DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 106 389 UD 015 117

AUTHOR Reddick, Larry
TITLE Social Scientists and Public Policy; [and Seminar Discussion].
PUB DATE 7 Jun 74
NOTE 55p.; Paper presented at Seminar on Public Policy (Center for Urban Studies, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts, June 7, 1974); Best Copy Available

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$3.32 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Economic Factors; *Educational Policy; Federal Government; Financial Support; Government Role; *Negro Education; Negro History; Policy Formation; Political Issues; Private Financial Support; *Public Policy; Research Methodology; *Research Problems; Social Influences; *Social Sciences

ABSTRACT

In his presentation, at the start of the seminar, the author notes that the overall question of the seminar may be posed two ways. Put politely, it is necessary to know whether social scientists may be induced to use their research to arrive at premeditated conclusions. Put bluntly, it is necessary to find out if social scientists can be "bought". That brings up the cognate question. It is necessary to know to what extent that government, special interest groups and philanthropic foundations favor or disfavor certain people or points of view. Finally, it is necessary to examine the historical aspects of the relations of social scientists of the past to public policy. Several questions are posed for subsequent debate: (1) how should a core group of critics be composed? (2) how should this basic group of specialists meet and work themselves into a team? (3) should such a team, once developed, restrict itself to research? (4) an appropriate methodology needs to be fashioned; and, (5) which few subjects should be researched almost immediately? The remainder of his presentation illustrates how revealing it might be to do a systematic study of the impact of social science upon the race relations policies of this nation. (Author/JM)

SOCIAL SCIENTISTS AND PUBLIC POLICY

Larry Reddick
Temple University
June 7, 1974

SOCIAL SCIENTISTS AND PUBLIC POLICY *

The proposition before us for discussion today is less about any particular research problem than it is about the sponsors of this whole lecture series. We intend to be exploratory, not at all conclusive. Even so, it does seem that the time has come for us to take a good, though quick, frontal look at ourselves so that we might define a bit more clearly what we are after, and if we are moving at a proper pace toward that goal.

We have been in business for about two years; but, for one thing, have never named ourselves. Such a tag may not be necessary at all yet I like to think that the center of our concern might suggest an identity for us. Our focus, I take it, is upon: Black education and public policy.

The idea for such a group may have been floating around for some time but was precipitated by the publication in October of 1972 of Inequality by Christopher Jencks, assisted by others, many others. Some of us were alarmed by the sophisticated scholarship that this book represented and the cleverness with which its assault upon the education of Black and low-income children was wrapped up in a package of pseudo liberal reform.

This volume, we realized, was not the product of a loner; rather of a corpus, almost a conspiracy, that planned and plotted its charts and extrapolated curves in regular meetings for several months straight. One of its moving spirits was Daniel Patrick Moynihan.

*Prior to publication, copious footnotes and bibliography will be added to this preliminary draft.

To us he manifests certain of the characteristics of his group in that he had made use of the statistics of social disorganization to write the most devasting attack yet made upon the Black Family. It was, of course, at first a "secret," unsigned report. Professor Moynihan was sufficiently nimble to serve as chief advisor on social policy to two successive presidents of the United States and of different political parties. He would pronounce a benediction of "benign neglect" upon government affirmative action for Blacks and others and would write in Life magazine ( ) that one of these men was indeed an intellectual. Soon afterwards, Professor Moynihan would be on his way as Ambassador to India where presumably he could rest and write another book.

In a word, we were alarmed about the role of social science--at least of social scientists--in the formulation of public policy and the machinery that was being mounted to increase that influence. For example, the Harvard-MIT group succeeded in getting itself well located and funded and in addition to its projection of a half dozen books, enlarged its advisory to institutions and public officials and launched or took over the quarterly, which is ironically named, The Public Interest.

It was in such an atmosphere that a dozen or so of us put together an immediate answer to the Jencks book and arranged to meet and make plans for a more long-range effort.

This we have done, after a fashion. However, it could be that if we would better define our needs and intentions, we could accelerate our pace forward.

Let me suggest for debate a few questions that I think we ought to consider.

Firstly, as to the composition of the core group. We have specialists in sociology, psychology, history, educational administration, child development and the Black family. But don't we need also an economist, who would be familiar with school finances and a quantifier, who is at once knowledgeable in social science and also in the uses and abuses of the computer?

Of course, as we go along, we will pick up other skills as needed.

Secondly, this basic group of specialists should meet and work themselves into a team. Social scientists, operating individually, can hardly compete with an intergrated team of multi-disciplines. The jargon and concepts of the several scholarly areas need to be blended and coordinated, if the maximum effect is to be achieved. Some of the problems of schools--home--family--learning--mobility and finance are so interwoven that a multi-approach is requisite.

For example, this current lecture series was conceived as a mechanism toward developing such inter-disciplinary intercourse and team support. It is working out splendidly but by itself appears to be insufficient--don't you think?

Thirdly, such a team, once developed, will have to restrict itself to research and resist the temptation to get involved in social actions campaigns. Please hear me out on this....Of course, our research must be oriented towards social change and social action. But we cannot do everything in a 24-hour day. If we are able to develop policy, we ought to be content to leave to others the implementation of that policy. At least, so it seems to me.

Fourthly, we must address ourselves to fashioning an appropriate methodology. I do not need to stress the point with this audience that social science thus far has fallen far short of the ideal of objectivity. What goes for social science today is largely a European development and is strongly European-American oriented.

Of course, long before the rise of Europe, mankind had invented ways of keeping records of experience and investigating the conditions of the physical and social environment. Drawings, picture writing, carvings, setting up markers and oral history are examples of such efforts.

But written history, the mother of the other social sciences, generally speaking, was a much better way of recording and analyzing. It was especially adapted to the European situation, even on controversial points. For example, the Germans could write their version of the Franco-Prussian War and the French could answer back by writing their version. The reader could examine both accounts and decide for himself what actually happened.

But written history and anthropology and sociology and political science were not appropriate for describing and recording the relations of European nations with the non-European world. Most of the people of Africa, Asia and Indian America either had no written social science or had no way of reaching the same audience that read the European accounts of the expansion of Europe, her contacts with the peoples of other continents and the establishment of overseas trade, colonialism and imperialism.

Thus, what goes for the history of the modern world is mostly the European version. We have no comparable studies from the perspective of the Native American Indians of the intrusion--they might call it--

of western Europe into the New World, from the sixteenth century up to now.

Neither do we have comparable studies from the African or Afro-American perspective on the Atlantic slave trade, slavery and the whole Black Experience in the United States.

The problem, unfortunately, cannot be solved by merely changing or revising the contents of the histories and sociology books, for the social science, that we know, is largely a Euro-American creation--especially as to concepts, methodology and professional training. So persuasive--perhaps insidious-- is its influence that many non-Europeans, that is,Blacks,Indians and Asians, once they have been put through the mill of an American or European graduate school, come out thinking and writing from the European perspective.

Thus, any one who wishes to look at human experience from a universal, or say, a Black perspective will need to be careful of falling into the trap of the techniques and interpretations, approaches and procedures of the very scholars whose work he would want to correct.

For example, just about all studies of the Black family in America compare or contrast the Afro-American family over against the norms of the Euro-American family. This is to say, that if the Black family has a higher percentage of so-called illegitimate childbirths or unwed mothers or female heads of families, the Black family is thus adjudged to be that much inadequate, weaker, delinquent,, inferior or whatever descriptive the white expert may choose to use.

Is the norm of the monogamous nuclear family appropriate to the Black Experience? Instead, would not the necessity and the struggle for survival be a more fundamental and relevant life principle? On the basis of survival, the fact that the half-million Africans who were imported into what is now the Unites States from the sixteenth

century to 1860, not only held their numbers but increased to four million by the time of the Civil War is a phenomenal achievement. And that the Black man under enslavement was able to survive psychologically, maintaining himself as a whole personality, with courage and faith in his future, so that he could help the Union military win a war against the slave owners, is a human truimph of the highest order.

Other revisions or rejections of Euro-American methodology relate to the examination of oral traditions and other seldom-used sources. We must constantly remind ourselves, the world of scholars and the public that the cultural inheritance of researchers is often so influential that it dissolves and washes away in many of us all of our efforts at objectivity and universality.

Fifthly, I believe that there are a few subjects that we should begin to research almost immediately.

The first of these would be a quick, sample survey of the extent to which social scientists are presently involved in the making of social policy on the part of the federal government. Do not almost all of the cabinet department have research components? Are not extensive research grants made by these departments to university professors? What roles do social scientists play in the innumerable commissions, hearings and White House conferences that occur? It would appear that nowadays no question of moment is decided on the basis of common sense. Everything has become so complicated. Every Congressman, I hear, has a big budget for his staff, including researchers and consultants.

We really need to get a look at the general picture but our specific concern is asking what influence these experts and advisors have on the policies and practices that relate to Blacks and other so-called "minorities."

Another, somewhat separate but related question, is whether social scientists, who are doing so much advising these days, are impartial, neutral, unbiased and operate on universal principles or if they behave as did a history teacher down in Kentucky who was being interviewed for a job in a local high school. One of the board members, who were interviewing the prospective instructor, asked him: "How would you teach the Civil War?" The job-seeking man, remembering that Kentucky was one of those border states with strong feelings about the Civil War, answered, "Sirs, I can teach it either way."

Restated our question is: can the individual sociologist or the American Sociological Society, for instance, be depended upon to be"scientific" or should we realize that, after all, we are dealing with human beings who are hungry and ambitious, have bills to pay and children to feed.... To put it politely, we need to know whether social scientists may be induced to use their research to arrive at premeditated conclusions. Or to put it bluntly, we need to find out if social scientists can be "bought" with fellowships, grants and other emoluments.

And that brings up the cognate question. We need to know to what extent that government, special interest groups and philanthropic foundations favor or disfavor certain people or points of view. For example, do Black scholars have an even chance at fellowships for African studies, of the Black experience in America or of the poor whites of Appalachia?

Finally, I think we need to look into the historical aspects of the relations of social scientists of the past to public policy. What we are today concerned with,and at times outraged by,is not altogether new. As the old joke has it: some of these things have been going on for a long time.

Permit me to spend the remainder of my time, illustrating how revealing it might be to do a systematic study of the history of the impact of social science upon the race relations policies of this nation. We can only hop and skip about in the few moments at our disposal.

The first president of the United States, we know, had many qualities but he was no scholar. One of his chief advisors,however, would surely qualify as an economist and perhaps also as a political scientist. That would be Alexander Hamilton. We recall that he laid the foundations of the economic policy of the new, young nation. Washington, previously, had taken Hamilton's advice on the wider use of Black troops in the War for American Independence. But the approach that Hamilton offered Washington concerning the Native American Indian was rejected. For example, Hamilton had suggested that the President address the Indian delegations that came to see him as "Dear Brothers." Washington scratched out the word "Brothers" in his prepared speeches that were written for him and substituted the word "Children."

From that it followed that Washington would tell the Red man that he ought to give up his "savage" ways, settle down to subsistence and commercial farming, cease roaming the woodlands and become "civilized."

Thomas Jefferson was himself a scholar though we would label him more of a humanist than a social scientist. Still, he was

one of the most widely read and informed men of his time. Before he became President, he was openly against slavery but after he became the nation's chief executive, he quieted down on the subject. He never freed his own slaves prior to his death. Through the years. he maintained his personal relations with Miss Sally Hemings and their children.

James Madison was also a social scientist by any test. Any university today would award him a Ph.D in political science. But he never used his deep understanding of the political process to devise ways and means of abolishing slavery. This question to Madison was always what compromise would work best between the slave-holding and the non-slave-holding states.

James Monroe was not a scholar any more than was George Washington. But Monroe, when he became President, talked with Jefferson and Madison about all phases of national policy.

It was Monroe who cooperated with the American Colonization Society,urged Congress to appropriate funds for the transportation of freed and free Blacks to west Africa. Appreciation for his help in the founding of Liberia is reflected in the name of the capital of that Black nation, Monrovia.

As many Blacks,contemporary to James Monroe,said: His heart was in the right place but he should have cooperated with such ones as Paul Cuffe, a Black man who actually transported Blacks, who under their own initiative, wanted to go to or go back to their African homeland. The Colonization Society was run by whites, many of whom were mainly interested in getting freed and free Blacks out of this country.

John Quincy Adams was another of our early presidents who was sufficiently trained so that he would fall into the general category of a social scientist. His impact upon the Black situation during his presidency was almost nil. However, after his years in the White House, he returned to the U. S. House of Representatives. This is where he shone as the chief vechicle through which the Black people of the nation presented petition after petition, contesting their mistreatment--often as a result of government policy or non-policy.

Thomas R. Dew was one of the first professional social scientists to receive national attention for his advice on public policy relating to Blacks. After the Nat Turner Rebellion of 1831, the Virginia legislature faced up to the question of whether it should take the drastic step and actually abolish slavery. It asked Professor Dew of William and Mary College for a scholarly opinion. Characteristically and in the best tradition of the social sciences, he summarized the pros and the cons. He was remarkably objective. Perhaps if he or somebody else had come up with a plan of what to do about a state full of freed Blacks, abolition might have won. The apprehension of Black power plus the economic interests of the large slave owners tipped the balance in favor of continuing slavery and adding to it a rigid and brutal policing system.

Virginia's decision served as a watershed for the whole South. Either it had to get rid of slavery or make it an unquestionable way of life. As we know, the latter was decided on. Subsequently, all organs of public opinion were corralled to close ranks. Scholars as well as preachers and journalists were recruited and organized

to elaborate a proslavery argument. Dissent was wiped out or driven underground. Thus from 1832 to 1860 the South was a closed society on the Black-White question. One of its notorious efforts was to use the figures of the census of 1840 to prove that the percentage of Black mental defectives was greater in the "free North" than in the "slave South." The hoax [illegible] for a while but was finally exposed.

George Fitzhugh made quite a contribution to the proslavery propaganda by a book he had printed in 1854. It was the first book published in this country that had the word sociology in its title: Sociology for the South. That same year another Southerner, Henry Hughes, published his book that was entitled: A Treatise on Sociology. He was also a defender of slavery.

Fitzhugh came of a family of large land owners. His education was mainly in the classics. But he outdid most of his contemporaries by recommending--perhaps with tongue in cheek--that the slave system that had worked so well with Blacks in the South might be applied by industrialists in the North, who were having trouble with native-born white and immigrant labor.

It is interesting to note that the Northern answer to the proslavery intellectual offensive was more a condemnation of slavery as an economic and human relations system rather than an affirmation of the capabilities and abilities of Africans and Afro-American as individuals and organized societies.

Despite everything, the free and enslaved Afro-Americans broke through this anti-Black barrage by their demonstration of the so-called higher human qualities during the American Civil War. They mounted a drive that went beyond minimal survival. The objectives of the

Black thrust were for freedom, full citizenship and strong institutional life--the legalized family, viable churches and faternal orders, farm and home ownership, political participation.

It is a pity that no historian has told us how remarkable were the achievements of the ex-slaves during their first decades after 1865. It looked for a while that the Black drive would succeed: the Constitution was thrice amended, a strong civil rights act was passed and some 22 Blacks won seats in Congress. And so on.

The reactionary forces in government and big business in alliance with the large land owners of the South, mobilized anti-Black sentiment so as to blunt, then break, the upward swing of the Blacks toward equality in a truly participatory democracy. No such new society was wanted. What was really desired was a reservior of landless farm laborers and unskilled urban workers.

The social sciences were rallied for the intellectual phase of this assualt upon the Black initiative. It was indeed a comprehensive offensive--economic, political, social and cultural. These were history books, sociological surveys and from them, novels and dramas. The black-faced ministrel supplied the crowning touch of ridicule.

Social Darwinism proved to be perhaps the most effective instrument at hand for the scholars. Its growth was intimately associated with the development of American social science. It had deep roots in Germany and Britain.

From the 1850's to the turn of the century, American historians made a pilgrimage to German universities for the final finish to their scholarship. Here they became acquainted with the seminar and the monograph that were subsequently imported into this country and made a part of graduate education--especially at Columbia and Johns Hopkins.

Incidentally, it was at these two institutions that American historians researched the Reconstruction period, state by state, and came to the general conclusion that it was all a big mistake to confer citizenship upon Blacks and to assume that they might become the civic equals of whites. Thus, the legal and extra-legal disfranchisement of Blacks followed logically and sharecropping and peonage struck many persons as perhaps the necessary state for human beings who just could not make it on their own.

While historians went to Germany for their inspiration, American sociologists drank at the fountain of English scholars. Charles Darwin's book, The Origin of the Species may not have influenced Herbert Spencer directly, for the latter claimed that he arrived at his theory of social evolution independently. At any rate, Spencer's books, Social Statistics and Principles of Sociology were enormously popular in this country, selling over 400,000 copies-- and they were not easy reading.

William Graham Sumner at Yale became known as a "Spencer in American dress." Located at Yale University, his influence upon American social thought and policy was also enormous. Most of the colleges and many writers and legislators were fascinated with the terms "Folkways" and "Mores." Spencer's most famous book was named Folkways but the elaboration of his theory perhaps is most available in his Science of Society, which he did not live to complete

but was finished by his disciple at Yale, Professor Albert Keller.

Sumner most candidly stated his views in a little book that he called What Social Classes Owe to Each Other. In it he had a chapter entitled: "That it is not Wicked to be Rich" and another: "That We Must Have Few Men, if We Want Strong Men," and another: "That He Who Would be Well Taken Care of Must Take Care of Himself."

Sumner's theory and philosophy of the survival of the fittest, applied to the world of man what Darwin believed that he had found to be true in the world of plants and animals. As for American society, no pity or help should be wasted on failures and delinquents, for if the human race was to improve, the unfit should be sluffed off. A basic assumption was that the Euro-American represented the highest and best and most civilized of mankind. It was up to the individual to achieve or perish. Charity and reform were futile and merely misdirected sentiment.

Perhaps one of the largest and most convincing statistical documentations of Social Darwinism was the Army-Alpha test for all draftees of World War I. Its results "proved" that Blacks were not as smart as whites. This, of course, confirmed what everyone felt he already knew from "common sense."

It took a whole generation of scholarship before the weaknesses of this test were accepted as fatal to its theory. It was hard for some scholars to realize that Northern Blacks scored higher than Southern whites and that urban Blacks scored higher than rural whites. Perhaps, after all,the environment played a part in I.Q. test scores.

I do not mean to suggest by these illustrations that the influence of social scientists upon public policy has been wholly negative, though, unfortunately, this appears to have been the main tendency. Happily, we have always had challenges and challengers to the scholarly backup of anti-Black and anti-common man politics.

We even have to give a plus to President Herbert Hoover's Recent Social Trends as a systematic involvement of organized research to serve the ends of better government, despite the fact that this massive work touched upon the Black Question ever-so-lightly.

Perhaps this deficiency was repaired by Franklin D. Roosevelt's "Brain Trust" that was more socially responsive to the needs of poor and non-middle-class whites.

Gunnar Myrdal may have idealistically exaggerated the strength of the American creed to overthrow American materialism; still, his perceptive book had a positive and optimistic effect upon public attitudes and policies.

And there has been a line of valiant Black scholars, who have escaped or defied the major trends of their disciplines. No doubt the greatest and most lasting challenger of all was W.E.B. DuBois. He was not only brilliant but durable, defeating and outliving his most serious opponents.

Lest we forget, social scientists helped the U. S. Supreme Court make up its mind in 1954. And during the early 1960's, when the politics of Kennedy and King were in vogue, social scientists researched and reinforced the thrust forward of civil rights, the war on poverty and the determination of one man, one vote, be he white, Black, Puerto Rican or Indian. Also during the '60's, almost every national, professional scholarly society had a radical or Black or liberal caucus within its ranks.

But the politics of reform seems to have been followed by the most subtle politics of reaction and "rip-off" that this nation has ever had.

One of the latest contributions of the social scientists to the racism that is reflected in public policy is the theory of historian Stanley Elkins that slavery left a permanent mark upon Black personality, that induced self-debasement may be culturally transmitted, producing generation after generation of shuffling "Sambos."

This, of course, is not really a new theory; rather it is a new statement of the old stereotype, dressed up in current scholarly language that would fit the reading level of today's educated public.

Moreover, Elkins to bolster and modernize his thesis, throws in examples from the Nazi concentration camps, equating them with the enforced subordination of the slavery system. With the falsity of the analogy and the illogic of the reasoning and the absence of supporting data, one would have expected wholesale rejection of the Sambo thesis. Instead, it is remarkable that Elkins has been quoted and debated so extensively.

Could it be that in the dreams and wishes of so many Americans there is such a need for justifying and rationalizing the pattern of race relations, that if no Sambo existed, one would have had to be invented. The Jensens, Banfields, Moynihans, Jenckses --you name them-- seem to be coming out of the woodwork, rallying to the white flag of reactionary politics.

My closing thought is that if we are to defeat them <u>at the intellectual level</u>, we will have to master the more sophisticated skills of social science and revise, adapt, and at times, reject them so that scholarship may indeed serve the needs of mankind universally.

VI. SOCIAL SCIENTISTS AND PUBLIC POLICY

Larry Reddick

Participants in Seminar

Ron Edmonds -	Center for Urban Studies, Harvard University
Bernard Anderson -	Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania
Monique Garrity -	Department of Economics, University of Massachusetts at Boston
James Comer -	Yale Child Study Center, Yale University
Blenda Wilson -	Graduate School of Education, Harvard University
Barbara Hatton -	Administration and Policy Analysis, Stanford University
Don Nakanishi -	graduate student in Political Science, Harvard University, and member, Asian-American Studies Center, University of California at Los Angeles
Sam Warner -	Boston University
Roosevelt Steptoe -	Center for Economic Research, Southern University
Kenneth Tollet -	Director, Institute for the Study of Educational Policy, Howard University
Eloise Cornelius -	Graduate School of Social Work, University of Illinois
Vivian Johnson -	Graduate School of Education, Harvard University
Charles Willie -	Department of Sociology, Syracuse University
John Boone -	Boston University, and Director of Urban Affairs, WNAC-TV
Larry Reddick -	Professor, Department of History, Temple University

Ron Edmonds: Does anybody have any questions or comments or responses?

Bernard Anderson: I have one, Ron. I noticed in Dr. Reddick's definition of a court ruling, he did not identify the political scientist as a component of that group, and recognizing the political naivete of people of color, and if we are going to be developing public policy recommendations or social policy

recommendations, it seems to me that that ought to be a component of the court ruling, and I just wanted to know your opinion on that.

Larry Reddick: Well, I'd like to brush aside your negative comment about political naivete and say that I believe in the core group. We do have political science represented. Some of my colleagues seem to operate in several fields at one time, but I do think very definitely we need to have that component, absolutely. I agree with your suggestion and I'll try to check out their resumes and the courses they're teaching and the areas of research that they are in to find out whether or not they have it. But I think very definitely we need that in addition to the other two fields I suggested this morning.

Ron Edmonds: Yes, yes.

Bernard Anderson: I'd like to raise a question about the end product of the effort that has been suggested here as the object of activity for the core group. The relationship between social science and policy seems to me to suggest two kinds of areas of concern. One is the development of ideas which inevitably, I think, are based upon the acceptance of an initial ideology. The development of public policy, though, it seems to me, is a political process which is of the nature of the exercise of power, and within the context of the achievement of relative compromises of the questions. So the line of connection as I see it is first of all the initial generation of ideas within the context of an ideology, the acceptance of those ideas by individuals who are in a position to develop public policy, and then the implementation of that public policy with respect to various groups which are to receive the public policy, with a view toward changing a variety of issues with respect to their behavior, their environment, and all the rest. One of the things that troubles me about the social sciences, and I speak mainly from the perspective of an economist, is that I would have to agree with Myrdal, I think, that the social sciences in general and the science of economics in particular perceive through their

acceptance of certain paradigms of relationships. There are certain concepts that are fundamental to the understanding of those fields and the conduct of research within those fields. One is the market concept, another is the concept of equilibrium, and I could go on to mention several others. The question in my mind is, if then we have a group of blacks who are interested in making an impact on public policy, presumably they do that because they are unhappy about the public policy which exists at a given time. What are they to do to change that public policy? Are they to challenge the fundamental methodology, or are they to challenge the fundamental paradigm out of which that methodology is drawn? If so, from where will they draw an alternative paradigm? What will represent the new framework of analysis that blacks will bring to bear on the analysis of public problems? That is the first important issue, it seemed to me. The next issue is, how are they going to go about effecting a change in public policy? One of the basic assumptions, Larry, of your paper is that information makes a difference. That if, in fact, research is respectable, it is developed through the application of sophisticated techniques, that it will be received on that basis alone, and that individuals who are in a position to develop and change public policy will be impressed by that evidence and will act accordingly. I, over the past ten years, have become very pessimistic about this. I don't think that public policy is affected significantly by ideas. And one of the questions in my mind is not only why the Jenckses and Moynihans and the others write what they write and think the way they do, but why are their ideas accepted at a given time? What is it that makes the environment hospitable to the reception of some of those ideas at a given time? And I think that until black intellectuals address that question, no matter how much sophisticated research they conduct, that research and the outcome of that research will not have an impact on public policy. The next thing then, of course, is the whole question of how you go about developing power so that

you do have an impact on public policy. And here, Larry, I'd have to disagree with you slightly on your suggestion that the intellectuals devote their time solely to the research. I know that you've modified that somewhat, but I think it is essential that intellectuals not only be about research, but that they seek, demand, and obtain an opportunity to get into positions of influence in the federal government so that they can begin to effect some of the change that is necessary, and I'm very mindful of the fact that at the time Daniel Patrick Moynihan published his report on the Negro family, he was the Assistant Secretary of Labor for Policy, Evaluation, and Research. One of the things that black intellectuals ought to be about, it seems to me, is being sure that as a result of the next Presidential election, blacks are appointed to some of those policy making positions. Finally, with respect to issues that I think need to be addressed, I would suggest serious work on an examination of the impact of economic policy on low income groups, in general, blacks in particular, because we are now laboring under a false set of assumptions regarding the distributional effects of national economic policy. We have been led to believe, for example, that the current economic policy of inflation is in the interest of all members of the community, and that therefore if there is a trade-off between full employment and inflation, and the statistics seem to indicate that there is, then it is in the interest of all groups of society that that trade-off be decided in the favor of price stability rather than full employment. There is a body of data available that would tend to show that black people in particular, poor people in general, are helped more by full employment even if that full employment is purchased at a higher rate of growth in prices. That is an idea which has no currency at all among professional economists, some of the most prestigious of whom are at this university. It is an idea that I'm sure the statistics would support. It is an idea that has profound policy implications because what it would mean, you see, is that if inflation

does not hurt poor people and black people as much as others, then our national economic policy should be one of supporting full employment all the time rather than supporting price stability. And if we are able to, in this group, we ought to generate an area of research that would be rewarding so far as affecting the quality of life for minorities is concerned. I hope that that issue would be one that some economists could spend some time looking at and justifying for whatever benefit it would have in enriching our understanding of the impact of economic policy on the various population groups in our time.

Ron Edmonds: You want to say anything about that, Larry?

Larry Reddick: Well, Bernie Anderson speaks so beautifully and so thoughtfully that it's easier to listen to what he has to say than to try to deal with it as an intellectual question. In the first place, the whole process of effecting social change or attempting to effect social change is a process, and I think it would be a mistake for any of us to assume that we could operate along the whole line of that. I'm trying to carve out one position on that line that I think has been severely neglected, and that position of scholarship that will not only help initiate action but will support it. It's easy to look back and say what we should have done, but I would say that during the 1960's when many of us were marching and sitting in -- which was wonderful and fine, and which of course may have been the most important thing we could have been doing -- at that same time, somebody should have been producing the literature, should have been producing the books that would have given a political and ideological support to what was taking place. We were almost in a position during the 1970's when those other people who were liberals then wrote books supporting some of the things that were happening are now writing books on the other side, writing it now. So I think it's a mistake to pass over to our friends of the moment the intellectual tasks that are connected with the whole thing. The other point along the same line is what I thought I was suggesting this morning.

Our number of scholars is relatively small. The calls upon them are immense. They can't do everything. My hope is that we can persuade them to save at least one-third of their time for research, and that we ought to do everything we can to make that attractive. For example, there is good money in going around and making speeches. There is quick applause to be gained by addressing a mass group that is planning to march on some building. But I should hope that by making it possible for these social scientists to eat at least two meals a day so that they won't have that economic compulsion there and a sort of a carrot, a financial bait, to give them stipends not to begin and explore research problems but when they come forth with the first draft of a book or an article, that we might be able to turn that around just a little, because we do need more done in terms of the scholarship of political change. Again, to move on to another of your points, Bernie, I think we need to do a lot about the flow of information. I think Howard University is in a strategic position in terms of the black politicians and other politicians who are there. I hope that there is a developing relationship and I believe that perhaps there is a developing relationship between your black and radical Congressmen and the scholarship at Howard University, so that each group realizes that each is part of a political process.

Now about the scholars getting into these government jobs. Sometimes it's good, sometimes it's bad. For example, Ralph Bunche was quite radical before he got into the government and then the UN services, and what he said to me was this, he said, "One of the first things they told me was that no official of the UN can publicly criticize one of the member nations." So that almost closed out three-fourths of all the research he had been doing. So you have to watch a little when you take these government jobs. They may have a rule there to keep you from doing things. You can't just imagine that you can go in and be the way you used to be when you were more or less free-lancing.

Finally, I think your suggestions about a kind of economic study in terms of unemployment or employment and inflation would be a wonderful thing. I have the impression you know more about this than I do. So I should hope that you would consider this a kind of informal invitation for you to work out a little outline of how such a study like that might be done and let us take it from there and see if we can't get a slice of your busy day and time and maybe make some progress upon it. Thank you very much for that concrete suggestion.

Charles Willie: I would like to underscore Bernard's comment and take modest issue with you on black social scientists becoming involved in action. I think that by becoming involved in the action phase of institutions you begin to determine what really needs research. Otherwise, the black scholars will spend their time doing research, answering those who have been critical of them, and will not really address themselves to the more crucial questions. Let me give some examples. At Syracuse University where I have been serving as Vice-President of Student Affairs for about three years, I found out some of the things that bug black students in white colleges. And essentially it's not the racism. They've been experiencing that for years, and they can deal with it. What does bug them are some regulations which say that an individual who falls below a certain grade point average will lose the scholarship. But if a person is paying his own way, he can stay on until he hits the bottom. If you're on scholarship, they send you out half way through. This bugs the black students. The kind of relationship they have with the financial aid office that I as a professor never knew, I began to see in my new capacity, and began to realize that this was the kind of thing that we need to do some research on. These small issues sometimes really bother people rather than the big issues that we can put under a massive banner of racism, and I think we need to know more about these small administrative procedures and regulations that make it difficult for people to make it in some of these institutions,

and you can only know these if you're involved in action. Indeed, I think your own career indicates this. One of the finest books that I have read is a modern history of the Montgomery bus boycott, which was written by Professor L. D. Reddick*/, and could not have been written by him if he had not been deeply involved in that movement. I've learned a principle out of your book that I didn't know until I read it, and that is that they will keep doing it to you as long as you let them.

Larry Reddick: You knew that before.

Charles Willie: I didn't know that until I read your book. It's very simple. You know, when he shows how the seamstress decided she wasn't going to go to the back of the bus any more, blacks stopped going to the back of the bus. And then you documented what needs to be done in order to develop a movement, which takes me to my second point. Again, Bernard Anderson stimulated my thoughts on this. I think that a policy group like you're forming needs to give attention to some subjects that may not have anything to do with race per se. I'm quite intrigued by the concept of power. I think that's because everybody uses power strategies and doesn't want to tell anybody else how to use them. Yet if minority groups are ever going to be able to deal with powerful institutions, they are going to have to learn some strategies for the use of power. Everybody else can use power too. I have no feelings about everybody else knowing about it, but I do think we need to develop some good principles on it. Let me give you a good example of what I mean. Very few minority group people realize the relationship between what I call table-sitters and street-fighters, and they actually talk about each other. I've been sitting around tables for a long time, and I know that I don't get any victories around the table unless there are street-fighters. I also know that street-fighters

*Footnote

very seldom know how to formulate a program once they get to the table. I know that these two categories of people are in symbiotic relationship with each other, yet there have not been any good studies done so that these people know their relationship. I was at a meeting just this past week that Chester Pierce put on down in New York for the National Institute of Education, and the same issue came up. Many of the black intellectuals around the table felt that the problems with blacks today are because we haven't taken our responsibility. There is a tendency to think that one can do it alone. Anyone that knows power relationships knows that you may have the best proposal and you may present it in the most cogent way, but if you don't have street-fighters out there, if you can't say "I'm going to tell on you," you're not going to get anything at the table. Now we've got to do these kinds of studies to show the relationship between these kinds of groups. These can be used by blacks, these can be used by Puerto Ricans, these can be used by anyone. I think we've spent a great deal of our time trying to defend blacks rather than trying to study methods and techniques of effective social change, and I would highly recommend that this become high on the agenda of this policy group, studying methods and techniques of social change. This means that we are going to have to do a number of comparative studies. See, some things that work for blacks will be appropriate. Some things that work for other groups that blacks have not even observed, would be very appropriate to look at at times. Many of the changes that came about in the economy associated with the labor movement have never even been reviewed by many minorities. So I would hope that one of the high priorities would be the study of power relationships and methods and techniques of social change. Now this gets back to the intial comment. I don't think you learn about the methods and techniques of social change that ought to be studied systematically unless you have been involved pragmatically in some of these situations and therefrom you form an hypothesis over what

happened in the real situation that you may wish to test to see if it's generalizable.

Larry Reddick: May I make a brief comment on that? I think we don't have a real difference between the scholar and the activist. I don't think it is a real difference. My argument is not for separation. My argument is not that the scholar shouldn't be acquainted and shouldn't participate enough to be fairly acquainted, but you do have to divide your day, you see, and I think I could use the example which you were gracious enough to give about what I wrote about the bus boycott. I did spend some time actually participating in it. But when I started writing on it, I had to miss some of the meetings and couldn't go to all of the conferences. And that's all I'm saying. You cannot attend every conference and still have enough hours in the day to write the conference relationship up. That's all I'm saying there. And of course the study of power, it seems to me, is basic to any study of the location of who gets what. I think that's central to the whole thing. I'm very much in favor of that.

Sam Warner: Larry's paper got this discussion started, but it seems to me it should be thoroughly re-written, and I'd like to suggest a line in which it should be re-written. My criticism of it is that you can't tell this group from any other group from reading the paper, and if this is a special group, then I'm proposing a somewhat different task for you. You know, we all know, that social scientists in this country anyway are white, and they are associated with people, power, and wealth, and they write that way and they've always written that way. We won't go through the many fashions that that point of view has, but you've documented a number of these. It seems to me that this is a kind of summary paper, and in a way it should be directed so that it summarizes what this group is, what it has in mind by social science, and that it be more positive in its direction, rather than saying, "Fellows, there has

been a lot of bad social science in the past." It seems a shame for the group to have to spend all its time going around and saying that there is a lot of wrong-headed material. So let me summarize briefly what in my mind is special about the group, and then see if that makes any sense to you.

This is a group of well trained and highly credentialed blacks who have come together around the subject of education and maybe the delivery of social services more broadly. And that's who these people are, and a statement should identify the group as being that cluster of people. Now there's some other special characteristic of this group. One of the characteristics which you are trying to attack but the paper does not suggest positively, is cultural autocracy. It wishes to speak on behalf of the blacks and of other minorities and perhaps lower class people in general, and it shares in common at least the notion that cultural autocracy should be opposed. So we already have the kind of focus for its social science questions, whether it's applied to employment or education or delivery of social services or whatever. We have a particular group of people. We have a focus which is the value focus from which the social science would flow. There are some other special features of the group. There are statements in the preceding papers of what the group means by social science from this focus, namely, the cultural setting in which teaching takes place, the economics of modern education as it applies to different class and racial groups in the country and so on. So that you could draw upon material in the previous papers as giving an example not of what the bad boys are doing, but rather of what you can do with social science which produces some sort of positive output. Then there are further criteria of this group. On this I may be further off base. I feel pretty confident about the statement up until now, but it has, it seems to me, a lot of confidence, whether it's false or correct, but it has a lot of confidence that it can deal both with large groups in government and also with disaggregated groups, that is, with community control

groups, with all kinds of fragmenting of what are now massive systems which we might think deliver zilch to the very clientele which you wish to represent. The group has a lot of confidence that it can deal with a situation in which this is no longer large-scale bureaucratic functioning but much more responsive to social situations. There are a lot of groups in this country who don't think that they can deal with people that way. They don't think they can take that on. Maybe it will turn out you can't take that on, but this group has, you know, moxie to think that it can, and that seems to be another common sense notion. I notice that Commissioner Boone is here. He thought he could talk to prisoners. He talks about politicizing prisoners. There are just not a lot of people who think they can cope with that. It seems to me from what I've heard about the papers in this series, that this group has a point of view, a sense that you can abolish cultural autocracy, you can apply the social science and you can deal as professionals with all sorts of responses, less bureaucratically. And the final thing that's very special about this group is that it is willing to submit itself to the test that the pupils or the clients of whatever social agency that you purport to be dealing with will be measurably better off as a result of your actions than if you hand't taken any action. And there's a whole mess of other people in this country, social scientists and others, who are not willing to submit to that test. I'd really like to urge you to use your historical knowledge, but first go into the papers themselves and speak of the special nature of the group and do more of a kind of summary of the conference and then weave historical examples into that, so that when the reader gets the final chapter in the volume, he's not getting just a rap of what's wrong with Moynihan. He gets a kind of sense which I think is going to be very up-sense, of what this group can do, what it's about and where it's going.

Larry Reddick: Well, I'd like to thank you for that positive look at things.

Now as I understand Ron, our division of labor, you're editor of these papers and in the last chapter and the introduction you will sort of set the context of the whole thing one way or the other. So I think something that you've suggested is more Ron's job than mine. I think, though, that you're a little more of a gentleman, a little more genteel than I am, because one thing that I'm out to do is to expose these scoundrels who masquerade under the cloak of being objective and above politics. I'm out to expose them and I think if I did no more with all the help I can get from all of you than to get over to the public and get over to policians that when they read a book like Inequality they're not reading something that came from Mount Olympus, from a very definite group that has political orientation and is very interested in politics, I'd be satisfied. But this essay, if Ron will subsidize me, will be converted into a book. And I should like to assure you that we will have the good guys in as many chapters as we have the bad guys.

John Boone: I wonder if the policy group shouldn't re-define research and perhaps we need to say what we mean by social sction. You know, Kenneth Clark legitimized desegregation in school, and several years later he pulled together a plan for the District of Columbia which of course was not accepted. I'll tell you why I'm a little concerned. I have all at once been looking at a notion of making progress in this country and looking back at my prison experience; we had progress reports.

Larry Reddick: Now, when you were a prison executive, not in prison.

John Boone: We were doing some stupid things. When you have a policy of progress in this country, if you don't make progress you're going to get put out and put in jail, and you've got what, three million, four million, five hundred thousand people in control in this country and we're doing the same thing in Southeast Asia. I went over there January 6th, and I think it's tied into economics or something like that. In Lorden*/ I created an evaluative

*Footnote

furlough. That was a behavior modification program. "You be a good boy and you go out and we want to evaluate how you behave, you know, because something is wrong with you." I think Sam Yette said, you know, Sigmund Freud came over here with his jargon and social workers just embraced it and quickly forgot about Mary Richmond and put in on top of everything, so we got rehabilitation, we got a progress book, got a damn parole board -- the expletives out. We got a parole board that's judging people from Harlem way up in Attica, whether or not they're making progress, and all of it is based on this country with four or five frontiers and you know, bootstrapping you can make it if you try. And I think that really, when I mean social action, I mean just say desegregating and all of that; I mean come up with a plan like Kenny Clark did and all of that.

Larry Reddick: I would agree, and that's all I can say. I would agree with you.

Barbara Hatton: I'm a little uncomfortable with the idea that a study of how social scientists have influenced social policy before, will demonstrate that scholarship alone does have an impact on social policy. Are you uncomfortable with social scientists taking on some position of advocacy? Shouldn't there be more of a determination of what that advocate position ought to be before you start talking about centers and the allocation of time for researchers? It seems to me that that is a prior consideration, and that is the part when you talk about the separation or the resistance to the temptation to get involved in social sction. That makes me uncomfortable, because I'm unwilling to trust knowing more about the relationship between social science and public policy, to doing something with what we've learned more about. I'm worried about that.

Larry Reddick: I think that perhaps one reason that you and some of the others of us would be a little skeptical of a Harvard Ph.D., which is not my school, or a Chicago Ph.D. who would come out doing the right thing as a social scientist is that at these big standard universities, they get the kind of professional

training that I referred to just in passing. I think I made the point that unless you are very careful, if you go through the mill of graduate education in your big standard universities, you will come out with a European point of view, and you will come out just by reading and summarizing the literature with a dim view of blacks and poor people and almost everybody else. So part of the task of a group such as this will be to begin to change graduate and professional education in the social sciences, you see. And it's amazing that some of us have come through that mill and didn't get seduced into its assumptions and perceptions. So if we had a center for research, in which we have a methodology that was based upon the universal and not upon the European experience, not upon the European needs, not upon the anthropology of colonial peoples, not upon the sociology of minority peoples you've seen in this country, then you wouldn't have to worry about the question of advocacy. But the reason you have to worry about it now is that the people doing the research are products of the cultural education for another group. And my only point in trying to downplay advocacy, which is, of course, a little contrary to my own experience, is that it's so exciting and so involving to get into these marches and everything, that it's kind of hard to get home and go through all those books and write and re-write and do that kind of thing. And so my plea is really against my own tendency, and I think we have to try to hold that down, to discipline that a little, and then we want people like Ron and all the other administrators who control budgets to make the rewards great for those who do the writing and things of that sort. See, in my research team, we will not have a party for anybody's birthday, but we do have a party if you pass your prelims, you see, and that is the kind of reward system that I think we need.

Ron Edmonds: I was trying to remember whose birthday we had celebrated.

Jim Comer: Until we get that center, maybe we had better help black students learn to operate like that Kentucky school teacher.

Barbara Hatton: You know more about it than you've stated here, what you think that graduate training ought to be.

Larry Reddick: Oh yes.

Barbara Hatton: It seems to me that that's the position to take the stand around, and refuse if you can to participate in the either/or type of thing that that type of advocacy is so important to coming up with the type of output that you project here.

Ron Edmonds: I infer from what you are saying, Barbara, that what you're really suggesting to us is that greater effort be made to agree around a substantive core, which would then have the effect of dictating the process we would use for organizing and implementing and so on, and you'd really like us to pay more attention to things like Sam's reference to our opposition to cultural autocracy and issues like that? But you'd really like us to spend more time pursuing the points at which we agree on a research agenda, what we mean by methodology and so on and so forth?

Barbara Hatton: Yes, yes. If you accept these I think that --

Ron Edmonds: You know, that's interesting to me because I have been thinking along that line myself. Larry said when he first sent the paper that he would have liked it if the members of the group could have responded to the paper. Now, you know, I think Larry was right. Fortunately it doesn't have to be either/or, but I think what the nine of us ought to do is invest a lot more time in the substance of what our perspectives are and what our positions are than we've been able to so far. I really am enamored of your critique there.

James Comer: I'd like to make several points which are rather disjointed, but I guess you could put them loosely together under something called power. I think we ought to look at why blacks in the same positions as whites don't have the same power as whites, and expose that problem as Larry pointed out the need to expose the scoundrels. I think we ought to look at the whole

business of the dissemination of information and the network that is involved in all of that and why certain points of view don't get the same widespread dissemination that other points of view favorable to the established order will receive, and develop ways of confronting people with that fact, the fact that a Jencks will get page 49 and 50 in Newsweek and somebody else who has information that would make the opposite point will not get in Newsweek at all. I think one of the important things to look at too, is the structure of the social sciences. What is there about social science and why does the present model exist without violation in any way? Why is it so rigid and what needs are people trying to meet in setting it up in that way? Is it a simple matter of insecurity of people in the social sciences relative to the physical sciences, and the need to have a model that gives them the same kind of credibility, or is it that social sciences are so structured to make the kinds of points that the people in the social sciences want to make? But there are certain hang-ups in the social sciences that I think need to be exposed among social scientists. Why is it, for instance, that participant-observer research, which is so absolutely necessary to be able to come up with even decent hypotheses, why is it so frowned upon? And why are other types of research considered the Bible, and you haven't really done science unless you've done hypothesis testing research of some kind, and set up some kind of experiment? In fact, we know from what has happened in a number of experiences that something is wrong with that approach. Consider the research on violence, where by the time they set up three cities that didn't have riots, and looked at the three cities where they did have riots, they'd had riots in the three cities that hadn't had riots. Yet nobody can question that approach. I think there is a need to look at what methodology is appropriate for the kind of problems we're dealing with, and are we prepared to say that maybe, just maybe, there are some things about human behavior that can't be measured. I personally believe that that's true.

Social scientists are doing the equivalent of putting the round ball into the square hole very often. And yet, because it can't be quantitative in some way, it becomes very important and I think we ought to look at those kinds of problems, because I think what is being done in the name of good social science is hurting minority communities.

Larry Reddick: Well, I would agree with all of that, and when you go over many of these so-called scientific studies that come out with great conclusions, very often you find that the social scientist had very few samples to deal with. I think a couple of men who came out with the big thick book on the Mark of Oppression or something like that had only twenty-five cases. Two other people who came out with some world-sweeping generalizations had about a dozen cases. Two psychiatrists who had a few patients (the patients would hardly come to them unless they had problems) generalized about the whole black experience. We have all those things. I think part of our work is to try to induce a little more modesty into social scientists who make these world-sweeping generalizations on such small and unrepresentative data.

Then I think your other point is most true. It's very difficult for me to explain how blacks could go through all that slavery, come out of the Civil War with a vision of a new society that is more democratic than anything we have ever had in this country, and work toward it and have to be knocked down before they give up that ideal. So I write a little passage like this. I say, "Well, was there something very special in the African or Afro-American that come out, or was it a human quality in all human beings which will come out if the circumstances are favorable?" Or is it that we just don't have instruments that are sufficiently delicate to deal with something like that? Because you're quite right and I think we might be a little more modest and just say, "I don't know why they did that"; you know, "I just don't understand." You can give opinions and all that, but much of what is done especially in terms of, I would

say, physical anthropology, a great deal of social anthropology, is done on the basis of the concepts and notions that are in the heads of the investigator before he looks at anything at all. Before he leaves London to go to Africa, he knows what he's going to look for and maybe find there, you see. And maybe part of our task is to try to pull back and try not to make the same mistakes out of enthusiasm or reacting to anger that the others have made by claiming more than we can prove.

Blenda Wilson: I'm concerned mostly about what I see as two strands both in the discussion and the paper. One is the scholarship, scholar, social scientist strand, which sounds to me very much like what all of us in academia have heard all along, that a scholar is objective, that a scholar is not an activist, that a scholar has to perform his or her work in terms of accepted procedures, methodologies, and whatever. Using those premises, your history criticizes white social scientists for not being objectivesand in some ways, it seems to me, for being like all other human beings, goes to describing a role for the black social scientists that seem to hang very much toward the first premises. And I think the trap of the scholar is a deeper trap than we're acknowledging in this discussion. When you look at the participation of blacks in public policy making in this country, you find a whole range of people who are both leaders and contributors to at least the sense black people have of themselves, who weren't scholars at all. Jesse Jackson spoke on the Today show this morning and he talked about organizing black ministers who have indeed played a major role in the formulation of public policy affecting blacks. Lawyers have done the same thing. I guess the question out of all that to you would be, have you considered the possibility that your group, structured as it is of scholars in some shape or form, may not by itself be able to pull away from that dependence on a rationale which your paper rejects.

Larry Reddick: Well, I'm confident that we can, by arguing and working together

and examining the situation as it is. I think if we went through Sumner*/ and pitilessly looked at his work, nobody in the group would ever quote Sumner in a positive way. Now that's negative, that way. Then if we would take say one or two examples of black scholars or scholars from India, who studied under a man like Sumner and came out reflecting his point of view, we could show that even the personal experience of a man may not always be sufficient to keep him from falling into the habits of something he respects as strongly as he might respect the scholarship of his professor of sociology. I think, though, that our main task is to get these people from the different disciplines to give up the time to meet, and when they meet, to deal with the problems of scholarship. I think many of us have such a tradition of the enjoyment of life that sometimes when we meet we do other things, you know. I play poker sometimes, things like that, you know. And you could get into these others things you do with your scholarly colleagues, but I think you should try to save the thing for the most part for what you're there for. And I have a great confidence that we will do that and that we will win the respect of the community and that we will win the respect of scholars when they know that we know what we're talking about and that we are making critiques in terms of methodology and things of that sort. That's a faith and that's all I have at this time.

Roosevelt Steptoe: I think we do need to delineate our mission, recognizing that we have perhaps more problems than we can address. If we have decided that our basic mission will be scholarly research, hopefully with linkage to the politicians and those in decision making positions, then we ought to say that, and perhaps then move to develop some of the issues that we need to research and how we will go about it. So my question to you is, has it been decided that we will limit ourselves basically to scholarly research rather than action programs? You see, this question has come up, and I think if we

*Footnote

resolve it, that we can move on to something else.

Larry Reddick: Well, to speak to that politically, I think in our meeting of the Board at this meeting today, we will concentrate upon doing scholarly work, that we will set up a series of seminars for ourselves, that we will attach to the production of articles and essays and books all of the carrots we can think of. I do believe we have the votes to do that. I think we'll do that.

Roosevelt Steptoe: That does not preclude establishing the networks so that we can feed this information into those who are in positions of decision making power.

Larry: No, no. And then we will meet with other people, people in the media, people who are in social action and social service programs, and meet in such a way as to transmit to them some of the things that we may have found out, and maybe correct ourselves at the same time. It's a process; we're learning as we recommend and as we go along. But my hope is that when we leave Cambridge at the setting of the sun today, that we will have a much more concrete idea of where we're going from here.

Ken Tollet: In some respects, the discussion itself seems shocked by the European-American perspective. The Western mind, Cartesian dualism, is stripping through here. We're talking in terms of either/or. We'll either be scholarly or we'll engage in action programs. We'll either be very scientific -- quantify, gather a lot of data -- or perhaps we might respond to Jim Comer's very fascinating insight that the explication of some aspects of human relations are not amenable to measurement. Now one thing we're trying to do in the Institute is to do two or three things at a time. We don't have so much of an action component, but we do feel that we have to master the state of the art.

Ron Edmonds: I think you should say a word about what it is.

Ken Tollet: The Institute for the Study of Educational Policy, at Howard

University. And we're doing three things. One, we are going to assess the status and needs of blacks in higher education by issuing reports which authoritatively describe where blacks are, what they're doing, what their background is, the educational process they go through in higher education, and outcomes. And to a certain extent this analysis initially will be influenced by input-output analysis in economic and mathematical models. At the same time, it will critique the methodology, and thus we'll be working from the tradition of Western social science. And the second objective I suppose we'll be doing, also we'll be using the methodology of social science, or at least criticizing social science, with the view of determining what benefits and what hurts blacks. Our second purpose is to monitor and evaluate the impact of law and social science upon the status and needs of blacks in higher education. We will be engaging in impact analysis of cases like DeFunis and Adams v. Richardson, or impact analysis of inequality, how it suggests that some people are not educable and that there's no correlation between educational inputs and outputs, therefore why bother with trying to develop compensatory programs or put more money in education. Our third objective, which your statement may put more clearly than we have phrased it in our proposal, is that we are going to try to develop new and fresh educational models, maybe we'll call them paradigms, for explicating the higher educational enterprise without succumbing to the hegemony of economic and mathematical models. And what's behind this is the notion that there may be much about the explanation of the educational enterprise that is not measurable. And we can take a word from Herbert Read: we have to get humanistic maybe. There are some truths about reality that artists can communicate better than scientists. If you look at the works of Dostoyevsky and some of the other Russian writers, you'll get as much insight into the troubled psyche as you'll get from reading Freud or Jung, and I think that since we've been victims of statistical and empirical

studies, we should be able to transcend their imperialism and not get ourselves trapped in the Western way of thinking that you have got to go either this route or that route. I think our experience puts us in a position to be flexible. I feel very strongly that we must master their art but not be overwhelmed by it and not be afraid to branch out on our own and try to develop a new perspective. I like very much Larry's notion of universalism, and I think that although Western minds have developed this some, some of the concepts of structuralism suggest that there is some possibility for universalism. Levi-Strauss has shown, I believe, the capacity of the minds of all peoples around the world to conceptualize and to think in a logical way depending upon what their interests and concerns are. And indeed I think that he more than anyone else refutes Jensen, Herrnstein, and Shockley. But my main point is that we have to be, to a certain extent, effective. Blacks have a greater burden, whatever they're dealing with, than others. We've got to know economics, we've got to know mathematics, we've got to be able to quantify. We must not lose touch with our humanistic tradition and folklore and we must proceed on all of these fronts if we want to accomplish educational equity.

Charles Willie: What I want to say is almost the opposite of that, although I buy everything that Ken has said. I think to achieve something, one has to recognize one's finiteness, and none of us is infinite, including this group. This group cannot do everything. It has to limit itself. I think it's quite appropriate for the group to limit itself to research. This does not dismiss the value of the humanistic condition, and it does not suggest that research is even more valuable. It just simply says that in terms of the priorities we are setting and in terms of our limitations of time and knowledge, research has got to be the area that we're going to deal with. On the other hand I would tie that up with what you have suggested, then what Blenda suggested, and probably would come out a little different from where Jim Comer comes out.

I think the group needs to be concerned about its composition in terms of the kinds of questions that it will do research on. And I think the humanistic tradition is very important in asking the right kinds of questions. But I do suggest that after you ask those right kinds of questions, they are amenable to research. And I think it's a mistake to suggest that certain questions are not researchable. I would say, at the hypothetical level, one of our problems is that we have not asked questions on important concepts such as faith, hope, love. These are researchable questions and whites don't ask anything about faith and hope. But when you start looking at how blacks have survived to the extent that we do some research on the concept of hope as it has been operationalized, we would learn a great deal about social organization. To the extent that we do research on a concept of love as Joseph Fletcher has operationalized it in a beautiful way in his little book, Situational Ethics, we will learn a great deal about interaction between people. So those concepts of the humanistic condition are very valuable to help us in terms of doing our research, but I would go slow on suggesting that you cannot research those. Social scientists have abandoned these and left them to theologians, some of whom are researchers and some of whom are whoppers. And I think these kinds of concepts need to be, you know, studied in terms of trying to understand what is going on not only in the black experience, but for the experience of America at large. So I'm saying two things: on the one hand, I think you ought to limit yourself to research. I think the action which Bernard and I have been urging upon you in suggesting this ought to be the action of individuals. And after you go out and learn what our problems are, then you come back and do research. I'm very clear in making a distinction between when I'm acting as an advocate and when I'm acting as a researcher. Other people don't believe this, but I've put very severe limitations upon myself when I'm in those two roles. And I do think we need to draw a distinction between our roles as

activists and our roles as researchers, because as I said this morning, the only thing we have to believe in is the integrity of the scientists. And the scientist who pushes the data a little to make them come out certain ways again has violated the only thing we can believe in. So I think it's an important distinction between the activist and the scientist. I think that one person needs to have experience in different directions, and I also think the humanistic tradition is very important. It is a very important source of hypotheses. But then when you study those concepts, I think you really ought to study them with the rigor of science, not necessarily statistical methods. Rigorous scientific methods are not limited to quantitative methods, either.

Ron Edmonds: As I sit here listening and as I remember the paper, I think that Larry and my elders and my mentors are going to have to help me with a dilemma, because we do have some substantive perspectives that are different at the moment, and I think they can be worked out. I want to put them on the table. One is that in my judgment, social science, like public policy, is nakedly, unambiguously, one thousand percent political and nothing but that. Second, that the function of scholarship and the reason I'm participating in it as an activist is because at the moment, people in this society who are abused and put upon are constantly required to defend themselves against an initiative that often has its origin in opinion-making settings like this. And third, my purpose for participating in academic and scholastic activities is not because I expect to see us seize some great moment as a consequence. I only hope that we can at least neutralize the mischievous and pernicious scholarship so that the nakedly political struggle is on a more equal footing. That is to say, I do not suggest that people not read Jencks's book; neither would I suggest that it be withdrawn. I would only suggest that we ought to produce a book of equal weight so that it will be plain to those who must deal with the day-to-day political struggle of the policy implications of that book;

that you take these two books of equal weight and lay the damn things aside and then get on with what it is you have to do, and that you're put upon by the fact that this book being heavier and not being balanced by another, you get beat over the head with it as is presently the case. And finally, my own perspective on science in general, scholarship in particular, is that it is neither objective nor apolitical, that there is no such thing nor has there ever been an objective and disinterested and apolitical social scientist or physical scientist or academician or intellectual, and that what I would rather propose and one of the things I would like the group to pursue is the notion that we ought to stop the effort to produce objective disinterested social science. It can't be done, and furthermore, in my judgment it oughtn't to be done. But all work serves a purpose. The point is, who will it serve and what will it do? It seems to me that what we ought to press in the name of legitimate social science is two things: (1) All social scientists ought to have their biases, predilections, predispositions identified at the outset. That is, what is the cultural context from which you proceed, on whose behalf do you speak, to whose benefit do you intend your work to accrue, and that ought to be in preface. And if you don't put it there, then we ought to put it there. (2) The question ought to be put, "What are the uses to which you mean to see this put?" And that does not preclude what has historically been called impractical or pure research or anything of the kind. Some things, it seems to me, people ought to do because they are disposed to do them and interested in doing them and a social order can afford it and profits from it, and we need people around like that. In any case, they ought to do it in the name of art or individual indulgence if they have the capacity or whatever the case may be. But the case I want to end up with is, I'm not particularly enthusiastic about participating in an effort in which we legitimize ourselves by producing work that is observably neutral or observably objective. I just don't think

we can do that. I don't think we ought to even try. And I think, in fact, if we're going to recommend anything in the way of an agenda around which we can gather, we should quit that and start to talk about identifying work on the basis of whose interest the production is meant to serve.

Ken Tollet: How are you going to gain adherence?

Ron Edmonds: Well now, that's a proper question and I think it ought to be pursued, but we'll lay it aside for the moment.

Monique Garrity: I support what you just said, but I think it's very instructive to look at the development of social sciences, for example, in Latin America. I happen to be familiar with this because my own field is economic development in Latin America and Africa. And I think after the second World War, when there was a great interest in economic development of these countries, all of the models developed in the United States and Western Europe were used as a basis for policy. We might mention Rostow, The Stages of Economic Growth*/, so all of a sudden we assume that this country is where the United States was two hundred years ago. But this is a fiction. And I think little by little, the Latin American economies started to question all the assumptions, the assumption that each country was autonomous, that you could deal with Brazil in isolation, with Brazil's integration into the world capitalist system, for example. They have very often a whole new approach to these problems that obviously this is strictly in terms of the problems of the less developed countries. And the dependency approach that they have developed cannot be applied in the United States. It's not a universal approach. But it's an approach which addresses itself to the problems of these countries and gives an answer to a lot of these problems and now can be used for policy purposes. So I do think it's a fiction to talk about totally objective social sciences and about universal social science. I would agree with you.

---

*Footnote

Don Nakanishi: I think Asian-American scholars in the past have learned a great deal from blacks. In my participation here I've learned a great deal, not only about how black intellectuals and policy makers are looking at current questions. Other things I don't find too enlightening, but I would reaffirm what Ron was saying, in relation to this institute or to this center that is being formed, that more explicit consideration be paid to really answering the questions, research for what and for whom? And I think discussion up until then dealt a great deal with methodology, be it scientific or non-scientific, with different programmatic things, but really didn't deal with the whole question of purpose and also the question of who do you serve. I think that has to be an overriding consideration of any kind of institute that's formed or any kind of program that's formed.

Sam Warner: In the Latin American case, the reason that the imported model was not continued is that it didn't work and these people were in some way accountable for the fact that it didn't work. Now it seems to me if you set up a research institute to do scholarly work, you're all human beings, and unless you also build into it some clear statement and perhaps even some process whereby the research that goes on is directed toward someone and then is questioned by that very constituency that it's supposed to help, then you'll become as abstract and academic as the rest of us.

Charles Willie: Well, I don't think that's bad. I want to be ahead on that. I don't think it's bad to be abstract and academic. You know, it's my standard joke that when they let blacks into white churches, they pulled a hoax on them. They turned around and told them God's dead. Harvard's been going on for years being abstract and academic, and now that blacks are getting in, we're saying let's stop that. I think I'm in accord here with Larry. I think there has to be research, and the only way you can believe what any scholar presents is his integrity of saying "I tried to not let my biases interfere but tried to

see the day that they were there." Now he may not be able to do it completely, but that's what he strives for. And he doesn't select and exclude material that will make certain cases but would not make others. I think that's the only hope you have of reading any scholar's output and having any belief in it. I do agree that the questions you select to study grow out of value systems, and I agree that what you do with what you find is linked up with value systems, but in the analysis, if the person does not attempt to try to be as objective as that person can be, then you have difficulty because no one is going to believe. It will be another propaganda trap.

Barbara Hatton: But aren't there methodologies by which you can avoid that? As a researcher--

Charles Willie: No, that's the point I'm making. You cannot make mechanical what is human. The striving toward objectivity is a human quality, and no amount of statistics or any other kind of thing will achieve it. It's only the individual scholar who has got to say, "I'm going to try to do it as much as I can, in the analysis."

Barbara Hatton: That's a question I wish we could pursue; I know we can't. Is it an individual situation? That's the question that ought to be raised once again. Is it an individual responsibility? It seems to me that we have not done enough thinking about that particular component of it. Of course it's human, but is the cogent factor the individualism in research or not? That seems to be the trap.

Charles Willie: Well, that was the reason why the group is of some value. Everyone ought to be anxious about being honest, and anybody that tells you they're going to be honest on their own, I question. And this is one thing the group's got to do. The group's got to make sure that its members are striving to be honest. Lazarsfeld presented some excellent material several years ago in The American Soldier. He found that the common sense beliefs

everybody agreed with, research had actually found the exact opposite. I found in some of my own research that the push for separate black housing or predominantly white college campuses is dangerous. Now that's not popular to say. But if blacks have a need to have separate housing because the environment is so racist, they then have become sitting ducks for fire bombing and everything else like what took place at Cornell. Now you don't get any brownie points for saying this at a meeting where blacks are rapping about we got to get together to be unified. The other question is, do you want to be unified and wiped out at the same time? That kind of research has got to consider the consequences for this kind of living and survival and that kind of living and survival, and you have got to make an analysis on which kind of living, let's say, is likely to be most related to survival if that's the question you're asking. And you can't push your data one way or the other. To answer that question you have got to look at different kinds of housing arrangements on predominantly white college campuses and then you've got to say these different kinds of housing arrangements tended to result in this. That's the straining toward objectivity.

Eloise Cornelius: I would like to raise one question about what you've said. Is it possible that maybe one of the questions needing research is, what is the timing and what ends does segregation versus integration serve regarding not only the survival of the minority but also in the move toward development of whatever is maximum potential? Is there differential use of keeping minorities together at one given time for one purpose, and at what point does this become dysfunctional and should you move?

Charles Willie: That's a legitimate question to ask. And the only point I'm making is that you do research on that.

Eloise Cornelius: Well, that's what I think. I think that's the question.

Ron Edmonds: Can I state that research question in a way that makes it not

liable to research? It seems to me that the question that you have raised, Chuck, which is a proper question that interests me, is under what circumstances do people best satisfy their own sense of their own needs? I'm interested in the research you suggested, but it seems to me that when black students do things, there are two ways to respond to what they are doing. One way is to treat what they're doing as though it had to do, in fact, with housing as an explicit phenomenon, and therefore to research housing patterns. The other way is to say, people do what they do because at the time they're doing it, they believe it to be in their own best interests. Now I don't derive that from a research inquiry, and in fact, I'm going to resist data that suggests that the answer to that is other than the one I just gave.

Charles Willie: That has come out of the research of a situation with psychology, particularly the phenomenology.

Ron Edmonds: You see, though, Chuck, that's illustrative. When I took Sociology 103, I discovered that that sociologist teaching that course was telling me the things in the university that my barber knew when I was eleven. And I spent a lot of time trying to figure out why I wasn't spending more time in the barber shop. So it seems to me that there are a lot of instances in which questions that are straightforward and simple become complicated and immutable because people like Coleman spend all that money to make a set of observations that my third grade teacher could have told him. Although all those people who worked on that would have been unemployed, but if they'd asked her she could have said, oh, she would have said it much better, as a matter of fact. And she wouldn't have been free of the biases that he introduced. I mean, she had her own, but I prefer hers, you know, and so on.

Charles Willie: I don't buy that, Ron. I was growing up in Dallas as a boy. I heard, and many others in this meeting have heard, the very same thing. I heard that the reason why blacks are treated the way they are is they don't

know how to act right. I'm giving you common sense ideology that I heard when I was growing up. I heard that whites don't like blacks on the front of the streetcar because they talk too loud. You know, I can rattle it all off, what you and I heard in the neighborhoods and on the corners where we grew up. Now that was common sense theory. And yet it took Reddick to document it. I've been using his document. It documents that it wasn't that whites didn't like blacks in the bus because they didn't act right, because the more they tried to act right, each time the whites said, no, you're not acting right. It's only when blacks finally said "Stop doing it to us." I'm going to do some comparative analysis. For example, women in the Episcopal Church are not ordained as priests, and I'm telling women out of the black experience, the only way you're going to be a priest in the Episcopal Church, you're going to have to day "Stop doing it to me." They can't wait for men to do it, because whites never got blacks on the front of the bus. This is the kind of research, and now you see if I had lived by what my barber said when they were ridiculing blacks, see the barber says good things about blacks but he also ridicules them. And you're not going to say all those things they said. When they were ridiculing, that also was part of the folk wisdom. And we knew that blacks were not discriminated against, we know now, as social scientists, simply because they did not act right, because we know that nothing they could do now, based on research, caused other people who were prejudiced against them to say that they were acting right. In-group virtues become out-group vices. Now that grows out of our research. And unless we begin to look at things pretty systematically that way, that folk wisdom takes over and causes us to provide some action programs that are totally antithetical to the goals we want to achieve.

Blenda Wilson: Yes, he's right. The question is, who determines the goals you want to achieve? Scholarship is arrogant. Scholarship is a process by which the intellectual, the scholar, decides something is important to know

from an objective, theoretical abstract, however you want to describe that process. The kind of social activism and political activism you're talking about, Ron, is responsive. When you're involved in political action, it doesn't matter if the swimming pool isn't the most necessary thing for black kids in Boston. If the constituency you're responding to thinks that's important, then it is important. And social scientists at that point are irrelevant.

Charles Willie: I don't agree with you, Blenda. That's why I was asking who was part of the group.

Ron Edmonds: Only good people.

Charles Willie: I was tying up with what Ron was saying and you were saying in a different way. I was saying the questions that get asked may not be the questions social scientists can ask. That's the one thing. But on the other hand, I was saying the questions that the barber asks are that the mothers ask who need something other than a swimming pool. These then can be researched by the same people who ask them. I think we make a mistake to say that they all did research. I think Larry's group is a group to do the researching. But if research is on the questions that may be asked by persons other than his group--

Vivian Johnson: I just want to extend Blenda by saying that it seems to me that social scientists are relevant because they are people to whom that group can turn to do the necessary research in order to get that swimming pool. But we then come to the other point which I think the dialogue has revolved around, and that is, objectivity versus honesty. And what you were saying is that there's no such thing as objectivity, and your response was, but there must be honesty. Therefore you're ships passing in the night. I don't see any disagreement on the issue of honesty. But I don't know whether there is the same conclusion about objectivity. That was the question that I wanted to raise. Are you gentlemen disagreeing on what objectivity is, and could

there be some definition that each of you could give?

Ken Tollet: I don't think there is a definition of objectivity.

Charles Willie: Objectivity is something one strives for but never knows if one has attained. And that's the honesty of the scholar.

Ken Tollet: Yes, but that doesn't tell me what objectivity is. What is the difference between, you know, Thoreau wrote at length about value-free social science. Are you talking about objectivity in the sense that Max Weber--

Charles Willie: No.

Ken Tollet: --meant, tried to say that there's objectivity.

Charles Willie: Objectivity is the attempt to marshall data and let the analysis grow out of what data are there, rather than what the individual would like to see there. Now you may not be able to do that, but when you give up trying to do it, then you've rendered your point useless to all others, because they can never be sure that you're not messing with the data. And actually, that's what Larry's paper was about. It was saying in a sense, I suppose I'm arguing this point so strongly because what I have argued all along is that blacks should not turn over the page and do the same things as whites except color it differently.

Bernard Anderson: I just want to say a word about the future of the group. The question has been raised here about where the group will go from here and how it will proceed. I would hope that in answering that question, the group would not be overly concerned with waiting until there is as much general agreement as possible on as many different issues as possible. I happen to believe that the group having come together out of a common sense of outrage is sufficient of itself to suggest that there is some basis for the group proceeding beyond this point. And the second thing that might be said about this is that very often some of the best ideas come out of dissonance and disagreement, and so I would hesitate to have this group impose upon itself, I'm talking now about

the nine members, impose upon itself too much uniformity of view and commonality and agreement. I think that that began to truncate the development of new ideas, the exploration of new perceptions, and the development of new insights into a variety of these areas. I'd rather see the group held together even by so slender a thread as common outrage at the Jencks book and at continued groping for some truth, because I think that I'm not aware of any other organization or group of black intellectuals in the country that is attempting to do that at the present time. I think that in my own view, that in itself is worthwhile.

Sam Warner: Well, I just want to clean up the objectivity issue with a little maxim, which is not a maxim--

Ron Edmonds: Good luck, Sam.

Sam Warner: I think it can be done. If you think social science is political and you think your group should be available to research important issues, issues that concern blacks and other minorities, it seems to me you can get at the objectivity issue by saying something that most social scientists would not accept but by saying, one, I have to be more careful in my research because I know that there are some people who are going to go out and risk their necks on the basis of what I say. Isn't that, in a way, a more severe test of the accuracy of my investigation than the ordinary academic study in which you expect it to be filed in the library and the feedback to come from your colleagues? So it seems to me you're going to have a more severe discipline, and if you accept that maxim you're going to be more careful, not less.

Jim Comer: I've always said that social scientists should be liable to malpractice and then they'd be more careful. But Chuck's point about objectivity, I think that striving towards that is tremendously important. I'd like to tie that in with the point that Bernie made in the very beginning, and I'm not sure that you were dealing with this and I may be off-base, but Bernie made the point about paradigm, and I wonder if we as black scholars coming from experiences

very different, very often, than white scholars, who were very often second, third, fourth, ninth generation American born, educated, and so on, if we don't have input and ideas and a background that will give new approaches or offer the possibility of new approaches, and while objectivity is important, what I'm concerned about is when some of the approaches proposed by blacks and minority groups and so on are proposed, then there's said that that's not good science, that's not objective, it's not a lot of other things. I'm raising a question of whether there aren't some approaches, whether there may not be some approaches which aren't scientific as we know them today and as defined, and yet might be very helpful. Now the danger there, I'm aware, is that people will hide behind such things to keep from doing solid research and investigation. On the other hand, I think we ought to be open to inputs and insights and observations that come from methods other than the ones commonly used today.

Roosevelt Steptoe: I'm just slightly bothered by something that my fellow economist Bernie Anderson said. And I know that we shouldn't attempt to stifle anyone, but I believe that we need some sense of common purpose and direction as a group, otherwise we go around in circles and accomplish nothing. I've had some difficulty determining, over the last thirty minutes, what was the point of the discussion. And I'd hate for the organization to continue to drift that way, so I must say at this point that I want to advocate some guidelines as to where we're going and how we're going to accomplish it. Are we going to research issues that have national significance for the minority population, or are we going to allow individuals to drift off into dark corners and do their own little thing? And then we have to address those issues before we can start, or we'll end up not accomplishing very much.

Ron Edmonds: Before Chuck says anything, one of the things that sustains us, you see, is that we know that it is not possible to do things of benefit to

the least advantaged portions of the population without simultaneously being of even greater benefit to the most advantaged portions of the population, so we never have to talk about being of service to minorities exclusively.

Charles Willie: Well, I want to say that the issue of objectivity is really a non-issue. The methodology one uses can be much broader than the methodology currently used in the social sciences. Indeed, I think the methodology needs to be broad and we need to use methods and techniques that have never been heard of before. But all of the methods and techniques that are used are still used within the framework of trying to obtain information which someone can also have faith and confidence in. I have one criticism of my study of black students in white colleges as reviewed in Social Forces. The reviewer kept saying that all he used was the testimony of the students, he never used any independent data of the racist experience of the students there. Now I opposed that. I usually don't respond to reviewers. But I said, you know, that's very similar to the New York State law which says that you cannot convict a rapist even though the jury believes that the woman was raped if you cannot produce any corroborating evidence. And now that's all been changed because that law was recognized as sexist, and I refuse to let my work be judged as being not valuable because I used the testimony of the people who had experienced the racism. So I responded to that guy. In other words, my methodology was different from the methodology he wanted to use. And I'm opposed to that. Now if he had said that I selected only those students who had had racist experiences and didn't select those others, then I would have felt accused of not being objective. So I think the issue of objectivity on the one hand and methodology on the other, are different issues, separate issues.