Much of the current scholarship on the Black Campus Movement focuses on public and historically black colleges and universities (HBCUs), while studies on private, religious, and predominantly white institutions (PWIs) are slim. This study reveals that the private Lutheran PWI Valparaiso University was accepting of the Black Power-inspired demands of their small Black student population, which contrasts the reactions of many larger institutions. These findings serve as a call for scholars to examine more institutions like Valparaiso University to further reveal the varying levels of influence and acceptance Black students had during the Black Campus Movement.

In 1966, Black Power, a movement advocating Black self—leadership and self—help, emerged in the United States. This came about as White politicians began to balk at passing legislation for civil rights concerns, causing many Black Americans to become alienated by the Civil Rights Movement. Former leaders of the Civil Rights Movement started conveying the message that Black Americans needed to forcibly achieve their goals for racial equality, as White people could no longer be trusted in helping Black people obtain them. This ideology was heavily accepted by disillusioned Black Americans, especially those who were younger and more fervent. College—age Black people began to spread the ideas of Black Power to politically active colleges in the mid—‘60s. Historians who analyze the effects of Black Power ideology on universities have differing opinions on when or where the emergence of the Black Campus Movement occurred, but most show that the peak of activism and revolutionary fervor was between 1968 and 1969. The years 1966 and 1967 are rarely mentioned in the scholarly timeline, passed over as a time when Black Power advocates were beginning to foment revolutionary passion in young Black Americans.

However, historical musings about Black Power on American campuses rarely discuss small, private Predominately White Institutions (PWIs) or religious institutions. With this in mind, it is quite surprising to see then that a small Lutheran PWI—Valparaiso University—in the mid—sized city of Valparaiso in northwest Indiana had a Black student population that displayed an intense passion for Black Power ideas in late 1966 and 1967. They adopted and advocated for the implementation of these ideas early on, despite objections from the administration and campus community. Valparaiso was unique in that several Black Power and Black nationalist figures spoke on campus in 1967 and 1968. Additionally, community acceptance of Black Power increased with a change in university leadership. This allowed the Black Campus Movement to achieve its goals more smoothly at Valparaiso than at many other institutions. This paper seeks to compare historical analyses of the Black Campus Movement with articles from Valparaiso University’s student newspaper *The Torch* and its Black Caucus’ records. These findings will illustrate how Valparaiso University’s expression and community reception of Black Power ideals surprisingly differed from those of other colleges and universities at the time.
Scholarly takes on the role of Black Power on college campuses from 1966 to 1969 have focused significantly on histories of institutions that are quite different from Valparaiso University. One of the most comprehensive works on this subject is Martha Biondi’s *The Black Revolution on Campus*. According to Biondi, a combination of awareness of the different troublesome facets of American society, combined with calls for change from Black Power leaders, led Black students to pursue activism for Black Power causes at their universities. These university—specific causes included the implementation of affirmative action programs, Black administrators, and African American studies courses.\(^1\) She notes that no one party directed the activism of Black students during this time but that different leaders and groups, such as the Black Panthers and Stokely Carmichael’s Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC), profoundly influenced these students. Various campus movements across the country were led indigenously and locally by students.\(^2\) Biondi notes that Black college students’ adoption of Black Power ideas at PWIs was an expression of their alienation toward campus racism and their feeling that they had to become “white [people] with dark skins” at their institutions.\(^3\) This social awakening came about in 1966 and 1967, as they started seeking to “embrace [their] Black identities” by reading and debating revolutionary communist and Black Power works.\(^4\) As a result, they began to adopt revolutionary language, question non—violence, and form Black student groups.\(^5\) Biondi quickly shifts the timeline in her work to the period of intense campus protest in late 1968 to 1969—which she notes was inspired by violent and deadly clashes between police and students at Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs).\(^6\) Biondi’s work is limited in its analysis of the preliminary years of 1966 and 1967, but she relays a narrative that the increased politicization of Black students through Black Power figures led to violent social activism at American college campuses.

While Biondi is more comprehensive in her argument to include both HBCUs and PWIs as hotspots of Black Power ideas, Ibram Rogers, in his article “The Black Campus Movement and the Institutionalization of Black Studies,” claims that the Black Campus Movement began at HBCUs. Rogers denounces the scholarly de—centralization of student activism during the Black Campus movement and seeks to fill what he sees as a “glaring hole in the historiography of Black Studies” by offering a comprehensive narrative of the nationwide student protests for Black Studies.\(^7\) Instead of situating the intensification of the Black Studies Movement in 1967 and 1968 like other works, he claims that the “mass struggle” of students at HBCUs like Tuskegee and Howard began in early 1965.\(^8\) These students were politicized and emboldened by the repression of civil rights and Black nationalist efforts in the early 1960s to request the right to control the Black curriculum on their Black campus. According to Rogers, the emergence of Black Power, spearheaded by Stokely Carmichael in 1966, only intensified this politicization that people like Malcolm X
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instilled in Black students. Inspired by the San Francisco State Black Student Union’s push for Black Studies programs in 1966, the February 1968 Orangeburg Massacre, and Martin Luther King’s assassination in April of that same year, demands for Black Studies programs increased at HBCUs. Rogers notes that the Black Campus Movements at public, private, HBCU, and PWI schools alike faced some challenges but eventually achieved their goals with the institutionalization of Black Studies in late 1969 and 1970. The movement, however, began declining that spring. He concludes his article by conveying that the success of institutionalizing Black Studies brought about the diversification of higher education in the United States. Rogers, by centering his argument around student protest, brings awareness to the idea that HBCUs led the fight for Black Studies before the emergence of Black Power. Additionally, he claims that Black Power ideology only intensified Black students’ demands for educational control, which they ultimately acquired.

Unlike Biondi and Rogers, Joy Ann Williamson bases her analysis on a single PWI: the University of Illinois at Urbana—Champaign. In doing so, she seeks to center her argument around Black college students, labeling them the “ideological leaders of the Black struggle.” She criticizes scholarship that takes a “top—down” approach to the Black Campus Movement, noting that, while the federal government and liberal university administration and faculty were important in installing valuable institutional change, the students fighting with Black Power ideology were crucial to this reform. Black college students who attended northern PWIs like the University of Illinois were driven to protest for these changes due to a long history of alienation from the racism and discrimination they experienced at these institutions. Additionally, their protests were an expression of reconciliation with their Black identities while attending White institutions and an acknowledgment of late 1960s turmoil. Williamson notes that Black student protests against their adverse conditions on college campuses had been occurring for decades, but that the advent of the Black Power Movement in 1966 spoke to students that were frustrated at the slow pace of change. It appealed in particular to the small populations of Black students at PWIs, and they began to create power bases for themselves through the formation of Black student unions. These organizations would unify Black students, remind them of the positive aspects of their African identities, and provide training grounds for political organization. While Williamson acknowledges early efforts at San Francisco State in 1966 to instill Black Studies and separate Black centers, her concentration on the University of Illinois sets the beginning of her timeline in January 1967, when the Black Student Association (BSA) was formed. She notes, however, that the real intensification of campus protest came in with the tragedy of Martin Luther King’s assassination. Like Biondi and Rogers, Williamson’s section on the formative years of 1966 and 1967 is very brief. However, she differs from the other two scholars by focusing primarily on PWIs, noting that Black students’ alienation
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within those institutions led them to absorb Black Power ideology and demand social and educational change.

The current historiography on Black Power at colleges and universities aptly notes that Black students at campuses across the United States made valiant efforts for change but tends to overlook those who attended private religious universities like Valparaiso University. Despite its religious status and small Black student population, it is important to recognize that Black Power became just as popular among Valparaiso’s Black students in the mid—to—late 1960s as it did at larger private and public PWIs and HBCUs. However, there are several differences between Valparaiso’s adoption of these ideas and the campuses that Biondi, Rogers, and Williamson analyzed. The first of these aspects is that, while these historians talk about the years of 1966 and 1967 as fleeting years of influence, Black Power was already a topic being studied and praised at Valparaiso not even a month after the publication of Stokely Carmichael’s Black Power manifesto “What We Want.”18 In an attempt to educate the majority—White university, Black female student Forrestine Eubanks published a Torch article on October 11, 1966, which delineated the changes in civil rights organizations’ leadership and doctrine that brought about Black Power. She acknowledged the fears of White people in the rise of Carmichael and Floyd McKissick into the civil rights fold but notes that Black Power is “neither separatist nor racist.”19 Eubanks stated that Black Power does not exclude White Americans, but, rather, focuses on serving the needs of Black Americans to elevate them in Black organizations without bowing to the White man’s concerns. She even published the four tenets that Black Power philosophy is based on and conveyed that McKissick and Carmichael hoped to achieve their goals in tandem with the American system before turning to alternative means.20 Eubanks’ article illustrates that Valparaiso’s Black students were passionately seeking to educate the student body on Black Power in the wake of Carmichael’s 1966 statement.

Despite early efforts from Black students to educate others about the Black Power Movement, a majority of the Valparaiso University community remained unsympathetic toward it for a significant amount of time. Some of the most direct hostility toward the movement came from the university’s president at the time, O.P. Kretzmann. On November 5, 1966, an incident occurred on campus in which visiting Black high schoolers were taunted and harassed by Valparaiso students. Kretzmann attempted to defend the civil rights reputation of the university in a speech addressing the incident. Instead, however, Kretzmann showed his aversion toward the Black Power Movement, as he stated that he was “frightened—even terrified” by the Civil Rights Movement’s transition to Black Power.21 He claimed that he feared “evidence of hate on both sides” and directly attacked Stokely Carmichael, saying that he had “no place” in the “picture” of Civil Rights Movement leadership.22 Following that, he labeled the Carmichael—led SNCC as an “extremist group,” comparing them to what he believed to be the other side of the ideological spectrum: the American Nazi Party.23

Student response to Kretzmann’s address was mixed, but many students agreed that he used the issue of the emerging Black Power Movement as a red herring
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to avoid the original issue of White students harassing Black campus visitors. Some, however, were naturally angered that more militant SNCC members would ever be likened to Nazis. In their eyes, Kretzmann was hurting Valparaiso’s civil rights reputation by promoting popular stereotypes of Civil Rights Movement leaders.\textsuperscript{24} An editorial, presumably written by a White student, expresses disappointment in Kretzmann’s insensitivity and complacency, claiming that it furthers Black students’ alienation from the university and the Christian church.\textsuperscript{25} President Kretzmann’s attack on the Black Power Movement, in an attempt to avoid discussing real civil rights issues on Valparaiso’s campus, alienated both Black and White students, which reveals strong, unified support of Black Power as early as late 1966.

The formation of Valparaiso’s first Black student organization, the Black Caucus, made 1966 a significant year. More educational events were also put on to spread awareness of the movement, but no records show that the Black Caucus was involved in the organization of these events. The Summer Community Organization and Political Education (SCOPE) Project put on an event on November 11 where Wabash College student Ronald Clark was invited to discuss the meaning of Black Power with Valparaiso students. Clark applied Black Power ideology to the American government saying that “Black power aims at killing the myth of black inferiority,’ and, until that myth is laid to rest, America will never have a Great Society.”\textsuperscript{26} He pointedly advocated for White Americans to face problems of bigotry head—on and change American society to meet Black people’s needs. Unlike Eubanks, he boldly stated that violence from Black Americans would be inevitable if racial inequality continued to persist in the country and that they would turn inward for sources of power.\textsuperscript{27} These three \textit{Torch} articles from 1966 reveal that the influence of Carmichael and McKissick’s early Black Power ideologies had a significant effect on the fervor of Black students on the small, Midwestern, religious campus of Valparaiso, leading them to become more passionate in fighting for institutional change. While the current historiography claims that 1968 and 1969 were times of intense Black Power acceptance on public, secular campuses, one can see that a noteworthy surge of Black Power advocacy was taking place at Valparaiso soon after the movement’s genesis.

This zeal would only increase in 1967 due to crucial Black Power events and speakers on campus. A Black Power panel held on October 1, 1967, shows the kind of passion both White and Black students on campus had on the issue of Black Power, whether they were for or against it. It consisted of local representatives from SNCC, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), the JOIN Community Union, Students for a Democratic Society (SDS), and the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE) who discussed the meaning of Black revolution in the United States. Trudy Heinecke, the student reporting on this article, was shocked to hear that the panelists were unified in their approval of Black Power and that the audience had a polarized response to it. According to her, the participants all agreed that Black Power and revolution were cries from the Black community against the oppression they were subjected to. Heinecke felt as if students were being “bombarded with the accusation” that they were a significant part of the system that controlled and accepted
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this oppression. Other White students took further offense to it, saying that the “militant organizations” who accepted this were splitting the country. Black students in attendance were equally passionate in their support of the Black Power Movement. One Black student claimed that Valparaiso’s White students were more focused on changing problems with the world rather than “[handling] Scheele Hall and your fraternities,” accompanying it with a statement that integration was currently out of fashion and that “maybe [in the long run] we can get together.” Another claimed that the younger Black generation did not have the patience of their elders and that “a little revolution” was needed to “shake up” the American people. Heinecke’s reporting on the matter was not overtly negative toward the Black Power movement but seems to object to the language of “fighting the system.” For example, she notes that the panelists made it seem inevitable that one would be in the system unless they “put [their] job on the line in the face of social concern.”

Heinecke’s article came under intense criticism from Black female student Sandy Govan. Mainly, her attacks against Heinecke were charges of her misrepresenting the civil rights leaders’ statements and underreporting certain speakers. Govan noted that Heinecke slanted Chicago NAACP representative Tom Bullock’s statements as more militant than they were. She believed that Bullock was more restrained in his positions than usual and that it was shameful that a Torch reporter, a “symbol of light and truth,” would distort Bullock’s statements to make Black Power seem worse than it was. While over representing Bullock, she also found that Heinecke underrepresented CORE and SNCC representative Robert Brown. She notes that Heinecke’s exclusion of Brown was a detriment to the students who did not attend the panel, denying them the “opportunity to see in print a Black Power advocate who pulled no punches and who spoke to them on their own level.” Heinecke only stated in the article that Brown defined Black Power as simply Black people telling White people to stop oppressing them. Govan was not satisfied with that though, as she conveyed that Brown said “a hell of a lot more than that;” that Brown’s definition of Black Power is more direct and militant in being “Power for Blacks.”

Govan’s concluding remarks are especially critical toward not only Heinecke’s article but also the complacency of the White student population: “The White man has been used to the other end of the whip… he does not like the feel of the lash on his own naked hide. Well, bare your hide Brother and get used to it! Because You can’t handle it, Black Power will strip Your pretentions, Your injustices and You bare.” This bold message was not what White Lutheran students expected to be confronted with when they enrolled at Valparaiso. Govan’s editorial reveals the passion with which Black students were defending Black Power by 1967. Valparaiso’s Black student sought to spread its message in the most unadulterated, accurate way possible, even if White students viewed it as radical.
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Unlike many American institutions at this time, though, Valparaiso University’s administration seemed to take a surprising turn toward acceptance of Black Power starting in late 1967. December 5 was a particularly momentous day, as the Student Senate voted to pass Black Power legislation created by the National Student Association (NSA). The legislation denoted the meaning of Black Power as “the unification of all black people in America for their liberation by any means necessary,” and the Student Senate—then an all—White group—unanimously agreed upon it without any serious debate.\(^{37}\) It also led to the creation of a Black commission within the NSA headed by a Black chairman.\(^{38}\) The fact that Black Power was being acknowledged as a positive force in Black America by the all—White Senate, and even praised by other White students for the decision, showed a significant step toward campus approval. Chas Piehl and Ronald Roschke wrote an editorial celebrating the legislation’s passage as a “necessary step towards the establishment of the black student in his full integrity.”\(^{39}\) They also advocated expanding Black education for both Black and White students through the addition of courses in Black history and culture as well as expanding the pre—existing Christ College Urban Internship Project. Additionally, Piehl and Roschke noted that the Senate should only allocate resources to help the Black Power Movement expand on campus and allow its leadership to come naturally from the Black community. In contrast to President Kretzmann’s previous diatribe on the movement, Piehl and Roschke end their editorial by emphasizing how the Black Power Movement benefits Valparaiso: “Black Power does not signal the end of peace at this university. Rather, it gives birth to many potentials for black and white both to someday rise above racial differences and work together at building a world fit to inherit.”\(^{40}\) This overwhelmingly positive White student editorial and the Senate’s passage of Black Power legislation were signs of Valparaiso University’s progression toward embracing Black Power.

Along with passionate Black students seeking to educate others about Black Power, Valparaiso University was also unique in the fact that, despite being a small, White, Lutheran institution, many Black Power leaders were invited to speak on campus. Two significant speakers who espoused Black Power ideology spoke during Valparaiso’s March 1968 Week of Challenge. The year’s theme was “Man in Revolution” and two crucial speakers, Floyd McKissick and Richard G. Hatcher, focused their speeches on Black Revolution.\(^{41}\) McKissick was the national director of CORE at the time and one of the early champions of the Black Power movement who spoke to a “packed chapel” on March 18 about the importance of Black control of their local economies.\(^{42}\) Black control of the community capital, according to McKissick, was necessary before issues of racism could be handled adequately. He conveyed that the American White establishment did not help, but rather hindered the achievement of these goals, and therefore integration was not the answer to solving racial issues.\(^{43}\) Richard G. Hatcher, the first Black Mayor of Gary and a Valparaiso Law alumnus, also spoke positively to a full chapel about Black Power’s expressions.
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He noted that his political victory in Gary was an electoral expression of Black Power, while the Detroit riots of the previous summer were expressions of rebellion in the movement. Hatcher understood the violence and pushed for change but noted that only cooperation between Blacks and Whites would allow for Black communities to receive the aid they needed.\(^4^4\)

The third influential leader was a more militant Black nationalist who spoke just a few days before the 1968 Week of Challenge: Maulana Karenga. Karenga, a co-founder of the US Organization, a California—based Black nationalist group, addressed a full chapel and sparked controversy over statements about Christianity failing and enslaving Blacks.\(^4^5\) He stated that “Jesus didn’t suffer like us... The crucifixion was a matter of hours, while the internal agony suffered by blacks is a lifetime.”\(^4^6\) Karenga claimed that Christianity was only good for White people, as Jesus looked “just like [George] Wallace” to him.\(^4^7\) Along with his attacks against Christianity, he also questioned the premises of law and order, claimed that rioting was the expression of Black revolution, and advocated a cooperative Black economic system to achieve the goals of the revolution. From Diane Rupp’s reporting on the event, the reactions varied along racial lines. The White students in the audience only reacted to jokes Karenga made about George Washington, Vietnam, and Valparaiso. A third of the audience, however, gave him a standing ovation at the end of the speech and the Black students displayed enthusiastic responses to Karenga’s ideas.\(^4^8\) These three speakers may have had different expressions of Black Power, but it is evident from the large audiences they attracted and the passionate responses they received, particularly from Black students, that they were important influences when it came to Black Power fervor on Valparaiso’s campus.

Many White students and faculty, however sympathetic or apathetic they were toward the Black Power Movement at that point, had a negative reaction to Karenga’s Black nationalist and anti—Christian ideas. Even before his arrival, the Student Senate Committee on White Racism, which sponsored the event, noted that posters that advertised the event around campus were vandalized. Some placed in the university’s West Campus buildings were shredded and those placed in Brandt Hall, then a male residence hall, were torn down. Others even had racist terminology written on them, such as “That’s all we need—some loud—mouthed nigger.”\(^4^9\) After Karenga’s speech, the only overtly racist reaction reported was one overheard from a fraternity man, who believed that Karenga had an interesting speech, but thought that Black people were “so stupid, they’ll do anything he says.”\(^5^0\) Other students were more irked by his comments on Christianity, saying that he was disrespectful and should not have “mocked out” Jesus in the university’s chapel.\(^5^1\) White faculty were just as distressed about Karenga’s ideology. One history professor, Dr. Willis Boyd,
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commented that he left before the speech ended as he believed Karenga was spouting hateful rhetoric. Dr. Boyd claimed to have understood and sympathized with the Black Power movement but felt that Karenga was too extreme and unhelpful to the cause. Like President Kretzmann in 1966, he compared Karenga to a Nazi, saying that “if he had a brown shirt and a swastika, he would have reminded me of Hitler’s men.”

While Valparaiso’s Black students accepted Black Power wholeheartedly, White administration, students, and faculty refused to accept it when it became more militant, sometimes responding with overt racism.

Despite these examples of hostility toward Black Power on campus, Valparaiso University’s administration, unlike those at many other larger institutions, heard various demands from Black students during the Black Campus Movement and moved remarkably quickly to meet them. The movement’s sudden acceptance coincided with O.P. Kretzmann’s resignation at the beginning of the 1968—1969 academic year, with Dr. Albert G. Huegli assuming the presidency. In the same week as the opening convocation where Huegli first spoke, the university’s three Black student organizations—the Black Caucus, Highlights, and Caparanga—succeeded in obtaining a Black student center at 804 Mound Street. The administration also cooperated with these groups to hire Dr. Jeff Johnson as a Black student advisor and implement more Black works into the university’s curriculum.

This liaison extended into the beginning of 1969, when the Valparaiso administration responded quickly and positively to demands from the Black Caucus to hire a Black administrator and implement a Black studies program. The implementation of the Black Studies program in the 1969—1970 academic year was successful. No concrete evidence was found, however, for the implementation of a Black administrator at this time, even though a response letter from President Huegli to the Black Caucus showed interest in creating and fulfilling such a position.

Black students’ demands were accepted, and at times fulfilled by Valparaiso University’s administration in 1968 and 1969, a reaction in contrast to the poor responses to the Black Campus Movement at other larger American institutions.

It is also surprising to see how slowly those achievements obtained through Black power activism dissolved at Valparaiso University. Unlike other institutions, whose Black studies programs only extended into the mid or late 1970s, Valparaiso had Black Studies listed as a special program of their College of the Arts and Sciences until the 1981—1982 academic year. The legacy of Valparaiso’s Black Studies program can still be seen in the university’s Ethnic Studies minor, which, due to the efforts of former social work department chair and Black alum LouJeanne Walton and funding by a Knight Foundation grant, has been offered since the 1993—1994 academic year.
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academic year. While no clear cause can be found as to why the Black Studies program collapsed, there is an obvious explanation as to why the university’s original Black Student Union dissolved. Although originally planned to be on Mound Street, the Union was moved to a house on Greenwich Street near Old Campus and was nicknamed “The Ghetto” by the Black Caucus. However, the house was in such disrepair that the second floor was unusable. In response, Professor LouJeanne Walton worked with Black students to obtain the MLK Center in the 1970s. That too has since disappeared, however, leaving the Black Caucus, now named the Black Student Organization (BSO), in a space that is shared with other multicultural programs in Loke Hall. While the university still provides an organization and a small academic program that allows Black students to gather and learn from other Black voices, the original accomplishments achieved by the Black Caucus in the late 1960s have diminished.

From Valparaiso University’s history with the Black Power Movement, one can see that Black Power manifested itself in various ways at collegiate institutions around the United States. Student—led Black Power movements were also met with varying degrees of acceptance from campus communities and administrations. The current historiography defined by historians like Martha Biondi, Ibram Rogers, and Joy Ann Williamson, however, does not elevate every type of collegiate institution when talking about Black Campus Movements. They mainly discuss HBCUs and public PWIs, leaving a gap in the discussion of Black Power at private and religious institutions. The historiography also has a narrow view of when certain events progressed at colleges and universities during the Black Power Movement. The Black Power Movement at Valparaiso University challenges prior historiography. Late 1966 and early 1967 tend to only be precursory years in the discussions of Black Power at most institutions, with not much blossoming at that time. However, that period was when Valparaiso’s Black students were educating the campus community about Black Power through various Torch articles and visiting speakers. While the typical narrative for most institutions is that they had to violently protest only to not have demands fully met, Valparaiso Black student organizations were met with openness and implementation of their demands through Huegli’s administration. For the most part, both Black and White students at Valparaiso alike tended to embrace Black Power, which heavily contrasts the existing scholarship. These differences in Valparaiso University’s Black Power student movement are significant in showing how much political strength Black students had at some collegiate institutions during the height of Black Power. This begs further analysis, especially of private, religious PWIs, to increase historical understanding of how Black Power and Black Campus Movements were manifested and received at American college campuses.
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