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BACKGROUND AND RATIONALE

I was an early and enthusiastic advocate of concrete pluralism, and I wholeheartedly endorse that part of the majority report.

I have major problems, however, with the factual and conceptual foundations of that document. I take particular exception to the language and recommendations on the Third World and the slighting references to militancy and Black Studies.

I believe, moreover, that the apologetic tone of the majority report distorts the pluralist imperative, which I discussed in a memorandum on the Brown dilemma.

I maintained in that memorandum that Brown University's problems are reflections of structural problems in higher education and American society. It can be argued, I said—and the majority report quoted only one side of my argument—that Brown's problems are a function of progress. For in some areas and on some levels Brown has made more progress than many, perhaps most, predominantly White institutions of higher learning. But progress brought new and, in some cases, more acute problems. The new demands of the students could not be met without structural and institutional reforms. They could not be met without dealing seriously with traditional perceptions and traditional definitions of education, diversity, and integration.
The majority report does not explain how and why this situation developed. Nor does it deal with the paradox of "progress." For it can be argued that the more racial "progress" you make (using traditional definitions), the more "problems" you are going to have. In other words, the more Asian, Latino and Black students you admit, the more you talk about diversity while maintaining a Eurocentric curriculum and environment, the more problems you are going to have with concrete diversity.

We can make the same point from the other side. For if you go out of your way to meet the expressed demands of Third World students, aren't you, as some ask, increasing the very separation and demarcation you want to eliminate? Here again we confront the dilemma (according to traditional definitions), which should be redefined and raised to a new level. For contrary to the statements in the majority report, we are dealing here with an effect, not a cause. The causal factor is that the Brown world is a de facto White world (in terms of power, orientation, staffing). How do you get out of that dilemma? That's the question.
The New Racial Frontier

Brown University finds itself, because of the very progress it has made, on the frontier of race and higher education in America. Because of its history and its stress on diversity, Brown is facing the inevitable and necessary problem of dealing with and defining the requirements of the next phase of desegregation, which is concrete pluralism.

This is a new challenge, a new process, a new stage. It is a frontier process, and it is impossible to cite one-two-three recipes. The answers will come out of the process, honestly and painfully faced. I believe, with the university chaplain, that this is inevitable, necessary, and healthy. It is part of the educational process. It is part of the painful process of learning how to teach and learn and live in an age that is no longer dominated by the idea that the world is of, for and about White people.

We are not sketching here a theory of demonology. The only thing we are saying is that this is such a basic way of looking at the world that it is difficult for anyone raised in this culture to transcend it and look at it critically and analytically. This is not a peculiar failing of Brown University. For Brown and other predominantly White universities exist in a society organized around that idea. Hence, another dilemma. Can a university transcend its societal setting?
There are indications that Brown can meet the elementary demands of the first phase of desegregation. The question is whether Brown can meet the new demands of Third World students, demands that raise the question of real pluralism, real diversity, and real integration.

Problems of Perception and Definition

To understand this challenge, it is necessary to look briefly at the history of race and higher education in America. For the American (and Brown) venture in higher education began not in equality, but in inequality. In the beginning, and for a long time afterwards, the university was closed to Blacks, Native Americans, Hispanics and women (Black and White). The history of higher education in America is a history of a gradual and painful widening of the circle (in response to protests and changing world conditions) and a gradual and painful democratization of the educational process. And from this standpoint we can say that one of the most important advances in the history of the American university (for Blacks, Latinos, Whites and women) came in the sixties and seventies not because of a deeper understanding of educational theory but because of social movements led by (or inspired by) Black adults and Black students. It is scarcely possible to say anything real or meaningful about the education of Black or White folk without an understanding of this dynamic.
This unfolding process has created new problems, including problems of perception and definition.

A. The Problem of Perception

The dominant view of the university administration is that Brown has made good progress in good faith. The dominant view of the Third World students is that the university has made little progress and is acting in bad faith. The dominant view of the university power structure is that Brown is a liberal university committed to diversity. The dominant view of the Third World Community is that Brown is a White university which gives lip service to diversity.

These are not monolithic positions. There are individuals in the governing structure and in the Third World Community with divergent views. Some, perhaps most, Third World students say the university has made some progress. But most Third World students say progress has exposed the limits of liberal rhetoric. They contend, in general, that you teach not by teaching but by doing and being. They say that the university curriculum is the university and that the university is what it believes.

The perception of some university authorities, on the other hand, is that Brown has made more progress in race relations than other predominantly White institutions and that some student demands are separatist.

There is thus a fundamental difference in the perception of Brown reality. The first task, a task that the majority report
within the confines of a common civilization." In other words, Jews, Blacks, Latinos and Asians remain Jews, Blacks, Latinos and Asians if they want to, but they become Americans or abstract Brown individuals when they leave their private worlds and group cultural enclaves and participate in the hard work which is necessary for the creation of a new community which will be defined not by whiteness, not by blackness, not by brownness, but by blackness—whiteness—brownness.

Part of the problem here is the traditional liberal view that individuals come to Brown and swim as individuals in the "mainstream" (a term some Blacks and Whites use without grappling with the implications of their semantic and political commitment) with polite bows, from time to time, to the group experiences that shaped them. Many, perhaps most, Third World students are asking the university to deal with them as "group individuals" with a history and a vision that the university and America need in order to make a whole. And this raises dangerous questions about the meaning, definition and location of the "mainstream," and the meaning of education in a multicultural society.

There is nothing radical or separatist about this position. For Brown and other predominantly White universities assume, as a basic starting point, that White individuals will come to the campus with a White group point of view which is reflected in the staffing, in the content of the courses, and in the very air that students breathe.
evades, is to define what people see. The second task, also neglected by the majority report, is to deal with

B. The Problem of Definition

Brown University authorities and Brown University students are not talking about the same thing; they are not even speaking the same language. There are, in essence, two conflicting definitions of the problem. One is based on the old ethos of individualism, the other is based on a new and largely undefined definition of pluralism. And it is not possible to make further progress in this environment until the terms are defined and understood. One of the major problems I have with the majority report is its failure to define integration, pluralism, diversity, separation, militancy, racism and institutional racism. Because it refuses to define its terms, the majority report makes confusing statements, praising theoretical pluralism on one page and criticizing concrete pluralism on the next.

This is a frontier subject, and no individual has the truth—certainly not the writer—but the simple definition of pluralism in Webster's provides a basis for discussion: "a state of society in which members of diverse ethnic, racial, religious, or social groups maintain an autonomous participation in and development of their traditional cultural or special interests.
The problem on one level is to define the definitions. The problem on another level is to change the environment that teaches the students and the teachers.

I am in general agreement with all recommendations of the majority report except those relating to the Third World, but I believe, in opposition to the majority report, that it is necessary to go beyond a shopping list of recommendations and emphasize priorities.

The first task is a university-wide dialogue on the meaning of concrete pluralism.

The second task is a university-wide commitment, backed up by the trustees, the administration, the faculty and the student body, to concrete pluralism (in the makeup of the student body, the university power structure and the faculty, and the orientation of the curriculum).

This will require a painful reassessment of what it means to study, teach and learn in a pluralistic world where the overwhelming majority of the people are colored.

Beyond all that, there should be concrete goals, a timetable and periodic reports on progress.
CRITIQUE OF THE MAJORITY REPORT

I. The majority report begs the question and assumes in some cases the point of view of the university.

Some statements in the majority report are not justified by the evidence, and others beg the question by assuming the truth of points that are still at issue. In some cases, phrases and sentences have been lifted bodily from the university position paper (see Appendix 3).

In a critique of the draft, I offered several examples of the apologetic tone:

"On Page 4 [now pages 3 and 4], the report says six times that the task facing the university is difficult. On page [6], the report uses the word difficult two times and speaks on a third occasion of the "inordinately difficult task." [The new draft substitutes synonyms for some of the disputed words.] We are told on Page [7] that "consensus on this task will be elusive." On Page 11, the report says "the feasibility of establishing an Ethnic Studies concentration should be explored by a task force of the faculty....I don't want to be difficult, but I don't think it's wise--or courageous--for a committee to recommend the appointment of another committee to explore the feasibility of action."

Responding to my objections, the new report adopts a more "militant" tone and recommends that the faculty give "formal consideration" to the feasibility of action.
It is worth noting here that President Swearer is more forthright in some of his comments. Consider, for example, his statement on minority faculty in "Race Relations at Brown":

"While Brown has made solid, if modest, gains in the employment of minority—and especially Black—administrators over the last 10 years, the record of non hospital-based minority faculty is disappointing. In 1975 the number of minority faculty was 38. That number declined to 30 in 1981 and returned to 38 in 1985. The number of Black faculty has gone from 17 in 1975 to 11 in 1981 and up to 13 in 1985...."

In the same spirit, President Swearer addresses the Eurocentric bias charge in a memorandum to students, faculty and staff (April 3, 1985):

"As professors Gleason and Stultz have pointed out in their letter to the BDH, despite the emergence of Brown as a significant university in this century, we still inherit a certain provincialism from our past, which our curriculum no doubt still reflects. How often do we focus, in dealing with the human experience, on minority perspectives, or minority achievements, or minority views of history? Or to ask this question in another way, what is it that we either do or fail to do that continues to give members of our Third World Community the uncomfortable sense that they are marginal to the dominant interests and activities of the university?"
It is unfortunate that the majority report does not speak in the same tone.

The defensive tone of this report was noted by other Committee members. In a letter to the drafting committee (April 11, 1985), President George Ayers of Chicago State University said:

"Throughout the report, there are certain areas where the style of writing conveys a perception which might be interpreted differently. In addition, there are several places in the report that convey a defensive tone. For example, on page eight, references to the institutional racism [indicate that it] is a more difficult form to identify, diagnose, and rectify. I disagree with this section. I think there are many elements of institutional racism that are easy to identify and diagnose...."

*Pluralism in the Curriculum*

In this same connection, the section on "Pluralism in the Curriculum" repeatedly begs the question and ignores statements about the limitations of changes and complaints about the lack of material "on the culture and history of the African Diaspora." In this case, as in others, there are real questions about the factual foundations of a report which ignores the core of the demands reported in "Section II Curriculum" of "Black and Third World Student Demands," April 5, 1985:

*It is exactly necessary to say here that individuals quoted in this report do not necessarily share my overall view of the deficiencies of the majority report.*
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Brown's curriculum continues to fail to encourage Third World and White students to take courses related to the Third World. Although much of this can be related to the low percentage of minority faculty and hence the low availability of courses taught from a Third World perspective, a significant deficiency can be found in the very structure of the Brown curriculum. To alleviate this deficiency we demand the following:

1) By 1989, four new faculty positions must be created, funded, and appointed to Afro-American Studies Program at least two of which will be in African History and culture and two in African-American history and culture.

2) While the Council on International Studies has planned to incorporate "non-western" perspectives into the curriculum, the culture and history of the African diaspora has been ignored. We demand at least one position in African history in the History Department, one position in African-American political thought in the Political Science department and one position in social stratification and oppression as they relate to African-Americans in the Sociology department.

3) The President must impress upon department heads that Afro-American studies must be cross-registered in all university departments containing related disciplines (e.g. African history listed in the History department.) The President shall reserve the right to indefinitely freeze the budget of those departments which refuse to allow reasonable cross-registration.
4) Since all of the required courses in the International Relations concentration are eurocentric, it must require courses which focus on the Third World perspective. Specifically, at the very least, three new positions in IR should concentrate on African studies.

5) The Dean of the College must create a course that compares and contrasts the experiences of White and Third World women in the United States. This course must be one of those required of Women's Studies concentrators.

6) The President must set up a special student/faculty task force to evaluate the curriculum and recommend areas where beneficial changes can be made. This task force will consider, for example, creating a special themes and topics course that discusses racial issues and industrial racism. This committee must report to the President and the faculty no later than March, 1986.

7) More efforts must be made to increase the foreign study opportunities that are acceptable at Brown for academic credit. CAS, with the advice of the minority members of the committee, must be especially open to accepting credit from universities in the Third World countries.

I was surprised, incidentally, that the majority report omitted the key documents detailing the student demands and the university response. I am therefore submitting these documents as part of this minority report.
Another significant document on the curriculum is the collection of statements from students and graduates on "the dynamics of teaching and learning at Brown." Here are three excerpts:

I. Minority Perspectives on the Curriculum

1. "I concentrate in one of the big social fields, a discipline which draws most of its data from surveys, and poses many of its arguments and generalizations in terms of statistics. This means that almost every social sciences generalization which is not actually "about" Third World peoples and communities, ignores them. No survey can afford to pay any meaningful amount of attention to so small a part of its data....

"This is not an acceptable state of affairs for Third World students. I guess I communicated my feelings on this subject to one professor, because he turned around and said, probably trying to help, "if you want to know more about minority people, why don't you do a research project on them?" But is it really true that every time I want to learn about my people I have to go out and do ground-breaking independent research on them? Surely the professor has some obligation to know about minority people as well as the majority--to include them in his bibliographies, to discuss the implications of theory X or theory Y for black people, to recognize that we exist. At present, in most courses at Brown, minority people do not exist."

2. "It should be needless to say that the students who are really most deprived by this state of affairs are not the minority but the majority students. I don't need to get a black perspective on narrative fiction (for example); they do."
3. "I know that most professors at least start out by teaching more or less what they themselves have been taught, so it's hard to blame them for not being completely up to date with everything that is going on in ethnic studies, as it relates to their field. But that is not at all true of major topics in major disciplines: for example, the Music Department should certainly include some courses that teach gospel music or jazz...."

II. The majority report evades issues.

It is encouraging to note that the new draft backs away from the erroneous statement that the university agreed to hire fifteen minority faculty members in response to the "imaginative recommendations" of a faculty committee. In fact, as I pointed out, and as the majority report now concedes, the university acted in response to student demands. But there are other assumptions and statements of "fact" which require, at least, discussion. The first draft, for example, said that "the students' demands were well heard and understood." I objected and the word well was deleted. But the statement is still inaccurate. For there is abundant evidence in this record of a failure to understand and even resistance to understanding. More importantly, there is evidence of perplexity, frustration and even anger in the face of demands that go beyond the traditional rhetoric of integration. We were repeatedly confronted with complaints about "Black separatism" and the fallacy of seeking a Black or Third World experience at Brown.
One member of the Visiting Committee concluded after speaking to different constituencies on three visits to the campus "that there is very little meaningful dialogue taking place among them. Faculty and Administration speak of 'overcommitted resources' and of the lack of understanding shown by students in manifest progress to date and in ongoing efforts to improve areas such as minority faculty recruiting and the 'internationalization' of the curriculum (See Page 7 of the majority report)."

He added:

"This is not communication; it is not even contact. To begin with it is never easy for students to understand and appreciate fiscal and other constraints within which the university must operate; it becomes even more difficult when language is indirect and vague. If one wants to achieve true dialogue with students, then one must stop striving to achieve virtuosity in language and seek, instead, an honest and open discourse. Such a discourse is not taking place at Brown University."
The majority report errs in failing to advance the cause of open, honest and perhaps painful discourse.

III. The majority report is marred in several instances by inarticulate conservative premises.

We can see this clearly if we look for a moment at the discussion of the Third World name (pages 1, 13, 14), militancy (Page 15), and Black Studies (page 9).

The Third World

The Charge to the Visiting Committee said that "the term Third World is used frequently and in different ways at Brown. The Visiting Committee should become familiar with the usage."

If the discussion of the Third World name and concept is any indication, the Visiting Committee failed in this task. For the majority report begins (page 1) by taking issue with the Third World concept and by "electing" to use the word minority. Some members of the Committee protested that decision and affirmed "the right of people," as the Charge said, "to choose their own descriptive."

"There are real reasons," I said in a memorandum of April 1, "why the students use the term Third World and why they are uncomfortable with the word minority."
In response to this and other objections, the second draft dropped the unwise recommendation "that the name of the [Third World Transition] program be changed to the simpler appellation, Minority Orientation Program. But the discussion of the term and the program is still quarrelsome and pejorative. In view of this record, I question the purpose and meaning of Recommendation B on pages 13 and 14. Who wants to "take a more active role in shaping and directing the program"? And for what purpose?

The problem here, I suspect, is not the name but the thing. "At Brown," Kristin Wells wrote in the Brown Daily Herald, September 13, 1985, "the term 'Third World' is used in a global context, linking all people of color together, as opposed to the term 'minority,' which carries with it many derogatory connotations in the U.S. and which is numerically valid only on a national level. The unity of the term 'Third World' also represents the common struggle of all people of color throughout the world against centuries of oppression. On a national level it also represents the crisis we face in trying to identify ourselves and the battle between our heritage and our American culture."

Here, as elsewhere, the majority report goes off on a tangent which raises questions about our understanding of the pluralist imperative. For the Third World name and program are not the problem. They are products of the problem or, better still, attempts to solve the problem.

Since there is so much controversy over the Third World concept, I have attached a publication of the Third World Center for informational purposes (Appendix 1).
Brown and the Pedagogy of Pluralism

There was surprising opposition to requests for the deletion of the following sentence (page 9): "Without falling into the categorical trap of assuming that only Black English professors can teach Black literature...." I argued for the deletion of the sentence for it "requires completion and a serious discussion," and added: "It would be necessary, for example, to say that a person who has not transcended the racism of American culture and who believes the world is of, for and about White people should not teach Black literature—or anything else. It would also require a serious discussion of the pedagogical needs of oppressed students (or students who believe that they are oppressed) and the pedagogical limitations of teachers linked in any way to structures of oppression."

In a number of books and articles, I have maintained that "a teacher in a situation of oppression is either a liberator or an oppressor." I would make the same point here, and I would quote Du Bois (The Education of Black People) and Freire, not Disraeli. In The Pedagogy of the Oppressed, which ought to be required reading for any one who is worried about the academic performance of Black students and Third World students at Brown and other predominantly White institutions, Paulo Freire said: No pedagogy which is truly liberating can remain distant from the oppressed by treating them as unfortunates and by presenting for their emulation
In a letter of March 17, 1986, Dr. Ayers made the same point:

The impediment of major significance to minority students, particularly those matriculating at a predominantly white college or university, is the institutional environment. The reputation attributed to the institution with respect to the treatment of minority students, and the presence of minority faculty, administrators, and staff affect the minority student's academic success. Institutions which do a better job of increasing the visibility of minority faculty also do a better job of recruiting and enrolling black students.

Historically, minority students on white campuses have been subjected to open hostility and exposed to racism in every segment of society which precludes their advancement, both in the arena of education and the world of employment. It is not surprising, then, to find minorities seeking access to higher education skeptical of many administrators, faculty and students who may manifest racist attitudes and behaviors.

An elitist or patronizing attitude accompanied by the relevant behaviors serve as obstacles in learning for minority students. Students are often perceived as being under-prepared, intellectually incapable of learning in the university setting at a level and pace traditionally expected, and with limited academic potential.

Most predominately white colleges and universities lack representation of
minority staff who display a more sensitive understanding of the minority student's learning style and needs and who can serve as role models. It is interesting to note that the number of minorities on faculties in white institutions continues to be less that 2 percent, yet over 60 percent of the minority students enrolled in a college or university are enrolled in such institutions. Even where institutional diversity exists pluralism may be lacking. What needs to take place on white campuses is the development of true pluralism toward the elimination of an educational environment that inhibits the free exchange of ideas, attitudes and values.
models from among the oppressors." And what is required now is joint work by Blacks, Hispanics, Whites, Asians, male and female, to create a new pedagogy that will make concrete pluralism possible.

The majority report very properly challenges students to make the most of their opportunities, despite indifference, despite insensitivity, despite racism, despite everything. But it improperly ignores (on pages 11, 12) the context in which learning takes place. In fact, as any number of studies have shown (see Jacqueline Fleming, Blacks in College: A Comparative Study of Students' Success in Black & in White Institutions), the environment of predominantly White institutions—the White staff and White orientation, the lack of Black supporting models and images, and the absence of that climate of love and expectancy that makes historically Black institutions effective in educating Black youths—is partly responsible for the academic performance of minority students.

Militancy as a Psychological Complex

The draft of the majority report said, in so many words, that militancy is a psychological complex. I said, in objection, that the discussion was abstract and misleading, adding: "It does not define militancy, and it does not recognize that militancy, however defined, can, under certain circumstances, be an adequate political—and educational—response, and not a psychological
coping mechanism." In response, the majority report concedes that militancy can be a "reasonable" political response. But what the report gives with one hand it takes away with the other. In the final draft, militancy (which is still undefined) is a psychological coping mechanism and a distraction—"It sometimes becomes a costly substitute for attention to academic progress...." "More to the point, it is a threat to minority students, for "it can also be heard by a less outspoken, more freewheeling minority student as an unwelcome call to separatism (my emphasis). This is abstract, polemical, and misleading. For the question is not either/or; the question is study and struggle against racism and miseducation. I would go further and say that for an oppressed person struggle is a form of education, perhaps the highest form of education.

It is hard to understand why there was such a rigid insistence on this language. For the paragraph doesn't really say anything and the implicit definition of militancy—militancy is saying "a loud 'yes' for one's group identity"—is preposterous.

This paragraph throws a revealing light on the curious discussion of integration in higher education. In fact, as everyone knows and admits, court decisions in the fifties and student militancy in the sixties were major factors in the integration of institutions of higher learning. Why was there so much resistance to telling this elementary and essential truth?
The same apologetics inform the discussion of Brown's evolution. We are told of Brown's "aggressive interest in addressing racial inequities" and the "ample" resources it has committed to the struggle, but we are not told that militancy (the militancy of Blacks and Whites struggling in courtrooms and on city streets and college campuses) was a major factor in progress at Brown.

IV. The majority report lacks a sense of urgency and a sense of priorities.

Several committee members argued against the presentation of a shopping list of recommendations. Perhaps the most incisive statement came from President Ayers:

"One of the areas that is lost in the current document which we discussed at length at the last meeting in Boston was listing the priorities among our recommendations. Currently it is difficult to ascertain which recommendations are priority. It seems to me that in the final draft we should dictate which recommendations are a priority and even add a time frame for expectation of the University to be responsive to them."

There are other problems. There is no mechanism for periodic reports on compliance. Nor is there the sense of urgency Dr. James P. Comer called for in a memorandum of January 27, 1986:
An outside group, with interest but less emotional involvement, can observe the functioning and identify the processes and conditions that interfere or facilitate its goals. Such a group can make recommendations. To achieve institutional goals, a permanent assessment and change mechanism must operate internally. It must be centered around persons and programs most related to the central mission of the institution, and; therefore, would involve its most powerful people. At an academic institution, such a mechanism should involve a preponderance of faculty—representative of all levels and disciplines. Those responsible for supporting the faculty—administrators at all levels and others—should be appropriately represented. And, of course, the educational consumer, the students, should be represented.

A group should attempt to determine what is already being done to facilitate diversity and learning, what should be eliminated, modified or enlarged, how to communicate their findings, goals and strategies to all involved in the institutional enterprise and how to maintain an on-going, proactive program designed to promote diversity and learning.

There is no quick fix for the tensions and problems that develop in settings involving people from diverse backgrounds. But the price of excluding any particular group from the important enterprise of education is to weaken the most critical infrastructure of democracy. Promoting diversity must not be viewed as a painful, time consuming bother which interferes with the central mission of higher education. In a multicultural society, in a multicultural world, diversity must be understood as a central issue in education and responded to with appropriate human and financial resources and enthusiasm.
V. The majority report is a product of a flawed process.

The fifth and final reason for my opposition to parts of the majority report is a sense of concern about the integrity of the process that produced the document. This problem surfaced early and was reflected in communications problems and delicate questions of definition and staffing. Some members, for example, said it was important for the report to be drafted and written by members of the committee. After a long delay, a drafting committee was appointed, but the full committee debated the shape and content of the final report. In fact, the final draft was sent to the printer without the knowledge and consent of the full committee and two of the three members of the drafting committee. There were questions about this procedure from several committee members, including members of the drafting committee. On April 16, I discussed my objections in a telephone conversation with the chairman and I was told, according to notes I made at the time, that the last draft was being sent to me. This was not done. On May 7 and 8, after the report had been printed and distributed to some Brown University officials, members of the Committee received copies. This was a fundamental violation of the agreement that every member of the Committee would have a chance to read the report and "sign off" on it.
Since my name was attached to a public document containing language I had repeatedly protested and criticized, I had no alternative except to protest this violation of equity. And it is important to note here that I did not ask the chairman or the committee to add language or change the shape of the draft. I didn't ask the committee to add language critical of White faculty; I asked it to delete language critical of Black Studies. I didn't ask for language expressing my views on the education of Third World people; I asked for the removal of language expressing conservative views on the miseducation of Third World people. I didn't ask for language attacking conservatives; I questioned language attacking militants.

Was this unreasonable? Or is more required? Have we reached a stage where we are expected as a matter of course to attack militancy and to endorse conservative shibboleths about the education of Black and Third World people? Are we required now to rewrite history and to abandon that Brown (and Morehouse and Howard) maxim which asks us to follow truth or even the scent of truth, wherever it leads.

Some individuals say it is necessary to endorse questionable language and questionable means for the sake of the pluralistic end. I would say, in opposition, that some means are based on inarticulate premises that doom the end. I would say further that some means are, in and of themselves, contestations of the end and negations of the end. And we are invited to consider the words of Ralph Ellison who said, in another connection, that "the end is in the beginning and lies far ahead."
APPENDIX 1

THIRD WORLD CENTER *

HISTORY

The seed that grew into the Third World Center was planted in the late sixties. Afro House, a place where Black students lived and worked on issues of common concern, was created through the social and political struggles of that time. In the early seventies the house was demolished to make way for the New Pembroke dormitory complex. As the students moved into their new quarters at Churchill House the idea arose that the new Center should reflect the interests of all Third World students, Asian, Black, Latino and Native American. From that small beginning, the Center has grown to become the focal point from which Brown's Third World Community coordinates a variety of on-going activities and special events.

PROGRAMS

During the year, programs ranging from political forums and academic support groups to activities celebrating the cultural and ethnic diversity of Brown's community are sponsored by the Third World Center. These events find high visibility at times such as Black History Month (Feb.), Asian Awareness Month (Nov.), and Latino Awareness Month (Apr.). Each week, the Center Series, a calendar of events, is published to inform the community of Center activities.

In the past years the Center has sponsored such programs as poetry readings by Lawson Inada and Wing Tek Lum, and lectures from Maya Angelou, Manning Marable, and Michael Manley. Film series presenting works like Against the Wind and Tide: A Cuban Odyssey, Harvest of Shame, and Black Orpheus have been organized. Musical groups such as Grupo Aymera and Minantillan have also enriched Brown's cultural life via the Center.

The Center plays a positive role in the lives of Third World students. It creates a comfortable atmosphere in which students can have impromptu parties, or simply study quietly. In this regard, Unity Day, a weekly social gathering on Fridays, has become an important part of the Center's activities. It is often organized around a cultural theme and sponsored by one of the Third World organizations.

"Being involved in LASO and FEP has been a lot of fun and educational; I got a chance to learn about other Hispanic groups that I didn't know about. The organizations allow you to become involved in social and cultural exchange. We share music and ideas, we talk about problems; it's just people talking to other people."

—Evelyn Cosme '87

* Undated publication of the Third World Center.
Students, faculty, and staff are not only committed to the Third World Center but to the Third World community throughout Rhode Island. The Center encourages involvement of Third World students in the Providence community as tutors and role models. It supports the Saturday Enrichment Program, the Rhode Island Chinese School, and an introductory computer course to the Third World Community. Many members of the Brown Third World community participate in service organizations such as the Urban League, Progresso Latino, and the International Institute.

The Center does not stop there. Because of its interest in bringing together the concerns of the university and the surrounding community, Center facilities are utilized by off-campus groups. In recent years the NAACP, Lippitt Hill Tutorial, and the Mount Hope Neighborhood Society have found meeting space at the Center.

GOALS

By helping the student to understand the web of connections between the self, the group and the larger society, the Center tries to meet three primary goals. First is to create a collective consciousness that transcends the various cultural and racial backgrounds of its members; an awareness that allows people of separate groups to come together and work on common problems. Second is the need to recognize and support the diversity found among individuals; diversity of opinion as well as unity of action is an essential component of the Center's philosophy. Third is to expand the social awareness of Third World people and deepen their concern for all people.

The Third World Center is part of the commitment that Brown has made towards allowing its students to shape their own educational and cultural experiences. It is an integral part of the educational experience that the university offers its students, a statement of its continuing commitment to "diversity as strength." It would be a shame to waste such a resource. Come join us.

"I was attracted to AASA because I talked to some of the people and found that we shared a lot of the same experiences; experiences unique to the Asian-American community. It helps to know that there are others who have the same problems that you do; it's important to have that kind of support when you leave home."

—Noreen Wu '86
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THIRD WORLD ORGANIZATIONS

African Students' Association
(ASA)

ASA sponsors cultural, social, political, and educational activities concerning Africa. It also serves as the focal organization for the African student community.

Asian American Students' Association
(AASA)

AASA hosts social and cultural events, offers services to the Providence Community, and provides counseling for its members. AASA is active in campus politics as a member of the Third World Coalition.

Daniel Hale Williams Medical Society
(DHWMS)

DHWMS is an organization of Third World medical students that provides academic and social support to Third World students in the Brown University Program in Medicine. The organization also sponsors health service projects for the community.

La Federacion de Estudiantes Puertorriquenos
(FEP)

FEP is a political organization whose purpose is to encourage cultural awareness, recruit and retain Puerto Rican students at Brown, foster awareness of Third World issues, and establish a social interaction for the well-being of its members. FEP sponsors cultural activities, films, lectures, and promotes community involvement.

Latin American Students' Organization
(LASO)

LASO serves as a common bond for Brown students of Latino heritage. It promotes social cultural, and political unity among Latinos, and also reaches out to establish ties with the Providence community. Its activities include speakers, films, colloquia, and special orientation programs for newly arrived Latino students.

Minority Peer Counseling Program
(MPC)

The MPCs are a network of Asian, Black, and Latino undergraduates who provide workshops, academic and personal counseling to new minority students. The counselors are interested in the continuation of a positive Third World existence at Brown.
National Society of Black Engineers (NSBE)

NSBE works for the development of programs to increase Black interest and participation in the fields of engineering and architecture. Throughout the school year, the Society sponsors workshops and lectures directed towards this goal. The Brown Black Engineers are affiliated with the National Society of Black Engineers and members attend the annual national conference.

Organization of United African People (OUAP)

OUAP is a political organization for Black students on the Brown Campus. It serves as the focal point for Black cultural, political, and social activities. The organization is also active in the recruitment of Black applicants to Brown and conducts special orientation projects for new Black matriculants.

Third World Coalition

The Coalition serves as the umbrella organization for the Third World student organizations (AASA, FEP, LASO, and OUAP). As a politically active organization on campus, the Coalition is concerned with issues pertinent to Third World people at Brown, in America, and around the world.

"The Center has also enhanced my awareness of other minorities in America. Before coming to Brown "minority" to me meant "black." Now I've learned more about other Third World groups in the nation and how their concerns are both similar and different from the needs of Black Americans."

-Harold Jordan '85
APPENDIX 2

BLACK AND THIRD WORLD STUDENT DEMANDS

April 5, 1985
APPENDIX 3

Resolution of the Advisory and Executive Committee
of the Brown Corporation

The Advisory and Executive Committee, having carefully reviewed the Brown Administration's considered response to the "Black and Third World Student Demands," and having also reviewed the "Demands" themselves, strongly supports the positions taken by the Administration and authorizes their implementation. A&E appreciates the depth of concern of minority students and the efforts of the Administration to respond to them in a constructive manner.

April 12, 1985