

Looking through the Looking Glass: A Historical and Factual Perspective on Black Higher "Book Learning"

Barbara C. Dease

ADFL Bulletin Vol. 14, No. 2 (November 1982), pp. 18–24

ISSN: 0148-7639

CrossRef DOI: 10.1632/adfl.14.2.18

Copyright © 1982 by The Association of Departments of Foreign Languages

All material published by the The Association of Departments of Foreign Languages in any medium is protected by copyright. Users may link to the ADFL Web page freely and may quote from ADFL publications as allowed by the doctrine of fair use. Written permission is required for any other reproduction of material from any ADFL publication.

Send requests for permission to reprint material to the ADFL permissions manager by mail (26 Broadway, New York, NY 10004-1789), e-mail (permissions@mla.org), or fax (646 458-0030).

LOOKING THROUGH THE LOOKING GLASS: A HISTORICAL AND FACTUAL PERSPECTIVE ON BLACK HIGHER "BOOK LEARNING"

THIS paper has indeed been a labor of love, combining as it does a subject dear to my heart and an attempt to lighten the tone and imbue a sustained metaphor with sardonic but fitting quotations from a literary work. I extend apologies to Lewis Carroll, whose words of wisdom I incorporated without thought to the order of presentation in his *Alice in Wonderland* and *Through the Looking-Glass*. To give a more complete picture of the development and roles of black colleges and universities, I combined the subject matter of five principal articles, all of which are footnoted. I hope the authors will forgive me for using their thoughts and opinions, not indiscriminately, but as guiding lights to help me pull together a cogent presentation of salient facts covering approximately 150 years.¹

Barbara C. Dease

. . . an area that historically has lagged behind in intellectual enlightenment and educational innovation. There is both irony and tragedy in this situation. The irony is that the doors to higher education for Blacks should be open most widely in states with, historically, the greatest prejudice toward Blacks. The tragedy is that these institutions offer education with a limited range and depth.⁴

With these few statistics, needed as bedrock for our terra firma, we will now step through the looking glass into the nineteenth century.

"The horror of that moment," the King went on, "I shall never, *never* forget."

"You will, though," the Queen said, "if you don't make a memorandum of it."

"The time has come," the Walrus said,
"To talk of many things:
Of shoes—and ships—and sealing wax—
Of cabbages—and kings—"

(Carroll, pp. 116,125)²

And so, we will step through our looking glass, as Alice did, into a series of scenes depicting a short historical development of predominantly black colleges and universities. As Alice did, we will be talking of many things, because however selective the scenes they touch most of the raw nerves of the whole of America. Black colleges and universities are so intertwined with America's past and present strengths and weaknesses that the condition of the colleges cannot be divorced from the state of the country. Today there are 104 predominantly black colleges and universities, whereas in 1963-64 there were 123. One hundred of the 104 colleges are located in seventeen southern states, including Maryland, Delaware, Missouri, Oklahoma, and the District of Columbia. The four schools in northern states are Wilberforce University and Central State University in Ohio and Lincoln University and Cheyney State University in Pennsylvania.³

Of these black colleges and universities, 39 are public four-year, 49 are private four-year, 5 are public two-year, and 12 are private two-year. The predominance of universities located in the South is no accident, for that is where the roots of most blacks are. Young and McNulty point out that the South is:

Scene 1: 1826-90

"Beware the Jabberwock, my son!
The jaws that bite, the claws that catch!
Beware the Jubjub bird, and shun
The frumious Bandersnatch!"

(Carroll, p. 117)

This scene encompasses the antebellum period in the north and the Reconstruction period in the South. On the one hand, the white man-Jabberwock sought to contain four million newly freed blacks in their slave mentality while, on the other hand, Congress in 1865 established "The Freedmen's Bureau, which helped thousands of Blacks survive by providing them with food, shelter, clothing, and medical attention" (Hornsby, p. 162), as well as preventing economic exploitation and promoting education. The government's actions were mirrored by financial support coming from church-related missionary associations, foundations, and philanthropic societies. Most of the names are still heard today: Phelps-Stokes, Slater, Peabody, Huntington, Carnegie, Wanamaker, Ogden, Eastman, Rockefeller, Warburg, Rosenwald. But:

"How cheerfully he seems to grin,
How neatly spreads his claws,
And welcomes little fishes in
With gently smiling jaws!"

(Carroll, p. 11)

This paper was delivered at ADFL Seminar East, held at the University of Maryland, 8-11 June 1982. The author is Head of the Department of Modern Foreign Languages at Jackson State University.

We, though, are referring not to Alice's little golden crocodile, but to the philanthropists. Just listen to the fear:

Patriotism, philanthropy and religion, with united voice, urge us to consider [Negro education] and make provisions that this calamity which threatens us may be averted. Four millions of ignorant citizens in a national crisis may wreck the Republic. . . . This people . . . if neglected and left in ignorance will fall as easy prey to wicked and designing men, and become a terrible scourge to the nation.

(1872 Report of the Freedmen's Aid Society)⁵

And more fear: "If you do not lift them up, they will drag you down to industrial bankruptcy, social degradation and political corruption," said J. L. M. Curry of the Peabody Fund in an 1889 address to the Alabama general assembly. As Winston says, the chief dilemma in our development as viable vehicles of education was twofold:

On the one hand an ignorant black rabble was a menacing Trojan horse, but on the other a truly educated class of Negroes would upset not only the cherished doctrine of the innate intellectual superiority of whites, but, more important, make impossible any prolonged maintenance of political and economic white supremacy.

(Winston, pp. 680-81)

And that, plain old racism, is the raw, exposed nerve that still exists today. Everything else that follows must be viewed from this point of view.

The missionaries, however, were in the South to teach all the poor, both black and white. They too had to bow to the will of the South. Since "common schools" for Negroes could not be abolished, these states "felt compelled to provide teacher-training institutions to supply the lower levels of the common one-race schools" (Young and McAnulty, p. 168). These were called "normal" schools, a name under which most black schools were chartered and which remained until the late 1940s and early 1950s, when they branched out into more than teacher training. They then changed their names and usually dropped the word "normal."

Another landmark in black college development occurred with the wording of the Second Morrill Land-Grant Act in 1890. The first, passed in 1862, provided special colleges for "agriculture and the mechanic arts." The second was supposed to distribute funds equitably between black and white institutions, though it did not. Today 58% of the 104 black colleges are land-grant colleges (Young and McAnulty, p. 169).

All this explains why the first two black universities were founded in the North. Lincoln University in Pennsylvania, founded by the Presbyterian Church in 1854, and Wilberforce University in Ohio, founded by the African Methodist Episcopal Church in 1856, are cited

as the first black colleges in the nation. These were also the only two antebellum northern black colleges to last beyond the Civil War (Hornsby, p. 163).

W. E. B. Du Bois, in the light of these historical circumstances, reduced the responsibilities of the black college to the community to four basic missions:

1. Establishing the principle that higher education should be made available to blacks,
2. Defending the principle of racial equality by combating national and international doctrines to the contrary,
3. Establishing freedom of Negro colleges to decide what they would teach and to whom it would be taught,
4. Promoting democracy and social power for black people by working for enfranchisement and gradual acquisition of political power.⁶

When we return to the other side of the looking glass, we will review the changing missions and note the progress of these four objectives in the light of changing circumstances.

Before the Civil War, every southern state had enacted laws prohibiting the education of slaves and their progeny.

For those free Blacks in northern states, educational opportunity had also been constrained. By 1860, Black graduates of American colleges totaled only 28. Amherst and Bowdoin . . . conferred degrees on two Blacks as early as 1826. [Only Oberlin in Ohio and Berea in Kentucky] made a regular practice of admitting Black students because they both had strong Abolitionist sympathies. (Young and McAnulty, p. 168)

The first Ph.D. degree was awarded to a black in 1870 from Yale University (physics). Between 1876 and 1914, only fourteen blacks earned the Ph.D., two of whom were W. E. B. Du Bois and Carter G. Woodson, both historians and both receiving the degree from Harvard (Winston, pp. 684, 689, 692).

"For both our oars with little skill
By little arms are plied
While little hands make vain pretense
Our wanderings to guide."

(Carroll, p. xxvii)

So the curtain falls on Scene 1, which established the climate and revealed the Jabberwock as the real enemy.

Scene 2: 1890-1954

"Contrariwise," continued Tweedledee, "if it was so, it might be; and if it were so, it would be; but as it isn't, it ain't. That's logic." (Carroll, p. 141)

These years were rife with stumbling blocks placed

in the path of developing black colleges, not the least of which was how to decide their own missions and goals instead of letting others decide for them. During the first decade of the twentieth century, five institutions emerged as the most notable: Hampton and Tuskegee institutes and Howard, Fisk, and Atlanta universities. The first two were industrial-agricultural; the other three were "academic-classical." But a 1916 report by the U.S. Bureau of Education announced "that hardly a colored college meets the standards set by the Carnegie Foundation and the North Central Association." Fisk, Howard, and Meharry Medical School were classified as "colleges." Such schools as Atlanta University, Benedict, Bishop, Lincoln, Morehouse, Talladega, and Wiley were called "secondary and college." Florida A&M, Lane, and Morris Brown were described as "dealing in college subjects" (Hornsby, pp. 163-64). The logic of "if it was so, it might be" was a deadly game dominated by white standards but fought by black scholars.

Another existential battle, this time waged among blacks, strongly affected the course of black education through the 1930s and 1940s. This was the Du Bois-Washington controversy, otherwise known as technical or industrial versus classical or academic education. Booker T. Washington was trained under the industrial-technical system at Hampton and later went on to found Tuskegee, patterning it after Hampton. White philanthropists rewarded his "accommodationist" philosophy by heavily endowing both schools. W. E. B. Du Bois was trained under the academic-classical system at Fisk and Harvard. Atlanta, Fisk, and Howard were the leading representatives of the classical tradition (Hornsby, p. 166).

What made the battle so heated was, of course, the eminence of Hampton Institute and Tuskegee Institute and the effort by whites to establish industrial education as the only type of education available to blacks. For fifty years, most white financial support went to the trade schools. Industrial education would draw the fangs of "the Negro menace" by reducing the worst illiteracy, social deviance, and naked anger produced by the white supremacist social system, but it would not give blacks enough education to challenge seriously their legal and political domination by whites. Called "the great detour" in the education of blacks, it was recognized as a vicious scheme to destroy the higher aspirations of the race and the means of their realization.

The real conflict concerned the status of blacks in the American mainstream: shouldn't they forever be laborers and socially subordinate, or, having the same intellectual aptitudes as whites, shouldn't they opt for higher education and social equality? (Winston, pp. 681, 682, 683). ("If it were so, it would be . . .," said Tweedledee.) We thought the controversy, which raged until the 1950s, was a dead and almost completely

forgotten issue, but we are now becoming more and more aware of the numbers of black students being counseled and channeled into junior colleges and vocational and technical two-year degree programs—a different disguise but the same old quid pro quo. The significance was that colleges were forced to operate at a mere survival level, and substantial faculty development and sustained research programs were out of the question until recent years.

Then there was the question of where black scholars would work and what they would do after they became so highly educated. They were barred from attending national conventions and meetings of learned societies; they couldn't work at white educational institutions of any level; they were forbidden to use research laboratories, both industrial and educational; their articles were not accepted by journals. They could not even use municipal libraries. So they were funneled back to their own colleges, where they established their own societies, journals, laboratories, research centers, and social organizations.

This is how the College Language Association began in 1937. The CLA was founded so that black English and foreign language professors could come together, share their views, and present scholarly papers. Today the CLA is a strong organization with twelve thousand members and its own journal, placement service, and relevant committees.

Evoking Alice's "much of a muchness" (Carroll, p. 57) and Benjamin E. Mays's praise, "Never have so few done so much with so little" (Hornsby, p. 165), black scholars kept busy teaching young blacks and excoriated their woes in their articles, sermons, and speeches.

They were few, yet many: Between 1930 and 1943 a total of 317 blacks had earned the Ph.D., all from prestigious universities like Chicago, Columbia, University of Pennsylvania, Harvard, Cornell, Ohio State, and Michigan (Winston, pp. 693-94). The southern states refused blacks admission into their own schools and usually dealt with the situation in other ways. For example, Mississippi passed a law giving funds to teachers to allow them to attend out-of-state universities; in return they had to give so many more years to their jobs in the state or buy themselves out. In the 1960s this law was amended to include anyone of any race whose subject field was not offered in the state. (And that's how I got financial support to attend Florida State University for the terminal degree.) The laws were changed for two reasons: (1) Blacks were allowed admission into southern white universities in the 1950s and 1960s, and (2) the plan boomeranged—blacks were returning with degrees from better universities than the state universities and without the state universities' tunnel vision and provincialism, and they were professionally better prepared than their peers in the white schools; these differences were noticed.

By 1943, 40% of the Ph.D.'s were in the social

sciences, and of those, 53% were in history and sociology. Only nine were in history, fifteen in sociology, and five in economics. In the fifteen-year period 1932-47, about 15% of the 2,535 M.A. theses and 359 Ph.D. dissertations on black subjects were done by blacks (Winston, p. 701). This "second generation" of degree holders was attracted to Fisk, Atlanta, and Howard, and in 1936 more than 80% of all black Ph.D.'s were employed by those three schools. In the late 1920s the Rosenwalds and Rockefellers developed a plan to fund "four centers" in the South: the Atlanta University System; New Orleans, Louisiana; Tennessee (Fisk and Meharry Medical); and the District of Columbia (Howard's undergraduate and professional schools). Atlanta's group of scholars included Mercer Cook (romance languages), Rayford W. Logan (history), Frank M. Snowden (classics), William H. Dean (economics), and Ira Reid (sociology). Howard's big names included Ralph J. Bunche (political science), Charles Eaton Burch (English), E. Franklin Frazier (sociology), Abram L. Harris (economics), Ernest E. Just (zoology), Alain L. Locke (philosophy), Charles H. Thompson (education), and Charles H. Wesley (history) (Winston, pp. 693-96).

And, of course, the curriculum varied, but in the main, it was

. . . Reeling and Writhing, to begin with, and the different branches of Arithmetic—Ambition, Distraction, Uglification, and Derision, as well as Mystery, ancient and modern, with Seaography: then Drawing, Stretching, Fainting in Coils, Classical, including Laughing and Grief. (Carroll, pp. 73-74)

Carroll's mythical curriculum aside, the curriculum of both land-grant and academic institutions reflected the Western European tradition—heavy emphasis on English, history, mathematics, philosophy, and other general-education requirements. Most graduates became teachers of their major and minor subjects, employed in the elementary and secondary schools of the states.

Again, though, there were setbacks, this time in the form of accreditation challenges. After World War I, accreditation associations pressured black colleges to upgrade themselves to conform to regional and national standards. Before 1930 the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools had refused to consider accreditation of black colleges because approval of a school carried with it membership in the association. That would have been all right by itself, but membership entitled the institution to representation at association meetings and objections were raised to blacks' attending. In 1930 SACSS ruled that the colleges could be reviewed, but acceptable ratings would not guarantee admission. Only one school received an A rating in 1930, and the pressure was on (Winston, p. 694).

"Take some more tea," the March Hare said to Alice

very earnestly.

"I've had nothing yet, so I can't take more."

"You mean you can't take *less*, it's very easy to take *more* than nothing," said the Hatter.

(Carroll, p. 55)

The preceding quotation describes the holding pattern until 1954. There was much effort and little payoff, much teaching and research and little gain and acceptance. But blacks were earning more bachelor's degrees, though the fields were mainly related to teaching. And then in 1954, the Supreme Court and Justice Earl Warren, in *Brown vs. Board of Education of Topeka*, stated:

To separate [Negro children] from others of similar age and qualifications solely because of their race generates a feeling of inferiority as to their status in the community that may affect their hearts and minds in a way unlikely ever to be undone. . . . We conclude that in the field of public education the doctrine of "separate but equal" has no place. Separate educational facilities are inherently unequal.⁷

Thus came the end of one kind of golden era and the beginning of another.

Scene 3: 1954-73

1. "O Oysters, come and walk with us!"
The Walrus did beseech.
"A pleasant walk, a pleasant talk,
Along the briny beach."

.
And thick and fast they came at last,
And more, and more, and more—
.
And all the little Oysters stood
And waited in a row.

2. "Now! Now!" cried the Queen. "Faster! Faster!"
.
"Now, *here*," said the Queen, "you see, it takes all the running *you* can do, to keep in the same place. If you want to get somewhere else, you must run at least twice as fast as that!" (Carroll, pp. 144-45, 127)

Scene 3 was a period of increasing enrollment in black universities, especially after Congress passed the Pell Grant Bill in the late 1960s. Before the civil rights push of the 1960s, most openings for black students were in the black colleges and universities. But the increased enrollment did not stir state legislatures to fund more readily. In spite of the wording of the Land Grant Act and the 1954 Supreme Court decision, the primary reality was still separate and unequal facilities and budgets. Our lack of appropriate libraries and scientific and research equipment and capabilities was a serious handicap.

For example, in 1968 the National Science Founda-

tion reported that the white land-grant colleges in states where there are dual institutions received \$200 million from various federal agencies, roughly eleven times the amount (approximately \$18 million) awarded to their black counterparts. The Spring 1970 issue of *The Civil Rights Digest* tells us more:

The University of Georgia, with ten times the enrollment of Fort Valley, received nearly 24 times as much Federal aid. The University of Florida with less than five times the enrollment of Florida A.&M., received 24 times as much Federal aid. (and so on *ad infinitum* and *ad nauseam*)

Similarly the states themselves appropriate nine times as much money to support the white Land-Grant institutions than their Black counterparts. Georgia appropriated 20 times as much state aid, Texas more than eight times, for white schools. In no case was there an equitable distribution of funds based on enrollment.

(Winston, p. 706)

Was it therefore surprising, in view of these gross inequities, that the state-supported black institutions had to commit nearly all their resources to teaching and very little to research? Today the privately supported black colleges are even more hard-pressed for funds as the costs of instruction rise faster than sources of support. No wonder "it takes all the running you can do to keep in the same place." We have always had to run at least twice as fast to show even a small gain.

And then there came affirmative action, known in other circles as the "black brain drain." That was a double-edged sword if ever there was one. Winston states that "token desegregation [and affirmative action were] sufficient to slowly erode the small but productive clusters of research scholars and top professors in black schools" (p. 708). We welcomed affirmative action as opportunities for worthwhile professors to better themselves professionally. (But many jobs were by and large what is called "window dressing" and usually ended up in alienating the job holders from us and swelling egos insufferably.) We were, however, still in a euphoric state:

"And hast thou slain the Jabberwock?
Come to my arms, my beamish boy!
O frabjous day! Callooh! Callay!"
He chortled in his joy. (Carroll, p. 119)

We smelled victory, and so we were caught off guard. To mix Alice's metaphors, we Oysters were not ready:

"But wait a bit," the Oysters cried,
"Before we have our chat;
For some of us are out of breath,
And all of us are fat!"
"No hurry!" said the Carpenter.
They thanked him much for that.
(Carroll, pp. 145-46)

On the one hand, the black brain drain was affecting us, and on the other, the black awareness movement was upon us. We thought we had slain the Jabberwock, because what we were experiencing was the most widespread attempt yet devised to achieve an intellectual and cultural position that would overcome the vicious heritage of racism, inferiority, and second-class citizenship. Black studies programs proliferated, and we stood by dismayed because the most successful were located on white university campuses. To make it worse, "the shrill stridency" of many of the propagandists of blackness seemed to confirm Ralph Ellison's prophetic dismay with Americans, white and black, who display that "intellectual abandon, that lack of restraint, which seizes those who regard blackness as an absolute and who see in it a release from the complications of the real world" (Winston, p. 711). The cultural awareness being instilled in young blacks was offset by the behavior of the professors.

Scene 4: 1973-Present

1. "Who are you?" said the Caterpillar [to Alice].
"I-I hardly know, Sir, just at present—at least I know who I *was* when I got up this morning, but I think I must have been changed several times since then."
"What do you mean by that? Explain yourself!"
"I can't explain *myself*, I'm afraid, Sir," said Alice, "because I'm not myself, you see."
"I don't see," said the Caterpillar.
2. The Queen bawled out, "He's murdering the time! Off with his head!" (Carroll, pp. 32, 54)

With the advent of the Pell grants, proposal writing, and Title III funds, black college financing has improved, but the institutions are still hampered by a patronizing attitude in American education. So now again, we are standing in a row, too fat and out of shape—we allowed ourselves to relax during the Ford and Carter regimes.

We are responsible to state and federal fiscal agents, but we must also contend with the black awareness politics—it is no wonder that we cannot explain ourselves. As Mack H. Jones said, "the piper's patron has a disproportionate voice in tune selection," and the colleges were "caught between these conflicting forces" (p. 738).

With accreditation reports (we call them "raison-d'être studies"), a fact of life at black institutions, those involved have found themselves examining not only their basic missions but the four historical missions asserted by Du Bois. Jones, in his commentary, reflects the status quo condition of the missions and the need for change:

To say that black colleges have met the responsibilities entrusted to them at their inception is not to exonerate their contemporary successors from criticism, because the conditions under which African-Americans live have

changed, the responsibilities of the colleges have changed commensurately, and *black colleges have not moved to meet these new responsibilities*. Instead they continue to operate according to the prescriptions of DuBois' now obsolete missions. While it is impossible to say precisely when these new responsibilities evolved, it seems fair to say that by the mid 1950's the missions enumerated by DuBois had been fulfilled and it had become obvious that a new age had dawned.

At this juncture it is appropriate to ask exactly what happened to render obsolete the historical missions of black colleges and to usher in an era of new responsibilities. Essentially, as suggested earlier, it was the successful execution of a number of tasks implied in the earlier mission, the concomitant failure of these changes to bring about substantive changes in the black predicament, the resulting heightened intensity of the black struggle, and the repressive response by the white nation.

(pp. 738-39)

Most institutions, depending on situation and circumstances, have tried to address current goals and objectives. This problem, however, is being placed "on the back burner" because of another more pressing matter: the survival of black higher education institutions.

To underline the reality of the situation, I would like to quote a few sentences chosen at random from Samuel Dubois Cook's article. Even though written in 1978 during the waning days of the Carter regime, the commentaries are more apropos today after the antieducation federal budget cuts proposed by Reagan through Stockman and the OMB.

In terms of racial justice, social reform, and institutional change for human betterment and enrichment, the mood and climate of America are today tragically unhealthy and hostile. *Black*, once more, is clearly out of style. The forces of conservatism and reaction are at work with vengeance and grim determination. . . . Liberal forces are in radical disarray.

The American Dream has been deferred again for Black people. . . .

Often, there are combined the eloquent rhetoric of friend and the harsh reality of foe, the warm formal commitment of support, and the cold material action of negativism.

Sophisticated and clever minds—with the great convenience and advantage of awesome and perhaps unchecked power and authority—arrogantly preside over the destiny and are constantly at work to the detriment of Black higher education.

Many Black leaders are convinced of the existence of a conspiracy to "kill" or eliminate Black colleges. . . . The signs are ominous.

So one thing is clear, and that is that the present-day double-edged sword is the federal government, which,

according to Cook, is a mask behind which its employees "commit the most illiberal and destructive acts against Black institutions." Furthermore,

When vice is wrapped in the garment of virtue, when foe is disguised as friend, when evil is paraded as good, there is no limit to the harm that can be done and the deep misery engendered. . . . A treacherous foe with all the unique and awesome advantages of power, privilege, influence, and prestige is being fought.⁸

This is all, of course, because of federal money. Now, in the period of Reaganomic conservatism (in an 1845 speech, Disraeli said, "A conservative government is an organized hypocrisy"), black colleges are being victimized and exploited by the political process under the guise of great tidings and agents of salvation, such as managerial deficiency, integration, the elimination of fraud and mismanagement, the prevention of waste, the payment of honest debts, and the protection of the "taxpayer's dollars" (Cook, p. 174). The ominous signs that we are "to bite the dust" are many: Bishop College in Texas is in a state of receivership; Mississippi Industrial has closed its doors; Tennessee State and Alabama A&M have been merged with or taken over by white universities; Kentucky State was threatened with reduction to a junior college level; specious program reviews threaten public black universities in Mississippi; many private colleges are in dire financial straits. ("Off with his head!")

To gear ourselves up for the fight for survival, we ask each other, why should we fight to save black colleges and universities? First, according to statistics and despite the increase of blacks attending white institutions, black institutions still continue to educate and graduate a substantial proportion of black youth. What is called a "revolving-door policy" is in effect at white institutions. The minority attrition rate at white universities varies from 70% to 85%. In 1976 black colleges graduated 20% to 25% of their student enrollment while white institutions graduated about 3% of the minority enrollment. Second, in spite of governmental hassle about fiduciary responsibility, black institutions are known for accomplishing more with less, especially when one considers the low income bracket of many of their students.

Third, as of 1978, Young and McAnulty point out that 75% of all black Ph.D.'s received their baccalaureate degrees from predominantly black colleges. They further state that 80% of all black physicians, nearly all black dentists, 75% of black military officers, and 60% of high-level black federal civil servants received the undergraduate degree from black institutions (p. 172). We have graduated a large proportion of black scholars and intellectuals, as well as many of the blacks holding major leadership positions in federal, industrial, educational, and legal areas of employment.

Apart from what statistics tell us, the contribution

of black colleges is at stake—what they have given to the social, economic, and moral composition of American society. Cook implies that black colleges imbue their students with “intangible realities like self-confidence, a sense of dignity and worth, faith in higher possibilities, belief in the future and viability, general optimism, and self-projection” (p. 177), all of which are essential to the realization of the American Dream. They stress cultural awareness, a black-on-black setting, and the importance of black role models. They have also “sought to create a culture of difference rather than of deprivation, to build skills, and to enhance self-awareness” (Young and McNulty, p. 169), qualities that white American institutions either cannot or do not impart.

According to signals from the *Chronicle of Higher Education* and other literature concerned with higher education, it is no accident that we are the victims of a disproportionate number of audits, monitoring pressures, and “big brother” managerial concerns, techniques, methods, and visits. It is also no accident that there have been claims of reverse discrimination in admissions, challenges to affirmative action policies, and close examination of admission criteria. We are victims of the politics of white power and the power of politics, as strongly stated by Cook (p. 175). Could the future of black colleges and universities be the fate of Lewis Carroll’s Oysters:

“O Oysters,” said the Carpenter,
 “You’ve had a pleasant run!
 Shall we be trotting home again?”
 But answer came there none—
 And this was scarcely odd, because
 They’d eaten every one.

(Carroll, pp. 146–47)

Or will it be as Cook believes, that the survival of black colleges requires that blacks become totally immersed in the political process—become *Homo politicus*, believe that political activism is the key, with all the rights, privileges, and pressures therein involved (p. 176). His thought is that the public policy of the United States must be changed, as well as the public philosophy and national priorities of this nation and its people. Once all Americans have decided how to “explain themselves,” they will see how much is at stake in the survival, success, and prosperity of black colleges and will no longer ask the question, why black colleges and universities? After the many years of argumentation and debate, we should be in shape:

“In my youth,” said his father, “I took to the law,
 And argued each case with my wife;
 And the muscular strength, which it gave to my jaw,
 Has lasted the rest of my life.” (Carroll, p. 34)

In conclusion, the development of black colleges and

universities parallels the development of America and mirrors America’s progressions and retrogressions from the stated ideal of achieving the American Dream. One of Lewis Carroll’s characters said, “Sentence first—verdict afterwards” (Carroll, p. 95). Let us not be guilty of retarding the fruition of our black institutions without first becoming acquainted with the cogent rationales for survival and the attendant statistics. We should know the facts, come to the correct verdict, publicize it, and only then, carry out the sentence, which, it is hoped, will not be punitive. Black colleges and universities, by and large, have put behind them the “poor sort of memory that only works backwards” (Carroll, p. 155) and are testing the waters of the future in their oft-repeated role of being the totally immersed *Homo politicus*.

And so, having been exposed to the scenarios on the other side of the looking glass and having talked of many things, let us return through the looking glass to the land of the living, where cabbages and kings are the order of the day. When Alice remarks that “one *can’t* believe impossible things,” the Queen rebukes her pessimism by advising her to practice for half an hour a day and, in that way, become capable of believing “as many as six impossible things before breakfast” (Carroll, p. 157). Once it is understood from whence black colleges and universities have come and how deeply their roots have dug, their survival will be one more impossible thing in which to believe.

NOTES

¹For further reading, consult the special editions of the Fall 1978 *Western Journal of Black Studies* and the Summer 1971 *Daedalus*, both of which deal exclusively with the issue of black colleges and universities.

²Lewis Carroll, *Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland and Through the Looking-Glass* (New York: Bantam, 1981).

³Alton Hornsby, Jr., “Historical Overview of Black Colleges in the United States,” *Western Journal of Black Studies*, 2 (Fall 1978), 162–66.

⁴Herman A. Young and Brenda H. McNulty, “Traditional Black Colleges: The Role, Social Benefits, and Costs,” *Western Journal of Black Studies*, 2 (Fall 1978), 167–72.

⁵Quoted on p. 680 in Michael R. Winston, “Through the Back Door: Academic Racism and the Negro Scholar in Historical Perspective,” *Daedalus* Special Edition: “The Future of the Black Colleges,” 100 (Summer 1971), 678–719.

⁶Quoted on p. 737 in Mack H. Jones, “The Responsibility of the Black Colleges to the Black Community: Then and Now,” *Daedalus* Special Edition, 100 (Summer 1971), pp. 732–44.

⁷From John Bartlett, *Familiar Quotations* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1968), p. 1021.

⁸Samuel DuBois Cook, “Politics and the Future of Black College: A Commentary,” *Western Journal of Black Studies*, 2 (Fall 1978), 174–76.

Perspective and Narrator. Through the Looking-Glass is told by a third-person narrator with an omniscient point of view. Tense. Through the Looking-Glass is written in the past tense. In Through the Looking-Glass a mirror, or looking-glass, serves as a gateway to a strange new world. Diagrams. Alice Young girl; travels in the Looking-glass world Friends Spouses Friends Friends Opponents Caregiver White King Note-taking chess king Red Queen Assertive chess queen White Queen Disorganized chess queen. This study guide and infographic for Lewis Carroll's Through the Looking-Glass offer summary and analysis on themes, symbols, and other literary devices found in the text. Explore Course Hero's library of literature materials, including documents and Q&A pairs. Characters. If you are looking for a high quality version of the book, I couldn't recommend this one more. The size is medium. It is half way between the size of a paperback and a hard cover text book. Read more. 104 people found this helpful. The sketches throughout the book are in black and white. The pages are thick and sturdy but cut roughly on the sides. The font is a great size and spacing and on a very white background. I hate when they use a small print and tight spacing on older books. The sketches are beautifully done and do a wonderful job of bringing Alice and the story to life. However, as a history buff, I enjoy reading the annotations from a historical perspective. It's a big book, so if you enjoy a hefty hardcover, this is the one for you. Read more. The Looking Glass : New Perspectives on Children's Literature. However, certainly not everything children learn is taught in school; as Alice explains in Through the Looking Glass, "Manners are not taught in lessons" (Carroll 225). A child of the 1960s, Milo's manners may simply be described as common courtesy. He demonstrates a respect for authority, always remembers to say "please" and "thank you," is egalitarian in his treatment of various creatures, excuses himself for staring when he meets the 0.58 child, and wonders without prejudice and for "just a moment" how it is that someone with no facial features a... Alice's Adventures in Wonderland and Through the Looking Glass. Ed. Roger Lancelyn Green.