

# **Towards a Research Theme on Racial Politics (2020)**

## **Executive Summary**

During the summer of 2020, as the world protested over the deaths of George Floyd, Breonna Taylor, and Ahmaud Arbery, this working group formed in order to draft a departmental response to these events and chart a vision for the future. Our efforts build on a 2011 Department White Paper that proposed several thematic clusters intended to guide our research and teaching in the years to come. Inspired by the ambition of this document, we argue that we should place the study of racial politics at the center rather than the periphery of our work in the department. Acknowledging the place of our department in the historical formation of Political Science as a racist discipline, our aspiration is to take the lead in reformulating the discipline through an anti-racist ethos. To this end, we propose the inauguration of a department-wide research theme entitled “Oppression, Repression and Justice in Racial Politics”. We intend this theme to fertilize cross sub-field engagement, whether that be research or teaching. We recommend:

1. The formation of a working group tasked with developing supportive resources and recommendations for incorporating the research theme into introductory undergraduate courses at appropriate points and intersections;
2. The creation of a small committee to bring to the attention of faculty members graduate applicants whose interests in racial politics might not fit neatly into a single subfield;
3. A faculty search, when the moment is opportune, emphasizing the department’s strengths in and commitments to the study of racial politics with a pronounced anti-racist ethos;
4. The development and submission of a proposal to the Provost for a two-year post-doctoral fellowships as part of the renewed JHU Roadmap on Diversity and Inclusion with a further commitment from the university to transition the post-doc into a junior faculty line at the end of the fellowship period.

## **Introduction**

Throughout its history, the nation and the city of Baltimore have faced crises that expose the deep connections between racial oppression, repression and other forms of

injustice. This summer, the world watched and then erupted in protest as Minneapolis police officers casually murdered George Floyd as he called for his mother. Five years ago, Baltimoreans took to the streets after Freddie Gray was killed in an encounter with Baltimore police. Worldwide, monuments to racism and colonialism have fallen, just as they did several years ago in Baltimore. And this occurs as the covid-19 public health crisis disproportionately affects black, brown, indigenous and poor citizens. These events are markedly political events, calling into question the nation's commitment to a democracy that fully protects and nurtures all of its citizens.

Until very recently, contemporary political science has eschewed these types of questions, thinking them out of the range of politics properly considered. In this discussion paper, we adopt a different stance, one that other departments in KSAS are also actively debating. We do so acknowledging the unique role the Johns Hopkins University political science department has played in creating our discipline. We do so acknowledging the unique role that Johns Hopkins University plays in Baltimore and through Baltimore, the world. We have a mission to both study the world as it is and the world as we wish it to be. Studying the political causes and consequences of racial oppression and repression through an anti-racist ethos should be an essential part of this mission.

In 2011, the Department drafted a White Paper designed to articulate a vision for the department that would structure its agenda in the years to come. Inspired by this document we nonetheless take a more targeted approach, arguing that we should place the study of racial politics at the center rather than the periphery of our work. We also put forward several concrete steps we believe will help the department advance its collective goals.

## **Political Science, JHU, and Racism**

The 2011 Department White Paper began by acknowledging Hopkins' status as one of the two birthplaces of Political Science as an academic discipline. Johns Hopkins and Columbia were arguably the birthplaces of Political Science as an academic discipline in the United States. Although Columbia's department of Political Science was formed in 1880, before the Hopkins faculty was organized into departments, the central figure in the formation of the American Political Science Association appears to have been W. W. Willoughby of Johns Hopkins. (White Paper, p. 3)

We wish to take a deeper dive, connecting political science and Johns Hopkins to the racial politics of the era. We do so in order to articulate the explicit connections

between racial politics, racism and political science. Political Science was formalized in an era when race science – especially eugenics – was in ascendance. In the US, race science was tasked to address a particular conjuncture of concerns over the integrity of a rapidly expanded and diversified citizenry. New imperial acquisitions, non-Anglo-Saxon immigration (from Europe's East and America's South), Black citizenship and industrial urbanization led many fin de siècle thinkers to argue that a "social contract" between fictitious equals could no longer be deemed sufficient to hold the polity together. In place of such a contract, the idea of a racial volk – an Anglo-Saxon one with Teutonic lineage – gained prominence.

John Burgess, founder of Political Science Quarterly and instrumental force behind the founding of Columbia's Faculty of Political Science, was a key purveyor of this idea. Surveying the terrain of the American Commonwealth, Burgess (1895, 406) opined that "Indian America has left no legacies to modern civilization; Africa has as yet made no contributions; and Asia, while producing all of our great religions, has done nothing, except in imitation of Europe, for political civilization." Given these racial facts, Burgess (1895, 407) was convinced that "the prime mission of the ideal American commonwealth [should] be the perfection of the Aryan genius for political civilization, upon the basis of a predominantly Teutonic nationality."

When the American Political Science Association (APSA) was inaugurated in 1903, many of its founders were progressives. As a movement, progressivism drew attention to the external mixing of races and the internal degeneracy of the white race as conjoined threats to the colonial experiment of transplanting Anglo-Saxon democracy in North America. The solution, they argued, was to find ways to unify the polity by mitigating class conflict, uplifting the ostensibly "white" masses into a culturally homogenized middle class, and pursuing segregationist policies. Towards these aims, many progressivists dabbled with eugenics.

As Jessica Blatt (2018) has recently argued, modern political science scholarship began by retaining the racial volk thesis but adding pragmatic and experimental approaches to the public administration of a fractured polity. Tellingly, two of the five articles in the first issue of APSR concerned "Negro suffrage", the 15th amendment and Southern voting legislation. Incidentally, one of these articles was written by John C. Rose, District Judge of Maryland, and editorial writer for the Baltimore Sun. This intellectual landscape did not fundamentally shift for decades. Take, for instance, Charles Merriam, known for his promotion of a "science" of politics, a progressive and a mild proponent of the eugenics movement. In an address to APSA in 1925, Merriam (1926, 8) clarified some of the "basic problems" that a scientific approach had to engage with: crime,

alcoholism, “the vexed question of human migration [and] the relations of the Negro”. He also proposed that APSA deliberate on how “modern scientific doctrines regarding heredity and eugenics [might have a] bearing upon the foundations of our political and economic order” (see also Hanchard 2018).

## **Political Science at Johns Hopkins University**

JHU was heavily implicated in the racist agenda that underlay the discipline’s beginnings. Around 1880/1, Herbert Baxter Adams began the Johns Hopkins Seminary of Historical and Political Science. Adams was in part inspired by John Kemble, an English historian of early medieval England and Teutonic languages, who used the race science of physiognomy to assert that an Anglo-Saxon “type” could be observed in distinction to a Celtic type (Irish, Scottish) and other populations living in Britain’s imperium. Anglo-Saxon culture could be traced back to the self-governing villages of ancient Germany. Adams extended Kemble’s mythic history forward so as to claim that the source of American democracy lay in the Anglo-Saxon settlers who, having crossed the Atlantic, set up the same kind of communities in New England. In this regard, Adams saw his task not only as promoting the study of local histories, but as using these studies to train a new school of public administrators. He hoped that trained officials might transfer the ethos of Anglo-Saxon influenced local-government into the halls of national government.

In 1894, Westel Woodbury Willoughby became the first chair of the JHU Political Science department. A co-instigator of APSA, Willoughby espoused what we would nowadays call a “communitarian” political theory: rights were only made possible by the state, and for this reason the state was a morally justified entity. His pronounced Hegelianism also seems to have imbibed Hegel’s racist philosophy of history, which saw Spirit moving from the East to the protestant West, bypassing Africa all together. Resonating with the Teutonism en vogue at the time, Willoughby (1896, 422) wrote that “the law-abiding habit of the Anglo-Saxon race has been its greatest glory, and chiefly to that feeling is due the success that it has achieved in its various homes in the establishment and maintenance of democratic government”.

However, at fin de siecle, Woodrow Wilson was the most influential political scientist associated with Hopkins who promoted the thesis that democracy was specifically an Anglo-Saxon inheritance. Arriving in 1883 as a graduate student, Wilson’s relationship with Adams soon soured. In pursuing his critique of the American congressional

system, Wilson took inspiration from the English writer Walter Bagehot, editor-in chief of the *Economist* and the first person to introduce biology into the study of politics.

Evolution, Bagehot claimed, had created different brain capacities amongst the races which enabled and outlawed different political behaviors. In the case of the “modern savage”, the mind was “tattooed over with monstrous images”. Base instincts congealed in the brain’s crevices such that modern savages lived a life “twisted into a thousand curious habits; his reason ... darkened by a thousand strange prejudices; his feelings ... frightened by a thousand cruel superstitions” (Bagehot 1873, 120). Bagehot applied this racist evolutionary theory to the study of politics, arguing that only the Anglo-Saxon mind could manage a democracy that provided civilizational advance yet in an orderly fashion.

Like Adams and Burgess, Wilson believed that American democracy could be understood as a “truly organic growth”, originating in Teutonic forests, and carried across the seas by Anglo-Saxon settlers to take root in the villages of New England. Agreeing with Bagehot, and sharing his concern for orderly change, Wilson proposed that the genius of the Anglo-Saxon race – even when transplanted to a new continent – was its ability to balance both vigor and rationality so as to induce an evolutionary development of political behavior. With the Anglo-Saxon race, government proceeded by balancing rash instincts with rational deliberation so as to produce an “animated moderation” (see Wilson 1895).

Writing in the *Political Science Quarterly*, Wilson directed his thesis explicitly towards fears of racial mixing. Unlike the Anglo-Saxon race, the bulk of mankind, asserted Wilson, was “rigidly unphilosophical”. Wilson sounded the alarm that “nowadays the bulk of mankind votes” and that these masses were no longer only Anglo-Saxons, but also Irishmen, Negroes and others. To effectively govern in this context required the ability to “influence minds cast in every mould of race, minds inheriting every bias of environment” (Wilson 1887, 209).

Wilson thus conceived of the challenge of public administration through a logic of race heredity which required the evolved Anglo-Saxon mind to be preserved amidst the contamination of the public sphere by degenerate racial inheritances. In place of Bagehot’s focus on the British Cabinet, Wilson ultimately presented the presidency as the force that would bind a fractured nation together and make sure that Congress remained honest. After meeting Frederick Jackson Turner upon a return to Hopkins in 1889, Wilson shifted his estimation of the origins of American democracy from New England towns to the Western frontier. Henceforth, Wilson would also shift his sense of

historical scale and manifest destiny to the global level, preparing him for his meeting with South African politician Jans Smuts at the Paris Peace Conference in 1919.

Crucially, and similar to most race scientists and progressivists, Wilson was deeply distrustful of the ability of the “negro” mind to exercise rationality. Wilson had always been suspicious of the emancipation won from America’s Civil War. “It was a menace to society itself”, he argued, “that the negroes should all of a sudden be set free and left without tutelage or restraint” (Ambrosius 2007, 690). Politics and academia were entangled in Wilsons’ career. His de-facto segregation of the White House administration drew upon his prior experience as president of Princeton University. There, Wilson encouraged the de facto barring of African American applicants to the student body, arguing that a “negro” presence would be out of keeping with “the whole temper and tradition of the place” (O’Reilly 1997, 117).

It is notable that four years of effort to rename our Woodrow Wilson Undergraduate Research Fellowship Program met with administrative intransigence despite a vote passing in the HFA. Only the recent and unprecedented public protests regarding Black Lives Matter have pressured the administration to set up a committee to inquire into the names of awards.

## **An Alternative Tradition of Political Science at Johns Hopkins**

However, even as Johns Hopkins and the Political Science department have a history of explicitly and implicitly producing and reproducing racist ideas through individuals like Adams, Willoughby, and Wilson, and embedding these ideas in an array of institutions (including the discipline of political science, the American state, and the international order itself), there is also evidence of a counter anti-racist history of Johns Hopkins University. Indeed while a range of elite colleges and universities are now forced to reckon with the roles that slavery and colonialism played in their founding, Hopkins is one of the few universities that can plausibly claim to have an abolitionist undertone.

Johns Hopkins himself was born a Quaker, supported anti-slavery movements and expressly allocated a portion of his wealth to providing for black denizens. He established an institute for black orphans, and explicitly willed that the Johns Hopkins Hospital be open to the poor no matter their racial background. While we refer to this as an “undertone” on purpose—at no point in time did these efforts ever work to overthrow pre-existing and newly created racist practices and institutions— they did provide a means through which people over time could articulate a different vision of

what was possible, both in Hopkins and beyond it, critique existing institutions, and propose new ones. It is this undertone abolitionist history that we wish to draw upon, as this history subtly reconfigures the department's past and points the way towards a better future.

Germaine Hoston joined the political science department in 1980. She was one of the first women the department hired as well as the first African American faculty member. Hoston was also the first woman to receive tenure in the department, and the first scholar of color to receive tenure in the university as a whole. Her work bridged comparative politics and political theory, with her first book *Marxism and the Crisis of Development in Prewar Japan* (1986) examining the ideas of and conflicts between the two major Japanese schools of Marxist thought, and her second book *The State, Identity and the National Question in China and Japan* (1994) examining the ways Chinese and Japanese radical theorists reconciled their marxist ideas with the nation-state. Her third book (which went unpublished) sought to examine the role the theme of spiritual regeneration played in radical Asian, African, and Latin-American political thought, as a way to reassess the role the non-rational can and should play in Marxist thought more broadly.

Hoston's body of work reflects the two central components of what we now think of as the department's unique strengths. She asked and answered big questions. Her work bridged the subfields of Comparative Politics and Political Theory, and was a forerunner to what is now considered "comparative political theory". But by focusing on the Global South, she extends the purview of political science itself by attempting to decenter it. It might, for instance, be interesting to re-narrate Hopkins' current strengths in Asian politics from this departure point.

Richard Iton received his PhD from the department 1994, one of the first African Americans to do so. His dissertation which served as the basis for his award winning book *Solidarity Blues* (2000) asked a simple, heretofore unexplored question, how did America's racial politics influence its "American exceptionalism". Before his untimely passing in 2013 he would go on to write perhaps the best book ever written on the relationship between black politics and popular culture – *In Search of the Black Fantastic* (2008). The first person he thanked in *Solidarity Blues*? Germaine Hoston. It is likely that at the very least Hoston provided a model of how to take standard political science questions and expand their purview by taking insights from the undiscovered country political science often ignored. Iton, too, sought to ask and answer big questions in a way that bridged subfields. But like Hoston, in taking racial politics seriously, he worked to expand and extend the discipline.

Hoston and Iton are by no means the only scholars who in one way or another extended the purview of the discipline during their time in our department, especially vis-a-vis the study of racial politics. For example, Siba Grovogui (1996) wrote one of the first monographs in IR that made the African continent a crucial site of global politics and did so by drawing attention to the racialized nature of international law. Michael Hanchard was seminal to scoping out the sub-field of Black Political Thought (2011) and undertook ground-breaking comparative work on race (for example, Hanchard 1999).

The institutional legacy of these faculty contributions is evident in several centers and programs. The Racism Immigration and Citizenship Program (RIC) founded by Erin Chung and Michael Hanchard in 2006 is today a rich interdisciplinary forum of annual workshops, speaker series, and conferences where faculty and students explore the interplay of racism, mobility, and national belonging in a comparative and global perspective. Department faculty members Siba Grovogui, Michael Hanchard, and Lester Spence (who served as Co-Director) contributed to the revitalized Center for Africana Studies (CAS), which has become a vibrant intellectual community for scholars and students working at the intersection of African-American studies, African and diaspora studies, and urban studies. Together, this work established a strong interdisciplinary foundation upon which current faculty continue to build. However, the chronic underfunding of these initiatives coupled with the disproportionate service burden carried by a small number of individual faculty members is a significant limitation. Centers and programs cannot fully flourish without the active engagement of departments. And interdisciplinary initiatives are that much stronger when accompanied by transformative work undertaken within disciplines.

## **The challenge**

As political science grew to encompass four distinct subfields, American Politics, Comparative Politics, International Relations, and Political Theory, the study of racial politics and exclusion grew slowly, often in-between sub-fields, and always in fits and starts. In part, this reflected a collective reluctance in the discipline to grapple honestly with its eugenicist and racist origins. As noted above, although it is close to impossible to examine many of the central issues of the discipline without taking racial politics into consideration, for decades the four subfields largely either ignored or obfuscated racial politics or hid it in plain sight. Similarly, through the end of the twentieth century, many if not most of the top political science departments in the country refused to teach racial politics, refused to hire racial politics specialists, and relatedly refused to train graduate students and hire faculty of color. Recently this situation has changed somewhat, primarily because racial politics has increasingly been integrated into the



study of American Politics (often as an offshoot of political behavior). However, other subfields of political science are more likely to treat “race” indirectly via other (albeit related) concepts such as “ethnicity”, “culture” and “hierarchy”.

Working against these disciplinary tendencies is one of the distinctive features of the department at Johns Hopkins, where there is a tradition of directly studying racism and racial politics in a global perspective (e.g. Chung in Comparative Politics, Shilliam in International Relations, Brendese in Political Theory and former members of the department such as Grovogui in International Relations and Hanchard in Comparative Politics,). In the American subfield as well, the department is distinct from the disciplinary mainstream in the way faculty extend and expand what constitutes the political in the study of race beyond solely behavioralist methods (e.g. work by Lieberman, Spence, and Weaver).

While we acknowledge these achievements, we also emphasize that the recent history of the political science department at Johns Hopkins unfortunately displays a similar pattern as the one prevalent in the larger discipline. A Google search of scholarly publications from all current faculty in the department that have race/racial/racism/racist in the title provides a rough and ready benchmark. According to this search criteria, over the last 10 years, seven scholars have produced 3 monographs, 2 edited volumes, 17 articles and 11 book chapters. On the face of it, this is an impressive record. However, approximately two thirds to three quarters of these works were published by colleagues before they arrived at JHU. A similarly rough and ready stock-take is the number of courses taught by full-time Political Science faculty over the last five years in which the course title indicates a central concern with race in the syllabus. Once more, we find a qualified record: half of all courses on race have been taught by just two faculty members. A proper evaluation of teaching and research would, of course, need to be far more granular and rigorous.

Nonetheless, these preliminary metrics point towards what we consider to be the key challenge to the department: the study of racial politics is structurally uneven, rendering any commitment to anti-racism at the department and university as precarious and prone to variance and erasure. This fact points to the need for greater diversity in faculty recruitment and retention, as we discuss in greater detail below.

As one of the first political science departments in the country, situated in the first American research university, we have a unique mission and a unique opportunity. The ethos of Political Science at Hopkins can be characterized as daring to ask big questions designed to recreate the ground upon which our discipline stands. Arguably, the anti-

racist tradition of Hopkins deserves to be integrated intentionally and foundationally into this ethos. Taking up this challenge is especially urgent given

a) the complicities of political science at Hopkins in the creation of a racist discipline, and b) our city's location in time and space as a frontline in the contemporary struggle for black lives to matter. The good news is that, while over-represented in American politics for understandable reasons, cutting-edge scholarship on racial politics is currently being undertaken in each and every one of our sub-fields. Moreover, much of this scholarship exceeds the strictures of any sub-field and pushes the boundaries of what counts as Political Science itself. To leverage this scholarship to a position that it deserves – ethically, politically and above all intellectually – we propose the introduction of a departmental research theme that cuts across and runs above sub-fields.

## **Research theme: oppression, repression, and justice in racial politics**

We propose the inauguration of a department-wide research theme entitled “Oppression, Repression and Justice in Racial Politics”. We intend this theme to fertilize cross sub-field engagement, whether that be research or teaching. We also intend this theme to act as a connecting tissue with which we can draw in expertise from the wider university, especially faculty and graduate students working with CAS, RIC, The Billie Holiday Project for the Liberation Arts, Agora, History's Black World Seminar and other initiatives.

But our ambition is greater still. As we have suggested, racial politics is not solely the province of American Politics, but rather is a fundamental component of political science more broadly. Our very ideas of the citizen, the state, and civil society are shaped by our conceptions of racial and ethnic difference. Moreover, the primary victims of international conflict are black, brown, and indigenous. As late as 2010 France still collected debt from Haiti for the “theft” of Saint Domingue property and land. Put another way, we believe that we as a department can lead in shifting the very coordinates of the discipline towards an anti-racist political science. This ambition will draw in faculty whose teaching and research, while not directly engaging with racial politics, nonetheless speaks to the issues of oppression, repression and justice which underpin the research theme.

The 2011 White Paper proposed four themes that would constitute intellectual clusters of research and teaching: Power and Inequality, Identities and Allegiances, Agency and

Structures, Borders and Flows. Whilst we think these themes remain salient, we see our proposal as departing from this earlier effort in two very crucial ways. Content wise, although the four themes hint at racial politics our proposal places racial politics at the center. Structure wise, the department rarely drew upon the White Paper after its completion, partly because of the increasing role the administration played in setting hiring priorities, but also because the department never operationalized the White Paper's suggestions. Accordingly, we suggest several concrete steps the department can take to advance the study of racial politics in the discipline as well as provide an anchor for centers and programs in the Krieger School and across the university.

To this aim, we suggest the following foci as examples of cross-field research agendas that engage multiple colleagues in the department and, we believe, should inform our teaching at both the graduate and undergraduate levels.

- Police, Repression and the State
- Knowledge, Crisis, and the Human
- Governance, Immigration, Citizenship
- Power, Resistance and the Global

We see these foci as a starting point for the discussion of several concrete recommendations outlined below that we urge the department to adopt in the near term. In the longer term, we envision other research clusters emerging organically from shared intellectual interests among faculty and students in the department.

## **Graduate study**

One of the great strengths of our graduate program is the way it encourages work at the intersection of subfields, such as Political Theory and International Relations or American and Comparative Politics. Yet, we also know that graduate applicants who straddle fields risk falling between stools. In fact, recent admissions decisions suggest that this is especially a risk for students interested in studying racial politics. We believe our admissions process may be unintentionally creating a barrier to these students, and presently it is only the keen-eye and good-will of individual faculty that mitigate against unfair outcomes and lost opportunities. On the one hand, we are attracting applicants because of our unique cross-field approach, and after the first two years a number of graduate students become attracted to the study of racial politics. On the other hand, we are forcing our applicants to designate a single primary field that serves as a sorting mechanism for short-listing potential admitted students. Although some students

navigate this hurdle, students who come from a different disciplinary or institutional background are less likely to do so successfully. To the extent that students of color are drawn to our department to study racial politics (among other topics), we should be mindful of unintended bias baked into our admissions process.

A research theme on Oppression, Repression and Justice in Racial Politics, accompanied by the four foci outlined above, can help with graduate recruitment while, at the same time, creating vibrant intellectual communities for faculty and students. To advance this goal, we propose faculty collaborate on a draft document elaborating the intellectual content of the four foci above. To be clear, these clusters are not meant to map onto sub-fields but are intended to synergize research strengths between sub-fields. This document will describe existing expertise in the department and opportunities for cross-field (as well as interdisciplinary) supervision of graduate students. The audience for this document is graduate students, both potential applicants we identify as targets for graduate recruitment and existing graduates still developing a research agenda.

In addition, we propose the creation of a small committee who will review applications during each admissions cycle from students interested in one of the four foci but who otherwise do not fit neatly into a single subfield. The committee would bring these applicants to the attention of sub-fields and advocate on behalf of those students in the admissions meeting or with relevant subfield faculty with whom they are likely to work.

## **Undergraduate study**

The traditional Johns Hopkins University senior was born in 1999. Over the past 22 years that senior has lived through 9/11, a second Great Depression, two nation-altering presidential elections, worldwide protest over police violence and racism, and will graduate in the midst of the worst pandemic in 100 years.

It's with this context in mind that an engaged group of undergraduates working through the Political Science Steering Committee recently initiated a constructive conversation about the Political Science major and, specifically, decolonizing the curriculum. We see an opportunity to address the concerns of our undergraduates through the proposed research theme. While we would in no way wish to attenuate the teaching of political science solely to a focus on racial politics, neither would we wish to impinge upon faculty autonomy, we are nonetheless excited at the prospect of purposefully contouring our political science curriculum with an anti-racist ethos. In this

respect, we celebrate the diverse range of upper level seminars that already address various dimensions of racial politics. Additionally, though, we believe the four introductory courses required of all Political Science majors is a logical place for us to explore the shaping of our curriculum. Of course, some of this work already happens in our 100-level courses.

Accordingly, we recommend the formation of a working group tasked with developing supportive resources and recommendations for incorporating the research theme into introductory courses at appropriate points and intersections. The working group should include faculty who regularly teach 100-level courses as well as faculty whose expertise include racial politics. The working group should be diverse with respect to rank and field as well. Pedagogically, we think this will provide some needed coherence to our undergraduate program, one that is more consistent with our own intellectual commitments, while better preparing undergraduates for upper level courses in Political Science. All students must acquire a strong foundation in the four fields of the discipline. At the same time, they should be able to leverage the insights and perspectives from each subfield to address larger, cross-cutting questions about politics. We think the introductory courses are an essential and appropriate part of the curriculum in this regard.

## **Faculty recruitment**

A third component of our proposal is in the area of faculty recruitment. Over the past several years department hiring decisions have been overdetermined by administrative priorities. In pushing back against this dynamic, a number of our colleagues have urged us to articulate our own vision for the future in a way that restores faculty voice in setting the department's intellectual agenda. We believe the proposed theme is one that, while possessing its own rationale, can also enable us to push back against administrative initiatives that do not speak clearly to our interests, and advance our goal to carve out a distinct approach to political science itself that can be used to recruit graduate students and humanize the discipline.

In addition, the proposed theme will help us address our own shortcomings in the recruitment and retention of diverse faculty. The composition of the department is less diverse today than it was ten years ago. During a period in which the size of the tenure line faculty grew by 30%, the number of faculty from under-represented groups remained unchanged. This statistic reveals more than our inability to retain key faculty. We point this out so that we, as a department, can better understand why our own search practices as currently constituted result in so few diverse candidates being

invited for interviews and why those candidates from under-represented groups who do visit campus are not offered positions. We do not believe the creation of a research cluster in racial politics can alone address all of these problems. Nevertheless, we do believe that a faculty search emphasizing the department's strengths in and commitments to the study of racial politics with a pronounced anti-racist ethos will attract a diverse pool of candidates and, with faculty working on these topics, improve our ability to retain the scholars we do hire.

Although we are realistic about the limited resources available for faculty hiring apart from signature initiatives, we also believe there is a strategic opening to press our case at a moment when the university is beginning to reckon with its past, its place in Baltimore, and the steps necessary to achieve its goals for diversity and inclusion. Our ability to articulate a vision for the department that speaks to these pressures and possibilities – a bold research theme that evinces an anti-racist ethos – and especially one that includes new approaches to undergraduate teaching and graduate student recruitment, will help us to secure resources for new faculty lines – and through our own agenda. This strategy might take advantage of our relationship with centers and institutes outside of the department, such as Agora. Additionally, a second iteration of the Faculty Diversity Initiative will hopefully begin soon. We further recommend that the department develop and submit a proposal to the Provost for a two-year post-doctoral fellowships as part of the renewed JHU Roadmap on Diversity and Inclusion with a further commitment from the university to transition the post-doc into a junior faculty line at the end of the fellowship period.

## **Conclusion**

On February 22, 1876, Daniel C. Gllman delivered his first address as President of the new Johns Hopkins University. While he spent much of the address speaking of the new university's endowment and the factors that distinguished it from its private and public peers, he concluded the address noting 12 factors that characterized university education. Among them were ideas we now take for granted, ideas about academic freedom, excellence in scholarship and teaching, and about the object of the university itself. Even though at the time Johns Hopkins University was founded neither white women nor men and women of color were allowed entrance, we would still agree with these factors.

The twelfth and final factor is worth quoting. "Universities easily fall into ruts. Almost every epoch requires a fresh start."

Arguably the university itself is in the midst of a decades long rut. And every indicator we have suggests we are at the beginning of a new epoch. This new epoch requires new citizens, and if not new disciplines, renewed disciplines. While the approach we suggest going forward is one tailored expressly for the Johns Hopkins University political science department, we believe that just as Hopkins played a critical role in the development of political science in its beginnings, it can play a critical role taking the discipline forward. Integrating the study of racial oppression, repression and justice into our undergraduate training, our graduate admissions process, and into our hiring, would go some way towards building an anti-racist political science appropriate for the 21st century.

## **Bibliography**

- Ambrosius, Lloyd E. 2007. "Woodrow Wilson and The Birth of a Nation: American Democracy and International Relations." *Diplomacy & Statecraft* 18 (4): 689–718.
- Bagehot, Walter. 1873. *Physics and Politics*. New York: D. Appleton and Company.
- Blatt, Jessica. 2018. *Race and the Making of American Political Science*.
- Burgess, John W. 1895. "The Ideal of the American Commonwealth." *Political Science Quarterly* 10 (3): 404–25.
- Grovogui, Siba N'Zatioula. 1996. *Sovereigns, Quasi Sovereigns, and Africans: Race and Self-Determination in International Law*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press
- Hanchard, Michael George. 1999. *Racial Politics in Contemporary Brazil*. Durham [N.C.: Duke University Press.
- ———. 2011. *Party/Politics Horizons in Black Political Thought*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- ———. 2018. *The Spectre of Race: How Discrimination Haunts Western Democracy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Hoston, Germaine A. 1986. *Marxism and the Crisis of Development in Prewar Japan*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- ———. 1994. *The State, Identity, and the National Question in China and Japan*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Iton, Richard. 2000. *Solidarity Blues Race, Culture, and the American Left*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- ———. 2008. *In Search of the Black Fantastic: Politics and Popular Culture in the Post-Civil Rights Era*. New York; Oxford: Oxford University Press

- Merriam, Charles E. 1926. "Progress in Political Research." *The American Political Science Review* 20 (1): 1–13.
- O'Reilly, Kenneth. 1997. "The Jim Crow Policies of Woodrow Wilson." *The Journal of Blacks in Higher Education*, no. 17: 117–21.
- Willoughby, Westel Woodbury. 1896. *An Examination of the Nature of the State. A Study in Political Philosophy*. New York: Macmillan and Co.
- Wilson, Woodrow. 1887. "The Study of Administration." *Political Science Quarterly* 2 (2): 197–222.
- ———. 1895. "A Literary Politician." *The Atlantic*, 1895.  
<https://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/1895/11/a-literary-politician/519852/>.