

ED 161 967

UD 018 046

AUTHOR Banks, James A.
 TITLE Ethnic Studies in the Social Context. Series Paper No. 4.
 INSTITUTION National Urban League, Inc., New York, N.Y. Education Div.
 PUB DATE Oct 72
 NOTE 25p.; Not available in hard copy due to institution's restriction; The last line of page 16 is not reproduced

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
 DESCRIPTORS American Culture; Black Education; Black Leadership; *Educational Objectives; Elementary Secondary Education; Ethnic Stereotypes; *Ethnic Studies; Higher Education; Minority Groups; Multicultural Education; *Power Structure; *Racism; Social Environment; Social Factors; Social Science Research

ABSTRACT

Since ethnic studies in schools is an integral part of the larger social system in this country, its current status, problems and strengths must be examined within the total social context. Ruling groups determine the formulation and dissemination of knowledge (particularly negative social science research about ethnic groups and the poor). This knowledge is designed to support the status quo, and to legitimize the position of those in power. Ethnic studies programs must be replanned and novel teaching strategies formulated in order for students to effectively challenge and invalidate the assumptions about ethnic groups on which white-dominated social science research is often based. A primary goal of ethnic studies must be to help minority students to psychologically liberate themselves from myths and stereotypes and to help them to develop a commitment to social change. Unfortunately, reform of current programs is needed, as dissension among different ethnic groups, lack of funds, and inadequately qualified instructors have caused them to be self defeating. Despite the difficulties that minority leaders encounter, they should demand this reform and take steps to see that ethnic studies programs survive and gain integrity. (Author/KR)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *

ED161967

ETHNIC STUDIES IN THE SOCIAL CONTEXT

A Position Paper Prepared for the Education Policy
and Information Center

National Urban League, Inc.

by

James A. Banks
Associate Professor of Education
University of Washington, Seattle

October, 1972

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY
HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

National Urban League

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND
USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN-
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT
OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

UDO 18046

FOREWORD

The National Urban League's Education Policy Information Center (EPIC) presents the fourth in a series of Monographs designed to provide a major new forum for black educators and an authoritative black perspective on educational issues. In this Monograph, "Ethnic Studies in a Social Context," Dr. James A. Banks discusses Afro-American studies and the full portent of its mass introduction into our educational systems.

The first three Monographs entitled "Survival--Phase II, Unity Without Uniformity," "The Student Rights Issue--Strategy for Prevention of Genocide," and "The Young Black Child--His Development and Education," have been written respectively by Dr. Bernard C. Watson, Professor and Chairman of Urban Education at Temple University, Philadelphia, PA; Dr. Arthur E. Thomas, Director, Student Rights Center, Dayton, OH; and Dr. Evangeline H. Ward, Professor of Early Childhood Development, also at Temple University. However, the opinions expressed in the Monographs are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the policies or the positions of the National Urban League.

The League's Education Policy and Information Center (EPIC) was established January, 1972, to keep black people abreast of trends in education policy-making, and to initiate change in complex national educational processes by studying pending legislation and current programs affecting public education in urban ghettos.

--Ermon O. Hogan, Ph.D.
Director
National Urban League
Education Division

Ethnic Studies in the Social System.

The Black man's dreams which emerged and blossomed during the sixties were shattered by the events which ushered in this decade. Blatant racism, which was harshly condemned by national leaders and influential commission reports in the sixties, raised its ugly head unabashedly in the seventies and became a powerful political weapon that was used advantageously by both political demagogues and America's most esteemed political leaders. As Dan W. Dodson has noted, racism has become good politics.¹

The law and order cult, anti-bussing movement, and the current popularity of racist politicians are clear indications that the struggle for human justice in America is experiencing some of its most serious repercussions of this century. Since ethnic studies is an integral part of the larger social system, its current status, problems and strengths must be examined within the total social context. In this essay, I will briefly examine the economic and political systems in America, and analyze ethnic studies within this broader conceptualization. A plea is made for the reformation and permanent institutionalization of ethnic studies programs at all grade levels. The promises and problems which might result from an attempt to reform ethnic studies are discussed, and strategies for change are set forth.

Economic and Power Relationships in America

While human communities are highly diversified, they share certain characteristics which social scientists call cultural universals.² These common cultural components arise because men

everywhere share certain biological, psychological, and social needs which they must satisfy in order to survive. In each society, man develops responses to these common needs and problems which are highly similar but which take a wide variety of forms. Each culture, for example, must have some institution to assume the major responsibility for socializing the young and for teaching them the values, attitudes, beliefs, and behavior which they must learn to function within the society and contribute to its survival. In every society, the family assumes this responsibility, although the forms of family life vary greatly.³ They range in character from the highly individualistic, nuclear family in middle class Anglo society in America to the intimately interdependent Puerto Rican family of the 1800's.

Man has also expressed the need to explain unknown social and physical phenomena in his environment, and to develop a sense of control over his fate throughout human history. Myths, religion, shaman, psychoanalysis and empirical science are cultural elements that developed to satisfy these human needs. More important for our discussion is the scarcity of goods and services which each society faces, and man's unlimited wants for them. Because of scarcity, each society must solve three related economic problems: What goods and services shall be produced? How shall they be produced? For whom shall they be produced? Each society must also determine who shall produce what goods and services, and the rewards which will be distributed for their production, and what rewards will go to whom.

Who solves these economic problems for a society is political, because those who make up the Power Elite of a society determine what goods and services are produced, who will produce them, and for whom they will be produced.⁴ They also determine the rewards that

will be given for the production of various goods and services, and how these rewards will be distributed. The reward structure of a nation's economy is highly related to other aspects of its social system. Thus those who get the greatest share of the economic rewards also have the widest opportunities to participate in the social system and to attain more social class mobility. Individuals and groups who get the least economic rewards can only participate in the social system to a limited extent. Thus, an individual's or group's economic situation is highly related to his social status.

What criteria does the ruling elite use to determine the production of goods and services and distribution of economic rewards? Every decision made by those in power, including economic policy, is made to enhance, legitimize and to reinforce their power. Thus jobs which have the highest economic and social rewards are given to people who constitute the ruling elite; other jobs which have high economic rewards are assigned to groups and individuals who are similar to the ruling group in values, physical characteristics and culture. The least desirable jobs, those with the lowest economic and social rewards, are reserved for groups which the ruling elite defines as "undersirable" and "non-human." These groups are least like the ruling groups in culture and physical characteristics. In the United states, Blacks, Chicanos, Puerto Rican-Americans, Asian-Americans, and Native Americans constitute the bulk of this group. They work primarily in service occupations, such as domestic work, restaurants, hotels, farming and factories. While these groups are assigned jobs primarily in low paying, laboring occupations,

White Anglo-Saxon male Protestants with money own most of the production industries and are the corporation presidents and major economic decision-makers. These jobs have lucrative economic rewards and high social status.

Thus the groups in our society which do the most arduous work receive the least economic and social rewards. This is a very deliberate policy created and maintained by the ruling groups in America because such a delineation of work roles is necessary for them to maintain their power and affluence. Notes Ermon Hogan, Education Director, NUL, "(The Poor), regardless of race, continue to live in slavery and to be victims of genocide, 1971 style. Such conditions are not accidents of history but are carefully designed to provide a labor supply for the mines, the kitchen, the farms, the garment industry, and all of the other menial and nonmechanistic jobs that form the base of America's affluent society."⁵

The Function of Social Knowledge: Legitimization of the Status Quo

I have discussed power and economic relationships in the United States at some length because a sophisticated understanding of ethnic studies and social science can be gained only by conceptualizing the present nature of ethnic content and the status of ethnic studies programs within the larger social context. Ethnic studies simply cannot be understood in isolation because it is intimately related to the political and economic systems in America. Ruling groups determine the formulation and dissemination of knowledge within a society just as they determine economic and political policy. We will now explore the question of what knowledge becomes institutionalized in a social system and the purposes which it serves.

In order for a group to maintain power, it must, through some means, acquire legitimacy. A government or ruling group is regarded as legitimate when the individuals affected by its policy accept its authority as valid. Unless a ruling group establishes legitimacy, each of its decisions will have to be implemented with naked force because people influenced by the decisions would not think that the group had a right to rule.⁶ The knowledge which becomes institutionalized within a society is designed to support the status quo, and to legitimize the position of those in power. Thus social science knowledge reflects the norms, values and goals of the ruling and powerful groups in society; it validates and legitimizes those beliefs and ideologies which are useful for powerful groups and is detrimental to oppressed peoples.

To justify and legitimize their oppression of colonialized groups, the ruling groups create myths and stereotypes about them to explain why they "deserve" the low status in society to which they are assigned. Such stereotypes and myths within our society are rampant; e.g., Blacks were enslaved because they were uncivilized and lazy; slavery would not only civilize them but would save their souls from hell; Indians were savages who had to be civilized by whites in order to survive; Asian-Americans were a threat to "national survival" during World War II and thus had to be confined to "relocation" camps for national security. Many social scientists and other scholars are the gatekeepers of the status quo; they generate research which legitimizes the myths and stereotypes which the ruling group creates about exploited peoples to justify their oppression.

Social science knowledge which is consistent with the ideology

of the ruling elite becomes institutionalized and perpetuated within the lower schools, high schools, colleges and universities.

Research which is antithetical to the interests of elitist groups is usually ignored by the scientific community and the society which supports it. This fact explains why Louis S. B. Leakey's seminal findings about man's African origins have never been popular among established anthropologists and the larger society.⁷ On the other hand, for generations historians elevated Ulrich B. Phillips' racist descriptions of the nature of slavery to the status of conclusive truth.⁸ Sociologists produced "proof" of the natural inferiority of the Black man in the nineteenth century to justify his oppression. Lothrop Stoddard, in his Rising Tide of Color, developed the thesis that there are higher and lower races, whose intermixture produces a race which reverts to the lower type.⁹ Myths such as those invested by Phillips and Stoddard were institutionalized because they were consistent with the value systems and self-interests of powerful white groups.

Racist social science myths are still being invested today and institutionalized in America to justify the exploitation of minority groups. In a perceptive essay, Barbara Sizemore documents the ways in which recent research by such social scientists as Banfield, Jensen and Moynihan distorts Black culture and supports prevailing myths and ideologies.¹⁰ As Sizemore points out, "Jensen's work (for the black man) is useless and false."¹¹ However, it is highly functional for powerful white groups because it provides them with "scientific" reasons to deny minority children equal educational opportunities.

The Goals of Ethnic Studies

Periodically, those in power focus attention on a particular oppressed group to convince them that their lot will soon improve and that a millennium is imminent. This is done to legitimize and maintain their power. Such superficial interest and concern is especially likely to come about when excluded groups show signs that they are going to challenge the status quo, and when the ruling elite becomes threatened. Thus, when Blacks and other ethnic groups challenged the myths about their cultures which are pervasive in school books and demanded ethnic studies programs, the White Establishment responded with a series of hurriedly put together and ill-conceived ethnic studies programs.

Few of these programs are sound because the goals are confused, ambiguous and conflicting, and the qualifications of many of the teachers are highly questionable. Most were structured without careful planning and clear rationales. Effective teaching strategies and sound criteria for judging instructional materials cannot be formulated until goals are identified and stated explicitly. In most ethnic studies programs now in the public schools, the emphasis is on the achievements of isolated minority heroes such as Crispus Attucks, Cesar Chavez and Sitting Bull. Unless ethnic studies programs attain more significant goals, and implement new teaching strategies, students will get just as sick and tired of ethnic history as they have become with White racist schoolbook history. Some students already feel that Black history has been oversold. Many teachers who teach ethnic studies use new materials but traditional approaches, concepts and theories.

Without both new goals and novel strategies, ethnic studies



will become just another fleeting fad created by the ruling elite to pacify excluded groups. Isolated facts about Crazy Horse don't stimulate the intellect any more than isolated facts about Thomas Jefferson. Ethnic studies must focus on goals more important than the mastery of discrete and unrelated facts about "heroes."¹² I will present a rationale for ethnic studies and discuss how ethnic content can become an integral part of a curriculum that is designed to psychologically liberate minority students and to help them to develop a commitment to social change.

Psychological Liberation

A primary goal of ethnic studies must be to help minority students to identify and critically analyze the myths and stereotypes which have been created by ruling White groups to justify their oppression and to make them believe that they are less than human. Although the recent Black Power, Red Power, and Brown Power movements have exposed many of these myths and have helped minority persons to feel more positively toward their peoples and their cultures, there is some rather compelling evidence which suggests that too many of our youths are still psychologically victimized by these destructive and insidious myths. In a recent study, Joan W. Moore found that more than two-thirds of a sample of Chicanos felt that Mexican-Americans are less progressive than Anglos and that they (Chicanos) tend to blame Anglos for what are really their own problems.¹³ In a recent review of the literature, Banks notes how Blacks often accept the myths about them which Whites have invented and perpetuated.¹⁴ These kinds of data indicate that White educators and social scientists have been highly successful in their efforts to convince minority

individuals that they deserve the racism which they experience in America. The successful manipulation of knowledge is one of the most effective ways to make the oppressed complacent and content with their social and economic status.

However, knowledge can also be used to free the minds of oppressed peoples, to make them discontent with the status quo, and to develop an unrelenting commitment to challenge those in power. Ethnic studies must take up this critical challenge, and teach minority students how to have victorious confrontations with the myths and illusions which white people cherish about them and which ethnics often accept without question or reflection. It is not enough to simply teach students about these myths. They must know why they were created and became institutionalized in the mass media and in the textbooks which they read in school. An effective ethnic studies program must also go beyond teaching students why myths were created; it must teach them the skills and knowledge which they need to invalidate and refute the assumptions and conclusions on which white social and natural science research is often based.

To merely call the research by Jensen and Shockley "racist" is not enough to invalidate it and to prove its absurdity.¹⁵ Rather, the student who wishes to expose the insidious nature of this research must critically analyze its assumptions, research methods, and the logical relationship between the assumptions, data and conclusions. Ethnic researchers must be able to use Jensen's data, and with new assumptions about I.Q. and minority people, to reach highly divergent conclusions. The point which I am trying to emphasize is that we need to teach our students how to use the white man's own

research techniques and data to invalidate his conclusions. This can be done if we use different assumptions and methods of data analysis to analyze existing and emerging data.

Influencing Public Policy

This is the only response to racist social science research by minority communities that will have any impact on the policy makers in Washington and in other high seats of power. If we respond to the Shockleys and the Moynihans¹⁶ by calling them "racists," the people who shape public policy in this nation that profoundly influences the lives of minority groups will quickly dismiss our arguments as the "emotional responses" of "an understandably alienated people." I am not trying to suggest that our refutation of the Jensens and shockleys will be received as enthusiastically by the people in the White House as Jensen's or Armor's¹⁷ (the anti-bussing prophet) "research" has been received. This will not be the case since the ideologies of Jensen and Armor (the ideas of these men are more properly called ideologies than science) are highly consistent with the ideas and perceptions of those who rule America. However, I am suggesting that our arguments and debates will not be given even a fair hearing by people in powerful positions in this nation unless they are stated in the vernacular, style and nomenclature with which they are familiar and regard as "scientific." Obviously, arguments that are not even heard by those in power cannot possibly influence or become public policy.

Invalidating Racist Knowledge

Furthermore, there are other reasons why we should teach our students how to successfully fight intellectual warfare with "scientists" who promote white supremacy. Minority students in this country attend schools and colleges controlled and manned by people who have been trained in colleges and universities where the Western model of science is held up as ideal. There is nothing wrong with the model itself; it can be used by the liberation leader as well as by the racist to validate conclusions. Thus when minority students confront racist knowledge in their textbooks, lectures and class discussions, they need the intellectual tools and skills to invalidate these arguments and conclusions; they must be able to use the research model which is perceived as the ideal way of knowing and validating beliefs in the institutions of which they are a part.

I will use a simple example to illustrate my point. A Chicano youth might be a member of a class in which the teacher cites data on the I.Q. performance of Chicano children and concludes that this data supports the proposition that Mexican-Americans, as a group, are intellectually inferior to Whites. For the student to respond by simply saying that this is a "racist" conclusion would not logically or empirically invalidate the teacher's argument. However, if he argued that this data cannot be used to test propositions about general intellectual abilities because the I.Q. test is merely a generalized achievement test based on the culture of middle class Anglo Saxons, and that an I.Q. test is only a measure of a sample of an individual's behavior at a particular point in time, then he is beginning to set forth the propositions which are needed to invalidate the teacher's conclusions. To attempt to ascertain a

group's intellectual abilities with a test that was standardized with a different cultural group is either racist or ethnocentric. However, minority students need the skills and knowledge to tell why an act is racist; merely labeling it racist is insufficient. Minority students also need to learn how to combat racist social science in order to bolster their self-images and to prove to themselves that many of the conclusions derived by white social scientists are false and useless. The need for such self-assurance is exceedingly important.

Ethnic students should study the works of the new group of minority social scientists who are developing new assumptions and concepts to explain minority behavior. Their explanations are more consistent with a liberation ideology than most propositions advanced by White social scientists. Their assumptions, concepts and theories emphasize the unique strengths of minority cultures that have emerged as human responses to oppression. Unlike the majority of White social scientists, they do not assume that minority cultures are pathological. Notable among this group of young social scientists are Andrew Billingsley, Robert Hill, Joyce A. Ladner, Barbara A. Sizemore, Vince Deloria, Jr., and Jack D. Forbes.¹⁸

Billingsley, Hill and Ladner have developed new concepts for studying the Black family which seriously challenges the work of researchers such as Moynihan. Sizemore structured a conceptual model which delineates the stages which an oppressed people must experience to become liberated. Her logical and careful analysis refutes the research by Coleman and Pettigrew. Deloria and Forbes have formulated novel ways to interpret the experiences of Native Americans which shatter pervasive stereotypes about "Indians."

The work of these perceptive scholars are prototypes of the kinds of analyses which I am suggesting that we must teach minority students to do in ethnic studies programs.

I have stressed the importance of helping our students to develop the skills to logically and scientifically invalidate racist knowledge because such knowledge is rampant within our society and it profoundly influences public policy at the national level. It has escalated in recent years during the Nixon administration. The white social scientist today who invents some seemingly "scientific" idea to support the myth that ethnic minorities are inferior is venerated, canonized, and is in some ways a folk hero of the day. The list of such "scientific demagogues" is nearly endless: Banfield, Armor, Mohnihan, Shockley, Jensen, ad infinitum. Their public forums are wide; their research is published in prestigious and highly influential academic journals such as the Harvard Educational Review¹⁹ and the Review of Educational Research.²⁰ Publication of their "research" is justified in the name of "academic freedom."

Characteristics of Ethnic Studies Programs

While we must train minority students to confront and to contradict the arguments and ideologies of the "scientific demagogues," ethnic studies courses in many public schools, colleges, and universities too often consist primarily of "rap" sessions in which students do little serious reading, venerate the beauty of Red, Brown and Black, and romanticize about the imminent millennium and their historical and cultural ties to great ancient civilizations. Much highly emotional and unreflective dialogue about the racist sins of "Whitey" also takes place in such courses. While these kinds of rap sessions

might have some cathartic value, and may have been essential during the early years of the ethnic revolts, they have largely outlived their usefulness, and if used too often are dysfunctional and useless in a time when the struggle for human rights is experiencing some of the most serious set-backs of this century. These set-backs are too numerous and well known to repeat here.

While rap sessions should not constitute the bulk of ethnic studies, ethnic studies programs should be innovative and should not be drained of their vitality by what Cuban has called "White Instruction."²¹ The emphasis should be on higher levels of knowledge (such as concepts and principles), the building of new assumptions, and not on the mastery of discrete facts about "heroes" and insignificant historical events. The mastery of factual information, the veneration of "heroes" and the focus on developing patriotism are characteristics of "White Instruction." Ethnic studies must radicalize students, teach them how to critically analyze the system, and to develop a commitment to liberation and social change. A wide variety of novel teaching techniques and experiences, such as community research and social action projects, and even some rap sessions, could constitute ethnic studies.²² The teaching techniques and activities chosen should be dictated by the instructional goals. Thus rap sessions, role playing, and action projects should be used whenever they facilitate the attainment of the instructional goals delineated. No one particular technique can meet the needs of all students, thus a program which consists solely of rap sessions is insufficient and detrimental.



Ethnic Studies: A Conspiracy?

The tragic irony of ethnic studies programs in most schools and institutions of higher education is that White administrators often designed them to fail so that their beliefs about minority peoples would be, once more, confirmed. Minority individuals, both students and teachers, must realize that ethnic studies programs, too, are in most cases part of a larger conspiracy in America to make them believe that they are less than human.

On almost every campus where there are ethnic studies programs and departments, the required credentials for teachers are rarely identical to those in other academic areas of the institution. Many White administrators assume that any White who has taken a course or workshop in Black Studies and who can parrot the popular liberation rhetoric, or that any Black regardless of what he has or has not taken, can teach Black Studies; they also assume that any person who has a Spanish surname can teach courses in Mexican-American history and culture. A person with a Greek background without the required formal training would not be hired by most universities to teach in a classics department. The absurd assumptions which many Whites harbor about ethnic studies indicate that they often regard them with little respect and rarely consider them rigorous academic areas. These kinds of misconceptions of ethnic studies must be aggressively attacked whenever they are manifested in actions or deeds.

Multi-Ethnic Departments

The lack of sufficient funds has also haunted ethnic studies programs at all grade levels. This, too, indicates that ethnic

studies is usually the stepchild on a school or college campus. This problem can be partially resolved by consolidating ethnic studies "departments" on a particular campus. Black, Chicano, Puerto Rican American, Asian-American and Native American Studies "departments" on college campuses are often like warring tribes, showing little willingness to cooperate and to form a common coalition to make demands from the White Establishment. Such separate divisions often fight over the crumbs which are thrown out by White administrators. Such divisive tactics are usually sanctioned by college administrators because they divert attention from the real villain: the White Establishment. Energy and power which ethnic divisions should focus on the White Establishment are often dissipated battling with each other. Each group frequently feels that another might get a few more bits of the crumbs.

Antagonisms between the various oppressed groups is myopic and self-destructive. It should stop. Because each ethnic group in this country constitutes such a small minority, they will be able to exercise effective political power only when they form coalitions which are directed toward common goals. There is no need for Blacks, Chicanos, Native Americans, Asian-Americans, and Puerto Rican Americans on the same campus to demand and try to man separate departments or divisions. In unity there is strength. While the experiences of these groups are in many cases different, and there is a need for some specialized courses and experiences for the different groups, the similarities in their social, economic and political conditions overshadow their differences. They are all

Needed Reform in Ethnic Studies Programs.

The results of many ethnic studies programs, at all levels, have been criminal and self-defeating, just as they were designed to be. Not only are many ethnic studies courses merely rap sessions, but academic standards in some of them are relaxed to such an extent as to be practically non-existent. Some are classic examples of Moynihan's now infamous concept of "benign neglect." Many perceptive, serious minority students now see what most ethnic studies programs were designed to be and are, justifiably, turned off by the rhetoric and dehumanization often found in them.

Minority leaders with vision must take vigorous steps at both the local and national levels to see that ethnic studies programs are maintained after ethnic protest is silenced and the Eagles from Washington have been extinguished. They must also insist that people who teach in ethnic studies programs have both the academic competence and commitment to do so, and that the academic standards in these programs are equal to those in any department in the academic community. We must take these steps because our positions of responsibility demand that we have the integrity, audacity and foresight to push for nothing less than the very best for our students. It takes little foresight to know what happens to programs in academic communities which are staffed primarily by untenured teachers whose qualifications are below those of other members of the community, and whose salaries are paid mostly from soft money funds. Such programs are the first to go when the gold pool in Washington dries up (which is rapidly happening), and when the academic institution finds it "imperative to cut down programs for budgetary reasons."

Whites' fascination with Blacks, which began during the heat

of the Black ghetto rebellions in the sixties, is just about over, and whites are now courting Native Americans. The White Establishment's interest in any ethnic minority group is always fleeting and temporary; Whites rarely stick with any social issue long enough to resolve it. They much prefer to dab in fads. While Whites can go from fad to fad, the sincere minority scholar's commitment to the struggle for human rights is a lifelong one. All of his actions, words and policies must be dictated by this enduring and irrevocable commitment. Thus to demand that ethnic studies programs have academic rigor (in ways that I have defined rigor above), and have teachers with unquestionable credentials and abilities, is simply a matter of survival and commitment to our youth. If ethnic studies programs fade from school and college campuses a decade from now--and there are already signs that this can and might happen--we will have utterly failed both our students and ourselves.

The Challenge and Commitment

Minority leaders who are committed to taking concerted actions to assure the survival and integrity of ethnic studies programs in our schools and colleges will face many difficulties and be subject to harsh condemnations by some of their own people and many Whites in power. The teacher and scholar who demand that all teachers in ethnic studies programs have degrees and the needed academic skills and knowledge will be told by some Whites that such persons simply cannot be found; they might be criticized by minority teachers who lack these qualifications themselves; these teachers might see such a teacher as a threat to their survival in the academic community. Many of the teachers who will resist academic reform in ethnic

studies programs were hired in response to pressure during the ruckus created by the rebellions in the sixties. Some of them lack the skills to teach and should have never been hired in the first place. These individuals were not hired because qualified minority persons could not be found, but because White administrators wanted ethnic studies programs to fail.

They reasoned, rather accurately, that one way to discredit ethnic studies programs and to assure them a fleeting existence was to hire teachers who did not have the skills and credentials needed to survive in the academic battle field. The irony of this situation is that while Whites often argue that they cannot hire minority persons because no qualified ones can be found, they keep hiring unqualified Whites and minority teachers to teach in ethnic studies programs while many skillful and highly competent minority group teachers are not hired; many of whom are now aggressively seeking employment, as can be seen monthly in the classified ads in magazines such as the Black Scholar. Whites also created and perpetuated the myth that Blacks with higher degrees could "name the place" in the nation in which they wished to work. This myth was repeated so often and with such intensity that repetition of it became accepted as evidence of its validity by many Whites and minority persons.

Serious minority teachers and scholars may initially experience student hostility. Since the norm in many ethnic studies programs are non-academic, many students will perceive the serious and demanding teacher as a traitor who has "sold out" to the Establishment because he is using "Whitey's" standards for grading and assignments. The loss of fleeting student popularity is a small price to pay for the establishment of academic norms in ethnic studies programs which

will help to assure their survival. Many students will, understandably, tend to resist reading the works of writers such as Jensen and Shockley in a university seminar because of the blatant racism in these works. However, our students must be helped to understand that a person must know his enemy in order to defeat him, and that the best way to deal with a Jensen is to use his own poison to destroy him.

Also, most students are reasonable people and are more perceptive than we often think. While they may initially regard the serious and demanding teacher as a "sell out," a skillful teacher who is highly knowledgeable and sensitive to minority students can gain his students' respect. And perhaps respect is all that we should expect from our students. Good teachers should not have as their primary goal the winning of popularity contests, but helping students to develop the skills, knowledge, and commitment that will enable them to make a substantial contribution to the liberation of oppressed peoples in this nation.

Minority teachers and scholars who are committed to the reformation and permanent institutionalization of ethnic studies in the schools and colleges must be willing to risk being criticized and publicly abused. No human endeavor worth pursuing is ever without serious risks. Ethnic leaders whose main quest is for fleeting popularity are not the men for the season. The challenge is herculean. The odds are against us. The hour is late. However, what is at stake is priceless: The liberation and salvation of the hearts and minds of Black, Brown Red, and Yellow students. Thus, we must, like Don Quixote, dream the impossible dream, reach for the unreachable, and act decisively to right the unrightable wrong.

FOOTNOTES

1. Dan W. Dodson, "Action for the Seventies: What is Our Agenda?", an address presented at the 27th Annual Conference of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Philadelphia, March, 1972, p. 10.
2. James A. Banks (with Ambrose A. Clegg, Jr.), Teaching Strategies For the Social Studies: Inquiry, Valuing and Decision-Making, (Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1973, p. 235.
3. Bernard Berelson and Gary A. Steiner, Human Behavior: An Inventory of Scientific Findings, (New York: Harcourt Brace, 1964), p. 313.
4. C. Wright Mills, The Power Elite (New York: Oxford University Press, 1956), pp. 4, 9.
5. Ermon O. Hogan, "Review of Educating the Powerless by Stanley Charnofsky," Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 53 (January, 1972), p. 330.
6. Francis J. Sorauf, Political Science: An Informal Overview, Columbus: Charles E. Merrill, 1965, pp. 3-4.
7. Louis S. B. Leakey, White African, (Cambridge, Mass.: Schenkman, 1966).
8. Ulrich B. Phillips, American Negro Slavery, (New York: Appleton, 1918).
9. Lothrop Stoddard, The Rising Tide of Color Against White-World Supremacy (New York: Scribner, 1920), pp. 165-175.
10. Barbara A. Sizemore, "Social Science and Education for a Black Identity," in James A. Banks and Jean D. Grambs (eds.), Black Self-Concept: Implications for Education and Social Science (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1972), pp. 141-170.
11. Idib, p. 147
12. James A. Banks, "Teaching Black History with a Focus on Decision-Making," Social Education, Vol. 35, (November, 1971), pp. 740-745, ff. 820-821.
13. Joan W. Moore (with Aldredo Cuellar), Mexican Americans (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1970), p. 8
14. James A. Banks, "Racial Prejudice and the Black Self-Concept," in Banks and Grambs, op. cit., pp. 5-35.

15. Arthur R. Jensen, "How Much Can We Boost I. Q. and Scholastic Achievement," Harvard Education Review, Vol. 39, (Winter, 1969), pp. 1-123; William Shockley, "Dysgenics, Geneticity, Raceology: Challenges to the Intellectual Responsibility of Educators," Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 53, (January, 1972), pp. 297-307.
16. Daniel P. Moynihan, The Negro Family: A Case for National Action (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Department of Labor, 1965).
17. David J. Armor, "The Evidence of Busing," The Public Interest, (Summer, 1972), pp. 90-126.
18. Andrew Billingsley, Black Families in White America (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1968); Robert Hill, The Strengths of the Black Family, (New York: Emerson Hall Publishers, Inc., 1972); Joyce A. Ladner, Tomorrow's Tomorrow: The Black Woman (Garden City: Doubleday, 1971); Barbara A. Sizemore, "Separatism: A Reality Approach to Inclusion?: In Robert L. Green (ed.), Racial Crisis in American Education (Chicago: Follett Education Corporation, 1969), pp. 249-279; Vine Deloria, Jr., Custer Died For Your Sins: An Indian Manifesto (New York: Avon Books, 1969; Jack D. Forbes (ed.), The Indian In America's Past (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1964).
19. Arthur R. Jensen, Harvard Education Review, op. cit.
20. William Shockley, "Models, Mathematics and the Moral Obligation to Diagnose the Origin of Negro I. Q. Deficits," Review of Educational Research, October, 1971, pp. 369-377.
21. Larry Cuban, "Ethnic Content and White Instruction," Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 53 (January, 1972), pp. 270-273.
22. For examples of teaching techniques, see James A. Banks, Teaching The Black Experience: Methods and Materials, (Belmont, Calif.: Fearon, 1970); James A. Banks and William W. Joyce (eds.), Teaching Social Studies to Culturally Different Children (Reading, Mass: Addison-Wesley, 1971); William W. Joyce and James A. Banks (eds.), Teaching The Language Arts to Culturally Different Children (Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1971).

