Where Do We From Here: Chaos or Community? (Boston, Massachusetts: Beacon Press, 1968), 23-29.
158. Ibid., 28.
159. Ibid.
160. Ibid., 36-40.
161. Foster, 84; Foster identified the source of this quotation as follows: "Stokely Carmichael and Charles V. Hamilton, Black Power: The Politics of Liberation in America (New York: Vintage Books, 1967), 44."
162. Mary Francis Berry, "Unfinished Business of Carter G. Woodson," New York City Sun, 20-26 March 1991, p. 31.
163. Ibid.
164. Ron Daniels, "The Study of Black History: The Challenge to Be of the Race and for the Race," New York

Amsterdam News, 13 March 1993, p. 34.

165. Ibid.; Molefi Kete Asante, in an article entitled "The Afrocentric Idea in Education," indicated that a Eurocentric education is one that places white students, who have a European ancestry, "within the center of the context of knowledge"; Asante explained that "centricity refers to a perspective that involves locating students within the context of their own cultural references so that they can relate socially and psychologically to other cultural perspectives." See Molefi Kete Asante, "The Afrocentric Idea in Education," Journal of Negro Education 60, no. 2 (Spring 1991): 171.

166. Molefi Kete Asante, "The Afrocentric Idea in Education," Journal of Negro Education 60, 2 (Spring 1991): 170; Asante discussed Afrocentricity and the Afrocentric approach in education as follows:

Afrocentricity is a frame of reference wherein phenomena are viewed from the perspective of the African person. The Afrocentric approach seeks in every situation the appropriate centrality of the person (Asante, 1987). In education, this means that teachers provide students the opportunity to study the world and its people, concepts, and history from an African world view. In most classrooms, whatever the subject, Whites are located in the center perspective position....In Afrocentric educational settings, however, teachers do not marginalize African American children by causing them to question their own self-worth because their people's story is seldom told. By seeing themselves as the subject rather than the object of education...African American students come to see themselves not merely as seekers of knowledge but as integral participants in it (p. 171).

167. Ibid., 170.

168. [DuBois], "The Negro College," in The Seventh Son: The Thought and Writings of W.E.B. DuBois, 214-23; On page 215, Lester identified this contribution to the book as a speech which DuBois delivered at Fisk University in June of 1933.

169. Ibid., 218.

170. Ibid.

171. [DuBois], "Does the Negro Need Separate Schools?" 415; underline mine.

CHAPTER 9

CONCLUSION: DIFFERENT IMAGES, CAUSES OF DIFFERENCES,
AND A BROADER AND NECESSARY CONTEXTDifferent Images

This study has noted that there are historical and present differences between African Americans and whites and among African Americans themselves over the kind of education that is most relevant for African Americans. It has presented some of the images of education held by twelve African American social scientists: W.E.B. DuBois, Thomas Sowell, Walter Williams, William Wilson, Charles Willie,¹ Alphonso Pinkney, Bartholomew (Bart) Landry, E. Franklin Frazier, Kenneth Clark, Nathan Hare, Maulana Karenga and Abdul Alkalimat. The different images of these scholars place them on different sides of issues designated as critical ones for educational institutions and for African American students' educational opportunity and achievement. The different sides of the issues designated as critical for the education of African American students are class versus race and racial desegregation/integration versus racial segregation/separation/nationalism. Some of the social scientists support class and others support race as having

a greater influence on African Americans' education. Similarly, some of them contend that racial integration has a greater influence than racial separation on African Americans' education, while others argue the contrary position.

The study's search for a sociological explanation of the social scientists' opposing positions on the critical issues places the study in the field of inquiry known as the Sociology of Knowledge. This discipline has a sociological interest in the social context of knowledge. In relationship to this study, the sociology of knowledge is applicable in the search for the social determinants of the African American social scientists' different perspectives which places them on different sides of the critical issues affecting African Americans' education.

Chapter 2 reports that DuBois changed his emphasis from race to class as being more significant for the education of African American students' educational and general success. He changed his emphasis, not because he thought race had declined as a detrimental factor for African Americans, but because he could not perceive that African Americans would gain an appropriate and equal education--one that is African and African American centered and equal to that received by whites--or achieve equality in any other institutions in American society, merely as a single racial group attacking racism. DuBois

felt that African Americans and all other Americans, who were not private owners and controllers of capital and free enterprise, had to join together to attack capitalism, which exploited and exercised control over all Americans, regardless of their race and color.

As revealed in Chapter 3, Thomas Sowell, Walter Williams and William Wilson, two economists and a sociologist respectively, implied that changes in American society relating to or affecting the economy were the primary influences in African Americans' advancement. They insisted that race/racism did not and could not explain the lower educational performance of African Americans when compared with white students, nor the lower income or employment rates of the African American population when compared with the white population.

Sowell and Williams identified the Federal Government's interference in a free and open market, particularly its establishment of minimum wage laws, as a critical change in American society. These scholars believed that such interference by the Federal Government accounts for the socioeconomic differences in the African American and white populations. According to these social scientists, the minimum wage laws price many African Americans, who have low levels of education and training, out of the labor market. Sowell and Williams saw educational achievement level, a measure of social class,

as important because the higher the level, the more likely one is to obtain employment at a rate of pay above the minimum wage scale.

Wilson, like Sowell and Williams, believed that education was important for upward mobility. He felt that educational criteria were becoming increasingly important for African Americans to gain access to the means of production and to escape the "black underclass." Significantly, Wilson argued that educated and talented African Americans, who possessed equivalent qualifications as those of whites, were experiencing unprecedented job opportunities in the expanding government and corporate sectors, opportunities that were equal to, or better than, those of whites. Wilson emphasized, however, that in contrast to the educated and talented African Americans, those who were poorly educated and inadequately trained, particularly teenagers and young adults in the inner cities, were experiencing worsening conditions.

Although Wilson argued that race was less significant than class for African Americans' success, a position which corresponds with that of Sowell and Williams, he differs from those scholars in his explanation of the economic gap between African Americans and whites. Instead of attributing the lower economic progress of African Americans to government interference in the free market economy through minimum wage laws and

to labor unions and civil service pay scale arrangements, which were included in the explanations of Sowell and Williams, Wilson identified four changes in the structure of the American society to explain the present poor and worsening economic conditions of African Americans compared to whites. Those changes were (1) the sharp and substantial increase in the population of African American teenagers in the nation's central city areas; (2) the shift in the economy from a concentration on goods producing industries (e.g., manufacturing, construction) to service-producing industries (e.g., transportation, finance); (3) the growth of corporate industries and their relationship with labor unions, a relationship in which unions tended to be dominated by an elite labor force that was effectively organized, had success in gaining consistent wage hikes, and had a firm hold on the respectable and higher paying blue-collar jobs, which were representative of the corporate sector, resulting in an almost total elimination of the labor force that was not attached to the labor unions and transitory, the labor force which would include many African Americans; and (4) the expansion of the government sector, which resulted in an increase in white collar, higher paying job opportunities for highly educated and trained African Americans, but little, if any, occupational advancement for the African American underclass.

The fundamental position held by Willie, Pinkney, and Landry, three sociologists, and reported in Chapter 4, is contrary to that of Sowell, Williams and Wilson. Willie, Pinkney, and Landry insisted that race is more significant than class for African Americans' education and life chances. Each of these scholars was critical of Wilson and his contention that race had declined in significance to the degree that in the modern industrial era race had become less significant than class for African Americans, particularly for middle class/educated and trained African Americans.

A central thrust of the arguments presented by Willie, Pinkney, and Landry was that Wilson was incorrect in his assessment and proclamation that talented and trained African Americans were experiencing job opportunities at least equal to those of whites with equivalent qualifications. For example, Willie noted in his book, Caste and Class Controversy, that even when African Americans had equivalent educational and occupational levels, two primary indicators of social class position, African Americans earned significantly less income than whites.² On the basis of a 1978 study of over 15,000 households by the United States Civil Rights Commission that was presented in a report entitled "Social Indicators of Equality for Minorities and Women," Willie concluded that "when all things are equal (including age,

education, and occupation) a majority of the white males received yearly income of 15 to 20 percent more than African Americans and other minority males.³ In his book, A New Look at Black Families (1981), Willie reported that African Americans in both high-status and low-status occupations earned lower incomes than whites, even when the education levels were equivalent, indicating that the differences were due to racial discrimination, not to social class level.

In his book, The Myth of Black Progress (1984), Pinkney emphasized that whites see race, not upper-class nor poor social status, as the salient factor in race relations with African Americans.⁴ Pinkney explained that African Americans are victims of racial oppression, not because they are separated from whites by class differences, but because of their racial heritage.⁵ In Pinkney's estimation, upper class African Americans enjoy no advantage over poor African Americans in matters involving the two races.⁶ Pinkney contended that in the middle 1980s, discrimination against African Americans continued to be wide spread and that there was available evidence to show that the economic gap between African Americans and whites was widening, not narrowing. In essence, Pinkney argued that African Americans' oppression and their lower position relative to whites in American society in income, occupational status, and education, is

due primarily to historical and continuing racism.⁷

Pinkney defined racism in the United States as a rationalized ideology that postulates African Americans and other people of color as possessing innate inferiority. He explained that since racism posits African Americans' alleged inferiority as innate, it makes, in effect, that inferiority genetically determined and unaffected by history and culture, and therefore, unchangeable/permanent.⁸

In Pinkney's opinion, education, income, and occupation are the primary indicators of socioeconomic achievement and are intertwined in American society. According to Pinkney, of these three indicators of achievement, education is usually the one that determines one's status in the larger society.⁹ Pinkney noted that African Americans are often not provided quality education, resulting in their consignment to lower statuses and lower incomes than whites.¹⁰ He provided statistics that show a wide disparity in educational attainment between African Americans and whites in the number of years of school completed and in the percentages enrolled in two-year and four-year colleges.¹¹

In his book, The New Black Middle Class, published in 1987, Landry argued that Wilson provides little or no substantial evidence to support his assertions--(1) that the African American underclass became permanent due to

economic segmentation among African Americans and to enacted civil rights laws, which gave middle class African Americans an opportunity equal with that of whites with similar qualifications;¹² (2) that educated and talented African Americans were experiencing job opportunities in the expanding corporate and government sectors that were at least equal to those of whites with equivalent qualifications;¹³ (3) and that educated and trained African Americans continued to improve their income and occupational positions relative to whites, even during the serious economic recessions of 1973-1975 and 1980-1982.¹⁴ According to Landry, educated and trained African Americans not only did not improve their income and occupational positions relative to those of whites, but experienced a worsening of their positions.¹⁵

Landry noted that African American families place greater emphasis than white families on education and that their concentration on educational achievement/advancement results from a belief that education is the only means to combat race and color discrimination and to gain occupational success in the United States.¹⁶ According to Landry, a college education is important to both African Americans and whites, but more critical for the former group than the latter one. He explained that among comparably qualified African American and white college graduates, racial discrimination harms the African

American graduates and helps the white ones. It is more difficult for African American college graduates to translate their college degree into a middle class job when first entering the labor force after graduation, argued Landry.¹⁷ Based on his own and other scholars' research, Landry concluded that racial discrimination is responsible for the advantage enjoyed by white middle-class college graduates in their ability to enter middle class jobs as their first employment after graduation.¹⁸ Also, he attributed a wide gap in income to racial discrimination.¹⁹

In this reiteration of the views of the social scientists identified above, it should be evident to everyone that Thomas Sowell, Walter Williams, and William Wilson believe that social class has a greater impact on African American's education and life chances than race. It should be equally apparent to everybody that Charles Willie, Alphonso Pinkney, and Bartholomew Landry perceive that race has a greater influence than class.

Chapters 6 and 7 indicate that there are also African American social scientists who have held, and continue to hold contrary positions on the relative significance of racial integration and racial separation for African American students' education. In Chapter 6, E. Franklin Frazier, Kenneth Clark, and Charles Willie stated or implied that education is important for African

American students and argued that racial integration in educational institutions and in American society is necessary for African Americans to achieve equality. They opposed racial segregation/separation in education and in the society.

In "The Failure of the Negro Intellectual,"--an article written by Frazier during the Civil Rights Movement (1962)--Frazier stated unequivocally that African Americans must be integrated into the American society.²⁰ Frazier believed that integration would lead to economic benefits for African Americans, who historically, had been forced to be dependent upon the economic institutions in the general, predominantly white society for employment and livelihood.²¹

Clark has been a harsh critic of America's system of education, especially the poor quality of education it has provided African American and other minority students. Continually, Clark has opposed racial separation/segregation and its advocates, both African American and white.²² Clark advised African American organizations and parents to plan a strategy to fight racist public school officials and school boards who opposed the development and implementation of programs designed to provide high quality and efficient education to African American students.²³ Many of the students affected by the racist school officials to whom Clark

referred lived in inner city areas and attended legally desegregated schools, but essentially or actually segregated ones. Clark encouraged African Americans to unite in their fight to acquire higher quality and more efficient education for African American children and such schools.²⁴

Although Clark believed that unity among African Americans was necessary to fight white racist and separatist school personnel and school programs and to achieve high quality education for African American students, he unequivocally opposed racial separation/segregation and supported racial integration.²⁵ Clark argued that demands for segregated schools were unacceptable whether the demands came from African American or white segregationists.²⁶ According to Clark, racial segregation and racism are physically and psychologically damaging to children, both African American and white ones.²⁷

Willie argues that school desegregation has been helpful, not harmful, to African Americans and all Americans.²⁸ He noted that African Americans made substantial educational progress between 1950 and the early 1980s. Willie explained that the disparity between African Americans and whites in educational opportunity was much less at the latter than at the earlier date.²⁹ According to Willie, the greater disparity in educational

attainment between African Americans and whites is due, in large part, to racial desegregation.³⁰ Willie believes so strongly that desegregation has been beneficial to the education system in the United States, including both African Americans and whites in that system, that he has referred to desegregation as the major contributory to the enhancement of education in recent years.³¹ In fact, Willie described the movement from segregated to desegregated schools, with its spirit of inclusiveness, as the greatest contribution in the Twentieth Century to educational reform and urged its continuation.³²

In Chapter 7, Nathan Hare, Maulana Karenga, and Abdul Alkalimat, who gained prominence as social scientists and intellectuals during their advocacy of African American studies programs in the late 1960s, like Frazier, Clark, and Willie in the preceding chapter, indicate their support for high quality, effective education for African American students. Hare, Karenga, and Alkalimat, unlike Frazier, Clark and Willie, however, did not believe that racial integration was necessary for African American students to receive such an education. In fact, they felt that integration was, or could be, harmful to African Americans' educational and general progress. These scholars argued that African Americans were not likely to achieve liberation and equality in education or other areas simply by integrating themselves

with whites, but would reach, or move closer to, those ends by separating themselves culturally, and, if necessary, physically, from whites.³³

The central concern of Hare, Karenga, and Alkalimat was the necessity for African Americans to free/separate their minds/thinking from white influence, domination, or control. Hare believed that an African American Studies program could free African American students' minds/achieve cultural separation from whites, by having a "black perspective" as its basis. In Hare's opinion, such a perspective was revolutionary and nationalistic. He felt that a "black perspective" would effectuate the regeneration of the African American child's ego, which had been humiliated by a "whitewashed"/Europeanized education and a separation of both the child's ancestors and the child from their devotion to land, culture, and themselves.³⁴

For Hare it was imperative that courses in African Studies programs be taught from a "black perspective" and be established on both pedagogical and ideological blackness.³⁵ An African American Studies program with a "black perspective," Hare maintained, could instill in the African American students a sense of pride in themselves and their history, and in a collective destiny. Hare explained that such an education had the potential to be therapeutic for African American students, who were

impaired by defeatism, a condition that was unlikely to change due to generations of exclusion.³⁶

In the middle 1970s, Hare argued that African Americans had to provide their own education, which included when and how they should/could integrate with whites. In Hare's opinion, African Americans could provide their own cultural education only if they seized back control of their own minds. He noted that African Americans had begun to exhibit independent thinking and unity and, as they did so, the white power structure began to exhibit fear, hostility, and oppression. He contended that white racists were so fearful of the display of independent thinking and unity among African Americans that they attempted to persuade, even coerce, African American students and schools into accepting and promoting the doctrine of integration. Criticizing school integration as it was established, Hare argued that it meant "disintegration" of African American schools. He believed that disintegration of African American public schools would occur through the "bussing" of African American students from their schools to white schools and disintegration of colleges and universities would occur through the "consolidation" of African American schools with white ones and the elimination of African American schools.³⁷

Hare challenged African American scholars to

decolonize their minds. He noted that African Americans were victimized by white colonialism and its scholarship. The scholarship of white colonialism, Hare explained, was embodied in the concepts of scholarship in Western nations, which obviously included scholarship in the United States. Hare argued that Western concepts of scholarship (e.g. the use of "objectivity" and "neutrality" as synonymous terms) allowed white scholars to remain ostensibly impartial while supporting the desires or demands of the status quo, which for African Americans was a condition of inferiority, inequality, and injustice. It was Hare's contention that white colonialists' Western concepts of scholarship had enslaved African American scholars and that those scholars had to free themselves from these concepts.³⁸ In other words, Hare believed that African American scholars had to free their minds and thinking from the influence, domination, and control of white colonialism and white racism.

Karenga, like Hare, has shown more of an interest in cultural than in physical separation of African American from whites. In the latter half of the 1960s, Karenga argued that the revolution that was occurring in the United States at that time, which also included the universities, was a cultural revolution by African Americans to win back their own minds. While not rejecting the possibility of or need for a violent

revolution in the future, he did not believe that African Americans could wage a violent revolution if they failed to win the cultural revolution.³⁹ Karenga contended that a cultural revolution for African Americans had to be a nationalist revolution because there was an unavoidable interrelationship between African American culture and African American nationalism. From Karenga's viewpoint, African Americans in the United States constituted a cultural nation, a people with a common past, a common present, and hopefully, a common future.⁴⁰

For African Americans to win the cultural revolution, Karenga maintained, they had to seize control of their minds and thinking from whites. He asserted that African Americans could take such control and escape their continual task as servants of whites, but only if they were provided identity, purpose, and direction. Karenga explained that "identity" tells African Americans who they are, "purpose" tells them what they must do, and "direction" tells them how to do it.⁴¹

In his analysis of the white university of the late 1960s in the United States, Karenga insisted that it was fundamentally a political, not an educational institution because it was maintained by the "power structure" for the purpose of reinforcing that power structure's position of power. In Karenga's estimation, the white university influenced its students, including the African American

ones, to accept white people's values. The White University, Karenga asserted, communicated the authority and values of the United States, the mother country, to the African American community, its colony.⁴² The implication of his views is that the white university was communicating white racism, inequality, and oppression which was, and continues to be characteristic of race relations in the United States.

In more recent years (the late 1980s), Karenga has continued to insist on the cultural separation of African Americans from whites. He argued that the first step toward African Americans' full liberation is a cultural revolution which overthrows the negative conception that African Americans have of themselves and ends the monopoly that whites/"the oppressor[s]" have on their minds.⁴³ Based on Karenga's advocacy of a cultural revolution (which means a cultural separation of African Americans from whites and a freeing of African Americans' minds from white domination and control) at both the closing years of the 1960s and the 1980s, it is apparent that he believes that an adequate cultural revolution has not occurred and that such a revolution remains necessary for African Americans' liberation.

Alkalimat, like Hare and Karenga, perceived African Americans to be a colonized community. He explained that colonization in the United States is the total attempt by

whites at subordination of African Americans' including their values, beliefs, norms, institutions, myths, and history.⁴⁴ Alkalimat affirmed that a central task of African Americans was to decolonize themselves. In his view, that was a process which required them to gain control of their minds. He emphasized that the process of decolonization would result in African Americans' replacing self-hatred, which was instilled in them by colonization, with self-love; moving toward liberation, the process of becoming independent and positive about themselves and their communities; having complete control over all of their institutions--and this would, obviously, include education--and, consequently, their destinies; and becoming socialized into "Africanization," the transformation from a European and/or an American culture to an African culture.⁴⁵

In his discussion of the white university in the 1960s, Alkalimat identified several functions performed by the university, each of which was in some way(s) detrimental to the education of the African American students in them. He noted that the university was an agent of racism, a reservoir of knowledge, a social and a political institution, and an agent of socialization.⁴⁶

In his analysis, the white university was an agent of racism, in part, because it systematically excluded African Americans in its admissions policies. He also

emphasized that it failed to consider African Americans' style of life and indigenous culture in its standards of evaluation.

Alkalimat explained that as a reservoir of knowledge the university maintained a racist tradition. In delineating this position, Alkalimat emphasized that the university was a maintainer of a racist tradition by depicting African Americans as having no meaningful history; by promoting the research of white scholars, who were apologists for the existing racist practices in the United States and deprivors of equality and full participation to African Americans; by defining African Americans in pathological terms; and by using white peoples' standards and values as the normative ones and imposing them on African Americans.⁴⁷

Like Karenga, Alkalimat believed that the white university of the 1960s was more a political than a social institution. In describing the university as a political as well as a social institution, Alkalimat contradicted the university's definition of itself as an apolitical or nonpolitical institution. Alkalimat accused the university of operating for the Establishment (the existing power structure). The university, he explained, had a closer relationship with consultants and research organizations that wanted to preserve the existing power structure than with communities devoted to extreme

change.⁴⁸

Alkalimat contended that as an agent of socialization, the white university produced students with a white orientation. From his viewpoint, aspects of student experiences on white college and university campuses, including role models, admissions policies, and peer groups were entirely white oriented.⁴⁹ Apparently, Alkalimat believed that African American students, whose experiences were influenced entirely by white ideas, ideals, values, and standards, would become indoctrinated with the ideology of white supremacy/white superiority and think and act like white people.

Despite Alkalimat's criticism of white universities, he envisioned them as having the capacity to contribute positively to African Americans. According to Alkalimat, universities could become relevant to African Americans by developing courses to address the questions being raised by African Americans⁵⁰ and by providing a few million dollars to investigate the African American experience and to generate a body of knowledge on that experience.⁵¹

While criticizing the university for its destructive racist tradition and scholarship and informing it of its potential for positive contributions to African American students, Alkalimat was lauding the African American community for changes it had made which, in his opinion, had moved it toward maturity. Those changes, he

noted, included the desire by African Americans to be called "African Americans", "Afro-Americans", or "blacks", instead of "Negroes", and to use terms such as "Black Power" for communication of ideas and practicality.⁵² Additional changes by African Americans were their move toward new unity, a unity which manifested itself in young African American men refusing, for the most part, to offer serious criticism of one another and their challenge to the correctness and truthfulness of some of the positions advocated by the United States government and white social scientists. Alkalimat described the positions of whites, such as an underrepresentation of African Americans in the national census and an implied threat of the use of military power to curtail their progress, as detrimental to African Americans and their movement toward national liberation.⁵³

Apparently, what Alkalimat meant by a move toward maturity was a move toward liberation and nationalism, with some degree of physical and/or cultural separation from whites. In the late 1960s, he supported African American students who demanded separate living quarters and cultural events that were relevant to their own needs.⁵⁴ Alkalimat has continued to promote "black nationalism" and to insist that African Americans must free their minds from white racist influence and control to achieve liberation.⁵⁵

Causes of Differences

DuBois

DuBois's shift in emphasis from race to class as more critical for the education and life chances of African Americans by the last decade of his life/the middle of the twentieth century was due to his becoming convinced that the United States and its capitalist system had not only oppressed and exploited African Americans because of their race and color, but also, more fundamentally, because of their class position. Class position became more fundamental than race for DuBois because reality for him in the latter years of his life was that Capitalism, while combining with racism for greater oppression and exploitation of African Americans than white Americans, was, nevertheless, oppressive and exploitative of the vast majority of United States citizens on the basis of their class position, regardless of their racial identification.⁵⁶

Class Versus Race

As noted in Chapter 5, available information suggests that there are two fundamental causes for some of the social scientists in this study developing images of education in the United States that place them in support of social class as having a more significant influence than race on the education of African American students and others developing images that put them in support of

race as having a greater influence than social class. Both causes apparently are related to whether the social scientists' early experiences including their undergraduate education, occurred, primarily, inside or outside the South. Thomas Sowell, Walter Williams, and William Wilson, who believed that class has a greater influence than race on African American students' education, were born or reared outside the South and earned a bachelor's degree from a university in a state outside the South. In contrast, Charles Willie, Alphonso Pinkney, and Bartholomew Landry, who argued that race has a greater influence than class, were born or reared in the South and received a bachelor's degree from an African American college in the South. In essence, the degree to which the social scientists' early life experiences occurred in or outside the South appears to be the defining factor in the two groups of social scientists' choices of class or race as more critical for African Americans' education and life chances.

During the period from the late 1920s to the middle 1960s, the period when all of the scholars were born, reared, and completed their undergraduate education, millions of African Americans migrated to the North, due to the oppressive racial conditions and decreasing economic opportunities in the rigidly segregated and highly agriculturalized South and to the higher wages and

increasing economic opportunities in the more racially integrated and more industrialized North.⁵⁷ In the North, race became less dominant and social class, that is, issues related to social class position or economic advancement, more dominant in their daily lives than it had been in the South.⁵⁸ The social/racial environment of the North, when compared with that of the South, was characterized by a reduced emphasis on both racial segregation and overt physical violence against African Americans, by an increased emphasis on issues of social class position, and especially, through its schools at all levels, by a more enthusiastic presentation and promotion of ideals of equality and justice contained in the American Creed and in American virtues. This environment is assumed to have influenced the African American social scientists in this study, who were born, reared, and or/attained their undergraduate education in it, to develop ideas that are supportive of issues of social class as more significant than race for African Americans' education and progress. In the South, where there was continual and strict racial segregation, as well as brutal and unrelenting mental and physical abuse of African Americans, race and racism, not social class position or economic or social mobility, continued to be consuming issues for African Americans.⁵⁹ The oppression and brutal treatment of African Americans on the basis of their

race/color appears to have led the group of African American scholars from the South to conclude that race was more critical than class/economic concerns for the education and life chances of African Americans.

Desegregation/Integration Versus Segregation/Separation/Nationalism

As reported in Chapter 8, available information revealed that age was the only differentiating characteristic between E. Franklin, Kenneth Clark, and Charles Willie, who argued that a desegregated/integrated school system and society were necessary for African Americans' progress and success, and Nathan Hare, Maulana Karenga, and Abdul Alkalimat, who contended that physical separation from whites could be helpful to African Americans in some situations and circumstances and that cultural separation was an absolute imperative. Each member of the former group of social scientists, the integrationists, was older than each member of the latter group, the Nationalists.

The difference in ages between these two groups of scholars appears to be related to differences in the dominant ethos among African Americans, particularly at the time they received their college/university education and entered professional careers. From the 1890s to the 1960s, the period in which the integrationists were born, reared, attending higher education, and pursuing

professional careers, the dominant ethos among African Americans was integration. In contrast, the nationalists, although born and reared when the dominant ethos among African Americans was integration, attended college and began their professional careers in the 1960s and 1970s, when the Civil Rights Movement and integration waned and the "Black Nationalism," "Black Power," and "Black Studies" movements waxed, resulting in nationalism, particularly its cultural separation element, replacing integration as the dominant ethos among African Americans. The dominant ethos of integration among African American people during the first two-thirds of the twentieth century appears to have influenced Frazier, Clark, and Willie to choose racial integration as more significant than racial separation or nationalism for African Americans' education. Hare, Karenga, and Alkalimat appear to have been influenced in their choice of nationalism as more critical than integration for African Americans' education by the change from integration to nationalism as the dominant ethos among African American intellectuals during the 1960s, when these nationalists scholars were attending institutions of higher education.

As noted in Chapter 8, Willie, an integrationist, was only six years older than Hare, a cultural nationalist. This fact made them contemporaries and suggested that the few years differences in their ages

might not have been sufficiently wide to attribute their respective integrationist and nationalist viewpoints, totally, and, perhaps not even partially, to differential influences from changes in the dominant integrationist and nationalist ethos among African Americans. Chapter 8 explained that available information suggests that Willie and Hare were strongly influenced by their respective undergraduate colleges/universities--Morehouse College in Atlanta, Georgia, and Langston University in Langston, Oklahoma. Willie respected and admired Benjamin Mays, an integrationist and president of Morehouse when Willie was in attendance at that institution in the late 1940s. Willie's belief that Mays was an ideal African American college president; his support of Mays's philosophy of education, which defined education as a moral experience that motivated one to be concerned about other people, especially those experiencing injustice and oppression; and his awareness that Mays strongly supported racial integration, suggests that Mays either influenced Willie to adopt views supportive of integration or if such views already existed, to reinforce them. Similarly, Hare held high admiration and respect for Edwin R. Edmonds and Melvin Tolson, his anthropology and English professors, respectively, at Langston University. Hare revealed that these two professors were highly conscious of race and color and seemed to hold nationalistic views. According

to Hare, Edmonds and Tolson were the two professors who influenced him most at Langston, where he was in attendance in the early 1950s.

A Broader and Necessary Context

I believe that it is important to learn what African American social scientists think about the education received by African American students in the United States and how those scholars' ideas place them in contrary positions regarding the relative influence of social class and race and of racial integration and racial separation on the education of the youth of their race. It is apparent to me, however, that if African Americans wish to achieve liberation and equality in education and all other areas of society, which I perceive to be their ultimate goal, they can not simply adopt one or another of the social scientists' opposing positions. African Americans can not be successful and achieve the goal of liberation and equality unless they accept class, race, racial integration, and racial separation--all these issues, not just some--as having a major influence on African American students' education. Also, to move substantially toward educational equality, or any equality, with whites, African Americans must develop a point of view about race relations and the social structure in the United States that is broader than any one of this study's critical/central issues of class, race, desegregation,

integration, segregation, separation, or nationalism.

Their point of view must be one that considers all these issues as significant ones.

Whether one chooses to emphasize race/racism as the major problem in the United States, as DuBois did during most of his long life, or to stress class as a greater problem, as he did during the last decade of his life,⁶⁰ it appears to me to be an indisputable fact, as it was to DuBois, that African Americans experience inequality both due to social class position and to racial identity. DuBois shifted his emphasis from race to class but did not indicate that race had declined as a problem in American society.

In general, the other African American social scientists, whose ideas on class and race are examined in Chapter 3 and Chapter 4, reveal a recognition, although a minor one in some cases, that both class and race influence African Americans education and progress. As reported in Chapter 3, Thomas Sowell, Walter Williams, and William Wilson argued forcefully that race was not the primary cause of educational or economic differences between African Americans and whites, and suggested that racial differences resulted more from social class position, or factors related to economic progress, than to race. Explicit or implicit in their arguments was the position that race had some influence, although probably

minimal in comparison to other influences on the lower educational and economic achievement of African Americans, when this group was compared with whites. Chapter 4 reports that Charles Willie, Alphonso Pinkney, and Bartholomew Landry held the contrary position, insisting that race had a greater influence than social class. When one considers seriously the assignments of these two groups of scholars--one group insisting that race is less significant than social class and the other that race is more significant than social class for African Americans' educational advancement and overall success--it becomes apparent that both class and race continue to have an influence on African Americans' education and life chances as they had during DuBois's lifetime.

My views on the relative impact of class and race on African Americans' opportunities in education and other areas, were presented in Chapter 5. Here I will simply emphasize that, in my opinion, racial prejudice and discrimination/racism, which were given birth before the institution of slavery and have been continually nourished by the doctrine of white supremacy, have a much greater impact than class prejudice and discrimination on the chances for African Americans to achieve equity with white Americans. I believe that the barriers of race and/or color offer more resistance to African Americans' efforts to achieve equality in education, and in other

institutions, than barriers from any other causes. The debate over the relative influence of social class and race on African Americans' educational and overall equality is likely to continue among African American scholars beyond the immediate future. In my view, the class versus race debate continues, and whether class or race is proposed or projected as having the greater influence in promoting or obstructing efforts by African Americans to achieve educational and total equality is not the central issue, either for African American scholars or the African American populace. I believe this to be true despite the fact that I stated earlier and repeat again, emphatically, that my position is that African American students' educational, as well as overall, opportunities and achievements in the United States are influenced more by their race and/or color than by their socioeconomic status, background, or environment. What African American scholars must know, remember, and convey to all African Americans is that African Americans suffer discrimination and oppression both due to their social class position and circumstance and to their race. From the arguments of the various African American social scientists presented in earlier chapters, it is obvious that African Americans' quest for equality in education and other areas of life in the United States is hindered both by race--more specifically, white racism--and by issues related to their

socioeconomic status. With this awareness, all African Americans must then condemn and confront all persons and institutions that discriminate against and oppress them, whether the discrimination and oppression are based on African Americans' class, race, or both.

On the racial desegregation/integration versus racial segregation/separation/nationalism debate, as I outlined at the end of Chapter 8, I believe that African Americans must see both integration and separation/nationalism as having an influence on their education and future success. The critical issue is not whether racial integration has a greater influence than racial separation or nationalism on African Americans' education and success in life, as E. Franklin Frazier, Kenneth Clark, and Charles Willie asserted in Chapter 6, or whether the contrary is a more accurate position, as Nathan Hare, Maulana Karenga, and Abdul Alkalimat declared in Chapter 7, but that both integration and separation have been, and have the potential to be, both beneficial and detrimental to African Americans.

As I explained in Chapter 8, the essence of my views on racial integration and racial separation is embodied in three beliefs: (1) that there is no essential opposition between integration and legal, voluntary physical separation or cultural separation/autonomy; (2) that both integration and separation have been, are, and are likely

to be in the foreseeable future, both helpful and harmful to efforts by African Americans to gain educational equality; and (3) that African Americans' primary concern regarding their relations with white people, whether in education or in American society more generally, is not the degree to which there is integration or separation, but the degree to which there is both the absence of discrimination by whites and the presence of a nationalistic point of view among African Americans themselves.

While my views on education place me on the side of race over class as having the greater impact on African American students' education and in a position of ambivalence on the relative impact of racial integration and racial separation on students--favoring either to the degree that African Americans (1) are not discriminated against by whites and (2) establish unity and cultural autonomy among themselves--it is imperative that African Americans realize that all these issues--class and race, integration and separation--not just some, influence African American students' education. African Americans must understand that, historically, all of these issues have impinged upon African American students' opportunities to gain an adequate and effective education and to earn an equal education with white students. They must be aware that all of these issues are influencing

African American students' education, presently, and are likely to do so into the distant future.

Since the social scientists in this study, when considered collectively, have demonstrated that class, race, racial integration, and racial separation have all affected the education of African American students, then, all the issues combined, not simply the perceived differential influence of one issue when compared with another one, must be the central focus and concern of African Americans in any attempt to understand educational institutions and race relations in the United States. The combination of all the issues, not merely the one perceived by a social scientist or group of social scientists to have the greatest influence, must evoke the attention and concern of all African Americans because all the issues emanate from a common destructive problem in American Society: white supremacy and its inescapable/inextricable companion, white racism. White supremacy/white racism is truly the critical issue. It was instituted before slavery by the English colonists, when they first encountered Native Americans;⁶¹ it continued during the enslavement of "black" Africans, giving birth to and nurturing African American inferiority and white superiority.⁶²

Of white supremacy, Louis L. Knowles and Kenneth Prewitt in their book, Institutional Racism in America,

wrote:

Some form of white supremacy, both as ideology and institutional arrangement, existed from the first day English immigrants, seeking freedom from religious intolerance, arrived on the North American continent. From the beginning, the early colonizers apparently considered themselves culturally superior to the natives they encountered. This sense of superiority over the Indians, which was fostered by the religious ideology they carried to the new land, found its expression in the self-proclaimed mission to civilize and Christianize--a mission which was to find its ultimate expression in ideas of "manifest destiny" and a "white man's burden."⁶³

The English colonists operated from a premise that the "Anglo-Saxon race is culturally and religiously superior" to other races and that "neither the validity nor the integrity of alien cultures can be" given recognition.⁶⁴ This same mentality--Anglo-Saxons operating from a premise of racial, cultural, and religious superiority--appears to have produced the institution of slavery and its accompanying justification.⁶⁵

The premise of white supremacy on which the English colonists and slave holders operated in relation to Native Americans and African American slaves, respectively, "has continued to have a strong impact on American thought."⁶⁶ This continuous and effective influence of white supremacy on American thought/African American-white relations has not been due solely to the Anglo-Saxons' racist theories of white superiority and to their religious ideology which, in large part, has been to civilize and Christianize alien/inferior cultures, but also to "Social Darwinism."⁶⁷

According to Knowles and Prewitt, "the Social Darwinian theory of evolution greatly influenced social thought, hence social institutions, in nineteenth century America."⁶⁸ They explained that Social Darwinism/Social Darwinists "extended the concept of biological evolution in the development of man to a concept of evolution in the development of societies," nations, and races; presumed that the nature of a "society or nation or race" was the product of "natural evolutionary forces"; and proposed that the primary characteristics of the social evolutionary process were "struggle and conflict in which the 'stronger, more advanced, and more civilized' would naturally triumph over the 'inferior, weaker, backward, and uncivilized peoples.'"⁶⁹ Further explicating the Social Darwinian theory of evolution, Knowles and Prewitt quoted from Thomas F. Gossett's book, Race: The History of an Idea in America (1963):

The idea of natural selection was translated to a struggle between individual members of a society, between members of classes of society, between different nations, and between different races. This conflict, far from being an evil thing, was nature's indispensable method of producing superior men, superior nations, and superior races.⁷⁰

As Knowles and Prewitt noted, Social Darwinism introduced and fostered "such phrases as the 'struggle for existence' and 'the survival of the fittest' [which] became lingua franca" [common language]; it also provided white Americans with a full blown ideology to explain their treatment of

the 'inferior [African American] race.'"⁷¹

Knowles and Prewitt presented this history and ideology of white supremacy/white racism to demonstrate that it is "embedded in the American experience and values." The authors argue that America's "contemporary social institutions"--educational, political, religious, legal and medical--"have adapted to their heritage" of white supremacy/white racism.⁷² Knowles and Prewitt contended that the procedures, practices, and policies within American institutions consistently penalize African Americans for reasons of color.⁷³ It was obvious to these authors that "the social arrangements which fix unequal opportunity for black and white citizens can be traced back through American history" to a period before the beginning of slavery.⁷⁴

It is apparent to me from the analysis of American institutions by Knowles and Prewitt that white supremacy/white racism gave birth to and fostered white superiority and African American inferiority in American education. If African Americans had not been forced to experience and endure a long and continuous history of separation from whites and consignment to an inferior position in America's educational institutions, there would be little or no basis for a discussion of the relative impact of race or class, of racial integration or racial separation on American educational institutions or on

African American students' education. Without white supremacy/white racism, it is unlikely that differences by race and color, and, perhaps by class would have become destructive forces in American society.

While the images of education held by African American social scientists and the social roots of those images contribute to our knowledge of African Americans and to the field of sociology, one can understand this study and achieve a more complete and more accurate perspective on it and its issues only by placing it in a necessary context. That context must include three parts: (1) the consideration of the stated objectives of the study; (2) the awareness that all--not just some--sides of the issues in this study are critical ones; and (3) the realization that both historically and presently white supremacy and white racism have exerted enormous influence on race relations in education and all other institutions in the United States to the detriment of African Americans.

The first part of the necessary context--the stated objective of the study--is an unavoidable element. Obviously, for one to understand this study, one must know that its purpose is to report the ideas of selected African American social scientists on education, to determine whether those ideas place them on different sides of critical issues confronting African American students' education, and to specify how those social scientists came

to hold their views. On this latter point, the aim is to determine whether the scholars' different positions and perspectives emerge, at least in large part, from different social roots.

The study's stated objective and findings might lead one to conclude that learning whether or not the social scientists' ideas place them on one or another side of an issue is the total context of the study. This conclusion, however, would obscure, to a large extent, the second part of the necessary context of the study: the acceptance of all the different sides of the study's issues--class and race, racial integration and racial separation--as critical ones for African Americans' education, not simply the issue that a particular social scientist believes is most important. As I stated in Chapter 1, this study is based on the assumption that all sides of the designated issues are critical ones facing American education and the education of African American youth. This assumption is supported by the African American social scientists in this study, when their ideas are considered in combination. Each of them indicates that one side of an issue or the other is the more critical one for American education and/or the education of African American students.

The third part of a necessary context for this study--the realization that white supremacy and white racism have had, historically, and have, presently, a negative

influence on race relations, and have hindered African Americans' educational and general progress--is the ultimate/fundamental part. The study must be placed and can be fully understood only in a context that includes white supremacy and its inescapable and inextricable companion, white racism. If white supremacy/white racism had not existed and did not continue to exist, there would be no need for this study. There would be no need for a discussion and analysis of African American social scientists' images of education and how those images place them on opposite sides of the class versus race and racial integration versus racial separation dichotomies in terms of the relative influence of these issues on African American students' education. By the same reasoning, if white supremacy and white racism are not eliminated or greatly reduced in America, and I see no indications that they will be, a hundred years from now at the waning of the twenty-first century, some African American scholars will be declaring, then, as DuBois did nearly a century ago, that America's central problem is the problem of the color line. White supremacy and white racism will, then, as they have historically, continue to hamper, and even destroy, the potential and progress of millions of African Americans, many of them youths. Then, as now, African American social scientists will still be holding opposing positions on the relative influence of class and race,

racial integration and racial separation on America's educational institutions and on African American students' education and life chances.

NOTES

1. Charles Willie's views on both the class versus race and racial integration versus racial separation issues in terms of their relative influence on educational institutions and African American students' education are discussed in this study. He is the only scholar whose ideas are presented regarding both sets of issues.

2. Charles V. Willie, Caste and Class Controversy (New York; General Hall, Inc., 1979), 50-68.

3. Ibid., 55.

4. Alphonso Pinkney, The Myth of Black Progress (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1984), 53.

5. Ibid.

6. Ibid.

7. Ibid., 49-56, 135.

8. Ibid., 49-50.

9. Ibid., 135.

10. Ibid.

11. Ibid., 135-38.

12. Bart Landry, The New Black Middle Class (Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1987), 92-93.

13. Ibid., 93.

14. Ibid., 195, 209.

15. Ibid., 194, 195, 209, 210.

16. Ibid., 97-99.

17. Ibid., 105-6.

18. Ibid.
19. Ibid., 123-32.
20. E. Franklin Frazier, "The Failure of the Negro Intellectual," in The Death of White Sociology, ed. Joyce A. Ladner (New York: Vanguard Books, 1973), 53.
21. Ibid., 54.
22. Kenneth Clark, "Alternative Public Education Systems," in Equal Education Opportunity, ed. Harvard Education Review (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1969), 173-77.
23. Ibid., 178-79.
24. Ibid.
25. Ibid., 179.
26. Ibid., 176.
27. Kenneth B. Clark, "Unfinished Business: The Toll of Psychic Violence," Newsweek, 11 January 1993, 38.
28. Charles V. Willie, School Desegregation Plans That Work (Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1984), 4-5, 12.
29. Ibid., 5.
30. Ibid.
31. Charles V. Willie, "The Future of School Desegregation," in The State of Black America 1987, Janet Deward, ed. (New York: National Urban League, 1987), 37.
32. Charles V. Willie, "The Future of School Desegregation," in The Education of African Americans, Charles V. Willie, Antonine M. Garibaldi, and Wornie L. Reed, eds. (New York: Auburn House, 1991), 63.
33. For Nathan Hare's view on cultural and/or physical separation of African Americans from whites in education and/or other areas see Nathan Hare, "A Radical Perspective on Social Science Curricula," in Black Studies in the University: A Symposium, eds. Armstead L. Robinson, Craig C. Foster, and Donald H. Ogilvie (New Haven Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1969), 105; Nathan Hare, "The Case for Separation: 'Black Perspective'" in Black Power and Student Rebellion, eds. James McEvoy and

Abraham Miller (Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc., 1969), 233-35; Nathan Hare, "The Challenge of A Black Scholar," Black Scholar (December, 1969), 63; Nathan Hare, "What Should Be the Role of Afro-American Education in the Undergraduate Curriculum?" in New Perspectives in Black Studies, ed. John W. Blassingame (Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1971), 3-15; Nathan Hare, "Text of A Speech to be Delivered by Nathan Hare, Ph.D., to his Alma Mater, Langston University on The Occasion of Their "Cultural Renaissance" Rally, August 30, 1975, 6:00 O'Clock P.M." Speech delivered by Nathan Hare, the title of which might have been assigned by someone from the Melvin B. Tolson Black Heritage Center, Langston University, Langston, Oklahoma, Mr. Ronald Keys, Curator, on September 3, 1993, 1-19; and Nathan and Julia Hare, Crisis in Black Sexual Politics San Francisco, California: Black Think Tank, 1989), 170-71. For Maulana Karenga's views on racial separation/segregation see Maulana Ron Karenga, "from the Quotable Karenga," in The Black Power Revolt (A Collection of Essays) ed. Floyd B. Barbour (Boston, Massachusetts: Extended Horizons Books, 1968, 164-70; Maulana Ron Karenga, "the Black Community and the University: A Community Organizer's Perspective," including the "Question Period," in Black Studies in the University: A Symposium, eds. Armstead L. Robinson, Craig C. Foster, and Donald H. Ogilvie (New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1969), 37-54; and Maulana Karenga, "The Black Male/Female Connection," in Crisis in Black Sexual Politics, eds. Nathan and Julia Hare (San Francisco, California: Black Think Tank, 1989), 45-48d. For Abdul Alkalimat's ideas on racial separation and segregation see Gerald A. McWorter [Abdul Alkalimat], "Deck the Ivy Racist Halls: The Case of Black Studies," in Black Studies in the University: A Symposium, eds. Armstead L. Robinson, Craig C. Foster, and Donald H. Ogilvie (New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1969), 55-74; Abdul Hakim Ibn Alkalimat [Abdul Alkalimat], "The Ideology of Black Social Science," in The Death of White Sociology, ed., Joyce A. Ladner (New York: Vanguard Books, 1973), 175-87; and Gerald A. McWorter [Abdul Alkalimat] and Ronald W. Bailey, "Black Studies Curriculum Development in the 1980s: Patterns of Consensus, Conflict, and Change," paper number 17 in a series titled Afro Scholars Working Papers (Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Afro-American Studies and Research Program, [1984?]), 1-58, microfilm.

34. Nathan Hare, "The Case for Black Separation: 'Black Perspective'," in Black Power and Student Rebellion, eds. James McEnvoy and Abraham Miller (Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc., 1969, 234.

35. Ibid., 13.

36. Ibid.

37. Nathan Hare, "Text of a Speech to Be Delivered by Nathan Hare, Ph.D., to His Alma Mater, Langston University, on the Occasion of Their 'Cultural Renaissance' Rally, August 30, 1995, 6:00 P.M." Speech delivered by Nathan Hare, but it is not obvious from the title whether the title was given to the speech by Dr. Hare, or assigned to it by someone else, Received by the author from the Melvin B. Tolson Black Heritage Center, Langston University, Langston, Oklahoma, Mr. Ronald Keys, Curator, on September 3, 1993, 11-13.

38. Hare, "The Challenge of A Black Scholar," 61.

39. Maulana Ron Karenga, "from the Quotable Karenga," in the Black Power Revolt, (A Collection of Essays) ed. Floyd B. Barbour (Boston, Massachusetts: Extended Horizons Books, 1968), 166.

40. Ibid., 165.

41. Maulana Ron Karenga, "The Black Community and the University: A Community Organizer's Perspective," in Black Students in the University: A Symposium, eds. Armstead L. Robinson, Craig C. Foster, and Donald H. Ogilvie (New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1969), 42-45.

42. Ibid., 37-38.

43. Maulana Karenga, "The Black Male/Female Connection," in Crisis in Black Sexual Politics, eds. Nathan Hare and Julia Hare (San Francisco, California: Black Think Tank, 1989), 48d.

44. Abdul Hakimu Ibn Alkalimat, "The Ideology of Black Social Science," in The Death of White Sociology, ed. Joyce A. Ladner (New York: Vanguard Books, 1973), 183.

45. Ibid., 183-84.

46. Gerald A. McWorter, "Deck the Ivy Halls: The Case of Black Studies," in Black Studies in the University: A Symposium, eds. Armstead L. Robinson, Craig C. Foster, and Donald H. Ogilvie (New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1969), 57-64.

47. Ibid.

48. Ibid., 63.

49. Ibid., 64.

50. Ibid., 67.

51. Ibid., 71.

52. Ibid., 65.

53. Ibid., 66-67.

54. Ibid., 72-73.

55. Gerald A. McWorter and Ronald W. Bailey, "Black Studies Curriculum Development in the 1980s: Patterns of Consensus, Conflict, and Change," Paper number 17 in a series titled Afro Scholars Working Papers (Urbana Illinois: University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Afro-American Studies and Research Program, 1984?), Microfilm, 1-51; Abdul Alkalimat, review of Eurocentrism by Samir Amin, in Black Scholar 21 (Summer 1992): 43.

56. [W.E.B. DuBois,] W.E.B. DuBois: A Reader, ed. Meir Weinburg (New York: Harper and Row, 1970), xv-xvi, 352.

57. Harold M. Baron, "The Web of Urban Racism," in Institutional Racism in America, ed. Louis L. Knowles and Kenneth Prewitt (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1969), 140-41; Thomas F. Pettigrew, "Racially Separate or Together? (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1971), 2; Malefi Kete Asante, "The Afrocentric Idea in Education," The Journal of Negro Education 60 (Spring 1991): 177; "Life in the 'Promised Land': African American Migrants in Northern Cities 1916-1940," Art and Zoo (News for Schools from the Smithsonian Institute, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, Washington, D.C.), January 1992, 1-2.

58. "Life in the Promised Land," 2.

59. Ibid.; Lerone Bennett, Before the Mayflower: A History of the Negro in America 1619-1966 (Chicago, Illinois: Johnson Publishing Company, Inc., 1966), 221; Asante, "The Afrocentric Idea in Education," 177.

60. This shift in emphasis is discussed in Chapter 2.

61. Louis L. Knowles and Kenneth Prewitt, eds. Institutional Racism in America (Englewood Cliffs, New

Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1969), 7-9.

62. Ibid.

63. Ibid., 7. In defining Manifest Destiny, Knowles and Prewitt wrote:

Manifest destiny was simply the idea that white Americans were destined, either by natural forces or by Divine Right, to control at least the North American continent and, in many versions of the theory, a much greater share of the earth surface (p. 10).

Of the ideas of the white man's burden, they stated:

This notion of the "white man's burden" was that the white race, particularly Anglo-Saxons of Britain and America, should accept the (Christian) responsibility for helping the poor colored masses to find a better way of life (p. 12).

64. Ibid., 8.

65. Ibid., 9.

66. Ibid., 8.

67. Ibid., 9; A brief discussion of Social Darwinism, or the Social Darwinian theory of evolution, is also found in the following source: William Kornblum, Sociology in a Changing World (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1988), 89-90; According to Kornblum, Charles Darwin's biological theory of evolution had a profound effect on Herbert Spencer (1820-1903), "whose writings in sociology and philosophy" dominated "intellectual life in much of the Western world from 1870 to 1890" (p. 89). He noted that Darwin's theory of biological evolution influenced Spencer to develop a theory of social evolution. Kornblum explained the social evolutionary process as follows:

[S]ocial evolution... parallels biological evolution in that the most successful adaptations are handed down to the next generation. It is this process that Spencer had in mind when he coined the phrase "survival of the fittest." He meant that the people who are most successful at adapting to the environment in which they find themselves are most likely to survive and to have children who will also be

successful. (p. 89).

68. Knowles and Prewitt, 9.

69. Ibid.

70. Ibid. In footnotes 3, 4, and 5 on pages 8 and 9 of Institutional Racism in America (1969), Knowles and Prewitt identify the source of this quotation as Thomas F. Gossett, Race: The History of and Idea in America (Dallas: SMU Press, 1963), p. 145; underline mine.

71. Ibid.

72. Ibid., 6-7.

73. Ibid.

74. Ibid.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- The African American Encyclopedia. 1993 ed. Vol. 1. S.v. "Black Power Conference."
- _____. 1993 ed. Vol. 1. S.v. "Black Power Movement" by Gale T. Tate.
- _____. 1993 ed. Vol. 1. S.v. "Black Studies."
- _____. 1993 ed. Vol. 3. S.v. "Hare, Nathan."
- _____. 1993 ed. Vol. 4. S.v. "Karenga, Ron Ndabetta."
- Alkalimat, Abd'l Hakim Ibn (Gerald McWorter). "The Ideology of Black Social Science." In The Death of White Sociology, ed. Joyce A. Ladner, 173-189. New York: Vintage Press, 1973.
- _____, Abdul. Review of Eurocentrism, by Samir Amin. In Black Scholar 21 (1991): 43-44.
- Anderson, James D. The Education of Blacks in the South, 1860-1935. Chapel Hill, North Carolina: The University of North Carolina Press, 1988.
- Asante, Molefi Kete and Kariamuw Welsh Asante. African Culture: The Rhythms of Unity. Trenton, New Jersey: African World Press, Inc., 1990.
- Asante, Molefi Kete. "The Afrocentric Idea in Education." The Journal of Negro Education. Spring 1991, 60: 170-180. Washington, D.C.: Howard University Press.
- Asante, Molefi K. and Mark T. Mattson. The Historical and Cultural Atlas of African Americans. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1991.
- Asante, Molefi Kete. "African American Studies: The Future of the Discipline." Black Scholar 22 (Summer 1992): 20-29.
- Barbour, Floyd B. ed. The Black Power Revolt. Boston, Massachusetts: Extending Horizons Books, 1968.

- Baron, Harold M. "The Web of Urban Racism." In Institutional Racism in America, ed. Louis L. Knowles and Kenneth Prewitt, 134-76. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1969.
- Bennett, Lerone Jr. Before the Mayflower: A History of the Negro in America, 1619-1966. 3d. ed. Chicago: Johnson Publishing Company, Inc., 1966.
- Berry, Mary Francis. "Unfinished Business of Carter G. Woodson." New York City Sun, 20-26 March 1991.
- Berry, Mary Francis and John W. Blassingame. Long Memory: The Black Experience in America. New York: Oxford University Press, 1982.
- Bigelow, Barbara Carlisle, ed. Contemporary Black Biography: Profiles from the International Black Community. Vol. 4. Detroit, Michigan: Gail Research, Inc., 1993. S.v. "Walter E. Williams," by Isaac Rosen.
- Billingsley, Andrew. Black Families in White America. 1st Touchstone edition, 1988. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1968.
- Blackwell, James E. and Philip S. Hart. Cities, Suburbs, and Blacks: A Study of Concerns, Distrust, and Alienation. Bayside, New York: General Hall, Inc., 1982.
- Blackwell, James E. The Black Community: Diversity and Unity. 2d. ed. New York: Harper and Row, 1985.
- Blake, J. Herman. "Black Nationalism." In Black Conflict with White America: A Reader of Social and Political Analysis. ed. Van Der Slik. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing, 1970.
- Blassingame, John W., ed. New Perspective on Black Studies. Urbana Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1971.
- Bond, Julian. Introduction to Eyes on the Prize: America's Civil Rights Years 1954-1965 by Juan Williams. New York: Viking, 1987.
- Bracey, John, August Meier, and Elliot Rudwick. "The Black Sociologists: The First Half Century." In Death of White Sociology, ed. Joyce A. Ladner, 3-

22. New York: Random House, 1973.
- Bullock, Henry Allen. A History of Negro Education in the South. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1970.
- Burton, Orville Vernon. Foreword to Born to Rebel: An Autobiography by Benjamin E. Mays. Athens, Georgia: University of Georgia Press, 1987.
- Butcher, Margaret Just. The Negro in American Culture. New York: New American Library, 1956.
- Clark, Kenneth B. "A Charade of Power: Black Students at White Colleges." In New Perspectives on Black Studies, ed. John Blassingame, 116-122. Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1971.
- _____. A Possible Reality: A Design for the Attainment of High Academic Achievement for Inner-City Students. New York: The MARC Corporation, An Emerson Hall Book, 1972.
- _____. "Alternative Public Education Systems." In Equal Education Opportunity, ed. Harvard Education Review, 173-177. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- _____. Dark Ghetto: Dilemmas of Social Power. 2d ed. Middletown, Connecticut: Wesleyan University Press, 1965.
- _____. "Issues in Urban Education." In Black Manifesto for Education, ed. Jim Haskins, 74-84. New York: William Morrow and Company, Inc., 1973.
- _____. "Some Personal Observations on Black Separatism." In the Introduction to Black Separatism: A Bibliography, ed. Betty Lanier Jenkins and Susan Phillis, xiii - xv. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1976.
- _____. "Unfinished Business: The Toll of Psychic Violence." Newsweek, 11 January 1993, 38.
- Clarke, John Henrick. "Education and the Making of the Black Urban Ghetto." In Black Manifesto for Education, ed. Jim Haskins, 16-40. New York: William Morrow and Company, Inc., 1973.
- Cloyd, Iris, ed. Who's Who Among Black Americans, 1990-1991. 6th ed. Detroit, New York: Gale Research,

Inc., 1990.

Cruse, Harold. The Crisis of the Negro Intellectual: A Historical Analysis of the Failure of Black Leadership. New York: Quill, 1967.

"Contributing Authors." Black Scholar. 21 (March-May 1990): 79.

Daniels, Ron. "The Study of Black History: The Challenge to be of the Race and for the Race." New York Amsterdam News, 13 March 1993.

Davis, Arthur P. and Michael W. Peplow. The New Negro Renaissance: An Anthology. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Davis, David Brion. "Reflections." In Black Studies in the University: A Symposium. ed. Armstead L. Robinson, Craig C. Foster, and Donald H. Ogilvie. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1969.

Dewart, Janet, ed. State of Black America 1987. New York: National Urban League, Inc., 1987.

Dictionary of American Negro Biography. 1982 ed. S.v. "Frazier, E[dward] Franklin."

Dictionary of Black Culture. 1973 ed. S.v. "Hare, Nathan, Jr."

_____. 1973 ed. S.v. "Karenga, Maulana Ron."

[DuBois, W.E.B.]. "The Strivings of the Negro People (1897)." In W.E.B. DuBois: A Reader, ed. Meyer Weinberg, 19-25. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1970.

DuBois, W.E.B. "To the Nations of the World." In W.E.B. DuBois, An ABC of Color, with an introduction by John Oliver Killens, 19-23. New York: International Publishers, 1963.

[____]. The Autobiography of W.E.B. DuBois: A Soliloquy on Viewing My Life From the Last Decade of its First Century. ed. Herbert Aptheker. [U.S.A.]: International Publishers, 1968.

_____. "A Negro Nation Within the Nation." In W.E.B. DuBois Speaks: Speeches and Addresses 1920-1963. ed. Philip S. Foner. 77-86. New York:

Pathfinder Press, 1970.

- _____. The Souls of Black Folks. With an Introduction by Trusman Nelson. New York: Washington Square Press, 1970.
- [_____]. W.E.B. DuBois: A Reader. ed., with an introduction by Meyer Weinberg. New York: Harper and Row, 1970.
- _____. A W.E.B. DuBois Reader. Edited by Andrew G. Paschal. New York: MacMillan Company, 1971.
- [_____]. "Letter of Application for Membership in the Communist Party of the United States." In W.E.B. DuBois, The Seventh Son: The Thought and Writing of W.E.B. DuBois. Vol. 2, ed. Julius Lester. New York: Random House, 1971.
- [_____]. "Segregation." In The Seventh Son: The Thought and Writings of W.E.B. DuBois. Vol. 2. d. Julius Lester, 229-31. New York: Random House, 1971.
- [_____]. "The Negro College." In The Seventh Son: The Thought and Writings of W.E.B. DuBois. Vol. 2. d. Julius Lester, 214-23. New York: Random House, 1971.
- _____. The Seventh Son: The Thought and Writings of W.E.B. DuBois. Vol. 2. ed. Julius Lester. New York: Random House, 1971.
- [_____]. "Does the Negro Need Separate Schools?" In The Seventh Son: The Thought and Writings of W.E.B. DuBois, Vol. 2, ed. Julius Lester, 408-18. New York: Random House, 1971.
- _____. "On Being Ashamed of Oneself: An Essay on Race and Pride." In The Seventh Son: The Thought and Writings of W.E.B. DuBois, Vol. 2, ed. Julius Lester, 225-29. New York: Random House, 1971.
- _____. The Emerging Thought of W.E.B. DuBois. Compiled and with an introduction, commentaries, and a personal memoir by Henry Lee Moon. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1972.
- [_____]. Against Racism: Unpublished Essays, Papers, Addresses, 1887-1961. ed. Herbert Aptheker. Amherst, Massachusetts: University of

Massachusetts Press, 1985.

Edwards, Harry. Black Students. New York: Free Press, 1970.

Encyclopedia of African-American Civil Rights: From Emancipation to the Present, 1992 ed. S.v. "Civil Rights Bill of 1990."

_____, 1992 ed. S.v. "Clark, Kenneth Bancroft."

_____, 1992 ed. S.v. "Frazier, Edward Franklin."

Encyclopedia of Black America, 1981 ed. S.v. "Sowell, Thomas."

_____, 1981 ed. S.v. "Willie, Charles V."

_____, 1984 ed. S.v. "Clark, Kenneth Bancroft."

Evory, Ann, ed. Contemporary Authors: A Bio-Bibliographical Guide to Current Authors and Their Works. First Revision, Vols. 41-44. Detroit, Michigan: Gale Research Company, Book Towers, 1979.

Fineman, Howard, John McCormick, Ginny Carroll, and Vern E. Smith. "The New Politics of Race." Newsweek, 6 May 1991.

Foner, Philip S., ed. The Voice of Black America: Major Speeches by Negroes in the United States, 1797-1971. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1972.

_____. W.E.B. DuBois Speaks: Speeches and Addresses 1920-1963. New York: Pathfinder Press, 1970.

Foster, Gerald Anthony. "The Ills of Integration: A Black Perspective." In Dream of Reality: The Modern Black Struggle and Equality, ed. Jeannine Swift, 77-85. New York: Greenwood Press, 1991.

Franklin, John Hope. From Slavery to Freedom: A History of Negro Americans. 5th ed. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1980.

Frazier, E. Franklin. The Negro in the United States. New York: Macmillian Company, 1957.

_____. E. Franklin Frazier on Race Relations. ed., with an introduction by G. Franklin Edwards.

Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968.

_____. "The Failure of the Negro Intellectual." In The Death of White Sociology, ed. Joyce A. Ladner, 52-56. New York: Vanguard Books, 1973.

Gale, Addison Jr., ed. The Black Aesthetic. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1972.

Goldstein, Robert. "Prisoners of the Economy." New York Times, 25 October 1987, Book Review Section, 1, 46-48.

"Grad's Book on New Black Middle Class Acclaimed, First Printing Goes Fast." This Week at Xavier [Xavier University, New Orleans, Louisiana, Newsletter, edited by Paul Keith, Director of University Relations], 17, No. 6.

Green, Dan S. and Edwin D. Driver, eds. W.E.B. DuBois on Sociology and the Black Community. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1978.

Hacker, Andrew. Two Nations: Black and White, Separate, Hostile, Unequal. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1992.

_____. "Blacks and Clinton." New York Review, 28 January 1993.

Haines, Herbert H. Black Radicals and the Civil Rights Mainstream, 1954-1970. Knoxville, Tennessee: University of Tennessee Press, 1988.

Hamilton, Charles V. "Promoting Priorities: African American Political Influence in the 1990s." New York Amsterdam News, 13 February 1993.

Hare, Nathan. "How White Power Whitewashes Black Power." In The Black Power Revolt, ed. Floyd B. Barbour, 182-188. Boston, Massachusetts: Extending Horizons Books, 1968.

_____. "A Radical Perspective on Social Science Curricula." In Black Studies in the University: A Symposium, ed. Armstead L. Robinson, Craig C. Foster, and Daniel H. Ogilvie, 104-121. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1969.

_____. "The Case for Separation: 'Black Perspective.'" In Black Power and the Student Rebellion, ed. James McEvoy and Abraham Miller,

233-35. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc., 1969.

_____. "The Challenge of A Black Scholar." Black Scholar (December 1969): 58-63.

_____. 1971. "What Should Be the Role of Afro-American Education in the Undergraduate Curriculum?" In New Perspectives on Black Studies, ed. John W. Blassingame, 3-15. Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1971.

_____. "Will The Real Black Man Please Stand Up?" Black Scholar 2 (June 1971): 32-35.

_____. "The Challenge of A Black Scholar." In The Death of White Sociology, ed. Joyce A. Ladner, 67-78. New York: Vanguard Books, 1973.

_____. Chairman of the Board, The Black Think Tank, San Francisco, California to Jerry Woods (author), 4 September 1993. Letter from Dr. Nathan Hare to the author, including responses to questions on a questionnaire mailed to him in a letter dated 22 July 1993 and on another questionnaire mailed to the Alumni Office of Langston University in Langston, Oklahoma, his alma mater, in a letter dated 23 July 1993.

_____. Hare, Nathan. Speech delivered at Langston University's Cultural Renaissance Rally on August 30, 1975. Heading on the speech read as follows: "Text of A Speech to be delivered by Nathan Hare, Ph. D., to his Alma Mater, Langston University on the Occasion of Their 'Cultural Renaissance' Rally, August 30, 1975, 6:00 O'Clock P.M." Jerry N. Woods (author) Received a copy of the speech, along with other materials, from the Melvin B. Tolson Black Heritage Center, Langston University, Langston, Oklahoma, Mr. Ronald Keys, Curator, in a letter dated 3 September 1993.

Hare, Nathan and Julia Hare. Crisis in Black Sexual Politics. San Francisco, California: Black Think Tank, 1989.

Harris, Joseph R. "Education for Manhood: A Black Perspective for Higher Education," In Black Manifesto for Education, ed. Jim Haskins, 97-115. New York: William Morrow and Company, 1973.

Haskins, James. Profiles In Black Power. Garden City,

- New York: Double Day and Company, Inc., 1972.
- _____. , ed. Black Manifesto for Education. New York: William Morrow and Company, Inc., 1973.
- _____. "Black Studies: Is a Valid Idea Being Validated?" In Black Manifesto for Education, ed. Jim Haskins, 116-127. New York: William Morrow and Company, Inc. 1973.
- Herbers, John. The Black Dilemma. New York: The John Day Company, 1973.
- Hooks, Benjamin L. "The Reagan Years and Black America," Crisis, April 1984.
- Hornsby, Alton, Jr. The Black Almanac: From Involuntary Servitude (1619-1860) to the Age of Disillusionment 1964-1971. Woodbury, New York: Barron's Educational Series, Inc., 1972.
- Huggins, Nathan I. Afro-American Studies, A Report to the Ford Foundation, 1985.
- Jackson, Edward M. Black Education in Contemporary America: A Crisis in Ambiguity. Bristol, Indiana: Wynham Press, Inc., 1986.
- Jenkins, Betty Lanier and Susan Phillips. Black Separatism: A Bibliography. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1976.
- Joyner, Gerald David and Robin M. Williams, Jr. eds. A Common Destiny: Blacks and American Society. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press, 1989.
- Karenga, Maulana. "Political Culture and Resurgent Racism in the United States." Black Scholar (May/June 1985): 21-35.
- _____. "The Black Male/Female Connection." In Crisis in Black Sexual Politics, ed. Nathan Hare and Julia Hare, 45-48d. San Francisco, California: Black Think Tank, 1989.
- [Karenga, Maulana Ron.] "From the Quotable Karenga." In The Black Power Revolt (A Collection of Essays), ed. Floyd B. Barbour. Boston, Massachusetts: Extended Horizons Books, 1968.
- _____. "The Black Community and the University: A Community Organizer's Perspective," which includes

- the "Question Period." In Black Studies in the University: A Symposium. eds. Armstead L. Robinson, Craig C. Foster and Donald H. Ogilvie, 37-54. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1969.
- _____. "Which Road: Nationalism, Pan-Africanism, Socialism?" Black Scholar 6 (October 1974): 21-30.
- Karp, Abby. "Gauging the Ascent." Baltimore Sun, 13 January 1988, morning edition, sec. D, 1, 5.
- Katz, Michael B. The Undeserving Poor From the War on Poverty to the War on Welfare. New York: Pantheon Books, 1989.
- Keith, Paul. (Director of University Relations of Xavier University of New Orleans, Louisiana). Letter dated 14 July 1992 and other materials to Jerry Woods, author, Howard Beach, New York, in response to the author's request for biographical data on Bartholomew Landry, who received his undergraduate degree from Xavier.
- _____, ed. This Week at Xavier. "Grad's Book on New Black Middle Class Acclaimed, First Printing Goes Fast." [Xavier University, New Orleans, Louisiana, Newsletter, 17, no. 6., 15 March 1988.
- King, Martin Luther, Jr. Stride Toward Freedom: The Montgomery Story. New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1958.
- _____. Why We Can't Wait. New York: New American Library, 1964.
- _____. Where Do We Go From Here: Chaos or Community? Boston, Massachusetts: Beacon Press, 1968.
- Knowles, Louis L. and Kenneth Prewitt. eds. Institutional Racism in America. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1969.
- Kurtz, Paul. Preface to The Black Man in America: Integration and Separation, by James A. Moss, ed. New York: Dell Publishing Company, Inc., 1971.
- Ladner, Joyce A., ed. The Death of White Sociology. New York: Random House, 1973.
- _____, ed. The Death of White Sociology. New York:

Vanguard Books, 1973.

_____, ed. The Death of White Sociology. New York: Vintage Books, 1973.

Landry, Bart. The New Black Middle Class. Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1987.

Lincoln, C. Eric. The Black Muslims in America. Boston, Massachusetts: Beacon Press, 1961.

_____. The Negro Pilgrimage in America. New York: Bantam Books, 1967.

Logan, Rayford W. and Michael R. Winston., eds. Dictionary of American Negro Biography. New York: W.W. Norton and Company. 1982. s.v. "Frazier, E[dward] Franklin," by C. Franklin Edwards.

Lowery, Charles D. and John F. Marszalek, eds. Encyclopedia of African American Civil Rights: From Emancipation to the Present. New York: Greenwood Press. 1992. s.v. "Frazier, Edward Franklin, " by Gary B. Mills.

Marable, Manning. Race, Reform and Rebellion: The Second Reconstruction in Black America, 1945-1982. Jackson, Mississippi: University Press of Mississippi, 1984.

Marshall, Thurgood. "The Opinion of Justice Marshall." (Marshall's Opinion in Reference to the Bakke Decision, Supreme Court of the United States, Regents of the University of California v. Bakke), In Sourcebook of Equal Educational Opportunity, 3d. ed., 119-29. Chicago, Illinois: Marquis Academia Media, 1949.

May, Hal. Contemporary Authors: A Bio-Bibliographical Guide to Current Writers in Fiction, General Non-Fiction, Poetry, Journalism, Drama, Motion Pictures, Television, and Other Fields. Detroit, Michigan: Gale Research Company, The Book Tower, 1983.

May, Hal and Deborah A. Staub, eds. Contemporary Authors: A Bio-Bibliographical Guide to Current Writers in Fiction, General Non-Fiction, Poetry, Journalism, Drama, Motion Pictures, Television, and Other Fields. New Revision, Vol. 25. Detroit, Michigan: Gale Research, Inc., Book Tower, 1989.

- Mays, Benjamin E. Born to Rebel: An Autobiography. With a Foreword by Orville Vernon Burton. Athen, Georgia: University of Georgia Press, 1987.
- Metcalf, George R. Black Profiles. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1970.
- McWorter, Gerald A. "Deck the Ivy Racist Halls: The Case of Black Studies." In Black Studies in the University: A Symposium, eds. Armstead L Robinson, Craig C. Foster, and Donald H. Ogilvie, 55-74. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1969.
- McWorter, Gerald and Ronald W. Bailey. "Black Studies Curriculum Development in the 1980s: Patterns of Consensus, Conflict, and Change." Paper number 17 in a series titled Afro Scholars Working Papers. Schomburg Center for Research in Black Culture, New York, New York; Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, African American Studies and Research Program, [1984?]. Microfilm.
- Meier, August and Elliott Rudwick. Black History and the Historical Profession, 1915-1980. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986.
- Merton, Robert K. Social Theory and Social Structure. New York: The Free Press, 1968.
- Miller, Herman P. 1971. Rich Man, Poor Man. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1971.
- Molette, Carlton W. and Barbara J. Molette. Black Theatre: Premise and Presentation. Bristol, Indiana: Wynham Hall Press, Inc., 1986.
- Moss, James A., ed. The Black Man in America: Integration and Separation. New York: Dell Publishing Company, Inc., 1971.
- [Myrdal, Gunnar]. "Gunnar Myrdal on Negro Education." In Education in the United States: A Documentary History, ed. Sol Cohen, 3000-3006, Vol. 5. California: University of California Press, 1974.
- Nasso, Christine, ed. Contemporary Authors: Authors: A Bio-Bibliographical Guide to Current Authors and Their Works. First Revision. Vol. 25-28. Detroit, Michigan: Gale Research Company, Book Tower, 1977.
- National Commission on Excellence in Education. A

Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1983.

Newby, Robert G. Book Review of The Declining Significance of Race: Blacks and Changing American Institutions by William Julius Wilson. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. American Journal of Sociology 87: 100-106, 1978.

Ola, Akinshiju C. "Dr. Clarke Tells Apollo Radio Audience to Develop Their Own Value System." New York Amsterdam News. 13 June 1992, 3, 36.

Pear, Robert. "His Heroes Are Social Democrats." New York Times, 25 October 1987, Book Review Section, 47.

Pepper, Robert S. "Education Is Not Enough." Ph.D. dissertation, Graduate Center, City University of New York, 1975.

Pettigrew, Thomas F. Racially Separate Or Together? New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1971.

Pinkney, Alphonso. "The Assimilation of Afro Americans." The Black Scholar. December: 36-46, 1969.

_____. The American Way of Violence. New York: Random House, 1972.

_____. Red, Black, and Green: Black Nationalism in the United States. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1976.

_____. The Myth of Black Progress. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1984.

Ploski, Harry A. and James Williams, eds. The Negro Almanac: A Reference Work on the African American, 5th ed. New York: Gale Research, Inc., 1989.

Poston, Ted. "Kenneth Clark: Civil Rights Front Runner." New York Post, 16 March 1964.

Random House College Dictionary. 1973 ed. S.v. "Great Depression."

Ravitch, Diane. The Schools We Deserve: Reflections on the Educational Crisis of Our Times. New York: Basic Books, 1985.

- Record, Wilson. Book Review of The Declining Significance of Race: Blacks and Changing American Institutions by William Julius Wilson. American Journal of Sociology 85: 965-66, 1980.
- Robinson, Armstead L., Craig C. Foster, and Donald H. Ogilvie, eds. Black Studies in the University: A Symposium. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1969.
- Rose, Arnold. The Negro in America: The Condensed Version of Gunnar Myrdal's An American Dilemma. New York: Harper and Row, 1948.
- Rose, Peter I., Stanley Rothman, and William J. Wilson. Through Different Eyes: Black and White Perspectives on American Race Relations. New York: Oxford Press, 1973.
- Schwartz, Barry N. and Robert Disch. White Racism: It's History, Pathology and Practice. New York: Dell Publishing Co., Inc., 1970.
- Simmons, Althea T.L. "1984: The Crucial Vote... Civil Rights and Reaganomics." Crisis, April 1984.
- Sinclair, Abiola. "Martin R. Delany, Father of Black Nationalism." New York Amsterdam News, 19 February 1994, 26, 36.
- Smithsonian Institute. Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, "Life in the 'Promised Land': African American Migrants in Northern Cities 1916-1940." Art and Zoo. News for Schools. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institute, January 1992, 1-4.
- Sowell, Thomas. Black Education: Myths and Tragedies. New York: David McCay Company, 1972.
- _____. ed. Essays and Data on American Ethnic Groups. The Urban Institute, 1978.
- _____. Knowledge and Decisions. New York: Basic Books, 1980.
- _____. Education: Assumptions Versus History. Stanford, California: Hoover Institute Press, 1986.
- Staub, Deborah A., ed. Contemporary Authors: A Bio-Bibliographical Guide to Current Writers in Fiction, General Nonfiction, Poetry, Journalism,

Drama, Motion Pictures, Television, and Other Fields. New Revised Series. Vol. 24. Detroit, Michigan: Gale Research, Inc., 1988.

Sussman, Michael H. "A Sorry Story...Reagan's Record on Civil Rights Retrenchment." Crisis, April 1984.

Thompson, Daniel C. A Black Elite: A Profile of Graduates of UNCF Colleges. New York: Greenwood Press, 1986.

Turner, James. "The Sociology of Black Nationalism." The Black Scholar. December: 18-27, 1969.

Weinberg, Meyer. The Search for Quality Integrated Education: Policy and Research on Minority Students in School and College. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1983.

Whitaker, Mark, Mark Starr, John McCormick, Vern E. Smith, Marcus Mabry, Lynda Wright, and Ginny Carroll. "A Crisis of Shattered Dreams." Newsweek, 6 May 1991.

White, Joseph L. The Psychology of Blacks: An Afro-American Perspective. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1984.

Who's Who Among Black Americans 1985. 4th ed. S.v. "Williams, Walter Edward."

_____. 1988. 5th ed. S.v. "Willie, Charles Vert."

_____. 1990-1991. 6th ed. S.v. "Clark, Kenneth Bancroft."

_____. 1990-1991. 6th ed. S.v. "McWorter, Gerald A."

_____. 1992-1993. 7th ed. S.v. "McWorter, Gerald A."

_____. 1990/1991. 6th ed. S.v. "Hare, Nathan."

_____. 1990/1991. 6th ed. S.v. "Willie, Charles Vert."

_____. 1992/1993. 7th ed. S.v. "Hare, Nathan."

Who's Who In America 1990-91. 46th ed. S.v. "Clark, Kenneth Bancroft."

_____. 1990-91. 46th ed. S.v. "Willie, Charles Vert."

Who's Who In American Education 1989-90: Educators in Professional Schools of Education and School Administration and Support Staff. 2d ed. Vol. 2. S.v. "Willie, Charles V."

Who's Who in the East 1995-1996. 25th ed. S.v. "Pinkney, Alphonso."

Williams, Juan. Eyes on the Prize: America's Civil Rights Years, 1954-1965. New York: Viking Penguin, Inc., 1987.

Williams, Michael W. ed. The African American Encyclopedia. vol. 1. New York: Marshall Cavendish.

Williams, Walter E. The State Against Blacks. New York: McGraw Hill, 1982.

Williamson, Joel. The Crucible of Race: Black-White Relations in the American South Since Emancipation. New York: Oxford University Press, 1984.

Willie, Charles V. "The Inclining Significance of Race." Society 15: 10-15, 1978.

_____. The Sociology of Urban Education. Lexington, Massachussets: Lexington Books, 1978.

_____. The Class and Caste Controversy. New York: General Hall, 1979.

_____. A New Look at Black Families. 2d. ed. Bayside, New York: General Hall, 1981.

_____. Race, Ethnicity, and Socioeconomic Status: A Theoretical Analysis of Their Interrelationship. Bayside, New York: General Hall, 1983.

_____. School Desegregation Plans That Work. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1984.

_____. Five Black Scholars: An Analysis of Family Life, Education, and Career. Lanham, Maryland: Abt Books, 1986.

_____. Effective Education: A Minority Policy Perspective. New York: Greenwood Press, 1987.

- _____. "The Future of School Desegregation." In The State of Black America 1987, ed. Janet Dewart, 37-48. New York: National Urban League, 1987.
- _____. "The Future of School Desegregation." In The Education of African Americans, ed. Charles V. Willie, Antonine M. Garibaldi, and Wornie L. Reed, 51-64. New York: Auburn House, 1991.
- Willie, Charles V., Antoine M. Garibaldi, and Wornie L. Reed, eds. The Education of African Americans. New York: Auburn House, 1991.
- Willie, Charles V. and Ronald R. Edmonds, eds. 1978. Black Colleges in America: Challenge, Development, Survival. New York: Teachers College Press, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1978.
- Wilson, William J. "The Declining Significance of Race: Revised But Not Revisited." Society 15: 11-21, 1978.
- _____. The Declining Significance of Race: Blacks and Changing American Institutions. 2d. ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980.
- _____. "Race, Class, and Public Policy." The American Sociologist 16: 125-134, 1981.
- _____. The Truly Disadvantaged: The Inner City, The Underclass, and Public Policy. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1987.
- _____. "Ghetto Underclass and the Social Transformation of the Inner City." The Black Scholar 19: 10-17, 1988.
- Woodson, Carter G. The Education of the Negro Prior to 1861. 2d ed. Washington, D.C.: The Associated Publishers, 1919.
- _____. The Education of the Negro Prior to 1861. Reprinted 2d ed. Salem, New Hampshire: Ayer Company Publishers, Inc., 1968.
- Wright, Nathan Jr. Black Power and Urban Unrest. New York: Hawthorn Books, Inc., 1967.