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A NEW ROLE FOR ANCHOR UNIVERSITIES: EMBRACING A RHETORIC OF RECONCILIATION

FLAVIUS R. W. LILLY, PH.D., M.A., M.P.H.*

INTRODUCTION

This article is a contemplation of the role played by the University of Maryland, Baltimore (UMB) as an anchor institution and how this role may evolve to include a process and rhetoric of reconciliation with the community it aims to serve. Anchor institutions are not-for-profit or commercial entities that are tied to a geographic location because of their mission, investment, or relationships with customers and employees.¹ The notion of the anchor institution has emerged in the lexicon of community development to define the role of universities and other organizations in addressing societal problems.² The leading role of universities is education and research, but increasingly they are seen to have a critical role in the economic development of poor neighborhoods that suffer from rundown housing, high rates of crime, unemployment, substance abuse, floundering schools, and troubling health status indicators of residents.³

Universities often struggle to fully realize their anchor role and to have substantial impact due to historical mistrust and tension with
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³ See LEE BENSON ET AL., DEWEY’S DREAM: UNIVERSITIES AND DEMOCRACIES IN AN AGE OF EDUCATION REFORM 33–40 (2007) (commenting on Jane Addams et al.’s essay The School as Social Centre which highlighted the importance of the “unique role that the school could play in the development of community life” by “extend[ing] the range and fullness of sharing in the intellectual and spiritual resources of the community . . .”).
their adjoining communities. Universities typically constrain themselves to conventional strategies such as providing programs and services, developing real estate, driving commercialization, purchasing locally, creating accessible employment, and building community infrastructure. Undeniably, these are important practical approaches to revitalizing distressed communities, although none attend to the precursor issues of mistrust and tension which may act as considerable barriers to progress. However, in recent years, reconciliation processes have emerged as a reasonable and successful means of reducing barriers and leading to greater cooperation.

This article seeks to advance “reconciliation” as a potential path forward for anchor institutions who are confronting difficult if not seemingly intractable challenges within their communities. Far from presenting a comprehensive look at how and where the University of Maryland, Baltimore currently operates as an anchor institution, to clarify what constitutes a reconciliation process, and to provide a series of recommendations on how the University may embrace a rhetoric of reconciliation to more fully engage with adjoining communities.


7 See Josh Inwood et al., Addressing Structural Violence Through US Reconciliation Commissions: The Case Study of Greensboro, NC and Detroit, MI, POL. GEOGRAPHY 1, 7 (arguing that the Truth and Reconciliation Commissions in Greensboro and Detroit exemplify “diverse communities crafting grassroots responses to unpeaceful conditions and . . . expanding our definitions of what peaceful societies might actually look like”).

8 See infra Part II.

9 See infra Part III.

10 See infra Part IV., Sections A.–E.
II. THE CONTEXT: BALTIMORE IS A TALE OF TWO CITIES

It was the best of times, it was the worst of times, it was the age of wisdom, it was the age of foolishness, it was the epoch of belief, it was the epoch of incredulity, it was the season of Light, it was the season of Darkness, it was the spring of hope, it was the winter of despair, we had everything before us, we had nothing before us . . . .

This famous first line in Charles Dickens’ 1859 novel “A Tale of Two Cities” portrays the paradox and contradictions between London and Paris during the chaos of the French Revolution. Baltimore, even though just one city, is cloaked in similar contradictions, making it a city with two opposing identities. Simultaneously the laudatory “Charm City” and the unflattering “Harm City,” it is at once the “birthplace of the ‘Star Spangled Banner,’” a “Monumental City,” and “Bodymore, Murdaland,” a recent pejorative epithet coined by locals, but made popular by the hit television series The Wire. Concurrently, people have described it as “[T]he City that Reads,” and “[T]he City that Bleeds.” Baltimore is also a “comeback city” and “Mobtown,” a nickname dating back to the 1830s because of the ease at

---

12 Id.
14 Marvin “Doc” Cheatam, formerly the head of the Baltimore Chapter of the NAACP, once stated, “Baltimore has always been a tale of two cities. There’s always been the well-to-do Baltimore and other Baltimore. But there’s also the tale of West Baltimore . . . .” Id.
which residents would form a mob and riot. These monikers reveal the complex identity of a city mired in inequality, divided by race and class, and embroiled in social tension.

Today, Baltimore’s residents live in vastly different realities depending on their neighborhood. While many live in rather idyllic areas with alluring and spacious row homes, vibrant arts scenes, premier education institutions, and lively urban streets with restaurants and coffee shops, others are confronted with blue police monitoring lights on the corners, omnipresent drug dealers and addicts engaged in illicit trade, food swamps and deserts, gun violence, poverty, and decrepit homes

---


and vacant lots.\textsuperscript{25} Not surprisingly, these disparities and inequalities fuel social tension in Baltimore.\textsuperscript{26}

How did this come to be? Many point to the economic, political, and social circumstances that have imprisoned a substantial proportion of the Black community in Baltimore’s poor neighborhoods.\textsuperscript{27} From the early 1930s through the 1960s, Baltimore’s Black population grew dramatically from 142,750 to 328,512.\textsuperscript{28} At the same time, more than 440,000 Whites fled to the suburbs, encouraged by block busting,\textsuperscript{29} redlining,\textsuperscript{30} and school busing programs.\textsuperscript{31} Constrained by these unjust


\textsuperscript{26} See Berube & McDearman, supra note 22.

\textsuperscript{27} MARY ELLEN HAYWARD & CHARLES BELFOUR, THE BALTIMORE ROWHOUSE 170–75 (2001). Post-Jim Crow Baltimore remained heavily segregated. In 1940, African Americans comprised one-fifth of Baltimore’s population, but due to segregation they were “crowded together in only one-fiftieth of the city’s total land area.” Id. at 171.


\textsuperscript{29} Blockbusting was a practice used by real estate and building companies in the 1950s and 1960s to frighten White people to sell their homes at a loss by promulgating fear that Black people were moving into the neighborhood. The companies then profited by selling the homes to Black families at above market prices, collecting commissions on those sales, and charging them higher financing rates on housing loans. See W. EDWARD ORSER, BLOCKBUSTING IN BALTIMORE: THE EDMONDS VILLAGE STORY 4–6 (1994).

\textsuperscript{30} Redlining refers to a “geographic-based form of discrimination” where mortgage lenders allegedly drew red lines around areas within which they refused to make loans, or made them on “less favorable terms,” based on the “racial composition of the neighborhood.” Helen F. Ladd, Evidence on Discrimination in Mortgage Lending, 12 J. ECON. ASS’N 41, 43 (1998).

\textsuperscript{31} See MATTHEW F. DELMONT, WHY BUSING FAILED: RACE, MEDIA, AND THE NATIONAL RESISTANCE TO SCHOOL DESEGREGATION 2 (2016) (detailing how desegregation school busing programs were unsuccessful because those in power cared more about the thoughts of White parents than Black students’ rights); Erwin Chemerinsky, The Segregation and Desegregation of American Public Education: The Court’s Role, 81 N.C. L. REV. 1598, 1599, 1605–06 (2003) (noting that White families fled the city to avoid desegregation and as such busing African American students to other districts within the city did not change racial demographics of schools because so few White students remained).
social policies, Blacks continued to settle in impoverished and racially homogeneous neighborhoods to the east and west of the center of Baltimore.\textsuperscript{32} Today, these neighborhoods are racially segregated, distressed, deprived, isolated, and have little access to quality education and employment.\textsuperscript{33}

Tensions created by these inequalities boiled over in April of 2015, following the death of Freddie Gray.\textsuperscript{34} Gray was a 25-year-old Black man who was injured while being transported in a police van and subsequently died of his injuries.\textsuperscript{35} His death came at a time when tensions around police brutality towards African Americans were already high in the United States.\textsuperscript{36} Activists across the nation started to be increasingly outspoken about racial discrimination at the hands of law enforcement and the systematic devaluation of Black lives.\textsuperscript{37} Shortly after Gray’s death, protesting began in Baltimore and turned to looting and multi-day rioting\textsuperscript{38} when residents’ frustrations with injustices caught the city off-guard and unprepared for their indignation.\textsuperscript{39}

Freddie Gray lived in Sandtown-Winchester, an impoverished neighborhood just west of downtown Baltimore,\textsuperscript{40} not far from the University of Maryland, Baltimore, where life expectancy is only 70 years.\textsuperscript{41} Yet, the Roland Park neighborhood that is home to many of the University’s employees boasts a life expectancy of 83.9 years – nearly

\textsuperscript{32} Randy Yeip, Baltimore’s Demographic Divide, WALL ST. J. (May 1, 2015, 6:45 PM), http://graphics.wsj.com/baltimore-demographics/.

\textsuperscript{33} See Yvette N. Pappoe, Comment, Remediying the Effects of Government-Sanctioned Segregation in a Post-Freddie Gray Baltimore, 16 U. MD. L.J. RACE RELIG. GENDER & CLASS 115 (2016) (assessing Baltimore City’s ongoing racial segregation resulting from discriminatory housing policies in the context of Freddie Gray’s home, Sandtown-Winchester).

\textsuperscript{34} Delese Wear et al., Remembering Freddie Gray: Medical Education for Social Justice, 92 ACAD. MED. 312, 312 (2017).


\textsuperscript{38} Hermann & Cox, supra note 35.


\textsuperscript{40} Pappoe, supra note 33, at 126–27. “Sandtown has been characterized as ‘blighted,’ ‘depressed,’ and ‘struggling.’” Id. at 127.

\textsuperscript{41} Sandtown-Winchester/Harlem Park, supra note 23, at 22.
a 15-year difference. The disparities continue to mount as illustrated in Table 1, resulting in accumulated inequality in terms of income, education, exposure to violence, health outcomes, and infant mortality. Commensurate with Sandtown-Winchester, many of Baltimore’s other neighborhoods also beget chronic inherited disadvantages, where children from these poor communities often remain poor for the rest of their lives.

Table 1. Baltimore City 2017 Neighborhood Health Profiles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Indicator</th>
<th>Sandtown-Winchester</th>
<th>Roland Park</th>
<th>Baltimore Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median household income</td>
<td>$23,374</td>
<td>$104,482</td>
<td>$41,819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent unemployed</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of families in poverty</td>
<td>50.3%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of single parent homes</td>
<td>86.8%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>64.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent with ≥ bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>80.4%</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homicides per 10,000 residents</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant lots per 10,000 housing units</td>
<td>1589.3</td>
<td>396.1</td>
<td>677.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life expectancy in years</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>83.9</td>
<td>73.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infant mortality per 1,000 babies</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teen birth rate per 1,000 teens</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>42.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

42 Greater Roland Park/Poplar Hill, supra note 23, at 22.
43 See infra note 45 and accompanying text.
45 Sandtown-Winchester/Harlem Park, supra note 23, at 7, 9, 15, 17–18, 22, 25; Greater Roland Park/Poplar Hill, supra note 23, at 7, 9, 15, 17–18, 22, 25.
III. ANCHOR INSTITUTIONS NEED A NEW APPROACH

In the years since the death of Freddie Gray, tensions persist as Baltimore, its people, and its institutions continue to confront historic and current injustices while simultaneously working to heal from the unrest that followed Gray’s death.46 Currently, the University of Maryland, Baltimore embraces an anchor institution role and has a laudable commitment to the community adjoining the campus.47 The leaders of the University understand their vital role and have over the last many years invested in noteworthy economic, health, and youth development initiatives.48 Moreover, the University’s current strategic plan reflects this commitment with a prominent strategic objective to “deepen and expand local . . . engagement by providing health, legal, and social work programs, and engaging in research to promote social justice and improve health.”49

The concept of anchor institutions became popularized in the mid-1990s.50 Early on, those advocating for the crucial role of university anchor institutions described higher education as advancing past mere knowledge creation and accepting the responsibility to make more direct contributions to the local economy.51 Researchers and practitioners have described the unrealized role of universities to help address urban

48 Id. (noting these initiatives include, among many others, community lunches, job readiness workshops, treatment referrals, and tutoring).
disparities. For example, Henry Cisneros, former U.S. Secretary of Housing and Urban development, explicitly stated in an essay that universities were a vital resource for improving American urban areas and “universities cannot wall off their surroundings; nor can they just pick up and move.”

Harvard economist, Michael Porter, has advocated for a “competitive inner-city model,” in which entities like universities responsible for strengthening the economic base of poor urban areas, take on novel roles. Porter went on to explicitly call on university leaders to create urban economic development strategies to revitalize the neighborhoods and communities in which they were anchored. In his call to action, Porter highlighted the best practices and successes of the housing rehabilitation program at Howard University, the neighborhood purchasing program at the University of Pennsylvania, the minority hiring program at Columbia University, and the technology transfer initiative at Virginia Commonwealth University. A common characteristic of all of Porter’s best practices was partnership between anchor institutions and their communities based on principles of mutual benefit.

Today, effective partnership is regarded as an essential and vital aspect of success for anchor institutions in meeting expectations and goals. Anchor institutions must strive for relationships built on mutual benefit in which each actor is sensitive to counterparts’ distinctive organizational and community cultures. The Initiative for a Competitive Inner City (“ICIC”) developed a framework for considering the key role

---

52 Ira Harkavy et al., Anchor Institutions as Partners in Building Successful Communities and Local Economies, in RETOOLING HUD FOR A CATALYTIC FEDERAL GOVERNMENT 147, 147–48 (Paul C. Brophy & Rachel D. Godsíl, eds., Penn Inst. for Urban Research 2009).
54 See Michael E. Porter, Inner-City Economic Development: Learnings From 20 Years of Research and Practice, 30 ECON. DEV. Q. 105, 105–06 (2016) (discussing how his “competitiveness frameworks” have developed since 1997 to “guide inner-city economic development” and “better engage anchor institutions in inner-city revitalization”).
55 URBAN ECONOMIC REVITALIZATION, supra note 51, at 2.
56 Id. at 3.
57 Porter, supra note 54, at 112 (“Anchors create value for both themselves and their communities in taking proactive steps to build a healthy local economy.”).
of partnership. The framework identifies seven roles in which anchor institutions interact with their communities to derive mutual benefit or value for itself and its community. The first role is as a provider of products or services which improves community access to the anchor’s expertise and allows the institution to innovate and become proficient in its core competencies. The second role is as a real estate developer to improve distressed neighborhoods and make campuses and communities more inviting. The third role is as an intentional purchaser from local suppliers to help create local jobs and a thriving business environment and improve neighborhood amenities. The fourth role is as an employer who capitalizes on local talent and creates accessible jobs with opportunities for advancement. The fifth role is as a workforce developer providing leadership to build a pipeline of residents with qualifications to be hired into local institutions and businesses. The sixth role is as a cluster anchor who uses its influence to “attract talent, funding and new companies to help drive innovative research and commercialization.” The seventh and final role of an anchor institution is to act as a community infrastructure builder using strategic community engagement to advance the other six roles and to address any other needs of the community.

The University of Maryland, Baltimore is committed to interacting with the community across all these roles. The University’s President, Jay Perman, MD, has vowed to take steps to strengthen the neighborhoods surrounding the campus. Dr. Perman explained in his

61 Id. at 3–8.
62 Id. at 4.
63 Id. at 4–5.
64 Id. at 5.
65 Id. at 6.
67 Id. at 7–8.
68 Id. at 8.
2015 State of the University address that “[t]he areas of need on which we are focusing are health and wellness, education and workforce, and community and neighborhood revitalization.”70 He went on to say, “localized engagement isn’t something we’re doing in isolation.”71 He cited the Baltimore Integration Partnership, a consortium of 11 Baltimore hospital and university anchor institutions sharing resources and expertise.72 This way, he said, “we can knit together neighborhoods of strength, so that it takes less work to do more good for more people. And of course, we are engaging our community partners to make sure the ‘good’ we’re doing is actually the ‘good’ they want.”73 Examples of these efforts are many and often facilitated by the University’s Community Engagement Center, which has a physical location in West Baltimore, and provides access to services that promote neighborhood and economic development.74

In addition to partnership and mutual benefit, sustained commitment and cultural orientation toward community engagement is paramount; yet many universities struggle with how to institutionalize this component of their anchor role.75 Anchor universities suffer from what Hartley and colleagues describe as four significant internal barriers to institutionalization of community engagement: (1) elucidation of theoretical knowledge rather than solving everyday problems,76 (2)

---

71 Id.
72 Id. See About the Baltimore Integration Partnership, BALT. INTEGRATION P’SHP, https://baltimorepartnership.org/about-baltimore-integration-partnership/ (last visited Oct. 9, 2018) (describing the Partnership as one “focused on establishing economic inclusion as the business culture of norm in the Baltimore region”).
73 2015 State of the University Address, supra note 70.
74 Id. See Community Engagement Center, UNIV. MD., BALTIMORE, https://www.umaryland.edu/oce/center (last visited Oct. 17, 2018) (explaining the center’s mission of giving West Baltimore residents access to services “promoting neighborhood and economic development” and bringing the University and community together).
75 Ira Harkavy & Matthew Hartley, Integrating a Commitment to the Public Good into the Institutional Fabric: Further Lessons from the Field, 16 J. HIGHER EDUC. OUTREACH & ENGAGEMENT 17, 19 (2012) (“For public schools to actually function as integrating community institutions, however, local, state, and national governmental and nongovernmental agencies must be effectively coordinated to help provide the myriad resources community schools need . . . . How to conceive that organizational revolution, let alone implement it, poses extraordinarily complex intellectual and social challenges.”).
distributed decision-making and complicated organizational structures, (3) insufficient faculty engagement to ensure sustainable change, and (4) the desire of institutions to remain neutral on difficult social issues. Universities also struggle with sustainability of their anchor role because higher-level outcomes, such as the reduction of poverty and improvement of community economic conditions, have been difficult to quantitatively demonstrate.

Several researchers have hypothesized that the power dynamics between the anchor and its community make it difficult to reach agreement about mutual benefit. In the same vein, historical mistrust and unresolved issues between the community and the anchor create tensions and thwart progress. For instance, the University of Maryland, Baltimore has the unfortunate legacy of segregation policies which prevented Baltimore native and Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, Thurgood Marshall, from applying to its School of Law, despite his widely known desire to attend. Marshall later filed suit against the University on behalf of Donald Murray, who was denied admission to the School of Law based on his African American race in 1935.

---

77 Id. at 395.
78 Harkavy & Hartley, supra note 75, at 26.
79 Hartley et al., supra note 76, at 396.
80 See Rita Axelroth & Steve Dubb, The Road Half Traveled: University Engagement at a Crossroads 169–170 (2010) (“One area where data is particularly lacking is quantitative community impact data.”).
81 See id. at 40 (“Power dynamics play an important role in campus-community partnerships . . . . Some institutions have signed community benefit agreements with their neighborhood, in order to negotiate results and expectations.”). See also Maurrasse, supra note 58, at 33–34 (noting that the “messiness” of partnerships can be avoided through “a great deal of effort,” communication, and creation of agreements at the “outset”); Steve Dubb et al., Achieving the Anchor Promise: Improving Outcomes for Low-Income Children, Families and Communities, Democracy Collaborative 1, 12 (Aug. 2013), https://democracycollaborative.org/sites/clone.community-wealth.org/files/downloads/Achieving%20the%20Anchor%20Promise_composite_FINAL.pdf (explaining that community organizations often feel they are not “treated as an equal partner,” and experience arrogance and inaccessibility from the anchor institution).
82 Alison Taylor, Service-Learning Programs and the Knowledge Economy: Exploring Tensions, 10 Vocations & Learning 253, 262 (2017) (explaining how universities that prioritize their own expertise over community knowledge create “tenuous” partnerships); Nicole Mirra & John Rogers, Institutional Participation and Social Transformation: Considering the Goals and Tensions of University-Initiated YPAR Projects with K-12 Youth, 29 Int’l J. Qualitative Stud. Educ. 1255, 1256–57 (2016) (discussing how universities have shifted focus away from public sector to the private sector to increase revenue).
84 Id. at 235–38 (“On April 20, 1935, Murray sued the University of Maryland in Baltimore City Court, complaining that the law school had arbitrarily rejected his application.”).
Murray was later admitted after the University was compelled to accept him by the Maryland Court of Appeals, marking the racial integration of legal education in Maryland. Contemporarily, the University’s development policies are perceived by some to displace residents and local organizations. In 2013, the United Workers, a community organization with the mission to mobilize low-wage workers and develop solutions to poverty, claimed that the University’s growing presence in West Baltimore had made office rentals unaffordable and resulted in their eviction. More recently in 2016, a group of approximately 40 protestors organized by the Committee of Concerned Citizens Inc., marched from Poe Homes public housing to the University’s BioPark in opposition to a tax increment financing subsidy issued by the Baltimore City Council for greater expansion of the BioPark in West Baltimore.

Clearly, despite good intentions, anchor institutions like the University of Maryland, Baltimore may struggle to develop strategies to address power dynamics and historical mistrust as barriers to sustained mutual benefit with their communities. The traditional roles and strategies of anchor institutions are simply limited with respect to solving these types of dilemmas. However, in recent decades, the process of reconciliation has emerged as a viable response to formerly unyielding problems of this type. Reconciliation can build sustainable mutual trust and lead to productive cooperation and progress with tangible benefits to individuals who have suffered historical inequalities.

85 Pearson v. Murray, 182 A. 590, 594 (Md. 1936); see id. at 256 (“The Murray case was the first of many court orders throughout the nation ordering the desegregation of schools and other government facilities and activities.”).
87 Fern Shen, Marching Against the UM BioPark, Questioning Developer Subsidies Citywide, BALTIMORE BLOG (Mar. 3, 2016, 12:26 PM), https://baltimorebroad.com/2016/03/03/marching-against-the-um-biopark-questioning-developer-subsidies-citywide (noting protestors feel they were “left out” of the agreement and the agreement terms are “vague and that enforcement mechanisms are weak”).
89 Yaacov Bar-Siman-Tov, Introduction: Why Reconciliation, in FROM CONFLICT RESOLUTION TO RECONCILIATION 3, 5 (Yaacov Bar-Siman-Tov ed., 2004) (explaining that reconciliation is a “mutual and consensual process” which is slow to develop but results in “simultaneous[] and joint[]” efforts).
IV. A WAY FORWARD: EMBRACE THE RHETORIC OF RECONCILIATION

The University’s engagement with the community clearly reflects an ethos to act upon identified needs and to embody its role as an anchor institution.90 Yet, these efforts may be diminished or held back by mistrust between the University and residents of West Baltimore.91 A process and a rhetoric of reconciliation may be a way to alleviate this tension and help the University achieve its anchor goals. Even the most successful university initiatives may fall short in reducing tensions without recognition of the importance of language and rhetoric, because programs in themselves may be insufficient to address the precursory issues of past racial injustices and discriminatory policies that perpetuate social tension. Notwithstanding existing efforts, how can the reduction of inequality and the easing of tensions be accelerated in our contiguous neighborhoods? The remainder of this article argues that reconciliation, which is a “dialogic rhetorical process of healing between parties,”92 is a path forward for reducing the remaining tensions between the University and its community and should be adopted by anchor institutions wishing to overcome barriers to mutual trust.

The process of reconciliation has gained significant credibility through its role in reducing contention following the fall of apartheid in South Africa, during the Northern Ireland peace process, in West Africa’s Benin, and in other countries across the globe.93 Yet, Yaacov Bar-Siman-Tov has indicated that “[s]ince reconciliation is a mutual and consensual process, it cannot be imposed by one side or even by an external side (that is, a mediator). The process is likely to develop naturally

90 See supra notes 69–73 and accompanying text.
91 See Michael Harris & Karri Holley, Universities as Anchor Institutions: Economic and Social Potential for Urban Development, in 31 Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research 393, 406 (Michael B. Paulsen ed., 2016) (noting that when the relations between cities and anchor institutions become strained, the result is that the “long term success of both cities and higher education institutions” is threatened).
93 See Linda R. Tropp et al., Intergroup Contact and the Potential for Post-Conflict Reconciliation: Studies in Northern Ireland and South Africa, 23 Peace & Conflict: J. Peace Psychol. 239, 249 (concluding that “high-quality contact” can aid the reconciliation process and increase trust and involvement in reconciliation efforts); Theodore R. Johnson, How to Apologize for Slavery, ATLANTIC (Aug. 6, 2014), https://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2014/08/how-to-apologize-for-slavery/375650/ (discussing how Benin officials and their “global apology tour[s]” are the “most cited and revered state apology for slavery to date” and can serve as a model for the United States).
and slowly, with direction or intervention by the leadership, who must be accountable for its role if the process is to succeed.\textsuperscript{94}

Rajeev Bhargava, a noted Indian theorist on multiculturalism and identity politics, has defined reconciliation as “an end to enmity through forgiveness, achievable only when perpetrators and beneficiaries of past injustice acknowledge collective responsibility for wrongdoing, shed their prejudice and victims regain their self-respect through the same process.”\textsuperscript{95} In short, the goal is to reestablish cooperation, peace, justice, and empathy in the relationship between parties alienated by offenses. Reconciliation is thought to involve the following acts: acknowledgement of tensions,\textsuperscript{96} promoting intergroup contact,\textsuperscript{97} confessing truth, apologizing for offenses, forgiving offenders, and engaging in a cooperative discourse regarding reunion.\textsuperscript{98} Each of these acts hold potential lessons for the University of Maryland, Baltimore as well as other anchor universities who would begin a reconciliation process with their own communities.

\textbf{A. Acknowledge Tensions}

A key component of reconciliation is the acknowledgement that tension is the consequence of social exclusion and inequality.\textsuperscript{99} Tension can also be described as misunderstanding, disagreement, mistrust, irreconcilability of goals, antagonism, and dilemma.\textsuperscript{100} The University must recognize that social tensions are not only a consequence of inequality but may be a powerful source of social change. Accordingly, acknowledging and even embracing tension as an instrumental forbearer of reconciliation is appropriate as we do the demanding work of relationship building. Indeed, Lord John Alderdice,\textsuperscript{101} a leader of the

\textsuperscript{94} Bar-Siman-Tov, supra note 89, at 5.
\textsuperscript{96} Bar-Siman-Tov, supra note 89, at 5 (noting the reconciliation process should “openly address painful questions of past conflict so as to build a foundation for normal peace relations”).
\textsuperscript{97} Tropp et al., supra note 93, at 247.
\textsuperscript{98} Hatch, supra note 92, at 189.
\textsuperscript{100} Id. at 13.
\textsuperscript{101} Biography, LORD ALDERDICE, http://lordalderdice.com/about-lord-alderdice/ (last visited Oct. 19, 2018). See generally John Alderdice et al., \textit{Understanding Terrorism and What We Can
Northern Ireland Peace process, recently indicated at the University’s Rising Baltimore symposium[102] that waiting until tension subsides to engage in reconciliation is folly; tension and reconciliation must be addressed simultaneously and with a commitment to truth and justice.[103]

B. Promote Intergroup Contact

One important aspect of racial reconciliation is intergroup contact, which is supported by substantial evidence as a means for reducing prejudice.104 Gibson and Classen note that “more interracial contact, and more contact of an intimate sort, produces less racial animosity.”105 The process is unambiguous: “racial segregation [is] a source of ignorance and ignorance [is a] breeding ground for derogatory stereotypes and racial hostility. If stronger bonds could be forged between Blacks and Whites . . . racial attitudes would improve dramatically.”106 The University recently initiated a Live Near Your Work program offering financial incentives to faculty and staff to purchase a home in West Baltimore.107 The University’s President, Jay Perman, was quoted affirming the notion of intergroup contact when he spoke of this program, stating “the initiative was grounded in the fact that it’s infinitely easier to build a community of strength, a community of mutual respect, a community shaped by shared destiny when we work Do About It, 4 INT’L J. OF APPLIED PSYCHOANALYTIC STUD. 277, 277 (2007) (summarizing Alderdice’s presentation at the 2004 winter meetings of the American Psychoanalytic Association); John Alderdice & Michael A. Cowan, Metaphors for One Another: Racism in the United States and Sectarianism in Northern Ireland, 11 PEACE & CONFLICT STUD. 19 (2004) (analyzing racism through metaphor as used in the literary, psychotherapeutic, religious, and philosophical disciplines).

102 See Rising Baltimore: Managing Tensions in Communities, RISING GLOBAL PEACE FORUM, http://rising.org/rising-baltimore/ (last visited Oct. 19, 2018) (explaining that the goals of RISING Baltimore are to share community engagement strategies that can help address the problems facing Baltimore).


104 See Thomas F. Pettigrew & Linda R. Tropp, A Meta-Analytic Test of Intergroup Contact Theory, 90 J. PERSONALITY & SOC. PSYCHOL. 751, 766 (2006) (finding the study’s results “clearly indicate that intergroup contact typically reduces intergroup prejudice” and is applicable to a “variety of intergroup situations and contexts).


together, and socialize together and yes, live together.” The University should expand programs of this type, and commit additional resources to seek out and facilitate opportunities for intimate intergroup contact between university administrators, faculty, staff and students and members of our community.

C. Confessing Truth and Apologizing for Offenses

Since reconciliation is a process concerning “mutual acknowledgement of past suffering and the changing of destructive attitudes and behavior into constructive relationships toward sustainable peace,” the University should speak honestly and acknowledge any historical role in the institution of slavery, marginalization of minorities, and the perpetuation of inequality. Determining historical truths and apologizing for any such role is an important and difficult symbolic act. Institutional apology would not be without controversy as the predominant culture in the United States denies that guilt can accrue to institutions where historical decision-makers are long removed. Yet, if the act of apology is co-created among all parties concerned, both the apologizer and the offended, perhaps even amidst contention, then mutual respect and healing can occur.

D. Forgiving Offenders

Concomitant with acknowledgement of offenses and subsequent apology is the act of forgiveness, defined as “forswearing of resentment - the resolute overcoming of anger and hatred that are naturally directed toward a person who has done one an unjustified and

110 Supra notes 76–87 and accompanying text.
111 Robert R. Weyeneth, The Power of Apology and the Process of Historical Reconciliation, 23 PUB. HISTORIAN 9, 20–21, 25–26 (2001) (explaining that institutions can apologize for “collective wrongs” in a “retrospective” manner but, one of the most “frequently voiced objections” is that the “modern apologists are not the perpetrators”).
112 Id. at 11, 31 (noting that there are two sides of reconciliation, the apology and forgiveness, the latter of which “originates with those who have been wronged” and that a forthcoming apology “make[s] a difference to recipients” as it acts as a “balm for the injury”).
non-excused moral injury.” The act of forgiving others is perhaps the most controversial component of the reconciliation process because it occurs in an asymmetrical power context. Those individuals or institutions asking for forgiveness are typically the more influential and powerful. Some have even argued that forgiveness should be disconnected from the reconciliation process because there should be no implied burden to choose to forgive. Therefore, the University should enter a reconciliation process with no expectation of forgiveness as a goal, but only a possible by-product of authentic engagement.

E. Engaging in Reunion Discourse

The aspiration of each of the previous acts of reconciliation is to lead to a final act of reunion discourse between parties. This act requires ongoing intergroup dialogue which Dessel and Rogge summarize as “designed to give individuals and groups a safe and structured opportunity to explore attitudes about polarizing societal issues. Participants are encouraged to suspend assumptions, collaborate willingly, believe in the authenticity of all participants, speak from experience, and be open to possibilities.” The dialogue should, as Cissna and Anderson claim, “presume sincere caring about the future of the other, the relationship, and the joint project of sense-making . . . “

There are many factors working against productive intergroup dialogue around issues of race and reunion, which Derald Wing Sue has elaborated on as differing significantly for people of color versus

113 Jeffrie G. Murphy, Forgiveness and Resentment, in FORGIVENESS AND MERCY 14, 15 (Jeffrie G. Murphy & Jean Hampton eds., 1988) (citing JOSEPH BUTLER, FIFTEEN SERMONS PREACHED AT THE ROLLS CHAPEL (1726)).
115 Michael Wenzel & Tyler G. Okimoto, How Acts of Forgiveness Restore a Sense of Justice: Addressing Status/Power and Value Concerns Raised by Transgressions, 40 EUROPEAN J. SOC. PSYCHOL. 401, 410, 414 (2010) (noting that those asking for forgiveness believe they have more power but, the act of forgiveness “returns status and power to the victim” and repairs the balance of the relationship).
116 See HOWARD ZEH & ALI GOHAR, THE LITTLE BOOK OF RESTORATIVE JUSTICE 6 (2003) (concluding that forgiveness and reconciliation is a “choice that is entirely up to the participants” and there should be “no pressure” to forgive).
White Americans.\textsuperscript{119} White people are less likely to openly discuss race because of the perceived negative consequences of engaging with the topic as well as “denial of power and privilege.”\textsuperscript{120} For people of color, Sue explains that discussions about race can be difficult because

[T]hey are placed in the unenviable position of (a) determining how to talk about the ‘elephant in the room’ when Whites avoid acknowledging it; (b) dealing with the denial, defensiveness, and anxiety emanating from their White counterparts; (c) managing their intense anger; and (d) needing to constantly ascertain how much to open up, given the differential power dynamics that often exist between the majority and minority group.\textsuperscript{121}

Considering the potential stumbling blocks to productive reunion discourse, the University should engage a trained facilitator familiar with dialogic interaction who has experience in the realm of racial reconciliation.

CONCLUSION AND NEXT STEPS

University efforts at reconciliation are not unprecedented in the United States. For instance, in 2015 John J. DeGioia, President of Georgetown University charged a working group on \textit{Slavery, Memory, and Reconciliation} to “make recommendations on how to best acknowledge and recognize the university’s history as it relates to slavery; examine and interpret the history of certain sites on [their] campus; and convene events and opportunities for dialogue.”\textsuperscript{122} Georgetown University’s working group subsequently issued a report making recommendations to rename certain university buildings, apologize for the university’s historical role in the institution of slavery, develop public memorials to honor the enslaved, and establish an institute for the study

\textsuperscript{119} Derald Wing Sue, \textit{Race Talk: The Psychology of Racial Dialogues}, 68 \textit{AM. PSYCHOLOGIST} 663, 667 (2013) (“In general, persons of color are more willing to discuss topics of race than their White counterparts.”).

\textsuperscript{120} \textit{Id}. at 665, 671 (explaining that White people are “extremely threat[en]” by race talk because it “may unmask the secrets of power and privilege” and by ignoring it, White people can “maintain[] their innocence” and be excused from taking personal responsibility for injustices).

\textsuperscript{121} \textit{Id}. at 671.

of slavery and its legacies at the university. As of this writing, Georgetown University has begun implementation of the recommendations of the workgroup. Marcia Chatelain, a workgroup member and Associate Professor of History has said Georgetown University’s efforts “teaches people that nothing bad happens when we’re honest about the past . . . and [it is] a critical moment . . . to navigate[] the long-term consequences of inequality.”

The noted sociologist and civil rights pioneer, W.E.B. Du Bois proclaimed the United States’ most intractable challenge as “the problem of the color-line.” Regrettably, nearly 115 years after Du Bois’ assertion, the problem of race relations seems just as obdurate now. Yet, a reconciliation process may hold some hope of easing the problem at a local level. The University, as an important anchor institution, has a social and moral responsibility to work to reduce tension and to engage in a process of reconciliation, as Bouget suggests, where all parties are accorded equal status, privileges and opportunities. The University of Maryland, Baltimore should convene a Task Force on Reconciliation to guide the institution’s efforts as outlined in this article. The task force should be composed of university representatives from the administration, faculty, staff, students, and most importantly representatives from the neighboring community. The task force should work at first to inform itself on the evidence and the best practices for engaging in a process of reconciliation. The task force should organize a program of opportunities for interchange and learning with the community. Finally, the task force should make recommendations on the deliberate actions in a reconciliation process to establish a relationship of mutual trust and benefit. The University’s leadership should then act swiftly to embrace the recommendations and work to efficaciously and authentically implement them. Henceforward, let us proclaim reconciliation as the path forward, embrace our unique role as an anchor institution, work to reduce inequality, build mutual respect, and forge a future for Baltimore that is the Tale of One City.

125 GEORGETOWN UNIV., Reflections from the Working Group on Slavery, Memory, and Reconciliation, YOUTUBE (Sept. 1, 2016), https://www.youtube.com/watch?time_continue=251&v=97ATHT0_e64.