



Essay

Nuanced Negro Studies: A Hare Perspective on the State and Nature of Black Studies Today

Fredrick Douglass Dixon, Ph.D.¹

fdixon@uwyo.edu

Director of African American Program and Black Studies Centers
Radford University

Marcus DuBois Watson, Ph.D.

watsonmd@buffalostate.edu

Associate Professor of Africana Studies and Individualized Studies
Buffalo State University

Abstract

This paper provides a critical assessment of Black Studies using the life and work of Nathan Hare as a lens of interpretation. The authors hope to honor Hare's contributions to the Black freedom struggle generally, and to the making of Black Studies specifically, while simultaneously contributing to the understanding of the discipline's history. It is argued that, within the first year of its establishment at Predominantly White Institutions, conservative forces of both White supremacist and Negro origins sabotaged Black Studies before it could make the revolutionary history it was intended to make. Specifically, it appears that conservative forces derailed the transformative potential of Black Studies by disassociating it from its origins in the Black Power Movement and hooking it anachronistically to the earlier Civil Rights

Siyabonana: The Journal of Africana Studies, Volume 1, Number 2, Summer 2023

Copyright © The Author(s) 2023

Movement where Africans called themselves Negroes, and equality meant achieving sameness with Whites. A cursory look at twelve current Black Studies programs leads the authors to hypothesize that often, programs trace their lineage to the sabotaged version of the discipline and not to Black Studies as envisioned by Hare. In this sense, many current Black Studies programs are more Nuanced Negro Studies than Black Studies suggesting an urgent need to critically reflect on the discipline.

Keywords

Nathan Hare, Black Studies, Black Power Movement, Negro Question, theoretical development

Black Studies “is a torch with which to burn down a decadent world of corruption and oppression so that the green grass of freedom and justice can begin to grow” (Hare, 1970, p. 5).

What should be done with the presence of the troublesome Negro for maximum exploitation? (Dixon, 2022).

Negro Studies is...restricted to the recounting of our historical travails and the ferreting out of black contributions to a diabolical civilization (Hare, 1970, p. 2).

Nathan Hare “represents an organic linkage of Black Studies with its earlier sociological roots” (Colon, 1980, p. 48).

Introduction

When Black Studies’ architect, Nathan Hare, referred to Negro Studies as that which highlights “black contributions to a diabolical civilization” (1970, p. 2), he was lamenting that Black Studies was being duped into becoming something diabolical within the first year of the discipline’s creation in 1968-69. From its inception, Black Studies was a historical force that was intended to be revolutionary in its nature and impact. Hare’s critique is significant, first, because it says something illuminating about himself. Hare was aware of the cooptation of Black Studies as it was happening,

indexing his powers of perception based on his experiences as a sociologist, psychologist, journal creator and editor, and community-engaged scholar-activist. Indeed, other scholars have, importantly, recognized and addressed this “missing year of sabotage” of Black Studies only decades after the fact (e.g., Biondi, 2012; Nicol, 2013; Rojas, 2007; Rooks, 2006).

Second, by putting a spotlight on this missing year of sabotage of Black Studies, Hare was distinguishing between what he knew the discipline was meant to be as *Black* Studies versus the *Negro* Studies he saw it becoming, in real time, in the late 1960s. Fifty-five years after Black Studies began, Hare’s insight empowers one to ask: which version of the discipline has passed down to current Black Studies programs? Is the discipline “a torch with which to burn down a decadent world of corruption and oppression” as it was intended to be as Black Studies? Or, has its historical force for revolutionary change been forced to submit to a “diabolical civilization” in the form of Negro Studies? Do the ongoing changes of the discipline’s name from Black Studies to monikers such as African American Studies, African Diaspora Studies, and Africana Studies speak to the direction the discipline has gone since it was first conceived as a force for Black liberation?

By answering these questions, this article offers an assessment of the discipline using Hare’s life and writings as a lens of interpretation. The authors hope to honor Hare’s life and work for achieving the status of “intellectual maroonage,” i.e., scholarship in which Black scholar warriors have “declared their freedom” from the European worldview responsible for sewing unprecedented turmoil among and within human populations and the earth (Carruthers, 1999; see also, Hotep, 2008; Watson, 2022a). This article is also intended to develop a new approach to assessing the discipline and holding it accountable to its original purpose—that is, if today’s Black Studies scholars think the original purpose is accurately represented herein, and is of continued relevance, fifty-five years later.

Using Hare’s ideas as an interpretive lens, we argue that the discipline of Black Studies has morphed, generally, into what we call “Nuanced Negro Studies.” “Negro” and “Black” are best known as identity labels used by African descended people in the U.S. respectively before and after the Black Power Movement (BPM) of the mid-1960s (Martin, 1991). However, the terms have been recently developed as concepts referring to two broadly conceived subconscious dispositions that govern the way African descended people in the U.S. may view themselves, their relationships to

White supremacy, and their ideologies for pursuing the Black freedom struggle (Watson, 2022b). A Negro psychological perspective is developed out of a dependence on the basic presumptions of the European worldview, including the supremacy of European civilizations and of Whiteness. As a dependent subconscious mental state, this Negro orientation allows one to criticize and modify the European worldview. However, when one adheres to this orientation, one cannot, ultimately, overhaul or displace the European worldview within one's own psyche. Doing so undermines the basis of one's own existence and is, therefore, tantamount to suicide. By contrast, Black consciousness refers to a deep mental state in which African descended people presume a hard break from the European worldview by regrouping on an independent basis as an African people. By, thus, presuming an independent African worldview as the deep orientation governing African descended people, a Blackness mindset imagines change, ie., the Black Radical Tradition (Carr, 2011). Now, it is something situated within the long history of African adaptations and improvisations to global challenges, and, thus, wholly alternative to the European worldview.

Negro Studies and Black Studies are not being used, then, as rhetorical devices to respectively mean “bad studies” and “good studies.” Further, our reading of Hare's work does not make us think he was using the terms for inflammatory purposes; his use of Negro and Black resonates with the concepts as they have been reviewed above as psychological orientations. As the academic embodiment of Negro consciousness, Negro Studies may center the agency of African people; recover the missing contributions of Blacks to American and world history; and be complex, brilliant, and interesting. But, Negro Studies would not seek to overturn the basic premises of the European worldview on which it depends for its survival. Thus, and as distinguished psychologist, Daudi Azibo, has argued (1992), Negro Studies becomes an intellectual exercise largely detached from the goals of transformational change, and, therefore, also detached from Black liberation and the upliftment of Black communities as independent, African-centered spaces. By contrast, Black Studies embodies Black consciousness and, thus, seeks to escape from being conceptually incarcerated (Nobles, 1986) by the falsely presumed superiority of European thought and behavior associated with the European worldview (Ani, 1994). Black Studies, then, results in intellectual work that is considered meaningful to the extent that it uncompromisingly works toward revolutionary change, Black nationhood, and the unification and

empowerment of independent Black communities and Black institutions (Lomotey, 1992; Watson, 2022b), which all presume grassroots action, and an equality of value between academic and lay knowledge.

The authors assess contemporary Black Studies generally, and in its essence, to be Nuanced Negro Studies. Here, “nuanced” means that much of the scholarship associated with the discipline, that used to be called Black Studies, is of a sophisticated intellectual nature. Nuanced also connotes a time dimension—whereas, Negro was the dominant identity and form of consciousness for African descended people that existed prior to the 1960s. Negro consciousness has continued into the present, but with greater sophistication in the form of Negro Studies. Its sophistication, or nuance, the authors suggest, is achieved by an ever-finer cutting up and conceptualizing of information and ideas. Such prioritizing of differentiation for-its-own-sake is characteristic of the European worldview (Narvaez, 2020) and makes Negro Studies valuable and “acceptable” to a White-male-heteronormative gaze. Negro Studies, which embodies the subconscious felt-need to prove oneself as worthy within the European establishment, values nuance as an end-in-itself as a marker of acceptable scholarship.

If the original discipline of Black Studies is now effectively Nuanced Negro Studies, it has lost its revolutionary force and, as Hare states (1970, p. 2), if Black Studies is not revolutionary “it will be useless if not detrimental” to Black people’s quest for freedom.

How Scholars Have Reviewed Black Studies: Themes

Since Black Studies started in the mid- to late-1960s, scholars have assessed the discipline in various ways. However, using Hare’s ideas as an interpretive lens to provide a critique appears to be unique. As will be reviewed below, Hare’s perspective is especially relevant since he “represents an organic linkage of Black Studies with its earlier sociological roots” (Colon, 1980, p. 48), which is to say the dialectical unfolding of the BPM out of the ashes of the classical Civil Rights Movement (CRM) (Watson, 1980). Based on a review of relevant articles from three prominent and diverse journals—*Journal of Black Studies*, *The Black Scholar*, and *The Western Journal of Black Studies*—the authors have identified several themes that represent the major concerns of scholars regarding the discipline.

The most fundamental and frequently expressed theme is that Black Studies lacks definition. Scholars mean that Black Studies lacks a paradigm that distinguishes the discipline from other fields of study (Akbar, 1984; Allen, 1974; Asante, 2006; Biondi, 2012, p. 241; Conyers, 1997, p. 119; Kershaw, 1992; Mazama, 2010). The argument is that defining Black Studies by subject matter alone, i.e., the study of Black people, does not do enough to mark the discipline as unique from Sociology; History; Philosophy; Dance; Art; Anthropology; English; American Studies; Education; Social Work; Biology; and other academic fields that may also, at times, make Blacks the subjects of investigation (Mazama, 2010). What makes a discipline distinct also involves its approach or paradigm, i.e., the historical circumstances of its emergence; its purpose; the questions it asks; and the tools it uses to find answers and interpret findings (Kershaw, 1992). Frequently, when scholars lament the lack of definition of Black Studies, they argue for Afrocentricity as the solution.

If African and African descended people tend to appear in the margins or as footnotes in the way American and world history are taught, Afrocentricity, at its simplest, is an approach to research and writing that makes Black people's histories, cultures, and voices the center of the story (Asante, 2006). Afrocentricity also refers to a set of philosophical assumptions said to be found across all historical African cultures that can be used to distinguish an African worldview from a European worldview. Further, the African worldview is understood to contain the governing principles of most African Diaspora people despite surface-level changes to the latter's lifestyles based most fundamentally on situations related to the holocaust of enslavement (Asante, 2006).

Briefly, the European worldview that governs the assumptions of most traditional disciplines starts with the idea that reality is essentially material (Akbar, 1984). Since reality is material, there is scarcity of what is real and valuable. Scarcity makes competition over limited resources appear like the natural order of things. Tribalism and individualism follow because competition over scarce resources means everyone "goes for theirs." Scholars understand that it is these interlocking set of ideas that are behind the making of Euromodernity (Gordon, 2017) including, but not limited to, White supremacy ideology; the genocide of Indigenous People and mass theft of Africans; the ongoing obliteration of the value of Blackness; and humans' catastrophic relationship to the environment. Without a unique paradigm, scholars

fear that Black Studies has existed for many years as “nothing but European studies of African phenomena” (Mazama, 2010, p. 250).

In response to this dilemma of definition, scholars argue for the African worldview would make Black Studies (1) distinguishable from traditional disciplines and (2) consistent with the discipline’s original purpose of pursuing the liberation of Blacks from literal and conceptual incarceration by European colonial forces (Nobles, 1986). The African worldview is independent of the European worldview because the starting assumptions differ. Whereas ultimate reality within the European worldview is material, ultimate reality within the African worldview is spiritual (Akbar, 1984). Thus, value is not scarce but ever-present and abundant—i.e., there is no conceivable end to the spiritual energies or vital forces of life. Instead of competing over limited resources, sharing of value becomes the dominant philosophical assumption. As a result, it is assumed that the basic nature of human action is collectivist; that is, people pursue value through relations with others, not in spite of them. In short, scholars have argued that Black Studies lacks definition and would do well to fashion itself as the study of everything in the world from African-centered perspectives.

Scholars have also expressed concern that Black Studies has lost its way when it comes to the co-production of knowledge between Black community members and trained academicians. Without the construction of knowledge across the false divide between the academy and community, Black Studies can lack “practical relevancy to the actual conditions and problems experienced by African American people” (Marable, 1992; see also, Akoma & Johnson, 2010, p. 283; Alkalimat, 2021; Douglas & Loggins, 2021; Karenga, 1988; McClendon, 1974). Many scholars understand the displacement of knowledge away from the Black community as a betrayal of the spirit and purpose of the Black Campus Movement, which the discipline most directly originated:

The demand for Black Studies cannot be separated from the rise of the militant black student movement in the 1960s. In fact, it is no exaggeration to say that the establishment of hundreds of Black Studies curricula in colleges and universities across the land was a major achievement of the black student movement (Allen, 1974, p. 2).

In essence, scholars who are making this critique are saying that many impressive Black Studies texts appear to be so concerned with demonstrating nuance and heterogeneity-differentiation within Black populations that they have lost touch with the original Black Studies idea that valuable knowledge must be broadly understood and practical with respect to the Black freedom struggle. Some Black Studies texts are said to be “literally indecipherable except to a small body of scholars. It replicates the stilted, obtuse language which characterizes much of the western intellectual tradition” (Marable, 1992, p. 32). Divorced from reality-on-the-ground and, thus, the ability to address the predicaments of Black communities, much Black Studies scholarship ironically facilitates the preservation of White supremacy and anti-Black racism.

This relates to a broader concern among scholars that, due to its lack of definition and commitment to its original ideas, Black Studies has been too pliable by allowing itself to be remade in the image of traditional disciplines (e.g., Biondi, 2011, p. 227; Karenga, 1988; Mazama, 2010; Phillips, 2010, p. 273). Hence, many faculty who teach courses in Black Studies programs are rarely hired full-time within those programs (Mazama, 2010). Instead, faculty are either jointly hired between a traditional discipline and Black Studies, or hired outside of Black Studies; but, whose courses count toward the Black Studies curriculum. Unsurprisingly, therefore, many Black Studies scholars identify themselves more as economists, political scientists, philosophers, and other intellectuals of the traditional, Eurocentric disciplines than as Black Studies scholars. Consequently, Black Studies scholars find themselves beholden to the cultures of the traditional disciplines, including commitments to the parochial nature of those disciplines; tenure proceedings that oblige Black Studies scholars to measure up to the “Eurocentric-masculinist-knowledge-validation-process” (Collins, 1990); stress on intellectual achievement that is disconnected from praxis; and the ideal of the apolitical, value-free scholar (Marable, 1992). Thus, Europeanized, many Black Studies programs and scholars may not differ much from traditional disciplines and intellectuals and, in fact, may invite opportunists to participate in and run Black Studies programs. As opportunists, they often will not have a genuine commitment to the historical struggle or philosophy of the discipline (Christian, 2006; Phillips, 2010). However, inadvertently, such opportunists emasculate the radical intentions of Black Studies.

In another instance of understanding a complex phenomenon, as it was unfolding in real time, Hare captured the essence of the emasculation of Black Studies

as early as 1975, i.e., just six years after the institutionalization of Black Studies at Predominantly White Institutions (PWIs). He writes, “We are slowly letting the discipline slip from our political grip,” for “it is being increasingly shaped and defined for us rather than by us” (Hare, 1975, p. 46).

Hare’s Life and Work as a Black Studies Template

One reason it is appropriate to use Hare’s ideas as a way of reviewing the state of Black Studies is that Hare, by and large, lived out the meaning of Black Studies as he understood it. That is, unless one reads him cynically, Hare cannot be accused of contradicting his own message. As such, this section is written to introduce readers to Hare’s understanding of Black Studies by following his biographical actions as a scholar-activist. In Hare’s vision for the discipline, as in his life, it is non-negotiable that Black Studies (1) uproots and transforms White supremacy; (2) helps African people everywhere to remember and remake a sense of Black nationhood; (3) produces academic knowledge in tandem with community knowledge to ensure scholarly ideas are relevant to Black communities; (4) develops teaching and research practices that grow from Black people’s urgent need to affirm themselves as an African people in a way that does not derive from traditional disciplines philosophies that reduced Africans to an animalistic footnote of human history; and (5) respectively prepares Black and White students to pragmatically deal with, and self-reflexively dismantle, White supremacist societies.

Chooses Howard University over Colorado State University

In 1961, Hare had a choice to be hired either at Colorado State University or at Howard University. Against the advice of nearly all his contemporaries who said he would be “holding back racial progress” if he chose Howard, Hare chose Howard (Re, 2019). In associating racial progress with choosing the PWI over the Historically Black College-University (HBCU), his contemporaries were thinking according to the integrationist mindset of the CRM associated with Dr. King. Here, people who consented to refer to themselves according to the Eurocentric label “Negro” viewed equality as achieving sameness with respect to Whites (Watson, 2022b). Within the parameters of this Negro mindset, being hired at Colorado State, and particularly into a research position there, would advance the racial progress of Negroes—i.e., a Negro

would have “made it;” showed he can do what Whites can do; opened the door for other Negroes to “succeed;” and made the masses of Negroes proud. Further, Hare would have made significantly more money at Colorado State.

Hare’s choice of Howard speaks to his mindset and how he would come to understand the purpose of Black Studies. Hare chose the work of raising Black students’ consciousnesses of themselves over chasing the American dream; he chose purpose over money; and he chose the popularly reviled agenda of Black nation-building at Howard over the politically safer integrationist ethos that would have come with joining Colorado State. Regarding why he chose Howard, Hare states, “it was my belief they [Howard students] would become the leading black individuals of the future, if not black leaders, and that the entire race and the world would benefit from whatever they became” (Hare, 1972, p. 34). In his use of “Black” and not “Negro,” and in his stress on the “entire race and the world,” Hare showed he was interested in increasing a newly conceived *Black* consciousness among Howard students who would then help unite the global African world. Hare was equally clear that the end goals of his time teaching at Howard and creating the discipline of Black Studies was that Black youth would understand themselves simply as Africans. Reflecting on his thought process a year into starting at Howard, Hare said, “I once wrote an article on the problem of names...in 1962. I thought it would spread as Afro-Americans. I didn’t know that Black would become acceptable so fast. But we call ourselves Black. We call ourselves Afro-American. Negro. African American. And eventually we’ll call ourselves Africans” (Black Journal, 1971, 12:40). Finally, since the position at Colorado State was a research appointment, Hare also rejected a situation where he could be potentially alienated from engaging with students and the Black community; the Howard teaching position would afford him maximum engagement on both fronts.

Criticizes University President

Over the next five years, Hare developed mentor-mentee relationships with many Howard students, including future Black Power leader, Kwame Ture. Simultaneously, Hare became networked with organizations that were either fully or becoming Black nationalist, such as the Nation of Islam (NOI) and the Student Non-violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC). Within this context, Hare reacted critically to the idea of Howard President, James Nabrit, to make the HBCU sixty percent White by 1970. Nabrit was responding to pressure he felt from several Harvard

University professors who had written a critique of HBCUs as “academic disaster areas” (Re, 2019). Trying to maintain Howard’s reputation as “the Negro Harvard” (Re, 2019), Nabrit seems to have reasoned that more White students would mean higher academic expectations, better GPAs, and more behavioral role-models that Black students could use to understand how to succeed in mainstream White society. On September 6, 1966, Hare criticized Nabrit’s plan in Howard’s school newspaper, *The Hilltop*. Still untenured, Hare wrote that he did not “see why we should have to give [Whites] Howard” since Whites already controlled half a dozen colleges and universities in and around D.C. (Re, 2019). Like his decision to join Howard over Colorado State, Hare was, again, imagining the education of Blacks as something that did not have to depend on Whites, their forms of behavior or intelligence, or integration into the White supremacist institutions. Of this, Hare declared that Black education does not involve the “searching merely for equality of education” (Hare, 1972, p. 33), which was implied in Nabrit’s quest to develop Howard in the Eurocentric image of Harvard. Hare later argued that education for Blacks that is based on the philosophy of Black Nationalism has three premises: “1) that there can be no equality of education in a racist society; 2) the type of education conceived and perpetrated by the White oppressor is essentially an education for oppression; and 3) black education must be education for radical black liberation” (Hare, 1972, p.33).

Indeed, for Hare, due to the nation-wide influence of the BPM in the mid-1960s, he believed that education for Black people no longer had to mimic the model of “education for docility,” which Africans had received for centuries. He called this education, “Negro” education, and HBCUs that delivered it, “Negro Universities.” Hare traces the origins of Negro education at HBCUs, first, to White missionaries who started many of the schools after the Civil War, and, second, to Negroes who took over from the White missionaries and “quickly instituted the mores of the plantation and sought to ape the academic trivia and adolescent fanfare of white colleges” (Hare, 1972, p 35). Of the Negro leaders who took over from the White missionaries, Hare continues, “These newcomers were mainly descendants of free blacks or ‘house nigger’ slaves (those who worked in the house instead of the field and became domesticated emulators of upper-class Southern white manners). They longed to be accepted at all costs by white society and modeled their lives to approximate white thinking and behavior—even toward their own race—shunning

association and identity with the lower class” (Hare, 1972, p. 35). Where Negro education “encouraged a preoccupation with lofty gobbledygook such as footnoting” (Hare, 1972, p. 32), Hare understood that the end goals of Black education are to correct historical injustices and liberate minds.

Conceivably, Hare could have “talked a big game” about education-for-liberation in the classroom while doing little to bring about such transformation in the actual workings of the university. Indeed, such a position would have been the safer route to his personal well-being and professional advancement, not to mention he would have been in line with the Negro approach to being a professor, “Negro professors are generally characterized by acquiescence to the administration and a resignation to academic nothingness” (Hare, 1972, p. 37). Hare continues his criticism of Negro professors, stating “they do just enough to get by” and “ceremonialize the most minute achievements into regal grandiosity” (Hare, 1972, p. 37). The Black professor, meanwhile, is doing nothing of historical significance unless he, she, or they are supporting “the black student in his vital preparation for the struggle against oppression and for saving and building a black nation” (Hare, 1970, p. 3). As reported above, Hare exemplified the Black professoriate by publicly critiquing Nabrit’s plan for Whitening the HBCU. Consequently, in late 1966, the administration “decided to sit on Hare’s contract renewal” while Hare endured “two more months of day by day harassment from his superiors” (Re, 2019, p. 3). Yet, toning down and accepting one’s place to keep a job at a racist Negro or White University were contrary to Hare’s ideas about the purpose of Black Studies. In fact, such Negro “footshuffling” (Hare, 1972, p. 35) contradicted the essence of Black Studies as an instrument of Black nation building and transformational change.

Collaborates with Black Power Students to Conceptualize a Black University

As the Howard administrators busied themselves with torpedoing Hare’s career as a college professor, from 1966 into 1967, Hare joined “with a militant band of student leaders to write and issue a ‘Black University Manifesto’” (Re, 2019, p. 3). Hare explains, “We wanted not only to prevent the proposed transformation of Howard into a white university but also contrarily to further ‘blacken’ Howard, to overthrow the Negro college with white innards and to raise in its place a black university relevant to the black community and its needs” (Hare, 1972, p. 38). By

“Black” university, Hare and the students of Howard’s Black Power Committee did not mean the opposite of White, as it may seem, considering black and white are color opposites. Instead, they took direction from the discourse of the BPM (Watson, 2022b). Here, “White” meant White nationalism, i.e., an ideology and practice of racial supremacy executed violently and unethically against Africans and other People of Color by and for the benefit of Europeans and their descendants. “Black,” by contrast, referred to an ethical call for Africans and their descendants to reclaim and unify around their common African heritage for the sake of humanizing and empowering themselves, thereby, bringing balance and justice among human groups back to the world. Black education implied a re-commitment to an African-based interpretation of culture and epistemology, both of which are tied to the long history of African responses to human experiences and challenges rather than to the European project of capitalist modernity (Carr, 2011). Hare understood that Negro education, since it was psychologically in cahoots with White supremacy, could not provide any new ground. The Black University, like Black Studies a few years later, promised to develop Black youth in accordance with the heritage, values, and aspirations stemming from Black people’s experiences as an African people within and beyond the Euromodern world that is grounded in White supremacy.

By June of 1967, Hare and several other Black and White colleagues and students were fired or expelled for their “Black Power activities.” After the issuance of the Black University Manifesto, these activities included, but were not limited to, students protesting against and preventing a pro-Vietnam speech on campus by a member of the Selective Service in March; a “Black is best” speech by NOI member, Muhammad Ali, to an impromptu crowd of four thousand people in April; the shutting down of ninety percent of classes in May due to a student boycott of the administration for threatening to discipline several students and faculty activists, including Hare, for their roles in shutting down the Selective Service speaker months earlier; and a walkout of President Nabrit’s semester-opening speech the next fall (Re, 2019; Washington Area Spark, 1967).

Many elements of Black Studies were implicit in Hare’s and the students’ call for a Black University: e.g., education for Blacks must be for liberation or it is useless; it must equip Black students with the ability to grapple with White supremacist institutions and prepare White students to dismantle the same institutions that give them their immorally-begotten privileges; and Black faculty, if they are to live up to

the meaning of the name, must work for the unity of African people and avoid being remade into “successful Negro individuals” chasing the American dream while concomitantly bolstering White supremacist professions and institutions. Hare exemplified the meaning of being a *Black* professor, for he would not compromise the goal of African unity to stay at a Negro university whose innards were made of White supremacy.

Hones Fighting Sensibilities

Shortly after being fired from Howard, Hare would become the Director of the first Department of Black Studies at a PWI (which will later become a Hispanic Serving Institution or an HSI). In the interim, however, Hare returned to his first love, boxing, in 1967. On December 5, Hare won his first and only post-Howard bout with a knockout of his opponent in two minutes and twenty-two seconds of the first round (Re, 2019). To the extent that, in Hare’s life, “his love of boxing and learning has helped him fight for social justice” (History Makers, 2004), Hare used the pugilistic characteristic of no-nonsense combat as a Black methodological template—and decidedly not a Negro one—for how Black Studies must announce itself to the academy and the world. This method may be read into Hare’s statement, “There is a method to all of this [i.e., creating Black education for liberation], but apparently one that some people will never really understand. It is said that it is better to die on one’s feet than to live on one’s knees, but some individuals appear actually to believe it is better to crawl around on one’s bare belly” (Hare, 1970, p. 4). Here, Hare implies an educational schema: White education leads to Africans living on their knees for this education compels them to submit to mainstream culture at the expense of killing the value of their Africanness (homicide). Negro education is worse—i.e., crawling on one’s bare belly—because Africans are doing this psychological- and identity-violence to themselves (suicide). Black education, meanwhile, is on its feet for it is unequivocal about the value of African humanity, no matter the cost, because affirming one’s humanity is what sane people do (pride).

Joins a PWI if it Means Black Educational Justice

Hare had a second bout scheduled for February 22, 1968, and was close to fighting it. If it was a choice between boxing and returning to higher education to contribute to homicidal-White or suicidal-Negro education, Hare would have chosen

boxing. However, when the Black Student Union (BSU) at San Francisco State College (SFSC) recruited him to launch the first-ever Department of Black Studies at a PWI in the U.S., Hare embraced the chance to foster African unity through the advancement of Black Studies. For Hare, it was not a contradiction to have first chosen to teach at an HBCU and now to accept an offer from SFSC, which was a PWI. It was an adjustment to reality. He had learned throughout the 1960s that most HBCUs were loyal to the Negro idea that African success meant showing they could do what Whites could do. Thus, and ironically, there was more room for Africans to express Black consciousness at PWIs than at many HBCUs:

...although the protest at Negro colleges in the 1960s sometimes took the form of black power cries (often exaggerated or concocted by administrators and public relations officials playing to public sentiment), the fight on Negro college campuses—in contrast to more nationalistic black tendencies on white campuses—more accurately reflected a desire to escape the doldrums of Negro bourgeois dalliance and administrative tyranny and mismanagement (Hare, 1972, p. 36).

In going to SFSC, by contrast, Hare was joining a situation where Black consciousness was strong, thanks to Jimmy Garrett, Marianna Waddy, and others who transformed the Negro Students Association into the first-ever BSU in the spring of 1966. Since its inception, BSU members: (1) engaged the surrounding Black community to such an extent that the line between them often disappeared; (2) met regularly with Black Panther Party members, including graduate student, George Murray, to foster Black consciousness among students; (3) lobbied successfully for Black Arts scholars, such as Amiri Baraka, Sonia Sanchez, and Askia Muhammad Toure, to serve as Black Studies instructors before there was a department; (4) clandestinely taught Black Studies courses as undergraduates to graduate students; and (5) demanded resources, including the hiring of Hare as the person to lead the development of the Department. When asked why they recruited Hare, BSU leader, Jimmy Garrett, recalls:

I was the head of Black Studies as a junior. I was teaching graduate courses. We were going to get caught. I begged Nathan to come out here. He had the heart. He gave up a career to come out here and be with us. He was a race man. He

had a Ph.D. We needed somebody who we thought had some consciousness. We couldn't recruit somebody who was going to come out here and sell us out. We needed somebody who we could communicate with, so we didn't need somebody who was stuck up. And Nathan was grounded. He was cool (Rogers, 2009, p. 38).

Thus, Hare, again, demonstrated the consistency between his personal decision-making and his vision of Black Studies—he would be disgusted by both if they failed to precipitate “drastic change, a total revamping of American scholarship and education” (Hare, 1970, p. 5).

Mentors Students Who Strike for Black Studies

Buoyed by the advocacy of Jimmy Garrett and the support of SFSC's then-President John Summerskill, Hare was hired to conceptualize and lead what would be the first Department of Black Studies at a PWI. However, Summerskill was fired before Hare began his work, and the remaining administrators used various tactics to frustrate Hare's efforts for three months. Within this hostile, anti-Black context, Hare nevertheless managed to draft “A Conceptual Proposal for a Department of Black Studies” and, later, the official proposal the college adopted in the context of opposition from conservative political forces in California (Re, 2019, p. 4). When administrators resumed efforts at stonewalling the department's development, BSU students, with Hare as a mentor, organized and led the biggest student strike in U.S. history. In helping to build student unions for Latin, Filipino, and Asian students who would then join the protest for a Department of Black Studies, the BSU and Hare exemplified the Black Studies principle of preparing Black students to deal with White supremacist institutions. In steering members of the mostly White Students for a Democratic Society to join the protest for the department (Rogers, 2009, p. 37), they were putting into practice the Black Studies idea of organizing Whites to help dismantle the unethical institutions of their European cultural heritage.

Guided by Hare and inspired by advice given to them the night before the strike by one of Hare's former students and Black Power leader, Kwame Ture; BSU members launched what would become a five-month strike for Black Studies from November 1968 to March 1969. The protesters made ten non-negotiable demands of SFSC administration, one of which was that all current Black-focused courses being

taught in traditional disciplines be resituated under the new Department of Black Studies. The issue here was scholars of traditional disciplines cherry-picking content from Black people's history and teaching them out of context within an apolitical, purely intellectual, and "objective" Eurocentric paradigm. BSU members and Hare wanted to pull the content and courses back into a central location where they could be revised to serve the sole interest of Black liberation. A second demand was that the Chair, faculty, and staff of the new department "have the sole power to hire faculty and control and determine the destiny of its department" (Hare, 1972, p. 42). In this case, students and Hare feared that the destiny of Black Studies programs would become dependent on the surrounding world of White-male-college-culture for defining the purpose of Black Studies and the hiring of its faculty members. Here, the BSU and Hare knew they could not build a Black nation that is dependent on its historical enemy, and further, that the historical enemy knows it benefits when Africans are dependent, divided, and demoralized. Hare writes, "The oppressor is the enemy and he attacks while we argue and continue to play bid whist" (Hare, 1970, p. 4). With these demands, BSU students and Hare were identifying and trying to eliminate disengaged intellectualism and dependency, both of which constitute Negro Studies.

While the BSU, students, community allies, Hare, and other faculty, protested for non-negotiable demands, SFSC administration sought middle-ground and an immediate end to the strike. However, compromising on the full independent humanity of Africans as manifested through Black Studies was incongruent with Hare's vision of the new discipline. On the idea of compromising the discipline, Hare writes, "We must understand that no educational program or institution can serve two cultural or political masters, two contradictory causes" (Hare, 1970, p. 5). For Hare, it was not enough to hire "a person with black skin lecturing or 'rapping' to students on 'the Negro'" (Hare, 1970, p. 3). Nor was it appropriate to acquiesce to the phenomenon whereby "Negro professors pin on their Ph.D.s and Greek letter fraternity emblems and trot out their old courses on Negro history, Negro literature, painting, music and the like, to now call black" (Hare, 1970, p. 3). Adding "Black" to courses, programs, and universities if "their [Eurocentric] ideology and methodology remain unchanged" is, from Hare's discipline-creating perspective, "pseudo-black studies" or "spook studies" (Hare, 1970, p. 3). Hare insists "we must know the difference between crude variations of black studies and the real McCoy" (Hare, 1970,

p. 2). Thus, Hare refused to compromise and to help end the strike. For refusing to compromise on doing what it takes to pursue, for Africans, the status of “full and equal humans”—i.e., for living out the true meaning of being a Black Studies scholar—the new SFSC President, S. I. Hayakawa, fired Hare two months after SFSC hired him to conceptualize and lead the Department.

Advances the Cause of Black Consciousness Through Journal Creation

In collaboration with Robert Chrisman and Allan Ross, Hare became a founding publisher of the first Black Studies journal months after being fired from SFSC in 1969. Where conservative forces of White supremacist and Negro origins undermined the fight for African humanity at both an HBCU and a PWI, Hare designed *The Black Scholar* as a more independent space to advance the cause of Black consciousness, nation-building, and liberation. As a widely published author of innovative articles and the classic book, *The Black Anglo-Saxons* (Hare, 1965), that focused on the Negro middle class losing sight of the freedom struggle; Hare was eminently qualified to produce a Black Studies journal of the highest quality. And while “The *New York Times* called *The Black Scholar* the best black intellectual publication since DuBois’s *Crisis* with the NAACP” (Re, 2019, p. 7), Hare would warn Blacks of feeling qualified because Whites give them a thumbs-up. In response to the criticism during the 1960s that a new Black Studies discipline would be substandard, Hare writes, “The notion that ‘academic soundness’ would suffer is basically a racist apprehension, a feeling that any deviation on the part of blacks away from white norms and standards inevitably would dip downward. It also is based, perhaps, on the naive notion that traditional education is value-free” (Hare, 1969, p. 732). Hare would feel more accomplished by getting a thumbs-up from a person who committed her life to Black liberation. Thus, esteemed sociologist, Doris Wilkerson, wrote that “Nathan Hare set a new standard for scholarly activism” (Re, 2019, p. 1) with the publication of the journal.

The journal also represented Hare’s understanding that a Black Studies scholar must work for Black liberation or do nothing. Indeed, within the first year of the founding of the Department of Black Studies at SFSC, Hare lamented that this particular department, and the hundreds of others cynically supported by conservative monies, “coerced blacks into hiring the closest thing they could find to ‘Uncle Toms’ who would be able to teach nothing but tomism so help them god” (Hare, 1970, p. 4).

Hare explains that an “analysis of black studies throughout the land shows hardly any worthy of the name” (Hare, 1970, p. 2). Here, Hare is pointing to the way in which real Black Studies, which was to bring about transformational change for Blacks, was backsliding into the Negro Studies of previous generations. Hare states, “It is better to have no black studies program at all than one that is false and in the long run damaging, just as a man far out at sea without pure water had better go on thirsty rather than drink salt water and die” (Hare, 1970, p. 3). In never again seeking a full-time faculty position in Black Studies, Hare lived what he thought—he stayed away from Black-turned-Negro Studies programs rather than join them and contribute to the eroding of the Black freedom struggle. Pouring himself into *The Black Scholar* was how Hare contributed to the liberation agenda of Black Studies.

The first several issues of *The Black Scholar* embody Hare’s meaning of Black Studies. First, by publishing contributions by Kwame Ture, Amiri Baraka, Eldridge Cleaver, John O. Killens, and others in issue one, Hare created the journal to conceive, plan, and execute the development of Black consciousness and nation-building. Second, works by African independence leaders, Sékou Touré of Guinea and Kwame Nkrumah of Ghana, and Hare’s own contribution on the Pan African Festival in Algiers, demonstrate the international intentions of Black Nationalism and Blackness itself. Popular criticisms today that say “Black” signals “America” and leaves out other African people are misinformed about general history and the history of Black Studies. It was the CRM, associated with Dr. King, where Africans who called themselves Negro fought almost exclusively for the civil rights of “African Americans.” It was the “Black” of the BPM, associated with Malcolm X, that emphasized Black people’s human rights, and sought to extend consciousness back to the first human civilizations of the Nile Valley and across the globe to Africans everywhere (Watson, 2022b). This was the era when many Africans rejected European names. Casius Clay accepted the name Mohammad Ali, and Kwame Ture and JoAnne Deborah Byron changed their names to Kwame Ture and Assata Shakur, respectively, for example. Taking the first several issues of *The Black Scholar* also as a witness, African independence leaders moved just as easily into Blackness as Hare moved into Africanness. This was because Blackness was the road to African identity, what Hare had always anticipated would come to Blacks in America. Third, the ideas in the first issues of *The Black Scholar* are straightforwardly about Black liberation, or they would

not have been published. Blackness, Africanness, liberation—in privileging these themes, Hare simply migrated three cornerstones of Black Studies into journal form.

The Sabotage of Black Studies

As alluded to above, Black Studies was made possible by and reflected the meaning of the BPM, and Hare was a key figure in transferring the meaning of the BPM from the community to the academy. The discipline that today goes by names such as African American Studies and African Diaspora Studies *had* to embody the essence of BPM, if not be called *Black* Studies, when it emerged. Even in instances where the discipline went by another name, such as *Africana*, in the case of Cornell University's Africana Studies and Research Center established by James Turner in 1969, program creators understood themselves to be building institutions modeled on "*Black* Universities" as called for by students and activists of the 1960s (Fenderson & Katungi, 2012). Further, the discipline could not have been called Negro Studies because this was the *mis*-education (Woodson, 2006) the advocates of Black Studies sought to supplant. To grasp the stakes involved in Hare advocating for Black Studies and conservative forces dismantling it, "Black" must be understood in the context of African people's quest, since the start of the Euro-modern world, to transform the meaning of themselves from White people's dependents to fully free Africans.

In the first several decades in the making of what would become America in the 1600s, the British colonizers fixed into place the brutal equation, "black=slave" (Gates & Yacovone, 2013). Since then, no one, especially Africans to whom the equation applied, wanted to be Black. Black meant slave, but also property, thing, chattel, animal, and not-human (Mbembe, 2017). It followed in law, culture, and mindset that Blacks can be disrespected, brutalized, and killed with impunity because it was not a crime or immoral to terrorize one's property (Higginbotham, 1982). In the U.S. and globally, then, Black became the incomparable picture of what insecurity looked like—a permanently dehumanized and defenseless state of deathly living. This meaning of Black carried on for centuries and was prominent as recently as the early 1960s when "black was an insult for many Negroes" (Martin, 1991, p. 90). Indeed, "Negro" was a euphemism. It was one of several "don't call me black" labels Whites invented for Africans. Under conditions of physical and psychological terror, Africans agreed to

use it to disassociate with the ultimate negative value that had become attached to Blackness and Africanness.

When Kwame Ture and other Black Power thinkers of the mid-1960s insisted that people of African descent identify as **Black**, they were also calling out the term **Negro** for the euphemism it was. For them, **Negro** was “a white man’s word to make us feel inferior,” as Roland A. Barton had written to Du Bois years earlier (Barton, 1928). As such, to live by the **Negro** mindset was to accept **White** supremacy’s twin false premises of **White** superiority and **Black** inferiority. Consequently, struggling for freedom under the persuasion of the **Negro** mind could be only imagined as integrating with **Whites** and assimilating into their European cultural forms of thought and behavior, which were **White** supremacist and anti-**Black** in nature (Ani, 1994). This is why **Negro** integrationism is not to be confused with otherwise desirable cross-cultural exchanges. In a U.S. and Euromodern context, **Negro** integrationism and African self-hatred are two sides of the same pathological coin (Watson, 2022b). By and large, the CRM, associated with Dr. King, operated according to **Negro** integrationist consciousness, which is why equality meant sameness vis a vis **Whites**; a we-can-do-what-they-can-do refrain; and the prideful assertion, “We are your equals” (Watson, 1980; Watson, 2022b).

The **BPM** represents a moment in the freedom struggle when Africans cast aside **Negro**, discarded **Whiteness** as a measure of their humanity, and stopped running from **Blackness**; thus, from themselves as African people. Representing a chance to distance themselves from **White** people’s immoral legacy—which included various forms of mass theft, genocidal violence, and environmental destruction—the **BPM** empowered Africans to ask of **Whites**, “Who are you to be equal to [anyway]?” (Watson, 2022b). Thus, **Black** represented the most free and independent state of consciousness Africans had achieved since being violently transformed into **White** people’s property centuries ago. **Black** meant a rejection of the European worldview responsible for African people’s dehumanization. **Black** did not emerge randomly or by accident as a replacement of **Negro**. **Black** was locked into the subconscious logic of American and modern world history, and had to someday take center stage. In particular, it was the negation of **Blackness**, as that which is not-human, that was the ultimate source of **Whiteness**’ world status as the paragon of the human. This anti-**Blackness** had to be found, and its value reversed into a positive for Africans and all people to live as equals. In its deep essence, it had to be the *Black Power Movement*;

it could not have been a Negro, Colored, Afro American, or some other euphemistically stated Power Movement. These “movements” would have been nonsensical except as methods of keeping Africans on a continued flight from their Blackness and thus, their health and well-being as African people.

This understanding of Black as the key to African people’s freedom is needed to grasp the full meaning and significance of the year of sabotage of Black Studies. As the intellectual manifestation of the spirit of the BPM, Black Studies was the educational component of a humanitarian striving of a people to reclaim their humanity and dignified place in history. Yet, African people’s quest to be viewed in their full humanity became ensnared in yet another manifestation of the question that has long kept White supremacy on track and intact—the Negro Question. Dixon (2022) has distilled the essence of the Negro Question down to the following interrogative: “What should be done with the presence of the troublesome Negro for maximum exploitation?” The Negro Question was formally raised by a cadre of who’s who White leaders, including former President Rutherford B. Hayes, at the First and Second Lake Mohonk Conferences of 1890 and 1891, respectively, in New York. However, the question has been at the heart of American society since the first enslaved Africans were transplanted to the land (Kazembe, 2021). The power of the question is twofold—first, since the enslaved could be only either submissive or troublesome in the eyes of Whites, the relevance of the question is permanent. Second, its permanence means it is forever adaptable, capable, that is, of being asked and already answered for any situation. Over the centuries, and in different contexts, the answer to the question has ranged from “keep them in their place,” “send them elsewhere;” or “annihilate them.” In the late 1960s, the troublesome Negro took the form of Black students and young, African scholars, like Hare, attempting to free Blackness from the brutal equation of “black=slave.”

In just a year, White and Negro politics managed to retrofit humanitarian Blackness back into the status quo of White supremacy in the form of Nuanced Negro Studies. Within this conversative discourse, Black people’s struggles to affirm themselves as an African people was depicted cynically as “separatism.” Critics further claimed that students and scholars who argued for the discipline were unnecessarily political, subjective and unacademic. Yet, education has worked exceedingly well at *politically* keeping Whites for centuries as the standard of value and the-human for students and the society—e.g., Haynes, 2017.

There are various conservative agents, sites, and times involved in the undermining of Black Studies. When the first Department of Black Studies was coming into being on the back of the student strike at SFSC, for example, President Hayakawa, administrators, California Governor Ronald Reagan, and other conservative agents made sure to rid the campus of Hare, just as they had expelled the Black Panther Party graduate student, George Murray, months earlier for essentially teaching Black Studies to undergraduate students. That is, what was Black about Black Studies was being removed from the discipline before it could make the humanitarian history it was meant to make. In the next two decades, other factors, such as a general economic decline and reversals of affirmative action (Colon, 1980, p. 51), conspired with White backlash against the Black gains of the 1960s, to further derail Black Studies. However, no entity is as responsible for sabotaging the true intentions of Black Studies as the Ford Foundation under its White male president, McGeorge Bundy—former Dean of Harvard’s Faculty of Arts and Sciences and national security advisor under the Kennedy administration (Rooks, 2006, p. 79).

Recent studies are clear that the Ford Foundation “was committed to guiding the shape of the field of Black Studies” since its inception (Rooks, 2006, p. 98; see also Rojas, 2007). In fact, due almost exclusively to the foundation providing more than \$2 million worth of grants between 1969 and 1971, Black Studies grew “from one department in 1968 to over five hundred by 1972” (Rooks, 2006, p. 94). However, the one condition for funding was a negative one—the element of Blackness, as it was understood by Hare and others of the BPM, had to be removed from the equation. By as early as 1969, in fact, Bundy “had rejected any form of Black Power as an organizing principle for African American Studies” (Rooks, 2006, p. 83) to the point where “a proposal based on a ‘separated’ Black power stood no chance of receiving funding” (Rooks, 2006, p. 95). Bundy knew the historical significance of the BPM; he, therefore, understood that Black Studies based on Black Power meant that Blacks would explore a reorientation to Africa; exercise independence of thought free from the European worldview; and use their knowledge to unify and transform Black communities. At a 1969 conference at Yale University, one of Black Studies’ seminal figures, Maulana Karenga, suggested that the new discipline would have a duty to serve the Black community. Bundy, however, repudiated the idea, stating, “There is nothing wrong with providing a sense of direction, identity and purpose; but it is a very

dangerous thing to start pushing around the subject for that purpose” (Rojas, 2007, p. 142-3).

While Bundy rejected the use of Black Studies for the unifying and transforming Black communities, his use of soft language—i.e., “there is nothing wrong with providing a sense of direction...”—shows he was aware of just how much Black Studies students and scholars at the time were anxious to base the new discipline on knowledge that would lead to Black and human liberation. Many Ford Foundation decision makers knew there was risk in removing Black Nationalism from the equation of Black Studies, as it was this nationalism, in the form of the BPM and Black Campus Movement, that inspired the call for the discipline. Indeed, “The decision to structure Black Studies in a way that not only sidestepped the demands of militant, nationalist, or radical students but also made it intellectually and structurally dependent on traditional disciplines was one that many program officers knew would raise eyebrows” (Rooks, 2006, p. 95). Yet, if the raising of eyebrows was something to be aware of, it was to be better prepared to snuff out and eliminate any attempt at using Black Studies to foster a sense of Black unity based on common African ancestry. In an interoffice memorandum within the Ford Foundation, a White male officer named John Scanlon states, “In my judgement, requests of this kind that are based on the separatist philosophy should be answered with a polite but firm ‘no’” (Rooks, 2006, p. 100).

White male officers of the Ford Foundation found value in Negro scholars’ perspectives on the discipline. The latter repudiated the idea of Black Studies as a new academic discipline that would be overly focused on liberation and community engagement. For instance, Harvard University professor, Martin Kilson, says, “I personally understand the viewpoint as held by Black nationalists. Indeed, I am compassionate toward it. But my intellect rejects it” (Rooks, 2006, p. 76). Kilson desired a study of African people removed from politics; a kind of “pure” and “objective” intellectual endeavor criticized by the likes of Hare for leading to disengaged scholarship that is irrelevant and often incomprehensible to the Black masses. Similarly, highly regarded African American economist, Sir Arthur Lewis, of Princeton University did not see the value of Black Studies unless it was tied to traditional disciplines. After evaluating Ford Foundation grant proposals for the development of Black Studies programs, Lewis said Black Studies should not constitute its own independent discipline because “He felt that potential Black Studies

majors should stay within traditional disciplines, such as economics, English, history, or sociology” (Rooks, 2006, p. 96). Lewis explained his reasoning to Bundy stating that, “Student demand for black teachers is associated with the desire for black studies to be taught inspirationally, and should therefore be rejected along with the inspirational approach” (Rooks, 2006, p. 97). Black Studies was meant to produce knowledge for the study of Black liberation and, thus, a rebalancing of human’s relationships to each other and the earth. Lewis did not see knowledge as valuable outside the form it took as disengaged intellectualism, which the BPM and the Black Campus Movement assessed as a White-male model of intelligence. Bundy and other Ford Foundation officers used Lewis’ “perspective to either fund or deny applications” (Rooks, 2006, p. 98) and, therefore, thwarted the transformative potential of Black Studies. Thus, Black Studies was intentionally derailed from its course as the intellectual wing of the BPM.

The new discipline would not be funded, achieve professional status, or scholarly legitimacy until it stopped being a political agent for Black freedom, Black nationhood, and community transformation. It was the Negro agenda of integration that was used to strip Black Studies of its *raison d’être* of liberation. The integrating-away of the purpose of Black Studies took several forms. First, academic administrators, scholars, and funding sources refused to acknowledge Black Studies as an autonomous academic discipline with its own paradigm and approaches to knowledge production. Instead, Black Studies programs would be funded if they used traditional paradigms, such as History, Sociology, and English, as their bases. The point was to “add Black” without disrupting Euro-America’s hegemonic ways of understanding the world. Furthermore, Black Studies scholars would be hired into traditional departments. Again, the point was not to challenge the Eurocentric thought of White faculty, but to desegregate traditional departments by hiring Blacks trained in the same Eurocentric fields as their White counterparts. Indeed, a new Negro Studies was emerging whose architects sought to depoliticize the discipline by establishing Black Studies units that would often serve more White students than Black students. In arguing for the utility of Black Studies for White students, Lewis spoke to Bundy about Princeton stating, “Princeton’s experience is that there is an enormous demand for black studies among white students” and that “white students sharpen the discussion, since they are not dominated by the black militants” (Rooks, 2006, p. 97).

Given this historical and ideological context, early architects and funding sources sapped the discipline of its original purpose. Black Studies carried the BPM into the realm of education and, while it could have been flexibly implemented, its basic presuppositions were not meant to be “sidestepped,” as Rooks put it above. The Black in Black Studies came from the Black of the BPM. As such, the new discipline was meant to convey an approach to freedom based on Black people reassessing Black as a positive value; reclaiming a stolen identity and history as an African people; uniting as an identifiable people; resisting White supremacy; and ushering in a new world based on humanitarian principles. In other words, Black Studies embodied a new meaning of education in which teaching, research, and intelligence must be tied to ethical considerations—i.e., knowledge is useless if it is not leading to or consistent with advancing human equality; liberating oppressed people; highlighting contradictions; rebalancing that which Euromodernity has thrown out of whack; and encouraging humans to treat each other and the earth with dignity. If education did not adhere to these goals, Hare would ask: what was it doing?

In its first year, then, Black Studies was Negro-fied by making it serve the interests of (1) integrating Blacks into White institutions and (2) preserving the European worldview of the traditional disciplines as the de facto standard of teaching, research, and intelligence. It was not that Blacks were figuring out among themselves what this new discipline should be, with some, like Lewis, advocating for the integrationist approach and others, like Hare, insisting on the nationalist approach. As an extension of the BPM, the new discipline was a rejection of the Negro-integrationist method as a failed approach to overcoming White supremacy and its anti-Black racism during the preceding CRM. Lewis, along with other Negroes and White institutions, such as the Ford Foundation, succeeded in injecting into Black Studies not so much a new spirit, as much as an older, Negro spirit of second-class dependency on Whiteness, thereby “evoking conciliatory language that saw the resolution of Africana into the mainstream of American cultural thought and history (Carr, 2011, p. 186). With their efforts came the professionalization and growth of the new discipline, a Nuanced Negro Studies, whose history is tied to assisting the White supremacist agenda. This institutionalization period of the discipline prevented the turn toward Blackness from changing the course of history toward justice. As early as 1968, Hare saw how Negro people’s noble, yet miscalculated, call for integration a decade earlier during the CRM was used as a weapon against them stating, “It will be

an irony of recorded history that ‘integration’ was used in the second half of this century to hold the black race down just as segregation was so instigated in the first half” (Rogers, 2012, p. 169).

The Hare Template as Interpretive Lens

Which version of the discipline has been passed down to current Black Studies programs: the Negro or Black version? Given the history presented above, it is conceivable that the discipline was Negro-fied so early on in its existence that we may have forgotten the initial purpose of the discipline and mistake the Negro version for the original. Here, we operationalize Hare’s life-and-work to create a template to discern the differences between Negro and Black Studies programs. In the same way the historical transformation from Negro to Black identity was a dialectical unfolding toward greater consciousness and freedom, Negro and Black Studies are viewed as stages of African consciousness, not as opposites.

In fact, in the conceptual framework presented here, drawn from Hare’s life-and-work, the two academic approaches to studying African people share four features. They both (1) center Black people; (2) understand Black experience within U.S., diasporic, and global terms; (3) correct for inaccuracies and omissions about Black people from previous research and in popular stereotypes; and (4) produce new knowledge focusing on Black people and issues. Feature 4 is important because if this new knowledge circulates mostly in academic circles and is not designed in collaboration with Black community members for the purpose of liberating African people, the work exemplifies Negro Studies. Taken together, features 1-4 (where number 4 is mostly about the intellectualism and not the efficacy of new knowledge) are the defining characteristics of Negro Studies. However, Negro Studies becomes Black Studies with two additional features: (5) knowledge for liberation’s sake and (6) knowledge in collaboration with, and for, the Black community. Features 5 and 6 are the active ingredients that make Black Studies Black; thereby, maintaining the discipline’s organic link to its origins in the Black Power and Black Campus Movements.

Regarding feature 5, the idea is that many Black people and communities continue to suffer multifaceted maladies associated with neo-colonial violence. Yet, Negro scholars appear out-of-touch, finding new things to study, almost solely for the

careerism, and/or the disengaged intellectualism of it. Hare criticizes this aspect of Negro Studies stating, “While we have no wish to appear disdainful of research in any form, it is our considered judgment that enough research has already been done to suit our current needs” (Hare, 1969, p. 731). Hare continues, “There are studies on ‘Negroes and Potato Growing in South Georgia,’ ‘Negroes and the Consumption of Watermelons in Maine.’ And yet people still maintain their ignorance of what is wrong—or even that there is really something wrong—let alone about what we need to do about it” (Hare, 1969, p. 731). For Hare, the knowledge needed for liberating Black people and, thus, resetting the world according to ethical standards was available in 1969. However, as the academic manifestation of Negro consciousness, Negro Studies can only imagine freedom as integration into the European worldview, on which it depends, to take the conservative shape it does. Negro Studies can innovate ideas, but cannot conceive of, nor lead to, true African liberation.

Related to the idea that knowledge produced under the name Black Studies must be for the sake of liberation is the idea that liberation is achieved through Black Nationalism. For Hare, “Black Studies is nationalistic, not separatist” (Hare, 1969, p. 734). By rejecting separatism, Hare means that Black Studies should steer clear of shortsighted, ultra-Black symbolic gestures such as Blacks seeking “separate dormitories, chitterlings in the cafeteria, and similar diversions having little to do with changing seriously the power relations of blacks and whites, let alone the nature of education” (Hare, 1969, p. 733-34). Black Studies, in embodying the core principles of the BPM, is meant to use human intelligence, coming from people of all backgrounds, for the sake of transferring a portion of White people’s violently achieved power to Black people in order to bring a sense of ethical and equitable balance to human life.

Feature 6 of Black Studies is that, if the discipline is to be organized around liberation via Black Nationalism, it must necessarily create knowledge in collaboration with the community to ensure that knowledge is relevant to the community. As Hare explains about the original Black Studies, “Hence, most crucial to black studies, black education, aside from its ideology of liberation, would be the community component of its methodology” (Hare, 1972, p. 33). Hare continues, “This was designed to wed black communities, heretofore excluded, and the educational process, to transform the black community, making it more relevant to higher education, at the same time as education is made relevant to the black community” (Hare, 1972, p. 33). The

transformation of Black communities around the ideology of Black nation-building is the other feature that makes Black Studies Black and not Negro.

The authors used this six-feature framework to shed light on the perspectives utilized by the twelve representative contemporary Black Studies programs. Based on the following cursory assessment of the programs' websites, the authors hypothesize that current Black Studies programs are consistent with Hare's observation of the discipline's depoliticized objective that emerged during its institutional phase —that when it comes to Black Studies, there are “hardly any worthy of the name” (Hare, 1970, p. 2).

Most academic programs, including Black Studies, have websites, and many of the websites contain statements about the programs. The statements may be one to three paragraphs that essentially introduce and “sell” the academic programs to students. The “about statements” offer information about the purpose, parameters, benefits, and values of the program. The authors have selected twelve Black Studies programs that represent regional diversity across the U.S., and diversity according to the Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education: two R1-private; five R1-public; three R2-public; and two M1-public institutions. The process of selecting the sampled programs included (1) perusing the websites of six institutions representing the above diversity factors within each popularly known region of the country, e.g., East Coast, Midwest, Southern, etc.; (2) determining a “most commonly occurring” or “typical” discourse among each set of six programs within each region; and (3) choosing two programs representing the “typical” discourse from each region with preference for websites that used relatively more words for the sake of having more to cite and quote. Except for one that offers a minor only, the sampled programs are almost all free-standing departments with baccalaureate degrees, including several with Ph.D. or graduate minor options in Black Studies. We have not factored into our analysis how the structure or status of the Black Studies programs may impact their relative commitment to Black Studies as it was envisioned by Hare. The institutions will go unnamed, as the point is not to single them out. Rather, if what Hare had hoped would be Black Studies is being taught as Negro Studies across diversely situated higher educational institutions, there is reason to think we are reporting on a phenomenon beyond these twelve programs rather than random, disconnected incidences.

From the perspective of the “about statements,” all twelve programs show explicit commitment to features 1-4. Hence, the programs (1) center the Black experience; (2) see this Black experience in U.S., diasporic, and global terms, and understand themselves to be; (3) correcting the historical record; and (4) producing new knowledge about Black people. Regarding feature 4, however, none of the programs mention liberation or freedom as a goal. One of the twelve sampled programs uses the popular concept of “social justice” in its program description. This program, which is a Southern R1-public university, states it has an “interest in social justice issues that connect African diaspora communities.”

However, some programs promoted a spirit of Black unity and, therefore, Black Studies, to some extent; some programs also hinted about the oneness of the global African world. For instance, one of the California schools uses the term “African peoples, Continental and Diasporan,” suggesting, like Hare, that Black people are African no matter where they are in the world. Similarly, when an East Coast R1-public university says, “The African diaspora comprises people of African origin outside the African continent,” it is also depicting Black people’s diversity in terms of an ultimate unity. On the other hand, some programs apparently stress a distinction between Africans. For instance, a unit at a R1-private Ivy League school, emphasized what is “distinctively African American,” while a California university stresses the differences among African people. This latter program’s focus, on that which distinguishes Africans from each other, matches its interest in “producing, refining, and advancing knowledge of Black people.” Creating ever-finer, more nuanced studies of African people, if it is for knowledge’s sake alone, qualifies as Negro Studies. A Black Studies approach is concerned with producing knowledge that leads to Black people’s liberation.

Most of the twelve programs do not mention or allude to Black communities, whether in the form of collaborating to produce liberatory knowledge or using such knowledge to help unify and transform Black communities. In one case, however, a program from a Big Ten R1-public university recognizes that knowledge may be for both academic and practical purposes or, in its words, for “academic excellence and social responsibility.” A Midwest M1-public program states this matter in a way that resonates a little more strongly with a Black Studies approach—its website hopes to cultivate “socially responsible global citizens empowered to serve their communities.” The statement appears to be saying that its students will graduate and engage their

communities “someday” or “after the fact,” whereas a Black Studies approach grounds education in community collaboration as part and parcel of the learning process. Thus, when read generously, two of the twelve programs hint at a community relationship, but none say it in a way Hare would recognize as “the real McCoy.”

The language of the programs also appears apolitical. The programs under review do not prioritize Black unity. Intentional community engagement also seems minimal. Units, therefore, do not reflect features 5 and 6 of the framework, which defined the initial purpose of Black Studies. Instead, the programs manifest what Hare called “crude variations” of Black Studies for they appear motivated to integrate into and prove themselves worthy to the Eurocentric establishment. Overall, the programs embody the spirit of the classical or Negro CRM instead of the BPM from which Black Studies emerged as an alternative to Negro people’s mis-education (Woodson, 2006[1933]).

Several programs make it a point to show allegiance to the authority of traditional disciplines as if staying in close proximity with what is Eurocentric gives them a short cut to scholarly legitimacy. A unit at an Ivy League R1-private school demands that whatever else students may learn, they must develop critical thinking that is “rooted in a traditional discipline.” Similarly, an East Coast M1-public institution appears to trumpet the value of offering an interdisciplinary perspective for its own sake, i.e., as if simply saying it studies African people using “sociological, historical, political, literary” and a multiplicity of other disciplinary lenses, automatically makes it a credible program. While Hare, and early architects of Black Studies, designed the discipline to be multidisciplinary, the idea was to draw on traditional disciplines only if doing so advanced knowledge for liberation. The call for a multidisciplinary approach was certainly not intended to lend the traditional disciplines, and their White supremacist “innards,” any more credence than was necessary (Watson, 2022b).

Three programs seemed to rely on this holistic, multidisciplinary approach. For instance, a California R1-public university is explicit that “...we are not simply a collection of experts from traditional disciplines; we are united by a relentless commitment to pushing the boundaries of knowledge.” The point of multidisciplinary in the Black Studies Hare envisioned was not to become enamored with being a philosopher, sociologist, historian, or artist; but, to find ways of transcending and transforming traditional knowledge grounded in White supremacist

epistemologies. A Southern R1-public school is even more intentional about organizing knowledge outside of the rigidities of traditional disciplines. This school values “theoretical approaches different from those traditionally found in the curricula.” Finally, a different California university embodies the Hare-meaning of multidisciplinary. This R2-public program stresses that the parochial thinking associated with traditional disciplines is transformed into holistic approaches to knowledge for its students due to this program’s explicit grounding in an “Afrocentric or African-centered perspective.” This program positions “the disciplines” outside of, and beyond, their Eurocentric philosophical context, and recenters them within an African philosophical context.

Most of the sampled programs see their larger purpose as contributing to the multiculturalism and/or diversity agendas of their universities. Some programs use the exact terms or variants of “multiculturalism” and/or “diversity” when outlining their larger purposes. One program at a Midwest R1-public university sees Black Studies as a space “for students to grow cultural awareness.” Other programs use words and phrases that may be seen as coded to mean multiculturalism and/or diversity. For instance, an Ivy League R1-private school sees Black Studies as ensuring that students get “a broad liberal arts perspective,” while a Big Ten R1-public school has designed its Black Studies program “to train not only informed and productive citizens, but also the next generation of scholars.” However, the pre-sabotaged Black Studies was not centrally concerned with diversifying White supremacist institutions and integrating Blacks into them. During its founding, Black Studies architects sought to create independent spaces where freedom for Black people—which would include a transformation of what education means—could be planned and executed outside the close watch and influence of the “diabolical civilization.” From the Hare perspective, then, making a few Black people more comfortable in higher education does not address the systematic oppression of the masses. Multiculturalism and diversity are apolitical measures that make the status quo more palatable, not unacceptable. The sampled programs do not appear to be torches to “burn down a decadent world.”

Finally, none of the twelve programs call themselves Black Studies. Some are African American Studies while others use more diasporic or global names such as African American & African Diaspora Studies and Afro-American & African Studies. Seven of the twelve programs call themselves Africana Studies, which was the most popular designation. While the naming of Black Studies is so complex that “the issue

has lasted the life of the discipline” (Karenga, 2009, p. 42), the Hare perspective adds an important point here. When concerned with trying to make sure Africans everywhere feel included or with assuring the White establishment of the purely scholarly function of the discipline (Karenga, 2009), “Africana” is a reasonable name. However, when Black is understood from a psychological perspective to be at the center of African people’s desire for freedom, calling the discipline everything but Black represents, on the face of it, a diversion from the Black freedom struggle. Being Black has haunted African people since the start of Euromodernity. Africans were misled to such an extent that they used euphemisms such as Negro and Colored to avoid being Black. Hence, African American, African Diaspora, or Africana may reflect newer, nuanced flights from Blackness, especially given that the name changes coincide historically and politically with the sabotaging of the discipline from the late 1960s into the 1970s.² The Hare perspective is clear that the terminology and meaning of Black derived from the BPM and that it signaled a specific purpose, an unavoidably political and non-negotiable demand for Black liberation. In this regard, the Hare perspective would say there is a good chance that if the name changed, then the discipline is something new, and it is not technically Black Studies.

We are aware that assessing Black Studies programs via their “about statements” and names is, ultimately, rudimentary, and may hide complex dynamics such as a discrepancy between how a program presents itself and how it operates and that some of the websites may not be updated. Moreover, the “about statements” may accurately reflect the approach of some, but not all faculty members in a given program. Nevertheless, using the Hare perspective to assess the twelve programs provides readers with some insight about the current objectives of contemporary Black Studies programs. In doing so, the assessment highlights the distinction between these objectives and the initial purpose of the discipline. Most importantly, it is our hope that the Hare perspective on Black Studies might encourage programs to be accountable to the discipline’s pre-sabotaged and forgotten mission.

Conclusion

The discipline of Black Studies emerged during the BPM with a mission to transform Black communities. Through its significant funding program and ideological support from select Negro intellectuals, the Ford Foundation almost single-handedly helped

the new discipline of Black Studies become a fixture on college campuses across the U.S. The irony was that the new units would only receive funding if they rejected any commitment to the liberation and empowerment of Black communities. Absent the political commitments to liberation and community, the new discipline could not be “a torch with which to burn down a decadent world of corruption and oppression” as it was intended (Hare, 1970, p. 5). It could exist only as a castrated copy of the original—a Nuanced Negro Studies, in which scholars and their work would salvage the status quo of White supremacy, or not exist. This article has briefly outlined this history and concludes that Nuanced Negro Studies remains the dominant approach to Black Studies in American universities today.

To reach this conclusion, the authors reviewed Nathan Hare’s life and scholarship, and contributions to the origin of discipline. He is a seminal figure and architect of the originally conceived discipline of Black Studies in the late 1960s. Although there are several other activist-scholars who helped to bring about the discipline, Hare’s ideas and life experiences are especially fitting. First, his deep connection to the BPM inspired the call for Black Studies (including serving as teacher and mentor to Black Power leader, Kwame Ture). Second, Hare publicly and explicitly championed Black education over Negro education. Third, he was central to the five-month student strike at SFSC, which brought the first Department of Black Studies into existence where he would be its first Director. He is, therefore, an exemplar. Hare’s life and ideas are unmatched for understanding what Black Studies was meant to be as an academic discipline within a Euromodern context.

The purpose of this article has been to honor Hare’s life of service to the Black freedom struggle while developing a way to hold Black Studies programs accountable to the original purpose of the academic field. Using Hare’s life and experiences, the authors created an interpretive lens for assessing programs that today are often called “Africana Studies.” The Hare interpretive lens was applied to a sample of Black Studies programs, and it was hypothesized that these programs qualify as Nuanced Negro Studies as opposed to the Black Studies that Hare and others had envisioned. The point was not to invalidate the sampled programs and ones like them; rather, using Hare’s perspective, the authors were able to make a distinction between programs that adhered to a Negro consciousness, hence Negro Studies, and those units grounded in Black consciousness, hence Black Studies. An ability to shed light on where Black Studies programs and their faculty stand ideologically, in relation to

the original liberatory template of the discipline, is a critical piece of the puzzle for assessing the quality and direction of the Black freedom struggle in the 21st century.

The distinction is also significant for other reasons. One reason is that the history of Black Studies, since the late 1960s, is often discussed in terms of its growth, development, evolution, and the like. However, this language and these terms hide more than they reveal. While original architects, such as Hare, would have anticipated and accepted “change,” the *Black* of Black Studies was not meant to be one of the changes. Whether schools of thought or scholarly traditions fall within the bounds of Black Studies, as envisioned by Hare, ultimately depends on whether any particular execution of them, advances Black liberation and nation-building; respects community voices; and is, indeed, graspable by the “person on the bus.” By contrast, the Negro-fying of the discipline is a qualitative transmogrification of Black Studies that must be acknowledged and accounted for when discussing the discipline’s history. When reflection aligns with a proper accounting of history, the so-called evolution of Black Studies is happening mostly according to Negro approach to the discipline.

Finally, the distinction between Negro and Black Studies is significant in relation to a criticism of the discipline made by scholars over the years. Scholars have been concerned that the discipline is in need of a unifying definition; one that would make it distinct from traditional disciplines and would also make Africans and African descended people the subjects of their teaching and research. The concern is that the discipline has evolved into “nothing but European studies of African phenomenon” (Mazama, 2010, p. 250). In Hare’s succinct terms, these scholars are distressed that the discipline that was to be a transformative tool for liberation has become a new form of an older Negro Studies. This approach to studying Africans and African descendants is almost totally dependent on the Eurocentric principles of traditional disciplines including, but not limited to, theories of European worldview origins; the ideal of the apolitical, “objective” scholar; and a “museum approach to knowledge that is largely divorced from the everyday needs and interests of the black community” (Re, 2019). Based on the Hare perspective developed here, the authors share the concern of the aforesaid scholars, and agree with them that Afrocentricity, the African worldview, and similar African philosophical ideas are in keeping with the original Black intentions of the discipline that almost changed the world.

References

- Akbar, N. (1984). Africentric social sciences for human liberation. *Journal of Black Studies*, 14(4), 395-414.
- Akoma, E., & Johnson, L. (2010). Our future: Actualizing the interdisciplinary and community aspects of Black Studies. *The Western Journal of Black Studies*, 34(2), 283-290.
- Alkalimat, A. (2021). Rethinking Black Studies as a freedom project. *London School of Economics* (Review of Books).
- Allen, R. L. (1974). Politics of the attach on Black Studies. *The Black Scholar*, 6(1), 2-7.
- Ani, M. (1994). *Yurugu: An Afrikan-centered critique of European cultural thought and behavior*. Trenton, NJ: African World Press.
- Asante, M. K. (2006). A discourse on Black Studies: Liberating the study of African people in the Western academy. *Journal of Black Studies*, 36(5), 646-662.
- Azibo, D. A. (1992). Articulating the distinction between Black Studies and the study of Blacks: The fundamental role culture and the African-centered worldview. *The Afrocentric Scholar*, 1, (1), 64-97.
- Barton, R. A. (1928). Letter from Roland A. Barton to W. E. B. DuBois, January 26, 1928. W. E. B. DuBois Papers (MS 312). Special Collections and University Archives, University of Massachusetts Amherst Libraries, Retrieved November 12, 2021 <https://credo.library.umass.edu/view/full/mums312-b178-i177>.
- Biondi, M. (2012). *Black revolution on campus*. University of California Press.
- Biondi, M. (2011). Controversial blackness: The historical development & future trajectory of African American Studies. *Daedalus*, 140(2), 226-237.
- Black Journal, (1971). Black Studies in a White dominated education system [episode 40].
- Carr, G. (2011). What Africana Studies is not: Moving from crisis to liberation in Africana intellectual work. *Socialism and Democracy*, 25(1), 178-191.
- Carruthers, J. (1999). *Intellectual warfare*. Chicago: Third World Press.
- Christian, M. (2006). Black Studies in the twenty-first century: Longevity has its place. *Journal of Black Studies*, 36(5), 698-719.
- Collins, P. H. (1990). *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of*

- empowerment*. Oxfordshire, UK: Routledge.
- Colon, A. K. (1980). A critical review of Black Studies programs. Dissertation. Stanford University.
- Conyers, Jr. J. L. (1997). The problem of the twenty-first century: Black Studies locating a niche in the public sphere of higher education. *The Western Journal of Black Studies*, 21(2), 117-123.
- Dixon, F. D. (2022, January 13). Examining the Negro Question and the rise in American exceptionalism. Keynote Address. Black Studies Center's Black History Month Celebration. University of Wyoming, Laramie, WY.
- Douglas, A. J., & Loggins, J. (2021). The lost promise of Black Study. *Boston Review*, <https://bostonreview.net/articles/the-lost-promise-of-black-study/>.
- Fenderson, J.B., & Katungi, C. (2012). Committed to Institution Building: James Turner and the History of Africana Studies at Cornell University, an Interview. *Journal African American Studies*, 16, 121-167
- Filippakou, O. (2022). Higher education and the myth of neutrality: Rethinking the cultural politics of research in the age of instrumental rationality. *Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies*, Ahead-of-Print, 1-13.
- Gates, H. L., & Yacovone, D. (2013). *The African Americans: Many rivers to cross*. PBS.
- Gordon, L. R. (2017). Black aesthetics, Black value. *Public Culture* 30(1): 19-34.
- Hare, N. (1975). A black paper: the relevance of Black Studies. *Black Collegian* 6 (September/October): 46-50.
- Hare, N. (1972). The battle for Black Studies. *The Black Scholar*, 3(9), 32-47.
- Hare, N. (1970). A torch to burn down a decadent world. *The Black Scholar*, 2(1), 2-5.
- Hare, N. (1969). Questions and answers about Black Studies. *The Massachusetts Review*, 10(4), 727-736.
- Haynes, C. (2017). Dismantling the white supremacy embedded in our classrooms: White faculty in pursuit of more equitable educational outcomes for racially minoritized students. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 29(1), 87-107.
- Higginbotham, A. L. (1982). *In the matter of color: Race and the American legal process—The colonial period*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

- History Makers, The. (2004). Nathan Hare: *Biography*.
<https://www.thehistorymakers.org/biography/nathan-hare-38>
- Hotep, U. (2008). Intellectual maroons: Architects of African sovereignty. *Journal of Pan African Studies* 2(5), 3-19.
- Karenga, M. (2009). Names and notions of Black Studies: Issues of roots, range, and relevance. *Journal of Black Studies*, 40(1), 41-64.
- Karenga, M. (1988). Black Studies and the problematic of paradigm: The philosophical dimension. *Journal of Black Studies*, 18(4), 395-414.
- Kazembe, L. (2021). "The steep edge of a sharp abyss": Mohon, social engineers, and Black education. *Journal of Black Studies*, 52(2), 123-143.
- Kershaw, T. (1992). Toward a Black Studies paradigm: An assessment and some directions. *Journal of Black Studies*, 22(4), 477-493.
- Lomotey, K. (1992). Independent Black institutions: African-centered education models. *The Journal of Negro Education*, 61(4), 455-462.
- Marable, M. (1992). Blueprint for Black Studies and multiculturalism. *The Black Scholar*, 22(3), 30-35.
- Martin, B. L. (1991). From Negro to Black to African American: The power of names and naming. *Political Science Quarterly*, 106(1), 83-107.
- Mazama, A. (2010). Naming and defining: A critical link. *The Western Journal of Black Studies*, 34(2), 246-252.
- Mbembe, A. (2017). *Critique of Black reason*. Duke University Press.
- McClendon, W. H. (1974). Black Studies: Education for liberation. *The Black Scholar*, 6(1), 15-20.
- Narvaez, D. F. (2020, June 21). The worldview underlying White-European culture supremacy. *Psychology Today*.
- Nicol, D. J. (2013). Movement conservatism and the attack on ethnic studies. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 16(5), 653-672.
- Nobles, W. (1986). *African psychology: Toward its reclamation, revitalization, and reascension*. Oakland, CA: Black Family Institute.
- Phillips, M. (2010). Black Studies: Challenges and critical debates. *The Western Journal of Black*

Studies, 34(2), 273–277.

- Re, A. B. A. (2019). Dr. Nathan Hare: The father of Black Studies. *The Black Think Tank*. <https://www.scribd.com/document/100354206/Dr-Nathan-Hare-the-Father-of-Black-Studies>
- Rogers, I. H. (2012). *The Black Campus Movement: Black students and the racial reconstruction of higher education, 1965-1972*. New York, NY: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Rogers, I. H. (2009). Remembering the Black Campus Movement: An oral interview history with James P. Garrett. *The Journal of Pan African Studies*, 2(10), 30–41.
- Rojas, F. (2007). *From Black Power to Black Studies: How a radical social movement became an Academic discipline*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Rooks, N.M. (2006). *White money/Black power. The surprising history of African American Studies and the crisis of race in higher education*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Washington Area Spark, (1967, June 28). Fired and expelled by Howard U. for political activities: 1967.
- Watson, M. D. (2022a). Half-connecting theory: Developing African psychology theory in a “radical beginnings” direction. *Journal of Black Psychology*, 48(6), 683–725.
- Watson, M. D. (2022b). White supremacy’s horcrux and why the Black Power Movement almost destroyed it. *Journal of African American Studies*, 26(2), 1–27.
- Watson, R. V. (Uhuru). (1980). Community control of the schools: A case study of Black public school teachers’ and principals’ attitudes in Buffalo. Dissertation. Buffalo, NY: University at Buffalo.
- Woodson, C. G. (2006). *The mis-education of the Negro*. Africa World.

Notes

¹ Fredrick Douglass Dixon and Marcus DuBois Watson are equal co-authors.

² As stated previously, James Turner used “Africana” from the start in 1969 to designate his program at Cornell University. However, his case is likely unique because, despite the term Africana, the approach, goals, and content of the Cornell program under Turner were based clearly on the Black philosophy and ideology of freedom of the time. By contrast, our initial look at current programs called Africana suggests many of them appear alienated from Blackness in their purpose and content.