

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND ETHNICITY

William Simmons, Chair
Berkeley Division of the Academic Senate
March 1989

TO MEMBERS OF THE BERKELEY DIVISION:

Herewith the final report of the Division's Special Committee on Education and Ethnicity, chaired by Professor William Simmons of the Department of Anthropology. The Report is the result of much thought, consultation, and research. The Committee deserves the Division's thanks.

The Committee on Educational Policy is preparing legislation that, if approved by the Division, would implement the Committee's proposal for a breadth requirement in American Cultures. The general character of the proposal will be clear from pages 2-5 and 18-21 of the Report.

A forum discussion of the Report will take place on April 11 in the Heyns Room of the faculty Club from 3:10-5:30 p.m. A second forum will be scheduled if necessary. The Division will meet on April 25 in Booth Auditorium, Boalt Hall, beginning at 3:10 p.m. to consider and to act on the legislation proposed by the Committee on Educational Policy. The Notice of Meeting, including the proposed legislation, will be distributed in good time.

J.L. Heilbron, Chair
Berkeley Division of the Academic Senate
University of California

March 29, 1989

Professor J.L. Heilbron, Chair
Berkeley Division of the Academic Senate
320 Stephens Hall
University of California
Berkeley, California 94720

Dear Professor Heilbron:

On behalf of the Special Committee on Education and Ethnicity, I am pleased to submit our report and recommendations. We took account of faculty comments on the previous proposal, as well as of a broad range of faculty and student opinion. We recommend a one-semester breadth requirement to be satisfied by a series of courses from many disciplines that will focus on important themes in United States history, society, and ethnic diversity. In spirit this recommendation is akin to the existing American History and Institutions requirement and is intended to provide our students with a comprehensive understanding of the peoples and cultures that created our past and present.

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to all members of the Special Committee for the many months of concentrated work that they gave to this important task and to the Senate Office staff for their constant support.

Sincerely,

William S. Simmons, Chair
Special Committee on Education and Ethnicity

Submitted by the Special Committee on Ethnicity and Education, March 28, 1989
William S. Simmons, Anthropology, Special Committee Chairman
Emeka Kalu Ezera, Student Member
Lawrence W. Levine, History
David Lloyd, English
Lily Wong Fillmore, Education
Charles Henry, Afro-American Studies
Mark Min, Student Member
Guadalupe Valdes, Education
Ling-Chi Wang, Asian American Studies

**Report of the Special Committee
on
Education and Ethnicity**

University of California at Berkeley
March 28, 1989

CONTENTS

PREFACE 1

RECOMMENDATION FOR AN AMERICAN CULTURES BREADTH REQUIREMENT 2

Proposed Change in Division Regulations 5

BACKGROUND TO THE RECOMMENDATION 6

I. Diversity and the student body 6

II. Campus racism 7

III. The debate in higher education 9

IV. Student critique of the curriculum 12

V. The present curriculum at Berkeley 14

VI. Curricular changes at other institutions 15

VII. The old proposal: Criticisms and response 18

VIII. Possible American Cultures courses 25

IX. Implementation 26

X. Selected bibliography 29

XI. Appendices 31

A. Cultural Pluralism Requirements at other Universities 31

B. Existing Graduation Requirements in the University, Schools and Colleges 35

C. Summaries of Possible American Cultures Courses 40

D. Consultation with Students, Faculty and Administrators 62

PREFACE

The Special Committee on Education and Ethnicity was created at the Spring 1987 Representative Assembly meeting of the Berkeley Division of the Academic Senate by a resolution offered by the Committee on Educational Policy. The Special Committee was instructed to review existing campus ethnicity courses and to consider various ways of improving awareness, knowledge, and understanding of ethnicity. Specifically, the Committee was charged to:

- a. analyze the academic issues that are relevant to education about cultural diversity and ethnicity in the undergraduate curriculum;
- b. include an assessment of existing relevant programs and courses on the Berkeley Campus;
- c. identify approaches which would enhance current educational efforts in this area, including encouragement of academic innovations; and
- d. take account of other Academic Senate evaluations of our program of undergraduate education, especially those concerned with general education at the lower-division level.

The Committee began its work in late Fall 1987 and delivered its first report to the Committee on Educational Policy on April 11, 1988. On April 25, 1988, the Committee on Educational Policy endorsed the report and proposed amendments to the Regulations of the Berkeley Division based upon the proposal for an American Cultures breadth requirement. On May 10, 1988, the Berkeley Division voted to submit the proposed legislation to a mail ballot. Subsequently it was learned that the Berkeley Division had no provision in its by-laws for voting by mail ballot. The faculty voted at the November 28, 1988, Academic Senate meeting to recommit the Special Committee on Education and Ethnicity, and directed the Committee to submit a new proposal in Spring 1989.

RECOMMENDATION FOR AN AMERICAN CULTURES BREADTH REQUIREMENT

American colleges and universities are in the midst of an intense debate over the content and purpose of a liberal education. At the heart of this debate, which has spread far into public intellectual life, are competing images of our identity and best interest as a people. The intellectual concerns that ignited the debate have mainly to do with how to understand American experience and represent it to American students. As two commentators on the controversy recently noted, "The curriculum is a microcosm of the culture: its inclusions and exclusions are an index of what the culture deems important. A conflict over ... what books to teach and how to teach them is a conflict over a society's vision of itself" (Graff and Cain 1989: 310).

American society is distinctive if not unique in the diversity of racial and ethnic groups that shaped its early formation and that continues to shape its identity in the present. This identity, and academic debates about our identity, reflect three processes, two of which are encoded in our national motto, *E Pluribus Unum*. First, we are constituted by people with historical traditions from Africa, Asia, Europe, North America, and elsewhere. Second, these traditions have been reshaped by New World experience that has impressed a new level of identity upon the whole. Thus, American culture derives from its many constituent groups, but in their interaction on American soil it has been redefined, both within each racial and ethnic tradition and at a level that transcends all such traditions. The third process may be described as exclusion. The experiences of exclusion and isolation have affected most groups in the United States although some have experienced this over a longer time period and in qualitatively different ways than others.

Throughout the greater part of our history, for reasons that have to do with relations of class and privilege, the American university has reflected a narrow spectrum of American diversity in its faculties, students, and curricula. Until very recently most institutions of higher education in this country have been characterized by culturally and racially homogeneous faculties that transmitted knowledge to homogeneous student bodies.

This has changed both locally and nationwide. For the first time in its history the undergraduate student body at the University of California at Berkeley includes racial minorities in numbers that begin to reflect their presence in the larger California society. Although students from these groups are no longer excluded from a Berkeley education, they find that in some ways they are excluded from or not taken account of adequately by the academic disciplines that take responsibility for the analysis and interpretation of American experience. This is not surprising. Mainly white faculties talking to mainly white student bodies over many generations have worked out their own traditions of what is important, what is to be selected, and what is to be ignored in the codification

and teaching of knowledge about our society. Students of color, because they have had fewer opportunities to shape these assumptions, are less likely to share them, and ask where they are and their histories fit into academic depictions of American experience. This unprecedented conjuncture between relatively homogeneous faculties and heterogeneous student bodies is where old ideas and expectations come sharply into focus, and where new ones are beginning to take shape.

Scholarship is also changing. One prevailing view of a liberal education assumes that its purpose is to assimilate students of diverse origins to a single common culture. Such a curriculum reflects the idea of a culturally homogeneous nation but provides a limited framework for understanding the formulation of this society. The cutting edge of recent scholarship in history, literature, education, and several other humanistic and social science disciplines has gone beyond monocultural models that emphasize assimilation to demonstrate the importance of Old and New World racial and ethnic minority groups and their histories of assimilation, independence, and exclusion in the creation of an American culture.

Some contemporary critics of higher education fear that we as a society have gone too far in the direction of emphasizing differences to the point that the core of values, traditions, and assumptions that bind us are in danger of giving way. Others argue similarly that by giving attention to differences, we risk creating further alienation between racial and ethnic groups. We think that such fears are premature and function to remove the curriculum from a living relationship with the students whom we educate. If we would continue to hold up the ideal of an inclusive culture, then we must also recognize that the full diversity of ethnic groups that contribute to it needs to be represented in our curricular and research priorities.

In this report, we recommend a change in the undergraduate curriculum that will direct it more toward the diversity of students that it now educates. We recommend that a wide variety of disciplines establish courses that focus on major themes in United States history, society, and culture and that address the major conceptual issues relevant to understanding ethnicity, culture, race, and pluralism in the American context. Such courses should provide the intellectual tools to understand better one's own particular cultural identity and those of others in their own terms. They should take substantial account of those racial minority groups such as African Americans, American Indians, Asian Americans, and Chicanos/Latinos that have not only been excluded from the mainstream of American society, but continue to be underrepresented in our mainstream curriculum.

American Cultures courses should elucidate such major concepts as race, ethnicity, class, and gender and their influences upon the ways that Americans think about themselves and approach issues and problems that confront their society. How, for example, have our constituent groups shaped American literature, music, language, folklore, and art? How have power relations between groups been manifested in such

matters as racism, economics, politics, environmental design, religion, education, law, business, and the arts in the United States? What holds this nation of Old and New world peoples together? Students will be best served by a broad spectrum of choices offered by faculty members in a wide range of disciplines in the humanities, social sciences, ethnic studies, women's studies, and professional colleges.

The courses that the committee envisages are integrative and comparative. We intend that each racial or ethnic group be studied in the larger context of American history, society, and culture. Such courses should substantially consider at least three of the five main racial/cultural groups in American society: African American, Indian American, Asian American, Chicano/Latino, and European American. To be adequately comparative, no one of these grouped may be the focus of the greater part of the course. Other racial/cultural groups may be added where appropriate: for example, a course on California might include coverage of Americans of Near Eastern or South Asian descent.

The American Cultures breadth requirement will strengthen liberal education at Berkeley. It will expose all undergraduates to cultural experiences other than their own and provide each student with the intellectual tools for better understanding and interpreting cultural similarities and differences. It will create an opportunity for many disciplines to address the intellectual issues related to culture, ethnicity, and race, and to take grater account of ethnic and racial minorities in the American past and present. The ability to understand cultural differences is basic to living in the modern transnational world, but begins at our doorstep where cultural diversity is an everyday feature of student, community, and professional life.

Proposed Change in Division Regulations

The Committee on Education and Ethnicity unanimously recommends that the Berkeley Division adopt a one-course American Cultures breadth requirement for all undergraduates.

Satisfaction of the American Cultures requirement will be a prerequisite for every bachelor's degree awarded to students who begin their studies at Berkeley in lower division standing in Fall 1991 or thereafter, or in upper division standing in Fall 1993 or thereafter;

The American Cultures requirement will be satisfied by passing, with a grade not lower than a C— or P, a course expressly approved for that purpose by a nine member overseeing committee to be appointed by the Academic Senate;

The courses that qualify for the purposes of this requirement will be consistent with the spirit and intent of the Committee's recommendation as present in this report.

BACKGROUND TO THE RECOMMENDATION

This recommendation for an American Cultures breadth requirement responds to four changes that are affecting American higher education. The first is rapid change in the ethnic and racial composition of the student body. The second is a precipitous rise in issues related to campus racism. The third is a major debate within colleges and universities and in the wider society over the content and purpose of a liberal education in the American context. The fourth is the realization that racial minorities are not taken account of adequately in many departments and courses that represent American experience. We address these issues and others that bear upon the background and substance of our recommendation. Topics in this section include the following:

- I. Diversity and the student body
- II. Campus racism
- III. The debate in higher education
- IV. Student critique of the curriculum
- V. The present curriculum at Berkeley
- VI. Curricular changes at other institutions
- VII. The old proposal: Criticisms and response
- VIII. Possible American Cultures courses
- IX. Implementation
- X. Selected bibliography
- XI. Appendices
 - A. Cultural Pluralism Requirements at other Universities
 - B. Existing Graduation Requirements in the University, Schools and Colleges
 - C. Summaries of Possible American Cultures Courses
 - D. Consultation with Students, Faculty and Administrators

I. Diversity and the Student Body

American colleges and universities, including the University of California at Berkeley, continue to make effective efforts to diversify their student bodies. A release from the Berkeley Campus Office of Public Information announced last year that “For the first time at Berkeley, and probably at any academically top-ranked U.S. university, there is not a majority ethnic group in the entire undergraduate student body.” (11/2/88). According to this same release, Berkeley undergraduates this year are 48.5 percent whites, 26.5 percent Asians, 11.1 percent Hispanics, 7.0 percent blacks, and 1.1 percent American Indians. Berkeley campus ethnic diversity reflects larger scale population dynamics in the State of California. State Superintendent of Public Instruction Bill Honig announced at the beginning of the 1988 school year that for the first time there will be more minority than Anglo students enrolled in California’s public schools. Vice Chancellor Roderic Park noted in his address to the Berkeley Division of the Academic Senate on November 28, 1988, that “California is rapidly becoming a unique State in terms of ethnic composition, in the sense that all our ethnic groups will become minorities over the next twenty years.” He further added that we “need look only at the public schools in Los Angeles County this year where 142 languages are now being spoken by students.” According to recent research done by James Allen and Eugene Turner on “The Most Ethnically Diverse Places in the United States,” the greater San Francisco Bay Area (stretching from Monterey north to Solano County and Sacramento) is the most ethnically diverse metropolitan region in the United States.

II. Campus Racism

The effects of an increasingly diverse student body on higher education in California and elsewhere in the United States are numerous, complex, and still in the process of emerging. One apparent effect is a rise in attention to issues of campus racism. The following selection of titles from a range of recent publications attests to widespread awareness of and concern with racism on United States college and university campuses.

“Black Students Seen Facing ‘New Racism’ on Many Campuses.” *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, January 27, 1988.

“Campus Racial Tensions—and Violence—Appear on Rise.” *The New York Times*, Sunday, February 21, 1988.

“Campus Blacks Feel Racism’s Nuances.” *The New York Times*, Sunday, April 17, 1988.

“Bigotry Surfaces at U.S. Colleges.” *Los Angeles Times*, Sunday, May 8, 1988.

“Racism Still Smolders on Campus.” *USA Today*, Tuesday, May 10, 1988.

“What ‘Epidemic of Campus Bigotry?’ *The New York Times*, Friday, May 27, 1988.

“Racial Tension Erupts in Melee at UCLA.” *Los Angeles Times*, Friday, May 27, 1988.

“The ivory Tower Doesn’t Rise Above Bigotry.” *San Jose Mercury News*, Saturday, June 4, 1988.

“Report Reveals Stanford is a ‘Racially Troubled’ University.” *East/West News*, June 9, 1998.

“When Racism Goes to College.” *The New York Times*, Friday, June 10, 1988.

“Whites Allege Racism.” *The Sacramento Bee*, Wednesday, August 17, 1988.

“Prejudice on Campuses Is Feared to Be Rising.” *The New York Times*, Monday, October 31, 1988.

“Bigotry on the Campus.” *The Sacramento Bee*, Tuesday, November 8, 1998.

“Whether ‘Blacks’ or ‘African Americans,’ We’re Still on the Outside Looking In.”

***Los Angeles Times*, Sunday, January 8, 1989.**

“Bigots in the Ivory Tower.” *Time*, January 23, 1989.

“The Recoloring of Campus Life: Student Racism, Academic Pluralism, and the End of a Dream.” *Harper’s Magazine*, February, 1989.

“At Dartmouth: The Clash of ‘89.” *The New York Times Magazine*, February 26, 1989.

“Reagan’s Children: Racial Hatred on Campus.” *The Nation*, February 27, 1989.

Shelby Steele, Associate Professor of English at San Jose State University, and author of the above mentioned article on “The Recoloring of Campus Life” offers a thoughtful interpretation of today’s racism as experienced by college students: On a campus where members of all races are gathered, mixed together in the classroom as well as socially, differences are more exposed than ever. And this is where the trouble starts. For members of each race—young adults coming into their own, often away from home for the first time—bring to this site of freedom, exploration, and now, today, equality very deep fears and anxieties, inchoate feelings of racial shame, anger, and guilt. These feelings could lie dormant in the home, in familiar neighborhoods, in simpler days of childhood. But the college campus, with its structures of interaction and adult level competition—the big exam, the dorm, the “mixer”—is another matter. I think campus racism is born of the rub between racial difference and a setting, the campus itself, devoted to interaction and equality. On our campuses, such concentrated micro-societies, all that remains unresolved between blacks and whites, all the old wounds and shames that have never been addressed, present themselves for attention—and present our youth with pressures they cannot always handle (Steele 1989:48-49).Gerald Marwell, Professor of Sociology at the University of Wisconsin at Madison, author of the Friday, May 27, 1988, *New York Times* article on “What ‘Epidemic’ of Campus Bigotry?” sees current awareness of campus racism as a hopeful sign in the long historical picture: “In sum, more minority students, self assured and organized, demanding that responsive administrations end racist conduct that still occurs frequently on their campuses, represents progress, not regression.”

III. The Debate in Higher Education

Of the many voices that have contributed to the debate over the importance of culture and ethnicity in the curriculum, that of Allan Bloom, Professor of Political Philosophy at the University of Chicago, and author of the best seller *The Closing of the American Mind* (1987), has attracted particular attention. According to Bloom, the major works of Western civilized thought, natural human rights, the traditional emphasis on unity and shared principles in American life, and even the social contract itself are under siege. Against these are the proponents of moral relativism who are primarily concerned with exposing and redressing the many forms of social inequality and whose emphasis on other cultures and ethnic diversity threatens to weaken our social contract. “There is one thing a professor can be absolutely certain of,” writes Bloom, “almost every student entering the university believes, or says he believes, that truth is relative” (1987:25). This relativism and openness, combined with our diversity, has brought us to the point where we need to be reminded of “what we have in common all the time—what is America, what is a human being—in order that we not break down into a set of atoms that cannot adhere to a greater whole” (Bloom 1988:74). That which binds us in the present has deep roots in Western experience and thought: “My notion of education is precisely that in the U.S. we have this lengthy, old tradition. You read the *Federalist* papers and you are already with Plato, Aristotle, Hobbes, Locke” (ibid.). This “old view was that, by recognizing and accepting man’s natural rights, men found a fundamental basis of unity and sameness. Class, race, religion, national origin or culture all disappear or become dim when bathed in the light of natural rights, which give men common interests and make them truly brothers” (1987:27). Earlier generations of American immigrants put the claims of Old World experience behind them. “They became Americans not by growing up in old roots or maintaining ethnic diversity or accepting American myths but by learning certain common principles” (1988:74). The ethnic differences Bloom sees in the contemporary United States “are but decaying reminiscences of old differences.” Bloom is suspicious of the motives of those who would require a course on non-Western cultures, because despite their commitment to their areas of study, advocates of such requirements have a “demagogic intention.” Those who urge the study of other cultures do so to criticize America, and have “either no interest in” or are “actively hostile to the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution” (1987:33).

William Bennett, former U.S. Secretary of Education, entered the debate in April 1988 with his criticisms of the Stanford University decision to replace its Western Culture program with a “Cultures, Ideas, and Values” requirement. Bennett interpreted this decision as an instance of “the West and its unique tradition of open discourse and philosophical inquiry” coming under attack.. “Those who attack Western values and accomplishments do not see an America that—despite its imperfections, its weaknesses, its sins—has served and continues to serve as a beacon to the world. Instead, theirs an America hopelessly tainted—tainted by racism, imperialism, sexism,

capitalism, ethnocentrism, elitism, and a host of other 'isms.'" Bennett did not challenge the importance of other cultures and ethnicity in education in the curriculum, but rather opposed what he perceived to be the dilution and devaluation of Western culture. E.D. Hirsch, Professor of English at the University of Virginia, and author of the bestseller, *Cultural Literacy: What Every American Needs to Know*, stresses the importance of collective as opposed to local or ethnic values but in a more moderate way than Bloom: "Our debate has been over whether to stress the *many* or the *one*. If we *had* to make a choice between the *one* and the *many*, most Americans would chose the principle of unity, since we cannot function as a nation without it" (1987:96). Lynne V. Cheney, Chair of the National Endowment for the Humanities, argued recently in *Humanities in America* that teaching about Western civilization and the American society that has grown out of it is essential, but also acknowledges that "Any course in the American experience should make clear how men and women of diverse origins have shaped and enriched this nation's Western inheritance" (1988:13-14).

In his *Highbrow/Lowbrow: The Emergence of Cultural Hierarchy in America*, Lawrence Levine, Professor of History at the University of California, Berkeley, locates this debate in longer term historical perspective. The theme that high culture and social unity are endangered by popular, democratic, and marginal influences appeared at the end of the nineteenth century when one finds the same sense of America's cultural deterioration. Then, as now, this debate "is between those on one side who 'know' what culture is ... perceive culture to be something finite and fragile, which needs to be conserved and protected from the incessant Philistinism that threatens it, and those on the other side who, possessing no map and little liking for fixed and unmovable fences and boundaries, believe that worthy, enduring culture is not the possession of any single group or genre or period, who conceive of culture as neither finite nor fixed but dynamic and expansive" (1988:255). According to Stanley Fish, Professor of English at Duke University, "Projects like those of Bennett, Hirsch, and Bloom all look back to the recovery of the earlier vision of American culture, as opposed to the conception of a kind of ethnic carnival or festival of cultures or ways of life or customs" (*The New York Times*, Sunday, September 25, 1988). Other critics of these above mentioned viewpoints tend to argue that courses on the literary canons of Western civilization need to be expanded to include Third World and minority writers, both as an act of intellectual affirmative action and as a reparation for past exclusion and ignorance. Some aim not to provide an alternative list of essential works, or to establish a new canon, but rather to give voice to the experiences of marginalization and exclusion which such works explore. According to this view, the works of excluded classes, whether racially, sexually, or politically defined, provide the intellectual means to move outside the educational and hegemonic assumptions that the canon represents. Others have sought to reform the canon by including works by minority authors. For example, the collection of essays edited by Rick Simonson and Scott Walker, *Multi-Cultural Literacy: Opening the American Mind*, is intended to supplement Bloom's and Hirsch's Western-centered agenda, for "At a time when one in four Americans are people of color, none of us can afford to remain ignorant of the heritage and culture of any part of our

population” (1988:xi). The editors do not dismiss Hirsch’s catalogue of the necessary components of cultural literacy, but consider it to be “alarmingly deficient in its male and European bias” (ibid.,191). In his recent essay on “The Primal Scene in Education” Hirsch also acknowledges the importance of minority perspectives in his catalogue of essential elements of American cultural literacy. Henry Louis Gates, Professor of Literature at Cornell University, wrote recently of the need for new canon formation for American minority traditions. In preparing his own forthcoming “The Norton Anthology of Afro-American Literature” he defined a “position between those on the cultural right who claim that black literature can have no canon, no masterpieces, and those on the cultural left who wonder why anyone wants to establish the existence of a canon, any canon, in the first place” (1989:44-45). Gates’ comments upon the complexities of interpreting black American writing raise the sorts of issues that American Cultures courses might well address:

Every black American text must confess to a complex ancestry, one high and low (that is, literary and vernacular) but also one white and black. There can be no doubt that white texts inform and influence black texts (and vice versa) so that a thoroughly integrated canon of American literature is not only politically sound, it is intellectually sound as well. But the attempt of black scholars to define a black American canon, and to derive indigenous theories of interpretation from within this canon, are not meant to refute the soundness of these gestures of integration. Rather, it is a question of perspective ... Just as we can and must cite a black text within the larger American tradition, we can and must cite it within its own tradition, a tradition not defined by ... a mystically shared essence called blackness, but by the repetition and revision of shared themes (ibid.:45). Recent publications by Ronald Takaki, of the program in Ethnic Studies at the University of California at Berkeley (“An Educated and Culturally Literate Person Must Study America’s Multicultural Reality”), and Sucheng Chan, Professor of History at the University of California at Santa Barbara (“On the Ethnic Studies Requirement”), argue for the exciting, creative, and revitalizing potential of ethnic and multicultural studies in the university curriculum. Takaki notes that “The need to open the American mind to greater cultural diversity will not go away ... it offers colleges and universities a timely and exciting opportunity to revitalize the social sciences and humanities, giving both a new sense of purpose and a more inclusive definition of knowledge” (1989:B2). Chan adds that “our presence in the university should be treated as an exciting addition, not an inconvenient political necessity ... when we give students tools needed to enable them to make the world better, future generations benefit” (1989:14).

IV. Student Critique of the Curriculum

Increased awareness of campus racism and the academic debate over whether we are or should be a nation of one or many take place in a context of increased racial minority presence in the student body, administration, and faculties of American colleges and universities. This presence is the strongest at the undergraduate level and least strong at the faculty level. New students ask new questions that arise from their distinctive histories. They ask for new or additional expertise on the part of their teachers and want to learn of their experience and traditions from those disciplines that are concerned with American experience. In many cases they feel that they are misunderstood, not represented or slighted.

The following statements by Berkeley students that we extracted from newspaper article or heard in person make the point. We do not think that such student comments should be dismissed or that they reflect short-term interests. Rather, this critique of the curriculum is rooted in important changes in the student body that in turn reflect major and long-term changes in California's population.

An ethnic studies requirement is an attempt to address the systematic manner in which the histories of people of color in the United States have been ignored or misrepresented in the classroom.

Increasingly, the challenge to all Californians will be to develop a common awareness that recognizes and effectively responds to the cultures, histories, and concerns of our different racial minority groups.

U.C. Berkeley must familiarize its undergraduates with the histories and concerns of all racial populations that comprise our state.

The question is whether you believe people of color have contributed to this society.

There is a need for change in the curriculum. Courses are incomplete. The contributions of people of color are disrespected.

The curriculum denies the histories of people of color.

An ethnic studies requirement which would focus on the contributions and experiences of people of color in this country, is necessary to improve a traditionally Eurocentric curriculum.

There's a lot left out of history. I don't see my people when I read my history books. We must introduce the contributions of people of color, and I don't think there will be peace on this campus until this happens.

Berkeley students should hear what we [minorities] have to say about ourselves.

Such courses could help clear up misconceptions about ethnic groups and their contributions in America.

Such comments underline themes announced in the report from the Joint Committee or review of the Master Plan for Higher Education (*California Faces ... California's Future: Education for Citizenship in a Multicultural Democracy, 1988*): ... we affirm that education must be informed by a deep sense of our historical location. We need each student to fully develop his or her capacities for living proudly in a multicultural community, itself part of an international community.

Ours is, of course, a history and culture which has always been multicultural and international. Education for multicultural success is imperative for each and every student regardless of race or ethnic origin. Among the intellectual and social boundaries we now most need to move across are those segregating the cultures which make California so vibrant and rich. We regard it to be in the state's direct and immediate interest that our students develop an appreciation of, and comfort with, cultures other than their own (95).

... every student should have the opportunity to know the history of both ethnic minority and majority peoples, and learn something of the meaning of those histories in our current and future affairs. We therefore strongly support efforts within each segment to make ethnic studies and undergraduate graduation requirement, and to integrate multicultural issues into the departmental offerings across the board (95-96).

V. The Present Curriculum at Berkeley

Our committee, as part of its initial data gathering, collected course outlines from many Berkeley departments, in order to better understand the range and depth of treatment of ethnic and racial topics, particularly in the Humanities and Social Sciences. We created three loose categories: (1) those department in which a variety of efforts are made to study a diversity of racial and ethnic groups in the United States, (2) those departments which offer a few courses but make little concerted effort to cover racial and ethnic diversity, (3) those departments in which almost no effort to treat ethnic and racial diversity is made. Without naming department here (a complete outline of our results appears in Appendix C of our original report), we conclude that there is room for improvement in every department and that a number of major departments are weak or negligent in the study and teaching of ethnic and racial diversity. We concluded from our inquiries that there is a great need for a more coherent, focused, and integrated multi-disciplinary approach toward the campus-wide study of ethnic and racial diversity in the United States.

VI. Curricular Changes at Other Institutions

The activities of our committee are part of a nationwide effort by American colleges and universities to respond to the academic and intellectual issues raised by challenging student bodies. On the faculty side this has resulted, as we have seen, in a vigorous debate over how to represent American identity and experience. On the student side this has given rise to concrete recommendations for change, of which some form of ethnic studies graduation requirement is the most prominent. Many major institutions (See Appendix A) already have implemented or are in the process of considering change. The following three examples from Stanford University, the University of Michigan, and the University of Minnesota give an idea of the types of responses that we encountered in our survey of other academic institutions.

On Thursday, March 31, 1988, the Faculty Senate at Stanford University approved the new "Cultures, Ideas and Values" (CIV) requirement to replace the Western culture requirement, which had been in effect since 1980. The new CIV requirement can be fulfilled by as many as ten certified tracks, or year long sequences of courses. The objectives and specifications of the CIV requirement include the following, as selected from the Faculty Senate's Final Legislation:

To provide students with the common intellectual experience of broadening their understanding of ideas and values drawn from different strands of our own culture, and to increase their understanding of cultural diversity and the process of cultural interaction.

To develop students' abilities to examine critically ideas and values, for the sake of self-understanding and understanding of others.

To further understanding of self, others, and society and therefore to confront issues relating to class, ethnicity, race, religion, gender, and sexual orientation, and to include the study of works by women, minorities, and persons of color.

To further understanding of the diverse ideas and values that have shaped American society and culture by studying works from at least one of the European cluster of cultures and from at least one of the non-European cultures that have become components of our diverse American society. The ideas and values expressed in each work shall be treated in their own terms and, to the extent possible, within their own cultural and historical context.

To have substantial historical dimension. Tracks should analyze the temporal relationship of works to each other and examine some of the political, social, economic, and material contexts of the works.

To give substantial attention to the issues of *race*, *gender* and *class* during each

academic quarter, with at least one of these issues to be addressed explicitly in at least one major reading in each quarter.

The situation at Stanford differs from that at the University of California at Berkeley because the tracks for the year-long Western culture requirement already had existed there since 1980. They reframed the existing requirement to give substantial attention to the non-Western sources of Western and American culture, and to include attention to issues of gender and class. Following the approval of the CIV proposal, the Students of Color Coalition at Stanford urged in Fall 1988 that an ethnic studies graduation requirement also be added to the curriculum (*Stanford News* 10/26/88; 11/1/88) and a faculty sub committee has since been appointed to consider proposals to incorporate ethnicity and gender among the University's distribution requirements. Undergraduate Studies Dean Thomas Wasow noted that there is "likely to be a major rethinking of the distribution requirements with an eye toward incorporating more materials from traditionally excluded groups." (*Stanford News* 1/10/89).

On October 6, 1988, a group of faculty member at the University of Michigan called upon their colleagues to adopt a college-wide course on racism. The LSA Curriculum Committee approved the proposal and it is now under consideration by the Executive Committee of the College. Authors of the proposal note that "Opinion research on minority undergraduates do not show the University of Michigan to be an institution where minority students feel welcome-on the contrary." They propose a synthetic approach to the issues surrounding racism: "Central to thinking behind the present proposal is the idea that critical analysis-historical, sociological, cultural, and anthropological-is a powerful weapon against racism." The proposed four-credit course would draw upon faculty from many disciplines who would team-teach 400-student lecture sessions. It also would include 20 student discussion sections. This course would be repeated in four to five sections each term, each taught by different faculty.

The University of Minnesota now requires for graduation at least two courses to fulfill a "World Studies Requirement" and at least two courses to fulfill a "U.S. Cultural Pluralism Requirement." The World Studies Requirement asks students "to examine cultures substantially different from their own. The requirement is completion of at least two courses ... dealing with the cultures of Asia, Africa, or Latin America or with traditional American Indian cultures." The U.S. Cultural Pluralism Requirement may be fulfilled by at least two courses dealing with Afro-American, American Indian, Asian American, and Chicano cultures, and the concepts of race and ethnicity, ethnocentrism and racism, and other significant social factors in these cultures."

The concerns (both nation-wide and on this campus) that led to the appointment of our committee had to do with how to represent American experience to American students. We focused on how better to understand the American experience by better understanding the racial and cultural components that created it. The Michigan proposal, to focus exclusively on racism, highlights one important dimension of American experience but overlooks many other themes that might be elucidated.

Although we think that courses on foreign cultures could offer understanding of specific American ethnic groups, provide knowledge about other cultures, and impart an analytical framework for other-cultural understanding, such courses would be an indirect route to interpreting the American context. Ethnic Studies and Afro-American Studies courses at Berkeley are directly concerned with American racial minorities. An ethnic studies graduation requirement would guarantee focused academic exposure to one racial minority group in the United States. It would also compensate for any lack of coverage of such groups in other disciplines. However, such a graduation requirement would leave the current division of intellectual labor (where United States racial minorities are primarily the domain of Ethnic Studies and Afro-American Studies) unchanged. We urge that race and ethnicity be a greater part of the domain of the broad range of disciplines (such as Social Welfare, Political Science, Economics, Business, Education, Journalism, Music, History, Sociology, Linguistics, Anthropology, Law, English, Comparative Literature, Art History, and others) that interpret the American past and/or present. As difficult as it is to take this complexity into account, it can be illuminated by many disciplines and is basic to understanding our historical and contemporary identity. For this reason we advocate the inclusive and comparative approach.

VII. The Old Proposal: Criticism and Response

Our original recommendation for an American Cultures graduation requirement (April 27, 1988) read as follows:

Courses that satisfy the American Cultures requirement should ... emphasize the cultural and political experiences and contributions of racial minority groups such as Native Americans, Chicano/Latino Americans, Afro-Americans, and Asian Americans in their relations with Euro-American and other ethnic groups which resulted in the shaping of the United States.

The courses that the committee envisages are integrative and comparative. They should, for example, include in-depth coverage of at least two of the above mentioned American minorities so that the greater part of the semester should be committed to coverage of such groups.

Berkeley faculty criticisms of the academic merits of this recommendation (as expressed at three workshops, at the May 10, 1988, Academic Senate meeting, in written responses to our December 9, 1988, questionnaire, and at numerous committee meetings) focused on four principal points.

1. The strongest criticism was that the old proposal was too formulaic, too one sided, too political, a form of reverse racism, tokenism, white-bashing, and it excluded or minimized European Americans. Why single out those four racial minority groups and not include others such as Irish Americans, Jewish Americans, Arab Americans, and Armenian Americans who also suffered from prejudice and discrimination?

We intended that the American Cultures courses be comparative and integrative. We do not want comparison to be interpreted narrowly (for example, a course that would focus exclusively on European American ethnic groups) and do not advocate courses that would focus on any group as if it could be viewed in isolation from the context of the United States society and culture. By comparative we now mean explicitly that comparisons should be made between the main racial and cultural categories of American society, past or present. By main racial and cultural category we mean African American, American Indian, Asian American, Chicano/Latino, and European American. We do not require that all five categories be included in any one course, but in order to assure that the courses be truly comparative we stipulate as a minimal condition that at least three categories be included, and that no one of these shall be the focus of the greater part of the course. Other categories may be added where appropriate. The underlying criteria for these courses are that they 1) focus on important themes and issues in the United States history, society, and culture, 2) that they address the theoretical and analytical issues relevant to understanding race, culture, and ethnicity, in our society, 3) that they provide a framework for better understanding one's particular cultural/historical identity and that of others, and 4) that they take significant account of

racial minority groups.

Each of the above mentioned racial/cultural categories includes many specific ethnic or national groups that need not be enumerated in this report. African American, for example, is a complex category that also includes Cape Verdean American, and West Indian American. Asian American includes Chinese, Japanese, and Korean American. European American includes Irish, Italian, Jewish, and Anglo-American, etc. How one approaches comparison and integration, and the specific ethnic groups that may be deemed relevant would depend upon the problem and topical orientation of the course and would be for the instructor to determine. The Academic Senate appointed overseeing committee will be charged with determining whether or not a particular course qualifies for the American Cultures breadth requirement.

2. Some faculty members believed that the requirement would worsen racial tensions rather than lessen them, and divide students along ethnic and racial lines-either because we have gone to far in emphasizing differences, or because majority students would resent having minority issues forced upon them.

This belief underlies some of the arguments for a return to a more traditional, consensual, and Western-oriented core curriculum. In his article on “The Recoloring of Campus Life” Shelby Steele argued for a qualified version of this point of view: “I think universities should emphasize commonalty as a higher value than ‘diversity’ and ‘pluralism’—buzzwords for the politics of difference. Difference that does not rest on a clearly delineated foundation of commonalty not only is inaccessible to those who are not part of the ethnic or racial group but is agnostic to them ... Integration has become an abstract term today, having to do with little more than numbers and racial balances. But it stood once for a high and admirable set of values. It made difference second to commonalty, and it asked members of all races to face whatever fears they inspired in each other” (Steele 1989:55).

A case may be made for the reverse of this position: that commonalty emerges from openly acknowledging difference. A number of American corporations are exploring this point of view in their efforts to adjust to a changing work force. For example, King-ming Young, manager of the cultural diversity project at Hewlett Packard Co., noted recently in *The Wall Street Journal* that “The way to color blindness is through color consciousness” (Solomon 1989:B1).

The committee raised the question of whether such a requirement would create racial tension with representatives of three institutions where related requirements have been approved. Dr. Donna Shalala, Chancellor of the University of Wisconsin at Madison, responded that their requirement (which will emphasize American ethnic groups and foreign cultures) will go into effect this coming fall. The decision to implement it had not been the source, to her knowledge, of any noticeable resentment or increase in ethnic and racial conflict. A faculty committee is now identifying and approving courses that will

satisfy the requirement.

Dr. Fred Lukermann, Dean of the College of Liberal Arts at the University of Minnesota, indicated that their two-semester requirement has worked out well, and that it stimulated graduate students and young instructors to teach and do research in the general areas of ethnicity, pluralism, and comparative perspectives. According to Lukermann, the Minnesota requirement has evolved from one that is now more broadly comparative and that deals with class, gender, income, religion, and age, as well as race, culture, and ethnicity. At the initial phase of the requirement there was resistance from academic disciplines that felt only a few programs (i.e. ethnic studies) would benefit from and teach such courses. People were turned off by the narrow range of possible ways to fulfill the requirement. That changed when the emphasis on a comparative and pluralistic approach made it possible for many other disciplines to contribute. According to Lukermann, it was necessary for the University to provide funds for experimentation with new courses in order to break out of the situation where two or three departments cornered the market. Now that the basic orientation of the requirement is toward pluralism and a comparative perspective, and that a number of traditional departments have been given the resources and encouragement to participate in it, Lukermann feels that it is working well.

The third person we contacted was Professor Victor Rocha, Provost of Oakes College at the University of California at Santa Cruz, where an ethnic studies course or a course on a non-European culture have been required since 1985. According to Rocha, no one has studied the question of how this requirement has affected racial relations on campus. Although some students may have been uncomfortable with the requirement, they mainly have accepted it, and he has no evidence that it is a source of racial tension. In his opinion, the requirement has worked to alleviate such tensions.

The requirement that we are proposing avoids the extreme positions raised in the above mentioned canon controversy. It is similar to that in effect at Minnesota in that it is inherently comparative and pluralistic, and will draw upon many departments. By its very nature it will encourage attention to both issues of commonality and difference. This is the point. We sought to create a series of courses that will provide a framework for studying, teaching about, and understanding the three basic dimensions in American identity—the *plures*, the *unum*, and the experience of exclusion. In order to retain the vitality that made such requirements a national consideration in the first place, we focused upon American experience and in such a way that racial minority experience would be significantly included. We felt that to broaden the scope of the requirement to include pluralism *per se*, comparativism *per se*, or to open it to any foreign cultures, or to any non-Western cultures, would dilute its purpose. We see little evidence that an American Cultures breadth requirement will exacerbate racial to ethnic tensions.

In this regard, we would like to note that a very broad spectrum of Berkeley student organizations supported the original proposal in spring 1988. In the Monday, May 9,

edition of *The Daily Californian*, the African Students Association, American Indian Students Association, the U.C. Berkeley Interfraternity Council and Pan Hellenic Association, the Co-ordinators of MEChA, the ASUC President, and the ASUC President-elect endorsed the proposal jointly with the following statement:

What is important to note about this proposed requirement is the opportunity it will offer us as students. It will bring us together, from different cultures and ethnicities, in the systematic and informed study of American society in all of its diversity-how all of us as Americans of color and as Euro-Americans have contributed to the making of the United States (*The Daily Californian* May 9, 1988:4).**3. Another criticism was that ethnicity is only one topic among many, such as Western civilization, world civilization, science, technology, geography, gender, health, religion, foreign cultures, and ethics that are arguably important for a basic liberal education. Let's look at the curriculum first; why is it ethnicity so important that courses on this topic should be required?**

To some extent this criticism overlooks the fact that graduation requirements and breadth requirements already exist for all schools and colleges in the University. Nevertheless, our earlier recommendation stimulated interest in the broader discussion of curriculum change. We were not charged to pursue this larger project but rather to look at ethnicity and diversity to encourage innovations. We support further discussion of the curriculum but also would add that ethnicity and diversity are at national center stage wherever such discussions are taking place. In our estimation, the requirement that we propose merits inclusion in any revised curriculum that the faculty may propose in the near future. The change that we are recommending-a collaborative effort involving many disciplines to create a variety of new perspectives around the themes of culture, ethnicity, and race, the *diversity* and *unity* of American life-will bring the intellectual life of the university closer to the range of students whom it is trying to reach and educate. To recommend and not require the American Cultures courses will result in no effective change. We can also conceive that as the faculty changes and as attention to ethnicity and diversity takes root in the academic disciplines, that such a requirement may at some point no longer be necessary. We view this requirement as a necessary first step toward a long-term goal. We do not think it will end racism, but it will help students to better understand it and will make courses on American experience be more reflective of the ethnic and racial communities that shaped that experience. All students, majority and minority alike, will benefit practically and intellectually from a multicultural understanding of our multicultural society.

4. A fourth and widely raised problem concerned the impact that an American Cultures graduation requirement would have on student course load, and thus progress towards graduation. Students in the sciences and engineering are already overburdened. Would not this requirement add another burden and cut into their already limited opportunities to select courses outside their majors?

At present, the University, i.e., all component colleges and schools, mandates two

graduation requirements for all students, Subject A (a basic English reading and composition requirement) and American History and Institutions. Both these requirements may be fulfilled at high school, at other colleges or campuses, or by examination. In addition, each School or College demands the satisfaction of specified breadth requirements for graduation, often including up to six courses selected from outside the field of the student's major as well as Reading and Composition and a foreign language. In most Schools and Colleges, a number of these requirements, especially Reading and Composition, may be fulfilled at High School, by advanced placement or exam, or at other campuses. (A breakdown of School and College breadth requirements is appended.)

In every case, the philosophy behind the breadth requirement entails the supposition that a University education involves not only training in a specific area of study or for a particular profession but also the formation of citizens with a broad knowledge of institutions, history, and sciences which constitute their culture in the fullest sense. The philosophy behind the adoption of an American Cultures Requirement is similar, but since it involves also several principles which have not to date been assumed in University curricula, the conditions of its fulfillment will differ in some respects from those of other breadth requirements. In some ways, the conditions of fulfillment will be stricter, in others more flexible. What follows are some remarks on the conditions of its fulfillment which may help clarify the practical significance of its introduction for the various majors at Berkeley.

Since the American Cultures requirement involves the rethinking of what is entailed in an education adequate to the cultural diversity of the state and the nation, the committee does not feel confident that it could at present be satisfied by courses offered either at high school level or at other campuses or community colleges. (N.B. It would be the responsibility of the committee appointed to oversee the requirement to decide whether or not courses taken at other institutions can fulfill the requirement.) As we have stated, it is not simply an ethnic studies course, nor a civics course, but is specifically designed to encourage, through comparative study, reflection on the nature and history of cultural diversity. Only a certain range of courses, as defined by this report and developed along its guidelines, will respond adequately to this educational need as we understand it. We anticipate that U.C. Berkeley will perform a pioneering role in the development of such courses, and strongly feel that it is appropriate that only courses developed and taught on this campus should satisfy the requirement.

While we feel that the requirement should be satisfied only at Berkeley initially, we feel equally that in other respects its conditions of fulfillment might be more flexible than is the case with breadth requirements generally. Whereas currently existing breadth requirements are designed to ensure students' general knowledge outside their major, the American Cultures requirement is intended only to introduce reflection on cultural diversity into the overall programs of all undergraduates. Accordingly, we do not feel it is necessary for student to fulfill this requirement outside the field of their majors. Rather,

we feel the maximum flexibility as to the manner of the requirement's fulfillment is desirable. Students should be permitted to fulfill the requirement either within the standard format of their majors or as a course supplementary to other requirements. Thus, for example, a History or English major might take a course that also fulfilled a major requirement (e.g., English 138 to fulfill also that major's requirement in "Cultural Varieties of English Language and Literature") or take a course in a Social Science that would count as a breadth requirement as well as satisfying the American Cultures requirement. On the other hand, an Engineering major could take the same English course, or a course in a Social Science, either of which would count as fulfilling one of the courses that Engineering majors must take to fulfill eighteen units of breadth requirements.

In other words, we strongly recommend that the American Cultures requirement should be satisfiable in combination with the already existent requirements of individual majors. This recommendation is designed to limit to a minimum any increase in student workload that might otherwise follow from the implementation of this requirement.

As a corollary to this recommendation, we urge that all relevant departments consider ways in which courses that might fulfill this requirement could be added to or integrated into their current major requirements. We also urge that the Administration provide every possible financial and other practical assistance to departments seeking to develop new courses or to train or hire faculty and graduate assistants with this end in view.

Due to the expertise required to teach adequately such courses as would satisfy this requirement, we do not feel it advisable that it should be fulfilled through any course whose primary function is to meet the Reading and Composition Requirements. These courses are intended to develop students' rhetorical skills and, though there may be many exceptions, we do not feel it advisable to expect the numerous graduate students who have been trained to teach these courses necessarily to have the competence in the area defined herein as "American Cultures." Nor, given the importance which we attach to this requirement, do we feel it advisable for its fulfillment to be relegated to lower division courses whose primary function is the teaching of writing skills and which are, in any case, already oversubscribed.

In summary, we believe that the implementation of this requirement need not significantly add to the work load or reduce the breadth choice open to students beyond the present structure of their majors. We recommend, nonetheless, that departments assist in directing their majors' attention to the problems of cultural diversity by developing courses within their majors, where applicable, or by directing students' attention to American Cultures courses that also fulfill breadth requirements.

VIII. Possible American Cultures Courses

A number of faculty members in response to our earlier report proposed new courses that might satisfy an eventual American Cultures requirement. Summaries of these preliminary course descriptions and summaries of selected courses that already exist, may be seen in Appendix C. These proposed and existing courses would fulfill the requirement that we propose with little or no revision. The titles of these 31 courses, which represent 16 disciplines, are as follows:

A. Afro-American Studies

Ethnic and Racial Succession in Urban Politics

B. Anthropology

American Folklore

American Material Culture

Education in a Plural Society: Ethnicity, Race, and Schooling in the United States

Religion in America

C. Architecture

Housing Patterns for Different Subcultures

D. Conservation and Resource Studies

California Environmental History and Culture

E. Economics

The Economics of Racial Inequality

F. Education

Going to School in America

Language, Culture, Ethnicity, and American Schools

G. English

Ethnic American Autobiography

California Literature

Women of Color in the United States: Race, Class, Gender, and Writing

Publishing Subcultures in the United States: A Second World War Case Study

Narratives of Self-Formation in Minority Writing

American Literature 1820-1865

H. Ethnic Studies

Politics and People of Color

United States Third World Women Writers

Racial Inequality in American: A Comparative Historical Perspective

Women of Color in the United States

I. Geography
California

J. History
The Repeopling of America
California

K. Journalism
News and Culture: American Journalism and Its Public

L. Linguistics
The American Languages

M. Music
Ethnic Identity from a Musical Perspective

N. Social Welfare
Social Work Practice with Minority Families and Children

O. Sociology
Racial Change: The Last Generation
Race and Ethnic Relations in the United States
Comparative Population Histories of the United States

P. Women's Studies
Poverty and Progress: Race, Gender, and Dependency

A number of other faculty members provided outlines of courses that they teach that could be revised to satisfy the requirement. Others suggested possible new courses that we have not yet seen. Their disciplines include Afro-American Studies, Anthropology, Architecture, Economics, History, Legal Studies, Political Science, and Sociology.

IX. Implementation

Preparation: The Fall 1991 semester would be the earliest date that the requirement could go into effect. The list of possible courses given above should be expanded and developed in the two years prior to the start up date. The committee that oversees the implementation of the requirement will establish guidelines and procedures for determining which of these and other proposed courses satisfy the requirement, and will review descriptions and syllabi for these courses. Instructors will be encouraged to offer American Cultures courses in 1990-91, the year preceding the official start-up for the requirement. These courses will be advertised and promoted widely among students and undergraduate advisers as an elective or as an alternate for an existing breadth requirement.

Evaluation: A two-part evaluation plan will be developed to monitor the proposed requirement. The first consists of a formative evaluation plan the purpose of which is to help instructors assess the effectiveness of their courses and to refine course methods and content. Instructors and students should be involved in the design of these evaluation procedures.

The second part of the evaluation plan will be to look at the implementation and governance of the requirement, and at the educational effectiveness of the courses. Are they fulfilling the intellectual goals of the requirement? This evaluation should take place five years after the requirement goes into effect.

Courses: Very few American Cultures courses would be needed to satisfy student demand in 1991-92 (the first year the requirement could go into effect) since it would apply only to freshman admitted for the 1991-92 academic year (i.e., it would not be retroactive to students admitted in previous years). Ten courses (5 each semester) should be sufficient. A total of about 26 courses would be needed for 1992-93, and about 36 for 1993-94. We expect that the demand will have stabilized after 1993-94 and approximately 36 courses will be needed each year thereafter in order for students to fulfill the requirement. These figures are based upon an average class size of about 175 students.

Center: We propose that a center for the teaching and study of American Cultures be established right away on the Berkeley campus to orchestrate the intellectual and practical aspects of implementing the requirement. Faculty members with expertise in American cultures are now dispersed across a wide range of disciplines. The Center would provide them with the organizational structure to interact with and learn from colleagues in other disciplines with similar and related interests. In particular, the Center would: (1) offer support, assistance and resources for instructors who are interested in developing or improving courses and course materials that satisfy the proposed American Cultures requirement, (2) provide an intellectual setting in which faculty

members from different disciplines might identify and develop their common interests in issues related to culture and ethnicity in the United States, (3) provide a bridge between the intellectual resources in the Ethnic Studies Programs and the other departments in the university, (4) bring together, in colloquia and study groups, faculty and graduate students who will be serving as GSIs, with the objective of building an intellectual community of scholars who are responsible for teaching the courses that fulfill this requirement, (5) seek extra mural funds for grants and fellowships to support innovations and improvements in the teaching of cultural pluralism, and (6) serve as a valuable resource for the campus community, and for other universities across the country.

Any member of the faculty with an interest in American Cultures will be invited to affiliate with the Center and anyone wishing to develop a course for inclusion on the list may make use of its resources. As a Center for teaching, it will be unlike other centers on the Berkeley campus. It will be devoted to the improvement of teaching in this area rather than research, although research would not be precluded as a function or concern of the Center. In fact, by bringing together members of the campus community who have an interest in multicultural issues, the Center could facilitate cross-disciplinary research efforts. The main emphasis of the Center should be on teaching, however, and it is hoped that some of the research efforts of the teaching faculty will be devoted to evaluating the effectiveness of the courses, and to studying their effect on the perceptions, and attitudes of the students who take them.

Governance Committee for Center: We propose that the Chancellor appoint a five-person Executive Committee (with one of them designated as chair of the committee) to govern the Center. This Executive Committee will be charged with: (a) preparing a plan for the implementation and governance of the Center, (b) securing funding from the University and other sources for the activities of the Center, (c) working with interested faculty to establish community that will form the core of those who will teach the American Cultures courses, (d) Coordinating the campus-wide effort that will be necessary to assure that a sufficient number of American Cultures courses will be scheduled each semester, and (e) hiring the staff that will be needed for the proper functioning of the Center.

During the next academic year (1989-90) the Executive Committee of the American Cultures Center would begin work to create the community of scholars who would revise old courses and develop new ones that would fulfill the requirement.

Overseeing Committee for Requirement: We also recommend that the Committee on Committees appoint a nine-person overseeing committee to oversee the requirement and to approve courses to meet it. This overseeing committee would include a chair from the Committee for Educational Policy and would consist of seven faculty members, one undergraduate student, and a GSI who has assisted the teaching of an American Cultures required course. Four faculty members shall be selected from those who teach

American cultures courses and/or have some expertise in the in areas covered by the requirement.

This overseeing Committee will have responsibility for reviewing course descriptions and reading lists to determine their suitability (as defined in this report) for fulfilling the requirement. The overseeing committee will have authority to remove courses from the approved list if such courses do not effectively fulfill the intent of the requirement. It is understood that the courses in question will be approved by the Committee on Courses. The committee will also have the responsibility for determining which courses taken at other institutions may fulfill the requirement.

GSI Training Program: The Graduate Assembly TA Training project has expressed interest in designing a GSI Training Program for American Cultures courses should the requirement be approved.

X. Selected Bibliography

Bennett, William J. "Why the West?" Ms., Stanford University, Palo Alto, April 18, 1988.

Bloom, Allan. *The Closing of the American Mind*. New York: Simon & Schuster Inc., 1987.

_____. "A Most uncommon Scold." *Time*, (Interview) October 17 1988: 74-76.

Chan, Sucheng. "On the Ethnic Studies Requirement, Part 1: Pedagogical Implications." *Amerasia Journal* 15(1) 1989 (Forthcoming): 1-14.

Cheney, Lynne. *Humanities in America: A report to the President, the Congress, and the American People*. Washington: National endowment for the humanities, 1988.

Gates, Henry Louis. "Whose Cannon Is It Anyway?" *The New York Times Book Review*, February 26, 1989: 1, 44-45.

Graff, Gerald and William E. Cain. "Peace Plan for the Cannon Wars." *The Nation* 248 (9), March 6, 1989: 310-313

Hirsch, E.D. *Cultural Literacy: What Every American Needs to Know*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1987.

_____. "The Primal Scene of Education." *The New York Review of Books* XXXVI (3), March 2, 1989:29-35.

Joint Committee for Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education. *California Faces ... California's future: Education for citizenship in a Multicultural Democracy*. December 30, 1988.

Levin, Lawrence. *Highbrow/Lowbrow: The Emergence of Cultural Hierarchy in American*. Cambridge : Harvard University Press, 1988

Simonson, Rick, and Scott Walker, eds. *The Graywolf Annual Five: Multi-Cultural Literacy: Opening the American Mind*. Saint Paul: Graywolf Press, 1988.

Smelser, Neil, Chair. *Lower Division at the University of California: A Report fro the Task Force on Lower Division Education..* June 1986.

Solomon, Jolie. "Firms Address Worker's Cultural Variety." *The Wall Street Journal*. February 10, 1989: B1.

Special Committee on the Elberg and Smelser Reports. *The Elberg and Smelser Reports: Proposals for a Response from the College of Letters and Science*. June 15, 1987.

Steele, Shelby. "The Recoloring of Campus Life: Student Racism, Academic Pluralism, and the End of a dream." *Harper's Magazine*, February 1989: B1-2.

XI. Appendices

A. Cultural Pluralism Requirements at other Universities

B. Existing Graduation Requirements in the University, Schools and Colleges (not included here)

C. Summaries of Possible American Cultures Courses (abridged)

D. Consultation with Students, Faculty and Administrators

Appendix A: Cultural Pluralism Requirements at other Universities

Introduction

In recent years, the traditional content of liberal education has come under increasing criticism and scrutiny among the nation's leading universities and in public debates. The key question is: as the world becomes a global village and the population of the U.S. becomes increasingly multiracial and multicultural, what knowledge, skills and values are essential to enable educated individuals in our democratic society to live intelligently, productively, sensitively, and responsibly?

Some criticize the core curriculum of traditional undergraduate education for being too narrow and Eurocentric, while others accuse universities of failing to provide students with an adequate knowledge of Western civilization. Behind this current debate and some recent curriculum reforms in several major universities across the nation is a growing awareness that the content of the nation's liberal education needs to reflect the growing racial diversity and experiences of the U.S. population on the one hand and to add the intellectual and aesthetic contributions of non-European cultures on the other hand. Both are legitimate concerns and both require timely and appropriate remedies.

Since the original charge of our committee precludes a review of the latter, this report makes only passing reference to the issue of non-European cultures outside the U.S. and provides an informal survey of what some of the universities have been doing to make their curricula more inclusive and racial diversity an integral part of their undergraduate curricula. This brief report covers first the cultural pluralism requirement on California campuses and then recent trends in other states.

In California

In California, all junior colleges have, for the Associate of Arts degree, a

requirement for ethnic studies, and about half of all state colleges and universities (CSU) have some kind of ethnic studies graduation requirement for the Bachelor's degree. For example, in the Bay Area, both CSU campuses in San Francisco and Hayward include ethnic studies courses among those that satisfy their general education requirements.

Reflecting one aspect of the ongoing national discussion, the California State Legislature adopted Assembly Concurrent Resolution 71 on April 28, 1983, calling on the three segments of California's public higher education to review their policies and programs concerning the nature and extent of courses examining the cultural and historical experiences of the *nonwhite* ethnic groups that have been excluded from the core curriculum and to consider adopting necessary policies and programs to ensure that all graduates from the three segments possess an understanding and awareness of *nonwhite* ethnic groups. Pursuant to ACR 71, the University Committee on Educational Policy (UCEP) urged, on February 11, 1985, all UC campuses to "ensure that a variety of courses representing the cultural and historical experiences of *ethnic minorities* continue to be accessible to undergraduate students as both breadth and elective courses." The UCEP resolution was approved by the university-wide Academic Council on January 14, 1987. [emphasis in the original]

Thus far, UC campuses have responded to ACR 71 and the university-wide Academic Senate resolution differently. UC Santa Cruz currently is the only UC campus that has a requirement. Adopted in February 1985, students may take either an ethnic studies course on a non-European culture toward satisfying breadth requirements for graduation. UC Riverside, UC Irvine, UC Davis, and UC San Diego are considering the establishment of a requirement. UCLA is currently developing a cluster of courses designed to be used for a possible requirement.

In recent report (May 4, 1987) to the Chancellor's Office at UC Davis, an external committee appointed by the Vice Chancellor and chaired by Prof. Nathan Huggins of Harvard University noted: "The University of California Academic Senate and its committees have recommended that each campus develop some such requirement [an Ethnic Studies general education requirement] as basic to the general education of students living in the culturally pluralistic environment of the State of California We recommend that the Davis campus, conforming with Academic Senate recommendation, adopt a general education requirement in ethnic studies."

Similarly, a proposal to require a course "that studies a nonwhite ethnic minority group or groups in the U.S. or the area of origin of one or more such groups" was submitted in June last year to CEP of UC San Diego for consideration by the Third College Curriculum and Academic Affairs Committee. In submitting the proposal, the committee suggested: "Including an ethnic studies requirement in

the core curriculum strikes us as the only effective way to ensure that all UCSD graduates will have been asked to ponder issues of ethnicity at some point in their education. Equally important, including ethnic studies in the core curriculum can be one way of signaling the commitment of UCSD to maintain a multicultural learning environment in which all the diverse elements of the state's population are welcome."

Likewise, CEP at UC Riverside recommended on May 28, 1987, a campus-wide requirement in comparative ethnicity as part of the breadth requirements in either the humanities or social sciences. In making the recommendation, the committee wrote: "We see great value in exposing all of our students to the discussion of America's ethnic communities within an academic arena. Many students will arrive at UCR with no previous knowledge of ethnicity; others may have personal experience of ethnicity. Both will have much to gain from an academically rigorous analysis of the relationship between ethnic minorities and the national culture."

Perhaps the most ambitious curriculum reform in California has come from our neighbor, Stanford University. Defining new boundaries for the development of a common core of understanding about the U.S. society, the Committee on Undergraduate Studies of its faculty Senate unanimously recommended the incorporation of works by women, minorities, and non-Western intellectuals into the current requirement. "It is just as important as in the past for students to gain a knowledge of the deep roots of our American culture in western European intellectual history, but it is increasingly important for them to appreciate factors in the development of the uniqueness of American culture," the committee reported. According to Provost James Rosse, the proposal requires that each approved year-long course: a) study the works of at least one of the European cluster of cultures; b) study the works of at least one of the non-European cultures that have become components of our diverse American society; c) incorporate a substantial historical dimension; and d) focus on primary works, written and otherwise.

In Other States

Outside of California, a cultural pluralism or ethnic studies graduation requirement can be found at many colleges and universities. A systematic survey would have to be done to determine how many. But the institutions with a requirement in place include Washington State University, Indiana University, and the University of Minnesota.

The "Cultural Pluralism Requirement" for the University of Minnesota states: "Candidates for the Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Individualized Studies who enter the College after the fall of 1986 will complete at least two courses (at least

eight credits) in U.S. cultural pluralism. Courses approved to meet the requirement must satisfy three criteria: (1) primary focus on any of the four following American cultures: Afro-American, American Indian, Asian American, or Chicano; (2) incorporation and significant attention in course content and analysis to the other significant social factors in those cultures, such as social class, gender, age, sexuality, and the like; (3) incorporation and significant attention in course material and analysis to the concepts of race, ethnicity, ethnocentrism, and racism.”

Currently at least two leading national universities are considering instituting an ethnic studies graduation requirement. In its report, “The American University and the Pluralist Ideal” (May 1986), the Visiting Committee on Minority Life and Education at Brown University, which was appointed by President Howard Swearer, presented as one of its major recommendations: “We recommend that the faculty give formal consideration to a graduation requirement in ethnic and Third World studies. Other colleges and universities have installed such a requirement out of the conviction that the contemporary definition of an educated person must include at least minimal awareness of multicultural reality.”

In “The Madison Plan,” a report issued by the Chancellor of the University of Wisconsin, February 9, 1988, the Chancellor stated: An Ethnic Studies credit requirement has two purposes. One is to make students able to recognize, understand, and appreciate cultural differences throughout this country and the world. Another purpose is to learn about the contributions of the many ethnic and racial groups within our society. Every student needs to know much more about the origins and history of the particular cultures which, as Americans, we will encounter during our lives...This requirement should be seen as part of the general breadth requirement that encourages students to explore the curriculum outside their area of major interest.

Conclusion

In summary, it is clear from the above that colleges and universities throughout the country are seriously addressing the need for a requirement that would enable students to develop a more informed understanding of the racial and cultural diversity of U.S. society. They view it as an essential responsibility of their educational mission. Significantly, the recommendations for a requirement come from respected committees and high administrative offices within institutions. UC Berkeley is uniquely positioned to give national educational leadership on this crucial issue.

Appendix B: Existing Graduation Requirements in the University, Schools and Colleges

(not included here)

Appendix C: Summaries of Possible American Cultures Courses (abridged)

Afro-American Studies:

Ethnic and Racial Succession in Urban Politics, Charles Henry

Anthropology:

American Folklore, Alan Dundes

American Material Culture, James Deetz

Education in a Plural Society: Ethnicity, Race, and Schooling in the US, John Ogbu

Religion in America, William Simmons

Architecture:

Housing Patterns for Different Subcultures, Sara Ishikawa

Conservation and Resource Studies:

California Environmental History and Culture, Carolyn Merchant

Economics:

The Economics of Racial Inequality, Michael Reich

Education:

Going to School in America, Carol Stack and Jean Lave

Language, Culture, Ethnicity and American Schools, L.W. Fillmore

English:

American Literature, 1820–1865

Ethnic American Autobiography, Genaro Padilla

California Literature, Genaro Padilla

Women of Color in the US: Race, Class, Gender, and Writing, Susan Schweik

Publishing Subcultures in the US: A WW II Case Study, Susan Schweik

Narratives of Self-Formation in Minority Writing, Elizabeth Abel, Abdul JanMohamed, and David Lloyd

Ethnic Studies:

Politics and People of Color, Carlos Muñoz

US and Third World Women Writers, Norma Alarcón

Social Inequality in America: A Comparative Historical Perspective, Ronald Takaki

Women of Color in the US—“Our Lives, Our Stories: Tools for Building Coalitions, Lula Fraggd

Geography:

California, Richard Walker

History:

The Repeopling of America, Jon Gjerde

California, James Gregory

Journalism: News and Culture: American Journalism and Its Public, Thomas Leonard

Linguistics:

The American Languages, Leanne Hinton

Music:

Ethnic Identity from a Musical Perspective, Bonnie Wade

Social Welfare:

Social Work Practice and Minority Families and Children, J.T. Gibbs

Sociology:

Racial Change: The Last Generation, Robert Blauner

Race and Ethnic Relations in the US, Tomás Almaguer

Comparative Population Histories of the US, Russell Thornton

Women's Studies:

Poverty and Progress: Race, Gender, and Dependency, Carol Stack

Appendix D: Consultation with students, faculty, administrators

Our formal deliberations, which began in late Fall 1987, included an open meeting in Spring 1988 with students and the leaders of five student organizations:

- 1 Michael Stoll, African Students Association**
- 2 Julie Chang, Asian Student Union, and ASUC Executive Vice President**
- 3 Alfonso Salazar, Co-Chair, Berkeley MEChA**
- 4 Matthew Denn, President of the ASUC**
- 5 Marcella King-Ben, American Indian Student Association**

We met with:

- The Vice Chancellor Roderic Park**
- Professor William Banks, Faculty Assistant to the Vice Chancellor**
- Professor Jacob Lubliner, Chair of the Committee on Educational Policy.**

Chair Simmons consulted on several occasions with the CEP and with the chairs of the committees of the Academic Senate. Chair Simmons also consulted with:

- Professor Edwin Epstein, Chair of the Academic Senate**
- Professor Eric Sundquist, member of CEP and Chair of the sub-committee to oversee the American History and Institutions requirement**

- **Professor Troy Duster, Chair of Sociology**
- **Dr. Donald Billingsly, Dean of Student Life**
- **Professor Charles Henry, Chair of Afro-American Studies**
- **Professor Alex Saragoza, Chair of Ethnic Studies**
- **Professor Clara Sue Kidwell, Associate Dean of the Graduate Division**
- **Professors Barbara Christian, Terry Wilson, Kenneth Jowitt, Ronald Takaki, Carlos Munoz, and William Ellis.**

The Special Committee considered several submissions and memoranda from concerned faculty and student groups, and consulted other relevant materials (such as Elberg 1986, and Smelser 1986, and various responses) and reports, including the Report on Programs and Courses within the University of California Related to Ethnic Groups in Response to ACR 71.

On April 22, 1988, we met with interested faculty members at an open workshop to discuss the April 11, 1988, proposal. This proposal was discussed again at great length at the May 10, 1988, Academic Senate meeting.

The Committee continued its weekly meetings through the summer, during which time we consulted with:

- **Professor John Heilbron, Chair of the Academic Senate**
- **Professors Lubliner, Middlekauff, and Saragoza**
- **The Vice Chancellor Roderic Park**
- **Numerous students.**

Professor William Shack was unable to continue as a committee member after May 10, and was replaced by Professor Charles Henry.

In Fall 1988, in addition to continuing our weekly meetings, we convened two workshops for faculty members interested in learning more about the committee's work and in teaching prospective American Cultures courses (October 18, December 6).

We also met with student representatives of:

- **The African Students Association**
- **Berkeley MEChA**
- **The Asian Student Union**
- **The American Indian Student Association**
- **The ASUC, including Jeff Chang, ASUC President, and Valli Israels, Academic Affairs Vice President of the ASUC.**

In December 1988, we sent a questionnaire to all members of the Academic Senate to ask for their comments upon the old proposal and suggestions for a new one. We received 147 replies, which were very informative.

In the Spring 1989 semester, we continued to talk with:

- **Students**
- **Senate Chair John Heilbron**
- **Harry Bingham, Chair of CEP**
- **The Vice Chancellor Roderic Park**
- **Chancellor Michael Heyman.**

Other faculty members who met with individual members of the Committee or who contributed valuable advice include Professors:

- **Robion Kirby**
- **Bernard Gifford**
- **Kenneth Jowitt**
- **Austin Ranney**
- **Troy Duster**
- **Christina Maslach**
- **Ronald Takaki**
- **Acting Vice Chancellor, William Banks.**

Barbara Davis, Director of the Office of Educational Development, was helpful with planning the above mentioned workshops. Numerous faculty members and students wrote to the committee with particular concerns and suggestions—all of which helped us to take better measure of what students and faculty were thinking about the issue. The ASUC and Academic Affairs Office sponsored a debate on February 28, 1989, which provided the Committee with a major occasion to test its ideas and hear arguments for and against its almost-completed proposal.

END OF REPORT