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Abstract
The very presence of black professors at predominately white institutions (PWIs) constitutes a problem, giving rise to bullying and limits on academic freedom. Black students played important roles in changing black faculty experiences. Yet the decline in black student enrollments and the dismal numbers of black faculty over the last twenty years place black professors at continued risk for bullying, especially at flagship universities, which many whites view as sacred white spaces. This article focuses on the implications of these trends for the academic freedom of black faculty and the erosion of civility toward them. We discuss how the threat of bullying, made more likely by low numbers of black students and faculty at PWIs, both disrupts and dismantles the pipeline to the black professoriate and how antagonism toward black professors leaves other historically disadvantaged faculty vulnerable and with few allies. We offer recommendations to address bullying and potentially expand academic freedom.

“Between me and the other world there is ever an unasked question: unasked by some through feelings of delicacy; by others through the difficulty of rightly framing it. . . . How does it feel to be a problem?” This passage is on the first page of W. E. B. Du Bois’s The Souls of Black Folk (1903). We will find that these words
ring true in the case of black faculty at predominately white institutions (PWIs). The presence of black bodies is, for some, the problem.

Despite single and “mass” hires of African American professors, black professors have and continue to face bullying and threats to the exercise of academic freedom (Grundy 2017). Indeed, we argue that this lack of robust numbers of African American students and faculty makes black professors exceptionally vulnerable to bullying, especially given that PWIs, in particular, as structurally white institutions, are seen as sacred white spaces in which black bodies—black professors—represent an antagonism in that their presence cannot be adequately incorporated into the structure. They are constituted as “problems,” to use Du Bois’s language.

In this article, we contend that these expressions of violence, as well as expressions of white rage within the halls of the ivory tower, leave black professors at continued risk for bullying on various fronts, place further limits on their academic freedom, and ultimately serve as a (un)veiled attempt to dismantle the pipeline to the black professoriate and thus stop the flow of a perceived invasion of educated black bodies into the sacred white space that is the academy.

Race is an important factor in all American social institutions, including institutions of higher education (“Systematic Racism in Higher Education” 2015). Black professors are both hypervisible and invisible in the academy (Cruse 1967; Finley, Gray, and Martin 2018) and have experienced what some have characterized as a “crisis” (Cruse 1967). Historically, the crisis has ranged from anxiety about where black intellectuals fall on the assimilationist–nationalist spectrum to how their work can be influenced by white patronage. This crisis is further complicated by the paucity of black faculty at colleges and universities across the country. Indeed, black professors are on the faculty at historically black colleges and universities (HBCUs) and at PWIs, but at the latter they are still few in number (“Harvard Shows No Progress in Increasing the Number of Black Faculty” 2009–10).1

The variations in rank reflect much more than the sheer effort or productivity of individual scholars. The numbers both reveal and mask a set of practices and processes that are raced, gendered, and classed, policies and practices that have their origins in the history of racism and the development of the religion of whiteness.

---

1 According to the most recent data published by the National Center for Education Statistics, in the fall of 2016, there were 1.5 million faculty at US degree-granting colleges and universities (DOE, NCES 2018). This includes full- and part-time faculty from the rank of full professor to interim and adjunct professors. Over 40 percent of faculty were white men, 35 percent white women, 3 percent black men, and 2 percent black women. Of the full-time professors, more than half were white men, with less than one-third white women, 2 percent black men, and 2 percent black women. Among full-time assistant professors, 35 percent were white men, with 38 percent white women, 3 percent black men, and 4 percent black women. Forty-two percent of full-time associate professors during the fall of 2016 were white men compared to 35 percent white women, 3 percent black men, and 3 percent black women. Over half of full professors were white men, with 27 percent white women, 2 percent black men and 2 percent black women.
in America. It is not a coincidence that the history of the black professoriate parallels noteworthy periods in race relations in America (Du Bois 1903; Finley et al. 2016; Frazier 1957). Black people were forbidden to learn to read and write during the enslavement era in much of the country (Hine, Hine, and Harrold 2011; Martin 2015; Moon 2009; Rojas 2010). Over time, the number of black faculty and students in black graduate and professional programs increased, creating what some hoped would become a pipeline of black candidates for faculty lines (Bronner 1998; Dade et al. 2015; Yared 2016).

In Frank Wilderson’s (2010) conceptualizations, no synthesis is possible between the structures of whiteness that articulate themselves in white institutions and black bodies, understood and treated as human equals. Either the structures of the institution will be, at best, transformed and, at worst, deconstructed and reconstituted on an egalitarian basis, or African American professors will continue to constitute an ontological problem that places them perpetually at risk for bullying.

The mistreatment of black scholars has a long tradition in the academy (Slater 1998–99). For years, black professors have experienced exclusion from, and marginalization within, their disciplines because of their race and because of their willingness to debunk myths and pseudo-science about race (Green et al. 2018). Their commitments to studying the varied and dynamic experiences of black people in America placed their careers and lives in peril (Du Bois 1903; Frazier 1957). Black professors have endured bullying from within and outside of the academy (Flaherty 2013, 2015a, 2015b, 2017a, 2017b).

Black students and black communities played important roles in helping black intellectuals gain access to the faculty of historically white colleges and universities and protecting them while there (Finley et al. 2016; Rojas 2010). Efforts to silence these students and these communities in recent years have harmed black faculty in different ways, including placing black faculty at-risk for bullying by many white residents who have a special affinity for “their” flagship universities—which are often land-grant institutions with the greatest resources, influence, and authority to grant graduate and professional degrees (Turner and Pusser 2004)—and by white administrators and their white colleagues who participate in the common practice of consolidating around the religion of whiteness (Finley and Martin 2017; Weed 2017; Du Bois [1920] 1999). Efforts to silence black communities and render black students (those not in an athletic uniform) virtually nonexistent on campus not only places black faculty at risk for continued bullying but also diminishes the ability of black faculty to exercise their already tenuous academic freedom. In this article, we focus on the implications of what some scholars have described as the resegregation of predominately white colleges and universities over the past twenty years on the academic freedom of black faculty. We also consider the lack of collegiality and professional courtesy toward them both on and off campus (Huelsman 2018). The decline in black student enrollment may be attributable to neoliberal austerity, the lack of college readiness of black students trapped...
in underresourced primary and secondary schools, recruitment practices that favor prospective students from largely white middle-class backgrounds, and the gap between black male students who are in athletic programs and those who are not. The latter points to a preference for black muscle over black academic pursuits. Moreover, the twenty-year time period is bookended by legal assaults on the use of race in college admissions (Huelsman 2018) and the 2016 election of the polarizing president Donald J. Trump.

Missing from conversations about the implications of a historic decline in black student enrollment is the dismal representation of black faculty (“Harvard Shows No Progress in Increasing the Number of Black Faculty” 2009–10; Jones and Slate 2014; Modica and Mamiseishvili 2010; “Ranking the Efforts of Flagship State Universities to Increase Black Students and Black Faculty” 2009–10) during the same time period. In virtually every case over the past twenty years, the percentages of black faculty at flagship universities were lower than those of black students enrolled (see the table in the appendix). We show that not only is the underrepresentation of black students and black faculty important, but the timing is significant, given the heightened and very public religious response to perceived black progress by members of the dominant racial group in America. These responses often manifest themselves in antagonisms toward black scholars and their work through traditional and social media platforms. Moreover, the bullying and underrepresentation of black faculty, especially at predominately white flagship institutions, also leaves other historically disadvantaged groups without advocates, allies, and colleagues in the struggle, particularly white scholars who dare cross the color line and write about such matters as whiteness, white supremacy, white privilege, and the like.

Our analysis includes a brief history of bullying and limits on academic freedom experienced by black faculty. We then examine recent trends that seek further to expose black professors to bullying and assaults on their academic freedom. We make the case that the driving force behind the bullying and threats to the academic freedom of black scholars is religious and part of a complex of fear of black progress. Moreover, we address the implications of the relatively small number of black faculty at flagship universities for scholarship, instruction, and service. Finally, we offer recommendations for recruiting and retaining black professors, strategies to counter bullying, and ways to protect and expand the exercise of academic freedom for black professors and other endangered groups.

The Black Professoriate and Black Scholarship: Buried Beneath the Canon

The contributions of African American and women scholars have been buried in a number of areas of public life. Their historical erasure reproduces inequities and sediments the academy, especially PWIs, as inhospitable venues for black scholars, maintaining their low numbers as normative. The academic careers of W. E. B. Du Bois and E. Franklin Frazier are good examples of how this exposes black scholars to bullying.
Both Du Bois and Frazier are only recently receiving the attention they deserve thanks to the work of a handful of dedicated, primarily black, scholars (Collins 2005; Franklin 2015; Gooding-Williams 2018; Jarmon 2003; Morris 2015; Moses 2004; Moss 1981; Williams 2012). Aldon Morris (2015), along with sociologist Earl Wright II (2002), has been able to show that the Atlanta School, which Du Bois led for many years, was engaged in an empirical study of American society long before the professors at the University of Chicago. Morris (2015, 25) has also showed how Du Bois’s work was marginalized by other scholars in his field because he dared question their “car window sociology” and pseudoscientific beliefs about the inherent inferiority of black people.

The marginalization extended beyond his work. White scholars, according to Du Bois’s own accounts, would not meet with him during daylight for fear that being seen with him might hurt their careers, and he was subject to a vicious campaign led by University of Chicago sociologist Robert Park (Du Bois 1903; Magubane 2014; Morris 2015). Du Bois was bullied by conventional sociologists, and his inability to secure funding for his projects because of his marginalization compromised his exercise of the academic freedom readily available to less qualified social scientists. Du Bois is still very much an outsider within the discipline of sociology. Contemporary textbooks and syllabi, including for graduate students enrolled in sociological theory courses, fail to give Du Bois his due (Calhoun et al. 2002; Giddens et al. 2016).

E. Franklin Frazier was heavily influenced by Du Bois and his work while leading a school of social work in Atlanta before he was driven out. Frazier was bullied by individuals associated with the School of Social Work based, at least in part, on his scholarship. Frazier’s article, “The Pathology of Racial Prejudice” (1927a), for example, described a “Negro Complex” that turned normally law-abiding white people into irrational beings who refuse to accept facts and may even form actual (as opposed to virtual) mobs (Frazier 1927a, 1927b, 1927c, 1930a, 1930b). The response to this work forced him from his position in Atlanta and kept him from securing employment for a time, placing limitations on his academic freedom. Then, as now, black faculty risked bullying and the restriction of their academic freedom, particularly when they engaged in scholarship and teaching beyond the so-called mainstream.

Like Du Bois, Frazier’s work is often forgotten or reduced to a footnote in discussions about the (mis)use of his work by people like former US senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan, who famously described the black family as a national problem (Williams 2012; Moynihan 1965). Very few graduate students in sociology, philosophy, religious studies, and beyond are exposed to Du Bois, Frazier, and others in their foundational courses.
Resegregation and Gentrification of Higher Education: “Progress” in Reverse

Not only are black scholars like Frazier and Du Bois missing from the scholarship and the curriculum of the fields they initiated or influenced, but black people are also “missing” on many college campuses. Black students are disappearing while the numbers of black faculty remain at very low numbers, particularly at flagship universities (Huelsman 2018). The focus on flagship universities is merited given their status. John Aubrey Douglass (2016) describes the history and evolution of flagship universities, which are often land-grant institutions created with the mission of promoting scholarship, instruction, and service. They tend to have greater access to financial resources than other colleges and universities in their states. Sometimes they are the only institutions in their state to offer degrees and professional certifications in particular fields. Furthermore, flagship universities often create policies and engage in practices that other colleges and universities use as a model. Hence, flagship universities serve as “canaries in the coal mine,” so their (mis)treatment of black students and black scholars is predictive of these groups’ experiences at other colleges and universities across the nation.

Scholars have described the decline in black undergraduate enrollment over the past twenty years as a form of resegregation. Black students were excluded from many PWIs for much of American history (Huelsman 2018). In some cases, such as at the University of Florida and the University of Alabama, the first black undergraduates did not receive their diplomas until 1970 (Slater 1996). While the percentage of black students rarely, if ever, reaches parity with that of college-aged black students within a given state, some PWIs made progress in black student enrollment, but the reversal has been swift. For example, while black undergraduate enrollment was 18.7 percent at the University of South Carolina–Columbia in the fall of 1996, it was less than half that in the fall of 2016 (Huelsman 2018). The percentage change between 1996 and 2016 was −9.7 percent. The University of Michigan–Ann Arbor also experienced a decline in the percentage of black undergraduate students between 1996 and 2016. Nearly 9 percent of undergraduate students at the University of Michigan–Ann Arbor identified as black in 1996, while only 4.3 percent of black undergraduates identified at black in 2016. Many other institutions experienced declines in black undergraduate enrollment, including the University of Pittsburgh, the University of Virginia, the University of California–Berkley and Clemson University, to name a few. Even for colleges and universities that saw an increase in black undergraduate student enrollment, the rise between 1996 and 2016 seldom surpassed 3.5 percent (Huelsman 2018).

The disappearance of black students at flagship universities has many important implications. Not only does it limit opportunities for black students to earn degrees from flagship universities, but it also reduces the pool of black undergraduates prepared to pursue graduate studies. Additionally, black students have used
their numerical power in the past to create a crisis for PWIs about the absence of black professors and culturally relevant curriculum. The emergence of African American studies or black studies as a discipline was just such a circumstance in the late 1960s, and the field grew out of student protests and appeals for better representation on faculties and in programs. Through the activism of black students, PWIs began hiring black scholars. The presence of black professors at PWIs has remained disappointingly low over time, including over the past two decades (Slater 1998–99). Some flagship universities have seen increases, but nowhere has this been greater than 2.4 percent. Still other flagship universities saw decreases in the percentages of full-time black faculty between 1996 and 2016 (Krupnick 2018; Slater 1996).

Matt Krupnick, of the Hechinger Report, addressed changes in the presence of black faculty at selected universities and included an interactive component enabling readers to easily search national data. The percentage of black faculty at many flagship universities is in the single digits.2

Research has shown that people of color and women experience bullying to a far greater degree than their white and male counterparts, and bullying occurs more often in higher education than in other workplaces (Hollis 2017). Racial differences have also been shown in the number of negative experiences, greater service demands, and unequal treatment in tenure and promotion proceedings between black professors and other professors (Henry, Hicks, and Hall 2016). Black professors at flagship universities and similarly situated institutions of higher learning experience bullying from a variety of sources and, as a result, have experienced limitations on the exercise of their academic freedom (Williams 2018). Black professors, including those at flagship universities, report bullying from some white students in their classes who seek to aggressively challenge and “fact-check” them in real time by logging on to conservative websites, blogs, and news sites (Finley, Gray, and Martin 2018). Black professors are bullied when their names are added to lists that are shared on social media, where they are identified as scholars who engage in so-called reverse racism (Yancy 2018). Black professors may be reprimanded by their department chairs or the deans of their respective colleges, or even by the college or university president (Flaherty 2015b; Finley, Gray, and Martin 2018).

---

2 Results from data provided by the National Center for Educational Statistics for 2016, were compared with data from a 1996 study conducted by Robert Slater at the Journal of Blacks in Higher Education. The University of Mississippi and the University of Maryland both reported that 6.6 percent of their full-time faculty were black in 1996. By 2016, 7 percent of the full-time instructional faculty at the University of Mississippi was black, an increase of 0.4 percent. The presence of black professors at the University of Maryland declined by 2016 to 5 percent, for a loss of 1.1 percent. The percentage of full-time black faculty at flagship universities in 1996 ranged from less than 3 percent to 7 percent. The percentage of full-time black faculty at flagship universities in 2016 ranged from 1 percent to 7 percent in 2016.
Bullying happens not only off campus and online but also within departments. Black professors often find that they show more devotion to and concern for the area studies programs they lead, such as African and African American studies, than administrators. This creates undue stress and tension, as the professors seek to develop and expand these programs with little support and few resources. At the same time, while these same black professors may be called upon to recruit for their college or university, especially at HBCUs, black professors do not necessarily feel as respected and appreciated as nonblack professors—and yet, they often feel pressured or bullied into promoting their workplace as welcoming and diverse even though their experience contradicts this narrative. The continued use of black faculty images on promotional materials, often without their knowledge, serves as a daily reminder of the harmful treatment they are often subjected to. African American professors, including those who hold appointments in more than one unit (which is often the case with ethnic studies, African American studies, Asian studies, and other area studies fields and disciplines), often experience bullying from department heads, who demand that they perform service in both units in addition to publishing and teaching in two units. This often happens while jointly appointed scholars earn less than their peers, including peers who are less productive in all three legs of the proverbial academic stool: research, teaching, and service.

The bullying that takes place both on and off campus not only results in what some have called racial battle fatigue (Louis et al. 2016; Smith, Hung, and Franklin 2011), or the sheer exhaustion black people experience living in a world in which they are disadvantaged and constituted as “problems” by virtue of their birth and color. Although nonblack scholars are relatively free to select the topics they research and teach with limited interventions from others, the same is not necessarily the case for black professors, especially black professors who study race, who must calculate the benefits and risks of research in virtually every decision they make in the academy. The scholars themselves are viewed as inferior because of their race, and their scholarship is also viewed as inferior because of its focus on race. This is not a new phenomenon (Du Bois 1903; Frazier 1957). Recall that both Du Bois and Frazier were forced out of academic institutions because of racism and because of their work on race.

It is our contention that the relative invisibility of black faculty at flagship universities and the overrepresentation of black professors among those who are bullied on and off campus, as well as the limitations on their academic freedom, have implications for the quality and quantity of scholarship, instruction, and service not only by black professors, but for those from other historically disadvantaged groups. As in the broader society, black people on college and university campus hold a mirror to the institution and provide it with a reality check about the gap between what the college or university says it values and what it actually does value (Finley, Gray, and Martin 2018). The benefits of any changes in policies
that address inequities affecting black professors often benefit others, especially other professors of color and women professors. As a number of white professors, including white women professors, join what scholars have identified as the latest wave of whiteness studies, they are finding themselves the victims of bullying. They are experiencing threats to their academic freedom, and many of them do not know how to cope with or combat such threats because they have been the beneficiaries of systems and structures that tend to privilege whiteness, while simultaneously ignoring the misery heaped upon others. Black people, despite the prevalence of antiblack sentiments in society and on campuses, have always understood the “free rider” concept, that is, some people will benefit from the struggles of black people but refuse to join in the fight. Antagonism of black professors, limits on their academic freedom, and their lack of visibility at flagship universities and at other academic institutions have already been shown to affect groups that colleges and universities claim are important to their missions. Why underrepresentation of black professors, bullying of black faculty, and restrictions on their academic freedom persist is complicated. In the next section, we explore what Du Bois called the “religion of whiteness” and our understanding of it historically and in contemporary times to address the enduring racial divide in higher education.

Of Intimacy and Proximity: (The Religion of) Whiteness, Bullying, and the Limits of Academic Freedom

The etymology of the term “bully” offers critical insight here. The term “bully” comes from the Dutch word boel, which initially meant “lover.” Over time, of course, the term slides from a positive valence to a negative one, as “bully” becomes more associated with “bull” and transmutes into the meaning we have today. And yet, there is something about the juxtaposition between love and (bullish) power that marks the relationship that black faculty, more specifically, and black people, more generally, have with the white institutions within which they find themselves. Love, after all, indicates proximity and intimacy; and, while the romantic or filial undertones of the term has fallen away, “bully” still carries with it the necessity and centrality of intimacy, of proximity. In other words, one bullies and is bullied through proximity, through intimacy. Bullying is not primarily conditioned by malice (though it is eventually); it is conditioned foremost by an intimacy that whiteness created, and from which blackness cannot escape. In other words, bullying is not simply a matter of violence; it is a matter of violence articulated through an unbreakable proximity. As we have argued elsewhere (Finley, Gray, and Martin 2018), black faculty are often invited to and hired at PWIs only to become objects of derision and exploitation, experiences shared by
selected faculty of color, including, but not limited to, Latinx faculty. Brought in to be discarded, welcomed only to be derided, black faculty and black students bear the oppressive weight of institutions which, as Hortense Spillers (1987) once wrote, “need [us].” For if we were not here, we “would have to be invented.” There is something about blackness that makes it necessary to the construction of whiteness as its repressed object.

We contend that the fundamental reality of bullying is as a form of relation, of proximity, of closeness, of contact. But, more than this, it is a form of locked relation; bullying requires a binding, a tether, a connection that, when broken, denies the bully its power and offers the possibility of reprieve for the bullied. Escape seems to be the answer.

PWIs often treat black faculty and students as if they were objects—as if the thoughts, words, contributions, and conceptions of black life from black people were objects. PWIs show fidelity to such objects; as we have written elsewhere (Finley, Gray, and Martin 2018), PWIs will hire black faculty and recruit black students only to show through explicit institutional neglect that they bear no responsibility toward those the institutions use for their benefit.

What we want to suggest here is that this irresponsible relation, this nonreciprocal proximity, is conditioned by what we call the religion of whiteness. We, of course, did not come up with this term; Du Bois did. What he called “the religion of whiteness” (Du Bois [1920] 1999, 18), as early as 1910 and as late as 1920, describes for him a hypocritical impulse to control the world in the name of whiteness but then to claim virtue and morality and civilization, obfuscating avarice, violence, and self-deception, which is infused and encoded into all of its structures, including its institutions. Whiteness becomes a way of organizing the world, interfacing in it and through it, so that it becomes the weightiest embodiment and symbol that structures the world.

In fact, whiteness is a religion of symbol systems and signs, which are given moral valuation, whose semiotics populate and colonize everything it constructs—its philosophies, its educational and legal systems, its rituals and creeds, and everything it encounters, especially people (Du Bois [1999] 1920, 18). What we want to emphasize here, then, is the religious nature of the institutional neglect that allows black people in higher education to be rendered even more precarious, even more vulnerable. Like the universe that it constitutes, whiteness is multidimensional. One dimension of whiteness is the “problem” of blackness (Yancy 2015). Despite the efforts of black faculty to negotiate their race and their work on race with responses from students, colleagues, and the broader community, black faculty are almost always viewed as a problem and subjected to bullying and restriction of their academic freedom. Another dimension of whiteness is the theodicean condition. As we noted at the beginning of this essay, the problematic nature of blackness is not
simply an issue of encountering a black body; it is a theodicean problem of the legitimation of (divine) whiteness at the expense of (demonic) blackness (Gordon 2013). As multiple scholars of race and religion have demonstrated (Long 1995; Pinn 2003; Jordan 2012), blackness—and therefore black bodies—became the physical symbols of evil and sinfulness, a practice that continues to this day, to the point where black words from black professors are taken as nothing more than delusional babble or the musings of hatemongers.

It is their blackness that makes black professors—and by extension black people, including black professors—a problem. As theologian Kelly Brown Douglass (2016, 86) has pointed out, “Free black bodies have to be guilty of something. . . . America’s exceptionalist identity is sustained by the construction of racialized [black] guilt. Practically speaking, a free black body does not enjoy the presumption of innocence.” Not to enjoy the presumption of innocence is to always already be rendered guilty, problematic, a problem.

When coupled with low and declining numbers of black students and African American faculty, this places the black professoriate in dire straits—always a problem and with very little community from either African American students or faculty. Black professors are in a precarious situation that portends more vulnerability to bullying.

**Where Does the Academy Go from Here: Perpetual Antagonism or Egalitarian Institutions?**

In the title of his final and most radical—yet least publicly engaged—book, Martin Luther King Jr., who dreamed of becoming a professor one day, asked an important question: *Where Do We Go from Here: Chaos or Community?* (1967). King concludes the book’s first chapter with a sobering claim and challenge, which could easily be modified in the language of our present subject and reframed. Although antagonisms cannot be synthesized, King’s hopefulness nevertheless led him to issue a challenge in a similar spirit as George Yancy would later embody, and which we offer with creative license: “Social justice and progress are the absolute guarantors of [the prevention of bullying and incivility]. There is no other answer. Constructive [structural] change will bring certain tranquility; evasions will merely encourage turmoil. [The black professoriate] hold[s] only one key to this double lock of peaceful change. The other is in the hands of the white [administrators, faculty, and] community” (King 1967, 21–22). Black professors, for their part, contribute positively to colleges and universities in many ways, beyond what a purely quantitative analysis might reveal. While small in number, they make big impacts on their fields, on undergraduate and graduate students, on the faculty, and on the broader society. Colleges and universities, especially flagship PWIs, may think that in the current political and economic climate they cannot afford to expend any more financial, political, or social capital on addressing the challenges identified here. The truth of the matter is that they cannot afford not to.
The changing demographics of America alone point to the need for recruiting, retaining, and protecting black faculty from bullying and the erosion of their academic freedom. While black student enrollment is down now, the trend is likely to change in areas of the country experiencing demographic shifts, such as the Southeast, given the growing number of black and brown high school and college-aged students in America. With less government support and more of a reliance on undergraduate tuition, colleges and universities, especially flagship universities in the South with very high black populations, will need to recruit and retain black students and other students of color. Black professors play important roles in retaining black students through mentoring, instruction, and other forms of formal and informal support, such as serving as advisors to predominately black student organizations. Moreover, black professors provide necessary, if not “natural,” sources of support for other historically disadvantaged groups. Thus, as black professors go, so go the rights of other professors of color and the rights of white professors who dare challenge the religion of whiteness into which they were born.

Given that institutional change is rarely swift, we offer recommendations for increasing the percentages of black professors, institutionalizing antibullying strategies, and protecting academic freedom. To begin with, college and university search committees must live up to their name and actively search for potential black candidates who will enhance the mission of both the departments and the broader college and university, while simultaneously addressing white backlash concerning “diversity” hires. They should provide resources to black professors to support their scholarship, teaching, and service in ways that are not “equal” but rather equitable. Black professors often study and teach subjects that are not readily funded by sources to which nonblack professors often have greater access. Black professors must begin their academic positions in environments that are already welcoming and diverse and not be asked to cocreate “diversity” as they attempt to pursue their academic careers. Black professors must not only appear as numbers on departmental or institutional diversity reports (Wilder, Osborn-Lampkin, and Newton Jackson 2015); black professors must be included, or at the very least invited, to coauthor manuscripts, collaborate on grants, and so on. The academy has to ensure that black professors are paid in accordance with their rank and contribution to the department, institution, and surrounding community, including community engagement.

Department leadership and college administrators must reassure black professors from their initial appointment and onward that they will support their work and protect their overall well-being from threats originating within and outside their institution. Public safety officials and others charged with campus safety should be held accountable for protecting black professors even when the bullies are students, colleagues, and other members of the community. Training to make colleagues and administrators aware of bullying and how to best respond to it should be required along with other training, such as sexual harassment, Title IX, and
ethics training. If there is resistance to requiring antibullying training, then it should, at least, be a topic of
discussion at new faculty orientations, departmental meetings, college-wide sessions, and so forth. A no-
tolerance incivility policy should be part of every college and university mission statement.

Similarly, institutions should offer assurances that black professors have the right and the support to
exercise academic freedom not only in the classroom but also in their engagement with the surrounding
community—as public intellectuals—rather than abandoning the experts they hired at their most vulnerable
moments.

These are the monumental tasks at hand that academia must make concrete if it is serious about curtailing
and eliminating bullying and incivility toward the black professoriate.
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Appendix

Table: Change in Percentages of Black Student Enrollment and Black Faculty at Selected Flagship Universities, 1996-2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of South Carolina (Columbia)</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>-9.7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>+1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Michigan</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>-4.5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Virginia</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>-3.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>+1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California, Berkeley</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>-3.6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>-2.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Data from 1996 were extracted from the article, “The Status of Black Faculty at the Flagship Universities,” The Journal of Blacks in Higher Education, no. 12 (Summer 1996), 14–16. The numbers reflect the percentages of black faculty at flagship universities. Data for 2016 were used from the National Data Center for Education Statistics and made available at https://hechingerreport.org/after-colleges-promised-to-increase-it-hiring-of-black-faculty-declined/.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>2023 Rank</th>
<th>2022 Rank</th>
<th>Rank Change</th>
<th>2022 Score</th>
<th>2023 Score</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>2022 Rank Differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Oklahoma (Norman)</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>-2.1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State University (main campus)</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>-1.7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>+5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Arkansas</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>+5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Alabama</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>+2.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>+1.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Maryland, College Park</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutgers University–New Brunswick</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Massachusetts at Amherst</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>+.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>+.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University of Texas at Austin</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>+1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Delaware</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>+.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wisconsin–Madison</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>+.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana University Bloomington</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>+.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Georgia</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>+1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania State University (main campus)</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>+1.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Kansas</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>+.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Connecticut</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>+.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>+.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Missouri (Columbia)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Tennessee (Knoxville)</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>+.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Kentucky</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Mississippi</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>+.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana State University and Agricultural &amp; Mechanical College</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>+1.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>