

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 029 558

HE 000 486

By-Hinderaker, Ivan
The University and Race Relations.
California Univ., Riverside.
Pub Date 14 Jan 69

Note-15p.

EDRS Price MF-\$0.25 HC-\$0.85

Descriptors-Compensatory Education, *Educational Responsibility, Higher Education, *Institutional Role,
*Minority Groups, Race Relations, *Racial Discrimination, *Universal Education

The most critical issue that the US must face is whether people of all races can work together and create a society in which equal opportunity genuinely exists for all. The racism practiced throughout the US has produced potentially destructive forces that could lead to a second civil war between outraged minority groups and the rest of society. The college campus, which is in the center of the struggle, must seek solutions for some of the problems of race. The University of California at Riverside (UCR) has made a start in this direction. The Educational Opportunity Program provides financial help, special counseling, and tutorial assistance to needy minority group students. UCR also has a special admission policy for students who do not meet regular entrance requirements but who have a good chance for academic success. The number of non-academic employees from minority groups has increased by nearly 50%. 6 non-whites have been appointed to high level decision-making positions, and there are about 4 or 5 faculty members from minority groups. The problem is more difficult in the field of academic personnel because of the degree of specialization required. This illustrates the long-range aspect of the race problem which will be solved only when more non-white students become qualified and decide to make a career of college and university teaching. Other current and future UCR commitments to the urban crisis are discussed. (WM)

ED029558

HINDERAKER, IVAN

THE UNIVERSITY AND RACE RELATIONS, Jan. 14, 1969

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE
PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION
POSITION OR POLICY.

HE 000 486



N E W S

OFFICE OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS (714) 787-3415

NOTE: On Tuesday noon, January 14, 1969, Chancellor Ivan Hinderaker presented a campus policy statement on "The University and Race Relations." The following is a complete text of his remarks.

RIVERSIDE, Calif. -- Two months ago, in my "State of the Campus" message on November 6, I discussed four topics important to this campus: The first was academic freedom and responsibility; the second, the student role in decision-making; third, a new academic plan; and fourth, minority students at UCR.

Today, I will talk further about minority students at UCR. In doing so, I want to begin by relating our problems to the black and the Mexican-American movements in our society.

Of the many issues which the United States must decide, one stands out above all the others. It is the most critical question which we, as individuals, are going to be called upon to answer in this century, and, perhaps in the next as well.

Can people whose color is more or less white, and people who are more or less black, or brown, or red, or yellow -- can we all, working together, create a society in which equal opportunity genuinely exists for all? That is not really a question. There is no other alternative.

The United States does not offer equal opportunity now. It never has. We have a long way to go.

There is racial discrimination in our society. We all know it. One would have to be unable to hear and unable to see, not to know.

That pattern dates back over 300 years. Its most brutal form was slavery, practiced first in the colonies, and then sanctified in the Constitution from 1789 until after the Civil War.

Only a little less brutal than slavery were the practices used by southern states to undermine the rights given to black people by the 13th, the 14th, and the 15th amendments to the Constitution. The Ku Klux Klan reinforced these practices with its own special brand of terror and intimidation.

What replaced slavery after the Civil War was not freedom. It was not equality of opportunity. It was a kind of "permanent purgatory," somewhat above the hell of slavery but somewhat below acceptance into American society. It was a kind of second, third, or low class citizenship -- in job, in house, in school, in church, under the law, at the lunch counter, on the sidewalk, at the drinking fountain, in the restroom, at the voting booth.

Discrimination against black people has not been confined to the South. In different forms, and in some of the same old southern ways, it is found throughout the United States.

Racial discrimination has not been confined to black people. Those who are brown, and red, and yellow, as well, have been the victims of prejudice.

The plain fact is that we who are white have withheld from people who are not white something which should be everyone's sacred right. That is the right of every man, in this his one and only life on earth, to develop himself to the limit of his ability.

A non-white is less likely than a white man to be able to get and to advance in any job to which he might aspire, even if there is no question about his qualifications.

A non-white is less likely to be able to buy or rent any house or apartment he might want, even though he has the cash in his pocket.

A non-white is less likely to be able to achieve any educational opportunity of which he might dream, even if he has the ability and the willingness to work.

A non-white is less likely to be welcome at the door of any church in which he might choose to worship, even though he, too, is a child of God.

Since the Declaration of Independence, we have been telling ourselves and the rest of the world that a new and truly equalitarian social order was emerging in America. We defined this social order as one in which the fortunes of individuals were determined by their ability and willingness to work, rather than by the privileges of caste, or class, or race.

We have given credit to this dynamic system for the rise of the United States as a world power. We have offered ourselves as a model of democracy for other countries of the world to emulate.

We have talked about the importance of individual freedom, about the value of providing an equal opportunity for all, about equal protection under the law, about the dignity, under God, of each human being. We have talked about these ideals for nearly 200 years. But, in the main, it has been whites talking to whites. It has been whites thinking in terms of whites. It has been whites forgetting there were others besides themselves.

When we spoke of race being no bar to opportunity or advancement, what we really meant was that people of Polish, or Irish, or Italian extraction were being allowed to compete on equal

terms with Anglo-Saxons. That was about all that was really meant.

But black Americans and Americans of other races regarded themselves as Americans, too. They, too, were listening. They, too, got the message about this Nation's ideals. They, too, thought it was a good message. They wondered why these ideals did not apply to them.

As the answers to their questions became more clear, 300 years of pent-up anger came pouring out in the black rage and the brown rage of this decade of the 1960s.

That there should be fury from those in the minority should cause no surprise. The only wonder is that it took those in the majority so long to become aware of it.

Neither should there be surprise at the white backlash which followed. The habits of majority thinking have developed over generations. They are gounded deep in the emotions. They are hard to change.

And so, in a spiral with a terrible logic all of its own, the tensions continue to build. With each turn of the spiral, the explosions become more destructive and more frequent. If that spiral is not stopped, the result might well be a second civil war.

Is this an unreal threat? I don't think that it is. Neither the Nation, nor we in California, nor we in this area, nor we at UC Riverside, can behave as though it is unreal.

Such a civil war would not be between the North and the South. It would be between some outraged second class citizens and the rest of society, with urban areas all over the country as the battlegrounds.

It would not be fought with massed armies lined up on a Gettysburg farm. Strategy and tactics would be those of guerrilla warfare, with the guerrillas aiming to cut the many vulnerable arteries of our cities.

It would not be over in two, or three, or four years, to be finished with a formal treaty of surrender. It would be stretched out over decades, slowly draining the lifeblood out of America.

Such is the destructive potential of forces at work in our society today. Such are the stakes for all of us in the answer to the question which I first posed. Can we, people of all colors, working together, create a society of equal opportunity for all?

It is time to stop thinking that the problem of racism will go away if only a few rabble-rousers will quit inciting black people, or brown people. Or, that it will go away if only the magazines, the newspapers, and television will quit reminding black people, or brown people, of the inequalities that exist. The problem won't go away.

Neither will it be solved solely by court decisions, or by civil rights acts, or by educational opportunity grants, or by anything which money can buy. These things will help. They are necessary. But they cannot, in themselves, solve the problem.

It is time, now, for each one of us, personally, to do something about racism. Us. Today. Our personal commitment must be to the rejection of racism in every facet of our lives. We must do this not only because we are afraid of what will happen if we

don't do it. We must do it because we know in our hearts it is right. It is moral. It is what we want to do.

This, then, is the larger context into which we must place the problem of race relations on the campus. What we have is not a game, to be played like a water fight or a panty raid. It is a deadly serious struggle for the soul and for the destiny of America, and we on the college campus are right in the middle of that struggle.

It is necessary for us here to provide an equal chance for all who want to build, an equal chance for all who want to earn the respect of others, an equal chance for all to express themselves in the ways most meaningful to them, an equal chance to feel and to know pride in one's person and in one's culture of whatever color it may happen to be.

It is also necessary for us here to protect the integrity of our institutions from those who despair so deeply or whose anger is so uncontrolled that the overriding emotion is hate; the overriding goal, destruction. Such protection cannot be insured by force alone. Chiefly, our institution is protected through the voluntary consent of its members. For that to be possible, individuals must respect the rights of other individuals. They must respect the institution -- its goals, its performance, its leadership, its capacity for change. There must be a feeling by individuals that they have a personal stake in the success of the institution. There must be enough of all of these things so that consent is voluntarily given.

It is necessary for us here to decide what we want to accomplish. If we don't want to get anything done, then it doesn't matter much how we do it. If we do want to get something done, then it matters very much how we do it. Let me cite three examples.

First, there is the problem of timing. Some things are possible today. Some next week. Some next month. Some might take a year. Some, more than that. Just as surely as progress depends on our acting soon enough, so also does it depend on not acting hastily.

Second, there is the problem of pressure. Without strong pressures, even if ideas are good, nothing is likely to happen. But just as surely as progress depends on pushing hard enough, so also does progress depend on not pushing too hard -- so hard that we blow both the system and our objectives.

Third, there is the problem of winning support. To win support, it is necessary to attract allies to the cause. To attract allies, it may be necessary to compromise. But to maintain the integrity of the goals, it is necessary not to compromise too much.

I appreciate the dedication of UCR students to constructive achievement. You have concerned yourselves with both your needs and my problems. You have generated both constructive criticism and constructive pressure. You have shown respect for your fellow students and for the needs of the whole campus.

I think we can say that, together, we have made a start toward campus solutions for some of the problems of race. Compared to what we can do, however, it isn't much of a start. Even so, I would like to describe to you some of our beginnings.

Our most rapidly growing project is the Educational Opportunity Program. Its purposes are two. One is to provide financial help for students who would not otherwise be able to attend

UCR--particularly from minority groups. The other purpose is to provide special counseling and, if necessary, tutorial assistance.

From five students in 1966, the Program has grown to over 80 students this year. The percentage of entering Freshmen who come from other than white racial backgrounds was doubled over last year, with the total representing nearly ten percent of the class.

The EOP grants \$1,900 for each of the student's first two years. This is to permit him to work full time at his studies. Each grant starts with a contribution of \$165, raised by the campus. This is matched five-to-one from special funds of the Regents. The Federal Government adds the rest. After the sophomore year, EOP students work part-time to earn one-half of what they need, thus making more grant money available for additional EOP students.

Recently, EOP programs have come under attack because of the activities of some EOP students on such campuses as San Francisco State and San Fernando Valley State. Why, it is asked, should I help contribute to an EOP grant for someone who is not seriously committed to his academic work? Why should the University contribute to a grant for one who is not willing to live within campus rules? Why don't we eliminate the EOP and support instead those students who really want an education?

I can't speak about the substance of these charges as they relate to other campuses. I can state forcefully that they do not apply to UCR.

Furthermore, I am, as Chancellor, working to substantially expand the EOP program of this campus each year for as far as I can see into the future. That expansion should be not only in the number

of grants, but in the quality of our programs for counseling and tutoring. And next year, EOP will get underway with still another dimension -- a graduate fellowship program.

As I have a responsibility to EOP, so also does each student who is enrolled under the Program. It is his responsibility to do everything in his power to succeed in his academic work. His success will help make the Program succeed. As the Program succeeds, the greater will be the help which will be available for future UCR generations.

The Program is sound. EOP students are doing well. Many of them are represented in the brightest segment of our student population. EOP deserves the support of every one of us.

Closely related to EOP is the policy of the University of California and the State College System which permits a chief campus officer to admit each year, in exception to regular admission rules, a number of students equal to four percent of the total number of entering students. This policy has been in effect for ten years, with the exception level originally set at two percent. Recently, the exception level was doubled to four percent.

Although many of our EOP students have qualified under regular admission requirements, some have not. The latter have been admitted by my special action, on the recommendation of the Dean of the College of Letters and Science after he has consulted with the EOP advisory committee. In each admission, there is a determination made that the student has a good chance for academic success at UCR.

Recently, as with the EOP, this policy of making exceptions to the admission rules has also come under attack. The reasons have been much the same as they were with the EOP; namely, the alleged

activities of some special admission students at other college campuses. There are strong pressures to reduce the four percent back to two percent.

Why, critics ask, should students who do not meet regular admission standards be admitted when others who do meet these standards are being turned away from campuses which are already full? That is a difficult question. I will answer it in two parts.

One answer is that, in the experience of UCR, grade reports clearly indicate that special admission students have satisfied UCR's academic requirements. Beyond this, they have made many important contributions to the life of the campus.

The second part of my answer is this. The majority student who did not get into the campus of his choice is more likely to find a satisfactory alternative than a minority student who has the capacity but, for some economic or social or other reason of background, has a record which is technically deficient. Call this discrimination in reverse, if you will, but whatever the term, I believe the policy to be both necessary and desirable. Hopefully, the State, through the University, the State College System, and the community colleges will not allow unsatisfied enrollment demand to build up to the point where it might itself tend to produce its own set of social tensions.

Our UCR four percent special admission program is sound. It is my responsibility to see that it continues to be administered in that way. It is the responsibility of UCR's special admission students to continue to succeed, not only for what that means to them personally, but also for what it means to the continuance of the program.

Both the EOP and the special admissions program have helped to begin to correct some deficiencies of UCR student life which should have been attacked long ago. As UCR has been a white student campus, so also has it been white in its non-academic and academic personnel.

In the field of non-academic personnel, three types of policies have been directed to this particular problem. One is a general push by the administration to have all departments explore thoroughly all recruitment sources, including black and brown, prior to filling a vacancy. Overall, the proportion of UCR non-academic employees from minority groups has been increased by nearly fifty percent over the last two years.

The second of these non-academic personnel policies is illustrated by UCR's membership in the Riverside Job Opportunities Council. The purpose of the JOC is to help find jobs for so-called hard core unemployed persons -- persons not likely to be hired because of some physical handicap, or a record of having been in jail, or for such a simple reason as having given up hope of ever having a job. Each of the thirteen employer members of the Riverside JOC has agreed to fill at least fifteen percent of their vacancies from candidate lists developed by the JOC. They have also agreed to supply whatever are the special training needs of the employee to bring him to the standard level of qualifications for the job. Of the 117 persons placed so far by the JOC, eleven are at UCR, and ten of these are members of minority groups.

Third among these non-academic personnel programs is a special drive to recruit for high level decision-making positions

from minority groups. Since July, six such appointments have been made. We had been told that there were no blacks or Mexican-Americans qualified for these jobs. The contrary, in fact, was the case.

These three non-academic personnel programs add up to a major plus for UCR. I don't mean this in the sense that it is enough. But I do mean it in a qualitative sense. The functions and life of UCR have been much enhanced by these new presences who are here among us.

The problem in the field of academic personnel is more difficult. The degree of specialization required is so high. Its long-range and short-range aspects tend to be so different.

Presently, in the long-range context, UCR has two members of the faculty who are black, and not many more of Mexican-American extraction. Each of these individuals came here by the traditional route, and that included graduate education at a well-recognized university.

In the filling of vacant faculty positions, all academic departments have been urged to make every possible attempt to find qualified faculty members from minority backgrounds. I expect to have some progress to report before the start of the next school year.

This illustrates the long-range aspect of the problem. It will really be solved only when many more black and brown students go on to undergraduate work, when they decide to make college and university teaching their career, when they go on to graduate school, and when they enter the faculty job market. This is one reason why the continuation and improvement of the EOP and the admission waiver

programs are so critical to all of higher education. Each provides a significant assist in increasing the number of black and brown teachers, currently in such short supply.

There are also the possibilities of short-range solutions. A committee of the Academic Senate has made several proposals. They relate both to faculty recruitment and to matters of curriculum, which is the responsibility of the faculty. As has previously been announced, it is my intention to appoint as soon as possible an individual to a high level position in campus administration, whose major responsibility will be in this field, working with the faculty in developing ideas for faculty recruitment and curriculum, and working with the faculty, the students, and the administration in an attempt to put the ideas into practice.

In addition to these functions, this officer will be responsible for coordinating a whole range of other programs. One is the EOP. Another is the Upward Bound project. Still another is UCR's cooperative program with California State College at San Bernardino and neighboring community colleges to enable teachers who have never had an opportunity to complete their education to do so. This officer will also relate closely with such other units as Tutorial Project, the Community Service Office, the School of Education, the Dean of Students, the Admissions Office, and the Riverside Urban Coalition.

The entire University of California has made a major commitment to the urban crisis. Funds which UCR has just received from the President of the University make it possible to apply new ideas to the recruitment of minority students, to give support to the

efforts of United Mexican-American Students, to provide special services for the Mexican-American community, to assist Tutorial Project in its work with Riverside schools, and to further develop student internship opportunities with task forces of the Urban Coalition. Underway, as well, are programs to bring black and brown, along with white, culture to the campus.

On Friday, primarily through the efforts of the Student Committee on Undergraduate Education and the Black Students Union, you will have the opportunity at noon of hearing Mr. Lou Smith, Director of Operation Bootstrap in Los Angeles. This talk will be followed by a series of encounter groups through which there will be an opportunity for all students to become more aware of, and more sensitive to, those who are different from them. After Mr. Smith's presentation and the Friday afternoon group meetings, the administration, through the Counseling Center, will continue the encounter group program throughout the remainder of the year.

Perhaps there are some who feel that this is a great to-do about nothing. I hope that it is a great to-do. But I assure you that it is not about nothing. It is about the most critical issue in our Nation. It is about the most critical issue at UCR.

I invite you to join with me in the recognition of this fact. I invite you to act with me on the basis of this fact.

#####