Trotter Review

Volume 2
Issue 3 *Trotter Institute Review*

Article 3

9-22-1988

Dynamics of Minority Education: An Index to the Status of Race and Ethnic Relations in the United States

James E. Blackwell
University of Massachusetts Boston

Dynamics of Minority Education: An Index to the Status of Race and Ethnic Relations in the United States[1]

by
James E. Blackwell

Presented on the Occasion of His Retirement
April 21, 1988

Introduction of Professor James E. Blackwell

by Wornie L. Reed

Welcome to the fifth in our series of Distinguished Lectures this academic year. I am honored to present today's distinguished lecturer; however, this task fills me with mixed emotions as I am presenting Professor James Blackwell in what is his valedictory lecture as a regular faculty member at the University of Massachusetts at Boston. Professor Blackwell has held teaching positions at five universities in addition to the University of Massachusetts at Boston. He has lectured widely throughout the United States, and in countries in Africa and Asia. He is an honored scholar—the author of eight books, fourteen research monographs, and many articles and chapters in journals and books. Among the voluntary positions he has held in professional organizations, he has been President of the Society for the Study of Social Problems, President of the Eastern Sociological Society, and founding President of the Caucus of Black Sociologists.

For his scholarship and for his professional contributions, Professor Blackwell has earned numerous awards, including election to membership in the prestigious Sociological Research Association, the Spivak Award and the DuBois-Johnson-Frazier Award of the American Sociological Association, and the Chancellor's Medal, the highest honor bestowed by the University of Massachusetts at Boston.

Professor Blackwell exemplifies as well as any scholar the use of scholarship in the interest of social policy. What impresses many of us about him is that, unlike some scholars who engage in social science scholarship for scholarship purposes only, Professor Blackwell uses the tools and techniques of social science to advance society.

Although Professor Blackwell has traveled across this country speaking and consulting on critical issues, especially education, he is probably best known as a mentor. Many of you may know that "mentoring" is the concept and practice that Professor Blackwell advances in his book, Mainstreaming Outsiders: The Production of the Black Professionals. *Significantly, he has been performing this role on a national scale for all of his academic career. Although the University has not had a doctoral program in the Social Sciences in the 18 years he has taught here, Professor Blackwell has more post-doctoral students across the country than many professors who regularly supervise dissertations in their departments. He has dozens of young scholars across this country whom he has advised throughout their careers, and many of them have sent their best wishes for today's occasion.*

One final note about Professor Blackwell. In the old "down home" saying: "He does not bite his tongue."

Introduction

Throughout this century scholars and legal experts have devoted special attention to the issue of race and ethnicity as a determinant of life chances in the United States. Some of the more influential treatises in the social and behavioral sciences, many of which have become classics, addressed fundamental, derivative (and often more compelling) extensions of race and ethnicity. They focused on such topics as race-based group dominance, ethnic stratification, structural inequality based upon racial or ethnic identification, beliefs in inherent racial superiority and status privilege, class exploitation, the nature of prejudice, and the maintenance of power over groups defined as subordinate in an ethnically and racially stratified social system. All of these

themes are clearly related to the current status of minorities in higher education.

At the turn of this century, following the 1896 decision by the U.S. Supreme Court in the *Plessy v. Ferguson* case, W.E.B. DuBois insightfully predicted in *Souls of Black Folk*[2] that "the color line" would become the most powerful instrument for structuring black-white relations during the remainder of the twentieth century. Oliver C. Cox[3] carefully formulated the connecting links between capitalism, the spread of racial dominance, class subjugation, and group exploitation. Gunnar Myrdal[4] provided an institutional framework for understanding the degree to which racial apartheid had become deeply entrenched in the American social and political fabric, and he also brought conceptual clarity to the process by which prevailing patterns of institutional discrimination had been incorporated as norms, expectations, and ritualistic behavior. Samuel Stouffer[5] argued in *The American Soldier* that racial conflict could indeed be reduced. Through greater interracial contact and social interaction across racial and ethnic boundaries, demeaning stereotypes about members of minority groups could be eliminated. Allport and Kramer[6] asserted that to fully understand *the nature of prejudice* it is necessary to deal with the multidimensionality of prejudice. Prejudice is essentially an attitudinal construct composed of a system of beliefs and emotions easily translatable into discriminatory behavior. More recently, Reginald Horsman[7], in *Race and Manifest Destiny*, traced the spread of the white supremacy doctrine from philologists, who were convinced that "the march of culture" was from East to West, that "God's chosen people" were those Europeans and their descendants who pioneered in European settlements, who conquered indigenous populations through warfare, trickery and deceit, and who relished "manifest destiny" and territorial expansion for their own benefit in the name of the Christian God.

In treatises by DuBois, Cox, Myrdal, Stouffer, and Horsman, the common element, along with the recognition of race-based dominance in the United States, is the articulation of a race-based ideology of entitlements and privileges. According to this ideology, membership in the dominant white population, irrespective of the qualifications and merits of individual persons, entitles one to *first choice*, to primacy of opportunity, to primacy of the access to education, jobs, income, wealth, status, and power. Membership in minority groups, on the other hand, entitles one to substantially less because minorities are seen as outsiders, pariahs, inferiors.

This ideology is not countenanced by the guiding principles of American democracy as set forth in the Constitution of the United States and its Amendments. Stances of this sort are contrary to the countless Congressional Acts that have codified the rights of all citizens. Yet it is precisely because of the endurance of such beliefs, their persistence in institutionalized patterns of race-based discrimination, that the NAACP and the NAACP-LDF mounted a legal assault on all forms of de jure and de facto discrimination. That is why they organized attacks against all manifestations of prejudice and segregation, including racial exclusions in higher education, which prevent minorities from sharing in the benefits of education.

> *. . . retrogression [has] come to characterize the condition of minorities in higher education.*

Historical and Legal Considerations

In order to more fully appreciate the current status of minorities in education, it is crucial to recall some of the historical events that provide a context for the interplay between race relations in the larger society and the condition of minorities in educational institutions. It is especially salient to mention here outcomes of influential U.S. Supreme Court decisions: *The University of Maryland v. Murray* (1935); *Missouri ex rel Gaines v. Canada* (1938); *Sipuel v. Board of Regents of the University of Oklahoma* (1948); *Sweatt v. Painter* (Texas, 1950); and *McLauren v. Oklahoma Regents* (1950).[8] The principles attacked and declared unconstitutional in these cases are instructive with respect to the degree to which members of a dominant group will deliberately construct legalistic barriers in order to maintain their favored position and restrict the rights of any group perceived as a threat.

Imagine a state law or an institutional practice that prevents minorities from attending a publicly-supported graduate or professional school even though the taxes imposed on members of that minority group help to finance that institution. Imagine a state policy by which minorities are awarded "out-of-state tuition grants" to attend a graduate or professional school anywhere outside their own home state so long as they do not attempt to desegregate an institution within their own home state. Imagine a state legislative practice of establishing racially separate, makeshift professional schools for blacks as a means of claiming adherence to the principle of "separate-but-equal," the purpose being to deny blacks the opportunity to enroll in white "flagship" state-supported institutions. How demeaning and cruel to finally admit blacks to a previously all-white graduate school, under court order, and then separate blacks from whites in the classroom. All of these practices were declared unconstitutional by the U.S. Supreme Court in the cases

cited.[9] Such declarations of unconstitutionality facilitated matriculation of students from minority groups into institutions then operating under the principle of de jure segregation. The desegregation mandates explicit in those court decisions were designed to promote equity, to eliminate racial disparities in education, to foster production of substantially larger numbers of minority professionals. They strengthened multiculturality in higher education.

Without question, this process would not have advanced to its present level of success had it not been for the second phase of the Civil Rights Movement[10]—the period between 1954 and 1972, beginning with the U.S. Supreme Court decision in the case of *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas* (1954) and ending with the First District Court decision in *Adams v. Richardson* (1972). It is especially crucial for students in this generation, of all racial and ethnic groups, to develop a sense of history. In studying this period in American social and political history we can comprehend the role of organizational leaders, can appreciate the importance of positive leadership at the federal level, can understand the power of interracial cooperation and interethnic coalitions among college students, civic organizations, and ordinary citizens—all committed to ending the monopoly of one group over resources and determined to create a society that expands constitutional guarantees to all its citizens, irrespective of race or ethnicity.

I often look back on the 1960s with much nostalgia—neither misplaced nor romanticized—for that was indeed a time of unparalleled *optimism and determination*, of commitment to the belief that by working together across racial and ethnic lines it was possible to create a more just and humane society. Hundreds of thousands of Americans truly believed that collective efforts could open up previously locked doors so that blacks, Puerto Ricans, Mexican-Americans and other Hispanics, Native Americans, and Asians could matriculate in a college or university of their choice.

Activists of that period advocated federal intervention and came to believe that the U.S. Department of Justice fully supported equality of opportunity and the rights of minorities as well as those of the white population. That belief stands in sharp contrast to the viewpoint held by so many Americans in 1988 that the U.S. Department of Justice is *against* justice for minority groups and that the Attorney General of the United States supports efforts to return this country to conditions characteristic of the pre-1954 period. During that second phase of the Civil Rights Movement there was a growing respect for due process at the federal level. Many Americans—of all racial and ethnic groups—looked to the national level for moral leadership. There was also leadership within many colleges and universities that set a tone of compliance with the law, with the moral imperative that we achieve a desegregated society. Few understood then the depth of hatred and suspicion of minorities (and of their sympathizers) represented in the person of J. Edgar Hoover, the Chief of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, his infiltrators, and agents provocateurs. Nevertheless, in retrospect, it is my belief that we have every reason to look back on that period with excitement, and with the realization that the collective energies of interracial coalitions, the sustained efforts of blacks themselves, and the support of the federal government did appreciably expand educational opportunity in the United States.

Expanding Educational Opportunity

Consider the fact that in 1960 only 33% of all blacks between the ages of 25 and 34 had completed four years of high school compared to 61% of all whites. By 1982, 79% of all blacks, in contrast to 87% of all whites in this age cohort, were high school graduates. Observe also the fact that in 1960 only 4% of all blacks between the ages of 25 and 34 had earned a college degree. In the same year the figure was 12% for all whites in that group. By 1982, while the proportion of blacks with a college degree increased by slightly more than 300% (from 4% to 13%), the percent of whites doubled to 25%. However, the 13% blacks with a college degree in 1982 was only slightly more than the 12% white college graduates in 1960.[11] These figures underscore the relativity of progress, as blacks are continually confronted with economic instability and structural inequality in American society. In statistical terms, however, progress in educational attainment among black Americans and other minorities is indeed substantial.

In one decade alone (1970–80), Hispanics registered impressive increases in the proportion who had completed high school. The high school completion rate among Hispanics over the age of 25 rose from 24.2% to 39.5% among Mexican Americans and from 25.4% to 38.4% for Puerto Ricans.[12]

Pressure exerted on educational institutions by minority students, especially blacks and their allies, coupled with the enactment of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964,[13] accelerated college enrollment in the late 1960s and early 1970s. Between 1960 and 1972 the number of blacks enrolled in college climbed from 137,000 to 438,000. By 1981 some 750,000 blacks were matriculated in a college or university. Almost 300,000 blacks were involved in some other form of post-secondary education. In 1960 about 80% of all black students in college matriculated in historically black colleges and universities (HBCU). In 1988 about 82% of all blacks in higher education are enrolled at a predominantly white institution (PWI).[14]

During the 1960s and early 1970s special efforts were organized to promote recruitment of blacks, Hispanics, Asians, and Native Americans for graduate and professional schools. These actions were based on the premise that equality of educational opportunity really meant the development of all of the nation's talent, irrespective of race, ethnicity, and social class. Development of this talent was seen as in the best interest of the nation's colleges and universities and in the best interest of the society as a whole. This notion was consistent with an increasingly widespread agreement that no race should have exclusive rights to resources and that educational opportunity is central to economic and political empowerment of the relatively powerless. It is also essential for the production of informed leadership over a broad spectrum of racial and ethnic minority groups.

In my study, *Mainstreaming Outsiders: The Production of Black Professionals*, substantial documentation is provided with respect to expanded recruitment, enrollment, and graduation of blacks from graduate and professional schools since 1960.[15] That evidence reveals the degree to which expanded recruitment and related factors facilitated access, matriculation, retention, and graduation of blacks. That evidence underscores a national commitment to expanded educational opportunity and power sharing, a national sense that this was morally right and in the nation's best interest.

Consequences of that commitment are revealed in the following illustrative data. In the 15-year period between 1970 and 1985, the number of blacks who earned medical degrees increased by 9,124. The number of blacks who earned a degree in dentistry rose by 2,296, and more than 300 additional blacks were awarded the Doctor of Optometry degree. In addition, some 15,451 blacks obtained a first professional degree in engineering, 10,000 earned the Master of Social Work degree (MSW), an additional 3,000 were graduated from law schools; and between 1973 and 1985 alone 11,795 doctorates were earned by black American citizens.[16] Despite such progress, with the exception of the field of social work, blacks are underrepresented in all professions. They comprise 3% or less of all the professions mentioned here. Hispanics and Native Americans are even more noticeably underrepresented in the professions.

Achievements in the production of professionals among blacks and other minorities were not equally shared by the 2,500 colleges and universities in the United States. A brief examination of production rates of blacks in selected professions is illuminating on this point. The medical colleges of Howard University, Meharry Medical College, and Morehouse College (all HBCUs) enroll about 20% of all black students in medicine; but the combined enrollment of black students in these three institutions exceeds the combined black student enrollment of 74 of the 123 predominantly white medical colleges. The four colleges of pharmacy located at HBCUs account for approximately 40% of all black students in that field. The ten colleges or schools of engineering found at HBCUs enroll about 40% of all black students pursuing an engineering degree in the nation's 182 schools and colleges of engineering. The School of Veterinary Medicine at Tuskegee University (another HBCU) continues to graduate approximately 80% of all black recipients of the Doctor of Veterinary Medicine degree; there are 27 colleges of veterinary medicine in the United States.[17]

Retrogression in Minority Education

Except for a short-lived upsurge in affirmative action in higher education, evidenced by increased recruitment and hiring of faculty members from minority groups, stagnation was the dominant characteristic of the 1970s. Since 1981, just as retrogression has been observed in the status of race relations within American society in general, so has retrogression come to characterize the condition of minorities in higher education. A number of factors can be cited: the precarious economic position of minorities, a condition impacting on their ability to afford higher education; a decline in institutional commitment to the recruitment, matriculation, and graduation of minority group students; a declining enrollment of black students in colleges and graduate and professional schools; and a decline in the presence of blacks in faculty positions in colleges and universities.

When unfavored groups seek to alter or transform existing arrangements, the groups in power will adopt strategies designed to halt or retard the efforts of such groups. Dominant groups may also shift support from one minority group to another, favoring as more "acceptable" those groups who are "less threatening," or "model minorities," or "deserving groups," or those who do not "ask too much too soon."

Groups in power exercise authority to establish standards, to determine procedural grounds and "rules of the game," to make declarations of normative requirements and expectations—actions which function as gatekeeping mechanisms. An example of this would be changes in admissions standards, the reliance on quantitative criteria to determine eligibility. In practice, the mechanism is fundamentally exclusionary.

Dominant group members determine the criteria that must be fulfilled by persons of lower rank who seek advancement. In principle the criteria are "universal." In practice, however, they are so particular as to perpetuate the system of structured inequality. Many minorities become victims of a revolving door system.

It is understandable, though not acceptable, that educational attainment among minorities is hampered by deeply entrenched economic inequities. Minorities are concentrated in what Edna Bonacich and others have characterized as the lower tier of a dual or split labor market system. Few are able to obtain high-paying, upper-tier jobs. The unemployment rate among blacks is twice that of whites. The unemployment rate among Puerto Ricans is three times that of whites in some cities. One-third of the black population and almost 30% of the Hispanic population are mired in poverty. Yet the cost of a college education escalates year by year, even as the requirement of a baccalaureate degree becomes the minimum expectation of potential employees.

Retrogression is apparent also in the disturbing slippages throughout what Alexander Astin referred to as "the educational pipeline." These slippages are quite ironic and paradoxical: at precisely the same time that the high school completion rate among blacks, for instance, is increasing, their college-going rate is declining significantly. Astin showed that in 1982 some 72% of blacks graduated from high school but only 29% entered college; 12% obtained a baccalaureate degree; 8% entered a graduate or professional school; only 4% completed graduate or professional education. The high school completion rate among Hispanics was then at 55%; their college completion rate was 7%; only 2% completed a graduate or professional school degree. By contrast, white Americans had a high school completion rate of 83%, a college-going rate of 38%, a college completion rate of 23%, a graduate or professional school entry rate of 14%, and 8% completed graduate or professional school. In a soon-to-be-released study by Astin's Institute at UCLA, his researchers argue that conditions in the educational pipeline remain relatively unchanged. However, I, along with Arbiter, Thomas, and others, remain convinced that the evidence shows a worsening situation for particular minority groups, especially the black population.

For example, Christoffel[18] showed that as a result of the decline in the college-going rate among blacks, we now have at least 40,000 fewer blacks enrolled in college than was the case in 1976. We also know that the college-going rate among blacks fell to only 22.5% in 1986. Since 1976 the college-going rate among Hispanic students has dropped from 22.5% to 19.8%, while that of white students rose, albeit slightly, from 29.8% to 30.5% during the same period.

Just as ethnic stratification dominates the American society, that system functions in higher education so as to produce a concentration of minority students in two-year institutions. For instance, it is estimated that 54% of all Hispanic college students are currently enrolled in two-year institutions. This figure stands in contrast to the 36% of white college students and the 43% of all black college students now matriculated in two-year institutions.

The problem with this distribution is complicated by the relative paucity of blacks and Hispanic college students who are able to transfer from two-year institutions to four-year colleges and universities. Hilton and Shrader[19] have shown that about 25% of all Hispanic students and less than one-fifth (18.3%) of all black two-year college students, in contrast to almost a third (30.3%) of all white two-year college students, transfer to a four-year institution. This lack of transferability is yet another impediment impacting on graduate enrollment and the production of doctoral degrees among minority students.

This situation also reflects, in part, the lowered quality of precollege training that all too many pupils in urban schools receive. The plight of urban education is poignantly captured in a study financed by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and reported by Ernest Boyer. It describes conditions in a Cleveland high school in the following manner:

> . . . near a once bustling intersection of commerce, but so many surrounding buildings have been raised that now the vacant land makes the school look like a forgotten outpost in an underdeveloped country. A sprawling playground is rendered useless by a carpet of glass. Inside, lavatories for students have no light bulbs; the stalls have no doors, and there is no toilet paper. There is an atmosphere of hopelessness among students, mirroring the outside world.[20]

Despite the clarion cry for educational reform generated by *A Nation at Risk* some five years ago, the rhetoric has not been matched either by the appropriation of funds for learning resources or by the allocation of adequate human resources for fostering the kinds of improvements desired by urban educators. Without question, the situation described by Boyer is repeated time and time again across the nation, from Boston to Los Angeles, North, South, East and West. By the same token, countless numbers of minority students who graduate from urban schools where learning is stressed and self-discipline is internalized, where learning resources are available and the curriculum is excellent, where teachers and administrators demonstrate concern for students while exacting high standards, perform well on rigorous admissions tests and matriculate at some of the nation's most prestigious colleges and universities. An example is Banneker High School in Washington, D.C., where 96% of the graduates continue on to college. But outstanding urban public school graduates may still be thwarted by economic disability, by improper counseling and guidance, by lack of information, or by the inattention of college recruiters.

Declining college enrollment has led to a down-

turn in graduate school enrollment among blacks but not among Hispanic and Asian college graduates. Between 1976 and 1984 blacks experienced a 22.4% decline (or a loss of some 15,000 students) in graduate school matriculation. In other words, full- and part-time graduate school enrollment among black students fell from, approximately, 65,000 to 50,000 students. In 1988 less than 5% of all graduate students are black compared to 6.1% in 1976. By contrast, Hispanics have experienced a 14.4% increase in graduate school enrollment over the same time. In absolute terms, this percent change means an actual rise from 20,234 in 1976 to 23,144 Hispanic graduate students in 1984, the last year for which reported data are available. In fact, Hispanic students comprise only 2.2% of all graduate school enrollment. Students from the Asian/Pacific Islander population increased their numbers from 18,446 to 27,318 in graduate schools across the country.

Such enrollment patterns are not unexpectedly reflected in doctoral degree production rates. They also help to account partially for the current losses in the number of blacks holding faculty positions in colleges and universities. This fact may be illustrated by data from the six-year period between 1980 and 1986. In the context of an overall decline in doctorate production during that period, white Americans claimed 89.3% of all doctoral degrees conferred on American citizens. The most conspicuous loss in the number of earned doctoral degrees conferred was observed among black Americans, whose share of doctoral degrees fell by 275, from 4.1% in 1980 to 3.5% in 1986. Puerto Ricans experienced an increase, but only from 69 doctorates in 1980 to a total of 137 in 1986. Puerto Ricans constitute only 0.6% of all doctorates earned by U.S. citizens. Mexican Americans also registered an increase in the number of doctoral degrees earned, from 109 doctorates in 1980 to 182 in 1986. Asian Americans received 459 doctorates (1.9%) in 1980 and 527 (2.3%) in 1986. Significantly, only 820 doctoral degrees were awarded black Americans in 1986.

This maldistribution is troubling; it bespeaks barriers imposed by faculty in the fields not selected; it bespeaks a general insensitivity to the need to expand access.

Blacks, Native Americans, Puerto Ricans, and Mexican Americans who do receive doctoral degrees tend to be concentrated in education. Even in that concentration, *these groups are underrepresented* with respect to the total number of doctorates conferred in education. This maldistribution is troubling; it bespeaks barriers imposed by faculty in the fields not selected; it bespeaks a general insensitivity to the need to expand access. This situation is especially noticeable in the physical and natural sciences.

Note that in 1986 only one Native American, five black Americans, three Puerto Ricans, and three Mexican Americans received a doctorate in mathematics. Only one black American, two Puerto Ricans, no Mexican Americans, and no Native Americans were awarded a doctoral degree in computer science. In engineering the number of doctorates conferred on blacks was 14, on Puerto Ricans 11, on Native Americans 6, on Mexican Americans 5, and on Asian Americans 80.

These groups fared only slightly better in the life sciences. For example, in 1986 in the biological sciences the number of doctoral degrees earned by blacks was 40, by Native Americans 18, by Puerto Ricans 13, by Mexican Americans 9, and by Asian Americans 124. Clearly, the departments comprising the physical and life sciences have not done a good job of attracting minorities as undergraduate majors or as graduate students. These same departments offer few graduate research and teaching assistantships and few mentoring arrangements to minorities.

Is there any wonder, then, that blacks and Hispanics are underrepresented in faculty positions? The decline in absolute numbers and percentage of faculty positions held by blacks is especially alarming in 1988. When one looks at 1975, blacks represented 4.4% of all faculty positions in American colleges. In 1988, it is estimated that blacks comprise slightly less than 4% of such positions; and that percentage is deceptive inasmuch as it includes blacks employed in faculty positions in historically black colleges and universities. When those numbers are disaggregated, it is more likely that blacks represent slightly more than 1% of all faculty positions in predominantly white institutions, and that number appears to be in steady decline. As the number of blacks decreased in faculty positions, the absolute number and percent of Asians and Hispanics continued to rise between 1975 and 1983. For example, during that period the number of Asians in faculty positions rose from 9,763 (2.2%) to 16,899 (3.5%). The number of Hispanics rose from 6,323 (1.4%) to 7,456 (1.5%) during the same period. White faculty positions increased from 409,947 to 440,505, to 91% of all faculty positions.

Explanations for Retrogression

This pattern of retrogression and retreat from the pursuit of equity between minority groups and the white population began with a well-orchestrated and sophisticated attack on affirmative action in higher education, especially pronounced in the Bakke case. The media have increasingly misinterpreted and distorted the goal of affirmative action, which was and is to expand the diversity of the student body, the faculty, and the administration of colleges and universities. As a result, we witnessed considerable intergroup tension, mounting acrimo-

niousness and divisiveness in which minority groups were pitted against each other. Many whites felt threatened (even when only one minority was hired) by what they viewed as "an intrusion" by minorities in higher education. Many whites were resentful of the higher salaries offered to minorities whose specialization was in a discipline in which they were a scarce commodity. It was convenient for the intolerant to disregard the fundamental laws of supply and demand, easy for them to resort to such pejorative expressions as "preferential treatment" even when they knew that a preference for whites was a persistent feature of institutional racism.

This situation was reinforced and elevated to a new pitch with the arrival of the Reagan administration. Its avowed intention was to destroy affirmative action programs, even voluntary ones, indeed to dismantle most of the programs that had moved this country toward the achievement of constitutional guarantees and rights for all American citizens. Reagan and Meese, along with William Bradford Reynolds, communicated a clear and startling message: previous affirmative action policies were either to be abrogated or not enforced. Grievances would be stalled. Circumvention strategies would be condoned in order to maintain the preferred treatment of dominant groups to the detriment of members of minority groups. The hostility of the administration was shown in the appointments to key administrative positions of people indifferent to the rights of minorities, in the steadfast refusal of the President of the United States to respond favorably to requests from the Congressional Black Caucus to discuss basic problems of structural inequalities. The current resurgence of racism is hardly surprising in this content.

In this atmosphere of callous disregard for the rights of all citizens, of indifference to the debilitating consequences of structural inequities between the races, "respectable bigotry" arises as in the case of racial jokes told by high level staff members in the Reagan administration. The perception that America is exclusively a white culture dedicated to the preservation and sanctity of white privilege is thus reinforced, and thus racism has had a resurgence in American society as well as on college campuses. The National Council of Churches, the Anti-Defamation League, the NAACP and other groups have noted an alarming upsurge in anti-minority attacks during the past six years: murder, maiming, desecration of churches and synagogues, and other forms of racial/ethnic violence. Witness the boldness of the KKK, the White Aryan Nation, and similar groups in staging marches and using talk shows on cable television to spread a gospel of white and Nazi supremacy. Witness the activities of skinheads and other neo-Nazi groups in recent years.

In addition, within the past two years alone we have observed innumerable instances of anti-minority hostility—physical assaults, rapes and attempted rapes, verbal abuse, property destruction, attacks by white students wearing KKK garb or "Reagan masks" on blacks students at PWIs. Where is the national leadership when such incidents occur? Where is the national denunciation of such intolerable behavior? Where is the U.S. Department of Justice or the Attorney General of the United States? Who arises to assure the American people that such activities violate the principles of American society? We hear nothing! As a result, perpetrators feel assured that their deeds will not be subjected to punishment. This situation is social dynamite, and it needs to be addressed at all levels of leadership and by the rank and file American citizen.

Suggestions for Change

Although intergroup conflict is a high probability in situations characterized by multiethnicity, conflict resolution is possible. While inequities in college admission and college and graduate school production are apparent and the downturn in the number of black faculty is real, these situations can be corrected. Indeed, in 1988 some of these issues are being addressed, and concrete remedies to the fundamental problem of inequity in higher education are being proposed by such groups as the American Council on Education and the Southern Education Foundation and by such institutions as Ohio State University, the University of California/Los Angeles, Texas A&M University, the University of Michigan, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and the University of Massachusetts/Boston. What can be done?

First, people like Mr. Reagan, Mr. Meese, Mr. Bennett, and others who share their views about American society must recognize that America is a multicultural society comprised of a multiethnic and multiracial population whose roots are in *all* parts of the world, not exclusively Western Europe. Eurocentrism is only one among many perspectives from which cultural and historical contributions to *our* civilization may be viewed. It is vital, within an intellectually honest community, to respect multiculturality and diversity. If that is done, we will have made significant strides toward acknowledging that it is just as legitimate to study Afro-American literature, Ibn Kaldun, or Women's Studies, as it is to become an expert on Shakespeare, Sir Issac Newton, Machiavelli, or Walt Whitman.

Second, institutions must operationalize a renewed commitment to expanded educational opportunity. Aggressive efforts must be made to increase the number of college-going students from minority groups and to substantially reduce the inordinately high dropout rate among blacks and Hispanics. This commitment encompasses several components:

1. It means confronting the attitudes of faculty,

students, and administrators who rely on stereotypes about minorities when engaging in teaching, in social interaction, or in supervisory roles. It means confronting those persons who convey a belief that minorities "do not belong" to a university community. It means confronting those who perceive *every* minority as "naturally inferior," as one who has entered in some way other than "regular admission."

2. It means the participation of departments, especially those in which members of minority groups are underrepresented, in carefully planned and implemented collaborations with local junior and senior high school teachers, counselors, and administrators, to encourage increasing numbers of minorities to enter college.
3. It means the establishment of a three-tiered mentoring program involving a faculty member guiding, directing, and nurturing graduate and undergraduate students by joint action in research and creative activities. The anticipated outcome is heightened interest in the pursuit of advanced degrees and college or university teaching positions.
4. It also means the allocation of substantial resources for a strong recruitment program that will raise minority representation, both in terms of the student population and in terms of the hiring of faculty, to the level of critical mass within the institutional community. Recruitment of students involves marketing and selling the institution as an attractive learning environment, providing significant financial aid packages wherever such assistance is needed, demonstrating to students that the institution is genuinely committed to diversity among its student body and its faculty, and showing that its faculty is interested in the development of the intellectual capacity of all types of students—the talented, the gifted, and those (perhaps no less gifted) in need of special assistance.

Inasmuch as the median family income of blacks is only 56% that of whites and the median family income of Hispanics, including the Cuban population, is about 60% that of whites, and given recent projections of the one-year cost of a college education, the restructuring of financial aid programs will become increasingly imperative. *The Chronicle of Higher Education* recently reported a study that showed that the average one-year cost of public college education is expected to rise from its current figure of $5,789 to $12,000 in 1998. The same study estimated that the average one-year cost of education at a private college, including tuition, room and board, will climb from its current average of $11,982 to $29,000 in 1998—just ten years from now. Since minorities are falling behind whites in salaries and wages, major problems can be anticipated in the future unless financial aid is restructured.

Third, recruiting, tenuring, and retaining faculty and administrators from minority groups must be given the highest priority. Racial and gender homogeneity within colleges, departments, and special units has no place in an academic institution. Racial and ethnic ghettos have no place in college and university administrations or in academic departments and institutes. The responsibility and commitment to diversity must be shared throughout the college or university. Each department should reflect diversity.

Rewards should only be given to those department or units that demonstrate success in this endeavor. A moratorium should be placed on the allocation of positions to departments or units that employ strategies and selection practices designed to avoid compliance with institutional policies advocating equity in access and diversity. Every department, every college, and every unit should have a clearly defined program for the recruitment and retention of underrepresented target populations. The institution's affirmative action or equal employment officer should work with institutional unit heads or appointed designees in ways that promote harmony in the realization of institutional goals. That officer must be empowered to determine the acceptability of a practice and to reject candidates presented from searches that violate institutional policies and guidelines.

In the meantime, institutional units—colleges, schools, departments, and the like—can become proactive on their own behalf. They can organize their own mentoring programs. They may establish their own "grow your own programs," whereby promising minority students can be "early identified," nurtured, trained, and hired, perhaps after serving in a post-doctoral situation elsewhere. Minority students can be awarded scholarships and graduate, research, and teaching assistantships through which they may be prepared for and socialized into their profession.

When minority members are hired as faculty members, especially those recruited into junior positions, an atmosphere of collegiality is essential. Collegiality extends from social interactions, to intellectual discourse and interest in each other's work, to assistance, guidance and advice from senior professors and senior administrators.

Fourth, it is especially important in 1988 for colleges and universities to create and maintain a positive institutional environment. All of its students, faculty, staff, and administrators should feel comfortable in the institution and secure in the knowledge that the institution is promoting growth, intellectual development, creativity, and a free exchange of ideas among its members without fear of verbal or physical abuse. This means that racial and ethnic intolerance will not be condoned. Violators of insti-

tutional norms of tolerance and respect for individual dignity will be dealt with in an effective manner. A positive institutional environment, one that fosters genuine appreciation for multiculturality, can be accomplished through several methods. For example, multicultural views and contributions may be incorporated into the subject matter of one's courses. Understandings may be broadened through administrative and faculty retreats devoted to intercultural relations. Faculty workshops may also be utilized for this purpose. Students could be required to take a course in human relations during their first or second year.

Fifth, students of all races must learn to reach out to each other, interact with each other, listen and learn from each other, understand each other's concerns, appreciate areas of common interests. They must learn to work together, to disagree civilly, maintaining respect for each person's individuality.

Sixth, it is my view that every institution ought to have a viable, fully functional Caucus of Black (Minority) Faculty, Staff, and Administrators. Members of this group must be committed to the goal of social justice for all persons. They must express a special concern for the collective interests of minority students, faculty, administrators, and staff and for fair and equitable treatment for all. This body should be proactive in the development of programs that address issues of recruitment, retention, support systems for students, and the equality of the institutional environment. They should be equally aggressive in anticipating and preventing personnel problems at the administrative level. They should be involved in mentoring and networking, in stimulating collegiality within the group and between that body and other members of the institution's community. They must monitor hiring and tenuring practices and assure the maintenance of pluralism.

Despite the retrogression so evident during the past seven years, it is my belief that the progress attained over the past 30 years of American race relations is a clear indicator of what can be done in our quest for interracial harmony and a better society.

The commitment of this body's members must not be situation-specific, that is, active involvement should not center around promotion of personal interests such as one's own tenure crisis or conflict with members of one's own unit. Participation involves appreciation of the diversity of the group's membership, the realization that diversity is strength. However, the group must always be unified when dealing with issues that ultimately impact on minorities, when confronting institutional discrimination and racism.

Despite the retrogression so evident during the past seven years, it is my belief that the progress attained over the past 30 years of American race relations is a clear indicator of what can be done in our quest for interracial harmony and a better society.

Finally, permit me to take this opportunity to express deep and profound gratitude to the William Monroe Trotter Institute, to its extremely capable director, Wornie Reed, to Frances Stubbs and other members of the Institute staff, for the organization, planning, and work involved in sponsoring this lecture and the reception. I thank all of you for coming and listening to me. These have been 18 years of challenge, enjoyment of teaching and research, and enrichment through my interactions with so many members of the UMass/Boston community. I wish you happiness, prosperity, enjoyment of your own work, and the very best for the future. Thank you sincerely!

REFERENCES

[1]Parts of this address were excerpted from Blackwell, J.E. (1988). Faculty Issues Affecting Minorities in Higher Education. In R.C. Richardson, Jr., and A.G. de los Santos (Eds.). *From Access to Achievement: Strategies for Urban Institutions, Proceedings from a National Conference.* Temple, AR: National Center for Postsecondary Finance; Blackwell, J.E. (1988, February 11). Race and Education: Issues Affecting Blacks and Hispanics. A paper presented at a Conference on Race and Ethnic Relations in the 1990s, Texas A&M University; Blackwell, J.E. (1987). *Mainstreaming Outsiders: The Production of Black Professionals.* (2nd Ed.). Dix Hills, NY: General Hall Publishing Co.

[2]DuBois, W.E.B. (1906). *Souls of Black Folk.* New York: Fawcett.

[3]Cox, O.C. (1942, December). The Modern Caste School of Race Relations. *Social Forces, 21,* 218–26.

[4]Myrdal, G. (1944). *An American Dilemma.* New York: Harper and Row.

[5]Allport, G. and Kramer, B. (1958). *The Nature of Prejudice.* Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

[6]Stouffer, Samuel. (1949). *An American Soldier, Volumes 1 and 2.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

[7]Horsman, R. (1982). *Race and Manifest Destiny.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

[8]Blackwell, J.E. (1987). *Mainstreaming Outsiders: The Production of Black Professionals.* (2nd Ed.). Dix Hills, NY: General Hall Publishing Co.

[9]Ibid.

[10]Blackwell, J.E. (1982, April). Persistence and Change in Intergroup Relations: The Crisis Upon Us. *Social Problems.*

[11]Marger, M. (1985). *Race and Ethnic Relations.* Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Co.

[12]*Ibid.*

[13]Blackwell, J.E. (1985). *The Black Community: Diversity and Unity.* (2nd Ed.). New York: Harper and Row.

[14]*Ibid.*

[15]Blackwell. (1987). *Mainstreaming Outsiders.*

[16]*Ibid.*

[17]*Ibid.*

[18]Christoffel, P. (1986, October). *How Can My College Recruit and Retain Minority Students.* New York: The College Board's Research and Development Update.

[19]Hilton, T.L. and Schrader, W.B. *Pathway to Graduate School: An Empirical Study Based on National Logitudinal Data.* Princeton, NJ: GRE Research Report No. 81–21R.

[20]Boyer, E. (1988). *An Imperiled Generation: Saving the Urban Schools.* Cited in Shanker, A. (1988, March 27). Facing the Urban Education Crisis. *The New York Times.* P.E-9.