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Abstract

During its inception, proposed as a discipline was Black Studies that could spur new knowledge by countering Eurocentric modes of hegemony. Land grant institutions and public colleges, such as the University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign (U of I), have an unique capacity and obligation to residents to provide access and avenues to new forms of knowledge. The institutionalization of Black Studies at predominantly White institutions of higher education produced dialectic processes that shaped the discipline and reshaped the university. This research provides a better understanding of institutional culture and administrative reactions, which functioned both as an incubator and an obstruction to the emergence and evolution of African American Studies at U of I from 1968 to 2008. The major questions guiding this research are: In the context of the university, how did the growth of the Black student population and divergent Black Power ideology at U of I produce a dialectical relationships between Black Studies and institutional culture? How did the quality of leadership impact the development of Black Studies at the U of I and in what ways did administrators and policies have a profound influence on student engagement? What are the ways in which institutions of higher education negotiate ideological differences and manage forms of diversity?

The project consist of archival data, newspapers, and a collection of oral histories from previous Chancellors, Deans, Directors, faculty, Heads, Provost, students, staff, and community members from 1968-2008. The theoretical frameworks of “insurgency” and “ideological state apparatuses” are employed help articulate the challenges, negotiations, and institutional adjustments, which characterized the development and growth of the African American Studies unit. Contemporary historians have provided a foundation to assess the role of Black student activism on university campuses and provided insights into the thoughts and actions of student
activists (Rojas, 2007; Williamson, 2003; Bradley, 2009). Ultimately, this case study investigates the ways in which the Black Studies as a critical intervention created dialectical relationships between administrators, faculty, and students through negotiations of managing diversity and ideological difference which transformed U of I’s culture gradually over forty years.
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Introduction

A Century of Discontent 1867-1967

Each State which may take and claim the benefit of [the Morrill Act], to the endowment, support, and maintenance of at least one college where the leading object shall be, without excluding other scientific and classical studies and including military tactics, to teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and the mechanic arts, in such manner as the legislatures of the States may respectively prescribe, in order to promote the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes in the several pursuits and professions in life.¹

The above quote is the law established to govern the policy of land grant institutions (LGIs). There is nothing in the law to promote discrimination; however, there were no provisions in the law to prevent the denial of rights to people of color. Furthermore, the 1963 draft bill for the establishment of the university included a clause that “any white resident could attend” but was later omitted.² Although the language was changed, racial bias guided institutional culture for most universities over the next century. February 28, 1867, the Illinois state legislature chartered the Illinois Industrial University, which became the University of Illinois (U of I) in 1885. The first semester commenced March 2, 1868, with 50 students and three faculty. They were all White males.³ This became the institutional practice and cultural norm despite the enrollment of White women in 1870. Over the next one hundred years the U of I struggled to shed the legacy of White hegemony⁴ which was entrenched many American institutions. U of I

¹. 7 U.S. Code § 304 (1862) – “Investment of Proceeds of Sale of Land or Scrip.”


⁴. Michael W. Apple, Cultural and Economic Reproduction in Education: Essays on Class, Ideology, and the State (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1982). 3. Hegemony is a body of practices and expectations. It is a culture but a culture which has to be seen as the lived dominance and subordination of particular classes.
had a history of employment, housing, and admissions practices that were discriminatory, which diminished the quality of experiences for people of color that engaged the university.\(^5\)

The first African American student was not admitted until 1887. Jonathan Rogan was from Decatur, Illinois and attended the U of I from 1887-1888. Several years later in 1894 George W. Riley, a student in Art & Design, from Champaign, attended the University until 1897. William Walter Smith was the first African American to graduate from the U of I in 1900. Walter T. Bailey was the next to graduate, with a degree in architecture, in 1904 and subsequently earned a Master of Architecture degree.\(^6\) Maudelle Tanner Brown, the first African American woman to graduate, did so in only three years in 1906 with an A.B. in mathematics. The first African American School of Law graduate was Amos Porter Scruggs, who completed his degree in 1907.\(^7\)

However, this does not provide a true indication as to how many students of color actually applied to the U of I. The exact enrollment for African Americans during the early periods at U of I is inconclusive due to a dearth and the inconsistency of records and documentation concerning Black students. Approximately, 1,428 Black students attended the U of I from 1900-1939 out of a total student population of 208,905.\(^8\) The Civil Rights Movement of the 1950s forged a generation of students committed to equality and living in a culture of protest. These students struggled to make sense of their conditions and sought direct and immediate


\(^7\) Cobb-Roberts, “Race and Higher Education,” 45.

remedies to eliminate their political, economic, and cultural disenfranchisement both on and off campus.

Table 1. Student enrollment, University of Illinois 1900-1940

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Black Enrollment</th>
<th>Total Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2,932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1902</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3,288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1903</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1904</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3,729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>7,157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>10,710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>13,731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1927</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>14,071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>14,594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>14,986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>14,569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>12,122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>13,067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>14,036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>15,831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>16,865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>17,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>17,212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,428</td>
<td>208,905</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: "The University of Illinois Negro Students, Location, History and Administration," Arthur C. Willard Papers, General Correspondence 1934-1946, Series 2/9/1, Box 42, (Folder "Colored Students University of Illinois"), and Register of the University of Illinois, University of Illinois Archives, Urbana, Illinois.

In the Fall of 1967, the Black student population on campus was 1.1 percent, although the Black population for the state was over 10 percent. The assassination of Martin Luther King Jr. in April of 1968 ignited students as they demanded more equitable representation at U of I. By the Fall of 1968, the Black student population increased by nearly 300 percent with the advent of


the Special Education Opportunity Program (SEOP) also referred to as Project 500.\textsuperscript{11} The central questions guiding this research are: In the context of the university how did the growth of the Black student population and divergent Black Power ideology at the U of I produce a dialectical relationships between Black Studies and institutional culture? How did the quality of leadership impact the development of Black Studies at the U of I and in what ways did administrators and policies have a profound influence on student engagement? What are the ways in which institutions of higher education negotiate ideological differences and manage forms of diversity? Charting the emergence and evolution of African American Studies at the University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign shows how the culture of the university evolved and illustrates the realities of how inclusion and diversity are negotiated through policy in addition to administrative practices.

\textbf{Defining Terms}

Black students on campus were quite diverse. For example, in 1966 the \textit{Daily Illini (DI)} reports an incident where a photographer required a picture for an article in the DI of a Black student posing for a picture. The student responded, “I am not a Negro. I’m not an American therefore I am not a Negro. I am an African, in Africa we don’t have Negroes we just have human beings.” There were tensions, confusion, and frustrations regarding racial identity that strained the relationships between Africans and African Americans.\textsuperscript{12} Even the term “Black” should be understood as a cultural and political designation reflecting the diaspora and the ways

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{11} Williamson, “We Hope for Nothing,” 76.
\end{itemize}
actors in the narrative identified. It was a political statement; those who adopted the term Black to self-identify did so in contrast to previous generations.

Rodney Hammond, an active member of campus politics during 1966-1970, also points out that there were class disparities among Black students that attended U of I. In an interview with the *Daily Illini*, Hammond discusses the sentiments of some middle-class, “Black Bourgeoisie” students, stating “sometimes you can find nearly anti-Negro attitudes” such as, “the fundamental problem of poor Negroes is that they’re lazy and don’t have an education” and that “welfare should be cut off.” Hammond believed that the main problem affecting Black students on the U of I campus was a “lack of real solidarity among the 350 Negros…”

In October 1967, after years of alienation and many acts of racial oppression, Black undergraduate and graduate students formed the Black Student Association (BSA). The BSA was comprised mostly of students, but it had close allies among faculty, such as Walter Massey, and among community members. Members of the BSA engaged in a variety of protests, demonstrations, and discussions regarding the inequitable relationship between the U of I and people of color. The assassination of Martin Luther King Jr. in April of 1968 facilitated the forging of solidarity between Black students on U of I campus and the Black community. King’s assassination created a volatile atmosphere nationally, but it also opened new conversations with the White liberal community members, faculty, and administrators. In April of 1968, as a direct

---

13. “Black” as a political and racial identity.


response administrators led by Chancellor Jack Peltason announced “Project 500—Special Educational Opportunity Program” (SEOP)—a plan to enroll 500 African American students for Fall, 1968.

Nevertheless, the U of I would undergo significant cultural transitions as administrators negotiated the growth of the ideological and phenotypically\textsuperscript{17} new diverse cliental. Civil Rights legislation coupled with student, faculty, and community unrest influenced decisions made within the U of I. By the late 1960s, Black students’ conceptualization of Black identity\textsuperscript{18} and approach towards full enfranchisement was informed by Black Power ideology. The primary means of Black students working through issues of race on campus shifted slowly from accommodationism to resistance. This ideology would be the foreground to the demand for the development of Black Studies. An acceptable designation for all studies concerned with the experiences of African, Afro-American, Afro-Asian, Afro European, Afro-Caribbean and people from other island territory was the term \textit{Black Studies}.\textsuperscript{19} Black Studies was also seen as a liberating mechanism for people of color and a challenge to White supremacy. However, the challenge to racial inequity within universities began much earlier, over a century of discontent.

The philosopher Harold Cruse suggested that the idea of contemporary Black Studies programs originating and developing primarily in historically White colleges and universities demands investigation as it falls outside the “natural” home of such innovation. Land grant institutions (LGIs) were home to many of the practical disciplines medicine, law, agriculture, 

\textsuperscript{17} “Black” should be understood as more than phenotypical but rather, a shared understanding of experiences, philosophies, and ideologies.

\textsuperscript{18} Students on campus are not exclusively African-American; some are Afro-Caribbean, Afro-Cuban, or Continental Africans. Black is the term used by students to adopt identity and solidarity; hence, the formation of Black Student Associations.

education, and social work, which emerged to meet the needs of an increasingly professionalized economy. Black Studies curricula had other goals; it aimed to “transform the university as a whole and address racism in society more broadly.” The critical and pluralistic nature of Black Studies has perpetuated its innovations, developments, and persistence.

**Black Students in Higher Education**

In 1826, John Russworm and Edward A. Jones earned the first degrees awarded to African Americans in the US. Russworm graduated from Bowdoin College in Maine and Jones graduated from Amhurst College in Massachusetts. They both moved to Africa where they became educators. Oberlin College enrolled Black students, men and women as early as 1835. Education became a central focus and liberating force in the abolitionist movement. Other northern colleges accepted a handful of Black students during 1837-1855. Despite antislavery rhetoric in northern states, many White Americans assumed Black Americans to be inherently inferior. Most White Americans also shied away from any possibility of economic competition. They were not “prepared to spend more money on institutions for [B]lacks to enable them to graduate students who could compete effectively with whites…”

---


philanthropists and missionary associations were not prohibited from developing private [B]lack colleges so long as these institutions would accommodate the dominant/subordinate relationship between whites and [B]lacks in the South, said Tilden J. LeMelle."

One solution was to create higher education institutions specifically for Black Americans. Historically Black colleges and universities (HBCUs) were founded and evolved in an environment unparalleled to any other institution—one of legal segregation and isolation from the rest of higher education. “The population from which these colleges drew their students lived under severe legal, educational, economic, political, and social restrictions. The origin and development of the traditionally Black institutions cannot be fully understood except in the context of the educational and socioeconomic status of the Black population...”

February 25, 1837, the African Institute was the first school founded for Blacks; in April of the same year it was renamed the Institute for Colored Youth of Philadelphia. The name changed four more times until 1983 when the institution was brought into the State System for Higher Education as Cheyney University of Pennsylvania. Four other institutions founded prior to the Civil War designated for Blacks included: Avery College in Allegheny, Pennsylvania (1849); the Ashmun Institute in Chester County, PA (1854); Wilberforce University in Ohio (1855); and the academy for Black girls which became Milner Teachers College (1851). Chartered by Presbyterians was Ashmun Institute who believed college-educated Blacks could help spread the gospel. The school was later renamed Lincoln University of Pennsylvania in 1866 to honor President Lincoln.

26. Lovett, America’s Historically Black Colleges, 43.
27. Lovett, America’s Historically Black Colleges, 1.
29. Lovett, America’s Historically Black Colleges, 12.
Many teachers at these schools found Black culture “peculiar” and desired to instill Black students with the beliefs and customs of White, middle-class Americans. As a result, strict rules—similar to those at predominantly White institutions (PWIs)—to be enforced rigidly defined “appropriate” behavior, dress, speech, and extracurricular activities. These rules “predicated to an extent upon Blacks’ supposed moral laxity” and continued into 20th century, despite having been modified at PWIs. By the end of the Civil War, 4.4 million Blacks lived in America. Twenty-eight of them earned baccalaureate degrees. Many of the formerly enslaved persons wanted an education. General Sherman solicited aid from northern citizens to help support the recently freed Blacks. Blacks and Whites raised funds and provided clinics, hospitals, church services, and schools for the freedmen. As thousands of freedmen flooded into Union occupied territories, some northerners and local African Americans established classes in the contraband camps, which began the conceptualization of the Freemen’s schools and HBCUs. Began in 1846 and operated by the American Missionary Association (AMA), many of these early institutions ran as a nondenominational Christian agency to protest slavery. AMA operated in southern states in the 1850s and expanded dramatically over the next decade raising thousands of dollars to fund the freedmen’s education.

Religious organizations collaborated with other aid societies and helped established twenty-two HBCUs during 1867-1904. The Hampton Institute implemented a program to educate American Indians; also, the notion that education could mitigate the gross inequities between White Americans and other racial groups was an experiment several institutions


undertook. Some HBCUs were able to transition from an industrial tradition to liberal arts education; nevertheless, an undercurrent of Black cultural inferiority remained. “Manual training” became the focus of some institutions, for example, Hampton Normal, an Agricultural Institute, required students to complete a manual training program. The program, mandated by the founder of the institution, was a White missionary who believed that Blacks were “‘morally inferior’ to whites and incapable of effectively utilizing liberal arts training.” This type of program focused on basic academic competence, manual laboring skills, and strict adherence to the South’s racial codes… Despite the tumultuous inception of HBCUs, they would become a training ground for many civil rights leaders and activist during the 1920-1950.

**Land Grant Institutions**

Prior to the advent of LGIs, higher education was reserved for and by a social hierarchy in the United States. The pre-LGIs focused studies on a classical education, theology, the letters, law, and medicine. The *Morrill Acts* of 1862 and 1890 gave land to states if they would establish colleges dedicated to vocational education. These schools became known as Land Grant Institutions (LGIs). The initial purpose of these institutions was to undertake applied research in the fields of agriculture, military training, and engineering. “The Land-Grant view

---


of scholarship directly challenged the prevailing norms of scholarship at the time of their inception by making the work of cow barns, kitchens, cook ovens, and forges the subject matter of their investigation,” writes George R. McDowell. “In 1890, the Babcock test for butterfat content of milk was both a scientific advancement and a political/economic act necessary to rationalize markets for fluid milk. The exploration of the “known” or mundane produced new discoveries and ways to improve American society.

The LGI was the convergence of state interest and public need. The transformation of American society from agrarian to industrial—and now knowledge-based—has changed the missions of these institutions and reshaped them as they evolve to meet shifting obligations and demands. This shift demonstrated the need for new knowledge that would be applicable or relevant to the public. The creation of land grant colleges and universities was revolutionary in the chronology of higher education in three ways. First, the instruction and degrees were accessible to the working classes. Second, its agenda of scholarship considered no subject beneath its purview, and lastly, it provided access to new knowledge to those who would never qualify, nor want to attend private institutions. “Populism shaped LGIs during their initial stages by ensuring that admission criteria, curricular offering, and educational priorities [were] accessible and egalitarian—up to a point and only in a decidedly partisan way…Populism as a determinant of state colleges curricula and composition represented dramatic gains— if you were White, rural, male, and involved in agriculture.” Blacks, immigrants, and urban residents were often excluded. Women were only included if their participation aligned with other Populist


41. Thelin, “Higher Education,” 76.

42. Thelin, “Higher Education,” 77.
criteria and acquiesced to a subordinate role. Illustrative of White hegemony during the era was the second Morrill Act, in 1890, which provided LGIs to Black Americans, yet mostly through separate and unequal terms that allocated funding to HBCUs in deference to the laws in seventeen states that prohibited public co-education of the races.43 Over time the mission of these institutions would shift to meet emerging knowledge and maintain relevancy.44 The U of I offered many of the same possibilities to Illinois residents as other LGIs. White women were admitted because White men wanted their daughters, as well as their sons, to be educated. Black students were not able to gain admission until nearly 20 years later in 1887.

In 1866, despite a veto by President Andrew Johnson, Congress passed the Civil Rights Bill. That same year, the Klu Klux Klan (KKK) was established. White Americans fixated on the belief of supremacy, labored to reassert their pre-war dominance over Blacks and maintain control over the political landscape.45 Jim Crow or “Black Codes”—oppressive laws that prevented many Blacks from exercising their 13th, 14th, and 15th amendment rights—circumvented the Civil Rights Bill and reached their pinnacle during the Progressive era (1890-1917). Between the years of 1866-1871 an estimated 4,000 Blacks were lynched in an attempt to reassert White hegemony. Although there were no lynchings in Champaign County many towns surrounding area were considered “sundown towns,” or all-White communities Blacks knew to leave before sunset.46 In the city of Champaign there were discriminatory employment practices

43. Thelin, “Higher Education,” 77.
44. Lovett, America’s Historically Black Colleges, 14.
45. Drewry and Doermann, Stand and Prosper, 16.
and housing covenants which significantly diminished economic opportunities for Black people within the community.

U of I was considered a hostile place for Black students. January 27, 1915, honorary KKK became a registered student organization at U of I.47 Participants were mostly White fraternity members. From 1922-1940, it was customary for White students to dress in Blackface during homecoming, performing minstrel show variations of Blackface at the Illini Union (the campus recreation center) every year until President Arthur Willard help put an end to formal sanctioning of minstrel performances.48 White fraternities and sororities dominated the student politics on campus. The political maneuverings by White elites to methodically rescind any positive progress reduced the possibilities for African Americans. The Supreme Court of the United States (SCOTUS) made two landmark decisions that impacted the status of Black Americans. The first was the SCOTUS in Civil Rights Cases, 1099 US 3 (1883) which declared provisions of the Civil Rights Enforcement Act of the 1870 unconstitutional. And second, the Plessy v. Ferguson (1896) decision SCOTUS upheld that separate but equal clauses were constitutional but this produced inherently different opportunities and outcomes for people of color. Although separate but equal was the doctrine, equity for African Americans never materialized. White Americans adopted middle-class symbols of terror and use them to solidify their rite of passage into American whiteness. Some White students advocated for racial equality, yet most were indifferent about the experience of Blacks or any other racial minority on campus.49


The continued retreat from civil rights by federal, state, and local government perpetuated a system of oppression. Furthermore, this laid the stage for other race based laws (Jim Crow) and statues to be enacted by states. *Plessy v. Ferguson* provided clear implications—particularly regarding education. Enrollment of Blacks at the U of I remained extremely low: approximately 900 Black students that attended the U of I during 1887-1920. For Black students, implicit codes and practices propagated racial oppression, subjugation, and segregation. This was primarily the result of *de facto* segregation (i.e., customary segregation), which differs from *de jure* segregation (i.e., legal segregation), and other informal means and channels that exclude the African Americans full enfranchisement. At the turn of the twentieth century, interracial education grew ever more unlikely. In 1902 the U of I student body comprised of 3,288 student, 19 of which were Black. In 1904, Kentucky implemented a law that mandated segregation in both public and private institutions. This law, aimed specifically at the only college in Kentucky admitting both White and Black students, Berea College, which it had done since its establishment in 1859. The Supreme Court ruled in favor of Kentucky and upheld segregation as being constitutional. This ruling broke new ground in establishing that states could outlaw voluntary or obligatory contact between races as a means to create a caste system. Court decisions such as *Berea v. the Common Wealth* provided the foreground for colleges to institute race based practices, ignoring the call for equal facilities.

Even though the U of I did not have explicitly exclusionary racial policies, the realities Black students’ lived parallel Jim Crow conditions. Black students could not live in campus-

sponsored dormitories and instead found themselves forced to rent space from residences in the segregated North Champaign community. African American students were not able to occupy the dormitories unit in 1945. Historically, Black students were not permitted to reside or dine at campus sponsored facilities. Rationale given by administrators was that there was no concern to change practices as it resulted in appropriate housing and reduced assignment errors.

Admissions Officers traditionally wielded significant autonomy regarding the selection of students for the U of I. Many of the early students who attended the University sought to “fit in” (as reality would permit); their focus was maintaining a culture of respectability and garnering acceptability among Whites generally. Another factor that led to an increase in enrollment of Black students was establishing networks of matriculating students. Fraternities and Sororities, such as Alpha Kappa Alpha and Alpha phi Alpha, created communities to help Black students navigate the political landscape at the U of I. Established in 1914 was the Gamma chapter of Alpha Kappa Alpha sorority Inc. and established in 1917 was the Tau chapter of Alpha Phi Alpha the U of I.

Overall, LGIs have the capacity to provide significant access to higher education to most segments of society. These institutions have and continue to educate millions of students annually. Thus they are uniquely positioned to be a site of conflict (competing interest) but also

53. Cobb-Roberts, “Race and Higher Education,” 40. There were two African-American female students, one in 1945 and later in 1965. In addition, the first Black male students were able to stay in University dormitories; however, at no time were they able to cohabitate with non-White students.


56. Lee, “University of Illinois.”

social transformation. This prompts the examination of LGIs generally; moreover, it is necessary to investigate the outcomes of these contestations and residual effects. Black Studies is an enduring product of Black student protest and campus unrest in the late 1960s. Beginning to explore the origins of Black Studies across campuses throughout the country are contemporary scholars. I further this research by earnestly engaging the positionality and dialectical relationship Black Studies caused within institutions as it developed as an academic discipline. Whereas several scholars have examined Black students protest at state institutions and community colleges, not fully explored are the conditions and circumstances regarding curricular development; I assert that is mostly in the domain of research institutions. Investigating research institutions can provide additional insights into the intellectual developments and dialectic dimensions that shaped the trajectory of Black Studies. The U of I, as a public research LGI, can help us better understand the outcomes of student protest and administrative responses in addition to the ways in which institutions change over time.

**Early Administrative Advocates**

Prior to the mid-1960s, 1925-1939 demonstrated to be the most significant and consistent enrollment of Black students at the U of I. Minority students at U of I depended upon a handful of Black administrators to be their advocates and mentors on campus. Albert R. Lee was an African American and native to the Champaign area who was born on June 26 1874. He graduated from Champaign Central High School in 1893. Lee had a very intimate knowledge of the community and eventually landed a position at the U of I as a messenger for President, Andrew Sloan Draper (1894-1904) in 1895. Lee began to cultivate his knowledge of the campus

and, more precisely, of how to assist Black students. Overtime he was considered a leader in the community, and although he was not provided with a commensurate title or pay, he was unofficially known as the “Dean of Colored Students.” University administrators and students alike relied heavily on his counsel. Through the years, Lee would play a major role in the lives of Black students at the U of I, and he did many administrative duties including reports, housing, conducted investigations, and routine assignments. Lee did not publicly denounce the University administrators or their racist practices, but in his correspondence with the U of I Presidents, he questioned their discriminatory practices.

Lee was very concerned with improving the quality of experiences for Black students. In “University of Illinois Presidents I Have Known,” Lee recounted his 50 year tenure at U of I. He remembered that eventually he was no longer referred to as “boy” or simply Albert by administrators but, at the behest of President David Kinley, called Mr. Lee. Given the tone of correspondence between Lee and Kinley, I suggest that there were encouraging ways in which their relationship improved experiences for Black students, although the improvements did not reach the ideal. This is mostly evident in the enrollment patterns.

Some of President Kinley’s open ness to Lee and the Black students may have been because he was one of few presidents during this time to have extensive professional experience at the U of I and a deep understanding of the campus culture. Kinley began his career in 1894 as an Assistant Professor of Economics, nearly two decades prior to assuming the presidency. With Lee and Kinley’s progressive leadership combined and the economic state of the U of I and of

60. Lee, “University of Illinois.”
61. Lee, “University of Illinois.”
the country during the “roaring 20’s,” they sustained their leadership throughout the Great Depression. The political landscape was also shifting as African American representatives occupied more seats in the Illinois General Assembly and 1924 marked the first African American winning a Senate seat. There were five African American legislators in the 1920s, a number that remained stagnant until the early 1960s when the number of African American legislators grew to ten, and then within a year, to seventeen. George Kersey and Charles A Griffin, Illinois legislators, sent letters frequently in support of students and inquired about conditions on campus.62 Since the General Assembly oversaw the budgeting and administration of the campus, the legislators could leverage political power for positive change on campus.63

Most Black legislators represented districts well outside of the U of I campus limits, but they had a vested interest in increasing Black student enrollment and eliminating discriminatory practices. In the 1990s legislators convened a hearing for campus administrators to address issues of equity.64 In addition, significant economic mobility for Black Americans came during the First World War as Blacks migrated in large numbers to northern industrial centers, specifically Chicago. The sharp drop in European immigration increased demand for war material and the abandonment of jobs by Whites enlisting in the Army created a vacuum for unskilled industrial workers which were built by Black migrants from 1915 to 1920.65 This impacted the number of Black students able to apply for admissions into the U of I.


64. Giraldo Rosales, in discussion with author, February 19, 2016.

Post-WWII Politics

Specific policies like the GI Bill had a direct result in the increased enrollment of White college students. Alternatively, these policies had inconsistent outcomes for people of color. Due to the decentralized disbursement of funds for training, housing, and post-secondary education, states could determine which veterans received benefits. Ultimately, by directing federal funding and maintaining state control, “the veteran status that [B]lack soldiers had earned was placed at the discretion of parochial intolerance.” Although there was a two hundred fifty percent spike in total enrollment after 1945 at the U of I, the enrollment for Blacks was on a steady decline until 1965. At the U of I during 1946-1955 Black student enrollments averaged .0035 percent of the total enrollment, a significant decline from the two previous decades.

Table 2. Urbana campus enrollment trends, University of Illinois, 1941-1955

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Black Enrollment</th>
<th>Total Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>9,115</td>
<td>3,243</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12,358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>4,718</td>
<td>4,797</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>7,906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>13,983</td>
<td>4,440</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>18,378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>15,140</td>
<td>4,251</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>19,391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>15,137</td>
<td>3,957</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>19,094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>15,231</td>
<td>4,290</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>19,521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>13,098</td>
<td>4,064</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>17,162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>11,355</td>
<td>3,790</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>15,145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>11,452</td>
<td>3,987</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>15,439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>11,701</td>
<td>4,075</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>15,776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>12,648</td>
<td>4,218</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>16,866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>13,869</td>
<td>4,206</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18,075</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Greybook of Enrollment Tables: First Semesters 1945-1955, Annual Report of the Director, Series 25/7/0/5, Box 1, and Student Transcripts Series 25/3/4, University of Illinois Archives, Urbana-Champaign. 68


Internationally, mistreatment of Blacks was cited as the failure of democracy, prompting domestic policy reform. Domestically, many politicians, activists, and organizations protesting social inequalities were labeled as communist and summarily silenced or subverted. In July of 1947, the General Assembly of Illinois passed the Clabaugh Act. This Act prohibited the U of I officials from extending university facilities to “subversive, seditious, and un-American organization, or to its representatives.” The sponsor, Rep. Charles Clabaugh of Champaign, claimed that the bill was directed specifically towards the American Youth for Democracy chapter on the University of Illinois campus, but he believed it would generally stamp out any and all “subversive” organizations on campus. Unfortunately, due to the post-World War II (WII) politics, which had a pendulum effect, the fight against the spread of communism affected the struggle for civil rights. These occurrences created a significant rupture in the political climate of the time and the ways in which activism manifested on and off campus during the 1950s-1960s.

Consequently, in many foreign countries, the United States was viewed as cruel, dishonest, and unequal. In an effort to repeal this public image and maintain positive foreign relations, elite Whites in positions of power began to support policies for equitable treatment of African Americans, even within higher education. However, their focus on improving international perceptions did not actualize a substantial change in circumstances for disenfranchised groups. McCarthy-era political activism and the triumph of law-and-order rhetoric limited the nature and extent of positive progress. McCarthyism and the Cold War had a


dramatic and disruptive effect on the postwar northern civil rights movement.\textsuperscript{72} It was all but impossible for a Black person labeled as a communist to effectively advocate for civil rights with any degree of vigor. This prolonged and strengthen White institutional resistance to Black demands to social change. Despite an exodus of many southern Blacks into northern metro areas and cities post WWII,\textsuperscript{73} college enrollments for African Americans remained stagnant and did not increase in proportion to total enrollment at the U of I. Access was restricted according to prestige.

Comparatively, when examining the number of professorships given to Black individuals, male or female, there was a significant dearth. The university forced Blacks to the fringe areas of the institutional process and eliminated the opportunity for African Americans to become faculty members. Although there were Blacks qualified and available to work as faculty in various departments in academia, it is not until 1941 when Allison Davis, a distinguished anthropologist was hired at the University of Chicago as a professor of education, that an African American was hired into a full-time faculty position at any PWI.\textsuperscript{74} At U of I, the first full-time, tenure-track faculty member of color was Robert A Eubanks, who was hired in July, 1965 as an Assistant Professor with the Department of Civil Engineering.\textsuperscript{75}
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\textsuperscript{73} Jonathan S. Holloway and Ben Keppel eds., \textit{Black Scholars on the Line: Race, Social Science, and American Thought in the Twentieth Century} (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2007), 87. During the post-World War II era the second Great Migration of southern, rural African-Americans to northern cities caused a surge in the population of northern communities.
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\end{flushright}
Despite the 1954 *Brown v. the Board of Education of Topeka* ruling, the subsequent Supreme Court’s Brown II decision, declaring “all deliberate speed” allowed segregation in education to persist another decade. In addition, after 1957 the competition between the United States and Russia increase significantly as a result more students were encouraged to attend the college. The launching Sputnik by the Russians prompted US officials to consider ways to make college more assessable across the nation. The National Defense Act of 1958 would have a dramatic impact on student enrollment overall.\(^76\) Prior to 1961 the U of I had a mostly open admissions policy.\(^77\) Due to the increasing competition for those wanting to attend the U of I, admission standards were set as a sorting mechanism which disproportionately impacted low-income and minority student enrollment.

A pivotal moment for proponents of civil rights was President Lyndon B. Johnson’s signing of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, designed to eliminate discrimination against African Americans and other racial and ethnic groups. This began to influence some enrollment practices at the U of I. A faculty committee was convened in the early 1960s to discuss ways to increase the enrollment of Black students and faculty on campus. U of I President David Henry was sensitive to the challenges facing the country and the campus. President Henry requested a report from all University Department Heads regarding their experience during the year to identify and consider “Negro” candidates for positions. Most Heads responded negatively, suggesting they would stand by their principles of selecting the most qualified applicant.\(^78\) This is indicative of two things the Deans and Department Heads wielded tremendous autonomy and that most

---


78. “Negro Faculty Recruitment,” President, David D. Henry (1955-1971), General Correspondence 1955-1971, 2/12/1, Box 121, University of Illinois Archives.
campus administrators were resistance to promoting racial equity. The faculty committee decided a position dedicated to recruiting Black students was needed. One of the main criteria mentioned that a successful or ideal candidate would possess is the ability to navigate both worlds one “white and the other Black.”

Joseph H. Smith graduated from Morehouse University, served in the United States Marine Corps, and then attended graduate school at Harvard University. He worked as an English instructor in Jackson, Michigan and for 10 years prior to arriving to the U of I. Hired in 1964, Smith was a recruiter of Black students. He also taught classes part-time in the English Department. Despite having the support from U of I President David Dodds Henry, his immediate supervisor was not invested in changing policies to bring more Black students to campus but focused on ideas to increase the enrollment of rural White students.

Smith was very concerned with recruiting Black students throughout the state of Illinois. He often frequented public schools in Chicago as well as southern Illinois. He observed that many of the students that were interested in attending the U of I could not afford room and board in addition to books. The Higher Education Act of 1965 aimed to “strengthen the educational resources of our colleges and universities and to provide financial assistance for students in postsecondary and higher education.” This initiated a modest increase of African American student enrollment into HBCUs. Nevertheless, African American enrollment numbers at PWIs, specifically the U of I, remained relatively unchanged due to discriminatory admissions practices. Many students during this time indicated that the number of Black students at the
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The university was small throughout most of the 1960s. At this particular point in time, tuition was covered through grants and scholarships. Smith determined the U of I should provide additional financial support for Black students to attend. Finally as an act of desperation due to his supervisor’s indifference toward recruitment of Black students he confided in the campus Ombudsman, Willaim K Williams. A few days later, President Henry decided to allocate funds to support the enrollment of more Black students in 1965 after an invited meeting with Smith. The U of I piloted several different programs offering summer intensive institutes and eventually piloting year-long programs with the hopes of providing foundational skills for incoming Black students to be successful.

In the Spring of 1965, the President’s Office commissioned a report regarding the Special Education Opportunities Program. Out of the summary and conclusions of the report emerge several questions:

1. Should the University of Illinois devise programs to increase the enrollment of educationally disadvantaged Negro students at its campuses?
2. Should we admit educationally disadvantaged students who show motivation and academic talent but who do not meet present admission standards? If so, what kinds of retraining and post enrollment academic aids would be appropriate?
3. Shall we develop a system of financial aid for the disadvantage student based on need and designed to alleviate necessities for nonacademic employment?
4. How broadly shall we conceive our special function in research and training? Should we make a special effort to encourage research on a wide variety of areas connected with Negro life and problems or shall we concentrate our resources on educational research and training?
5. Shall we develop extension facilities for adult education content and issues specifically related to economic and communal problems of the Negro population?

---
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6. Should general education at the University of Illinois require all students to receive training in understanding the history and present nature of Negro/White relations in American society?

7. What should be the pattern of relations between the University of Illinois’s and the predominantly Negro colleges? Shall we attempt to support and improve such institutions? Shall we adopt the “big brother” pattern now developing in many American universities?

8. Should we make special efforts to recruit Negro faculty to our campus? If so how can we increase such recruitment?

9. Is a campus social climate favorable to integration and legitimate concern of university officials? If so, how can University policy be implemented?

10. Should we encourage the formation of a student committee or agency, similar to the present President’s Committee on Human Relations and Equal Opportunities, and charged with developing student policies towards a more equitable social climate?

11. How can the university ensure adequate representation of Negroes and its nonacademic employment? What influence can it, and should it, bring to bear on exclusionary unions with which the University or its contractors do business?

12. Should an administrative officer be appointed to coordinate activity in the area of equal educational opportunity?

13. Should the University develop an Institute or Center to be devoted to research, training and service and problems of the American Negro and the educationally disadvantaged?

14. How can we better coordinate the activities of both the Champaign Urbana and Chicago campuses? Should administrative and research facilities in the subject matters be centrally located in Chicago or in Champaign Urbana?

The report was very extensive in several authors of the report demonstrated the sensitivity and need for ameliorating conditions which Black students experienced on campus. They recognized the implementation of any of these initiatives will require the hiring of Black faculty as essential. However, the insistence was upon a pragmatic and deliberate approach to addressing the deficits outlined in the report.


85. See note 85.
The gradual increase of Black students into PWIs was an unintended consequence of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Higher Education Act of 1965\textsuperscript{86}, and the Voting Rights Act of 1965. The overall number of Black students matriculating into PWIs was remained consistent. At the U of I, some Black students felt as castaways in a sea of whiteness.\textsuperscript{87} Many students indicated the insular effects, being the only Black student in a class, dormitory, or student association.\textsuperscript{88} Although the Black student population relative to the total enrollment at U of I was relatively low, some student groups formed with the expressed purpose to combat racial oppression. Many Black veterans returning home from war were committed to the Double V Campaign: they have been victorious over Fascist hatred abroad, now they wanted to conquer racist hatred at home. The Student Community Interracial Committee highlighted the embattled relationships between university students and the larger community and engaged in demonstrations and protests both on and off campus, most notably at restaurants, skating rinks, and theaters. A discord between traditional philosophy and new “radical” ideology of members eventually caused the group to disband.\textsuperscript{89} The latter group focused on direct action and felt that there needed to be greater disruption. Those members went on to form the Student Community Human Relation Council (SCHRC). The SCHRC sent letters to the State’s Attorney office outlining multiple accounts of discrimination, in detail, by Champaign businesses. Other student led organizations began to develop such as the Racial Equality Committee of the YMCA, the Congress on Racial Equality, and Students for a Democratic Society, all of which had chapters at the University of Illinois.

\textsuperscript{86} Black Illinois Legislature, 1876-2009.

\textsuperscript{87} Williamson, “We Hope for Nothing,” 42.

\textsuperscript{88} Williamson, “We Hope for Nothing,” 42.

\textsuperscript{89} Cobb-Roberts, “Race and Higher Education,” 69.
Some administrators resented students who protested for equality, “Do we have education for accreditation, or do we have it to educate boys and girls? Are the schools run for the students, or are the students run for a university complex?” University Board of Trustees at various PWIs displayed contempt vs consideration for many student demands and supported college presidents who disciplined those who disrupted campus structure. At the U of I the Board of Trustees served as a break, rather than an accelerator, for innovation and social change. Students’ refusal to cease activism efforts prompted legal battles with college administration concerning “constitutionally protected speech and behavior and the right of a college campus to control its property and constituents.” In 1966, President of the Student Senate, Robert Outis, arranged for Alvin Poussaint, the renowned activist and scholar, to facilitate a forum to build awareness of racial issues on campus to improve conditions. The students continued to push onward. Paul Brady co-founded and became the first President of the U of I chapter of Congress on Racial Equality (CORE) in the mid-1960s. The primary focus of this group would be to advocate for the rights of Black students and community members. They initiated the call for a history course specific to the Black experience. Despite the limited number of participants, the group maintained their insistence that a course should be offer the Spring semester of 1967.

90. Bob Ingram, “Roberts Addresses AAUP,” The Student Printz 1 (December 11, 1969) Verner Holmes. Collection, Box 3, Folder 6, UMA.
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Another major contention in 1966 was Black students and staff creating a chapter of the W.E.B. DuBois Club at the U of I. This club was thought to be a direct challenge to the Clabaugh Act. The club received recognition from the faculty Committee on Student Affairs (CSA) November 18, 1966, and the Board of Trustees February 14, 1967. However, when a group of legislators announced their opposition to the group, articles in the DI drew parallels between the Ku Klux Klan and the W.E.B. DuBois Club, and other registered student organizations opposed its recognition, the Board of Trustees voted to rescind the club’s recognition. This act disallowed the club from the use of campus facilities.

As the struggle between the forces of racial oppression and Black liberation waged on, Black youth developed a culture of protest. The university was just another front “—a site to obtain critical thinking and technical skills—to liberate Afro-America.” Many Black college students across the country were frustrated and alienated by the overt hostilities directed at them by Whites within the campus and local community. They began to shed the assumptions that only through moral suasion and acceptance of the dominant group would equality be achieved. A new ideology highlighting Black identity began to emerge which further radicalized these

students but also empowered them to advocate for effective change.\textsuperscript{103} It would become known as Black Power.

Although there were Black fraternities and sororities on U of I campus for decades, these organizations did not mobilize students towards addressing civil rights issues. Rodney Hammond seized the opportunity to convene a small group to begin a dialogue regarding concern of Black students. October 27, 1967 the Black Student Association (BSA) was created with approximately 17 members. The BSA was open to all Black students by “virtue of their ethnicity.”\textsuperscript{104} This allowed Black students the opportunity to work collectively towards issues concerning them and aided their development of Black Power ideology at the U of I.

By the spring of 1967 the BSA had an established newsletter and continued a shift towards Black Power ideology. Adding to the call for a course in Black history was the demand to increase enrollment of Black students. The U of I had piloted several different initiatives to increase enrollment of Black students since 1965. They were mostly unsuccessful.\textsuperscript{105} A University Committee on Human Relations and Equal Opportunity was convened. In reality, it lacked the dedicated investment of resources to enrollment considering the significant number of Black students. Modestly, the enrollment of Black students in fall 1966 had nearly doubled from the previous two years to approximately 350.

The campus and local community were shaken by the assassination of Martin Luther King Jr. on April 4, 1968. This prompted university administrators to take seriously the demands of the BSA as the nation erupted in fear and violence. In fall 1967, nationally 8,000 Black
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students attended PWIs; by the start of the 1968 academic year, 80,000 Black students were enrolled in PWIs. At the U of I, over 500 Black students were admitted by fall, 1968. This set a chain of events in motion that would forever change the university.

Methodology & Contextualizing the Argument

In 2012, the 150th anniversary of LGIs prompted celebration but more importantly, sparked a reinvestigation into the mission of public colleges and universities. Did they really reflect the population of their states? Were they meeting the needs of their students? Many LGIs had become more inclusive as a result of social conflict in the late 1960s, particularly amongst PWIs. How were these institutions subsequently shaped as a consequence of the growth in diversity of the new students they served? I posit that a critical examination of U of I and its relationship with Black Studies will yield useful insights to understanding institutional culture and the ways in which the university responded to the shifting obligations of state interest and public demand (disenfranchised groups advocating for social transformation).

This research relies extensively on primary sources, including archival collections from the University of Illinois, student and local newspapers, and interviews with community members, alumni, staff, and administrative personnel—particularly, former department Chairs and program Directors that were affiliated with the creation of ethnic studies at U of I from 1968-2008. I employ two theoretical frameworks: insurgency theory and the Ideological State Apparatus (ISA). Collectively, these theories will produce a more accurate explanation of the emergence and institutionalization of contemporary Black Studies at the U of I. This provides a lens to view the political landscape of the university and complicates the dynamic relationships


between students, faculty, university administrators, and the local community. Fabio Rojas has delivered important theoretical frameworks and analysis for explaining the development and/or adoption of Black Studies within universities, particularly neoinstitutionalism, or the sociological study of how an institution emerges from its surrounding society. Neoinstitutionalism can be an applicable model for some organizational shifts of the university in the context of highly visible business-oriented areas, provided that university administrators are able to rationalize and explain to the Board of Trustees policy decisions beyond current trends or a “follow the leader” mentality. Moreover, mimicry does not aid in understanding the trajectory or stabilization of Black Studies at the U of I throughout the late 20th century.

Throughout the various monographs produced on Black student protest and the development of Black Studies, there remains an incomplete analysis regarding the outcomes and residual effects as well as the demands of Black Studies on administrative directives and policies. It is important to note that campuses throughout the nation garnered support internally and externally from a host of student and community led groups including, the Afro-American Organization (AAO), Afro-American Society (AAS), Association of Black Collegians (ABC), American Federation of Negro Students (AFNS), American Student Union (ASU), Black Panther Party (BPP), Black Student Alliance (BSA), Black Student Organization (BSO), Black Student Union (BSU), Black United Students (BUS), National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), National Association of Black Students (NABS), Revolutionary Action Movement (RAM), Students Afro-American Society (SAAS), and Students for a Democratic Society (SDS). All of these groups contributed to the material outcomes on college campuses, albeit some more than others. Rojas mentions the strong community component to

Black Studies at San Francisco State, but he leaves scholars to hypothesize its relational affiliation (demographics within the local community) and the dynamics of institutional type (private vs. public, large vs. small, teaching vs. research focus). Why were Black community members allowed to participate in the construction of a Black Studies program at San Francisco State and what is its juxtaposition regarding the other case studies? In addition, the institutions Rojas selected for case studies: University of Chicago, University of Illinois at Chicago (UIC), and Harvard University (Harvard) warrant further validation for their selection;\(^{109}\) the stated rational is incomplete and indicates that further analysis is needed.\(^ {110}\)

I suggest that the relationship between Black Studies and the rest of academia is not simply “a partnership in a coevolution process”\(^ {111}\) but a dialectic relationship of competing interest which occasionally yield unintended consequences. Unintended consequences are the critical interventions that developed due to the institutionalization of Black Studies: Latino/a, Chicano/a, American Indian, Asian American, Women and Gender Studies programs and departments as well as cultural spaces on campus and culturally-responsive admissions criteria.

Some aspects of change may only be symbolic as a means of appeasement. When did administrators’ management of diversity's insurgent possibilities negate its transformative power? Roderick Ferguson asserts that power is fluid within society and the academy seeking to

---

109. Rojas, *From Black Power*, 95. Often what has been missing from these narratives is an analysis of the long term impact of student demands on the universities. However, the objective of these scholars was not to follow the trajectory and outcomes of student protest but to explore the protest process. The U of I has one of the few monographs produced on BSP college campuses in the Midwest. Respectfully, there has not been a notable full-length monograph on the University of Wisconsin-Madison, Purdue University, University of Iowa, or University of Michigan-Ann Arbor (Michigan) or any other university within the Midwest. However, there are several articles and dissertation works that, collectively, can depict a larger narrative.


conserve and assume power recognized the unique characteristics of Black Studies. Thus, the academy negotiated to institutionalize Black Studies in an attempt to “reduce the initiatives of oppositional movements to the terms of hegemony.” This reality indicates the use of insurgency as a theory merits strong consideration. I argue that in the case of the U of I, the decision to institutionalize Black Studies relied heavily upon how advocates were persistent in their ability to marshal existing resources collaboratively in order to leverage ideological difference as an acceptable and/or necessary undertaking of the university.

At the crux of this research is the investigation of contemporary Black Studies programs as an academic discipline and the interplay between students, staff, faculty, and university administrators. Contemporary Black Studies embodies Black intellectual traditions such as Fredrick Douglas, W.E.B. Du Bois, Ida B. Wells, Carter G. Woodson, E Franklin Frazier, Martin Luther King Jr., Ella Baker, Malcolm X, and many others. These philosophical traditions, although articulated in very different ways, were antecedents to Black Power. Black Power reflected the Black communities disenchantment and disillusionment with the political process to achieve economic rights for Blacks in American. In addition they recognized non-violence and peaceful protest as a principle verses a tactic. The new ideology led activist and intellectuals such as Angela Davis, Amira Baraka, Eldridge Cleaver, Stokley Carmichael, Huey P.Newton, and Bobby Seale to engage in more direct, sometimes militant, actions to acquire political and economic justice. Black Power ideology manifested in a multitude of contexts, including political organizations, community action groups. The initial focus of this research is on the insurgency. Insurgency denotes the disparate strategies, ideology, and disputes between coalitions emphasizing that despite similarities in the particular goals, advocating for Black

Studies, it was not entirely monolithic. Focusing on the “insurgents,” the BSA, collective action, and its ideological alignments with the BPP, SNCC and other outside organizations provides ways in which to better understand the local and national context for investigating the Black insurgency at the U of I.

*Insurgency* is used as a framework for understanding how excluded groups mobilize political leverage to advance collective interest through noninstitutionalized and/or systematized methods. Students acted within and outside the routine structures of the U of I to achieve their goals. *Insurgency* characterizes a stage in the development, defined as short-run intermittent collective action and protest from 1968-1972 at the U of I. This approach accurately aids in the understanding the structure of political opportunity, indigenous organizational strength, and Black student protestors as being outsiders, challenging the campus polity. Although Black students and faculty were members of the institution (enrolled/employed), they lacked routine access to decisions affecting them. In this respect, many first generation African-American college students, springing from working-class roots sought to transition from being patrons (honorary members) of the U of I to shareholders. They wanted to create not only a physical space for Black identity (i.e., cultural houses and dormitories earmarked for Black students) but also an intellectual space through Black/Africana/African American studies departments and programs. This insurgency has ideological basis in Black Power that penetrated campuses throughout the nation during the late 1960s and perpetuated direct action aimed at deconstructing architectural frameworks of White hegemony within American society and higher education.


The work of several scholars refers to Black student protest on college campuses as the Black Campus Movement (BCM) or Black Studies Movement (BSM). However, these classifications do not fully depict or capture the true nature of a “movement” as a “movement represents a continuous process from generation to decline, rather than a discrete series of developmental stages.”¹¹⁶ The rationale behind this assertion is that scholars have not defined how BCM or BSM meet the criteria of a movement beyond the ideological and philosophical context of the Civil Rights Movement or Black Power Movement. This conflation contradicts distinctive features of social movements as collective actors with defined common interests who work toward social change using mass mobilization as their primary political tool, and it obscures the analysis of events that transpired.¹¹⁷ Rojas argues that the development of Black Studies was not significantly impacted by the size or proportion of Black students on campuses across the country.¹¹⁸ I submit that a critical mass of divergent and persistent ideology played a paramount role in the outcomes of Black studies at the U of I.¹¹⁹ “[I]deology, discourse, and long range objectives matter as much, if not more, than the specific inequities challenged, or the particular means employed toward those ends.”¹²⁰ Moreover, Black student protest manifested as


¹¹⁹. Critical mass is a measure for threshold that varies across institutional types and structures. One should not assume that critical mass at University (A) will yield the same result as critical mass at University (B).

an extension or cumulative effect of Black Power and is a sub-current or phase of the Black Power Movement.

Movements often have limited success within institutions that are counter to the ideologies justifying the institutions existence. However, focusing on state politics and regional contentions with can provide insights to understanding the development of Black Studies at the U of I. The State Apparatus (SA) is occupied with maintaining control and domination, which is done through social reproduction. The primary function of the SA is repression. This processes is achieved by inculcating people to respect the rules and systems enacted by the dominate group. The purpose is to establish a foundation for submissiveness to rules that perpetuate exploitation and repression. However, other ideological state apparatuses (ISAs), including family, legal, political, and most notably education can be sites for critical interventions. The primary function of an ISA is ideological. Critical interventions are the mechanisms used to add or reprioritize ideals or ideology within institutions (also insurgents or insurgent possibilities). ISAs allow for perspectives (ideologies) to have a priority function, thus being a site for positive transformation. In academia ideals and ideology governs the organizational structure and behavior. At the U of I, the ideals and ideology governing it was

121. Jacqueline Bobo, Cynthia Hudley, and Claudine Michael, *The Black Studies Reader* (New York: Routledge, 2004), 26. Black Power ideology is the intellectual basis of the Black Power Movement. Therefore the cumulative effect is understood as the “regrouping or strategical reallocating resources” to resist racial oppression.
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geared towards research and teaching believed to be compatible with the needs of residents within the state. The endeavor to institutionalize and stabilize Black Studies as an academic discipline was fraught with challenges. Administrative responses varied over the next forty years as U of I officials tried to negotiate ideological difference and manage forms of diversity. Universities should be understood as a microcosm of major socio-political shifts and contestations in the larger society. Examining the ways in which critical interventions of ISAs were leveraged to negotiate power dynamics within the university is essential to a more accurate historical and theoretical analysis concerning the institutionalization of Black Studies at U of I. Exploring the dialectical dimensions allows scholars to understand not only how Black Studies originated but its articulations within the institution.

Within this research, the emergence and evolution of Black Studies is the basis to examine the dialectic relationships between public demands within higher education. These power relationships reshape the structure of education and the culture within the institution. This research prompts exploration into the effects of Black Studies on campuses, becoming a forerunner to the adaptation of championing diversity as a compelling interest. Although some critics argue that Black Studies has been appropriated into the mainstream dogma of the academy, or that in many cases diversity is only symbolic, these scholars question substantial evidence of a racial reconstitution (anti-racism) in higher education. It is a substantially more complex history in which dialectical relationships of power are reordered to manage insurgent possibilities. Nevertheless, in 1968 U of I embarked one of the more ambitious initiatives centered on diversity and launched the Special Education Opportunity Program (SEOP or Project
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As an unintended consequence Black Studies became the vanguard of multiculturalism that is seen on campus today, especially through various related cultural centers and academic departments, including American Indian, Asian American, Latino/a, and Gender and Women studies.

After nearly 50 years, the U of I boasts of its commitment to inclusivity establishing various departments, offices, programs, and celebrations designed to signal the eradication of the vestiges of white hegemony within the institution. This research attempts to chart the most significant antecedent to this development—the emergence and evolution of Afro-American Studies at the U of I. A case study of this public land grant university will allow a better understanding of the historical and political context and the extent to which struggle and negotiation reshaped the university and its culture. Historically, providing new knowledge and relevant curriculum to working-class residents is the chief obligation of LGIs and public colleges. The aim of this research to better understand the interactions of bureaucratic organizations such as universities and advocates of Black Studies yet acknowledging that individuals can foster change. Moreover, it is the collective of individuals within the institutions or groups (ideologically and philosophically), which can negotiate for sustainable transformative outcomes. I argue that by exploring the ways in which U of I has negotiated ideological difference through Black Studies and the institutional culture will present greater insights for a more in-depth historical analysis.

Chapter Outline

This dissertation is divided into five chapters. Chapter 1, Insurgency: the Ivory Tower Under Siege 1968-1973, details the experiences of African Americans matriculation into

---

Predominantly White Institutions (PWIs). The initial sections of this chapter provide national and regional contexts to understand the interactions between students, faculty, administrators, and the local community surrounding the U of I campus. My analysis focuses on the sociology of students and administrators involved in negotiations for Black Studies. In addition, I explore the disparate and discrete activities of various student organizations. The advent of Project 500 created a drastic difference in the Black student population that historically attended the U of I. There is an attempt to understanding the sociology of project 500 participants, including geographical and social background information on the freshman students entering Fall semester 1968. Moreover, this chapter provides an examination of how the shift to Black Power ideology shaped the student protest at U of I and the subsequent outcomes, as well as administrative responses. These negotiations are able to produce the development of an academic course, HIS 199, provided as an act of “good faith” concerning the development of Black Studies. The increase of Black student enrollment at the U of I is central to understanding the push for Black Studies. Moreover, this chapter highlights key moments during the insurgency which led to the development of the Afro-American Studies and Research Program established in 1974.

dialectical relationship.

Chapter 2, Striving for Legitimacy: Charting a Course for Stability 1974-1987, looks at how Black Studies was perceived by students, faculty, and administrators during its formative years at the U of I. What are the ways in which Black studies and the U of I transformed due to institutionalization? This chapter delves into exploring the outcomes of student demands and administrative responses after Project 500. These interactions led to the creation of the Afro-American Studies and Research Program (AASRP), the Afro-American Cultural Center, and eventually the Office of Minority Student Affairs. I provide a chronology of events impacting
program development and administrative leadership of the AASRP. Gerald McWorter (Abdul Alkalimat) severed as Director of AASRP during 1979-1987. Articles and editorials from the Daily Illini and The News Gazette are used to supplement interviews and provide additional insights to the sentiment of students, administrators, and community members.

Chapter 3, Rising through Retrenchment: A New Mandate for Ethnic Studies 1988-2000, focuses on the challenges of legitimizing Black Studies at the U of I during a decade of stability but limited institutional growth for AASRP at the U of I. However, cross cultural collaborations emerged in 1992 as student protest erupted once again. Students rallied to support Latinos, Asian Americans, and American Indians achieve equitable representation on campus. Students issued new mandate for the development of Latina/o Studies, Asian American Studies, and American Indian Studies. Despite economic hardships, Director, Dianne Pinderhughes’s strategic leadership from 1988-2000 would allow the AASRP to survive, weathering the fiscal and political storms to chart a course for stability.

Chapter 4, Resurgence and Revitalization: Development of the Afro-American Studies Department 2001-2008, details the major events leading up to the approval of an African American Studies Department. Sundiata Cha-jua assumed the directorship in 2001; while using an assortment of tactics/strategies, collaborating with faculty and administrators was able to lead AASRP to departmental status in 2008. However, the arduous process had a series of setbacks and institutional challenges. There is an emphasis on exploring and contextualizing the political struggles within program to better understand the process and negotiations which took place.

Conclusion: Black Studies as the Critical Intervention of Insurgent Possibilities, attempts to demonstrate the transdisciplinary, descriptive, corrective, and prescriptive elements of Black
Studies, and its particular role within the university. Collectively these chapters articulate the ways in which institutions of higher education negotiate ideological difference and manage forms of diversity. Also within this section is a discussion of ISA and its impact on the structure and design of the department. This chapter provides an analysis for outcomes of Black Studies at the U of I, policy implications, and possibilities for future research.

---

CHAPTER 1

INSURGENCY: THE IVORY TOWER UNDER SIEGE 1968-1973

[Ke]ep the Negro from going too far. … We say that the Negro wants absolute and immediate freedom and equality, not in Africa or in some imaginary state, but right here in this land today. … Negroes no longer are tolerant of or interested in compromise. American history is replete with compromise. … American history chronicles the Missouri compromise, which permitted the spread of slavery to new states; the Tilden Hayes Compromise, which withdrew federal troops from the South and signaled the end of Reconstruction; the Supreme Court’s compromise in Plessy v. Ferguson, which enunciated the infamous “separate but equal philosophy.” These measures compromised not only liberty of the Negro but the integrity of America. … “Compromise” is profane and pernicious. … No Negro leader today could divert the direction of the movement or its compelling and inspired forward motion.131

Published in 1964, the excerpt above counters characterizations of Martin Luther King Jr. that are rampant throughout both scholarship and popular culture. Why We Can’t Wait captures the growing urgency of Black activist wanting immediate remedies to past and current discrimination. Although the call for Black Studies was not issued in the 1950s, the ideological coalitions and Black intellectual tradition forged during the Civil Rights Movement created the groundwork for the insurgency. Disenfranchised and disaffected Black youth in the mid-1960s began adopting Black Power ideology which, when combined with student radicalism, paved the way for the founding of contemporary Black Studies.

Modern Black Studies began in 1967 at Merritt College in Oakland, California and at San Francisco State. The founding scholars and student leaders included Nathan Hare, Amiri Baraka, George Murray, Jimmy Garrett, and Sonia Sanchez.132 At first, it looked like the program would be slow to spread because many campuses lacked the students and professors needed to fill the
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classes and the critical mass of divergent racial ideology to fully engage the university structure prior to 1968. White university administrators’ responded to the assassination of Martin Luther King Jr.’s by admitting thousands of Black students into PWIs, revolutionizing campus demographics and dynamics.

Black youth radicalism fomented and grew in response to both the frustrations they felt at the slowness of change occurring in society and the direction of the CRM. No longer were they interested in gradualism, these youth sought direct and immediate action aimed at achieving full enfranchisement. The Black students matriculating into PWI’s were tired of waiting and skeptical of some of the earlier social movement philosophies. The new diverse student body and divergent ideologies became a catalyst for growing tensions on already on college campuses. At the U of I, most student protests centered on political concerns other than racial discrimination including student rights, women’s rights, education reform, and the anti-war movement. In Spring, 1968 at students protested against Dow Chemical because of their role supporting materials for the Vietnam War. Dow Chemical came to the U of I for employee recruitment. Students also protested against the Clabaugh Act which promoted censorship and sanctioning of any organization student groups or material that was considered unpatriotic or seditious. Other students were concerned with the academic experience on campus and advocated for educational reform. However, in the fall of 1968, over 500 Black freshmen arrived on campus, launching a new phase of radicalism: the insurgency. The question guiding this chapter is how did the sudden growth of the Black student population and divergent ideology at the U of I produce dialectical relationships between student, faculty, administrators and the local community?

The initial sections of this chapter provide national and regional contexts to understand the interactions between students, faculty, administrators, and the local community surrounding the the U of I campus. My analysis focuses on the sociology of students and administrators involved in negotiations for Black Studies. In addition, I explore the disparate and discrete activities of various student organizations. Insurgency is used to explain the tactics and stages of activity employed by students to prompt administrative responses. These negotiations are able to produce the development of an academic course, HIS 199 that was provided as an act of “good faith” concerning the development of Black Studies. The increase of Black student enrollment at the U of I is central to understanding the push for Black Studies. Moreover, this chapter highlights key moments during the insurgency which led to the development of the Afro-American Studies and Research Program established in 1974.

**Machinations of Black Power on Campus**

After the violence of Freedom Summer and the limited successes achieved in Albany, Mississippi, and elsewhere across the South, Black Power resonated with Black youth throughout the nation. Stokely Carmichael was one of the better known rising community organizers during the civil rights era. He participated in most major demonstrations and events that occurred between 1960 and 1965. Carmichael firmly embraced the nonviolent principles of the 1950s and 1960s; however, as positive social progress began to stagnate, he considered other alternatives. He further questioned the notion of appealing to the moral consciousness of White communities as reality demonstrated in the United States that Black life was often regarded as disposable. The call for Black Power meant cultural, political, and economic self-determination. Carmichael demanded that Black people embrace their heritage and culture. The new philosophy changed how Black students protested on college campuses. On many campuses, the formation
of Black studies came to symbolize the change the students wanted. Between 1967 and 1973, students fought for it at PWIs including Cornell, New York University, Columbia, Rutgers, University of Pennsylvania, U of I, and other institutions around the country.  

Many of the tactics the Black students used were also used by their partners in the Students for a Democratic Society and other anti-war organizations, and unfortunately, the narrative of Black student activism has often been overshadowed by Vietnam-centered protests. In 1969, the New York Times issued a story with the following headline: “The Campus Revolution: One is Black, One White.” At the U of I, White students protested the Vietnam War, the university’s involvement with the industrial war complex, advocated for educational reform, and free speech. White students did not purposefully exclude Black students from activists groups geared towards antiwar sentiment, but Black and White students found it difficult to reconcile and rationalize their aims collectively. Black students felt that participating in an antiwar movement was not as immediate as the need to achieve racial justice domestically. As the War continued it came to be viewed as a racist war, both against the people of Vietnam and against the Black enlisted soldiers. However, some BSA members were concerned about the dedication and authenticity of White supporters. The BSA struggled to represent the interests of Black students without compromise while expecting to receive the major part of its support from
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White benefactors. The BSA also created tensions between the Black fraternities and sororities. Initially Black Greek members asserted that the students joining BSA did so as a last resort to for acceptance into a social club.

Although Black and White student activist groups had different purposes and worked exclusively of each other on the U of I campus, often the continuous succession of student protests provided each group with more leverage to achieve their goals. Black student protests derived from aspects of university policy or lack of policy that failed to adequately address the needs of Black students. Throughout the country, Black students engaged in demonstrations, protests, and sit-ins as a means to achieve institutional transformation. For example, at Northwestern University, Black students advocated for adequate housing. Black students at Columbia criticized the school’s encroachment on scarce green space in Harlem’s community.

At the University of Michigan campus administrators did not negotiate seriously with students in the Black Action Movement (BAM), so student activists partnered with the powerful local labor unions like United Auto Workers (UAW). The alliances fostered multicultural solidarity by including the establishment of a recruiter for Chicano students in addition to demanding a Black Studies program. Although the institutional structure of Michigan is unique, the demand students made mirrored those across the nation.
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**U of I at the Center**

Even before King’s assassination, U of I administrators planned to enroll approximately three hundred Black students and provide financial aid packages in addition to tutoring and mentoring for the fall of 1968. Chancellor Peltason had not made a formal announcement regarding the pilot program because he wanted to ensure a smooth transition and limit outside criticisms. He especially worried that people would think that seats earmarked for Black students somehow diminished the opportunities available for White students.\(^{140}\) Chancellor Peltason’s colleagues suggested that as a political scientist he was keenly aware of social and racial issues of the time.\(^ {141}\) He established a working group comprised of Smith, David Eisenman and several others to pilot a program to recruit 300 Black low income students. Chancellor Peltason had negotiated with other professors and staff to volunteer as mentors and provide additional educational services to these students. They had planned to initiate this pilot program in the fall of 1968. Chancellor Peltason decided that the 300 seats earmarked for Black students would be added to the seats that were historically reserved for the freshman class, increasing the total number of seats available. This was an attempt to eliminate the notion that “less qualified black applicants were taking seats from more qualified white applicants.”\(^ {142}\) Some administrator and faculty on campus attributed low Black student enrollment to unrealistic “Negro standards.” In a letter written to the editor of the *Daily Illini* on May 25\(^{th}\), 1966, John Swope writes:

> Regrettably, Negroes aren’t qualified to enter the university on a large scale due to the discriminatorily high standards for entrance into the [U of I]. As Mr. St. John so aptly put it, standards should be lowered to allow more Negroes to enter. Unfortunately his suggestion lacks realism. Due to the extra white people coming from the high schools in
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the future, Negroes will have a tough time getting in I feel that the standard for Negroes should be lowered while those for whites are raised. That way many of our colored brethren can come here and they won’t have to worry about competing with white people (it’s such a traumatic experience).143

Although these types of sentiments were popular among White liberals and conservatives, the notion that Black students were simply unqualified was unfounded. Prior to 1960 the admissions criteria for U of I was based mostly on completion of a high school diploma. There were no accurate measures to indicate the success of any students matriculating into the U of I until much later.144 By March 1968 Joseph Smith and his office had identified almost 258 Black applicants that would be enrolled at U of I for the Fall semester. Then the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. and the subsequent demands issued by the BSA significantly altered the initial plan.

The BSA demanded admittance of 1000 Black students in addition to an increase in Black faculty,145 which was the number that would be needed to create the same percentage of Blacks on campus as there were in the state of Illinois in September 1968.146 They figured their math was simple: if the state of Illinois was ten percent Black and the U of I served approximately ten thousand students, then one thousand seats was the minimum needed. Chancellor Peltason negotiated with the BSA executive committee to compromise on five hundred seats for Black students. The BSA did not know that the U of I administration had already committed to enrolling 300 Black students. The administration decided not to disclose the pilot program because they worried that BSA members would want to renegotiate their
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agreement. In addition, administrators doubted that the BSA could recruit any additional Black students in significant numbers. Although some did not believe Project 500 to be a complete success it was a watershed moment that would change the U of I.

At the same time BSA was negotiating for more Black students on campus, Peltsaon was negotiating with the Citizens for Racial Justice (CRJ), another group formed as a response to Martin Luther King’s assassination, over the discriminatory hiring practices the U of I historically employed. The CRJ was comprised of both residents of Champaign-Urbana faculty and students of the U of I. Peltason expressed his sensitivity to both the BSA and the CRJ demands by suggesting that the University had not done enough to support opportunities for Black residents and students. The overture was recognized as sincere, but both groups demanded tangible results.

In 1967, only 57 out of 4,766 students in the U of I’s freshman class were Black. To recruit more Black students, the BSA held high school weekends for over one hundred fifty high school (HS) seniors. Students primarily came from Chicago, East St. Louis, and Holmes County, Mississippi. There was a strong connection to Mississippi for many Black families that migrated from the South over the previous decades to Chicago. Black families that relocated from Mississippi would often send children to visit grandparents or other family members during the summer months. This relationship prompted many students to assert that they were from
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Mississippi but lived in Chicago. The BSA facilitated the HS Weekend overnight visits to recruit potential students. Following one of the weekend visits, Chancellor Peltason made two major announcements. On April 30, he launched Project 500 and told the BSA that he would appoint a Black Dean of Students who would report directly to him. Then just two weeks later, during his weekly Chancellor Chats Friday, Peltason discussed plans for the Martin Luther King Jr. Scholarship Fund for low-income students. He purposefully shifted the focus off of racially-based scholarships income based as a means to garner more support. “We are on the verge of a very exciting period of educational reform,” he told the students. “Our job is to provide people an education,” regardless of their income level. “Probably it will be true that a high percentage of students who meet the qualifications for grants will be [B]lack, but that’s a result of society’s discrimination.” This was very tactful navigating by Chancellor Peltason. He separated the initiatives from one another to limit possible conservative backlash from those who would condemn the use of funds for students of color who were deemed unqualified.

Project 500 was first headed up by Clarence Shelley, a native of Detroit, Michigan. Shelley had earned a Master’s degree at Wayne State University and had experience as a counselor and secondary education teacher for almost a decade prior to coming to Illinois. He was offered a position at the University to coordinate Project 500. In 1974, he would become the Dean of Students. “What the hell am I doing here? That was my initial thought,” he remembered.

I was loaned to the University by the Detroit Board of Education to get the program started, I felt that, I was eager enough to believe that I could knock this out in a couple of years and go back to Detroit, well this was around the time the Detroit Riots were in 1967 so when the riots occurred I was working at Delta College, I was loaned to Delta College to do some work for to get more young black and Latino, low income students into the Prep schools out East and Hanover…. when I came back to Detroit that summer to visit; the city was in such chaos, the smoke was still rising from the riots, so I said to myself, “Well this would be a good time to get the hell out of here and let this stuff cool and come back, and so I came here in July of ’68 and never left.

Shelley believed his main task was to keep students from “being killed or arrested.” He was also there to help students who were admitted to Project 500 but who were ill-prepared for the academic expectations at the U of I. Shelley asserted that most Black students believed he was a “flunky for white folks,” a perception that made students distrustful of his actions and intentions.

He understood many of the racial tensions that manifested on campus and throughout the community, and it was his job to try to mitigate them. Housing remained a problem for staff and students. It was often very difficult to find adequate housing for Black faculty and staff outside of Champaign’s North End. The North End was a predominantly segregated Black neighborhood in North Champaign. Once arriving on campus, Black faculty members or staff were given the opportunity to live in Orchard Downs housing, subsidized housing by the U of I, for two years. After that time, the faculty members often found a place to live out in the community and a new Black faculty member would move into the U of I sponsored housing complex. It became a constant joke among African-American faculty and staff at U of I that they all had to live in the same house. Moreover, students faced a similar problem, Black males were not allowed in campus housing until after 1965, and often the housing received was considered inadequate.

In the early years, things were very chaotic for Project 500 participants. Because recruitment was not centralized, the information provided to incoming freshmen was sometimes incomplete or completely fabricated. Some students were told that they would have “walking around money,” other students never even applied but just showed up to start classes. “The
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A flunky would be a person who did whatever they were told despite the interests of the constituency was meant to serve in this regard students felt that Shelley had more of an allegiance to White administrators then to the Black students he was charged with serving.
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advantage of it being so poorly prepared was that I think that we made every conceivable mistake,” Shelley told me. “We also were able to identify the people on campus who were supportive and helpful who were accessible, a lot of white folks. We would not have survived, I don’t think, if we had not had access to the resources from the local churches, for example. A real gift, I think.”

Students also had to figure out how to live in a community where attitudes about racial justice and equality had not yet changed. These conditions were not foreign to the Black students that arrived on campus. Many of these students were from working-class backgrounds whose families were directly engaged in the struggle for civil rights not only philosophically but in reality. Those students coming from Holmes County, Mississippi had experience dealing with overt racism in the South, and they would use those skills to navigate their new environment at Illinois.

**Black Students in Transition**

Navigating the racial politics on and off campus would be a difficult undertaking; however, the national circumstances fostered more alliances between Black students on campus and in the local community, creating greater solidarity. The process of navigating the implicit racial discrimination at U of I would be a galvanizing experience that prompted many students to fully embrace Black Power ideology. As Black students reached a bigger population on the U of I campus, their concerns could no longer be ignored. Although the Black Greek system and the BSA had a strained relationship, they aligned to some degree to achieve a similar mission of improved experiences for Black students on campus. Many of these students would join the BSA.

---
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as their ideology began to shift towards forms of Black Power, giving rise to the insurgency at the U of I.

In 1968 Champaign County had approximately 163,281 residents 11% were minority and concentrated in Champaign’s North end. Students arrived to a large and fairly rural community with only a few businesses that would cater to their needs. They arrived on campus a week before classes to receive Tuberculosis shots, advising, financial aid, and dormitory assignments. In 1968 most Project 500 participants were first generation college attendees who knew very little about college life. Some students’ matriculation to the U of I was accidental or by the recommendation of a friend. “Now, I was so ignorant of college, I did not know what degree I would be coming here and applying for. I didn’t know the difference between a bachelor’s degree and a master’s degree, or a Ph.D,” recalls Al Anderson Project 500 alum.157 The administration used the week to orient the students. All of the students stayed at Illinois Street Residence Hall (ISR), which was the newest dormitory at the time with air conditioning and modern accommodations. Each day, students walked to the Illini Union (Union), the campus recreational and administrative space for students, to receive testing and advising. At the end of the week, many students wanted to remain together in ISR, but Shelley was determined to disperse them throughout the residence halls as it seemed like the most appropriate arrangement "because there’s no way in the world we’re going to have six hundred Negros in one building in one place," he explained.158

On September 9, 1968, the night before classes began, the Black students decided to meet at the Union for one last bonding experience so they could exchange addresses and phone

158. Shelley, in discussion with author.
numbers. When students arrived, they voiced their disappointment with the room assignments after living in ISR for a week. The rooms they had been assigned paled in comparison. They gathered on the south porch of the Union and demanded to see the Chancellor. Peltason’s advisors encouraged him to not immediately engage the students. Determined students wanted to stay until their grievances were addressed. As it began to rain many students moved inside, which was prohibited after midnight without a permit. The only exceptions were for officers of student organizations housed on the second floor, which is where the BSA officers had their headquarters. Midnight came and the students did not leave. The police arrested 254 Black students. It became a formative experience for many students. Most of them had never been in any trouble, especially jail. Local churches, both Black and White, offered to bail students out of jail. “When the police saw all these White folks from these churches coming down here to get these kids out of jail they turn them loose…very quickly,” Shelley recalled. The more militant ones said that they would stay incarcerated.

The news media made a spectacle of the peaceful protest. Instead of a moderately peaceful sit-in, the event was touted as a rebellious student uprising in the local and national press. The University administration knew that a riot had not occurred, but they did nothing to counter the negative image presented in the Chicago Tribune of students “swinging from chandeliers.” States Attorney Larry Johnson filed charges on 252 persons but eventually had to dismiss the charges on a technicality. Subsequently, on March 24, 1969, he re-filed charges
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against 257 persons with a signature from Max Irwin, the U of I Assistant Security Officer, supporting the charges. Upset by the negative publicity Chancellor Peltason filed an *amicus curiae* brief requesting that all charges be dropped. It was denied.

The sit-in in the Student Union was just the beginning of a series of class boycotts, guerrilla harassment, and demonstrations that would consolidate Black students, Black youth on the North End, and also to the new left movement. In February 1969, after a group of ten Black Panthers were charged with defrauding an innkeeper in Champaign County, agitation spurred the development of the Students Against Racism (SAR) group which issued 41 demands at the U of I administrators aimed at wiping out “institutional racism.” The *Daily Illini* (DI) student newspaper would produce articles and editorials regarding protests from all parts of the country: San Francisco State College, Brandeis University, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Michigan, and Harvard. This only served to increase the intensity and persistence of Black students on the U of I campus. Students would also advocate for equitable representation on student body governing boards. It is often assumed that most White students were advocating for or concerned with the plight of nonwhite students or there were strong multicultural collaborations with White liberals. There were only a few White students and faculty that were progressive in their ideology and assisted in the negotiation process of Black student demands. Community members and Black students were at the forefront agitating for institutional transformation

---

163. Chancellor Peltason was progressive for his time. However, there were missteps in regards to his handling of this particular situation. When students demanded to speak to Peltason advisors including Joseph Smith cautioned him against any action and suggested that he not respond which eventually led to the arrest of the students. His response is not reflective of callousness of character but uncertainty.


regarding racial justice. On September 11, 1968, the student government established a discipline committee to deal with the Illini Union incident involving the arrest of 252 Black freshman.

**Ready for a Revolution**

These were the days of Vietnam War and the draft, the Chicago Riots and fifty or so urban insurrections in the country in 1968. Shelley stated that, “It seemed as if the world was in a kind of turmoil.” In the fall of 1968 Black Panther organizers came from Chicago and visited the local community and the U of I campus. They encouraged Black student activists to become more militant, aggressive, and assertive. Black youth were angry. Every time something happened in the South they would become increasingly vexed. The community was an important aspect. The U of I’s longstanding tradition of sending African-American students to live with families in the African-American community meant that Black students were rooted within the surrounding African-American community. Guest speakers that visited campus also motivated students toward political activism, “What ya’ll ought to do is just leave here, or burn down this place …. Brothers and sisters are down south being lynched and you sitting around here talking about Fraternities and Sororities and getting fat and lazy…” Black students engaged in extremely radical schemes: Shelley’s students drove a university car to Canada to buy guns. “The police stopped them on the way back,” he told me. “We didn’t learn till much later … the FBI had placed some black agents here posing as students.”

---
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On Friday, February 7, 1969, the BSA held demonstrations in the office of the Chancellor demanding the establishment of a Black cultural center and a Black Studies program. They employed unconventional tactics tying up administrative lines through a series of massive phone calls. A week later, on February 14th, a group of approximately 150 Black students headed to the office of the Chancellor and presented him with a list of 16 demands. The BSA solicited assistance from the student government and three days later, the Urbana-Champaign Senate Council, which was composed of the chairmen of various student Senate committees, recommended that the campus administration move as quickly as possible to create a Black cultural center. The next month, the student government supported a strike for Black student demand. Between five and seven hundred students attended a noon rally. Momentum did not dissipate, even over the summer. When students came back for the fall semester, they continued pushing. On November 4th, the Black coalition picketed and stopped work on IntraMural Physical Education Building (IMPE) due to the unjustified firing of a Black worker. On November 11, 1969, the Undergraduate Student Association (UGSA) voted to donate twenty percent of its funds from traffic fines to support BSA initiatives.

Although some events concerning Black student issues were reported by the DI, many were overlooked. With the newly allocated funds, Black students created their own newspaper, the Drum, to circulate awareness regarding issues affecting the black student community. The assassination of Fred Hampton on December 4, 1969 caused outrage among black students at the University of Illinois. Even those Blacks on campus and in the community who did not identify with Black Panther politics were upset by his death. Hampton was the Chairman of Illinois
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chapter of the Black Panther Party (BPP) and national Deputy Chairman of the national BPP who had done tremendous work for Black youth throughout the city of Chicago. Over three hundred Blacks marched in protest. While some White students were beginning to support racial equity on campus and push for the enfranchisement of Black students, U of I alumni, John Hundley, a previous reporter for the DI, remembered being one of the few White students participating in the march.\textsuperscript{174}

In January of 1970 violence began to erupt across the Twin Cities of Champaign and Urbana. Firebombs were used multiple times at rallies as resistance continued to grow. Students protested the war efforts, General Motors, and the campus ban on William M. Kunstler as an event speaker. Kunstler was most well-known for his defense for seven individuals charged with conspiracy to commit a riot at the 1968 Democratic National Convention in Chicago, Illinois. The U of I attorney Franklin’s office was bombed on March 16 as more chaos unfolded. Three days later, on March 19, 1970, President Henry announced his retirement as a result of continued student upheaval. U of I students instituted a strike after the Kent State incident where Ohio National Guardsmen opened fire killing four students. May 6, 1970, the student strike was underway and by late afternoon the Illinois National Guard had been mobilized and would stay mobilized for four days. Over 50 students were arrested for breaking curfew and disorderly conduct. Student protests were layered in a variety of different patterns and did not occur in any particular fashion. Students were ultimately concerned with gaining more autonomy within the institution. That also manifested as the agitation for education and curriculum reform.

Unbeknownst to many Black students on campus, Paul Schroeder a student activist on campus formed the Educational Reform Movement (ERM) and presented the Chancellor with demands, one of which was the implementation of 199-level courses in May of 1968. The 199

\textsuperscript{174} John Hundley, in discussion with author, December 3, 2015.
sequence code was similar in some ways to the Free University. This was an experimental way to explore subject content areas and field of study, to provide more flexibility and intellectual freedom development. The U of I adopted this practice in response to student demands which would allow professors the flexibility to develop pilot courses before going through the standard college requirements for course approval. Though faculty had been working to design a Black Studies course for years, it had not come to fruition.\textsuperscript{175} Finally, in the spring of 1969, after months of planning, HIS 199: Afro-American Culture was created as a studies course designed to explore the life and culture of African Americans. Prior to HIS 199, there were no African American history courses at the U of I or any other courses that explicitly focused on the experiences of African Americans. HIS 199 became the temporary stopgap and forerunner to the Afro-American Studies and Research Program.\textsuperscript{176}

**Faculty Student Commission on Afro-American Life and Culture & HIS 199**

On March 1, 1969, Chancellor Peltason created the Faculty Student Commission on Afro-American Life and Culture (FS-Commission)\textsuperscript{177} FS-Commission presented with the following five charges:

1. Under the supervision and direction of the Vice Chancellor for academic affairs identified and defined from perspectives appropriate to this institution the field in Afro-American studies generally.
2. Gather, analyzing, and classify according to appropriateness, relevance, and efficacy, Afro-American study and cultural programs now in effect or contemplated at select colleges and universities in the United States and gather, analyze, and classify in a similar way present efforts on this campus.

\textsuperscript{176} LAS Course Catalog 1965-1970.

\textsuperscript{177} *Daily Illini* March 1, 1960; Eubanks, Robert A. “A Brief Survey of the Afro-American Studies Program at the University of Illinois the administration of the University administration had planned on structuring the commission for African-American studies and a Cultural Ctr., February 11th 1969 however they were reluctant to and make an announcement due to student demonstrations and protests as they didn't want to seem to acquiesce to student demands. The University administration often slowed progress in order to provide a perception that they are not responding to protests. In addition a change is made to the commission to add three white faculty members.
3. Act as a coordinating body and information center on this campus for African-American studies.

4. Prepare recommendations for the Vice Chancellor of academic affairs as a result of your deliberations. If you see the advisability of such action, prepare and place before the appropriate officials a proposal for the establishment of a center, Institute, or other unit serving to focus and direct a continuing academic program of Afro-American concern and sensitivity. Retain an accurate awareness of the administrative implications of the conclusions you reach and the recommendations you make. The formal establishment of a funded, interdisciplinary, academic center, for example normally requires more than one year for complete approval by relevant agencies of the institution in the state of Illinois. The clustering of courses and studies into readily identifiable programs within an already established academic unit, on the other hand requires a considerably shorter time to implement. If you ultimately recommend the establishment of a major curriculum leading to a degree, you should recognize that such a proposal must proceed deliberately along a prescribed path overview to the Illinois border higher education, where a commission of scholars will be convened to discuss the merits of the proposal and to make recommendations concerning the proposal. These comments are in no way intended to discourage you from making appropriate recommendations, but simply to indicate the time relationship involved in establishing new programs so that we do not make commitments which cannot be met.

5. Maintain open awareness to issues outside the University which might become foci for African-American studies, and recommends of academic family at large, actions comprising appropriate community involvement in areas of African-American’s concerns.

Eubanks outlined in his interim report that continuation of the commission was paramount.

However he acknowledged his limitations in leading it as an engineer who was neither qualified, a full-time employee, a chairman, or willing to accept the position as director.178 The commission was chaired by Professor Robert A. Eubanks, a faculty member in the Department of Engineering and comprised of three Black students, four Black and three White faculty members.179 The other faculty members were: Charles Quick, Professor of Law; Allen Peskin, Professor of Comparative Education and Director of the African Studies Program (recently developed for the study of the African continent); Walter Massey Assistant Professor of Physics;
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Sonja Clay, Assistant Professor of Social Work; Kenneth Kinnaman, Assistant Professor of English; and Roy Malpass, Assistant Professor of Psychology. James Anderson also served as a commission member as a graduate student representative.\textsuperscript{180} Ultimately, the commission would define the purpose of African-American studies by gathering information about programs on other campuses and make recommendations responsive to the needs of Black students at the U of I.\textsuperscript{181}

Students worked diligently with faculty throughout the semester to identify possible solutions but, they were disappointed with the way the initial meetings were going. Students believed campus administrators did not take seriously the study of African American life and culture as an academic field of study.\textsuperscript{182} There was a point during the negotiation meetings where students walked out and “literally asked the university NOT to create an African American Studies program because it wasn’t a case that we didn’t want one, but we certainly didn’t want something that made a mockery of African American history and African American culture that we took as a serious field of study,” as noted by Anderson.\textsuperscript{183} We said, “We’re not going any further, why don’t you just stop this because it’s an insult to the African American community, to us as African American students that you try to create something that was just so watered down, so much of an appeasement that would actually make a mockery of it.”\textsuperscript{184}
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In addition, during this period some faculty challenged the notion of intellectual contributions by African Americans in the first place. “Well we didn’t have a lot of faculty advocating on our behalf,” Anderson recalled:

We were working directly with campus administrators, primarily the Chancellor at the time, so there was that, and the Chancellor had a couple of important associates, Lucius Barker and Joe Smith who worked with, in the Chancellor’s office, both were African-American, and there was a commissioner of African-American affairs, the late Eubanks, and we worked with them. … It wasn’t so much they were advocates for us because it was quite a very tense relationship; I mean I think their sense was that we were probably the more aggressive and in some cases the more radical, … pushing faster than they expected to go so it was more of a confrontational relationship than that. But we really didn’t have advocates on the faculty, we had faculty that worked with us but they didn’t align with us. … I mean, we were our own advocates really.185

Students recommended that administrators disconnect the politics from the academic field from, and insisted that the study of African American life and culture could be just as rigorous as any other academic study. They outlined readings such as Carter G. Woodson, The Mis-Education of The Negro, W. E. B. DuBois Souls of Black Folk, and Black Reconstruction to realize the level of scholarship that was involved in the production of all these wonderful scholarly works. “I never had the sense that we brought anything to fruition, we…engaged in discussion of what an African American studies program might look like, and whether its orientation should be towards establishing another bona fide department – it’s hard to speak in non-pejorative terms about that issue,” Faculty FS-Commissioner, Roy Malpass stated:

The fear among a number of members of the commission was that an African American studies program of any kind would end up just being a way for African American students to work out their frustrations in life, and it wouldn't have very much academic content. I know that’s a terrible stereotype, but it’s one that existed right from the beginning and with a fear that that orientation would dominate. Now it’s clear that in some places it has and in some places it has not, but that was a big concern at the time.

The FS-Commission agreed there was a necessity to hire an African-American bibliographer reference librarian. The Dean of the Library hired Alexander Boyd, a 1968 graduate from the Masters in Library Science at the U of I. From that point forward the campus had a dedicated African-American Studies librarian.

Black student protest, which fostered negative sentiment from faculty, often derived from missteps of a few BSA members, or in some instances, Black students that were simply assumed to be members. These missteps became the focus of criticism for U of I administrators and faculty, slowing progress. For example Black students protested against a White faculty member teaching Swahili. The professor previously worked in Africa with the Peace Corp. He was believed to be liberal and responsive to student needs. However, several Black students demanded, “Get a Black teacher; we don’t want no White guy teaching us Swahili.” The administration acquiesced and found a Nigerian man to instruct the class. The class became significantly more rigorous and the students that initially protested began to complain about the workload. Shelley said those students decided that they did not “need a Black teacher and perhaps a White teacher can do this for us.”

On July 23, 1969, after deliberating for approximately four-and-a-half months, the commission report recommended against formally institutionalizing a Black Studies unit and instead recommended that the commission be permitted to continue to carry out the function of coordinating African-American activities on the U of I campus. Jeffrey Roberts, writing for
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the *DI*, explained that the University needed to be more responsive to the needs of Black students and the Black community. Students believed that the campus administrators had secured an “inadequate house” for the cultural center and an “inadequate budget” to establish the programs needed.\(^{190}\) U of I administrators cautioned that the cultural center location was a temporary site and would be transferred to a larger building early the next year (the building would not have a permanent relocation until 2017).\(^{191}\) Although the FS-Commission did not have the rapid impact Black students anticipated, it was able to set in motion one tangible outcome for improved experiences on campus, specifically with the cultural lecture series HIS 199. HIS 199 had a very gradual development; it started out as a program with a lecture series. Billy M. Jackson, faculty of the Art Department, and William M. (Bill) Plater, his teaching assistant, would lend tremendous support in designing the initial course. Students had the option of taking the class for one hour of credit, which required eight pages of writing, or three hours of credit, which required twenty pages of writing. In addition, students could simply attend the lectures as they were open to the community.

The first guest lecture series featured some of the most renowned scholars, artists, and activists in the country including James Baldwin, Val Gray Percival Borde, Alex Haley, Rev. C. T. Vivian, Rev. Channing E. Phillips, A. B. Spellman, and Wardell Gaynor. Over three hundred students enrolled in the inaugural class.\(^{192}\) Several Black students wanted it to be an all-black program. “They didn’t even want the White folks to attend,” Shelley said. “They would have a speaker in the auditorium and announce from the stage: ’All the White folks must leave the

---


These actions created additional tensions and hostility toward Black students as many white students and faculty began to feel that this was a form of reverse discrimination. It also prompted some of the faculty to assert that Black students were not serious about scholarship, “that they just wanted to come in and get by.” This was a sentiment resurfaced during discussions and negotiations.

After guest lecturers would finish their presentation, students would meet with them in small groups and discuss ideas as well as continuation projects. Although participants and some faculty saw the lecture series as a success, the Chair of the Department of History felt that the class did not have rigorous enough academic standards. He no longer wanted the course offered under the HIS 199 heading. Advocates for African American Studies program were never satisfied with that. “It was really one of the more intellectually stimulating, exciting things happening on the campus,” Anderson argued. “We were bringing people in who were not traditionalists, … conformists, … people had never heard of the kinds of things they were doing.” These scholars and lecturers projects were central to the study of African American History and African American culture, politics, and so forth. Anderson found this an exciting and profound time to be at the U of I.

Students’ surveys of HIS 199 course indicated overwhelmingly that they wanted the class as a credited course and standardized for evaluation like any other course offered on campus. They wanted to increase the academic rigor of the class and increase writing assignments and
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small discussion groups. Gray, Baldwin, and Borde ranked highest in regard to contribution to the lecture series. “I learned that although I’m White, Black culture is a part of my culture,” one student wrote after the first lecture series. “I can sincerely say that this was the best course that I have ever taken at this university or anywhere else. If more courses were structured similarly, perhaps institutionalized education would not be so irrelevant and useless. This is the first time I’ve ever wanted to thank someone for the course.”

Val Gray’s personality became an instant success with students and faculty. The FS-Commission recommended Val Gray for the position of Director of African-American Culture Center and she was appointed August 1, 1969, unanimously. The success of the HIS-199 laid the foundation for the development for a program centered on African-American Studies. Despite the agreement to recommend Val Gray, the operation of FS-Commission seldom went smoothly. The interests of student and faculty members frequently diverged. Students felt the FS-Commission had a disproportionate number of faculty representatives, and after several months increasing student membership, it eventually topped out at fourteen members. The FS-Commission became virtually ineffective, and it was difficult for Eubanks to manage the group’s agenda. Eubanks stated that instead of using meeting time to formulate solutions and possible alternatives, students filibustered and used pressure tactics to divert any potential progress.

**Afro-American Studies Commission**

Chancellor Peltason dissolved the FS-Commission on January 22, 1970. He appointed a new body in its place, the Afro-American Studies Commission (AS-Commission). He named a
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part-time appointment to Rev. Redford Gains as Executive Director of the new commission and the Academic Program of Afro-American concern and sensitivity (Academic Program). The commission had three substantial components: a cultural program, which provided engagement regarding Black culture and became the Bruce D. Nesbit Cultural Center; the Public Service Office, which provided community engagement; and an Academic Program, which later became the Afro-American Studies & Research program (AASRP). One component that was not explicit was the expectation that this committee could also assist with policies regarding the 1964 Civil Rights Act primarily affirmative action hiring on campus. The Chancellor wanted each branch to have a Director, then that individual would be supervised by the Executive Director of the AS-Commission. The operation was aided by the advisory committee consisting of one faculty member nominated by the Black faculty, one student nominated by BSA, and two community members elected by members of their constituency.

Gaines’ attempt to manage the dual role of Executive Director of the AS-Commission and Director of the Academic Program was only marginally successful. Similar to the previous commission, he faced ongoing internal strife and external discontent. Val Gray, Director of the Cultural Center sent a letter to Rev. Gaines Executive Director of the Afro-American Studies Commission on May 6, 1970 and included the Chancellor’s office in the correspondence. This was in response to a letter that Gaines sent May 1st requesting explanation of her expenditures for the Culture Center. Gray addressed him as “Brother” Renford Gains and then began clarifying previous conversations regarding the operations of the cultural program while under her


203. Cha-Jua, in discussion with author. One component that was not explicit was the expectation that this committee could also assist with policies regarding the 1964 Civil Rights Act, primarily affirmative action hiring on campus.
direction. She reminded Gaines that under her contract and agreement with the U of I she would have autonomy over her budget and reported directly to the Chancellor’s office. In closing she wrote: “We view the African-American culture program and commission as separate fingers on the hand with each operating on its own, but effectively functioning as links in the great Black chain. Remember White economics as a major butcher’s cleaver in Black/Black relationships. Let us not jump on the chopping block.” Gaines summarily resigned in June 1970 due to increasing conflict. Robert Eubanks was then appointed as interim Executive Director in July 1970.

Val Gray was not content with the new arrangement because she felt the instability and the structure of the AS-Commission infringed upon the autonomy of African-American Culture Center. She had already been working in the capacity as Director prior to Gaines appointment, and she believed the new arrangement would further deteriorate productivity for the cultural center. Frustrated with attempts to reconcile differences, Gray threatened to resign her position. Gray continued to have disagreements regarding how funds should be allocated. Despite these tensions Eubanks stated that Ms. Gray, “did a great deal for Black students at U of I.” Students seemed to appreciate the work Ms. Gray was doing as she provided tangible outcomes with minimal resources. She hosted workshops and a variety of community engagement activities. Her talents in association with the U of I bolstered her national reputation. As a popular figure among Black students on campus she wielded significant influence. However, she decided to resign less than a month later.
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On July 1, 1970 a delegation of the BSA’s ad hoc committee visited Chancellor Peltanson. They reached a mutual agreement where Black students would have the ability to have equal contribution to the selection of the next director of the African-American cultural center. On July 23, 1970 Lance and Meryl Tolbert came to the University to interview for the position of director office assistant of the Afro American Culture Center. The next day students sent a scathing letter to Chancellor Peltason rebuking these actions on the principle that they had agreed to representation of selecting the next director. They wrote “Robert Eubanks and those who would assist him in attempting to pull such a coup d’état should be put on notice that without Black student participation and approval there will be no peaceful accommodations on this campus, in its stead will follow, ostracism, boycotts and hostility.” Students went on to indicate that they would boycott any event sponsored by Professor Eubanks.206

Eubanks, now the ultimate decision-maker for the AS-Commission, began to search for a new director of the cultural center. He did not consult with the advisory committee during his decision process; he issued two names to the BSA to determine a new candidate for director of the Cultural Center. The BSA rejected both names. Eubanks presented another list to the BSA and insisted that they choose an acceptable candidate. They selected Tony Zamora. Zamora was a jazz musician and poet that had a passion for youth. He had also been a resident of Champaign-Urbana community since 1953. In September of 1970, Zamora accepted the position. His was a joint appointment where he served seventy-five percent of his time as Director of the Cultural Center and twenty-five percent of his time in the Anthropology Department. Eubanks, in the fall of 1970, submitted a budget proposal requesting an additional $38,000 to fund the commission
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with $20,000 going to the Academic Program to support 1.0 FTE program director. The proposal was rejected by the Provost. Nevertheless, Eubanks appointed Delano Cox, a biologist and Assistant Dean of LAS, to the position of Director of the African-American Studies Academic Program. Again, he did not consult the advisory committee or the BSA. Students were not happy with the process in which Eubanks made decisions and wanted greater input and transparency.

After only a few weeks, Zamora resigned from the Director’s position. Two days later, on Sunday evening October 11, 1970, he made a public announcement at the Douglass Community Center’s general meeting that he would no longer be Director of the Cultural Center. By Thursday morning, October 15, a group of Black students surrounded the offices of the African-American studies offices and the adjoining YMCA to demand the resignation of Eubanks. “In a memo to the Chancellor, Eubanks stated, “It is clear that misinformation, frustration and poor communication have caused a large number of Black students to feel that the present commission structure is ineffectual, and I have been a major impediment to progress.” Although Eubanks felt that these accusations were unfounded, he believed that the perceptions would reduce his effectiveness and hinder his efforts. After Eubanks resigned, Cox decided that under no circumstance would he continue as Director of the Academic Program after his term was complete. Rochelle (Roe) Broome was hired in November as director of the Public Service Office for community engagement.

Despite the many efforts of the commission throughout the year, the initial plan of the commission never came to fruition. The attrition of employees, internal conflicts within the

---
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University, and external student demands kept the participants distracted. After a few months, the search to replace Eubanks as Executive Director was abandoned and each of the branches became semi-autonomous reporting directly to the Chancellor’s office.\textsuperscript{209} In December 1970, Eubanks wrote his account of events during his tenure as interim-Director of the AS-Commission. Rationalizing bureaucracy within the institution, he stated, “I believe that the University of Illinois has taken honest and ultimately productive course in its approach to the various Afro-American programs. It is seldom that an institution actually participates in its own reform.”\textsuperscript{210} However, it is more accurate to suggest that U of I administrators are often, if not always, involved negotiating and managing change.


\textsuperscript{211} Staff Writer “Black Studies Course Offered Next Semester” \textit{Daily Illini} November 20, 1969
of Illinois.” Although designed as a temporary solution until professors could develop their lectures and programs, these guest lecturers had personalities that resonated with students. The Academic Program supported library acquisitions of African-American holdings and provided videotaping of the LAS 199 lecture series. The program also sponsored student publications, “Perspectives in Change: Five Papers on Aspects of Contemporary Negro Culture in the United States.”

As of December 1, 1970, the collective programs had a budget of approximately $46,082. The Chancellor allocated $7,000 of that for Delano Cox, $13,000 for Alex Boyd and the African-American studies Library, $5,520 for Fred Kaneli, $5,500 for Henrietta Hoch (music), and $1,940 for Willie Amoaku (music), which totaled $21,260 earmarked for faculty. Student employee cost was $5,522. Fourteen thousand, nine hundred dollars was set aside for the lecture series speakers, which covered travel, room, and board and other miscellaneous expenses. In addition there was $4,400 for library acquisitions. There is a special note that of the total budget of $46,082 only $5022 would be provided on a recurring basis.212 Many of the thirteen courses associated with the lecture series received direct support from this budget. In December of 1970 Chancellor Peltason and dissolved the AS-Commission.

On January 13, 1971 Joseph Smith sent a memo to Chancellor Peltason titled, “a Modest Proposal for Restructuring the so-Called African-American Commission.” The rationale was that the existing components lacked a clear sense of direction and purpose. Smith stated that students and faculty expectations exceeded the resources of an academic institution. Moreover, he insisted that they lacked appropriate management.213 The resignation of two Executive Directors,
Gaines and later Eubanks, thrust chaos into the Chancellor’s office, an administrative policy unit not structured for handling these type of issues. To provide a more seamless process, Smith suggested pushing the three different branches of the commission into existing units. The idea was to restructure and merge the Academic Program with a traditional college like the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences (LAS), the cultural program in the direction of the office of student programs and services, and the community service component as part of the cooperative extension program. Smith believed that this would accomplish three things administrative and financial support will be channeled through established units. There would be increased involvement of professionals in the University sanctioning Afro-American programs improving the chances of success and roles would be clarified to resolve confusion.214

Cox made a substantial overture to significantly revamp the structure of the Academic Program and created a proposal and submitted it to the Chancellor’s office for review in the spring of 1971. Within the proposal, he outlined the need for a full-time Director with two full-time nonacademic staff with projected incremental growth of the program over the next four years with an estimated budget totaling $112,000 approximately annually.215 Cox learned after six months as interim Director of the Academic Program that in order to initiate a meaningful program steps must be taken to institutionalize the structure. There did not exist a formal line of reciprocity between the Academic Program and academic units on campus. He proposed an interdisciplinary Institute of African-American studies. The function of the Institute would be to provide a point of coalescence to gather scholars and units concerned with the Black
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experience. Vice Chancellor Herbert Carter in addressing affirmative action and the expression of institutional commitment to the initiation of the Academic Program promised support for candidates germane to this area. A number of the faculty expressed interest in associating with the institute such as the Kenneth Kennamon Department of English, Norman Whitten Department of Anthropology, Walter Strong, Jr. a PhD student in the Department of Political Science, and several other faculty.

The Academic Program would take two approaches to design and erect a meaningful framework to grow an interdisciplinary institute identifying faculty who engaged the Black experience through their research and studies and establishing new courses that can provide the necessary exposure. These courses are offered under the administrative umbrella of the LAS lecture series while carrying the rubric of the respective departments. Each course could probe the Black experience from a different disciplinary perspective and would be supported by the resources of Academic Program. Faculty involved in these efforts during spring semester did not receive compensation. And the requested proposal would allow at least ten professors to engage in activities for four full-time equivalent (FTE) to provide release time. Also the program held that nonblack instructors have a role in the academic efforts as they moved towards an established Academic Program and would need to institutionalize academic offerings.

Cox suggested that a revision of the Academic Program have three major goals of information, research, and operation. All programs in the area would be strongly directed towards acquisition of knowledge of African-American culture and life. In addition the major degree program were to furnish basic tools and techniques to attack the problems engendered through centuries of social psychological and economic tyranny. Upper level undergraduate and graduate courses were expected to include fieldwork and study in the black community, while graduate and staff research was a positive requirement and extension service was also envisioned but details have not been finalized. Ultimately, Cox’s proposal was denied. He already determined that he would not continue in the position as Director of the Academic Program. In addition, Jackson preferred not to continue his role in coordinating the Lecture Series. Cox sent letters to Vice Chancellor Carter recommending John Stuart, Maxine Nimitz, JD Elder and ten other candidates. None of the candidates that Cox suggested were selected to become the new Director. Cox resigned September 1971, and Walter Strong Jr. assumed the directorship.

Strong was born in Brooklyn New York October 11, 1944. He attended Syracuse University from 1962 to 1964 and transferred to Southern Illinois University Carbondale and completed a BA in government history in 1966. He went on to the University of Nebraska Lincoln earning in a Masters in Political Science in 1970. After graduating, Strong attended the U of I to pursue a PhD in Political Science. He was only 25 when he assumed the directorship—

---
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by far the youngest administrator the program would ever have. Strong had the makings of a promising scholar. Prior to becoming Director of the Academic Program he was a social worker in New York, worked for the Department of welfare in Lincoln, Nebraska. While he attended the University of Nebraska he also wrote a successful proposal for a $100,000 Special Service Grant for minority students from the Office of Education (Department of Education). He became the Coordinator of Special Programs for Minority Group and Low Income Students. When Strong came to the U of I, he became the Assistant Dean of Student Personnel and Assistant Director of Project 500. Despite all his experiences and education, Strong had not been part of administering an academic unit. There was a month of overlap between Cox’s departure and Strong taking on the Director position. This would not be enough time to fully prepare Strong for the undertaking of leading the Academic Program.

In 1971, the budget for the Academic Program was approximately $55,840, nearly half of the $112,000 Cox requested for fully functioning academic unit. There were 2.75 FTE academic and 2.0 FTE non-academic appointments.\(^\text{224}\) Strong attempted to continue hiring and recruiting Black faculty for other areas on campus, encouraging Black faculty from all areas on campus to work the broad academic course offerings, and ensuring the growth of the African-American library collection. During Strong’s directorship, *Irepodun*, the Black student yearbook, was published with program support. The new yearbook highlighted events and cultural aspects of the Black student population. The staff also issued an informational booklet on the Academic Program the U of I. Ora Brown assistant to the Director, was instrumental in planning and publicizing events and activities. Strong served as Director for two years, ending his tenure in 1973. Strong’s contribution to the Academic Program was increasing awareness among students

\(^{224}\) Subject File, 1948-2008, Box 2.
and recruiting Black faculty to the U of I. Although the Academic Program did not grow significantly during Strong’s tenure, he established himself as an ideal candidate in Affirmative Action recruiting. Strong was offered a position in the Equal Opportunity Office to oversee affirmative action policies. He accepted the position. Brown was recommended as the next director; however, she only received interim status as “her appointment had not been made under the most peaceful circumstances.” There were concerns over her lack of credentials and experience as an administrator. In addition, she would be the first female particularly an African-American woman to lead an academic unit at the U of I. Brown made the argument that she had conducted many of the duties needed to operate the Academic Program while Strong was Director and indicated that she was more than competent to continue as Director.

As interim Director, Ora Brown was the first female administrator for the program. She made numerous attempts to demonstrate her acumen as an administrative leader. Brown submitted a proposal to make LAS 199 a regular sponsored two semester course, entitled “Introduction to Afro-American studies I and II.” Brown recognized the importance of instituting courses controlled by the Academic Program. One of her major goals was to find a home for the Afro-American Studies Academic Program as it had been free-floating unattached to any specific college since its inception in 1969. The University administration responded favorably. In April 1974, Chancellor Patterson announced that there would be a restructuring of the African-

226. Peter Wallenstein, ed. Higher Education and the Civil Rights Movement: White Supremacy, Black Southerners, and College Campuses (Gainesville, FL: University Press of Florida, 2008), 213. Viewing black women differently from black men whites often assume that black women were pruned uppity obnoxious and even promiscuous behavior.

227. Thelin, Higher Education, 344-345. Higher education in 1970, in regards to women, represented faculty appointments beyond the lecture was minuscule surveying all academic field women constituted a negligible portion of the faculty. At the same time women constitute 10% of the full professors and 16% of the associate professors and 24% of assistant professors for the more the presence of women was skewed towards untenured ships
American studies program and the Cultural Center. The Cultural Center Directed by Bruce Nesbitt would be placed under the umbrella of the Student Programs and Services office and the AAP would be administered through the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences.

Gender dynamics and racial politics of the times made it difficult for Brown to navigate the U of I administrative structures to achieve her goals. Moreover, she operated within a marginalized and instable space within the institution. Brown’s budget for the Academic Program was cut by approximately thirty-one percent and the lecture series was moved from her governance to the Cultural Center. Robert W. Rogers, Dean of Liberal Arts & Sciences (LAS) explained that he viewed the lectures as more entertainment than academic, so he believed it would be better suited somewhere else other than LAS. Brown felt that the Academic Program was in jeopardy as it continued to operate year-by-year in a “crisis mode.” She understood that Dean Rogers did not take seriously the merit of an Academic Program for African-American Studies despite the appraisal of the Chancellor’s office. Nevertheless, Brown was relentless in her efforts. She allied her programming with the Department of Anthropology, which eventually implemented two courses geared specifically towards the study of African-American life and culture ANTH 161 and 162. Later that year, she fell ill and required surgery. She resigned the directorship. John O. Stewart Assistant Professor in the Department of Anthropology accepted the Director of the African-American Academic Program on August 21, 1974.228

Institutionalizing the Insurgency

All these activities were part of establishing the independent resources that would ensure the movement’s sustainability beyond the initial period of protest activity. McAdam points out,

“in order to survive over time insurgent groups must be able to parlay their initial successes into the increased resource support needed to place the movement a more permanent footing to affect the transformation from a short-lived insurgent episode to sustain political challenge the movement must be able to mobilize the resources required to support the creation or expansion of a structure or formal movement organization.”

Black students needed the ability to participate in the recruiting of new students that would share similar ideology and/or establish ways to sustain student activism concerning Black student issues. Insurgents at the U of I were able to achieve a variation of this through the development of the Academic Program, a Black Cultural Center, Student Services programs, a permanent African-American Bibliographer, and community outreach.

These programs gradually became institutionalized and the mechanisms in which to manage ideological difference more commonly referred to as diversity on campus. Revolutionary transformation did not occur. However the insurgency was successful in creating reservoirs of insurgent possibilities. The institutionalization of ideological difference is largely dependent on the organizations resistance or acceptance to change. U of I administrators became the final arbitrators to facilitate implementation through policy or discretionary funding. Black Studies advocates increasingly found themselves unable to identify long term administrative support for their efforts and demonstrate the payoff of cultural responsiveness would be worth the risk or
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effort. Student’s ability to leverage power on campus shifted from 1960 to 1980. Their interest in formal governance on campus rose and fell quickly. Most administrators understood the short duration and tenure of students attending their institution and in many instances sought to basically wait them out. Nevertheless, these negotiations produced a dialectical relationship regarding how U of I administrators managed ideological difference.

The U of I changed gradually to accommodate more cultural diversity among the student body. There also was increased awareness of cultural inequalities. In the early 1970s, administrators began discussing initiatives to recruit more Latino students to campus through SEOP. Administrators became culturally perceptive although not entirely responsive. In 1974, due to student agitation, the Casa Cultural Latina was established as a cultural Center for Latino students. However, campus administrators learned from the student unrest in the 1960s and subsequently negotiated ways to provide a more seemingly inclusive environment. The LAS 199 lecture series that the university sponsored help shape Black student identity and also offered the ability to critique the institution. Nevertheless, the institutionalization of programs and initiatives developed through ideological difference would be truncated to serve the context of the institution. The dialectical relationship between U of I and ideological difference would be a struggle that would continue over the next several decades. Historically, PWIs often sought ways to eliminate elements that could not be absorbed, co-opted, or institutionalized, which adversely impacted Black student retention during this period.

Many minority students ended up leaving the U of I before graduation. Their reasons varied: the sense of alienation, the lack of study groups, the visibility of being the only Black student in many classes, faculty who were culturally inept and indifferent to the improving

conditions for Black students. The prevalence of Black Power ideology also rapidly decreased despite a rising persistence of pessimism regarding race relations and systematic oppression.\textsuperscript{233} White student protest had begun to dissipate.\textsuperscript{234} By 1973 the Vietnam War was over. A U of I alumni stated “it quieted down a whole lot…. they were doing more streaking than protesting.”\textsuperscript{235} By 1974 Black power on the U of I campus had all but disappeared; however, “social movements do not disappear overnight rather they dissipate almost imperceptibly as a result of a complex mixture of local and national defeats challenges in the political move.”\textsuperscript{236}

The student demographic of first generation working class Blacks that initially came in the fall of 1968 began slowly shifting towards a Black middle class group. In addition, the Black power ideology that permeated campus for years prior seemed to matriculate with the graduating classes of 1973 and 1974. The blunt speaking and righteous vulgar cadence of outspoken Black student activists failed to resonate ideologically with the new Black student population.\textsuperscript{237} The vigorous recruitment of new Black student by former alumni and current student organizations began to dissipate. The recruitment of Black student had shifted to a more bureaucratic process centralized within U of I’s Admissions Office. As such many Black students that admitted were second generation, had attended predominantly White high schools, and often not from working class families.
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Although the new group of Black students suffered injustices, they were unable to mobilize and construct meaningful ways in which to engage the issues of inequality. There continued to be significant problems with attrition, retention, and completion. The rationale made by administrators was that Black students were not prepared or committed to undertake the rigorous academic demands of the U of I. The war against oppression in northern communities is often like a battle against the pervasive shadow, yet more insidious as White resistance is able to maintain a system of inequality through “de facto segregation a euphemism for type of American apartheid.” Due to the systematic and implicit constructs of oppression student were limited in their approaches to engage racism. There were very few things that worked in Black students favor. Anderson recalls, “our sense was that everything was an uphill struggle… you fought to stay in, …fought to maintain some sense of balance… identity, and it’s almost difficult to single out those things that were adverse…..that was the nature of the environment; you were struggling against an environment that said to you in so many ways…You don’t belong here!” The ways in which Anderson depicts Black students sentiment regarding campus inclusion became analogous to the institutionalization of Black Studies at the U of I.

At the onset Black Studies encountered a host of challenges as it emerged on the U of I campus. The Academic Program struggled with identity, purpose, and adequate support. The Academic Program because of its unfamiliarity was marginalized by some of the other Departments Heads and administrators including Robert Rogers, Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Science. The Academic Program lacked consistent and innovative leadership with a persistence to develop it as a superior academic unit. Despite these initial setbacks Chancellor
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Peltason and supportive faculty insisted on the continuation of the Academic Program. The Head of the Department of Anthropology suggested John O. Stewart as a candidate to assume the director position of the Academic Program. For the second time Stewart was recommended for the Director position. Stewart worked diligently over the next few years to improve the stability of the Academic Program. He strived to make the Academic Program relevant to students, faculty, and the community.
CHAPTER 2

STRIVING FOR LEGITIMACY: CHARTING A COURSE FOR STABILITY 1974-1987

Black people must create their own educational system. All systems of education are set up for the specific purpose: to perpetuate the system that sets it up. Since a White European racist system exists in the United States, … then the public school systems are designed to turn out … racists, who will in turn sustain the same system that produced them. This leaves Black people in an untenable position. … The only alternative to this racist European system is a Black Nationalistic ideology and the vehicle is a Black educational system. … Only when Black people create or control an educational system with a Black Nationalistic frame of reference will freedom for Black people approach realization. 240

The above excerpt is one of the many competing ideas regarding the development and trajectory of Black Studies. At the Institute of the Black World on the evening of November 7, 1969, Lerone Bennett, Jr. spoke before a small group of Black Studies directors and consultants gathered in Atlanta Georgia. Many directors had just begun their first academic year and were struggling to implement a robust program regarding Black education into PWIs. Bennett stated, “We believe in the community of the black dead, the black living, and the black unborn. We believe that our community has a prior claim on our time and our talents and our resources, and that we must respond when it calls.”241 Contemporary Black Studies, as a discipline within institutions of higher education, became the new frontier in the late 1960s and early 1970s. What Bennett identified, however, was the long-standing tradition of education through Black Studies within the community. The discussions and debates that unfolded over the next decade pertaining to the role and purpose of Black Studies became the focal point of its overall development. During this time there was no consensus regarding which seminal works to employ in the classroom, which disciplinary approach to adhere to, or even an established curriculum.
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Moreover, the concept of Black Studies had already come under significant scrutiny and criticisms. “Whites and Negroes tended to fear its political implications (as opposed, of course, to the political implications of White Studies),” Vincent Harden explained, “and Black persons feared the power of the system to co-opt the still undefined field if it were placed within two easy reach of Whites.” Other Black Studies advocates considered many programs, at least as they were articulated publicly, completely irrelevant to the needs of the Black community beyond the campus. How did the perceived role of Black Studies by faculty, administrators, students, and community members determine the program trajectory at U of I? As the new Academic Program became institutionalized, how were Black Studies and the U of I transformed?

**Articulating the Roles of Contemporary Black Studies**

In the spring of 1968, the Black Student Alliance at Yale University arranged a symposium titled, “An Educational Experience for Professional Educators,” and it became the site of rich dialogue about the possibilities of using race as an organizing concept for curriculum. The symposium was comprised of notable scholars from institutions around the country including: Harold Cruz, Martin Kilson Jr., Maulana Ron Karenga, Nathan Hare, and Alvin Poussaint. In their conversations, the turbulent decade of the 1960s and the fight for relevant curriculum became the “rallying cry on the part of those who not only wanted to restructure American colleges and universities but American society as well.” The scholars all saw universities as not only an “appendage of power structure” but a place where truth could be sought. They disagreed on the role of Black Studies. Should it serve the community and be

---
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explicitly political, or should it follow other traditional disciplines which were implicitly political?

In an article for the *Massachusetts Review*, Cruse outlined two major challenges confronting Black Studies: first, departments needed to identify and recruit qualified teachers, then faculty and students needed to reach a consensus regarding what content to include and a suitable method of instruction. Administrators across the country believed they had a very restricted pool of qualified applicants, that there was a dearth of African American and other scholars in the field of African American history. Manning Marable, the renowned historian, wrote of his disappointment with the process of hiring faculty for Black Studies positions due to the perceived explicit political nature. Political elements were dominating factors; all disciplines within the academy are political whether explicit or implicit. Most universities practiced gradualism, taking whatever personnel was readily available, which created meager programs that remained underdeveloped for a prolonged period of time. In reality there were numerous Black scholars that have the capacity and competency to administer programs; however, administrators at most institutions were hesitant to publicly announce national searches. Instead similar to U of I institutions relied on internal candidates often not experienced in managing or developing a fully functional academic unit. The suggestion that there were few qualified candidates for Black Studies positions was often unfounded.

The lack of a standardized curriculum also caused concern across campuses. In his remarks about the development of Black Studies, sociologist and clinical psychologist Nathaniel
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Hare posited two ways to view the initial stages of Black Studies, expressive and pragmatic. The expressive view suggested the field could help construct identity and racial pride, but the pragmatist view focused on crafting and teaching skills that helped Black students to navigate and manipulate American society. He stressed the importance of building a program that could engage White scholars and students. Hare argued that the participation of White students was needed for program development, but “[t]he control of black studies programs must, of course, be vested in the Black community just as the control over White education, indeed both Negro and White education, is presently vested in the White community.” Significant amounts of time and energy would be expended in an attempt to find a unifying paradigm for Black Studies that mirrored other traditional disciplines.

The call for Black Studies was not a declaration of separatism but autonomy within the university. Black students demanded a separate program/discipline as a result of their limited historical knowledge and distrust of traditional disciplines. Generally, education regarding contributions by peoples of African descent was often distorted or omitted in Western European and Euro-American text. Hare maintained, it “is not very reasonable, anyway, to assume that the same racist institutions ’ (self-defined as such by the Kerner report) will suddenly reverse their present course and extend freedom where before they oppressed.” He surmised that meaningful transformation would need to occur at the administrative level. The task of deconstructing hegemony within the institution to achieve democratic ideas will be “resisted to the death” by elites in positions of power.


248. Hare, “Questions,” 728.

249. Hare, “Questions,” 736.
Black Studies stood poised to strengthen and help the intellectual pursuits of their institutions. Marable noted, to thrive, Black Studies must “pursue connections and contrast between African American intellectual tradition and the western European and Euro-American cultural traditions.” Furthermore, Black Studies could be the most pervasive means to solidifying multiculturalism on campuses. Left to the institutional inertia of homogeneity, any type of ethnic studies courses may be perceived as “animated by a spirit of filiopietism and by fundamentalist notions of racial and ethnic purity,” that is thought to breed hatred and distrust. The flourishing of Black Studies depended on the critical enterprise of educating and transforming larger society through the “power of vision which is simultaneously particular and universal.” Black Studies provided a critical lens to deconstruct the intricate patterns of social privilege, which are obscured from scrutiny by normative frameworks like neoliberalism and “Ameritocracy.” Plainly, Black Studies provides the mechanism in which to challenge modes of White hegemony. Traditional fields of inquiry rest on a Euro-centric ideological element, which attempts to obstruct the reality of bias and consider its practice objective. Nevertheless, Black Studies support a needed counter-ideology.

Between 1964 and 1976, over five hundred Black Studies initiatives were undertaken, and almost all of them were operating within hostile intellectual and institutional terrain. Many institutions tried to manage the demand of Black students rather than addressing their concerns.


“Discussions were seldom about the merits of the proposals in terms of what they would add to the curriculum, how they could increase the students’ understanding of their society, or what such courses could contribute to the improvement of that society,” historian John Hope Franklin remembered. “Instead, the discussions were usually concerned with deciding on the best way out of the dilemma, on how the institution’s image would be affected by whatever action it took, and on how much time and how much peace would be bought by the decision to offer such courses.”

Even the process of naming a particular program or department was a site of political struggle, one that reflected the interrelationships between a university's politics and economics and their influence on the constructs of race, class, and gender. Other universities that only offered courses on the Black experience attempted to transform those courses into a program. There were three areas in which African American Programs were being established,

(a) special programs, which loosely coordinated a series of closely related courses offered in different conventional departments; (b) independent institutes with power of faculty and curriculum selection, though generally funded experimentally through private sources or temporary institutional channels; or (c) regular departments with conventional powers over faculty, course selection, and curriculum design, and with funding through conventional university channels.

The department model provided the most “realistic and viable alternative” for sustaining a newly devised African American Studies program curricula. However, such an approach would only


serve to “institutionalize and perpetuate the fragmented, incoherent approach to the subject [of African American Studies] which has been the only approach in the past.”

Thelwell suggests that African American Studies would need “an autonomous interdisciplinary entity, capable of coordinating its curriculum in traditional disciplines to ensure an historical, substantive progression and organic coherence in its offerings.”

By the late 1970s, however, what sociologist St. Clair Drake called the “action-oriented mood” of Black students began to dissipate. In the late 1970s the United States suffered an economic decline this consequently impacted allocations and subsidies for higher education. Most programs shifted focus toward capitalist models to sustain their programs. Another phenomenon that developed in the late 70s and 80s was pressure to retrieve outside sources for program funding outside of federal research and the pursuit of business or philanthropic entities. The neoconservative backlash caused the development of many Black Studies programs to languish. Criticism suggested that there was not a real value in pursuing Black Studies as there was not a concrete market available. Despite these realities some Black Studies programs produced PhD students and scholars who launched new initiatives or critiqued “traditional” disciplines. Drake suggests that Black Studies influenced university curriculum and content. American history classes, for instance, began to include key figures in Black history.


At the U of I, the emergent dominate paradigms continued to challenge the viability of Black Studies. The Academic Program faculty and leadership struggled to legitimize Black Studies as an academic field to U of I administrators. As student involvement dissipated, the Academic Program leadership would be tasked with charting a course for stability and sustainability. Faculty had to negotiate virtually every aspect of the program, a time-consuming effort because there was no substantiated model for it. These initiatives sustained numerous experimental modifications. Dynamic and innovative leadership was a prerequisite of any successful Director of Black Studies. Those campuses that embraced the notion of Black Studies, even minimally, began to thrive. Universities similarly situated to U of I, that remained indifferent in regards to African American Studies over the years judging from the building and facilities, teetered on ruin. Different administrators were supportive sporadically, which became a reminder that Black Studies was not actually institutionalized. The success of the program fluctuated according to the personality of the Deans and Directors. Some Black Studies initiatives flourished during the tenure of some administrators and declined or remained stagnant under others.

**Early Leadership of AASRP**

During the 1974-75 academic year, the Academic Program underwent dynamic changes. The program moved from under the supervision of the Chancellor’s Office to the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences (LAS). Robert W. Rogers, Dean of LAS assumed the role of hiring and assisted with program development. The two previous Directors, Walter Srong and Ora
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Brown, did not have the experience nor credentials of Stewart. Although Brown was a tenacious administrator she faced constant setbacks. One of the most detrimental was when she allowed the control of the LAS 199 Lecture Series shift to the African-American Cultural Center, which reduced the annual budget for the Academic Program by one-third. She made this decision on the advisement of Dean Rogers. Brown developed a proposal to build an interdisciplinary approach to facilitating African-American studies on U of I campus; however, due to significant health issues she was unable to continue as Director. For the second time, John O. Stewart was recommended as a potential candidate to take over the directorship of the program. Without much contestation, Stewart was named the new program Director in the summer of 1974.

Stewart was born in Trinidad and immigrated to the United States as a young adult to pursue a bachelor’s degree in American Literature in 1956 from Los Angeles City College. After he graduated in 1965 Stewart continued his studies earning a Masters of Arts in English from Stanford as well as a Masters of Fine Arts in creative writing from the University of Iowa (1965, 1966 respectively). Stewart received a Doctorate of Philosophy in Anthropology from the University of California Los Angeles (UCLA), where he also spent a year as a part-time instructor. During his time in California, Stewart helped establish Africana Studies (previously Ethnic Studies) at Fresno State University, and he was a major supporter of the establishment of Ethnic Studies at UCLA. He initially came to the U of I in 1972 to be an Assistant Professor of Anthropology, and he had authored several short stories and a novel regarding race relation in colonial Trinidad. He was not eager to assume the position as Director mainly due to the uncertainty regarding the commitment of U of I leadership to support the creation of a robust


program. In addition he wanted to continue the path to tenure that required research and publication. Nevertheless, he recognized the dedication of those students and scholars that worked to start the program and believed that his experience and leadership would help the sustainability of the program.

Stewart began his tenure determined to focus on the growth of the program, research, and teaching. He understood that the sustainability of the program rested on its ability to provide an academic major. Most faculty and administrators familiar with LAS 199 assumed it would continue to be a part of the Academic Program. Stewart wanted to use the LAS 199 to rebrand the program and provide the foundation for the new course of studies. Dean Rogers felt that LAS 199 was more entertainment than academic and resisted reinstituting it within the College of LAS. The relationship of Stewart and Dean Rogers was tenuous at best as they were frequently at odds regarding the trajectory of the Academic Program.

One of the first initiatives Stewart set forth was changing the name of the Academic Program to the Afro-American Studies and Research Program (AASRP). Dean Rogers and Stewart collaborated to institute an advisory committee charged with establishing operating principles and advising the Director on program development. The committee consisted of six voting members from LAS and four other non-voting members that would include the African-American Bibliographer, Staff Associates, students, and the Director of the Black Cultural Center. Committee members were asked to serve for a year but with terms that included a possibility for renewal. James Anderson, then Assistant Professor in Education Policy Studies,


was one of the first faculty to serve on the committee and continued as a formal and informal consultant for the program over the next three decades.

During the first year, members focused on creating bylaws and governing rules for programs. These were completed January 6, 1975. The mission and function of the newly formed AASRP were outlined as follows:

1. The program serves as the device for developing and coordinating research and study of African-American materials both establishing academic units across traditional department boundaries.
2. The program is concerned with the development of appropriate courses, research, student and faculty recruitment, and other matters of academic interest within the area of African-American studies in various colleges, departments, and other offices.
3. The program helps to promote and provide comprehensive instructional coverage for topics relevant to the life and history of African-American populations.

Stewart believed one of the keys to reinvigorating the AASRP would be retaining the funds as well as the authority over the LAS 199. The committee eventually helped bring the Lecture Series under the supervision of AASRP in the Spring of 1976. However, Dean Rogers continued to contest the change, arguing that he viewed the lectures as more entertainment than academic. This sentiment exacerbated tensions between Rogers and Stewart, who were constantly engaged in debates regarding the future of AASRP.

Dean Rogers felt that the AASRP was nothing more than freshman orientation to acclimate minority students and did not merit intellectual or academic investment. Ironically, Dean Rogers was a strong proponent of African Studies who spearheaded the program proposal in 1966 and announced the African Studies commission be tasked with developing the

program. Rogers told the DI, he intended the committee to become a focal point for African studies on campus. A series of activities were also suggested for the proposed program: 1) Encouraging additional teaching and research in the African field; 2) Bringing leading African scholars and other experts in the field to the campus for lectures and discussions with faculty and students; 3) Assisting African students and cooperating with the African student organization.

Conversely, the level of enthusiasm and support extended to the development of the African Studies program was not afforded to Stewart. Stewart proposed a similar structure for AASRP, as a better alignment with the Black Cultural Center that could potentially benefit more students. The committee suggested merging the Black Cultural Center and AASRP. Dean Rogers vehemently disagreed. AASRP was dismissed from the College of LAS for approximately three days following the program-housing dispute. Dean Rogers objected to the Program’s seat in LAS if it were to be housed with the Black Cultural Center as had been planned earlier. Following the decision not to house the two programs in a joint facility, the AASRP was reinstated to its seat in the College of LAS.

Through all this, Stewart continued to emphasize research, and he began revising LAS 199. He submitted a proposal to reconstitute the LAS 199 lecture series as Anthropology 161: Introduction to Afro-American Studies. In the Spring of 1976, the Head of the Anthropology Department approved this action. A staff of five (including Stewart) assisted with compiling a comprehensive Black Teaching and Research Staff Directory that listed all personnel on
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campus that taught or conducted research related to the Black experience. Next, AASRP created a biweekly newsletter called “Afro-Briefs” developed around a series of topics relevant to the Black experience on campus including: community service, research, funding, colloquiums, conferences and information pertaining to African-American Studies. Stewart also continued his own research publishing his second book *Curving Road* was published by the University of Illinois Press in 1975.

The next year, AASRP planed even more activities on campus and within the local community, starting with the Bicentennial Conference and Future Blacks in America Rights and Initiatives. This event was attended by scholars throughout the region, students, and local community members. There were several different workshops for teaching professionals as well as students wanting to attend graduate school. Community members benefitted from the information provided regarding employment opportunities and hiring practices. The program also offered a mid-day forum developed around a series of topics exploring the Black experience. Stewart tried to stretch the AASRP budget by partnering and collaborating with departments, units, programs, and agencies on campus and within the local community. Despite his efforts, the program began to carry a deficit.

In an attempt to adjust the budget to cover the deficit, Stewart proposed restructuring of the Program’s administrative staff. There was not much room for change. The AASRP program consisted of a director and one instructor. Stewart’s proposed changes proved controversial. Prior to the restructuring Bernie Lewis, the staff associate, often aired by passing information regarding AASRP to Dean Rogers prior to receiving Stewarts approval. This caused several

---
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disagreements between Lewis and Stewart. She believed this restructuring was in retaliation for previous disagreements, that Stewart was simply being vindictive.\footnote{279. Subject File, 1948-2008, Box 2.} Others blamed the administration, “AASRP has been placed in the position of barely holding on for too long,” Anderson told the advisory committee. “There was little room for creativity, no additional resources to accommodate a response to community needs, nothing by which long-range plans could be made.”\footnote{280. Afro Advisory Minutes, April 28, 1976, Box 2.} The program was stuck in a holding pattern when it needed to grow. To gain additional instructional staff despite the budget issues, the AASRP needed to partner with other departments to create jointly-appointed faculty. Even Stewart, director of the AASRP, taught classes within the Department of Anthropology. The risk to that idea was that the new faculty members would focus their energies and scholarship to the tenure-granting unit, not the AASRP. This continued to be an issue that would plague the program for years to come.

Stewart started looking elsewhere for money. In the spring of 1976, he submitted a proposal to the Center for the Study of Institutional Racism. The foundation helped AASRP secure joint appointments with the Department of Sociology. That spring, Stewart also learned that the National Institute of Mental Health would provide approximately $60,000 over three years. Finally, Dean Rogers agreed to transfer the funds for the LAS 199 back to AASRP. Stewart was able to use that money to create a scholar-in-residence-style program, which meant he could offer visiting scholars and guest lecturers significant teaching opportunities and financial support. Using that funding, the committee sponsored several events during the Fall of 1976, including guest lecturers and appearances by Congressman William Clay (D-MO.), Charles Rangel (D-NY.), Dr. Na’im Akbar and Prof. Dennis Brutus. One of the events was titled
“Afro-American/African Relations: Myths and Realities (Redefining Attitudes and Relationships).”  

In September of 1976, Director Stewart took a one semester sabbatical to conduct research in Trinidad. Stewart’s sabbatical created vulnerabilities within the program that would plague him. Probes were made by other Department Heads ascertaining the legitimacy of the program, and Rogers voiced increasing pessimistic predictions about the outcome of the program.  

Financial resources were diminishing due to an economic downturn and other Department Heads and Deans sought to seize the funds that supported AASRP. Their rationale was considered valid, Rogers argued, members of the AASRP were not producing sufficient scholarly research because they were too heavily invested in community outreach and program administration, ignoring the U of I’s research mission. Celebrations, workshops, newsletters, and conferences were all commendable activities, but in Rogers’ eyes, they did not constitute a viable academic unit. “In my view, a university is not a church, a psychiatric clinic, a political enclave, a social welfare agency or a playpen for life adjustment,” Roger stated. “It is a center of learning where the acquisition of knowledge and the transmission of knowledge takes place.” When Stewart returned, the program added a new course, Humanities 295: Seminar in Afro-American Folk Themes. The class materials were designed to be supplemented by the campus lectures.

Stewart had attempted to maintain communications while on sabbatical in Trinidad but most information regarding the program was either not relayed to him or was miscommunicated. After his return, Stewart’s attention was focused on administrative difficulties and disputes,
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particularly those concerning the program’s sustainability. Despite the AASRP’s previous financial setbacks, by February of 1977, the program had a surplus of funds. The stress Stewart undertook to set AASRP on a positive trajectory and develop stability for the Program began to overcome him. The final blow came when Chancellor Peltason, who had been an important advocate for AASRP, announced that he would resign effective June 30th, 1977. During the next advisory committee meeting on February 10th, Stewart announced that he would resign his appointment, effective July 1, 1977; however, this did not occur. Stewart requested a search be conducted to identify a new Director, but Dean Rogers indicated that they could not pursue a search at that time.

Stewart became a lame duck administrator, and the tensions with Rogers continued to escalate. In a memo to Dean Rogers dated March 23, 1977, Stewart asked permission to roll-over unused funds to the following fiscal year. Moreover, he asked for Dean Rogers’ recommendation to the Chancellor that this decision be made.284 Dean Rogers wrote to Stewart that under no circumstances could he recommend the extension of these funds, and in fact, he would send the Chancellor a letter recommending that the program not receive extended use of the funds. Stewart responded affirmatively, “please forward the letter to the Chancellor with your recommendation not to extend the use of funds.”285

Stewart left for a research trip on May 28, 1977. He took another trip in early August. The total expenditures of the trip were approximately $1000. On September 4, 1977, Stewart received a letter from Dean Rogers indicating that he would need documentation of these trips because they were not authorized and seemed a bit excessive. The university did not want to


have trouble if they were audited. Stewart, however, had already obtained the required signature from the Vice Chancellor of academic affairs agreeing that these trips were within the scope of his duties. Frustrated with the administrative limitations and the tenuous relationship with Dean Rogers, Stewart formally announced his resignation in late September to be effective June, 30 1978. In a unprecedented turn of events, Stewart relinquished the directorship in October of 1977 to return to a faculty position to pursue his research and writing career. Under Stewart’s four years of leadership, the AASRP budget increased from approximately $39,000 to $64,000 and the program created over ten new classes.

A suitable replacement had not been selected prior to Stewart’s departure, so Richard Barksdale assumed the interim Director position. Due to the unwillingness of Dean Rogers to support the carryover of funds from previous year budgetary issues resumed and with a lack of consistent leadership, the AASRP struggled to survive. This was in fact the most vulnerable the program had been since its inception ten years prior. During this period of instability, Dean Rogers assembled the Executive Leadership of LAS (Task Force). The group was comprised of different Department Heads within LAS. Their task was to conduct evaluations of units and programs within the College of LAS and eliminate waste. Dean Rogers and the Task Force recommended the withdrawal of funds from the AASRP at U of I in the Spring of 1978, “Be it resolved that the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences ceased to fund the administrative office currently consisting of a half-time director and administrative/clerical staff for the Afro-American Studies and Research program effective at the end of the current fiscal year...”

Outraged, advocates of the AASRP forced the campus’ executive administrators to reconsider its decision. Supportive administrators, faculty, and students galvanized. Within three days, they produced petitions, signed by over two thousand students, opposing the resolution and
requesting that it be rejected. William P. Gerberding, who only held the Chancellor position for one year, responded that he understood the rationale Dean Rogers presented, but, he continued, the AASRP had potential to become a quality program. Terminating it at that moment seemed premature given its potential benefit. Chancellor Gerberding came to be seen as a balanced but progressive leader. He left the U of I to become the 27th President of University of Washington, where he served for 16 years, the longest term of any president.

Chancellor Gerberding’s decision helped AASRP survive one more year. Subsequently, Dean Rogers resigned. The interim Dean, Lloyd Humphreys, aided in the searches for both a new Dean of LAS and a new Director for AASRP. Humphreys was a professor of psychology who came to U of I in 1957. He considered searching for individuals from outside of U of I and its troublesome institutional politics. William Prokasy assumed the Dean of LAS position. Dean Prokasy had a background in clinical psychology, and he had earned his PhD from the University of Wisconsin Madison in experimental psychology and statistics. Gerald McWorter (Abdul Alkalimat) became the new Director of AASRP beginning Fall of 1979. Alkalimat held a PhD in Sociology from the University of Chicago (U. Chicago) in 1974. Despite some of Alkalimat’s polarizing personal characteristics, Barksdale attributed much of the AASRP’s future success to Alkalimat’s hard work, as well as Dean Prokasy, who supported the program.

The Sociology of New Leadership for AASRP

Alkalimat had grown up as part of the generation that launched the Black studies movement. He was part of the youth wing of NAACP, and these activities had a profound impact on this intellectual development. While in college at Ottawa University, Kansas in 1959, he
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began to meet people who were interested in CRM and cultural identity. The philosophical and theoretical bases of the problems “we” faced captured his imagination and pushed him to pursue an advanced degree in sociology. Alkalimat sought to find his role within the movement whether within the academy contributing intellectually or as an activist helping organize communities. He started a graduate program in sociology at the University of Chicago in Fall, 1963, but he dropped out to become a full-time member of SNCC and part of the Mississippi summer project. The people around him did not support his decision. Alkalimat remembered in particular historian John Hope Franklin’s response. Franklin had also been invited to go to Mississippi, but “he decided to go to Maryland and teach southern white graduate students about the reconstruction rather than to go Mississippi and to be head of the freedom schools.”

288 Well, I thought that was whack.”

289 Alkalimat continued, “That was really the last serious conversation I had with John Hope Franklin. I mean, he was not for the movement.”

Other professors, however, were more supportive of his venture. Before he left for Mississippi, Alkalimat’s advisor brought him a tape-recording outfit so he could do oral histories. After a month in Mississippi, Alkalimat received a phone call from another professor at the University of Chicago announcing that they had received a major grant to study school desegregation in sixteen different cities. The teacher offered Alkalimat an opportunity to participate. He accepted the position as a graduate researcher and returned to Chicago in 1964, where he helped coordinate a SNCC program in the city. Participating in the research, Alkalimat stated, “really what impacted my life, because not only had I come up in a family that was oriented towards struggle and in the movement, but now suddenly I was interviewing senior
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Black people who were the ministers, the newspaper editors, the heads of local NAACP’s, that were telling me the deep story of each one of these cities, so I was like adding to my memory their memory of everything that happened.” These experiences shaped Alkalimat’s political education.

When Alkalimat finished his coursework in 1968, he ignored his professors’ advice and took a job at Spellman College, a HBCU. “I was in fact creating a career that I wanted to have,” Alkalimat explained. The following year, he accepted a position at Fisk University where he stayed for six years. In 1975, he left Fisk to become an associate professor of black studies at UIC.

When Alkalimat became Director of AASRP at U of I, he was 37, full of energy, possessing a variety of experiences that informed his vision for the program. Alkalimat proposed two objectives of Afro-American studies: 1) to rewrite American history and re-conceptualize the essential features of American society; and 2) to establish the intellectual and academic space for Black people to tell their own story. Alkalimat adopted an interdisciplinary model as a majority of African American Studies programs were structured similarly. In addition, Alkalimat focused on growing national attention to his initiatives in creating extensive regional and national networks to bolster Black Studies because he believed that professional publication outlets and conferences legitimized Black Studies.

290. Alkalimat, in discussion with author.

291. Alkalimat, in discussion with author.


Alkalimat’s entrepreneurial spirit helped improve the program, but it created tensions with Dean Prokasy. The two men had agreed that Alkalimat would build the AASRP into a nationally-recognized program and Dean Prokasy would help procure funding for this goal. Alkalimat suggests, “the University is like a corporation; they believe in a lot of different things, but they mostly believe in money, the bottom line.” This is an example of interest convergence and co-optation. In this instance, administrators within the institution changed or implemented policy as a benefit to the institution, and occasionally, these mandates afforded direct benefits to individuals or peripheral programs. In addition, the institutions’ bureaucratic operations were subject to political, economic, cultural, and social influences. Alkalimat believed that if campus administrators understood Black Studies as a commodity they better recognize its value. From this perspective he suggest if the U of I can make money on the idea “they would like; however, if they could not make money on the idea or it would cost money they would reject the idea. The Director would need to be extremely careful in balancing these competing interests as a pull too much in either direction could jeopardize the stability of the program.

During his first year, Alkalimat established the Illinois Council for Black Studies (ICBS), a centralized mechanism to address Illinois Board of Higher Education (IBHE) regarding the development of Black Studies. He also made the U of I an institutional member of the National Council for Black Studies. Between 1980-1982, Alkalimat worked to make AASRP’s
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place within the university more secure. In the fall semester of 1981, African-American studies moved into a three floor facility at 1204 W. Oregon. They gained two seminar rooms, a reading room, a copy room, a program research room and offices for faculty and staff. He launched a new newsletter that had a circulation of about four thousand subscribers. He made the program more visible nationally, even hosting the annual meeting of the National Council for Black Studies. Alkalimat involved AASRP in the African Liberation Support among many other things.

Alkalimat’s attempts to raise the AASRP’s visibility helped minimize budget cuts that happened at other institutions around the state. Fiscal crisis or economic decline often became the rationale/excuse for dismantling Black Studies programs. “The administration of the city colleges of Chicago announced plans to merge the six-year-old Department of American studies at Olive Harvey Community College with the Department of social sciences as part of a system wide economy measure to combine small departments with larger ones. “In another action the Illinois State Board of Higher Education recommended that the Department of African-American studies at Western University stop offering degrees because it did not appear to be economically or educationally justified. Alkalimat advocated against budget cuts to Black Studies programs by lobbying IBHE.

Robert A. Wallace, Deputy Director of the Illinois State Board of Higher Education, questioned the objectives of Black Studies at Illinois’ institutions of higher education. Deputy Director Wallace suggested that the programs served Black students and excluded Whites. This was another misconception of Black Studies program that prompted Whites to assert that these

---

programs were “inferior, irrational and irrelevant.” Alkalimat arranged regular meetings and invited IBHE representatives to attend. He engaged in a spirited debate articulating the merits of Black Studies and why it was needed not only for Black communities but it should include whites as well. By the one of end of the meeting in the spring of 1981, Deputy Director Wallace publicly agreed to support a statewide survey of the status of Blacks Studies.

AASRP secured a grant from the Illinois Humanities, formerly Illinois Humanities Council, to take a selection of Black films and preview them throughout the state a different community centers. The efforts of the AARSP under Alkalimat’s leadership continued to expand and not only did the U of I become a central figure in organizing Black Studies in the state but it also served to provide cultural programming. When the U of I Council on Program Evaluation (COPE) completed a review of the African-American studies program and issued its findings to Alkalimat December 3, 1983, however, they criticized the program for not devoting more time to serious scholarship and research. Alkalimat initiated several programs to address the perceived needs and interests of the Black community on the university’s campus. Since they were not a department, he focused on joint appointments. Despite Alkalimat’s polarizing and sometimes controversial style of delivery he was often able to move forward his demands.

**Instruction & Research**

Alkalimat brought some order to AASRP's curriculum, fighting to give the program ownership of the courses taught. When he took the helm, AASRP had only two or three

---
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courses, the rest were listed in history, in literature, and anywhere faculty taught courses on the Black experience. Under his leadership, AASRP’s class offerings gradually expanded to six. Alkalimat himself taught both sociology and African-American studies courses. Though Alkalimat had positive responses from students in both his departments, his African-American studies tended to be overwhelmingly Black, and his sociology courses tended to be mostly White. Alkalimat brought passion and energy to the classroom and encouraged student interaction through debate. Alkalimat strove to ensure that racist attitudes did not prevail in the classroom. If students engaged in seemingly racist rhetoric he did not hesitate to engage the class in a discussion.

Alkalimat wanted AASRP to offer new, expanded courses. He focused on developing a theory of the Black experience based on his conceptualization of the civil rights struggle, and he turned his ideas into a textbook, Black Studies: Introduction to African-American Studies. The book focused on historical periodization as a model for studying the Black experience from Africa throughout the diaspora to contemporary US History. The periodization provided opportunities for understanding historical dynamics and social institutions central to understanding Black experience. He also wanted to explore the political transformations caused by the ways the Civil Rights Movement had expanded the electoral process and created new opportunities for Blacks to seek office. He enlisted Richard Barksdale, Associate Professor of English to assist with developing course offerings around literature that highlighted the Black experience.

---
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Alkalimat believed research should be local and community-oriented. He argued that, “Black Studies started as a way of rescuing out history, and it starts where you are.” The local people to know their history because, he believed, this knowledge would transform the community. He suggested that this would provide a collective consciousness. Alkalimat lamented that so many people did not even know the history of the people streets were named after. “The environment we live in is full of history,” he explained, and felt that people should not think it’s normal to be ignorant of it.  

As he started gathering memories of the neighborhood around U of I, he discovered that many residents remembered the Black community with great nostalgia. They recalled it being more organically sustainable and wholesome. Grocery stores were neighborhood hangout places for families to socialize outside of church. They talked about a time when the streets were lined with more houses and fewer vacant lots. His efforts within the surrounding community during the 1980s forged strong ties with AARSP. Alkalimat also encouraged cross-cultural collaboration between Black and Latina/o Chicana/o students. As had been true of the Black students, many of these other students of color were first-generation college seekers from working-class backgrounds. The shared experiences allowed the two groups of students to empathize with each other. Students and faculty collaborated closely to achieve common goals of social justice that were reflected not only in their ideological orientations but also within their scholarship.
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Publish or Perish a New Fate

Alkalimat continued to gain national recognition for his work in Black Studies; however, this did not always improve the position of AASRP at U of I. He was an active member in a variety of different professional organizations, including: NCBS, Cooperative Research Network in Black Studies, ICBS. He served on a variety of different editorial boards for popular Black journals such as the Western Journal of Black Studies and the Afro Scholar Newsletter.

Alkalimat even began his own publishing company, Twenty-First Century Books and Publishing (21st Century Books), where he named himself as Senior Editor. This initiative might have been a response to the Cope report from 1983 which had criticized him for not publishing enough. Mainstream publications may not have been as expedient or receptive. Alkalimat used 21st Century Books, to expedite the publication of many working papers, conference presentations, speeches in addition to Afro Scholar journal.

Having created a programmatic and intellectual basis for the programs work, Alkalimat started looking for more funding. He acquired several grants from the National Endowment for the Humanities to support AASRP the creation of an introductory text on Black Studies. The increase in funding provided the opportunity for additional staff in AARSP to conduct research and assist with materials for the text. George Yu conducted the search committee to find additional faculty for AASRP while Alkalimat tended to national programmatic aspects. Several people were hired for joint appointments in the early 1980s including Alice Deck and Dianne Pinderhughes. In 1984 Pinderhughes accepted a joint appointment in the Department of Political Science and AASRP. Yu wanted to capitalize on the faculty search and requested permission from Dean Prokasy to make another appointment. Phil Bowman a graduate of the University of Michigan was offered a joint appointment in Psychology and AASRP. The program began to
stabilize with additional financial support and Dean Prokasy’s favorable perspective of the program.

Over the new few years, however, the relationship between Prokasy and Alkalimat became increasingly fraught and contentious. Prokasy specifically worried about how the program dealt with funds from grants by the National Endowment for the Humanities. Alkalimat also grew impatient with the slow pace of the administration’s response to support the program and went on sabbatical in 1984.\textsuperscript{310} Marvin Lewis, Associate Professor of Spanish, stepped in as the Director in 1984 during the midst of the unrest. Consequently, he was unable to sustain the work needed to improve the programming function of AASRP without Prokasy’s support. Within two years, Lewis resigned as the Director and left the university in frustration by the lack of institutional support.

\textbf{Passing of the Guard}

Given the circumstances surrounding AASRP, very few faculty either desired or had the experience necessary to stabilize the program. Despite some controversy regarding the organization, James Anderson accepted the Interim Director position of AASRP from 1986-1987. Anderson had a long history of involvement with the development of African-American Studies on campus, but most importantly, he had an intimate understanding of the institution. Anderson had been a fixture on campus since 1966, initially as a graduate student from 1966 - 1971, and later as an Assistant Professor in 1973. Transitioning from a student that advocated for Black Studies in the late 1960s to faculty on the Advisory Committee for AASRP throughout the 1970s, Anderson could not abandon the idea/initiative he helped nurture since its infancy. He

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{310} Alkalimat took leave in 1984 to conduct research and a sabbatical to Berlin in 1985. He did not officially leave the U of I until 1987. Then became an associate professor at Northeastern University in 1987 where Ronald Bailey was faculty. Bailey was named Department Chair less than a year later, serving in the position from 1988 to 1994.
\end{itemize}
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wanted to stabilize the program. Although Anderson was only Director for one year, the leadership he provided helped create an infrastructure and improved perceptions that allowed the program to survive.

Anderson’s major goal was to transform institutional perceptions of AASRP. He worked with existing faculty within AASRP, especially Alice Deck, Dianne Pinderhughes, Phil Bowman and several others, to reorganize the program. The existing structure of AARSP eliminated the ability for it to hire its own faculty, “because faculty would have to be either tenured or in the tenured track in an existing academic unit with tenure lines.” AASRP did not have tenure lines that meant in order hire faculty, collaboration and consensus was required with another which would not be an easy process. Often the AASRP faculty would identify someone that they thought would be wonderful for their program; the academic unit would say, “no, this person didn’t quite fit our needs or live up to our standards or do the kinds of things we think this person ought to be doing.” Directors were frustrated one after another, and if the LAS Dean was unsupportive or indifferent it created an untenable situation. Each hire required very difficult negotiations of consensus with a unit that actually held the tenure line AASRP lacked, which provided other departments predominant control over the search for new faculty, and that made it very difficult grow the program. Anderson used this knowledge to help the AASRP flourish under new leadership. Anderson also encouraged campus activity and student engagement as ways to improve program visibility on campus.

When Anderson stepped down after a year, a national search was started to identify the new AASRP Director. Dianne Pinderhughes was recommended as interim Director until a
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permanent candidate was selected. Pinderhughes was adept at the process of negotiating her acceptance of the new administrative position. She even made the point for her title to become “Acting Director” versus “Interim Director.” She made sure at each point she would have the resources and ability to support the program that was comparable to previous directors and she would be commensurately compensated. She created strategic partnerships with other departments and units across campus, boosted affiliate faculty members to cross list courses and strengthened the legitimacy of the program. While, other program directors had focused their energies outwards, internationally and nationally, attempting to draft a broad audience for initiatives on campus, Pinderhughes focused her energies on investing within the institution to gradually gain legitimacy and stability each year. Her thoughtfulness and understanding of institutional politics helped the program weather an economic downturn. Pinderhughes served as acting director from 1987-1990.

Pinderhous's work building on-campus relationships for AASRP garnered tremendous support from her colleagues and U of I Administrators. Dean Prokasy left in the spring 1988 to become Vice President of Academic Affairs at University of Georgia. Before his departure, he affirmed a “Statement of Commitment to Program Viability.” AASRP for the first time was “vested as a fully functioning academic unit within the College of LAS enjoying all rights and privileges and responsibilities thereof.” The agreement brought legitimacy to the program. Larry Faulkner was appointed the new Dean of LAS and became instrumental in the continuing development of AASRP. After a year working with Penderhouges the national search for a new Director of AASRP ended; Faulkner found the ideal candidate in Pinderhughes. Faulkner's
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commitment to diversity and Penderhughes’s ability to articulate the merits of AASRP allowed the program to thrive and rise through retrenchment.
CHAPTER 3

RISING THROUGH RETRENCHMENT: A NEW MANDATE FOR ETHNIC STUDIES PROGRAMS 1988-2000

The last half of the 20th century witnessed dismantling of the formal barriers excluding people of color, women, sexual and religious minorities, the dis/abled, the poor and immigrants from participating in socioeconomic activities. One of the results of admitting significant numbers of Outsiders as faculty and students to universities and professional schools has been the widespread change to teaching and scholarship practices…. The challenge to the homogeneity of the traditional canons throughout the discipline has been vehemently contested. Debates about the integration of feminist and critical social practices rage unabated in a number of disciplines. 314

By the mid-1980s, the students and faculty of AASRP had new allies on campus. The decade of the 70s yielded an unparalleled number of Black students matriculating into PWIs, including U of I. 315 The following decade, however, the African-American student population began to decline at the U of I, and elsewhere, for any one of a number of reasons. 316 In previous generations of students, the decline might have led to student protests, but by the 1980s, Black militancy had dissipated and mass demonstrations were less commonplace. 317 Black students struggled to identify a specific policy that could be fought. Without a specific issue or leader to target through protest, students became increasingly complacent. It was not as if the U of I did not abandon minority recruitment entirely. Agitation for the increase enrollment of Chicanos/Latinos students through SEOP began in 1971-1972. 318 At first, the change was slow.
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In 1975 there were only 240 “Hispanic” students enrolled at U of I, and only 160 were undergraduates.\(^{319}\) Five years later, there were 451, and there were 622 Hispanic students by 1985.\(^{320}\) The total campus student population during this time was approximately 35,500. Minority student enrollment grew rapidly. By 1990 the campus enrolled 1,266 Hispanic students, and 1,133 of these were undergraduates.\(^{321}\) In 1995 the African-American student population was 2,292 and Hispanic students were 1,687 equaling approximately 13% of the entire undergraduate student body.\(^{322}\)

Many of the new Latino students were from working-class roots from nearby Chicago, and they brought new perspectives and ideologies to campus. For one thing, they did not self-identify as “Hispanic.” They felt the term was a catchall for any person who spoke Spanish, which meant it included Europeans. Because of that, they believed being called “Hispanic” meant denying their indigenous roots. They preferred Latina/Latino, words that more accurately reflected their lived experiences.\(^{323}\)

Female student leaders also played an increasingly active role in democratizing the U of I. One of the first important female student leaders on campus was Patty Paker, who became the first female student Senate President in 1968. She helped reshape student politics in an era when student culture was changing. Students were becoming increasingly involved in issues affecting the campus and society in general. They learned their activism during protests against the Vietnam War. By the early ‘70s, female students demanded that their concerns be taken
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seriously. Women on campus, students, and faculty advocated for recognition of the contributions of female faculty. They also demanded the creation of Women Studies, an effort steered by Assistant Professors Paula Treichler (Communication), Cheris Kramarae (Speech Communication) and Librarian Beth Stafford.

The Office of Women Studies was founded in 1978, and it was housed in the School of Humanities. Women Studies became a program with a minor in 1980, and it moved to LAS. In 1986 Mary Loeffelholtz (English) was made the first joint appointment for the Women’s Studies program at the U of I. In 1993, Women’s Studies established a graduate minor. Then years later, it received approval for an interdisciplinary undergraduate major. That same year, Women’s Studies Director Kal Alston changed the program’s title to be more inclusive: Gender and Women’s Studies. Although the program development had a late start, the momentum brought the emergence of Women’s Studies. Black Studies on campus paved the way.

This chapter explores the relationship between minority student populations, especially how the alliance between the African-American and Latino students helped shape the push for Latina/Latino Studies. Students and AARSRP faculty played a significant role in the new trajectory of ethnic studies at the U of I. Most students did not have Chicanos/Latinos as teachers or professors throughout their educational experiences. Several students indicated that despite cultural differences, some professors could empathize with the Chicanos/Latinos, using their own experiences of prejudice to understand how to help engage the new minority students.

The major questions guiding the section are: how did the collaboration between student and

faculty leadership help reframe the discussions of diversity and inclusivity on the campus? Moreover, how do vulnerable units or programs withstand economic downturns within the university?

At first, many Latina/Latino students participated in the AASRP, and they found an ally in Director Marvin Lewis, who led the program from 1984 to 1986. He was fluent in Spanish and had a research interests in Afro-Spanish culture. He facilitated academic engagement between African-American and Chicanos/Latinos students and encouraged them to collaborate on political issues on campus. As the Hispanic student population on campus increased, the students’ demands for equitable representation and recognition intensified. Lewis asked Dean Prokasy for additional financial support, but he saw most of his requests denied. After only two years, Lewis left the U of I to be faculty at the University Missouri, Columbia. Nevertheless, relationships and ideas that he cultivated with students continue to thrive.

**Building Coalitions: Faculty & Students**

The next key ally for the alliance between the Chicano/Latino and Black students was Dianne Pinderhughes. Raised in Washington, DC, Pinderhughes earned her high school diploma from St. Sicilian Academy. After graduating she moved to New Haven, Connecticut and attended Albert Magnus College. Pinderhughes graduated with a BA of Political Science in 1969 and pursued her graduate studies at the University of Chicago (U. Chicago). As a graduate student, she was not isolated nor was she immune to the politics of the period, such as the corruption of the Nixon administration, or the civil unrest that preceded his election. Being a
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native of Washington, DC, she was immersed in politics and sensitive to how the powerful affected the lives of the disenfranchised. She earned a PhD in Political Science from U. Chicago in 1977. Her dissertation focused on race and ethnicity in Chicago politics. Her first tenure-track position was as an Assistant Professor of Government at Dartmouth College (Dartmouth). She stayed there for seven years while conducting research for her first book publication. She won a postdoctoral fellowship at the University of California Los Angeles’s Center for African-American studies, Institute of American Cultures. After that term—and at the behest of Michael Preston, a prominent political scientist—she accepted a joint appointment as an Assistant Professor of Political Science and AASRP at U of I in the fall of 1984.

Pinderhughes recognized the importance of collaborative relationships on campus. It was her first time to be working at a large public institution, so she asked Lewis and Preston to explain the U of I’s institutional culture. She also allied herself with Philip Bowman, another recent hire who had a PhD from University of Michigan in Social Psychology. Bowman helped Pinderhughes find her bearings in the new campus environment. The two of them decided to work together to make sure AASRP continued to survive. They supported and counseled the African-American and Chicanos/Latinos students.

Before the mid-1980s, many Chicano/Latinos remain fairly isolated on campus initiating their own separate academic clubs and social groups. In the 1970s, the Council of Higher Education for Spanish-Speaking (CHESS) and the Urbana Hispanic Organization (UHO) were
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the main advocates for “Latin” student’s on campus. They encouraged administrators to increase the number of “Spanish heritage” students enrolled on campus, and they lobbied the dean. They lacked the critical mass needed, however, to pressure U of I administrators into immediate action.

In 1970 Louis Esquilin was hired as a full-time counselor for the SEOP. Esquilin, a Puerto Rican and native of New York, served for two years, and he provided the Latino students with assistance, advice and lobbying. In 1972, Esquilin resigned so that he could go to law school. The students petitioned the University to hire another person full-time to assume the vacant position, but despite numerous requests to Dean Miriam Sheldon, the enrollment of Latinos did not increase nor did the University hire a new counselor.

The next breakthrough happened in 1974. That year students developed La Casa Cultural Latina (LA Casa), a cultural center for Latina/o students. La Casa hosted nationally renowned scholars and activists to speak to students. La Casa would have a variety of different cultural events, including music and dance. Students of vision, they developed this cultural center to be a respite within a physical space that they could express their identity’s and concern without the infringement of the dominant campus culture. Although the U of I provided space for La Casa, the administrative and financial support was inadequate to maintain a stable program. From 1974 to 1992, La Casa had 15 directors, averaging a new director almost every year.

336. 41/21/14, Box 6.
337. Report on the Latino situation at the University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign, 41/21/14, Box 6.
338. Report on the Latino situation at the University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign, 41/21/14, Box 6.
339. Rosales, in discussion with author.
By the mid-1980s, the Chicanos/Latinos and African-American students and faculty had forged close enough alliances to push campus administration into taking steps to address the Latina/Latino student grievances.  

In addition, students created the Committee on Latino Concerns. An outgrowth of this student group was the Peer Retention Program (PRP) that focused on increasing the retention and recruitment of Latina/Latino undergraduates and provided mentoring to incoming freshmen. This was similar in some ways to the fall weekends that Black students held in the late 1960s and early 70s. Some faculty were supportive and sensitive to the needs of minority students. Arlene Torres was a graduate student in the Department of Anthropology in 1985, and she remembered how Lewis, Pinderhughes, Bowman, and later Anderson, as Director, encouraged Chicanos/ Latinos to become involved with the AASRP.

Torres was already involved with La Casa, where she was a graduate student worker and also a member. At the time, La Casa was in between directors so some of the Puerto Rican and Latino graduate students had stepped forward to help the undergraduate students develop their programming, keep publishing the newsletter, and look for a new director. Torres’s primary responsibility was the newsletter La Carta Informativa, which gave undergraduate and graduate students information on campus and community activities and was also an outlet for Latino students to publish creative works.


342. Caballero, “Miseducation.”.

343. Torres, in discussion with author.

344. Torres, in discussion with author.

345. Torres, in discussion with author.
La Casa had a tense relationship with the U of I administrators. Many of the members had been very vocal about the changes that the Latino student population needed, changes that would also benefit other underrepresented populations at Illinois. Administrators were not responsive to students’ advocacy. Torres wanted to cultivate and broaden La Casa’s relationships on campus. She began attending the program events for AASRP and befriended some of the faculty. She was offered a graduate assistantship. Torres was one of the few people of color in the Anthropology Department, and she appreciated the interdisciplinary aspects of AASRP whose faculty provided her the intellectual support she needed as a young scholar. Using her experience from working with La Casa, she created the first archives for their newsletters.

In 1986 Alicia Rodriguez enrolled as a graduate student in Educational Policy Studies. She was struck by how receptive the African-American students were which made her feel more welcome on campus. By 1986, there were a few more Latino and African American students present on campus, but many students still felt isolated. To mitigate this, Rodriguez joined the campus YMCA, which had a strong women’s group. Many of the members were undergraduates, but they were a mix of races and included both White and nonwhite women. Imani Bazzell, a graduate of Fisk University, was the director at that time, and she had experience engaging students on and off campus. She facilitated discussions around gender inequality and helped students build their understanding of identity, illuminating the intersections of race and gender. She also helped them cultivate their political voices and advocate for the changes they wanted. Rodriguez was extremely involved in pushing for different demands for Latinos including the creation of a Latino Studies program.
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In 1990, the African-American and Latino student population (3,227) was ten percent of the total student population, the highest domestic minority enrollment there had ever been. At first, African-American and Latino students were supportive of each other, but they were also concerned that there were not enough resources to go around. If the Latino students received more support on campus, would that mean the Black students received less support? Gender dynamics also were of concern. The YMCA’s women’s group resisted any patriarchal or male-dominated structure of governance. Rodriguez stated that, “Latino males, a couple, not all, a couple who had masochistic, macho kinds of perceptions about things.” This often made their discussions regarding strategy more challenging. Tension developed among some of the student activist leaders, but they tried to “hash it out” lest these differences keep them from reaching their goals. The Latino students advocated for the development of Latina/o Studies at the U of I. But the campus was facing a fiscal crisis. The administration argued that creating a new program was not possible at that time. They were in the process of reducing units and reorganizing programs, not launching new ones.

Pinderhughes became the permanent director of AASRP in 1990. She began creating faculty affiliations with the AASRP and other departments to increase visibility and promote ethnic studies across campus. This strategy helped her maximize limited resources and expanded the program’s influence across campus in a moment when many programs suffered significant cutbacks in funding due to decreasing state appropriations. When faced with a fiscal crisis, universities often cut their small units and programs even though higher education finance
scholars assert that doing so does not significantly decrease the cost burden of the universities. When it comes time to make cuts, university administrators often focus on several factors to determine which departments or programs to target. They assess if the program is self-sustainable, or able to either generate revenue or in some other way continue functioning without institutional support. A program that is essential and nationally-recognized usually means they will be able to improve institutional rankings and bring in federal funding. They look at whether the program is mission-oriented, or able to fulfill land-grant institutions’ state mandates, to serve the region and act as a producer of knowledge for the state.

Pinderhughes worked with Meryl Bowen, faculty of African Studies Center at U of I, to try to position AASRP so that the administrators would assess it favorably. When it came to sustainability, AASRP did not have federal funding to support the program, so the two women improvised, looking for ways to generate alternative revenue. Because AASRP's faculty were all dual-appointments in other departments, the program was limited in how much funding it could generate through faculty grants. Nonetheless, the program did to try to procure grants to develop curriculum, and Pinderhughes negotiated with the executive administrators at the U of I to increase the number of faculty engaged in AASRP.

University Priorities and Politics

Despite the work by the students and faculty, little seemed to be changing on campus. By the mid-'80s and early '90s, conservative voices prevailed, and they questioned the merits of
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ethnic and women’s studies programs.\textsuperscript{356} They argued that these types of programs were not academic endeavors but rather political ones. Therefore, they had no place within academe.\textsuperscript{357} Latina/Latino students increasingly became vocal regarding what they considered campus administrators indifference to Latino concerns. Students wanted U of I administrators to commit to moving forward with some plan of action to establish positive progress, even if the movement had to be gradual. By the spring of 1992, Latina/Latino students mobilized and issued a statement to the administration titled “Latina/Latino Student Demands and Solutions,” which included four major areas for improvement:

1. Recruitment and Retention
2. Faculty and Administration
3. Chief Illiniwek
4. Latina/Latino Studies Program\textsuperscript{358}

Each area had multiple points and solutions. Students wanted a breakdown of the term Hispanic. They felt that a clear distinction should be made between students from Latin America (international students) and those that lived the majority of their life within the United States.\textsuperscript{359} Students advocated for geographic: the disaggregation of students from South America, Central America, Caribbean, and Mexico as well as areas by specific country Peru, Cuba, Puerto Rico, El Salvador. Students recognize that there were distinct differences among the various groups that fall under the ambiguous term Hispanic and believe that interest could be better served by distinguishing those differences. Latino students were concerned with not only the enrollment of Latino students but the retention and completion rates. They demanded that Latina/Latino
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graduation rates at least the equivalent to the percentage of the Latino population in the state of Illinois which was 11.6% in 1992. A recommendation to achieve this goal was institutionalizing the PRP which could provide direct support for retention efforts. They wanted to ensure that Latinos would be recruited for all educational levels on campus including graduate programs. Student activists recognize predominantly Latino inner-city high schools as well as community colleges as untapped resources to draw more Latino students to campus.

Their next area of demands focused on faculty and administration creating an environment that was more inclusive for Latino youth from low income families who were unfamiliar with navigating the college experience. They want the University administration to focus on hiring faculty that more closely reflected the historically underrepresented minorities in the United States. They lamented the fact that there were only two Mexican/Chicano faculty members. In addition they articulated the point that less emphasis should be on the recruitment of scholars in the Spanish Department and broaden the interdisciplinary scope of Latino hires. They advocated for more Latinos in higher offices of campus administration and Deanship. Many students were frustrated with the increased White racism in the institution overall and particularly within the dormitories. They felt that White racism was pervasive and institutionally supported. The presence of Chief Illiniwek, as a symbol, affected students understanding of the U of I’s commitments and epitomize institutional racism.360

Students demanded the immediate removal of Chief Illinwek as a mascot of the U of I. They felt the symbol was a direct insult to the indigenous heritage in the everyday life of Latina/Latino. This was another hallmark of the call cross-cultural collaboration student at advocates established to advocate their goals. They stood in solidarity with Native American

organizations and numerous residents that urged university administrators to take a step towards eliminating racism by removing the demeaning mascot.\(^{361}\) The Chief would continue to be an issue and symbol of racism for nearly two more decades. Rodriguez remembers that students finally realized more serious efforts had to be made just to get the administration to listen and take their demand seriously.\(^{362}\)

The final topic of student demands centered on the development and implementation of a Latina/Latino Studies Program. They wanted a program that would be differentiated from Latin American and Caribbean Studies. They felt the campus administrators aired in the notion that they could combine the two programs or there was no distinguishing between the Latin American and Latinos within the US. Latina/Latino students suggested their program would parallel that of African American Studies program and the distinguishing of it from the African Studies program. Students showed interest in developing the Latina/Latino Studies program as an interdisciplinary Institute.\(^{363}\) They also demanded library resources in addition to adequate financial support for La Casa to support the increasing needs of Latinos on campus. “Education is an ongoing process that occurs inside and outside the classroom. We have to open our minds to the injustice and take responsibility to seek the truth and challenge fallacies. We can no longer be silenced, our voices have to be heard in the classroom, in the books, wherever; but we cannot be silence. It is a struggle, but we can no longer let the oppression continue.” This became a rallying cry for many students addressing concerns of inequality on campus.\(^{364}\)

Students interested in developing the Latino studies program began by partnering with organizations and units across campus to invite guest speakers to give talks about the importance
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of the program. These speakers included program directors from other universities, leading scholars in the field, and department heads. While these individuals were on campus, students scheduled time for them to meet with the provost and other administrators, hoping the invited lecturers could help convince the university’s leaders that the program was necessary if the university was to gain the standing it desired. The visiting speakers also helped connect U of I students and faculty to what was happening around the country.365

Some students were asked to join committees, and they strategized with their faculty mentors on how to best use their new positions to create change. After a short while, however, the students became skeptical of the value of all the committee work. “This University’s response to everything is to set up a committee and then ignore the committee’s report,” Hermilo Hinojosa told the Chicago Tribune in May 1992, “We have no faith in their committees. They are just stalling waiting for the leadership to die out, drop out, or buy out.”366

Frustrated by the lack of progress, student leaders began considering launching demonstrations or protests. The students were determined to keep the protests nonviolent and peaceful. The organizing group was a multicultural coalition including Latina/Latino, African American, Asian American, American Indian, and White students. But not everyone was in agreement.367 Tensions arose during the planning of the protests. Some student leaders believed they were being infiltrated by spies. They worried someone might tip off the school administration, so they demanded that the important meetings be closed-door sessions, open to only the top student leaders.368
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On April 29, 1992, the students occupied the Office of Minority Student Affairs (OMSA). About 200 students participated in the demonstration held at OMSA. Approximately nine students occupied the inside the others remained outside and refused to leave until their demands were met. Vice Chancellor Stan Levy was dispatched to negotiate the student demands. Students often felt that Vice Chancellor Levy was often demeaning and paternalistic which strained any negotiation. After an extended meeting with Levy students walked out and issued one more demand amnesty for all students involved with the demonstration.\(^{369}\)

The following week, the students took over the David Dodds Henry Administrative Building (Henry Administrative Building),\(^{370}\) which the student organizers believed would have the greatest impact. It was the major administrative center on campus, and it was where students made payments.\(^{371}\) On Tuesday, May 5, 1992, at approximately 12:30 PM, students began the demonstration by hosting a rally on the U of I Quad. Student leaders had two-way radios to communicate with each other, and they used bullhorns to direct participants. MariCarmen Moreno an active protest participant wrote, “There comes a time in life when we almost put words into action; when our principles and beliefs mold who we are and if we allow someone or something to limit them, we are not being true to ourselves. So the Latino community said, ‘No, more!’ to the university administration.”\(^{372}\) The three hundred students who participated in the rally then marched to the Henry Administrative Building. They crowded into the building and lined up along the counters where students were registering for courses, obtaining transcripts,
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and making payments. Business halted. Approximately eighty students participated in the sit-in while another hundred or more students remain outside on the Quad. U of I administrators summoned the police to disperse demonstrators. The Latino, Asian, African-American and White students outside the building locked arms and chanted, “The people united can never be defeated.”

Four additional precincts came to support the campus police. They arrived in riot gear, and they quickly escalated the situation, using excessive force and enhanced tactics of pressure compliance including pepper spray, clubs, and stun guns. The students began to panic, and communication among the student leaders deteriorated. Their two-way radios were confiscated, so student leaders on the outside did not know what was happening to demonstrators inside the administrative building. As the demonstration became more chaotic, people not associated with the demonstration began to violate the demonstrators commitment to nonviolence. Campus garbage cans were set on fire, and a bomb threat was called into the Levis Faculty Center.

Students occupied the Henry Administrative Building for about eight hours, or the duration of a normal work day. Due to the other violent activities that began to erupt on campus, student leaders decided to end the demonstration. They did not want to be associated with those other types of actions being displayed. Although the demonstrations ended that day negotiations continued throughout the spring, summer, and the fall of 1992. Chancellor Weir appointed a committee three days after the demonstration to consider the student demands. One additional request was made that amnesty be provided for all students involved in the May 5 demonstrations. The committee was willing to accept many of the demands except for granting

amnesty to those students involved in the demonstration. Based on the ad hoc committees recommendation, Chancellor Weir established an Executive Committee to oversee concerns of Latina/Latino students. On June 24, 1992, Latina/Latino students frustrated with the rejection of amnesty for protesters decided to cut off all negotiations with the animist administration until amnesty was granted. Chancellor Weir stated that their reluctance to negotiate was an “unfortunate” turn of events but was committed to working with the newly established Executive Committee. These actions led to continued protests by students, faculty, and community members. Despite the lack of input from students the university administration began to make progress towards fulfilling the students demands.

**Development of Latina/Latino Studies Program**

Prior to their takeover of the Henry Administrative Building, the student protests had only made the local news. The May 5 protests were covered by the *Chicago Tribune*, and other national media outlets. The national attention meant the U of I had to appropriately respond. Campus administrators needed to demonstrate that they understood the demands of multiculturalism and could adapt to the changing intellectual landscape. Advocates for Latina/Latino Studies were prepared for this conversation, and they hoped to control the new program’s budget, curriculum development, hiring, and the tenure and promotion process. Their commitment to controlling those areas emerged from the experiences of the AASRP, which had been the vanguard for other programs focusing on race ethnicity and gender on campus but
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which operated under serious limitations. Administrators and faculty recognized that it would be a daunting task to win full enfranchisement for these programs to become academic departments. Pinderhughes recalls, “I wasn’t so excited about becoming a department” the relatively small number of faculty in AASRP compared to other departments like Political Science, Chemistry, Engineering which easily had 40, 50, or 60 faculty and staff. “AASRP would be like a mouse trying not to get stepped on by the elephant,” but several faculty wanted the program to expand and grow.

In 1990, Consuelo Lopez, a postdoctoral fellow, and Torres, submitted a proposal to Chancellor Weir to develop an Institute for the study of Hispanic American Culture. Chancellor Weir directed them to Professor Enrique Mayer, Director of the Center for Latin American and Caribbean Studies. The student protests were mostly successful and the campus administration began making preparation to create a Latina/Latino Studies program in the fall of 1993. Mayer became Chair of the Latino Studies Advisory Committee (LSAC). The primary responsibility of the LSAC over next two years was creating courses, curriculum, and a structure for the new Latino Studies program. In the Latina/Latino Studies Program (LLSP) was finally established in 1995. An interim-Director was appointed while a national search was convened. During the 1995-96 academic year, the faculty and staff who were part of organizing the LLSP organized a committee to establish priorities and develop a search for a director. One year later, LLSP was officially launched. The staff was small and consisted of two professors (both joint

379. Torres, in discussion with author.

380. Pinderhughes, in discussion with author.


appointments), a program director, and a secretary. Torres was one of the first hires in the program. Rolando Ramero became the first official Director in the fall of 1996. Prior to coming to the U of I Romero was a Professor in the Department of Spanish and Portuguese at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee.

By this point the staff from the various ethnic studies programs, and the women’s studies program, were allies. They worked collaboratively, strategizing and brainstorming, discussing faculty lines, curriculum development issues, the tenuring process, and the development of a post-doctoral fellowship. They also created a working group where they tried to work out ways to broaden their influence and improve their levels of institutional support. Pinderhughes and other AASRP faculty shared their insights on what potential benefits and pitfalls lay ahead for the younger programs.\footnote{Torres, in discussion with author.} LLSP’s first goal was to develop a new curriculum, which would help improve course enrollments. LLSP’s staff hoped to win an undergraduate minor or certificates that would bolster their argument for hiring additional faculty and expanding their research budget. They understood that to do that, they would need to submit a proposal to the Illinois Board of Higher Education to become a department, a long process that would take several years.\footnote{Torres, in discussion with author.} In fall 1996, the staff submitted a proposal to the faculty senate asking them to create a LLSP minor. The senate approved the minor in spring 1997.

Romero’s tenure as Director was cut short due to growing internal program conflicts. His acceptance of a Fullbright Fellowship to Europe the following year prompted students and faculty to call in to question his commitment to establishing a robust program.\footnote{Caballero, “Miseducation.”} Rolando
stepped down as Director in spring 1999. A new interim Director, Louis DiSipio, was appointed the following fall, creating instability in the program. Between 1999 and 2001, the program lost at least eight faculty. Two of these individuals left because they had better offers outside of the U of I. Six were pushed out by unfavorable tenure decisions. The departures meant there was not continuity of programming, and no opportunity for students or young professors to be mentored by senior faculty. The program also could not develop their process for hiring searches, course assignments, and tenure process. DiSipio collaborated with Pinderhughes to try and identify ways in which to help the program thrive in the future.

DiSipio wrote a proposal to Dean Delia and Provost Herman providing recommendations to ensure the program could create an environment which a new director could thrive and grow. Recommendations focused on staff resources, recruitment, and retention of new faculty. DiSipio argued that adequate resources allocated toward the LLSP would provide the opportunity to hire an academic professional as an Associate Director and a civil service employee for outreach. This was thought to expand the opportunities for planning in addition to extending networks into the Latina/Latino community in Champaign-Urbana. It was seen as critical for those faculty departing and replacements to be in their faculty lines to be reestablished and controlled by LLSP. This would increase the level of commitment and productivity of new LLSP scholars. DiSipio wanted to make sure that faculty resources were not frittered away in the future and to limit the leveraging of other departments through joint appointments. LLSP continued to struggle as the next Director, Pedro Caban, accepted the position in 2002.
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Caban was a Fellow and Co-Director for the Center for the Critical Analysis of Contemporary Culture at Rutgers University prior to assuming the directorship of LLSP. He submitted a report to the subcommittee on studies of cultural programs endorsing the rationale for augmentation of resources for LLSP. Caban endorsed the proposal that DiSipio and the Latina/Latino Studies Advisory Council presented. He believed that these resources would be needed to meet the specific programmatic targets for the upcoming years. One element that Caban highlighted in his report was the interdisciplinary nature of LLSP and the ongoing contribution the program but make towards fulfilling diversity initiatives. He further clarified the initial request in his report outlining the development of academic capabilities, a focus on undergraduate education and retention, research initiatives, and intercampus activity linking research to community empowerment issues. Most importantly, Caban sought convey a new vision and role of Latina/Latino studies at the U of I.

Caban wanted to establish comprehensive undergraduate education appropriate for all university students that would contribute to the knowledge of Latino populations and their varied historical roles within society. He suggested that the interdisciplinary and comparative nature of LLSP would provide more in-depth analysis for the lived experiences of Latinos. Faculty were considered student oriented working closely with many of whom were first-generation college students. Moreover, Caban conveyed the importance of creating an intellectually and culturally supportive environment that would improve retention of Latina/o graduate students.

The educational mission of LLSP includes encouraging other academic departments to develop courses and incorporate materials that provide an analysis of the Latino experience. Related to this program to resolve to assume a key role of the multicultural education and promoting diversity at U of I LSP is committed to increasing the number of Latino scholars, to fostering cut collegial environment that will stimulate intellectual
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collaboration and further professional advancement and academic development of Latino faculty.\(^{391}\)

Caban envisioned a nationally preeminent program that would engage the needs of students, faculty, and the broader community. LLSP continued to collaborate extensively with La Casa and other units to address diversity concerns on campus. Beyond the academic and research component LLSP made Latino student retention a priority and helped educate students and the larger community about the past several decades of campus activism regarding Latina/o concerns.

LLSP was not the only ethnic studies program to take advantage of the multicultural thrust of the early 1990s. After 1992 Asian-American students on campus continued to organize. The Latina/Latino student sit-ins encouraged Asian-American students to become more vocal and push forward their demands to Chancellor Morton Weir. In the fall of 1992, Asian-American student leaders presented Chancellor Weir with a petition signed by over one hundred students who supported creating an Asian-American Cultural Center.\(^{392}\) Asian-American student leaders met with staunch resistance within Chancellor Weir’s administration. The office rejected the proposal, telling the students that they did not fit the formula prescribed to be considered a minority on campus. In order to be considered a minority status, the group population would need to be below that state’s percentage. In 1992, the state of Illinois was three percent Asian, but the U of I’s student population was twelve percent Asian.\(^{393}\) A year later, Chancellor Weir resigned his position, and Michael Aiken took his place. In September 1994, Chancellor Aiken and Provost Larry Faulkner established a thirty thousand dollar fund to support Asian-American

\(^{391}\) Pedro Caban report to subcommittee on studies and cultural programs

\(^{392}\) Sharon S. Lee, “(Un)seen and (Un)heard: The struggle for Asian American ‘Minority’ Recognition at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1968-1997,” (PhD diss., University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign, 2010), 271.

\(^{393}\) Lee, “(Un)Seen,” 276.
programming. Asian-American student leaders were not satisfied with this compromise, and they continued to agitate for recognition at the U of I. First, they wanted to establish a cultural center, and later, they hoped, they would gain an Asian-American studies program.

In spring of 1996, Asian-American student leaders issued a list of demands to executive administrators, including staffing, course development, and library acquisitions.394 The administrators gave in. They organized an Asian-American studies committee, which consisted of approximately fifteen faculty and three students charged with building an academic program. The school gave the committee a budget of one million dollars and provided them with six faculty lines to build the Asian American Studies program.395 George Yu became the director of the committee in the fall of 1997. The Asian American studies program was operational by 2000.

**Toward the New Millennium**

In 1998, Richard Herman accepted the position as Provost and Vice Chancellor Academic Affairs at U of I. He renewed support for the various ethnic studies programs. Herman was trained as a mathematician, and he had attended Stevens Institute of Technology in Hoboken, New Jersey, one of the earliest engineering schools in the country. He earned his PhD in mathematics from the University of Maryland in 1967. His first tenure-track position was at the University of Rochester. In 1986, Herman accepted a position chairman of the mathematics department at Pennsylvania State University. Prior to coming to the U of I, Herman also served as dean at the University of Maryland in College Park from 1990 to 1998.

---


Herman wanted the U of I to compete for faculty, students, and resources worldwide. —he thought the lack of diversity on campus limited the U of I’s ability to do that. In 1999 one of the Provost Office’s first initiatives was to found a committee on diversity. In 2000 the committee developed into the Center for Democracy and Multicultural Studies (CDMS). Herman was attentive to the disproportionate annual operating budget of each of the ethnic studies program. He made an executive decision to increase and stabilize their budget. He committed approximately $160,000 to each program in reoccurring support. Unfortunately, just as ethnic studies programs began to improve, another economic downturn was on the horizon.

Dean Delia had weathered economic difficulties as a faculty member in LAS. Provost Herman worked closely with Dean Delia to safeguard the ethnic studies programs, which he suspected were more vulnerable than others. Provost Herman did not want to see the recently allocated money taken from the programs, especially since many of them operated near deficit. Provost Herman had significant control over the campus budget and eliminated many cuts to the most vulnerable programs. The Target Opportunity Program initiated by the previous administration allowed Provost Herman to use centralized funds to maintain employment or procure highly desirable underrepresented minority faculty for departments and programs across campus. Provost Herman initiated a variety of programs to increase diversity across the campus among both students and faculty. His initiatives benefitted all the ethnic studies programs. In 2001 Nancy Cantor was named Chancellor becoming a likely ally for promoting inclusion and diversity at the U of I.
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Chancellor Cantor came to the U of I on the heels of the SCOTUS Grutter v. Bollinger affirmative action case. Chancellor Cantor played a key role in advocating for diversity as a compelling interest. As a scholar and researcher and first female Chancellor, Cantor consistently advocated for inclusion and ensuring that all stakeholders have opportunity to be heard and respected. This became one of the hallmarks of Chancellor Cantor’s administration at the U of I. The way in which he actively sought remedies to social injustice began to gradually shift the campus culture. She also was a strong proponent of interdisciplinary approaches and collaborations within the academe. She was able to influence the institution tremendously in four years. These realities and disposition would help the ethnic studies programs blossom.

After serving nearly a decade as Director, Pinderhughes brought stability to the AASRP. She overcame numerous obstacles and forged coalitions that helped build the legitimacy of the program. Pinderhughes remained steadfast to her research agenda, and she was appointed as a full professor in 1991. She wanted to dedicate more time to research and other initiatives decided to step down as Director in 2000, but she helped lead the search to help identify the next director. Pinderhughes’s most notable contribution to AASRP was that she helped establish its legitimacy and its place on campus. Although the program did not grow structurally, revitalization was on the horizon for ethnic studies programs as they transitioned into the new millennium.
CHAPTER 4

REVITALIZATION AND RESISTANCE: DEVELOPMENT OF AFRICAN AMERICAN STUDIES DEPARTMENT 2001-2008

The American academy has demonstrated a phenomenal capacity to circumvent Black demands for structural and intellectual change. On many campuses Black Studies programs have been viewed not as vehicles for change, but as instruments to placate student arousal and short circuit student demands. The reach of Black Studies across the university has been curtailed by the failure to integrate Black Studies courses into the university-wide basic education curriculum, or to make enrollment in Black Studies courses mandatory for graduation.398

The process of stabilizing the AASRP was increasingly challenging. Pinderhughes—circumvented constant threats of retrenchment, resources shortfalls, and general lack of authentic support. Black Studies programs in various institutions were merely symbolic; the programs remained on the periphery of most campuses, physically and academically. Most directors understood that their programs would continue to remain unstable and marginalized unless a cohort of faculty could be hired specifically to teach and support Black Studies. At the U of I joint appointments were offered in the AASRP, but many were non-tenure track, which posed a significant threat to the sustainability of the discipline within the academy. Cha-Jua, and similar directors, constantly lamented that AFRO was always subordinate to another department and could never hire its own faculty independently. It made it hard to recruit promising professors who would help institutionalize and professionalize the programs.399 When AASRP partnered with another department to create a new position, the tenure-granting partner could leverage its resources strategically at the expense or exploitation of the AASRP.400 The process of hiring new
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faculty became a tedious, and even when administrators were supportive, AASRP struggled to develop into a full-fledged program. Even when they attracted good faculty, attrition was an ongoing problem.

Some Black Studies programs on other campuses had a lackluster start but blossomed under strong leadership and institutional support. At other universities—including the U of I—it took almost three decades to gain some stability and continuity of leadership. Many of the struggling Black Studies programs lacked a clear overarching definition of program goals. For one thing, they failed to define what constituted good pedagogy, leaving it to the discretion of the faculty. This chapter explores the maturation of the AASRP at the U of I through the examination of leadership—curriculum and course development, student/faculty engagement, and the manifestation of Black Studies initiatives across campus and the community. The major questions guiding this section are: what are the ways in which leadership supports or undermines efforts towards program growth? What are the philosophical and ideological underpinnings of Black Studies research at the U of I as it achieves Departmental status?
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Patricia Collins—when discussing Black feminist thought—argues that Black women are required to prove their legitimacy not only to the Black community, but to the larger society in order to be considered in the historical narrative. She states that a large part of proving the legitimacy of a group is to have a clear definition of what that group is.

Contextualizing Leadership

The U of I has staked claim to being a preeminent institution of research and innovation. During his inaugural address in 1867, President John Milton Gregory proclaimed that the institution would support the growth of technical and scientific discoveries. As a land grant institution, the school’s mission has been to serve the public and produce knowledge that is applicable to voters’ lives. Early interpretations of this declaration, however, omitted or disregarded anyone who was disenfranchised. Those overlooked included women, African Americans, Latinos, American Indians, and Asian Americans. Though U of I administrators, students, faculty, and community members have continued to make great strides towards inclusivity, enhancing the quality of education and the experiences for all who engage the institution, the full, inclusive realization of the university’s mission remains elusive. Each generation of students, faculty and administrators has altered the identity and ideology of the university. The university, in turn, has changed the people it serves.

The 1969 insurgency, embodying Black Power ideology and its mission to decimate the architectural frameworks of White supremacy, had a profound impact on the ways in which the U of I administration responded to ideological differences. It forced them to subsequently adopt mechanisms to manage diversity. Black Studies was the principal means to engage sustained efforts to achieve institutional transformation towards academic pluralism and diversity. Black Studies at the U of I has endured a series of different leadership styles and personalities since its inception in 1969. Robert Eubanks was charged with overseeing the initial F-S Commission and later the Committee for the development of Black Studies at U of I. He admits during the initial
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stages of development that Black Studies was not his area of specialty as he was an engineer and was not particularly equipped to carry out the task. Nevertheless, he would attempt to fulfill the recommendations of the committee at the behest of Chancellor Jack Peltason. In 1970, Robert Rogers, Dean of LAS from 1964-1978, indicated early on his perceptions regarding Black Studies initiatives as merely a coping mechanism for students to acclimate to campus culture. Dean Rogers also resisted housing the initial Committee in Gregory Hall despite Vice Chancellor Carter’s insistence on the location to demonstrate the importance and significance of the program being central to U of I’s interest.

The first Director of the Academic Program, Delano Cox, suggested a comprehensive plan to create a viable program that included full-time faculty and foundational support for staffing and research. His proposal was rejected; without additional administrative support or resources he was not interested in continuing the position. In 1970 Walter Strong, as Director, attempted to improve community campus relations and was mostly successful in increasing the number of African-Americans hired across campus. Yet this did very little to improve the growth of the Black Studies program. In 1973, Ora Brown recognized the importance of bringing legitimacy to the program and sacrificed the LAS 199 Lecture Series to demonstrate seriousness to Dean Rogers regarding the programs new trajectory towards academics and research. However, Black Studies at the time for all intents and purposes was the LAS 199 Lecture Series. There was a very a revolving door of directors until John Stewart was appointed in 1974.
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1974 marked the first program structure for Black Studies it was called the Afro-American Studies and Research program. When Stewart assumed the Director position in 1974 and he came with a variety of experiences in developing Ethnic Studies programs. Despite his efforts and dedication to create a full-fledged program he was met with staunch resistance from Dean Rogers and other faculty in LAS, albeit mostly passive. This culminated in a recommendation to the Chancellor’s Office to abolish Black Studies completely by 1978. The ad hoc committee that helped guide the AASRP led by Anderson sprang in the action mobilizing students to thwart the proposal. The committee was able to collect over 2000 signatures to quash the proposal issued by Dean Rogers and Department Chairs of LAS. The recommendation was summarily dismissed Chancellor William P. Gerberding. A committee was convened to search for a new Director of AASRP.

Chancellor Gerberding only held the position for a year but was able to help the program survive. In 1979 two things occurred that would help bolster the viability of AASRP, William Prokasy was named the new Dean of LAS and Abdul Alkalimat became AASRP Director. Alkalimat came to the U of I with a wealth of experience and energy to help move the program forward. He and Dean Prokasy established a good working as the new Dean was supportive in helping promote the growth of AASRP. Alkalimat’s ambition and entrepreneurial spirit aided in increasing the visibility of the program regionally and nationally. Alkalimat used the ASARP as a platform to promote and legitimize Black Studies. Nevertheless, the Committee on Program Evaluation (COPE) stated that although those efforts were commendable they were outside the scope of the research mission of the institution. Alkalimat’s leadership had a lasting impact on
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Black Studies however the program was left compromised. Marvin Lewis became the next Director in 1984 and brought an appreciation of cross-cultural collaboration and from an understanding of interdisciplinary studies. He was very influential in bridging the divide between Black and Latino students and provided an intellectual space for them to engage within AASRP. Lewis resigned after two years due to continued frustrations. He inherited the contemptuous relationship Dean Prokasy developed with the AASRP.

In 1986 James D. Anderson took on the role of Director of AASRP. He served on the initial steering committee in 1969 and in many ways continued to help guide the program since its inception. Within a year, he was able to assist with increasing legitimacy for the program and began to seek support of faculty outside of LAS. The collaborative leadership style Anderson displayed became the model in which the next director employed to achieve stability for the AASRP. Dianne Pinderhughes became Acting Director in 1987 and would become the longest-serving director in the program’s history. She was able to secure a letter of support from Dean Prokasy in 1987 proclaiming that the program would share all rights and benefits as a full member of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences (LAS). She continued to develop collaborative relationships with each new Dean (Larry Faulkner and Jesse Delia), in turn they help support the program. The AASRP benefitted from the increase of Latina/Latino student enrollment and continued to broaden participation of faculty across campus. Pindehughes tactfully stabilized the program while circumventing retrenchment, reduction in resources, and general critics of Ethnic Studies. Although the program did not grow vertically it did grow horizontally, stabilizing, and increased visibility on and off campus.

415. Prokasy Statement.
Richard Herman arrived as Provost in 1998 and sought to encourage diversity across campus. He and Dean Delia worked with Pinderhughes and other Ethnic Studies faculty to help develop Latina/o Studies, Asian American Studies and eventuality an American Indian Studies program. However, these developments did not occur without conflict and student protest. In addition, innovative and consistent leadership was needed to support the development of these nascent programs. Under the umbrella of multiculturalism the U of I continued promote as diversity as a compelling interest of the institution. Administrators sought symbolic and substantial ways to demonstrate their commitment to inclusivity. This critical development ushered in a new way in which dialogue and resources were employed regarding ethnic studies programs. This is most notable in the maturation of the AASRP at the dawn of the new millennium with the appointment of Sundiata Cha-Jua as Director.

**Back for the First Time**

Sundiata Cha-jua was raised in Decatur, Illinois, thirty miles west of the U of I, and he had a long history with the Black Studies at the school. He first came to campus in 1969 when he was a high school student and interested in the HIS199 Lecture Series. The Black Central Coordinating Committee in Decatur organized caravans to transport community members to events at the U of I.\(^{416}\) The lecture series and other programming hosted by the university had a profound impact on Cha-jua and other Black community members throughout central Illinois. After graduating from high school, Cha-jua attended Parkland College in Champaign, Illinois where he often made use of the U of I’s library as the library holdings on the Black experience continued to increase. The new African American Studies librarian insured access to an array of the seminal works by Black authors. Library acquisitions and materials held in the bookstore

\(^{416}\) Cha-Jua, in discussion with author.
became increasingly diverse.\textsuperscript{417} People would drive for miles to campus and retrieve copies of Black publications. These readings further shaped Cha-jua’s ideas around race, identity, and society. He continued his studies at Richland Community College (Richland) in Decatur, Illinois after it was established in 1972.

Cha-jua was very involved with the community and founded the Black Student Association (BSA) at Richland.\textsuperscript{418} He eventually transferred to Tougaloo College, an HBCU ten miles outside of Jackson, Mississippi, and he graduated in May 1977 with a BA in Political Science. Shortly after returning to Decatur, he was offered a position teaching Black Studies courses at Richland. After a couple years of teaching, he pursued a graduate degree at Sangamon State University (University of Illinois-Springfield). Later, he attended the U of I working towards a PhD in History. After finishing his coursework, Cha-jua left the U of I in 1988 and taught at several institutions over the next decade including: University of Missouri-Columbia, Pennsylvania State University, and Southern Illinois University-Edwardsville.\textsuperscript{419} Collectively, these experiences shaped his understanding of institutional culture and the politics of academia.

In 2001, he was named as the new director of the AASRP. His experiences as an associate professor at the U of I were different from what he knew as a student. As a faculty member and administrator, Cha-jua developed a more global understanding of the institution and how it functioned.\textsuperscript{420} He hoped he could use Black Studies to revitalize the critical consciousness of students, faculty and community members despite resistance and fiscal challenges. Cha-jua asserts that in many ways the institution operates in silos and fails to recognize its systematic

\textsuperscript{417} Acquisitions.

\textsuperscript{418} Cha-Jua, in discussion with author.

\textsuperscript{419} Curriculum Vitae, Sundiata Cha-Jua completed the PhD in History in 1993.

\textsuperscript{420} Cha-Jua, in discussion with author.
perpetuation of racism. Racially insensitive decisions were often brushed off as mistakes or misunderstandings. In addition, the mismanagement of the Ford Foundation Grant by the previous director had left the AASRP with a sixty-four thousand dollar deficit, a problem compounded by looming budget reductions over the next four years. The U of I had already issued strategic plans for cost reductions. For many academic units, this would include three to five percent cuts, without consideration of foundational operating cost. The first cuts were to general education and service courses. Second, the administration would reduce money given for support and services. Finally, they would reset target faculty sizes. ASSRP suffered a three percent reduction in 2002. Cha-jua began to negotiate ways to limit across the board cuts to smaller academic units. These negotiation helped minimize cuts while ASSRP was developing an infrastructure to become a department.

Resurgence & Curriculum Development

During Cha-jua’s initial interview for the directorship, a student made a comment that helped form his vision for AASRP. While at the Bruce Nesbitt Cultural Center (formally the Black Culture Center) a student announced, “If they did something to the Black House, there’ll be hell to pay. If they did something to the Afro nobody would know.” Cha-jua realized there was a substantial disconnect between AASRP and the Black student population. The program was no longer the only ethnic studies unit on campus. By 2001, AASRP had been in existence for thirty years. During that time, it had developed six courses it owned over the span of 30
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423. Cha-Jua, interview with author.

years. The program had approximately six faculty, and those individuals worked only fifty percent of their time with AASRP. The rest of their time was owned by their joint appointments with other departments in LAS. When he took his new post, Cha-jua created a strategic plan for the AASRP, and he centered it on generating a sense of presence, loyalty, and engagement on the part of Black students, hoping to reconnect them to the program.

His second objective was to hire more faculty and expand curricular offerings, intending to finally create an undergraduate major as well as a graduate program. He decided to focus his recruitment primarily on history and social science, though he would also include art. Cha-jua insisted that a research institution like the U of I would find traditional disciplines more credible. In 2004, AASRP aimed to develop a full range of degrees, including an independent Bachelor of Arts with a minor or certificate in Black Women & Gender Studies; a graduate concentration in African American Studies; and eventually a collaborative Ph.D. with the programs that study racialized communities and women and gender.

New course development was essential for getting students back into the program. ASSRP faculty worked to develop new course proposals. Several at the graduate level were submitted between 2004-2006. Cha-jua visited student organizations and met with a variety of different groups on campus within the first year, talking to them, the changes being made, and “trying to sell students on the idea that it was a new day for the program” He encouraged them to be part of the vision.

---
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His plan seemed to work. AASRP grew rapidly over the next seven years. From 2001-2008, the program faculty increased from six to twenty-one with 12.35 full-time equivalents (FTE). The program also transitioned from six courses to fifty-seven courses. The initial classes which AASRP focused on were the introductory classes typically taken by undergraduates: AFRO100: Introduction to African-American Studies and AFRO101: Black America, 1619-present. Both were three credit hour courses. AFRO100 was an “interdisciplinary introduction to the basic concepts and literature in the disciplines covered by African-American studies surveys the major approaches to the study African Americans across several academic disciplines including economics, education, psychology, literature, political, science, sociology and others.” The class used multiple faculty to facilitate the course from a variety of social science perspectives, and it met general education requirements for students, which helped make it popular.

In addition to encouraging faculty to develop classes that met general education requirements, he asked them to work on core courses that could be cross-listed in other departments. AFRO101, which was cross-listed in history, did both. It also spoke to the philosophy behind the trajectory of the program by prompting students to analyze the Black experience through power relationships, both material and ideological. It also broke apart the structural mechanisms that maintain and leverage difference according to race, class, and gender:

surveys the African American experience from the West African background to contemporary times. The course traces the lived experiences of African Americans. It examines why and how African peoples were incorporated into the United States of
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America. It examines the formation of slavery and subsequent systems of racial oppression. This course provides a materialist framework for understanding the dialectical relationship between changing structures of U.S. capitalist political economy, the structures and ideologies of racial oppression, and the self emancipatory practices of African American people. It delineates the elements of racial oppression, including both its structural and ideological apparatuses and offers a conceptualization of the periods and stages of African American historical development. AFRO 101 explores the processes by which diverse African ethnicities transformed themselves into one people, African Americans and created and maintained a distinct culture. The course explores the forces that both unify and fragment African American people. Consequently, much attention is given to Black women and questions of gender; Black workers and issues of class; and youth and generational conflict. Furthermore, this will examine the nationalist and radical wings of the Black Freedom Movement as well as the traditional liberal organizations.\footnote{University of Illinois Curriculum Booklet.}

Course enrollments in AASRP steadily increased. In 2002, approximately 1,649 were enrolled.\footnote{AFRO Course Enrollment, 2002-2013.} By 2006, that number jumped to 2,797, a 69.6% increase in four years.\footnote{AFRO Course Enrollment, 2002-2013.}

In 2003, Provost Herman and Chancellor Cantor decided to provide two tenured positions to each of the ethnic studies programs. AASRP and Latino Studies finally would have dedicated faculty who did not answer to other departments.\footnote{Richard Herman, in discussion with author, December 11, 2015.} Provost Herman worked with Anderson and Dean Delia to amend the initial prospectus and according to Richard Herman, “pushed—put [it] in place.”\footnote{Herman, in discussion with author.} This meant that during a period of reduced hiring, almost twenty-five percent of new faculty hires were in ethnic studies units.

The decision to provide ethnic studies programs with a more prominent, permanent standing caused resentment among some of the Faculty Senate members. In Faculty Senate meetings, some professors raised another problem: at the U of I, only departments could grant tenure, and the ethnic studies programs were not departments.\footnote{Cha-Jua, in discussion with author.} Cha-Jua pushed the faculty in
AASRP to expedite the transition from program to department. The perceived acceleration in which AASRP attempted to achieve parity with other academic units drew criticism from some department chairs in LAS and leadership around campus. Some believed the actions on behalf of AASRP and Latino Studies represented an overreach of academic authority by Provost Herman and Chancellor Cantor. Critics felt those kinds of resources should not be leveled for ethnic studies programs. 437

Cha-jua expected AASRP faculty, even his junior program members, to produce curriculum and research simultaneously.438 Other faculty within AASRP worried it was imprudent for junior faculty to focus extensively on program development, that it jeopardized their ability to publish, which would keep them from achieving tenure and ultimately diminish their careers. The ASSRP senior faculty asserted that it is nearly impossible to do both things well as an assistant professor.439 However, when hired their contract guaranteeing at least one course reduction within their first three years with the expectation to create 2-3 new courses. This allowed assistant professors to work on research projects and prepare their portfolios for the tenure process.

To help new faculty reach their publication goal, in 2002 the Collective was established to provide junior faculty with a writing workshop. The next academic year AASRP extended the workshop to all junior faculty in programs studying racialized communities and women and gender studies faculty working on race. AASRP sponsored two workshops on publications, which included V.P. Franklin, of Teachers College, Columbia University and the editor of the
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They also sponsored two workshops on tenure and promotion, which included members of the U of I Tenure & Promotion Committee.

The program also facilitated workshops on grant writing and teaching in racialized community studies. AASRP explored several ideas for collaborative ventures to bring national attention to the U of I. They attempted to bring the Ethnic Studies Review, the journal of the National Association for Ethnic Studies (NAES) to Urbana. In 2003 the Program was positioned to not only to acquire the Ethnic Studies Review, but become the national office for NAES, including the site of its journal. Securing the journal and competitive grants was believed to boost the standing programs nationally. In addition the program would become more appealing to other top scholars in the field. Hiring top scholars in the field is a strategy that a number of universities have used to raise their national ranking.

Unfortunately, the older faculty seemed to have been right. Burned out by the workload, some of the new faculty left only two years after they were hired. Yet, the success of some other new hires in AASRP led to the maturation of the curriculum, and their work was part of the reason the Board of Trustees approved the proposals for a Graduate Concentration (24 hours) and a Graduate Minor (12 hours).

---
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445. Afro Year in Review.
Even before the Bachelor of Arts degree was approved, eighteen graduate level courses were being offered, which helped make the program seem more research-oriented. In the summer 2005 under the leadership of Pedro Caban, Chair of the Curriculum Committee, and Jennifer Hamer, Chair of the Ph.D. taskforce, AASRP created and submitted to the Liberal Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee fourteen new graduate course proposals in addition to the ones already established.\textsuperscript{446} AASRP graduate courses explored the African American experience and the development of the field of African American Studies. Students examined how the study of African American history developed from popular vindicationist projects largely written outside the academy into an academic field that is central to the contemporary United States historians and other social scientists who study the Black community or other racialized groups. They were introduced to the methodological, epistemological, and ethical challenges of doing social science and humanities research on these minority populations. Using an interdisciplinary framework, students examined recent scholarship in history, women’s studies, political science, sociology, and anthropology to understand the experiences and challenges faced by people of African descent.\textsuperscript{447} Beginning in the spring, 2006 semester, AASRP launched the new graduate program. Despite the program’s forward momentum, there was constant resistance from other constituents within the College of LAS.

There was another hurdle. Because AASRP was not yet a department, faculty hired without a joint appointment to another department could not be part of the graduate faculty. This meant they could not serve on dissertation committees or thesis committees. They certainly could not supervise a dissertation because they were not part of the Graduate College. This became an
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impediment for faculty promotion. Cha-jua challenged this issue with the Graduate College. Eventually, the Graduate College consented and allowed programs’ faculty to serve as members of the Graduate College.

Cha-jua recalls that the constant struggles improved the program, but each conflict also had a cost.448 “You know my sense of this place is that you have to fight for everything you get and if you’re not vigilant, if you’re not fighting, you won’t get a damn thing,” he told me. Cha-jua highlights the importance of maintaining consistency and persistence in achieving the development of AASRP. Cha-jua’s believed that Black Studies should have a permanent place at the U of I. He felt that the AASRP was foundational to providing students with insights and ideas on how to resist oppressive forces both on and off campus.449

**Organizational Structure & Strategic Planning**

Cha-Jua also oversaw the reorganization of AASRP. He started by implementing significant changes to the AASRP bylaws in 2002, particularly regarding the governance of the program, standing committees, and leave. The previous bylaws left planning and coordination primarily the responsibility of the Program Director and the advisory committee. The advisory committee consisted of faculty and staff across campus, and in many instances these individuals were not affiliated with African American studies.450 The administrative responsibility for the program was given to the Dean of the College of LAS.

The new bylaws would allow Core Faculty and faculty and program affiliates to make policy recommendations, but only those who held at least a twenty-five percent appointment in
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AASRP would be allowed to vote. Cha-jua did not want to alienate affiliates and other program supporters. He recognized the tremendous role many affiliates played over the years. At several critical moments such as when Anderson served as interim director or when the summer institutes needed more participants or when the Afro-Americana Bibliographic Unit was in danger, the AASRP and its initiatives were preserved and sustained by the leadership of its affiliates. Moreover, affiliates remained a crucial element in the program’s functioning and future development, but the AASRP faculty felt more independence would help them to conduct their affairs as a department.

The most striking change to the by-laws, however, was that “The Director shall consult the Core Faculty regarding faculty recruitment and appointment and major curricular revisions. On these matters, a majority vote of the Core Faculty shall be binding.” This was the first time that the program had a democratic governing structure where most of the authority regarding governing AASRP was held by faculty and staff within the program. For Cha-jua, the changes were a way to create a more democratic governance structure, and they ensured that those deciding AASRP’s future would be heavily invested in the program.

Cha-jua also wanted the standing committees to play a major role in developing the future of the AASRP. There were four standing committees that recommended actions to the Director and the core faculty: Advisory Committee, Curriculum Development, Faculty Recruitment, Faculty Development and Review. The Advisory Committee assisted with the formulation of policy for the program, and advised the director in the execution of duties.
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Curriculum Development Committee recommended the organization of the program’s curriculum including the core curriculum, the undergraduate minor and the development of Bachelor’s, Master’s, and PhD. degrees. They also recommended the awardees for the annual Chancellor’s Postdoctoral Fellowships. The Faculty Development & Review Committee oversaw performance evaluations—annual reviews, third-year reviews, tenure and promotion, and assignment of salary increments. They also made recommendations regarding leave and sabbaticals. The Faculty Development and Review Committee operated fairly autonomously. The other three committees brought recommendations before the rest of the core faculty for approval.

By 2006, two additional committees were added, the Intellectual Activities Committee and the Graduate and Undergraduate Awards Committee, which distributed the Undergraduate Research Paper Competition and the Dianne Pinderhughes Graduate Travel Award. The Intellectual Activities Committee was responsible for recommending lectures, symposia conferences, Visiting Professors and institutes.

Cha-jua's strategic planning and the program’s new organizational structure helped catapult AASRP into a new phase of development. In a 2005 *Chronicle of Higher Education* article “Past Their Prime?” Robin Wilson outlined the struggle most of Black Studies programs faced as they fought to survive in the new millennium. Essentially, programs at elite private universities—including Cornell, Duke, Harvard and Princeton Universities—were thriving. These programs continued to attract students and had considerable resources to hire star professors like K. Anthony Appiah and Cornel West. However, Henry Louis Gates, Chair of the

---
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Department of Afro-American Studies at Harvard (1991-2006), stated, “some public institutions, including the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor and the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign—are holding their own.”457 This was one of several indications that the AASRP at the U of I was on a pathway to become and nationally recognize program.

In 2006, AASRP widened their hiring goals, trying to disaggregate faculty hiring. The U of I’s employment of African American faculty (approximately 62 of 2000 or 3.1%) was the lowest percentage among state universities. They initiated conversations with departments such as Anthropology and others to convince them to elevate the hiring of African Americanists within their strategic plan. AASRP sought ways to utilize the Target of Opportunity Program (TOP) for under-represented minorities to hire outstanding faculty. This program allowed earmarked funds from the Provost office to hire highly desirable minority candidates. The next focus was cross-program hires, attracting a cadre of faculty who study the intersections of two or more racialized groups. AASRP faculty and administrators hoped this would help them establish a comparative joint Ph.D.458 A few departments remained resistant. Part of AASRP strategic plan was to get authorization to make a one hundred percent hire in the field of African American Literature and another at seventy-five percent in African Diaspora Literature with Comparative Literature next year, plus another full hire.459 Since Cha-jua’s assumed the Director position, the English Department was not able to agree on a joint appointment. Louis Disipio, Director of LLS, encounter similar difficulties with the English Department.460
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As the program grew more prominent and stable, the members began to look beyond the campus, hoping to do good in the community. ASSRP began initiatives to increase the program’s involvement in the critical issues facing local and statewide African-American communities. They also agreed to add local community members to AASRP Advisory Committee. Some faculty members incorporated service-learning components into student grades. They explored converting Black Student Leadership Development into a permanent course or even redesigning it into a year-long class. The first semester students would learn theories of Black leadership, engaging national, statewide and local leaders, learn new technologies, and strategies for community organization. During the second semester, students would participate in a practicum or service-learning project in a community organization or government agency.\footnote{461} Publications were understood as paramount to garnering notoriety in the field of Black Studies. ASSRP began *Black Women, Gender, and Family; and Women, Gender, and Families of Color*, a multidisciplinary journal. In addition, the program continued to build on the Brown Bag, Du Bois Lecture and colloquia, symposia and conference presentations.

AASRP wanted to expand to include the African Diaspora and Transnational Black studies, though the emphasis would remain on the African-American community. Under Cha-jua’s leadership, they planned to marshal the program’s strengths in African-American urban populations to facilitate the study of transnational Black populations within the state and the Midwest region. ASSRP conducted colloquia, symposia, and conferences to reflect their new emphasis on the state’s urban African American and transnational black populations. From that foundation, research and teaching would focus on the immigration of Africans—especially Ghanaian, Nigerian, Ethiopian and Somali,—as well as Caribbean—particularly Haitian and

\footnote{461. Afro Strategic Plan.}
Jamaican populations—over the last two decades to Chicago and other Midwestern cities.\textsuperscript{462} In 2004 and 2005, AASRP hired several new faculty members whose research interests were located in African Diaspora Studies.\textsuperscript{463} Among this group of scholars are Fanon Wilkins, Karen Flynn, Frances Gateward, Jessica Millward, and Erilk McDuffie. In 2007 Merle Bowen joined the faculty, bringing a background in African Studies and an interest in land reform in Mozambique, Brazil and the U.S. South.

The growth and trajectory of AASRP prompted faculty to explore the concept of becoming a department. In 2007, there were only six Black Studies departments in the Big Ten: Ohio State, Northwestern, Indiana, Minnesota, Penn State, and Wisconsin. AASRP outlined six fundamental components needed to transition to department status: 1) different core faculty mix, one which allows the unit greater control over its course offerings and strategic development; 2) authorization to make more one hundred percent hires, especially when departments refuse to cooperate in hiring African Americanists; 3) the ability to offer undergraduate and advanced degrees, including a PhD in Black Studies; 4) general education requirements to enhance the diversification of the curriculum a student must take two courses: a) the experiences and relationships between more than one racial minority group, and b) the experiences of a single racial minority group; 5) U of I support for a proposal that links a research center/archive to AASRP, money and space; 6) access to a developmental officer, inclusion in the campus annual campaign, access to a unit similar to the Bureau of Research in the College of education, and inclusion on the states charitable organizations list.\textsuperscript{464}
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The most notable Black Studies units have academic programs which reflect a majority of these aspects, Harvard, Michigan, Columbia, Cornell, Texas, and UCLA. In addition, the leading programs had research centers or institutes. Some faculty also planned to establish a research center that would focus on: 1) The Black experience in the state of Illinois; and 2) the Study of Hip Hop & Contemporary Black Society.\textsuperscript{465} AASRP proposed a reconfiguration of the African American bibliographer’s line to provide basic operational support to maintain a research center. Even the program mission statement evolved to reflect the new trajectory. The 2002 statement read:

\begin{quote}
The African American Studies and Research Program (AASRP) at the University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign central mission is to expand the University’s teaching, research, and public engagement missions to include the experiences, perspectives, and interests of African descended people. AASRP builds on the University’s core values of providing an outstanding education by utilizing the most innovative teaching technologies and advanced research methodologies.\textsuperscript{466}
\end{quote}

The 2006 statement declared:

\begin{quote}
The central mission of the African American Studies & Research Program (AASRP) at the University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign is to: enrich the lives of individuals and transform society through the creation of new knowledge about the experiences, perspectives, and interests of African descended people; to promote excellence in teaching and research in order to produce a new generation of leadership that is grounded in Black Studies and committed to public engagement to meet the continuing challenges of a diverse democratic society; and to foster national discourse to stimulate public policy aimed at achieving social justice.\textsuperscript{467}
\end{quote}

The major difference between the two missions is the latter focuses exclusively on what the program brings to bear on the institution rather than aligning the program with the institution.
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Campus & Community Engagement

During its evolution, AASRP had been limited by its faculty’s failure to produce materials the U of I considered scholarly. The revitalized program continued to grow, and the new faculty scholarly contributions recognized. In spring 2006, held on campus was “Race, Roots, and Resistance: Revisiting the Legacies of Black Power.” Over eight hundred faculty, students, activists, artists and community persons participated in the four-day conference. There were more than one hundred presentations, including papers, films and performances. Former Black Panther leader, Emory University law professor and Black Studies professional, Kathleen Cleaver gave the keynote address. The conference attracted national attention, and the plenary speakers included Robert Allen (Berkley Professor Emeritus), Frances Beal (international activist), V.P. Franklin (UC Riverside Professor Emeritus), and Eugene Redmond (Poet Laureate). The conference highlighted the work of important scholar-activists from the Black Power generation and it featured the work of a new generation of activist-intellectuals engaged in what historian Peniel Joseph has called “the New Black Power Studies.”

AASRP faculty began to win internal and external fellowships, awards, grants and other honors. Several received multiple awards in a single year. One of the most prestigious lectures at U of I is the Center for Advance Studies Miller Comm Lecture series. Each year, the African American Studies and Research Program submitted a proposal to bring a highly regarded academic, artist or activist to campus. In the 2007 spring semester, CAS/AASRP hosted Dr. Joy James, John B. and John T. McCoy Presidential Professor of Africana Studies & College
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Professor in Political Science, at Williams College. As a result of the enthusiastic public response to Dr. James’s February 2007 DuBois/MillerComm lecture, she became AASRP/MillerComm Visiting Professor for fall 2007.\textsuperscript{471} AASRP also launched a fall symposium, the Ida B. Wells-Barnett Lecture. At the inaugural event, Valerie Grim gave the keynote lecture, “The State of Black Women in America.” In addition to engaging the campus, AASRP created programming for the local community. They facilitated a biennial summer institute for Illinois teachers and a summer scholars’ institute.

While Cha-jua was Director, some students, faculty and community members were fighting to remove Chief Illiniwek as the school’s mascot, arguing that it symbolized the vestiges of racism, paternalism, and White hegemony on campus. Chancellor Cantor was committed to the idea of creating a more inclusive campus. Her administration was notable for encouraging diversity and cross campus collaborations. Chancellor Cantor stated that advocating for diversity and equitable relationships has been a guiding principle throughout her career. She helped push the conversations regarding Chief Illiniwek into action.

AASRP occupied a unique position among units at the U of I. It was both a member of LAS and the larger campus community, as well as civically engaged as a member of the local and state African American community continuing the discourse on race matters. The Program often challenged the U of I’s traditions of cultural insensitivity.\textsuperscript{472} Cha-jua supported a campaign boycott the Illini Union Bookstore in 2004 for merchandising Chief Illiniwek. In a letter to Willard Bredfield, Director of the Illini Union Bookstore since 1978, Cha-jua, along with other faculty students and administrators across campus, explained that the racist mascot demeaned
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Native Americans and undermined efforts to be an inclusive academic community. In addition, the letter continued, the persistence of the symbol diminishes the U of I’s reputation and impedes efforts to recruit undergraduates, graduate students, and faculty from underrepresented groups. Cha-jua concluded by announcing that by profiting from a racial stereotype, the store was undermining the campus’s teaching mission. If nothing changed, then spring, 2005 would be the last time AASRP would order books through the school bookstore.\footnote{473} Chancellor Herman in his April, 2006 remarks at the "Documenting the Differences Racial and Ethnic Diversity Makes" Conference, tasked the campus community "to cultivate a welcoming campus climate and culture for all segments of our community."\footnote{474} Bredfield realized there was no compromise on the issue. He left the bookstore in July 2006.\footnote{475}

In 2001, Cha-jua became part of the Diversity Initiatives Committee where he helped craft a recommendation to discontinue the usage of Chief Illinwek as an embodied symbol, tradition, and name.\footnote{476} Due to racial insensitivity or historical amnesia, athletic fans, alumni, faculty, staff, and students needed to be educated on the historical context of the Chief and the negative consequences of racial stereotyping. The committee insisted that continuing to use the Chief undermined the goals of the U of I to create a pluralistic learning environment and it negated the Chancellor’s Diversity Initiatives Committee attempts to fulfill its mission. This was not simply a political issue but a quality of life issue for many employees and students and the larger public.\footnote{477}
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To this end, we urge the university to discontinue the use of Chief Illiniwek as the university symbol. The Chief helps create a hostile learning environment for culturally-connected American Indians and other racial and ethnic minority students. Therefore, as a vital step toward developing the kind of campus environment essential to achieving the University’s expressed goal of creating a truly diverse community, we urge the abolition of the Chief as a University symbol. We also urge that the university abolish officially sanctioned use of the Chief and his likeness at UIUC sponsored events, and further that the University deny permission by any and all other parties to use Chief Illiniwek as a University symbol, whether through licensing agreement, grant of rights or by any other means.

The committee recommended an immediate ban to ensure fans did not informally use the symbol as was they had at several other institutions of higher education. The committee also requested a multi-year campaign to educate the community on how genocide and racism had been integral to the creation of the state of Illinois, the histories of American Indian peoples removed from the state, and the debilitating effects of racial stereotyping. Chief Illiniwek was retired February 21, 2007.

The next battle was over the performing art group called Nigger Wetback Chink (NWC). The group was scheduled for a performance in the fall of 2007. After reading and viewing their material, AASRP found their routine simplistic and shortsighted. The group’s attempt to challenge individual’s personal prejudices by performing stereotypes and using offensive racial slurs was greatly flawed. After massive usage of racial slurs, NWC simply suggest that African Americans, Latino/Latinas and Asian Americans are not the stereotypes depicted and naively proclaim that there is just one race, “the human race.” Moreover, Cha-jua argued that NWC seemed to have no conceptualization of institutional racism, which is mainly needed at the U of I. AASRP considered NWC: The Race Show as “neo-minstrelsy or the "Birth of a Nation" for the era of colorblindness.”

---

Cha-jua wrote an open letter to Mike Ross, an associate dean in the College of Fine and Applied Arts, regarding AASRP’s opposition to NWC. Ross decided to bring the controversial performance without first consulting people of color on campus and in the community, especially those who study, teach and regularly engage these issues. “NWC is at best hopelessly naïve and at worst insidious,” Cha-jua explained. “Their act is poor quality and in poor taste.”

This performance is similar to the “Tacos and Tequila” race-themed parties at U of I in 2006 that were admonished in national news; members of fraternities and sororities dressed up "as gardeners, farmers, and even stuffed their stomachs to represent 'pregnant Mexicans'" as publicly acceptable entertainment.

What happens when members of ZBT or the Tri-Deltas complain that they were disciplined (however lightly) for doing the same thing, "parodying" racialized minority groups? The point is, Mike, we are weary of White arrogance. And your decision to impose this "play" on us without consultation represents the height of White liberal arrogance! I do not doubt your good intentions. Nonetheless, African Americans and people of color will suffer the consequences of your bad decision.

AASRP committed to organizing a campus and community boycott and picketing the performance. The revitalization and campus consciousness Cha-jua aimed to achieve during his directorship waxed and waned, but eventually it produced tangible results as the program restructured, developed new course offerings, and took a more active role on campus. All that was left was for them to become a department.

---
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What is in a Name?

In spring 2008 AASRP issued a proposal to the Senate Committee on Educational Policy to change its name to the Department of African American Studies. In the proposal, AASRP laid out the remarkable developments it had made over the last few years. AASRP was larger than most African American and Ethnic Studies departments or programs not only in Illinois but also among the Committee on Institutional Cooperation affiliates and the nation. The name change would reflect the program’s reality. It already operated as an autonomous academic unit. The unit had established a national reputation as leader in the transdiscipline of African American Studies and Black Studies more broadly, and it had functioned similarly to a department since then Provost Herman enacted Enhanced Rights in 2003. AASRP cultivated productive scholars. Its core faculty were active participants in professional associations and had received internal and or external grants, awards, fellowships, and in addition to other honors. Several faculty members were prominent in the transdisciplines or related professional organizations and served as editors/associate editors or editorial board members of several of the leading journals in Black Studies, racialized community studies or multicultural education. The Program produced an annual report, newsletter, and Black Women, Gender and Families, a journal developed in collaboration with the National Council for Black Studies, housed within AASRP and published by the University of Illinois Press. AASRP had garnered national attention. It hosted a biennial conference, annual symposiums and distinguished lectures, and a biennial summer institute for public school teachers. However, budget cuts threatened the
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continued viability of the Program. It needed the official designation as a department to continue moving forward.

In May 2007, Lou Turner, then Assistant Director of AASRP, and Cha-jua, constructed a policy brief for dual revenue streams within a single reporting structure. The fiscal crisis had caused LAS to call for a three percent reduction in the operational budgets of all LAS units, and Turner and Cha-jua worried that would erode the progress of the program.\(^{486}\) The rescissions would place the AASRP’s long-term planning strategy at risk in key areas such as obtaining the Bachelor of Arts degree and the robust expansion of strategic hiring. They proposed to have funding from both the Provost’s office and LAS as a department.\(^{487}\) This proposal to reposition AASRP with dual revenue streams within a single reporting structure provided alternative solution to the fiscal realities that would plague the program. Ultimately, however, the proposal was abandoned.

On June 3, 2008, AASRP submitted a proposal to the Illinois Board of Higher Education (IBHE) for approval of a Bachelors of Liberal Arts and Sciences in African American Studies. The projected enrollment for the first year was ten students, rising to thirty by the fifth year.\(^{488}\) The Bachelor of Arts in African-American Studies would\(^ {489}\) serve undergraduate students primarily interested in the social sciences and humanities by preparing them for graduate studies or research.\(^ {490}\) The program and its faculty would also be sensitive to issues of recruitment and

---
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retention for African American and other underrepresented students. The proposal also promised the program would provide all students with a breadth and depth of knowledge and skills related to the Black experience. The department would focus on the concrete historical, social, economic, and cultural depth of African descendants. It served to ground students in comparative and diasporic studies. Theory and methodology were considered central elements to the proposed curriculum.

The IBHE staff concluded that the Bachelor of Liberal Arts and Sciences in African American Studies program proposed by the U of I met the criteria to implement the Board of Higher Education Act (110 ILCS 205/et.seq.) as set forth in 23 Illinois Administrative Code, Ch. II, Section 1050.30, and the IBHE policies pertaining to assessment and accreditation or licensure. The U of I helped fostered one of the few success stories in the recent annals of academic pluralism and diversity.

When AASRP was established in 1974, it had two courses and added approximately two additional courses each decade. Even when AASRP developed a minor in 1979, it did not change the overall structure of the program. It was not until the directorship of Cha-jua that there become very robust African-American studies program. Since 2001 the orientation of the program has focused on the social sciences, especially history, partially for political reasons. Those who interpret history define truth and also defined the American paradigm. History, among other things, teaches people about their interests. By controlling historical consciousness,
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the dominant class weakens the common bond of working-class people and blurs working-class, racial, and gender identity.⁴⁹⁶ Cha-jua recognized this fundamental principle and work towards correcting the distorted narratives popularized by traditional disciplines. 2008 marked the Forty Year Commemoration of Project 500 and one the crowning achievements of student protest in the establishments of the Department of African American Studies.⁴⁹⁷

⁴⁹⁶ Acuña, “Sometimes there is No Other Side,” 57.

⁴⁹⁷ Griot The African Americanist Volume 1 Number 1 Spring /Summer 2008
CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION: BLACK STUDIES AS THE CRITICAL INTERVENTION OF INSURGENT POSSIBILITIES

To enrich the [B]lack intellectual tradition, we must push the boundaries of what has become black studies well beyond black studies. The historical construction of radicalization in the United States was largely, but not exclusively, framed by the [B]lack experience… ‘Living history’ must incorporate a dialectical method and appreciation of what history has in store for us and America’s and the world’s ghettos and barrios. As well as the numbers in our prisons as well as millions of new politically disenfranchise grow, new social protest movements will undoubtedly emerge. Many of the new leaders may speak different languages, have different demands and grievances, and different agendas for action. But I believe they will also quote and honor Malcom X as one of their own.498

Before Cha-Jua’s directorship there had not been a, “full-fledged, very robust African American Studies program.”499 He proceeded to establish the Department of African American Studies (DAAS), with its own tenure lines, whereupon Black Studies at UIUC suddenly flourished with a new faculty cohort and a program major in 2008. It took from its inception with the committee in 1969, some 40 years to get a full-fledged department. Clearly, not something that happened overnight, the process was a very slow, gradual development in which faculty and students fought at each turn to institute a department seriously devoted to the study of African American history, social science and culture.

“Black studies was literally the vanguard of the multiculturalism that is now taken for granted in the academy.”500 From this perspective one can analyze Black Studies’ the impact on transforming the ideological structures of race and class in the United States. Purposeful reform
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and systematic plans for change are rare in American higher education and the basic concerns of teaching, research, and service have remained largely unadulterated. At the same time, smaller and more incremental, ad hoc changes are relatively frequent, including where student movements are the impetus. In 1969, Black students organized around a set of institutional demands. No significant changes happen in a vacuum, they only occur when multiple factors combine at one historical juncture to produce a political space for open and sometimes radical contestation.

Early in its inception Black Studies was conceived as an emancipatory educational project. Black students sought to transition from being patrons of the university to shareholders, demanding the creation of physical spaces for Black identity, that is, cultural houses and dormitories earmarked for Black students, as well as intellectual spaces, namely, the development of Black, Africana, African American, and related area studies programs resulting in the Black Studies Movement. Lack of institutional knowledge of this emerging field of study fostered antipathy and opposition to programs that incidentally benefitted the entire student body.

As a result, the assault of Black Studies comes from many angles, for example, alledging that it is no more than a safety net for intellectually deficient students with political ambitions of restructuring institutional policy. To understand the dialectical relationship of opposition and transcendence that Black Studies formed within UIUC, it is necessary to revisit the original vision and mission of Black Studies, namely, the mission of providing Black students with the


knowledge and skills necessary for the acquisition of power, status, and privilege. This was expressed in the formative and innovative years of Black Studies as it evolved into a distinct field of knowledge.

The evolution of Black Studies had a more far-reaching impact than initially anticipated. The long process of institutionalizing Black Studies on the UIUC campus reverberated throughout nearly every aspect of its culture. What are the tangible effects of the institutionalization of Black Studies? Are there correlates to positive student outcomes with the emergence of Black Studies at UIUC? I argue that Black Studies as a critical intervention into institutions of higher education have helped produce positive outcomes for all student cohorts. Following the trajectory and material outcomes of Black Studies over time and paying particular attention to the institutional context can inform scholars, administrators, and policy-makers on how curriculum can become emancipatory.

Institutions and Interventions

In the recessions of the 1980s, institutions of higher education pursued a neoliberal strategy of commodification of education and stricter professionalization of degrees. The focus became how each degree translated into a direct career field. A student who earned a business degree could pursue business and a student who earned an engineering degree could become an engineer. This rationalization of degree fields inevitably begged the question: What can a graduate do with a degree in African American Studies, Latino Studies, Asian American Studies, American Indian Studies, and Women Studies? Ewart Guiner, the first Chair of the Department of Afro-American Studies at Harvard University, wrote, “It is in Black Studies that our Black youth, especially those on White campuses, have been learning the great lessons needed to survive in a hostile environment; how to combine the training of the mind with struggles for
justice, equality, and above all else for some measure of control over one’s destiny.” This captures the essence of Black Studies in its ability to transcend traditional disciplines and provide not only a new perspective on ways in which to engage the problems of the world. Upon losing the battle to keep the W.E.B Du Bois Institute from being expropriated from Black control to become an instrument of the Harvard administration, Dr. Guinier testified that “The treatment Blacks receive at Harvard today parallels their treatment in American life [and] is no more elevated than that of the conservative majority of the Supreme Court…or the local police force.” On the contrary, he accused Harvard of nothing less than the “academic lynching of Black students.”

The critical interrogation of the racial formations and constructs within American society has been a hallmark of the Black intellectual tradition. By its embodiment of this tradition, Black Studies’ critical imperative is to transform the ideational institutions tasked with rationalizing the racial formations of American society. The conceptual ground of African American studies stems from the Black intellectual tradition, the critical thought and perspectives of intellectuals of African descent, and scholars of the African Diaspora. More recently, Black Studies has evolved into a transdisciplinary framework, one which provides more incisive insights into traditional disciplines while fostering frameworks for counter narratives.


In chapter 1, I argued that institutions of higher education operate as an extension of the state as an ISA. The U of I historically has functioned to serve state interests. These interests are rationalized through ideological means and ideological formations which, in turn, govern institutional practices. Collectively, the shared ideology of the state proper and its subsidiary institutions form a corporate whole which is rationalized by a shared teleology of ends and means. On the other hand, the formation of divergent ideologies within these institutional arrangements reflects ideological differences and contestations, for example, the Black student protests of the late 1960s. The sites of these struggles and contestations become the terrain in which ideological differences are negotiated into the hierarchical priority of the institution.

The ISA framework allows for a more critical analysis of the agency displayed by students, faculty, community members, and executive administrators. It is the agency of these individuals which creates the opportunity for insurgent possibilities within the institution. This perspective thus moves beyond the deterministic model, “resistance is futile.” This is evident in the BSA demanding 1,000 Black students be admitted in the Fall of 1968 and Chancellor Peltason agreeing to recruit and enroll 500 new Black students in the SEOP. In the spring of 1969, students’ advocacy for Black Studies prompted executive administrators to establish a committee to consider developing a program. Following its establishment as a program, Black Studies became a mechanism within the institution to transform its practices. That this dialectical process in which ideas, ideologies, and the ideological are reprioritize and negotiated also yields unintended consequences must also be seen only producing a gradual transformation of the institution to greater inclusivity.

As positive progress is seldom permanent, and slippage of ideological and organizational priorities wax and wane, the sustainability of Black Studies ideological priorities ultimately
depends on the individuals involved and capacity of the state to enforce its interests. The two
critical moments for examining this dialectic in the history of Black Studies at UIUC are Spring,
1978 when Dean Rogers and other LAS Department Heads recommended to the Chancellor that
the University defund AASRP. Swift action by the AASRP ad hoc committee mobilized faculty
and students to get the proposal rejected. Another instance was a paradigm shift in the 1980s due
to the recession in which the consensus was that higher education should be a practical endeavor
where degrees lead directly to occupational outcomes, job placement.

Professor Perry Hall contends that institutions which may have money available to
strengthen the ethnic studies departments nevertheless operate in a very top-down fashion,
resulting in the disinvestment of such programs. A concomitant of divestment in ethnic studies
programs is that the faculty in such programs have less than equal involvement in course
development or class offerings, providing more power to the administration and less to those
directly involved and who benefit from the program. 507

The unintended consequences of negotiating the fate of Black Studies against the
University administration’s assault resulted in Pinderhughes pursuing a strategy of deploying
departmental resources horizontally across the campus which limited the depth or vertical
progression of the program. However, she stabilized the program, navigated economic
downturns and rescissions, as well as created opportunities for other ethnic studies programs to
develop at UIUC in the 1990s. These programs were instrumental in creating more
accountability for inclusivity within the institution in addition to helping spearhead the removal
of the University’s long-standing symbol of racism, Chief Illiniwek.

507. Perry A. Hall, In the Vineyard: Working in African American Studies (Knoxville: University of
Tennessee Press, 1999), 127.
Hence, the intervention of Black Studies at a critical juncture outflanked the University by reshaping organizational practices and ideology, thereby legitimizing and setting limits on administrative responses and capacity. Social inequality regarding race, gender, and class is not a “fixable maladjustment in the social machinery, but is rooted in and reproduced by the economic, political, and ideological forms which currently exist.” The ways in which institutions are organized perpetuate disenfranchisement and exclusion. The question is not the reality of differential power but how that power manifests and in which spheres it operates in addition to who ultimately benefits.

The U of I as an extension of the state apparatus transforms an array of economic, political, and cultural pressures from competing classes and ethnic groups within society. Black Studies cultivates an intellectual space for critical ideologies to emerge providing ways in which to resist functioning as an instrument of dominant groups which seek to gain consent and perpetuate White patriarchal hegemony. Black Studies fosters insurgent possibilities in recognition of all realities, even the unpleasant ones. Ultimately, Black Studies is a way in which to analytically deconstruct processes of inequality and systematic oppression to better understand as well as create sustainable positive transformation.

**Black Studies’ Struggle for Legitimacy & Influence**

Demonstrating the material outcomes of Black Studies on LGI supplements the argument from the previous section. The charts below illustrate LGIs as they transition into the 21st century

---


focusing on PWIs that offer four-year degrees. The data illustrates curricular offerings, unit type, and date of institutionalization. The one of the key aspects is the selection of course/degree the institution offers: undergraduate minor, Bachelor of Arts, Master of Arts, PhD minor, and/or PhD. I argue that Black Studies has exercised a culminative effect on institutions of higher education becoming more inclusive. Moreover, given their extensive reach into the public sphere, LGIs are uniquely suited to transform society.

Nonetheless, the process of separating standardization and institutionalization remains complex. Institutional type plays a major role in the curriculum development which reinforced by the intra-institutional consensus between faculty and administration on the academic approach to Black Studies. Black Studies has a dynamic history, one which places it squarely at the crux of the Black intellectual tradition. The Black Studies paradigm that has evolved across U.S. college and university campuses has at times assimilated standardized formalization and at times challenged it. This suggests that the concept of standardization does not apply across the plethora of institutional types so much as adopted Black Studies initiatives and perspectives are determined by their university context. This context affects the professionalization of Black Studies. As some Black Studies initiatives are autonomous or independent with its own tenure lines, others may be reliant on joint appointments in addition to alternative requirements for academic tenure and promotion. Assessing the institutionalization and professionalization of Black Studies is a critical to understanding its historiography and current trajectory.

Over 52 LGIs offer courses in Black Studies. A vast majority of institutions provide opportunities to earn a bachelor’s degree or graduate education. One study that seems promising is analyzing the correlation between course offerings and campus climate. In preliminary findings university administrators realized that access to these classes improve campus relations.
Some institutions have even began to make these courses part of a larger general education requirement. There are indications that the higher degree offerings lead to improved outcomes for the campus community.
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Another area of analysis was the academic unit type: open structure, department, center, or institute. Approximately half of the programs had an open structure even those offering PhD’s. There is not a formal unit that provides structure for the programs. But there were agreements among different departments that would lead to a degree offering. Other than the open structure, the department structure was the leading formal institutionalization for most Black Studies academic units. Although there were several alternative structures for black studies both institute and center, overall, more research is needed to better understand the value of academic unit types. Approximately 22 of the LGI’s have institutionalized Black Studies academic units. Nine were established pre-2000 some as early as the 1970s and 13 other academic units were institutionalize post 2000. This highlights major shifts in institutional priorities post 2000.

**Black Studies & Beyond**

The significance of understanding the bureaucratic apparatus and operations of the academy is critical to the sustainability, let alone the survivability of the discipline of African
American or Black Studies. One important dimension has to do with the capability of effectively dealing with the administrators of institutions higher education who control budgets, staffing, and curriculum committees. Another dimension consist of persons in African American Studies who aspire to administrative positions or are appointed to decision-making positions who have important institutional knowledge that ideally should preclude them from undercutting the resources or structural foundation of these programs.

Overall, some scholars interpret the emergence of Black Studies as the first step in multiculturalism within the academy. This perspective distinguishes Black Studies as the forerunner to other disciplines emerging in 1970s and 1980s which encouraged women, Latinos, Native Americans, and Asian Americans to make demands on university and college administrations for their own intellectual space. Professionalization and institutionalization was the touchstone that demonstrated that Black Studies was a viable endeavor in the pursuit of new knowledge. Only when we examine how challengers achieve legitimacy in light of these cultural, political, and organizational logics do we understand why certain insurgent movements may wield some power in institutional settings while others do not.512

In the year 2050, minorities will exceed fifty percent of the population, thus becoming the majority.513 As the nation becomes increasingly diverse, it is important that university faculties be proportionately diverse. Moreover, it has been found that students exposed to multicultural experiences in the classroom are more apt to be successful in a multicultural America and a global society.514 Research shows that such students are better educated, better
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citizens, and more competitive as professionals. Diversity among university faculty has been negatively affected by the downturn in the economy. Previously, financial incentives such as salary incentives were used to attract minority hires. However such tactics have had mixed results with regard to long-term success and do not guarantee retention or promotion.

Demonstrating how Black Studies became a conduit for multiculturalism, Latina/Latino Studies, Asian American Studies, American Indian Studies, and Gender and Women Studies is the task of future researchers. Not only is the academy gradually changing, many institutions of society are being challenged or transformed. People’s cultures and institutions are compressed and societal and cultural change is increasing at an accelerating rate. Some of these processes contradict and reinforce each other as seen in Black Studies seeming to wax and wane simultaneously. Vincent Harding wrote in the 1970s:

Within the heart of the [B]lack community in America there exists today a set of agonies which apparently are part of the necessary inheritance of any community that has been engaged in prolonged struggle for radical change, true freedom and lasting justice. In the realm of academic affairs no less than in the arena of political action the extended nature of the struggle in the modern reality of telescoped generational change has created gaps in understanding and intensities of feeling which are too often marked by bitterness and hostility…. If we allow our history to liberate us, our past press us on, our blackness to embolden us beyond our wildest midnight dreams, then we may finally begin to answer that magnificent call…..

At the U of I some are still holding out to see the DAAS treated like any other department at a “Research I” institution. Where executive administrators take a lot of pride in the DAAS,
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they capitalize on every opportunity to boast that it is a top-ranking program. Anderson suggests, on the other hand, that “It’s still ... a dream deferred.” In many ways, the articulation of Black Studies on some campuses is only symbolic or has been subverted altogether. Further research should outline the influence of Black Studies in the broader communities in which they are located; this research can be initiated through the continuation of critical case studies.
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