

the attitude of staff toward the children's families. One exemplary program can be found at Canaan Academy. At Canaan children at the preschool level are learning to count to a hundred in at least four languages. They also learn logic and ethical behavior. At Stratton and Booker T. Washington Elementary Schools in Champaign, children are being taught in an environment that respects bilingual and foreign language backgrounds. At the Nia Nation Freedom School Summer Program, students are encouraged to have deep discussions about their reading materials. Their reading materials also reflect their own cultural frames of reference. All of these educational environments have teachers who know their students' learning styles and their families. These few local programs can serve as examples to others schools in our local public school systems. They give me hope that ultimately *Brown* was, in fact, more positive than negative in addressing needs of access to the benefits of the educational system. In the fifty years since *Brown v. Board of Education*, would I have preferred to see more progress in Champaign-Urbana? I would have to answer yes to that question. One thing is certain: those families and social institutions responsible for *Brown v. Board of Education* exhibited a determined and focused commitment to justice for African American families. In our current multicultural world, those same qualities are still needed. Their diligence inspires me to continue their legacy by remembering and acting on it within my own context, and to encourage as many young people as will listen that they must do the same.

Notes

1. Douglas N. Harris and Carolyn D. Herrington, "Accountability, Standards, and the Growing Achievement Gap: Lessons from the Past Half-Century," *American Journal of Education* 112, no. 2 (2006): 209-38; Jaekyung Lee, "Racial and Ethnic Achievement Gap Trends: Reversing the Progress toward Equity," *Educational Researcher* 31, no. 1 (2002): 3-12; Richard Rothstein, *Class and Schools: Using Social, Economic, and Educational Reform to Close the Black-White Achievement Gap* (Washington, D.C.: Economic Policy Institute, 2004).
2. Janice E. Hale, *Unbank the Fire: Visions for the Education of African American Children* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1994), 155.

Reform in the Black Power Era

Joy Ann Williamson Lott

The black freedom struggle of the mid-twentieth century suffers from sterilization in the collective American memory. It is treated as a relic, a long-ago era that finally brought legal precedent in line with American ideas on democracy, freedom, and equality. Sanitizing history in this manner ignores the difficulty of the reformation process and minimizes the costs that activists paid when attempting to make the American Dream a reality. This piece seeks to humanize the reforms of the Black Power era at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (UIUC). It is not a discussion of the intricate nature of reform, but the climate in which the reforms occurred. In the late 1960s campus administrators and black students clashed on the kinds of reforms necessary to make UIUC a hospitable learning environment and valuable campus experience for black students. While they engaged in careful deliberations, both administrators and black students were under siege from a variety of internal and external sources admonishing them to focus on the business of education. Under these conditions, the reform process was intensely stressful. The point of this piece is to remind us of the price UIUC constituents, particularly black students, paid to make the reforms a reality.¹

Champaign, Illinois, was a southern town in its attitude toward and treatment of black residents well into the twentieth century. By the 1930s the city maintained a firm pattern of residential and educational segregation. Commercial sites like barber shops, theaters, and restaurants maintained segregated service policies until the early 1960s. UIUC supported similar regulations by barring black students from residence halls, maintaining all-white sports teams out of courtesy to "a Big Ten understanding," and allowing white student organizations to have racially restrictive covenants.² The increased demand for democratic rights at the end of World War II and the liberal attitudes of certain administrators, faculty, and students influenced university policy in the mid-1940s, but the university took only small and measured steps toward creating a hospitable campus climate for the small number of black students. University officials opened residence halls to black students in 1945, but only did so after being shamed in the black Chicago press and by a public campaign spearheaded by a black state

representative. Even then, the university allowed only two black women to move into university housing and forced them to live together—the university refused to assign black and white women to the same room.³ The university devised nondiscriminatory policies and allowed black men to participate on sports teams in the mid-1940s, but administrators refused to take action against white student organizations that refused to remove racially exclusive language from their charters. Administrators kept the university aloof from societal concerns and remained cautious in changing the racial dynamic in Champaign.

Administrators at UIUC responded to pressure from its constituents and federal initiatives in the early 1960s. The burgeoning civil rights movement of the early 1950s attracted liberal students and faculty at UIUC. They organized a variety of clubs and organizations, including a branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), and worked to equalize opportunities and put an end to the racial hierarchy in central Illinois. In fellowship with their southern civil rights counterparts, campus activists held fundraisers for southern civil rights campaigns, initiated attacks on segregated facilities in the Champaign community, stepped up the attack on racially exclusive student organizations, and criticized the university for its passive role in societal reform.⁴ Federal incentives also pushed the university to act. The 1954 *Brown v. Board of Education* decision did not have a direct impact on UIUC, but it provided a psychic boost to activists fighting for equal opportunity and questioning university complicity in the perpetuation of a racial hierarchy. The 1964 Civil Rights Act required a census of all postsecondary institutions and dramatized the low number of black students. It also threatened to withhold funding from institutions found in noncompliance with nondiscriminatory statutes. The 1965 Higher Education Act created a variety of financial aid programs to help low-income students afford college. The act did not restrict funding to black students, but African Americans benefited most from the newly created programs. UIUC administrators were not opposed to the notion of equal opportunity, but pressure from the bottom up and from the top down forced university officials to respond in a more active manner than in the past.

University officials decided that a recruitment program aimed at black students could be a first step in inserting the university in social reform. Administrators discussed how to increase the number of black students on campus as early as 1963. According to a faculty committee report: "It is not sufficient simply to affirm the principle of nondiscrimination in all aspects of the University's undertakings. Instead it is urgent to develop an affirmative action program to help overcome handicaps stemming from past inequality so that all shall have equal opportunity to develop their talents to their fullest capacity."⁵ But university attempts were uncoordinated and met with limited success. University-wide committees prodded administrators toward creating target enrollment numbers

and an aggressive recruitment program. By 1967 UIUC had only 223 black undergraduates, making up 1 percent of the student population, a negligible increase from previous years. In March 1968, UIUC administrators devised a cohesive plan to admit 200 black high school seniors for the 1968–1969 academic year, more than doubling the average number of black freshmen in recent classes.

The university's plans coincided with black student concerns. Before 1967, the few black undergraduates on campus remained relatively quiet in their criticism of the university. The expansive campus layout meant they rarely interacted with any other black students during the school day. They created organizations like fraternities and sororities through which they received social sustenance, but most recounted feeling isolated and intensely lonely. As the civil rights movement and its organizations became popular, black students began to entertain the formation of a political action group to serve their specific needs as black students at a predominantly white institution. By the mid-1960s, black students decided that the campus NAACP chapter was ineffective and outdated and instead created a campus chapter of the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE) in 1966. Initially, CORE maintained integrated membership, but a few months after its inception black students ousted whites from the organization.⁶ Their action mirrored a shift in the larger black freedom struggle, its mission, and its tactics. After decades of attempting to force their way into the existing social order only to meet intense white resistance and repression, many African Americans, including youths, became disillusioned with the goal of integration to the point of disdain. The murders of black youth activists, doubts about the federal government's dedication to improving the conditions of African Americans, and suspicions of the extent to which whites could be considered true allies produced a shift in ideas on the proper tactics and means to gain black liberation. Many African American youths, including those at UIUC, grew frustrated with the slow pace of change and demanded more power, real power, Black Power.

The Black Power movement called for African Americans to recognize and be proud of their heritage, build a sense of community, define their own goals, and control their own institutions. To accomplish these tasks, blacks were called to unite. Black UIUC students embraced the Black Power movement's militant form of grassroots protest based on an ethic of black self-determination and translated it into meaningful action at UIUC. A small group organized the Black Students Association (BSA) in late 1967 as a way to create a structured and legitimate power base to force change at UIUC. The campus CORE chapter dissolved, as CORE members became BSA members. In part, BSA became an advocacy organization through which students discussed grievances with the administration. The organization also fulfilled a more immediate purpose: the alleviation of psychological stress and frustration. The small number of black students on

campus was a constant source of anxiety, and BSA offered black students an opportunity to meet, socialize, and devise solutions to their concerns.

BSA, like the UIUC administration, devised ways to increase the enrollment of black students. BSA took up the task “due to a lack of initiative of the University” and because “the black students here would be able to relate much better to the other blacks, thus making our efforts more successful.”⁷ University officials agreed that black students could be effective recruiters, and with university sanction, BSA representatives visited eleven predominantly black Chicago high schools during the winter break of 1967. They spoke about BSA and UIUC, encouraged those interested to apply, and distributed applications. The lack of a real commitment and strategic plan on the part of the university hindered their efforts, however, and the number of black students admitted for the 1968–69 academic year barely increased. Disappointed but undeterred, BSA focused on strengthening the continuing-student community and directed its attention toward campus issues. In particular, the organization sought to unite the black student population divided by Greek-letter affiliations, physical separation on campus, political proclivities, and apathy. BSA also devised a political agenda and entertained direct confrontation “with any institution within or outside the University” and the use of “any tool necessary” in the fight for Black liberation.⁸

The April 4, 1968, assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. created a sense of urgency for both black students and university administrators. For black students, it provided one of the catalysts in increasing Black Power sentiment and promoting black student unity. Liberal administrators considered it a violent reminder that the university had a role to play in societal reform. Pressured by BSA, segments of the campus community, and the attitudes of liberal administrators, UIUC scrapped the original recruitment program to enroll two hundred black freshmen and devised an even more aggressive program.⁹ The university presented its new plan to the public in a news release May 2, 1968—less than one month after King’s assassination: “Working in close cooperation with the Black Students Association, the Chancellor announced that substantial efforts will be made to increase the program to hopefully enroll at least 500 students for September 1968.”¹⁰ The university used knowledge gained from previous efforts to cleave together the Special Educational Opportunities Program (SEOP). Due in large part to the efforts of BSA recruitment staff, UIUC enrolled 565 students through SEOP, a remarkable increase from previous years. By admitting such a large number of students, SEOP became one of the largest affirmative action programs initiated by a predominantly white university to attract low-income black high school students. Clarence Shelley, the black director of an economic opportunity program in Detroit, was recruited and appointed dean of the program in July.

The new SEOP students arrived on campus in early September, one week prior to the beginning of the academic year, for an extended orientation program.¹¹ Illinois Street Residence Hall (ISR), a new and highly coveted residence hall, hosted the students. A state of total confusion existed when the freshmen arrived, however. Miscommunication between BSA recruiters and SEOP students regarding financial aid and admission requirements exacerbated the fact that the university was unprepared for the number of students who accepted offers of admission. Many arriving students had not taken the appropriate placement tests, had no dormitory assignments, and found that the financial aid promised them was nonexistent. Nonetheless, a sense of camaraderie between freshmen and BSA members alleviated some of the tension produced by the academic, financial, and housing uncertainties. The students spent an entire week on campus prior to the arrival of the general student body, which meant that UIUC felt like a black college to many students. As the orientation week came to a close, black students expressed optimism about the upcoming academic year, though BSA members worried about how to maintain the sense of cohesiveness and community fostered during orientation.

Before moving to their permanent rooms on campus, several women visited the residence halls to which they were assigned. They complained that the rooms were too small and demanded that they be allowed to choose their roommates rather than be assigned to one through university channels. Twenty women refused to remove their luggage and vowed to stay in ISR until a satisfactory conclusion was reached. Financial aid concerns heightened anxieties for all of the incoming freshmen, and inadequate funding became an additional flashpoint. BSA executive staff, Dean Shelley, and housing staff met repeatedly over the next few days to resolve the issues. On September 9, 1968, students gathered outside ISR to hear the results of the most recent meeting. As the number of students grew, BSA members suggested the group convene outside the Illini Union. BSA officers and university administrators moved their meeting to the third floor of the Union, where BSA officers reiterated the female students’ complaints, described the financial aid situation as unacceptable, and demanded that Chancellor Jack Peltason come and address their grievances. Rain forced the group of students awaiting the results of the meeting to move inside the union to the South Lounge.

After the meeting with BSA officers, administrators went to the South Lounge of the Illini Union to address the group at 12:30 AM—half an hour after the union’s closing time. Administrators explained that they were doing everything possible to remedy the situation, but the students refused to leave. With rumors of property damage, theft, and physical assaults on white passersby, administrators decided that it would not be safe for Chancellor Peltason to come to the union, and they continued to negotiate with the students. By 2:00

AM, a few individual students had gone home but most remained for a variety of reasons, not all of which had to do with political consciousness and a desire to confront the university. Many students chose to stay for the sake of unity and to support the women protesting their room assignments. Some of the women were afraid to walk home so late at night and doubted they could get into their residence halls after curfew. In response to rumors of a growing police presence, many students feared they would be injured by billy clubs or dogs if they left the security of the lounge. Some actually thought the chancellor was going to arrive at any minute to address the group. Others were not aware of the fact that they were violating university regulations by remaining in the union after closing hours. Some students remembered being coerced into staying by BSA members, nonstudents, and older students. Some students simply were asleep. By 3:00 AM, it was apparent that most students had resolved to remain in the union, for whatever reason, until some action was taken on the part of the administration.¹²

Meanwhile, several administrators and staff gathered at the Student Services Building, one block from the union. Clarence Shelley remembered that “they were trying to decide what to do, arrest them, make them leave, or let them sit all night until they got tired.”¹³ Administrators established that the students violated university regulations by remaining in the union after closing. Reports of property damage and attacks on white students precipitated their decision to arrest the students. Chancellor Peltason described the decision as difficult, but he said he felt compelled to take action: “As much as one hates to call the police the alternative was to let them stay there for a week. Then the State will be breathing down our neck, the program will be in trouble, and everybody will say, ‘you shouldn’t have done it.’ So, let’s clean it up.”¹⁴ At 3:03 AM, university officials called ninety Urbana, Champaign, state, and university police to the scene. The police moved in quickly and the students, after being assured they would not be injured, left peacefully. By the early morning hours of September 10, 1968, the Illinois campus was inaugurated as the scene of the first student “riot” of the 1968–69 academic year. Police arrested almost 250 black students on counts of mob action and charged them with “being an inciter, leader or follower of an alleged unauthorized mass demonstration.”¹⁵ Nineteen of the arrested were continuing students, three were SEOP transfer students from the University of Illinois at Chicago, but most, 218, were SEOP freshmen. All students were released from jail on bond with considerable help from the black community in Champaign—concerned community residents guaranteed the bonds of the students who did not have the money to post it themselves.¹⁶

The arrests terrified many SEOP and continuing students. Many advocated Black Power, but they wanted to get a college education not simply spend their time spreading Black Power principles to central Illinois. The incident left many

students in a state of disbelief and completely stunned. They had been on campus only one week, and the beginning of the academic year was still another week away, when they were arrested, charged with mob action and unlawful assembly, faced with legal hearings, and confronted by possible dismissal from the university.

News of the September 9, 1968 incident spread across the country. In the *New York Times*, the headline read, “Classes to Begin at U. of Illinois: Tension Pervades Campus after Monday’s Protest”; in the *Wall Street Journal*, “Black Student Revolt: Colleges’ Bid to Enroll ‘Disadvantaged’ Brings Problems and Protests; Feeling Strange at Illinois”; in the *Los Angeles Times*, “College Plan for Negroes Passes Test; But ‘Project 500’ at Illinois U. Meets Obstacle”; in the *St. Louis Globe Democrat*, “300 Negro Students Charged in U of I Row”; in the *St. Louis Post Dispatch*, “Illinois University Officials Meet Negro Group’s Housing Demands”; and in bold letters in the local campus newspaper, the *Daily Illini*, “Blacks Occupy Illini Union.” The articles chronicled the goals of SEOP, the students’ arrival on campus, the fact that whites were barred from the South Lounge where the black students met to discuss their grievances with the administration, the vandalism of the Illini Union, and the number of black students arrested.

The *Chicago Tribune*, under the headline “Negroes Riot at U of I; Negroes Go on Rampage after Row,” painted a particularly vivid but grossly incorrect image of the student sit-in. The article described “the wave of violence” and nature of the “rampage” precipitated by the black women’s refusal to leave ISR. Citing police officials, the article estimated the damage at \$50,000, a figure far exceeding official estimates of \$4,000. For those unfamiliar with the nature of SEOP, the newspaper offered a false representation of the financial assistance they received, a representation that increased resentment toward SEOP participants: “The students, most of them Negroes from Chicago and East St. Louis—but some of them from as far away as Philadelphia—were to receive free tuition and free room and board.”¹⁷ A *Tribune* editorial published the same day corroborated the article’s representation and went further, using racist imagery to describe the sit-in. The editorial claimed that “black students and outside supporters went ape” and “swung from chandeliers in the lounges of the beautiful Illini Union.” The editorial characterized such behavior as unconscionable and lamented that these “slum products” responded to the benevolence of the university and Illinois taxpayers “by kicking their benefactors in the groin.”¹⁸

Tension had not subsided between the black students and the administration, and the sentences from their involvement in the September 9, 1968 incident had yet to be handed down when BSA delivered an ever-growing list of demands to the administration on February 13 and 14, 1969. The demands included dropping all criminal charges against those who participated in the Illini Union incident;

establishing “a Black Cultural Center large enough to accommodate all Black people which will be run by the Black Students Association”; hiring fifty black residence hall counselors by September 1969, including 15 percent blacks in the incoming graduate student class; hiring 500 black faculty within a four-year period, beginning with 150 by September 1969; establishing an autonomous Black Studies Department with a major emphasis on Afro-American and African studies; and fulfilling the university’s financial commitment to the SEOP students. Demonstrating their link to the black Champaign community, of the thirty-five demands published in the February 18, 1969 issue of the *Black Rap*, twenty dealt with student issues while the others dealt with Champaign resident issues and included eliminating the high school diploma as a requirement for employment at the university, forming a committee to assist in increasing employment of black residents, and extending access to university buildings such as the Illini Union and the Intramural Physical Education Building to Champaign residents. Though BSA demands centered around black students and black Champaign residents, they also recognized the value of certain white allies and explicitly included white Champaign employees of the university in their demand for a wage increase.¹⁹

Tension permeated the campus atmosphere throughout the 1968–69 academic year. Administrators felt under siege from the Illinois legislature, which curtailed student freedoms and tied the university’s hands while administrators dealt with student protests, from black students who continually provoked university officials, from white students who initiated aggressive and disruptive Vietnam War protests, and from an angry citizenry who wrote letters to the board of trustees, President David Dodds Henry, and Dean Shelley imploring them to “start cracking some heads, as that is what is wrong with this country.”²⁰ Black students also felt under attack. They faced angry parents unconvinced that activism and academics could coexist; white students who described BSA demands as irrational, discriminatory, and dangerous; racists who described them as “black apes,” “black pigs,” “dregs of society,” and “hoodlums”; lawsuits and possible university sanction; and a divide in the black student community about how to proceed with negotiations with the university.²¹ This environment aggravated both the opposition between BSA members and the university administration and the tension between blacks and whites.

Some faculty, administrators, and students exacerbated racial tensions on campus by openly doubting the black students’ ability to compete at Illinois. They claimed that the black students’ increasing activism reflected their academic frustrations. This view reached a national audience in a letter written by an Illinois professor of psychology, Lloyd Humphreys, and published in an October 1969 issue of the journal *Science*. Dr. Humphreys never mentioned SEOP by name but did identify his university affiliation and noted a “crash

recruitment program” begun in 1968. In the article, he stated, “recent events at my own university have produced in me a strong pessimism about the future.” He then characterized “Negroes” as less intelligent than “Caucasians” and attributed the difference to biological factors and “deficiencies in the home and neighborhood.” His main point was that affirmative action programs brought intellectually unqualified blacks to campus and had a negative impact on student quality. He then connected their academic difficulties to their activism on campus: “A group of young people who are newly imbued with pride in race are placed in a situation in which they are, by and large, obviously inferior. . . . The causal chain from [academic] frustration to aggression is well established. A large ability difference as a source of aggression cannot be ignored. The universities are damned if they don’t admit more Negroes, but they are also damned in another sense if they do.”²² Humphreys’s sentiment was far from universal on campus, and his statements were countered by other faculty members who supported the black students’ rights to attend Illinois.²³ However, anecdotal evidence suggests that black students encountered a markedly hostile environment inside and outside the classroom. Even if some claims of racism were exaggerated, many black students stated to the university ombudsman that their psychological well-being had been deeply affected.²⁴

The link Humphreys made between poor academic performance and aggressive campus activism was completely spurious.²⁵ The majority of SEOP students met standard qualification requirements. Though they received lower GPAs and graduated at a lower rate than white students, SEOP students consistently outperformed administrator expectations and succeeded more often than they failed. Moreover, white student activities, not black student protest, had brought the National Guard to campus on two occasions, caused more than \$20,000 in damage to the university and nearby campustown, and precipitated the need for a Rumor Center through which the university could control and correct misinformation during times of campus unrest.²⁶ The black student sit-in at the union and the \$4,000 worth of damage paled in comparison. If violence and campus activism were related to academic difficulty, it appeared that, according to Humphreys’s logic, white students were even less academically fit than black students.

It was in this context that the Afro-American Cultural Program, Afro-American Studies and Research Center, Office of Minority Student Affairs, and a variety of race-based organizations and support programs for underrepresented students came to exist at UIUC. The victories were hard won as black students and administrators battled each other and their critics over the nature of reform. Focusing on the results and ignoring the difficult process through which change occurred diminishes the role of black students and implies that a consensus existed on the worth of particular educational reforms and black student demands. Administrators were not uninterested in equal opportunity, but they were

pushed in a particular direction and forced to act more quickly by the activist black student community. Black students kept the university's feet to the fire and paid a price. Former student activists are proud of their accomplishments, but many left with psychological and emotional scars. UIUC was an important battleground in the black freedom struggle in Illinois, and its constituents paid a heavy price to improve the campus experience for all UIUC students.

Notes

1. For a detailed discussion of the reforms at UIUC see Joy Ann Williamson, *Black Power on Campus: The University of Illinois, 1965-1975* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2003).
2. "Negro Students at the University of Illinois: An Outline of Their Enrollment, Graduates, Activities, History, and Living Conditions, 1934-1935," 4, Arthur Cutts Willard Papers, General Correspondence, Box 2, Folder: Colored Students, University of Illinois, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign Archives (all archival material was gathered from the University of Illinois Archives unless otherwise noted).
3. "Just Like Dixie: No U of I Dorms for Negroes," *Daily Defender*, August 4, 1945; A. C. Willard to Charles Jenkins, August 2, 1945, Arthur Cutts Willard Papers, Box 92, Folder: Housing for Colored Students; and "Negro Students at the University of Illinois."
4. See various signed affidavits, Harry M. Tiebout Papers, Box 3, Folder: SCIC Dissolution and Reorganization, 1951; and Harry Tiebout to NAACP, August 26, 1961, and Herbert L. Wright to Claudia Young, April 4, 1960, Harry M. Tiebout Papers Box 4, Folder: Restaurants.
5. University Committee on Human Relations and Equal Opportunity, Preamble, "Interim Report by the University Committee on Human Relations and Equal Opportunity," 30 November 1964, 1, University Committee on Human Relations and Equal Opportunity Papers, Box 1.
6. "University of Illinois Undergraduate Student Organization Record," Student Organization Constitutions and Registration Cards File, Box 7, Folder: CORE formerly NAACP.
7. William Savage, "Retention and Recruitment," *Drums*, March 1967, Black Student Association Publications.
8. "Goals Are Black Unity and Black Consciousness," *Drums*, November 1967, Black Student Association Publications.
9. Illinois administrators attributed their swift action in part to the pressure from BSA ("University of Illinois-Urbana, Special Educational Opportunities Program," attachment in Charles Sanders to Emerson Cammack, February 21, 1969, Educational Opportunities Program File, Box 1, Folder: Proposals, 1968-69).
10. Press Release, May 2, 1968, Special Educational Opportunities File, Box 1, Folder: SEOP Feb.-July 1968.

11. Not all SEOP students were African American. Also, not all black freshmen were in SEOP. Some were admitted to UIUC prior to the initiation of SEOP.
12. The accounts of September 9, 1968, were taken from "Security Office Report of Events, Illini Union, September 9 and September 10, 1968," Clipped Article File of Clarence Shelley.
13. Clarence Shelley, interview with author, Champaign, Ill., August 29, 1997.
14. Jack Peltason, interview with author, Irvine, Calif., June 28, 2001.
15. "Report of Proceedings by Subcommittee A of the Senate Committee on Student Discipline," April 1969, Educational Opportunities File, Box 6, Folder: Union Incident.
16. "Security Office Report of Events."
17. John O'Brien, "Negroes Riot at U of I; Negroes Go on Rampage after Row," *Chicago Tribune*, September 11, 1968.
18. Editorial, *Chicago Tribune*, September 11, 1968.
19. "We Demand," *Black Rap*, February 18, 1969, Black Students Association Publications.
20. Legislative actions include Public Act 1583, 76th Cong., 2d sess. (September 26, 1969); Public Act 1582, 76th Cong., 2d sess. (September 26, 1969); and Public Act 1580, 76th Cong., 2d sess. (September 26, 1969). The quote is from M. Theodore Engeln to Clarence Shelly, September 10, 1968, Clipped Article File of Clarence Shelley.
21. White student sentiment is represented in Mary Kathryn Fochtman, "Complaint," *Daily Illini*, September 13, 1968; Dale A. Law, "The Masses," Letters to the Editor, *Daily Illini*, February 20, 1969; and Name Withheld, "Get with It," Letters to the Editor, *Daily Illini*, February 21, 1969. The racist remarks are from Engeln to Shelley, September 10, 1968.
22. Lloyd Humphreys, "Racial Differences: Dilemma of College Admissions," *Science* 166 (October 10, 1969): 167.
23. See Harry Triandis to Lloyd Humphreys, October 7, 1969, Vice-President for Academic Affairs Correspondence, Box 9.
24. The university questioned black students about the psychological stress they experienced. See "Audiotapes," [1965], Ombudsman's Subject File.
25. Patricia Gurin and Edgar Epps found that the individual achievement goals of black students and their activism were unrelated, that grade performance was not related to activism, and that nationalist ideology was almost always unrelated to how well students performed in college (Patricia Gurin and Edgar Epps, *Black Consciousness, Identity, and Achievement: A Study of Students in Historically Black Colleges* [New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1975], 346, 350).
26. For materials concerning white student protests see President David D. Henry General Correspondence, Box 221; *Illinois Alumni News* 49, no. 4 (1970); Ombudsman's Subject File, Box 2, Folder: Demonstrations 1969-70; and "Strike: The Student's Voice," March 4, 1970, Ombudsman's Subject File, Box 2, Folder: Demonstrations 1969-70.