Winter 1993

# The College of Ethnic Studies at Western Washington University: A Case Study

Maurice L. Bryan Jr.
*Western Washington University*

THE COLLEGE OF ETHNIC STUDIES

AT WESTERN WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

A CASE STUDY

by

Maurice L. Bryan Jr.

Accepted in Partial Completion

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Education

Dean of Graduate School

Advisory Committee

Chair

2/17/93

**MASTER'S THESIS**

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a master's degree at Western Washington University, I grant to Western Washington University the non-exclusive royalty-free right to archive, reproduce, distribute, and display the thesis in any and all forms, including electronic format, via any digital library mechanisms maintained by WWU.

I represent and warrant this is my original work, and does not infringe or violate any rights of others. I warrant that I have obtained written permissions from the owner of any third party copyrighted material included in these files.

I acknowledge that I retain ownership rights to the copyright of this work, including but not limited to the right to use all or part of this work in future works, such as articles or books.

Library users are granted permission for individual, research and non-commercial reproduction of this work for educational purposes only. Any further digital posting of this document requires specific permission from the author.

Any copying or publication of this thesis for commercial purposes, or for financial gain, is not allowed without my written permission.

Maurice L. Bryan Jr.
January 9, 2019

MASTER'S THESIS

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a master's degree at Western Washington University, I agree that the Library shall make its copies freely available for inspection. I further agree that extensive copying of this thesis is allowable only for scholarly purposes. It is understood, however, that any copying or publication of this thesis for commercial purposes, or for financial gain, shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Signature _____

Date March 1, 1993

# THE COLLEGE OF ETHNIC STUDIES
# AT WESTERN WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
# A CASE STUDY

---

A Thesis

Presented to

The Faculty of

Western Washington University

---

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Education

---

by

Maurice L. Bryan Jr.

March 1993

# ABSTRACT

The College of Ethnic Studies

At Western Washington University

A Case Study

Maurice L. Bryan Jr.

This case study is a brief history of the College of Ethnic Studies (CES or Ethnic Studies) at Western Washington University. Established in the fall of 1969 as the third of three cluster colleges, after Fairhaven and Huxley, it lasted until the fall of 1978 when it was disbanded and dispersed throughout the university. This study examines factors that led to the rise and fall of the College of Ethnic Studies.

Investigation showed that while budget and bigotry played a major role in the demise of CES, as assumed, other factors such as turnover in faculty and administrative leadership, and organizational structural barriers were involved and had a significant impact. Research centered around primary sources, minutes, memoranda, and interviews with selected individuals who were connected with the College of Ethnic Studies. The study ends with recommendations for approaching Ethnic Studies programs in the future.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

# CHAPTER ONE

# INTRODUCTION

## Background

Race and ethnicity exist as part of the human scene. Is it therefore inevitable that pride of racial and ethnic background separates us from one another? Arthur Schlesinger (1992), in The Disuniting of America, seems to think so. Another author, Nathan Glazer (1983), in his study of issues of ethnicity between 1964-1982, entitles his book Ethnic Dilemmas; and in a more recent study, The Lurking Evil (Hively, 1990), the American Association of State Colleges and Universities looked at racial and ethnic conflict on the college campus. Do these titles betray our attitude to the challenge of ethnic and cultural pluralism in America?

Violence erupts between Blacks and Koreans in Los Angeles. African war lords wage war in Somalia. Moslems and Serbs and Jews and Palestinians maintain their armed antagonisms. All across America indigenous peoples are reclaiming their land and their heritage. At the beginning of this century, W.E.B. Dubois (1903) warned us that the problem of the 20th century would be the color line. Unfortunately, he did not say when or how we would solve this problem.

In the midst of the Civil Rights Movement of the late 1960s, Western Washington State College (now Western Washington University) went to the edge. Western established an experimental college to reclaim the study of the liberal arts, a second was devoted to the study of the environment, and a third addressed issues of race and ethnicity. They were not alone in these pursuits. Other institutions, such as the University of California at San Diego were conducting similar experiments. In 1978, the

last of Western's three experimental colleges was aborted. I undertook this investigation to discover what led to the decision to disband the College of Ethnic Studies.

In short, the purpose of this study is twofold: to give a brief history of the College of Ethnic Studies, to tell its story, and through that telling to examine the key events of its brief existence and what led to its demise.

Need for the Study

Western's students of color continue to search in vain for reflections of themselves in the general curriculum. Diversity, although ill defined, has become the watchword of the 1990s. What do we mean by diversifying the curriculum? The College of Ethnic Studies was launched in part because ethnic studies was not reflected in the curriculum. The old debate remains--integrate cultural diversity into already existing disciplines, or develop separate cultural diversity courses and programs and give them a special focus.

Ethnic studies should be integrated throughout the curriculum and taught through a separate program. Both are necessary, and need not compete with each other. A political science or sociology course focusing on the 1930s and 1940s should touch on issues of race--e.g. how the depression affected residents of Harlem, or the sociopolitical implications of the zoot suit phenomena in L.A. for example--but an Ethnic Studies course or African American Studies or Chicano Studies course could go into greater depth on those topics.

A current development at Western is the evolving emergence of the American Cultural Studies program, an outgrowth of the American Studies and Ethnic Studies programs. Western is at a juncture in its history when it again has the opportunity to forge deeper into the complexities of curriculum transformation, especially in regards to cultural pluralism. What can we learn from the failure of the College of Ethnic Studies? What were the things done well? What should be scrapped from this old experiment, and in this new decade, redesigned so that it will take hold this time and move us toward more effective solutions on issues of racial, ethnic and cultural pluralism? A study of Western's previous efforts in this regard can provide us with a guide for future development.

Significance of the Study

The full story of Ethnic Studies has never been told. Robert Johnson (1972), in his paper, discussed the 1972 confrontation with the administration, and gave a brief history of the College up to that time. Ethnic Studies is mentioned in Hick's story of Western at 75, and it graces the pages of other texts discussing experimental programs of the 1960s. However, this will be the first effort to tell the story of Ethnic Studies from its inception until its demise. It is still only a small piece.

Research Question

My research question is fairly straightforward. Three cluster colleges were established at Western in the late 1960s; only two remain. The College of Ethnic Studies was phased out. Why?

Assumptions

This study proceeded on the assumption that budget and bigotry were key factors in the decision to disband the College of Ethnic Studies. It was further assumed that other factors must have been at play and that the road to the end was full of complexity and mystery.

# CHAPTER TWO

# REVIEW OF LITERATURE

## Introduction

The history and development of Ethnic Studies in America is fraught with conflict, resistance, institutional bigotry, debate and confusion. This chapter examines a number of areas relevant to the development of Ethnic Studies in higher education. It looks at definition and purpose, historical development, structure, debates over autonomy and challenges to Ethnic Studies as a discipline.

Related literature of the 1960s and 1970s is reviewed, as is current literature bearing on the development of Ethnic Studies of that period. The objective was to convey a sense of the literature in existence at the time the College of Ethnic Studies was being established. The current state of Ethnic Studies was not the focus of this study.

The catalysts for the founding of CES at Western came primarily from Blacks, American Indians, and Chicano students and faculty. Therefore the review of literature is deliberately limited to the three ethnic groups that the College of Ethnic Studies first set out to examine. In areas where Asian American Studies was implemented, they traveled similar paths as the other ethnic groups.

The first Asian American Studies courses at Western were offered in 1972, first by Geronimo G. Tagatac ("Introduction to Asian American Studies") and Bill Harris ("Japanese Literature in Translation"), then by Robert Kim when he was hired to teach Asian American Studies in the fall of 1972.

Afro-American/Black Studies

## Definitions

Definitions of Black Studies were not easily agreed upon. There were a number of agendas and perspectives regarding what was to be sought and accomplished. Bayard Rustin (1969), executive secretary of the A. Phillip Randolph Educational Fund, in the introduction to Black Studies: Myths and Realities asked:

> Is Black Studies an educational program or a forum for ideological indoctrination? Is it designed to train qualified scholars in a significant field of intellectual inquiry, or is it hoped that its graduates will form political cadres prepared to organize the impoverished residents of the black ghetto? Is it a means to achieve psychological identity and strength, or is it intended to provide a false and sheltered sense of security, the fragility of which would be revealed by even the slightest exposure to reality? And finally, does it offer the possibility for better racial understanding, or is it a regression to racial separatism? The power--and also the danger--of "Black Studies" as a slogan is that it can mean any or all of these things to different people. (p. 1)

Scholars, students, and administrators often disagreed on what Black Studies was: how it should be structured, where it should be housed, by whom it should be taught, and what should be its curriculum. Some argued that Black Studies should concentrate on developing pride and racial awareness among blacks. Other advocates wanted to focus on the survival needs of Blacks in a White dominated world, and the dominance of White value systems. Some wanted to concentrate on political

education and the unification and liberation of the Black community. Almost always there were voices who argued that no Black Studies program would be truly relevant if it were not "community based, community controlled, and directed toward the myriad problems of the Black community" (Russell, 1975, p. 184).

Nathan Hare (Ford, 1973) was one of the strongest proponents of Black Studies and its relationship to the Black community. "The fostering of identity with the black community, . . . would . . . commit the black student more to the task of helping build the black community, when once his studies are done, in contrast to the currently induced frenzy . . . to escape the black community" (p. 8).

Boniface I. Obichere (1970), in his article "Challenge of Afro-American Studies," presented several reasons for the necessity of Black Studies. In his view, "the absence of systematic teaching and vigorous inquiry concerning the black experience constitutes a grievous and culpable shortcoming in any university" (p. 169). In the short-run black studies would serve as a corrective to this shortcoming in higher education. The long-term goal of Black studies "would be the creation of viable links between universities and the black community" (p. 169). The idea of connecting the university to the Black community is a strong theme running through the movement for Black Studies. Obichere observed "in over fifty position papers on Black studies written by black students in various colleges and universities all over the United States, a strong sentiment of attachment to, and concern for, the black community" (p. 170).

Harold Cruse (Allen, 1974) and other black scholars considered Black Studies an instrument of cultural nationalism, designed to critique the "integrationist ethic" and "providing a counter balance to the dominant Anglo-Saxon culture" (p. 4).

Amiri Baraka (Mootry, 1983) had a more revolutionary view of Black Studies. For Baraka, Black Studies was an arm of resistance to the "imperialism and colonialism of an oppressed people" (p. 62). J. Saunders Redding (Mootry, 1983) on the other hand focused more on Black Studies as a "tool for correcting the deficiencies of American Studies" (p. 62). Redding's revolution would be in the educational arena. He opposed the anti-intellectual, anti-scholastic, action orientation of Black Studies.

Kilson (1969) was not sympathetic with "militant" demands. He thought the militant advocates of Black Studies preferred courses that allowed students to get off easy and to focus on politics rather than education. He argued for rooting Negro Studies in a strong academic curriculum. His view of the proper relationship of Negro Studies and the community was one in which Negro Studies would "go beyond using the black community as a laboratory to develop and test social science skills" (p. 723).

Despite these varying views of Black Studies, there were common features. Billingsley (1970) described four essential elements that Black Studies had regardless of curriculum, structure or student body: (a) a focus on the Black experience as a special area of study; (b) Black students and Black faculty involved in the major roles of conceiving, defining, governing, and administering these programs;

(c) a call to reach out to the contemporary Black community, and (d) flexibility in structure and form.

## History

Black Studies has roots dating back long before the 1960s. According to Crouchett (1971) the Pennsylvania Quakers, as early as 1713, had a plan for educating and training free Blacks. They gave them instruction on the culture, history and geography of Black Africa while preparing them to be missionaries in Africa. Later, Black individuals such as David Walker, Frederick Douglass, David Ruggles and Charlotte Forten addressed the need for Black and White understanding of the cultural and historical contributions of Black Americans. Northern teachers in the Freedmens schools during Reconstruction often inserted Black contributions in their lessons, using slave narratives as teaching aids.

Renewed interest in Afro-American history and culture arose after the Reconstruction Era. Several historical works by Black authors appeared at this time. The first, George W. Williams' two-volume History of the Negro Race in America in 1882, was followed by E. A. Johnson's School History of the Negro Race in 1893. In addition, several attempts were made to establish historical societies in the late 19th century. Finally, on September 9, 1916, the Association for the Study of Negro Life and History was organized in Chicago under the leadership of Edward Bruce, Arthur A. Shomburg, and Dr. Carter G. Woodson.

The two leading pioneers advocating for Black Studies were W.E.B. DuBois and Carter G. Woodson. They called for a national program of ethnic education and kept the issue before the American public during the first few decades of this century. Dubois, with his systematic study of African American people, provided the curricular rationale for the concept of "Black Studies." In 1897, at Atlanta University, Dubois initiated and taught the first formal "Black curriculum." He taught sociology and inaugurated the first scientific study of the conditions of Black people covering all important aspects of Black life. Woodson, as head of the Association for the Study of Negro Life and History, lobbied for the teaching of minority ethnic subjects at all educational levels. In 1891, Woodson reported on the first Black Studies courses in northern colleges. These institutions included Ohio State, Nebraska University, Stanford University, Harvard, and the University of Chicago. At this time, according to Woodson, no southern institution of higher education, other than Negro colleges, included a course bearing on Negro life and history (Crouchett, 1971).

Franklin (1989) suggests that racism and segregation of scholarship forced Black scholars to make "an institution of the field of Negro studies" (p. 301). Franklin noted how Negro scholars felt compelled to address faulty scholarship claiming Negro inferiority. He mentions, for example, W.H. Crogman deserting his field of Greek literature to write The Progress of a Race; C.V. Roman, temporarily abandoning medical research and practice to write The Negro in American Civilization; and Julian Lewis, a biologist, spending years writing The Biology of the Negro. "Here

was a vast field that was unexplored. Here was an urgent need to explore it in order to complete the picture of American life and institution. Here was an opportunity to bring to bear on a problem the best and most competent resources that could be commandeered. That the field was the Negro and that the resources were also Negroes are typical irrelevancies of which objective scholarship can take no cognizance" (pp. 301-302).

Advocacy for Black Studies by Black scholars waned between 1940 and 1960. The decade of the 1960s brought what Brossard (1984) refers to as "contemporary Black Studies," a period when formal programs or departments proliferated, partly in response to Dr. Martin Luther King's death, and partly in response to the Black Power movement of the time. These programs ended a period of indifference toward the inclusion of the Black experience in higher education offerings.

An Office of Civil Rights survey in 1968 (Russell, 1975) found that only 5.5% of the 5 million full-time undergraduate students identified in its survey were Black. Three percent of these Black students were enrolled in historically Black colleges and universities. Less than 3% of the faculty were Black, many in junior level positions. The Afro-American content in the curriculum was often limited to a few hours in only a few courses.

The assassination of Martin Luther King Jr. on April 4, 1968 radically altered the tone and tactics of campus efforts to develop Black Studies programs. In addition, the split in the civil rights movement from a focus on integration to black power significantly affected the course of the Black Studies movement. Ad Hoc

committees formed to put forth proposals to the administration and faculty; action and demands were more intense and direct. The lessons of the civil rights movement were an inspiration to Black students to push hard for more "relevance" in education. (Russell, 1975, p. 181)

Obichere (1970) gave some importance to this issue of relevance suggesting that "colleges and universities as they now exist are, at least, irrelevant, often even destructive to Black Students in terms of the recognition of new needs in the Black community . . . . This means that in some way the concept of education, its goals and methods, have to be re-examined and made relevant to a larger number of students than to whom it is now important" (p. 170).

For years higher education was seen as something for the elite, the chosen few, the leisure class. The returning veterans after World War II started to undermine that orientation. Black students and others during the 1960s continued that reformation. Black students began asking, "Why should we not learn about ourselves; and why shouldn't we be free to enter any college" (Kelly, 1971, p. 69)?

Allen (1974) placed particular emphasis on the fact that for the first time masses of Black students became involved in the struggle for educational change, and that it was widely recognized that the Black experience was absent from the curriculum of most colleges and universities. "It was these two factors that led to the demand for black studies departments as vehicles for incorporating black people and black experience into American higher education" (p. 3).

Ballard (1973) discussed the issue of low numbers of qualified instructors in Black Studies. He noted the 1968 Ford Foundation survey that indicated that over the five years from 1964-1968, 350 Ph.D's were awarded to Blacks, less than 1% of all Ph.D.s granted during this time. "Even if one adds to the potential pool of Black studies faculty such distinguished black historians as John Henrik Clarke, who does not hold an earned Ph.D. degree, but has received an honorary doctorate, the number of black scholars is insufficient to satisfy the demands of black students throughout the country for black studies programs" (p. 110).

Brossard (1984) discussed the change in financial climate in higher education during the early 1970s. "By the end of the 1974-75 recession, about three years after most Black Studies programs had begun, internal competition stiffened and modestly growing fiscal resources meant less in absolute terms" (p. 283). He also noted the rise of Women's studies and other specialties competing for limited funding. Researchers (Miller, 1972; Allen, 1974; Colon, 1984) estimate that at least 500 out of approximately 2500 institutions offered Afro-American studies programs or courses in 1971. Few of these programs were coordinated into formal degree programs in the form of departments, centers, or institutes. In less than five years the number of schools providing Black Studies programs diminished to approximately two hundred twenty-five and maintained that level for ten years.

James Banks (Crowl, 1972) expressed concern about the planning of Black Studies programs. "I'm distressed by what I see in Black studies," Banks said. "The goals are confused, ambiguous, conflicting. The courses are constructed out of crisis

. . . without new goals and new strategies, the student will be as tired of black history as he is of white chauvinistic history and it will go the same way as Latin and Greek" (p. 6).

Black student rebellion and the call for Black Studies looked similar on a number of predominately White campuses. Often there were student strikes or demonstrations, occupation of buildings or offices, and presentation of "non-negotiable" demands calling for admission of more Black students, hiring of more Black faculty, and initiation of a Black Studies curriculum.

Yale

Huggins (1985) in his Ford Foundation report contrasted the origins of Yale's and Harvard's programs. Yale's Afro-American Studies program came into being in an atmosphere of relative peace. The Black Student Alliance had been working since fall 1967 to convince Yale of the need for courses in Afro-American history and culture. They met with little encouragement. In early spring 1968 they decided to sponsor a conference that would have a national draw of Black and White intellectuals to address this subject.

The symposium was supported by funds from the Ford Foundation and brought together individuals with varied perspectives about Afro-American Studies, from Nathan Hare and Maulana Ron Karenga, who were strong critics of the academy, to committed academics like Martin Kilson, Harold Cruse, and Boniface Obichere. This symposium gave Yale a chance to explore a number of possible models to see which model might be best to adopt.

Yale's program was supported by senior faculty, several departments, including History, English and Anthropology, and an administration that allocated funds to make the program possible. Unlike many other institutions, there was a greater sense of trust among the various parties.

Harvard

Harvard might have gone the way of Yale "except for bad timing, bad luck, and perhaps excessive distrust on the part of some of those concerned" (Huggins, 1985, p. 27). Harvard began working on this issue in the spring of 1968. Henry Rosovsky, an economic historian, chaired a student-faculty committee organized to report on a number of issues related to Afro-American student life and needs at Harvard. In January 1969, the committee made its report recommending a program in Afro-American studies, increased graduate fellowships for Black students, and a number of initiatives to enhance Black student life on campus. Although the Black students did not officially support it, the report was adopted by the faculty of Harvard in February.

In two months everything changed. On April 9, 1969 members of Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) and the Progressive Labor Party occupied University Hall calling for the banning of ROTC from Harvard's campus, the university's active commitment to ending the war in Viet Nam, and amnesty for certain students who were under disciplinary terms from a previous demonstration. The protesters were mostly white students and the "sit-in" had nothing to do with Black Studies. Police

were called to force the eviction of the demonstrators and a general strike by students followed.

Within this crisis atmosphere the leadership of the Association for African and Afro-American Students presented the faculty with new demands framed as a thinly veiled ultimatum. They wanted Afro-American Studies to be a department on its own rather than a program, and they wanted a student voice in the selection and appointment of its faculty. On April 22, the faculty was asked to vote on these propositions without altering them. There were deep divisions among the faculty and forceful opposition to the student demands from Rosovsky, Kilson and others. Nevertheless, the faculty voted for the changes the students demanded.

## Structure

Billingsley (1970), Smith (1971) and Huggins (1985) identified five predominant structures around which Black Studies had been organized:

1. **Single Course**. An example of this is a course Harvard developed in 1968. It was a year-long, two-semester, comprehensive course in the history and contemporary conditions of Afro-Americans, designed to accommodate 100 undergraduates.

2. **Program**. A series of closely related courses from several different departments in a loosely coordinated program. Yale and Cornell designed their Black Studies offerings along program lines.

From an academic perspective, Huggins considered the "program" approach the most successful. He cited as strengths the interdisciplinary nature of Black Studies achieved by the utilization of faculty from a variety of disciplines, together with the fact that faculty initially appointed to teach in the program also retained status in the department of the discipline. The program can also take advantage of courses offered in other departments. Huggins acknowledged that a weakness of the program approach is its dependency on continued support and goodwill from administration and cooperating departments.

Yale's program was designed to offer undergraduates a major or field of concentration for their degree. Not all programs did. Some offered only a few courses with an Afro-American focus that were accepted for credit by the student's major department or that served as electives.

3. **Centers or Institutes**. This structure has the power to design its own courses and employ its own faculty. Institutes are a good means to support scholarship. Some are independent of universities, although universities often desire to house a center or institute because of the prestige and potential for attracting top line scholars.

The small number of scholars in the field able to support several competing centers, and dependency on annual funding from host institutions were the two biggest disadvantages identified with this structure.

Some examples of centers or institutes in the late 1960s and early 1970s were: Columbia University's Urban Center established in 1968-69; the Institute

of the Black World (IBW) established in Atlanta in 1969; and the W.E.B. DuBois Institute for Afro-American Studies established at Harvard in 1975.

4. **Department**. A department has its own budget, appoints its own faculty and staff, designs its own curriculum, and serves its students with minimal control or oversight by others. It was also assumed to be a more permanent structure than a program. This was the most popular model for those seeking some kind of independence and autonomy, and consequently the one that met the most vehement resistance. The intense battles at San Francisco State, Berkeley, Cornell and Harvard were largely due to the reluctance of the universities to establish such "autonomous" departments (Billingsley, 1970, pp. 146-149).

A persistent argument against the department was the perception that Afro-American Studies was interdisciplinary by nature and should be organized into a program made up of faculty from various departments serving it. Others argued it was a discipline defined by its particular perspective on a topic none of the other departments offered.

Ford (1973) noted how the advocacy for departmental status was often very personal. It symbolized the college or university acknowledging Black Studies as a legitimate academic field with the same rights and privileges afforded to other fields and departments. Critics of this independent structure were seen as questioning the ability or right of Black people to direct their own lives in a responsible and legitimate manner, and as advocating that only White values and standards are appropriate in this society.

Huggins (1985) noted the pros and cons of joint appointments which were frequently used with the program or department model. On the plus side, it can dispel suspicion about the quality of a department's faculty and give Afro-American Studies a voice within the department. On the minus side, an individual might fail to win tenure in the second department because its faculty claims the individual has no knowledge of their area or has failed to meet their standards. The loyalty and commitment of the faculty member may be questioned by the Afro-American Studies program or host department. "It is time-consuming to be a good citizen in two departments" (p. 50).

5. **The College Model.** This may be the most radical and most uncommon model. In his dissertation, Kelly (1971) recommended that Black Studies programs be taken to a higher level, to the establishment of Colleges of Ethnic Studies. He suggested that institutions need an umbrella organization of an Ethnic Studies College to "guide, direct, and relate the minority academic program to other colleges across a major university" (p. 160). Kelly saw advantages in the college model in its ability to initiate new Ethnic Studies components and expose its students to a number of cultures. The college model was the demand of San Francisco State, Cornell, and Western Washington State College.

All programs in the state institutions of California, except one, were organized within the interdisciplinary program or departmental model. The one exception was Third College at the University of California at San Diego

(UCSD). Although technically not a Black college, 50% of the students, faculty and staff were Black, and the provost was Black. The other 50% of the student population was divided among Mexican Americans, American Indians, Asian Americans and White Americans. Three colleges were in operation at USD at this time--Revelle College, John Muir College, and Third College--each with its own faculty, administration, buildings, laboratories and graduation requirements.

Third College accepted its first students in the fall of 1970. The student and faculty planners wanted its central thrust to be the education of minority students and the study and alleviation of social problems. They also wanted the life-style and character of the college to be such that it would encourage the continued association of students with their nonacademic community. "The core of the curriculum emphasizes the studies of the peoples which make up the racial minorities of the United States, as well as the Third World experience in the context of economic, social, and political phenomena with the aim of giving the student both a local and international perspective" (Ford, 1973, p. 75).

Despite the above, critics such as a California assemblyman would still claim that Third College was a "wild and wooly experiment in racism." Ford (1973) speculates it was the semi-autonomous nature of the Third College under Black leadership that invited such false charges, which would not have been provoked by interdisciplinary or departmental status subject to overall White control. (p. 76)

Most of the criticism of Third College came from Whites. However, some Blacks complained about inferior buildings and facilities of the college, compared to the attractive facilities of the other two campuses.

Some observers considered ethnic grouping an "unconscious or unacknowledged expression of the marginality of such programs" (Ford, 1973, p. 188). Ford cited several arguments against grouping ethnics into a single operational unit: (a) friction generated among the minorities grouped as they compete for funds and other resources; (b) tension arising when the director is chosen from one minority group rather than another; (c) conflict that occurs when one group receives more support than another, even if it could be documented that the purpose for that increased support might be valid and (d) a false sense of adequate financial support when budgets are lumped together.

From the results of his survey of higher education institutions, Smith (1971) found that 5% had initiated interdisciplinary programs, 6% had institutes, 7% had decided on the center approach, and 13% had established a Department of Black Studies. Fifty percent had no formal program and only offered courses. Nineteen percent said they had nothing to offer students interested in Black Studies.

## Issues

### Separatism

Several programs questioned whether White students should be admitted to the program. For whom was Black Studies? Some asserted that Black Studies programs should exist solely for Black students "because they were responsible for the existence of the programs" (Spaights, 1971, p. 40). They felt White students in Black-oriented classes tended to slow down discussion and learning for the Black students.

The participation of Whites in Black Studies was an explosive issue very much related to the integrationist--separatist controversy which infected the civil rights movements in the latter part of the 1960s. Separatists argued that no White scholar, regardless of degrees and publications, can truly understand the Black experience. "No white man can talk about Rap Brown or Stokley Carmichael," said Johnie Scott, a Stanford University senior from Watts (Fischer, 1971, p. 23).

Objections to Whites in Black Studies arose for a variety of reasons. Some expressed fear that Whites would take advantage of the knowledge gained to keep exploiting Blacks; others felt the presence of Whites held back discussion. A Black student at Oakland's Merritt College, urging a lone White student to leave a Black philosophy class, said, "So long as this white boy is in this class, we're going to be talking elliptically, all around and over the subject, but no one is really going to be saying anything" (Fischer, 1971, p. 23).

Fischer (1971), however, argued that "if 'white racism' is the greatest single obstacle to black aspirations, as the Kerner Commission has alleged, then white

students would be the most logical beneficiaries of black studies" (p. 26). Spaights also argued that "university faculties should protect any student's right to take any course offered by a university provided he possesses the necessary prerequisites" (p. 40). N. Wright (1970a) also emphasized the need for Black and White students to be exposed to the Black experience. "Without it, neither black students nor white students are educated for the hard realities of their times" (p. 366).

Antioch College serves as a good case study of this controversial question. In 1969, Antioch College excluded Whites from its Afro-American Studies Institute and from an all-Black dormitory. The U.S. Office of Education considered Antioch in violation of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act. Dr. Kenneth B. Clark, a Black member of the Board of Trustees, resigned in protest of the Institute's segregationist policies (W. W. Johnson, 1970).

The Institute was set up by Black students with instruction provided by "consultants", Black doctoral candidates from the University of Chicago. The students were offered courses in psychology, history, music and drama, along with basic required courses.

Lythcott, a student at Antioch, in arguing for separatism, tried to promote the thesis of government infiltration as a defense for the closed door policy of the Institute. He considered the Institute's courses different than regular courses at Antioch. Its economic courses dealt with concrete problems as well as theoretical issues involving the Black community and looked for solutions to these problems. Its psychology courses dealt with the problems and attitudes of Blacks and schisms and

prejudices within the Black community that limited the development of Blacks in this country. Lythcott thought White participation in these issues was inappropriate. (Lythcott, 1971, pp. 129-131)

Kenneth Clark, on the other hand, thought it imperative that Whites know the history, the psychology, and the economics of their own racism, and opposed separatist practices that protected Whites from coming face to face with this knowledge. "Painful though such confrontation would be," Clark said, "whites need to face with a terrible honesty the consequences of their own inheritance, and they need to do it in the presence of blacks" (Clark, 1971, p. 119).

In proposing a psychological interpretation for the support of separatism at Antioch, and other places that might attempt it, Clark said, "The symbiotic needs of each group help to sustain it: the need of the guilty white to feel innocent again, the need of the angry young black to nurse his pain in private. Together they serve the cause of inequality. The ultimate victory of white racism would be to encourage black suicide--whether the suicide of physical self-destruction or the suicide of self-imposed withdrawal from the conditions of life" (p. 122).

Overall, there was agreement that White students needed exposure to Black Studies, and interest was high at a number of institutions. At Ohio, for example, Whites accounted for about 40% of the Black Studies enrollment; at Yale, 75% were White, and many of the courses were taught by White faculty. (Crowl, 1972, p. 6)

Discipline

S.J. Wright (1970b) articulated that a central issue in the area of Black Studies was "whether the program . . . is to be treated as a discipline or as a constellation of disciplines" (p. 365).

Speaking against the view of Black Studies as a discipline, Vontress (1970) shared the view that, "As an academic discipline, black studies is a lot of mumbo jumbo. The objectives are elusive, the content weak, the methods questionable, the materials pitifully inadequate, and the assessment procedures totally inappropriate. Unless black studies programs are subjected to the same rigorous controls as are other academic departments and programs, they are in danger of becoming revival meetings which may have some therapeutic value but little intellectual substance" (p. 200).

Taking an opposing view, Hare (1969) suggested that, "The notion that 'academic soundness' would suffer is basically a racist apprehension, a feeling that any deviation on the part of blacks away from white norms and standards inevitably would dip downward. It is also based, perhaps, on the naive notion that traditional education is value-free" (p. 732).

Eugene DuBois (1970) believed there were four elements which gave an area of intellectual content academic standing or scholarship worthy of study: (a) a defined body of knowledge; (b) a body of content capable of analysis by traditional research tools; (c) an ability of a field to attract competent scholars, theoreticians and researchers for ongoing research and teaching in the field; (d) acceptance by academic centers, colleges and universities that this body of knowledge is within their purview of interest. DuBois believed Black Studies had all of these elements. (p. 8)

Resistance

According to Allen (1974), the counterattack against Black Studies started in earnest in 1972. Cutbacks in department budgets and student aid, especially in public institutions, forced the dismantling of many programs and curtailed student enrollments. In 1973, for the first time in a decade, the percentage of Black youth entering college decreased.

Allen (1974) identified three intellectual arguments used against Black Studies: (a) Black Studies was political, not academic; (b) Black Studies was intellectually bankrupt, not having a proper subject matter and (c) Black Studies was reverse racism. (p. 6)

Gordon (1981) suggested that "all too often, black studies programs were designed to fail, or, at best, were intended or expected to have limited academic impact" (p. 232). Gordon also addressed the failed efforts of students who had initially tried to work with the traditional departments to get them to open up their curriculum. "It was only after many efforts to influence traditionalists failed that Black students and their supporters used their collective power to pressure for separate programs through which the African and the Afro-American experience might be studied as a primary topic" (p. 232).

In addressing the question of whether Black Studies is a threat, Ford (1973) responded in the affirmative. "They are a threat to blatant ignorance . . . prejudice and bigotry . . . . They are a threat to apathy and inertia in vital matters that require action now. They are a threat to false and distorted scholarship that has flourished

without condemnation or shame in the most prestigious bastions of higher education in this nation" (pp. 188-189).

Miller (1972) placed much emphasis on the role of racism in this area. He wrote, "If colleges and universities are serious in their efforts to establish institutes and departments of Afro-American Affairs, and if they wish to continue to develop black studies as an academic discipline, they will have to recognize the obvious fact that the real issue pervading any discussion of the field centers around racism in American life. It is racism that has caused our educational system to fail in the most fundamental way to provide educational experiences that are relevant to blacks" (Epps, 1972, p. 87).

Ballard (1973) also identified efforts to make programs fail. He spoke with several Black Studies directors who indicated a number of roadblocks, ranging from inadequate funding for secretarial assistance or office space, to duplication of courses by traditional departments to draw students away from the Black Studies program.

Ballard identified six problems that Black Studies presented to the university: (a) serious doubt among academicians that a Black Studies body of knowledge existed; (b) anxiety by scholars that the programs would be highly politicized; (c) fear that quality would be low since there were few in the field, Black or White, trained in the discipline; (d) concern over academic freedom because of student demands for complete autonomy in faculty selection and course offerings; (e) fear or anxiety that Black Studies was only a device for diverting Black students away from the "hard" disciplines which would prepare them for the true struggles for success; (f) concerns

over questions of exclusion of White students and professors from Black Studies programs.

American Indian/Native American Studies

Definition

Naming is an essential step of defining. Two names have been prominent throughout the history of Indian Studies: American Indian Studies (AIS) and Native American Studies (NAS). They are fairly interchangeable terms. Researchers have found a 50/50 ratio between programs using these terms. B. Wright (1990) preferred the use of American Indian Studies, while Morris (1986) found the term "native" more inclusive of the many people and cultures that can legitimately be addressed in "Native Studies." Generally, the term American Indian Studies will be used in this thesis, since that is the term utilized by the College of Ethnic Studies throughout most its existence.

American Indian Studies is not anthropology, history, comparative sociology or political science. These and other disciplines, Morris suggested, may "study" and teach about Native Americans, but unlike AIS they do not foster the preservation and development of Native American cultures. American Indian Studies attempts to preserve and assist with this development by integrating a number of academic disciplines and methodologies to "address critical issues relevant to the Native Community" (Morris, 1986, p. 10).

Wilson (1979) suggested that American Indian Studies programs have a threefold mission: (a) to provide a place on college campuses where scholarly, interdisciplinary research on "Native Americana" can be "conceived, encouraged, and completed" (p. 221); (b) to provide a place for Native American students to find an environment

which encourages their cultural identity and (c) to provide a means through course content and attitudes of instructors to sensitize non-Indian students to the realities of Native American life and history.

For Forbes (1971) the rationale for Native American Studies was simple: to put "an end to cultural and racial bias in American academic life" (p. 171). He cites Irving Hallowell of the University of Pennsylvania who said, "Our contacts with the Indians have affected our speech, our economic life, our clothing, our sports and recreations, many of our curative practices, folk and concert music, the novel, poetry, drama" (p. 165).

## History

The College of Santa Cruz de Santiago de Tlatelolco was founded in 1536 to educate the sons of prominent Native Americans. It was financed by the Spanish government and staffed by members of the Franciscan order. Despite several critics who thought Indians were stupid and incapable of any advanced learning, a large number of educated Indian youth were educated at the college, many staying to teach at their alma mater. Others secured important positions in the civil government of New Spain.

The Spanish conquerors of Mexico in the 1520s encouraged the development of Santa Cruz de Tlatelolco. It produced Indians scholars who contributed to the knowledge of ancient Mexican history and society. Nevertheless, the College was

later suppressed "because it stood as a contradiction to the exploitative goals of Spanish imperialism" (Forbes, 1971, p. 162).

The higher education of Indians at Harvard, William and Mary, Princeton, Dartmouth and others was designed to "civilize" the Indian, to Europeanize them, and to suppress their indigenous worldview (Jaimes, 1987). In 1654, Harvard became the first of the colonial institutions to admit Indians. William and Mary, at the end of the 17th century, was the first Southern school to admit Indians. Dartmouth College, in New Hampshire, until 1893, "was the most active school in the higher education of Indians" (Wilson, 1979, p. 208-209). The few post-secondary institutions created specifically for Indians after the 1890s--Pembroke State Teachers College in North Carolina, Haskell Institute in Kansas, and the American Indian Arts and Crafts Institute in New Mexico were not "planned by, controlled by, or operated by Indians" (Forbes, 1971, p. 163).

In 1914, Senator Robert Owens, in response to petitions by Indian people of Oklahoma, introduced a bill to create an Indian Studies program at the University of Oklahoma. It was defeated. In 1932, a bill calling for the creation of an American Institution of Indian Civilization was sponsored by the entire Oklahoma congressional delegation. The mission of the institute was threefold: (a) research and instruction in the elements of Indian civilization; (b) preservation of materials illustrating that civilization and (c) annual meetings of Indians and Whites to discuss problems and strategies for improving conditions of the Indians. This bill also called for a College

of Indian Education and Research with the authorization to grant appropriate degrees comparable to other schools and colleges in the University (Wilson, 1979).

American Indian Studies re-emerged as an academic field during the student protests of the late 1960s and early 1970s, particularly in 1969, a watershed year according to Wilson (1979), for Native American Studies. "The official recognition of NAS as a scholarly concern on many campuses falls within that twelve month span" (p. 214).

Two schools developed programs that year, the University of California at Berkeley (UCB) and the University of Minnesota (UM). Their development and subsequent form differed greatly. UCB was established practically overnight. At the time of the Third World Coalition Student strike in 1969, Berkeley had less than a half dozen Native American students; Blacks, Hispanics, Asians were well represented. A primary objective of the strike was the development of a Department of Ethnic Studies. The Indians participating in the strike were asked if they wanted an Indian Studies unit. They said yes. The Department of Ethnic Studies established in March 1969 housed four semi-autonomous programs: Native American, Asian American, Afro-American, and La Raza Studies (Chicano Studies) (Wilson, 1979).

In 1963, President O. Meredith Wilson, at the University of Minnesota, established a committee to deal with American Indian affairs. Although the University of Minnesota drew its students from a state and region in which Indians are the largest minority, American Indians were not represented. By 1969 between 40 and 50 attended the University--partly due to a successful Upward Bound program

with an all Indian Board of Directors. However, it was UM's Black students in 1968 who first requested the creation of an academic unit devoted to studying one minority group. The American Indian students followed suit the next year. In June 1969, the Board of Regents established the American Indian Studies program (Wilson, 1979).

Deloria (1986) bemoans the haste with which many colleges adopted Ethnic Studies, driven by politics rather than academic reasons and casting Ethnic Studies into a different category than other subjects. "Instant history and culture had to be achieved if demands were to be met within the time frame set by the protesters. The most common practice was to survey every course which had any bearing at all on a minority group, and cross list it as 'Black Studies' or 'Indian Studies', and insert it into the catalog" (p. 2). Also, many programs were funded on "soft" money, grants from the federal government and foundations. Deloria suggests that institutions designed staff and teaching positions so that few ethnics received tenure when the money was gone, "the minority staff, which was always regarded as temporary . . . then would be gone also" (p. 2).

Washburn (1975) cites a 1973 survey in which questionnaires were sent to 262 institutes of higher education, of which 66 reported American Indian Studies programs. California was highest with 16 programs. Locke reported 10,971 Indian students, 950 of whom were graduate students. Non-Indian students were the majority of those enrolled in most Indian Studies courses offered in Indians Studies programs.

In 1985 Heath and Guyette (Morris, 1986) reported in a UCLA survey a listing of 105 NAS programs, 85 providing academic classes, with literature, history, religion and art courses being the most numerous and popular. Increasingly, programs included courses on federal and tribal government relations and law, Indian education and a few courses on economic or environmental resource issues.

A number of journals emerged in this field, such as Northeast Indian Studies at Cornell University, American Indian Quarterly at UC Berkeley, Wicazo Sa Review at Eastern Washington University and the American Indian Culture and Research Journal at UCLA. In addition, journals with a broader mission such as The Journal of Ethnic Studies at Western Washington University and Cultural Survival Quarterly at Harvard help provided a new forum for scholarship in this area. Jaimes (1985) said these efforts "can be seen as the viable beginnings of an independent forum within which AIS practitioners may publish according to the autonomous scholarly criteria rather than by the standards established by external (and often conflicting) disciplinary establishments" (Jaimes, 1987, p. 4-5).

## Structure

A number of structures were erected to house AIS, from autonomous departments with their own roster of interdisciplinary courses and faculty to decentralized interdepartmental, interdisciplinary programs. AIS was often part of an Ethnic Studies department which might include Afro-American, Chicano, and Asian-

American Studies. By 1984 almost half of the Native American Studies programs enjoyed full departmental status (B. Wright, 1990, p. 17).

American Indian Studies programs often went beyond the typical character of academic departments: (a) they assisted institutions in improving their minority diversity profile; (b) they were active in minority student recruitment and retention; (c) they served as a link between the academic and Indian communities and (d) they advocated for Indian concerns in the academic community. These extra burdens often went unnoticed and unrewarded by the institutions they served (B. Wright, 1990).

The Native American Studies program at UC Berkeley is an example of an autonomous unit. Established in response to the Third World strike at Berkeley in 1969, its goal was to produce "hundreds" with advance degrees and "thousands" with the bachelor degrees. Until 1975, with the arrival of Clara Sue Kidwell, no member of the department had a Ph.D. or a tenured appointment. Only one staff member was non-Indian. The rest had a strong identification with their tribal designations (Washburn, 1975, p. 266).

Another model is "interdepartmental" programs. They usually consist of a director/coordinator, one or two full-time faculty members and an academic or student counselor, with the majority of the curriculum subcontracted out to other departments. Supporters of this model believe that Native American Studies faculty and curriculum receive greater academic credibility through their association with a recognized academic discipline. Tenure and promotion are also more "regularized" under this structure (Morris, 1986, p. 10).

The Indian Studies program at UCLA was housed in an American Indian Culture Center with strong connections to all concerned departments, including political science, law, geography, and others. In addition to advocacy, the Center developed projects that could draw in more people. The Center's The American Indian Culture Center Journal is an example of one of these projects.

Convenience can be a factor in determining where a program is placed. At the University of California at Davis, the Native American Studies program was housed in the College of Agriculture. At Michigan State the program found a home in the School of Urban Development.

Churchill (1982) also cautioned against the continued practice of setting up parallel minority studies programs--AIS, Black Studies, etc. He believed this was another form of the "separate but equal" doctrine and gave a "tacit, if unintended" acceptance of the viability of "white studies" dominance (p. 56).

## Issues

### Resistance

From the beginning of the 1960s American Indian Studies was criticized by faculty from the more established disciplines. They questioned the academic integrity of the AIS curriculum, arguing that Ethnic Studies has "no academic substance, no theoretical foundation, no scholarly tradition" (B. Wright, 1990, p. 18).

Some argued that cultural elements that made Indians unique had disappeared, leaving a "degraded culture" or "culture of poverty" unworthy of serious study.

Other voices argued that if a distinctly Indian culture still did exist, it was irrelevant for today's Native Americans (Wilson, 1979, p. 224).

Professor Murray Wax considered these statements manifestations of the effort to preserve a status quo for Native American societies which have always been changing. He agreed with Indian scholars who suggested that the race's cultural identity should be re-emphasized and re-enforced and concluded that "particularly in the education context, it is misleading both to Indian and Non-Indian students to portray Indianess as if it were a matter preserving the traits of an aboriginal and static culture" (Wilson, 1979, p. 224-225).

Forbes (1971) identified five specific problems facing Native American Studies: (a) lack of money; (b) controversy over appropriate credentials for permanent academic appointments of Indian instructors; (c) immobility of Indian student population; (d) shortage of adequately trained Indian faculty and (e) lack of suitable texts, maps, and supplementary teaching materials.

Autonomy

One of the major areas of discussion and debate was the question of autonomy. Since American Indian Studies, like the other Ethnic Studies programs, grew out of political battles, fighting the resistance of established disciplines and administrators, it was difficult for the promoters and activists for AIS to trust the development of the programs to departments which had not expressed committed interest to AIS.

Many felt that the program needed to be under the direction of American Indian faculty, students, and community. "If this is not the case, it will probably develop simply another colonial style program, with a high degree of irrelevance" (Forbes, 1971, p. 170). Others cautioned against the separatism of Indian Studies. Washburn (1975) believed these programs would suffer if they alienated faculty from related fields who could be allies, non-Indian students who are needed to support these programs, and ethnic students who might abandon a program seen as damaging to their employment prospects if the program was seen as a political more than scholarly entity.

Thornton (1978), however, saw at least two reasons for AIS existing as a separate area of study. First, he cited the tension between studying American Indians from an external versus internal perspective. Both approaches are legitimate, he said. However, "until the formulation of Indian studies a few years ago, American Indians had been considered basically from an external perspective. Now . . . with the advent of American Indian Studies, other insights on these cultures and peoples are possible" (Thornton, 1978, p. 13).

Secondly, he argued that the study of Indian societies is best done from a holistic approach, not fragmented by the disciplinary approach. "It is perhaps commonplace but nevertheless true that the real world does not operate along disciplinary lines of academia, and while it may be important to separate out components of the world to study them, it appears necessary to bring them together to understand them" (p. 13).

Discipline

Typically a discipline develops around an intellectual entity, a body of knowledge and interests. A structure is then developed to support that activity's faculty, courses, programs of study, degrees and departments. Both Thornton and Clara Sue Kidwell note that with AIS the structure came first, "before a true academic discipline had evolved, or even been seriously contemplated" (Wilson, 1979, p. 219).

Thornton (1978) stressed the need to develop the research function for AIS to be solidly recognized as anything other than a "quasi-discipline." He went on to suggest the following areas AIS could focus upon that are not well developed in other disciplines: oral traditions, treaties and treaty rights, tribal government, group resistance, American Indian epistemology, and contemporary issues.

Morris (1986) believes that "lack of academic recognition continues to be the single greatest obstacle to research in NAS" (p. 11). Wilson (1979) had noted the restraint of a small number of faculty and their preoccupation with administrative organization, curriculum development, and student recruitment, preventing them from greater production of published scholarship. They were preoccupied "with attempting to formulate the tenets of a new discipline" (p. 222).

Jose (1985) believed the obstacle to full acceptance of AIS as an autonomous academic discipline was the multidisciplinary nature of its knowledge base. There are two significant dimensions to this multidisciplinary character. One is the "exogenous" or external knowledge base largely developed by non-Indian scholars from a number of disciplines researching, writing, and teaching about Indians, primarily from a non-

Indian perspective. The second dimension is an endogenous, internal knowledge base, originally transmitted through "tribal-specific oral traditions" (p. 36). This internal knowledge base was and is holistic and multidisciplinary.

The transmission of knowledge through oral traditions is often seen as unscientific. It has not withstood the "test of time" like the works of knowledge traditionally taught in Western higher education institutions. "This misperceived lack of 'literary' tradition in Indian studies has mislead [sic] some Indian and non-Indian people to deny the legitimacy of Indian studies as an academic discipline" (Jose, 1985, p. 37). In addition, many people see the Indian studies curriculum as an effort to make "Indian students . . . 'become or be better traditional Indians'" (Jose, 1985, p. 37); and this infects the view of Indian studies as irrelevant and impractical as an academic major in modern society.

In 1985 and 1988 Jaimes said AIS "exists as a conceptually rudderless discipline, generally isolated both within the academic environment and from its cultural roots" (Jaimes, 1985, p. 3). At the same time both Deloria and Churchill were calling for a "fully interdisciplinary approach to AIS as a discipline" (Jaimes, 1988, p. 9), not just the inclusion of Indians and Indian programs in academia. "Both maintain that it is impossible to arrive at a coherently Indian understanding of law or political science without a firm grasp of the spiritual principles governing Indian life, and that these in turn can be apprehended only via a grounding in the Indian relationship to the environment" (Jaimes, 1988, p. 9).

Mexican American\Chicano Studies

## Definition

The emphasis on community is a particularly strong theme within Chicano Studies. As stated in the Chicano Coordinating Council of Higher Education (1969) El Plan de Santa Barbara Chicano Studies is, "in the final analysis, the re-discovery and the re-conquest of the self and of the community by Chicanos" (p. 40).

Sánchez (1970) addressed a number of features common to the various Chicano Studies programs: (a) the study of contributions of the Mexican American to American culture and society; (b) promotion of better understanding among all Americans; (c) dissemination of information to wide numbers of people who encounter Mexican Americans and (d) promotion of higher education for Chicanos.

Dr. Guerra (Sánchez, 1970) noted the necessity of developing a bilingual, bicultural value system. "Ethnic studies," Guerra stated, "will put in perspective the sins of omission of our history textbooks and the misinterpretation of bilingual talents viewed as language handicaps" (p. 39). Rochin & de la Torre (1986) placed emphasis on developing a community of Chicano scholars, individuals dedicated to research and publication of articles in traditional journals.

## History

Sánchez (1970) identified more than 80 institutions of higher learning that had begun Mexican American study programs or departments. However, he noted the lack of definitive or coordinated efforts to develop a common pattern of program offerings. He cited Dr. Guerra, who said, "We are often treating the symptoms and not the causes. Just as we are concerned about the small number of Chicano . . . students in our college classrooms, more important is the proper intellectual idealism and scientific discipline which will reach into the heart of the barrio and correctly analyze the complex problems that still defeat the people" (p. 36).

Contemporary Chicano Studies was also a child of the 1960s. In the midst of the Civil Rights movement, the Black Studies movement, the Ethnic Studies and Third World movements in general, the call for Chicano Studies could be heard. Mexican youth were concerned with the same issues as other students--Vietnam, civil rights, racism, poverty--and they were "concerned with access to institutions of higher learning that historically had systematically excluded them. They demanded from the university an education that would teach them about their people's culture and history and provide them with the knowledge and training needed to make changes in their respective communities. Chicano studies was the direct result of their demands" (Muñoz, 1984, p. 5).

Muñoz (1984) notes that Chicano Studies was largely a California product. The largest population of people of Mexican descent in the United States lived in California. The vast majority of programs were located on the campuses of the

University of California and the California State College and University systems. Chicano Studies was given a high priority by the Chicano student movement in California.

By the fall of 1968 several administrators at California colleges and universities had responded to student demands for courses about different aspects of the Chicano experience. At the California State College at Los Angeles, the first department of Mexican American Studies developed out of two courses, one on the Politics of the Southwest and the other on Mexican-American History. They were taught by part-time instructors who were first-year graduate students in Political Science and Latin-American Studies. (Muñoz, 1984)

In addition to the Black Civil Rights movement and the Black Power movement, the direct involvement and exposure to the farmworker movement led by Cesar Chavez in California, and to some extent the struggle for land waged by Reies López Tijerina in northern New Mexico, helped raise the consciousness of students and moved many of the leaders in these organizations to move in the direction of a distinct Chicano political perspective. Involvement in local community politics also provided experiences which broadened their understanding of the nature of racial oppression in their respective communities and encouraged them to further action.

Muñoz (1984) noted how few scholars of Mexican descent there were in institutions of higher education prior to the 1960s. Four who stood out were: George Sánchez, Américo Paredes, Julián Samora, and Ernesto Galarza. Sánchez was a scholar at the University of Texas at Austin, committed to community activism and

scholarly research. Sánchez's The Forgotten People was a study of New Mexico and the invisibility of Mexican Americans during the "march of imperialism" to gain territory. (Muñoz, 1983, p. 20-22) Américo Paredes played a key role in the establishment of the Mexican American Studies Center at the University of Texas at Austin in 1970, serving as its first Director. His work focused on the history of resistance and struggle of Mexican people in the United States. Julián Samora was one of the first scholars of Mexican descent to focus on political leadership in the Chicano community. He established the Mexican American Studies Center at Notre Dame and helped establish a Mexican American Studies publication series through the University of Notre Dame Press. As an independent scholar, Ernesto Galarza contributed a great deal to the field of Chicano Studies. He was involved in the labor movement and governmental affairs, and with his first book, The Merchants of Labor, played a key role in the termination of the bracero program, a program of hiring Mexican nationals for seasonal work in the United States. All four of these scholars affected the young activists of the 1960s, who would build on their pioneering works and their example of action-oriented community based research. They were a critical force in the establishment of a Mexican academic intellectual tradition in the United States.

In the fall of 1967 a Chicano student group named Quinto Sol at the University of California, Berkeley, published its first issue of El Grito: A Journal of Contemporary Mexican-American Thought. El Grito became the first Chicano intellectual journal in the history of the United States, and, under the editorship of

Octavio Romano-V, was of paramount importance to the development of Chicano Studies. Romano-V criticized Anglo scholars for the stereotyping of Chicanos as passive and ahistorical, and challenged Chicanos to produce their own scholarship to demonstrate that Chicanos have some control over their own destiny (Garcia, 1983).

In an effort to bring coherence to the various programs in California, a Chicano Coordinating Council on Higher Education (CCCHE) was formed by students, faculty and staff who were actively involved in these programs. They called for a statewide conference to formulate a plan of action that could provide direction for the overall struggle for Chicanos to have equal access to higher education. The conference took place in April 1969 at the University of California, Santa Barbara and was restricted to one hundred participants. Twenty-nine campuses throughout the State of California sent two official student representatives; the rest were faculty and other university staff, and community activists involved in educational programs in Chicano communities. Some 30-50 uninvited guests also attended the three day conference. The conference was structured around nine workshops broken down into two categories. The first, "technical operations," addressed recruitment, support programs, funding and legislation, Chicano studies curriculum, and the "institutionalizing" of Chicano studies programs. The second category "political operations," focused on statewide communication and coordination, university community relations, campus organization, and political action. The latter provided the thrust for the formation of MEChA (El Movimiento Estudiantil Chicano de Aztlan), the statewide student movement, while the first category furnished the

impetus for the establishment of Chicano Studies programs and the strategy for the expanding Equal Opportunity Programs (EOP) to include a focus on Chicano students. The establishment of Chicano Studies programs, however, was perceived as the key objective to the successful implementation of all the goals of the conference (Muñoz, 1984, p. 10).

The organizers of the conference said that Chicano Studies represented "the total conceptualization of the Chicano community's aspirations that involve higher education. To meet these ends, the university and college systems of the State of California must act in the following basic areas: (a) admission and recruitment of Chicano students, faculty, administrators, and staff; (b) a curriculum program and an academic major relevant to the Chicano cultural and historical experience; (c) support and tutorial programs (d) research programs; (e) publications programs and (f) community cultural and social action centers (Muñoz, 1984, p. 10-11).

The conference was considered a success beyond the expectations of the organizers. It served to unify the divergent perspectives and allowed the participants to develop a sense of shared unity.

The Chicano master plan was published in October 1969 with the title of El Plan de Santa Barbara (Plan). The document stressed anti-assimilation and anti-racism as the point of departure of Chicano Studies. It placed the development of those programs within the context of the politics of change. Jesús Chavarría, an assistant professor in the Department of History at Santa Barbara, and one of the principal organizers of the conference, helped provide the philosophical framework of the

document. This framework came from a proposal for Chicano studies written for the UCSB campus by Chavarria.

The Plan outlined three premises for Chicano programs: (a) the colleges/universities must be a major instrument in the liberation of the Chicano community; (b) colleges/universities have a three-fold responsibility--education, research, and public service to the Chicano community and (c) the larger purposes of the academic institutions and the interest of the Chicano community can only be served by comprehensive programs instituted and implemented by and for Chicanos with a focus on the needs and goals of the community. (CCCHE, 1969, p. 11-12)

"In short, Chicano students are seeking an authentic freedom of expression within the university and society at large. Their call is for authentic diversification of American culture, a prospect which can only enrich the university's fulfillment of its cultural mission" (Muñoz, 1984, p. 11-12).

There have been differing views on how definitive a document the Plan was. Initially, Muñoz (1984) viewed it as a guideline, a set of recommendations and general analytical framework designed to place the development of programs in a proper perspective. Others preferred to view it as a blueprint. As one editor of the Plan later stated, "The seminal statement on Chicano Studies is the Plan de Santa Barbara . . . They were as clear and concrete as policy statements are and as pragmatic as called for by the reality of the time . . . . The six year old Plan is as relevant as the 200 year old Declaration of Independence" (p.12).

Muñoz (1984) described two major developments that occurred after the conference. One was the establishment of a journal named Aztlan: Chicano Journal of the Social Sciences and the Arts founded by MEChA activists at UCLA. The editors wanted to generate the kind of research called for by the Plan de Santa Barbara, research that produced rigorous analysis about the historical conditions and struggles of Chicanos useful to the development of a distinct Chicano consciousness. The other was the establishment of a National Association of Chicano Social Scientists in 1973. A goal of the association was to "generate the 'committed scholarship' necessary to 'contribute to Chicano liberation'" (p. 15). They defined the goals of Chicano research as having to be: (a) problem-oriented; (b) interdisciplinary in nature; (c) able to bridge the gap between theory and action; (d) critical of American institutions and (e) committed to studying the Chicano community within the context of the relationship between class, race, and culture. In 1975, the association changed its name to National Association for Chicano Studies to include Chicano Studies in the humanities (Muñoz, 1983).

## Structure

Autonomy and control were very important to the makers of the Plan. "If Chicanos do not exert dominant influence over the program, better no program at all" (p. 16). They saw this issue in terms of dignity and survival. "The Chicano programs must be as free and independent of all existing programs as possible." (p. 16). They

felt if non-Chicano participation had to occur, then the Chicano element should have the right of nomination and selection of all participants. (CCCHE, 1969, p. 16-17)

In the Plan, advocates called for a structure that would facilitate the most control and autonomy. It did not matter whether it was a program, department, college, or center. The critical element was freedom. Communication lines to top administrators must be direct and the organizational structure independent from existing hierarchy.

A separate university was the ideal. However, within existing structures the makers of the Plan agreed that the "college is perhaps the most suitable structure for a wide set of programs because of its defined autonomy in nearly all areas considered as integral for a viable Chicano program" (CCCHE, p. 20). They also acknowledged that a Chicano Studies department could be an effective means of developing and implementing a Chicano curriculum. A department was seen as an autonomous unit with control of its curriculum and with the ability to structure that curriculum in a variety of ways. It could also secure its own faculty.

Rochin & de la Torre (1986) identified a number of common features of several Chicano programs: (a) courses were largely taught by Chicano faculty members and were interdisciplinary in nature; (b) most programs offered a major and/or minor in Chicano or Ethnic Studies; (c) all programs had courses requiring fluency in Spanish; (d) almost all had a small core of faculty and/or administrators in charge of the programs; (e) most programs listed either joint or "associated" faculty who teach, advise or do research as part of the program.

At San Fernando Valley State College a proposal for Chicano Studies called for a traditional departmental structure for the Department of Mexican American Studies. At San Francisco State College, a Department of Raza Studies was proposed within the School of Ethnic Studies. Similarly, at UC Berkeley, Chicano Studies was proposed to be set up within the structure of a Third World College. The University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA), called for the establishment of a Center emphasizing research.

The proposal at UC Santa Barbara was perhaps the most ambitious. It called for a Chicano Studies Center to include a department, a research component, and a community-university component to develop cultural and "urban-change" programs. There was a strong emphasis on providing students with the necessary technical and educational skills to go back to their community and change it where necessary (Muñoz, 1984, p. 7-9).

Muñoz (1984) identified several common elements found in proposals such as the above. They consistently recognized a need for: (a) Chicano/Latino students to receive a relevant education; (b) the importance of community in the educational process; (c) the need to study the contributions of Chicanos to American culture and society; (d) a recognition that Chicanos, have been excluded from the educational process; (e) the promotion of a better understanding of Chicanos among all Americans; (f) a recognition of the value of practical problem-solving skills and (g) the encouragement of Chicanos to pursue higher education.

A Chicano Studies Institute (CSI) was established in 1970 under the National Foundation on the Humanities, which in conjunction with the University of Colorado at Boulder, the University of Arizona at Tempe, and California State College at Long Beach, contracted with a Chicano consulting firm to coordinate and develop their respective Chicano Studies. The CSI program was designed to develop standards for curricula that would lead to undergraduate and graduate degrees in Mexican American Studies. One of the objectives of the CSI was to "provide a periodic and continuous review of Chicano Studies programs in colleges and universities and to offer timely revisions as necessary as these programs develop in institutions of higher learning" (Sánchez, 1970, p. 37-38).

## Issues

### Resistance

By the time the Plan was published in October 1969, many of the Chicano Studies programs were embroiled in struggles with campus administrations over the questions of control, funding, objectives, role of students, and staffing. Decision-makers in the university were resistent to implementing these programs. Student strikes at San Francisco State College in 1968 and at the UC, Berkeley in 1969 demanding Chicano and Ethnic Studies resulted in violent confrontations between police and student protesters.

In response to efforts of Chicano faculty to allow students and community representatives a voice in the governance of Chicano Studies program, the

administration at Fresno State College fired all the faculty and temporarily shut down the program until the administration hired new faculty it perceived more in accord with an "academic orientation."

Internal Conflict

Although there was some agreement on the need for Chicano Studies, expectations and emphasis was out of sync. Some emphasized the importance of these programs in addressing cultural identity issues, some stressed academics, and others focused on providing a training ground for community organizers. Advocates for Chicano Studies programs could not escape internal conflict. At UCLA, the director of the Chicano Studies Center, a Chicano sociologist who had been recruited from Yale, was asked to resign by MEChA on the grounds that he was pursuing the objectives of UCLA and not those of the students or the Chicano community. At California State University at San Diego, Chicano faculty who up until 1973 were developing a Marxist orientation, were ousted by those who represented "cultural and revolutionary nationalist concepts." At California State University at Northridge, Chicano Studies became divided over the issue of sexism that emerged over the firing of a woman faculty member (Muñoz, 1984, p. 9-14).

Summary

The struggles to establish the various Ethnic Studies programs meet with similar challenge and resistance. Conflict over definition, structure to allow autonomy, challenges to the concept of Ethnic Studies as a discipline. These same issues affected the development of Ethnic Studies at Western. As the 1970s would progress support for cultural pluralism would increasingly diminish, and would have a definite impact upon the planning, teaching, and survival of ethnic studies programs.

# CHAPTER THREE

# METHODS

Summary

Initially, I viewed my study as a comparative examination. Fairhaven and Huxley still exist, why not Ethnic Studies? Eventually, the focus shifted from a comparative study to a simple recounting of CES's story. I intended to do an oral history. Through a series of interviews the story of CES would emerge. A number of circumstances, however, made it difficult for me to take this approach. I did not anticipate the large volume of material related to CES, including a number of reports, memoranda, letters, minutes, brochures, scant information on faculty, which was scattered about and undigested. Much work lay before me to sift through this mass of material to tell a clear and succinct story.

Geography and timing also proved to be barriers. While a few key players are still at Western and accessible, several others are not. The first Dean, Ron Williams, died a few years ago, as did R.D. Brown, who, as Academic Dean, played a pivotal role in the Administration's initial support of CES. Of the twenty-seven faculty and staff who worked at CES, only two continue to actively work at Western. Consequently, I decided to concentrate on primary sources, limiting my interviews to a few select representatives from students, faculty and administrators.

Merriam (1988) states that a case study is an examination of a specific phenomenon such as a program, an event, a person, a process, an institution, or a social group. Researchers generally choose this approach when they are most

interested in "insight, discovery, and interpretation rather than hypothesis testing" (pp. 9-10). "An historical examination of an educational program can be labeled a historical case study" (p. 35). The historical case study places emphasis on the use of primary source material, and "the notion of investigating the phenomena over a period of time" (p. 25). It was this approach then, which guided me through this investigation.

I interviewed five individuals including a student who graduated from CES, a student who left without graduating, a former faculty member, a Dean, and a President. I used an open-ended interviewing approach. In the interviews I tried to focus on what CES meant to each person, how they saw CES's strengths and weaknesses, and their views of why it did not continue.

The following are a few sample questions asked:

1. What were the critical events in the history of CES which contributed to or detracted from its successful operation?
2. What would you say were the fundamental strengths and weaknesses of the College of Ethnic Studies?
4. What was your overall feeling about CES?
5. Were you aware of any internal conflicts?
6. How did you see the mission of Ethnic Studies?
7. What do you think should or could have been done differently?
8. What do you recall about the faculty and staff?
9. What future do you see for Ethnic Studies at Western?

# CHAPTER FOUR

# CASE STUDY

## Introduction

Higher Education experienced an infusion of new students during the late 1950s and 1960s. Western Washington State College was not immune to this influx. Arthur Hicks, author of Western at 75, considered 1959 as the "Great Divide." Before that year Western was relatively small, with a primary emphasis on teaching. After 1959, Western grew in size and complexity with an expanded curriculum and an increasingly diverse student body, faculty and staff. In 1959 student enrollment was 4,505; by 1970, it was 10,672. Growth occurred in the faculty as well, tripling in number between 1959 and the early 1970s. In 1959 the count was 155; fourteen years later it was 477. The proportion of faculty possessing doctorates also grew as a result of the increased emphasis on specialization and the changing standards for promotion and tenure. By 1973 approximately 70%, or 338, of the faculty had doctorates. (Hicks, 1974, p. 96)

This overwhelming growth created a desire in many to return to a past when learning occurred in a more intimate environment. At the same time there was pressure to develop programs to meet the needs of the new and diverse student population. In response, Dr. Paul Woodring, of the Education Department, recommended in 1965 the establishment of a "cluster college" limited to 600 students. Such a unit within a large college might help recapture some of the style and sense of a smaller college.

Out of Woodring's suggestion Fairhaven College was conceived "with its own faculty and program of liberal education, an experimental approach to curricular and teaching strategies, and a large measure of freedom for the students to plan their own education and to participate in the governance of the new college" (Hicks, 1974, p. 87). Dr. Charles W. Harwood, Chair of the Department of Psychology, was appointed Dean, and in 1967 a pilot project with a small number of students was launched.

Huxley College was the second cluster college approved by the Board of Trustees. It opened in 1969 with Dr. Gene Miller as the first Dean. Huxley was to focus on environmental studies, with an interdisciplinary program in the natural and social sciences, limited to only upper division and graduate students. Like Fairhaven, Huxley was designed to be autonomous, with a small student body, and a faculty encompassing a variety of disciplines. Unlike Fairhaven, it was not residential, and would begin at the sophomore year.

As late as 1965, very few minority students attended Western. However, during the late 1960s and early 1970s Western, like many schools throughout the nation, was involved with a number of programs concerned with disadvantaged children and youth. These programs were early attempts by Western to address minority and ethnic concerns.

Project Overcome began the summer of 1965 and was designed to address the problems of disadvantaged children with potential for higher education. The program was directed by Thomas Billings, of the Education Department, and financed

primarily by the Office of Economic Opportunity. During the summer of 1965 fifty high school juniors spent eight weeks on Western's campus as early preparation for entry into Western.

Project Catch-Up grew out of Project Overcome. It was a two year program designed, for six weeks during the summer, focusing on junior high school students "caught between the prejudice of the past and the facade of the future"(WWSC, 1967, p. 10). During the first summer there were 26 American Indians, 14 Caucasians, and 14 Mexican Americans when the program started in June 1966.

Western became one of the first colleges in the nation to participate in the Upward Bound Program. This program was designed to attract secondary school students who had potential, but were disadvantaged economically, educationally, or, in the parlance of the times, disadvantaged "culturally," to keep them college bound. The program was structured around a full-time summer program followed up during the regular school year.

During the spring of 1969 Western instituted a special admission policy to allow "culturally and economically deprived students . . . special consideration for admission to Western" (Staff, 1969a, p. 95). One hundred faculty contributed 1% of their income to set up economic assistance for these students. A thousand dollars was given to the Black Student Union (BSU) for recruitment of these students. Twenty-seven people were interviewed, twenty-five admitted, and fifteen enrolled fall quarter.

Phase One -- Conception

The Board of Trustees established the College of Ethnic Studies (CES or Ethnic Studies) on October 9, 1969. Unlike Fairhaven and Huxley, the College of Ethnic Studies was born out of political conflict, agitation from minority students, faculty, and staff. Neither Fairhaven nor Huxley experienced the intense opposition Ethnic Studies had to face. Bernie Thomas, an American Indian graduate of Upward Bound and the College of Ethnic Studies, recalls the College originating "as a result of a number of the ethnic student groups who were disturbed about the absence of culturally relevant materials being present within the curriculum" (B. Thomas, personal interview, September 17, 1992).

Charles J. Flora, President of Western from 1968-1975, recalled how much resistance there was to the cluster college concept as well as Ethnic Studies. "Many people felt the idea of studying people by race or gender was intellectually fallacious. People felt we should focus on the works, not on the race. The whole idea of the cluster college was to provide something unique that could flourish and not be swallowed up by the larger institution. The concept itself of a cluster college was opposed by many people" (C. J. Flora, personal interview, October 18, 1992).

Ethnic Studies becoming a college was a result of timing and pressure more than design. Strong sentiment existed on campus that Western should have a third cluster college, and that Western needed to do more in the area of minority students and education. During 1968-69 two committees were in operation, one looking at minority and ethnic issues on campus, the other at the possibility of a third cluster

college. These two explorations traveled separate paths until 1968 when they were bonded, after much discussion and debate, by the decision to make Ethnic Studies the third cluster college.

The Ad Hoc Committee for Programs On Minority Cultures (Ad Hoc Committee) was charged "to study curricular programs and to submit proposals to the Academic Council" (Ad Hoc Committee, 1969a, p. 1). Their Interim Report was turned in on January 23, 1969, and debated and accepted at the January 28, 1969 meeting of the Academic Council. The Academic Council (AC) was a 12 member board, chaired by the Academic Dean, responsible for oversight of curricular issues.

The report covered five basic areas for a program of study: (a) a definition of minority cultures; (b) a rationale for ethnic studies--particularly Afro-American or Black Studies; (c) a proposal for a satellite College of Ethnic Studies; (d) a brief explanation of program content and (e) an example of a three-course sequence in Black Literature.

At the January 28 meeting, Thaddeus Spratlen, chair of the Ad Hoc Committee, drew the connection between minority cultures and ethnic studies when he said, "The ad hoc committee views the study of minority cultures as ethnic studies . . . with primary emphasis on the condition, relationship, behavior, etc, that might be associated primarily with the nonwhite minorities of the United States" (Academic Council, 1969a, p. 1).

The report attempted to define ethnic studies as a "comprehensive framework of comparative and analytical appraisal of the experience, conditions, and relationships

between whites and nonwhites in America as reflected in all forms of expression and behavior" (p. 2). And as a rationale for studying this experience, the committee said: "The life experience of whites and nonwhites in America, though inextricably intertwined, is nonetheless distinctive. One of the major facets of the study of minorities . . . is to more fully understand the meaning and extent of their distinctiveness, their ethnicity" (p. 2).

The Committee proposed the establishment of a cluster college "to coordinate, formulate, and administer an ethnic studies program at Western" (p. 3). They based this proposal on the following: (a) the need for flexibility, experimentation and continuing evaluation; (b) the interdisciplinary nature of the curriculum; (c) the desire to provide a different and more relevant kind of education and (d) the need for faculty members to be recruited for special assignments and arrangements not generally appropriate in conventional departmental units.

Initially the program content would emphasize Afro-American or Black Studies, until resources, faculty, and interest made it conducive to add other areas such as American Indians and Mexican Americans.

Faculty on the Academic Council raised questions concerning the program's long range goals, relevance to Western, and focus on one group. Dr. Spratlen addressed the long range goal question by emphasizing the committee's desire for the nonwhite experience to be incorporated into the collegiate programs. "Its purpose is to give expression to what this experience and this aspect of American culture and history really has been all along, but for a variety of reasons has been neglected or not

recognized as having the kind of substance for collegiate studies" (Academic Council, 1969a, p. 2).

One member questioned why Afro-Americans would be interested in such a program at Western, "certainly they are not going to come here just to study their own ethnic culture. They would come here more to understand the other side of the coin, which is the majority ethnic culture, so that they may be more successful in occupying a more respected place, a more advantageous place, in our Western civilization" (Academic Council, 1969a, p. 4).

E. Curmie Price, a member of the Ad Hoc Committee answered: "The problem that we are having here is that white people have found it peculiarly possible to talk about themselves without talking about black people. White people can talk about America and what it means, and not ever mention black people. . . . One of the great responsibilities, if we are really going to move ahead intellectually in this area, is that we are going to have to encourage whites to question the way in which they have done their research" (Academic Council, 1969a, p. 4).

To the question of why the primary focus on one group, McDonnell, another member of the Ad Hoc Committee responded: "Most of the examples are from the area of negro life. We were drawing on the strength that we now have at Western in order to provide examples. Had we had someone on the committee who could speak about Mexican and American-Indian matters, we would probably have had examples from those areas" (Academic Council, 1969a, p. 2).

Considerable discussion occurred at the February 4, 1969 Academic Council meeting around the issue of "Why a College?" Questions were raised whether a college would make the program exclusive. "The ethnic studies unit we are proposing," McDonnell said, "is a college in at least three ways; . . . it has a faculty; . . . a program, and . . . a body of students. . . . The courses in this program must be open to students at Western college" (p. 2).

In response to further concerns expressed about the proposal, Price elaborated upon the rationale for a college model:

> We are aiming for something which is innovative and flexible. Also, we are very interested in the kind of curricular arrangement, which can be changed from time to time, and which can be changed with the minimum of confusion and difficulty. We feel that there ought to be a core of courses which are given. We desire a faculty oriented college where there are basic courses offered from year to year, but where it is also possible to offer courses which are really reflective of what the teachers and scholars in this college are interested in at any given moment. We feel that in this the department framework presents certain difficulties. (p. 2)

And finally, committee member Thompson added: "One thing that impedes innovation in departments is the sheer mass of traditional academic apparatus . . . . One of the major reasons for a college is to provide the very vehicle that will promote the kinds of freedom needed here. I don't think we can effectively separate the nature

of the unit from the type of program. . . . The college recommendation is a necessary part of this report" (p. 3).

Additional concerns expressed by Academic Council members centered upon whether the Committee took a good look at what Western currently had to offer in this area and the utilization of departmental resources that already exist. "We would not . . . wish to duplicate whatever resources there are available in Western" (Academic Council, 1969b, p. 3). Spratlen continued, "I don't see that establishing an administrative unit for developing a program precludes the contributions of those who have an interest. . . " (Academic Council, 1969b, p. 3). At a later meeting, Spratlen added, "What we are talking about here is not something that would in any way eliminate the departments in this area, but would rather supplement their contribution, but, within a quite different context" (Academic Council, 1969c, p. 2).

On April 7, 1969 the Committee submitted its Second Report calling for a partial implementation of the program by fall 1969, with 50 freshmen, and four full-time equivalent faculty, and recommendations for long-range development calling for an enrollment of 300 students by 1970-71. In addition, they recommended that the program consist of a major and minor as well as a general education component, and that the courses be separated from the current quarter system allowing students "to proceed through it at a pace suited to their aptitudes and needs" (Ad Hoc Committee, 1969b, p. 1). The report also addressed the multidisciplinary character of the programs with an emphasis on the following three groups: Afro-American, "Indian-American," and Mexican-Americans.

In response to the discussion above, the committee supported the establishment of a college by identifying a need for (a) flexibility, innovation, and wide discretion in policies and procedures; (b) reasonable autonomy in budgetary operations; (c) accounting procedures independent of the quarter system and other standardized time or course sequences; (d) authority greater than that vested in departments; (e) the need to enhance the identity and academic stature of the program; (f) an administrative unit that can respond to changing characteristics of students, and the nature of study of ethnicity and (g) faculty strongly identified with and committed to ethnic studies.

On April 16, 1969, R.D. Brown, the Academic Dean, in response to the reports of the Ad Hoc Committee for Programs On Minority Cultures and the actions of the Academic Council, proposed to: (a) recruit a director for the Ethnic Studies program; (b) establish a Policy Board to begin negotiations on the program for the coming year; (c) instruct the Policy Board to design a study to determine the effectiveness of the program and (d) authorize the Director to commence the recruitment of staff (Memorandum).

In September 1969 the Board of Trustees approved the "establishment of a new program devoted to ethnic studies" (Staff, 1969b, p. 3), but denied college status. President Flora, the Faculty Council and Academic Council had all approved the recommendation of a College of Ethnic Studies. One Trustee member objected fearing that such a college might foster racial segregation and cause student unrest on campus. The next month, on October 9, the Board unanimously approved giving the

program of Ethnic Studies college status, and appointed Dr. Ronald Williams of the Communications Department, Dean of the College. Wilfred Wasson from Anthropology was placed in charge of Indian Studies, Curmie Price, from the English Department, in charge of Afro-American Studies; Tomas Ybarra was asked to serve as a consultant for Mexican-American studies.

Phase Two: 1969-1971

The Board of Trustees established the College of Ethnic Studies with two major goals in mind: to provide an academic setting in which minority cultures and histories were studied and to create instructional procedures that allow students to assume greater responsibility for the direction of their studies and the shaping of their educational experience (WWSC, 1971-73, p. 48).

As stated in the CES brochure, minority studies programs must not be established along traditional or narrow lines but rather within a structure that "will encourage American students to know and to come to terms with the inclusive nature of their worlds and their society, including its conflicts, tensions and possible resolutions" (p. 1).

Jesse Hiraoka, the third Dean of Ethnic Studies, noted the mixed expectations between the administration and the students. "The Administration was interested in solving a political problem. The students thought the purpose was to get more minority students, greater financial assistance, equality, and services" (J. Hiraoka, Personal Interview, July 21, 1991).

Two adverse events accompanied the launching of the College of Ethnic Studies. The first was the downward turn of the Washington State economy. Private and public institutions were severely affected. In response, President Flora established two ad hoc committees, one on curriculum, the other on non-instructional aspects of the college, "to find better ways at less cost to carry out the mission of this college" (Flora, 1971, p. 2). After 25 years of steady expansion this was a new reality for Western. Flora alerted the Western community that we "must now examine . . . evaluate . . . establish priorities and admit honestly that some programs or parts of them should be eliminated" (Flora, 1971, p. 2).

Although Flora recognized the seriousness of the financial situation, one of his highest concerns was the "increased politization" on campus. As Hiraoka later observed, the "fortunes of CES rose and fell with the amount of money available. As long as standard areas got their share, they didn't pay much attention to others" (J. Hiraoka, personal interview, March 31, 1992). As individuals and departments and units sought to protect themselves, educational objectives and missions were pushed aside. A not uncommon campus response to the budget situation was to point fingers at someone else's program as the one that should be cut. The Cluster Colleges were seen by many as the most logical place to slice. "None of them could survive," Flora later said, "unless they had the absolute support of the top administrators of the institution" (C. J. Flora, personal interview, October 8, 1992).

President Flora addressed this directly in his 1971 "State of the College" address:

> I have often heard that our cluster colleges are funded more than their fair share, that they survive at the expense of the rest of the institution. Such is not the case. As of this fall the average instructional cost for all of Western Washington State College was $4.23 per student credit hour. The most expensive department cost $8.18 per student credit hour; the least expensive department, $1.77 per student credit hour, while the cluster colleges were as follows: Fairhaven 4.50 per student credit hour; Ethnic Studies 7.01; Huxley 4.53 And as these colleges grow toward their projected sizes, the costs will decline. (Flora, 1971, p. 2)

President Flora continued to speak with pride and optimism about the establishment of the College of Ethnic Studies. "Though it struggled into being against a mountain of opposition, Ethnic Studies is fast becoming an established and widely accepted facet of Western. . . . Its charge is broad, staff is strong, its standards are high, and its promise is bright" (Flora, 1971, p. 2) Later Flora would still remember "the horrendous effort that was required" in establishing the College (C.J. Flora, personal interview, October 8, 1992).

The second adverse event accompanying the launching of the College of Ethnic Studies was the resignation of Ron Williams effective June 30, 1971. Hiraoka believes Williams had wanted to move "the College in the direction of a legitimate cluster college. Find the best minority students and give them a new style of education. The original idea was that this would be a high powered unit to produce high powered

minority leaders" (J. Hiraoka, personal interview, July 12, 1991). He also believes Williams saw that he could not get his idea of developing leaders to take root. "Student demands were for financial aid" (J. Hiraoka, personal interview, July 12, 1991). Williams decided Bellingham was not where he wanted to raise his children. Williams said his decision to leave Western was made as the result of personal reasons which required that he re-locate on the East Coast. He accepted a position as Chairman of the Department of Communication Sciences at Federal City College in Washington, DC.

Several other faculty left at this time: Curmie Price and Tomas Ybarra also left; and although he was not a member of CES, Thaddeus Spratlen's departure left an impact on the College.

Phase Three: 1971-1972

Dr. Sergio D. Elizondo was the second Dean of the College of Ethnic Studies. His appointment was approved by the Board of Trustees on February 4, 1971. He took over on July 1, 1971.

Dr. Elizondo was born in Mexico in 1930, educated there until he earned a Bachelor of Arts degree in Social Studies at Findlay College, Ohio, and his Ph.D. in Romance Languages in 1964 from the University of North Carolina. He came to Western from California State College in San Bernardino where he was associate professor in the Humanities Department.

The third year was a particularly frustrating and tumultuous year for the College of Ethnic Studies. In an article by Sue Gawrys in the February 4, 1972 issue of the Western Front, several Black students spoke of their frustrations at Western. They expressed a feeling of not being supported and of people being more interested in ecology than social justice like they were in the 1960s.

The Black Student Union (BSU), which began in the spring of 1967 with about 13 members, was comprised of about 130 Black students by winter of 1972. About 36 BSU members were involved with the College of Ethnic Studies at this time. Many said they came to Western because of the College. Some, like Curtis Knight, even thought CES "was set up for minorities" (p. 7).

Chicano students were also interviewed in the same issue of the Western Front. MEChA (Movimiento Estudiantil Chicano de Aztlan) had, at this time, about 25 members. MEChA had begun in 1969 with five members. It was an expression of their need for community. "Before MEChA was organized on campus, I felt really alone," said Maria Ivarra, Resident Director of Ridgeway Delta (p. 6).

MEChA, like BSU, concentrated on helping recruit students to Western. They distributed a newsletter to the Chicano community, tutored, and planned a statewide MEChA convention in Yakima for Spring. About 10 members were in the College of Ethnic Studies. Mary Rodriquez, a CES student from Seattle, felt good about the school. "If you don't know anything about your culture, you can learn quite a bit. With three Chicano professors, there is a lot in it for Chicanos. It's a beginning" (p. 6).

At this time the minority population of CES was 58.2%. There were 55 Whites, 35 Blacks, 15 Chicanos, 11 Native Americans, 5 Asian Americans, and one Panamanian student (R. Johnson, 1972, p. 4-5).

According to R. Johnson (1972), the 68 minority students and nine faculty at Ethnic Studies comprised 29.2 % of the total minority population. There were approximately 240 minority students enrolled at Western at this time, with a population of 152 Blacks, 27 Native Americans, 27 Chicanos, and 34 Asian Americans. There were approximately 20 minority instructors at Western, including those in the College of Ethnic Studies. The faculty included: eight Blacks, three Native Americans, three Chicanos, and six Asian Americans. (p. 5) There is some discrepancy in these figures. According to the 1978 Western Washington University Factbook, the Minority Affairs Office reported 428 minority students for fall, 1972. Nevertheless, CES still comprised a significant percentage of the total minority population (p. II-7).

This was a time of conflict, confusion, and mixed agendas. "It was a matter of survival, not simply getting support," said Robert Kim, a faculty member in the College of Ethnic Studies (R. Kim, personal interview, August 28, 1992). He described these years as filled with a "great deal of doubt about the success of our continuity of ethnic studies as an interdisciplinary field. Doubt within the college about our own identity within Western. Will we survive? Had to develop our own sense of who we are" (R. Kim, personal interview, August 28, 1992). Kim continued, "The Interdisciplinary nature of the program brought a great deal of

confusion. It was even hard to define what ethnic studies was. Could not agree on terms we were to use . . . Confusion reigned" (R. Kim, personal interview, August 28, 1992).

Hiraoka described the internal conflict that existed during this period. "Black Studies felt they initiated everything. Most militant staff. Student leadership felt they were in control. When the Dean shifted, some Chicano students tried to compete with the Black leadership. Fight was over who got financial aid. Students fought over the aid, maybe $20,000" (J. Hiraoka, personal interview, March 31, 1992).

By the end of winter 1972 a critical situation developed over the Provost withholding two positions from the College of Ethnic Studies. Curtis Knight, writing in the March 3 1972 issue of the Western Front, argued that CES needed those positions. "Enrollment has tripled in the three years the college has been here," he wrote and "eight faculty members cannot possibly meet the educational requirements of the minority students here, not to mention the needs of the white students in the college" (p. 2).

The rationale given for withholding the positions was student credit hours (SCH) generation. According to this formula, every 20 students carrying at least 15 credits of lower-division courses, or 11 full-time students in upper-division, courses earn one professor; seven graduate students rate one instructor. That was the ideal. The legislature, however, cut the budget to 72 per cent of this formula. The highest percentage Western had ever received up to this time was 89 per cent. (Hill, 1972, p. 12)

Segments of the faculty and administration thought Ethnic Studies was an expensive program. "I think the College of Ethnic Studies is here to stay," Provost Sargent said, "but from an administrative viewpoint, you have to decide how far you're willing to go with the limited funds available. If there is not enough money, you cannot keep everyone where they are, so you must take away from one and give to the other" (R. Johnson, 1972, p. 10). Knight argued that CES instructors had different responsibilities than other instructors. "They have to tutor and counsel, be active in community areas and be guides in the liberation struggle. These don't easily fit into the formula for SCH generation. Even if CES did not get the two positions," Knight suggested, the Provost "could at least make it known to whoever he gives the two positions to that they should be minority instructors" (Knight, 1972, p. 2).

Dr. Sargent indicated that based on Fall Quarter 1972, the cost per student credit hour for Ethnic Studies was $6.17. Huxley's cost was $5.65 and Fairhaven's cost was $3.05. The average for all of Western, including all cluster colleges, was $4.22. Only the Music Department had a higher cost, $8.50 (R. Johnson, 1972, p. 7).

Ernie Sams, Management Analysis and Systems Officer explained student credit hour generation to Johnson. He described how the cost per student credit hour is derived by dividing faculty salaries by the total faculty generated student credit hours. If an instructor teaches a five credit course, one hour a day, five days a week, in a class of twenty students, he has then generated 100 student credit hour (20 students x 5 credit course). Sams reported that the average number of credit hours generated by all Western faculty for Fall Quarter 1972 was 315.71 credit hours. The average for

all of 1972 was 313.9. The average number for Ethnic Studies in 1972 was 160. For Fall Quarter 1972 it was 161 (p. 7-8).

Sargent again: "The governor stated that these positions were to be used for the cluster colleges, only if they earned it" (p. 6).

The students were not satisfied with the administration's arguments. On Monday, May 15, 1972 a small group of students occupied a portion of Old Main near the President's office. On Tuesday morning, May 16, feeling their concerns had not been properly discussed, a larger group occupied the entire Old Main building. In the May 16, 1972 issue of the Western Front, the Associated Students of the College of Ethnic Studies placed an open letter to Provost Sargent. They argued in favor of Ethnic Studies obtaining the two positions awarded by the legislature for the cluster colleges. They reminded Sargent that,

> President Flora lobbied with the Washington State Legislature Appropriations Committee on behalf of WWSC and specifically our three existing cluster colleges. He explained to the committee that the three cluster colleges were still in the development stages and that reducing their appropriations could be disastrous to them. The result was . . . two new faculty slots . . . allotted to each of the colleges for the academic year 1971-72 and again for 1972-73.
>
> As yet, CES students have seen no such similar commitment from your office. For the last several months CES Dean Elizondo has been trying to negotiate through you and your office the release of funds which would allow us to fill two new faculty positions next year. You have not authorized this release

in spite of full justification offered by CES ("Associated Students of CES," 1972, p. 7).

In addition, the minority students listed six demands: (a) tenure for CES faculty available after two years; (b) require all education department graduates to take certain Ethnic Studies courses; (c) change Western's humanities requirement to include an ethnic studies option; (d) provide minority input, in the form of either a minority instructor or a minority teaching assistant, in all ethnic courses in the College of Arts and Sciences; (e) reform financial aid including expanded scholarships for minorities and (f) establish an off-campus cultural center.

In Normal College Knowledge, President Flora provides a vivid description of the events of that Tuesday morning:

> The door was locked behind us . . . Before me were the protesters sitting on the wooden central stairs before which they had placed a long table. A few, presumably the leaders, sat facing me at the table. Blacks, whites, Spanish-Americans, American Indians, men, women and several small children had spent the night in that old barn of a building. I heard the gentle sobbing of a baby and the soft voice of its mother trying to comfort it. All were exhausted, all were frightened. As I stood facing them, an unexpected emotion nearly overwhelmed me. I had gone there filled with anxiety and anger and now was struck by the pathos of the whole thing. My earlier fear and indignation changed to tenderness and compassion. The young people in this strange assemblage cared so much for their little College of Ethnic Studies . . . they were willing to take an enormous

risk. Individually and collectively, their's was a desperate gamble to make a point. (p. 103)

'Look, you people obviously don't believe me, you don't trust me. Let's have a neutral person come in, present the formula and explain how it works. Then let's put all the statistics for Ethnic Studies on the chalk board, do the calculations and see how they shake-out.' 'Who do you have in mind?' the spokesperson asked, 'we don't want the Provost.' 'The Vice President for Business, Mr. Don Cole,' I said, 'he has nothing to do with academic administration but is familiar with the formula and can get all the necessary statistics.' (p.105)

It was agreed and I left . . . found a telephone and asked Cole to bring the information to the meeting room. Calmly, methodically and clearly Cole explained how the formula worked. Then I asked him to do the calculations for E.S. on the board for all to see. Though I had not seen the figures . . . I knew Cole's calculations would confirm the Provost's actions. They did not!. . . The calculations showed the College of Ethnic Studies should have been allocated a base of two full positions. . . . I turned to the Dean of E.S. and said, "You are justified in having two new positions assigned to your college, how do you want them? (p. 105-106)

The demonstration was over.

Phase Four: 1972-1975

After a brief term with Dr. Robert Kim as Interim Dean, the College of Ethnic Studies' third and final Dean, Dr. Jesse Hiraoka, began his tenure in October 1972. Dean Hiraoka came from the University of California San Bernardino, where he was Professor of French. He had previously served as Chair of Humanities and played a key role in starting their Equal Opportunity Program. One of the key qualities Dr. Hiraoka was to bring to Ethnic Studies was "stability," said Kim. (R. Kim, personal interview, August 28, 1992) The next five years saw a flurry of activity: proposals, budget cuts, the addition of Human Services, and finally the decision to disband the College of Ethnic Studies.

By 1973-74, the College of Ethnic Studies was organized around five curriculum concentrations: American Indian Studies, Afro-American Studies, Chicano Studies, Asian Studies, and Comparative Cultures. It consisted of four options: (a) 55 credit Ethnic Studies major; (b) 30 credit minor to complement another area of study at Western; (c) 90 credit Honors Program designed for those students strongly committed to the pursuit of Ethnic Studies and (d) student designed major. Internships were also available in a number of government programs and in industry. Ethnic Studies had 11 positions allocated to the College at this time, including the Dean's position, with one position filled by a temporary lecturer.

For 1974-75, in the midst of campus wide reductions, CES was cut from 11 to 5.5 positions. This severely affected Western's minority profile. A subsequent

review of those cuts, in light of Affirmative Action concerns, led to the restoration of three of the positions, leaving the College with eight positions.

Dean Hiraoka paid close attention to the obstacles in the academic structure that adversely affected the development of the Ethnic Studies program. For example, "Fairhaven had total control over its own general education program. Ethnic Studies took care of 55 credits, the rest outside of the college. Fairhaven took care of 130 credits. Huxley had a full two year program. Realistically, Ethnic Studies was really a department not a college" (J. Hiraoka, personal interview, July 12, 1991). In July, 1974 Dean Hiraoka raised concern about the College of Arts & Sciences General College Requirement (GCR) Committee which had informed the Registrar's office that Ethnic Studies courses would not apply for the cross cultural category of the general education program. At the same time Ethnic Studies courses were accepted from Skagit Valley College and other community and four year colleges. Hiraoka proposed that a task force be established to examine the relationship between the cluster colleges and arts and sciences in the general education area. (Memoranda, July 29, 1974) Not until shortly before it was dispersed throughout the College of Arts & Sciences, was CES successful in getting two courses accepted as GCR's.

In 1974-75, The College of Ethnic Studies expanded to include a Human Services program. This program was geared for workers in the counseling, social welfare, and community organization agencies. The program was designed to "provide workers with more information to help them understand the people they're working with," said Hiraoka. (Sandboe, 1974, p. 9) It was an experimental degree

program. Two of the four years were field experiences, with classes relating to the work the student was doing. The other two years were general education courses and electives. Although this program was housed in the College of Ethnic Studies, in general it was operated as a separate program and evaluated as such by the various review committees.

During this period Dean Hiraoka attempted to initiate the establishment of a College of Human Studies and Services. He was confident that as presently constituted the College of Ethnic Studies would remain vulnerable, subject to dismantling. He hoped to move ahead of the flood, and expand the application of Ethnic Studies at Western. "The focus of ethnic studies has shifted increasingly to more general concerns of ethnicity as well as the ways in which specific ethnic studies courses can continue to deal with racism. Ethnic studies has had to develop and also compete for established funds and staff. Without a different context, it cannot do so. The argument here is that within a context of Human Studies and Services, Ethnic Studies would make sense since it would provide one of the programmatic contexts and not be a totally inclusive one" (College of Ethnic Studies, 1974).

Phase Five: 1975-1978

President Paul Olscamp began his tenure in the fall of 1975. He immediately established a Program Study Committee (PSC) to review and recommend whether the staff of a department or program should be increased, decreased, or maintained at the present level. The following are some factors the PSC decided to look at during its review:

1) Is the program appropriate to Western as an institution of higher learning?
2) What is the effectiveness of programs at Western in terms of student and other forms of evaluation, of faculty credentials, and of potential for future development? What overlap and replication of programs exist?
3) Which programs are operating significantly above or below formula?
4) Which programs are stable, rising, or declining in enrollment?
5) What has been the experience of relatively new programs at Western? What new programs are needed? (Memorandum, 1975).

As part of its study, the PSC sent out a questionnaire to programs and units. In October 1975 Dean Hiraoka responded to the questionnaire sent to CES. I excerpt a few below:

**Question: Is there a viable clientele for a College of Ethnic Studies in the Geographical Area Served by Western?**

There is a "viable clientele" for a college dealing with ethnic studies....There is a clientele since our program is increasingly directed to all students. This is why I

have persistently argued that our exclusion from the general college requirements is de facto an Arts and Sciences definition of our program, whereas we should be allowed to interest as many students as possible.

**Question: How do you explain the declining enrollment in Ethnic Studies?**

The explanation would be complex:

1. View of Ethnic Studies as a non-usable major.
2. The difficulty of obtaining a double major in order to deal with the job market, e.g. English-Ethnic Studies.
3. The loss of the original catalyst group which helped found the College of Ethnic Studies.
4. View of Western Washington State College as non-responsive to minority needs. . . .
7. Internal battles among ethnic groups which led to some disillusionment.
8. Lack of financial aid and work study when compared to UW.
9. No general college requirement course to introduce Ethnic Studies to the total campus population and serve as a recruitment ground.
10. Persistence of a limited view of Ethnic Studies on the part of W.W.S.C. faculty.
11. Direct advising against taking Ethnic Studies courses by certain faculty members of W.W.S.C.

**Question: How do you account for the large turnover in your minority faculty?**

> There has been no turnover in our faculty since 1972, except for RIF. The major turnover was in 1971 when the staff went from 10 to 2 and a major decision could then have been made about the fate of Ethnic Studies. (Memorandum, 1975)

The PSC submitted its final report to the President on March 23, 1976. "In its enrollment, spirit, impact, and relation to the rest of the campus," the committee indicated in its report, "our College of Ethnic Studies has not met the expectations of its founders" (Program Study Committee, 1976a, p. 10-11). The committee restated the original purpose of the College of Ethnic Studies: (a) to promote the scholarly study of ethnicity, especially that of Blacks, Chicanos, and American Indians; (b) to provide a center with which minority students could identify and where the style and content of instruction would be adapted to meet their special needs and (c) to challenge and counteract curricular ethnocentricity at Western. In the view of the PSC, the College of Ethnic Studies was not successful in achieving the above objectives, and it "concluded that the College of Ethnic Studies should be dissolved" (Program Study Committee, 1976a, p. 11).

The PSC was concerned about the absence of an Ethnic Studies program and urged that before acting to eliminate the College of Ethnic Studies, the President and Trustees should commit to initiating action to create "a more viable Program of Minority Affairs and Studies at Western" (p. 11). "To eliminate the College of Ethnic Studies," they continued, "without some such replacement we consider socially irresponsible" (Program Study Committee, 1976b, p. 1).

As further justification for their recommendation the committee cited the following:

1) high faculty turnover . . . with the College losing some of its outstanding teachers . . . (e.g. Price, Deloria, Williams).
2) Vitality--the CES has had little impact on the conventional departments. The committee finds little evidence of creativity and innovation at the college or from its students.
3) Minority students--Many of CES's few graduates are white. The College has seldom functioned as a center for minority student organization and activity. The academic program has not been able to attract and retain a substantial number of minority students.
4) Enrollment--CES enrollment has consistently declined. Five years ago class sizes varied from approximately 12-40 students. Today the average is somewhere between 3 and 16.

The Committee decided it was beyond their scope to speculate on the reasons for the decline of Ethnic Studies; nevertheless, they offered the following observations or opinions:

> At the time of founding CES, did not include ethnic study requirements in the General Education program of all students. More recently, when curricular bodies in the College of Arts and Sciences have made requests for appropriate General Education courses from CES, the College has been unresponsive. Another unfortunate factor was the adoption of an inappropriate structure, that of

an autonomous college with little working relationship to the main campus. This led to isolation on the part of the CES and ignorance and neglect on the part of Western proper . . . . It is also likely that a program for minority students cannot succeed without considerable scholarship aid. This Western failed to provide and, to our knowledge, the CES has not been able to raise such funds. Finally, concentration in ethnic studies may be inappropriate for the undergraduate level because college students often lack the background for such specialization. (Program Study Committee, 1976b, p. 2)

The committee had given Dean Hiraoka an opportunity to respond before they submitted their final report. In his March 8, 1976 response Dean Hiraoka suggested the committee had "ill-conceived perceptions." "The proposed recommendation leads us to conclude that those who have not participated in Ethnic Studies programs or who have only been involved partially in the move to establish them since the mid-sixties assume more understanding than they have" (Hiraoka, 1976, p. 4). Hiraoka addressed the PSC recommendations point by point:

1. The original purpose could not have been fulfilled by any kind of program in four or five years. Providing a Center is hopeless if anyone has seeen [sic] the Edens hall facilities. . . . It is shabby and remarkably poor compared to facilities provided for other areas.
2. Ethnic Studies had to involve White students at Western. It would not be possible to legitimate a program only for minority students.

3. The high turnover was a consequence of the pressures which were not attended to by the total institution.

4. Vitality. To what extent does the PSC expect creativity and innovation? . . . The concept of Human Services and the concept of Human Studies are innovative and were developed in 1973,1974.

5. Why is CES viewed as unresponsive? We worked for two years before CASC even invited us. (Memorandum, March 8, p. 5)

Later Hiraoka said:

Whatever structure develops, no viable program will develop unless legitimation takes place. Exclusion from GCR denies legitimation . . . . Obviously if students see no need to take courses in Ethnic Studies, they do not lend legitimation . . . . all accepted areas of study have both strong and weak faculty, strong and weak students, strong and weak courses. What you propose for Ethnic Studies surpasses requirements for other areas. (Memorandum, May 12, p. 2)

In comparing Ethnic Studies with the other two cluster colleges, the PSC had this to say:

Comparison of Fairhaven with other colleges and departments is made difficult by the fact that Fairhaven is an innovative college based on a unique set of assumptions. [italics added] Fairhaven's special programs involving off campus apprenticeships, field-study, and student-taught classes all encounter the difficulty inherent in equating SCH production with faculty instructional time. On the other hand, unconventional demands [italics added] on faculty at

Fairhaven make it very difficult to assess that College's staffing by traditional standards.

On the basis of information available to us, Fairhaven is not an expensive unit. class size is small--14.02 at Fairhaven compared with 22.73 for all of Western--but this is balanced by the fact that the teaching load is heavy compared with Western's average. The heavy teaching load more than balances out the small class size with the result that the cost per student is below Western's average--$53 compared to $63 . . . . the committee recommends that moderate priority be given to some staff increase. (Program Study Committee, 1976a, March 23)

The committee recommends that the faculty allocation to Huxley College be stabilized at its present level . . . . The committee is reluctant to recommend substantial increases until the role of environmental sciences, as opposed to environmental studies, is clarified.

At this time the College has yet to get its house in order, define its role, establish permanent liaison with other units and programs upon campus, and thus demonstrate its academic stability. Huxley College is <u>not yet out of the experimental stage</u> [italics added] (as is, for example, Fairhaven College), and thus should not be granted resources . . . beyond its present allocations. (Program Study Committee, 1976a).

In response to the PSC recommendations President Olscamp appointed an ad hoc committee to consider the phasing out of the college of Ethnic Studies as a separate

academic entity. This committee, chaired by G. Edward Stephan, of the Sociology department, recommended the relocation of CES Faculty, tenured and non-tenured, to appropriate colleges and departments of Western Washington State College.

On August 25, 1976, Stephan's committee recommended the following:

1. That there be a transitional year to end June 30, 1977. This would allow for (a) completion of current major and minor programs in Ethnic Studies; (b) evaluation and transfer of Human Services program; (c) evaluation of faculty and retention decision; (d) completion of arrangements with departments and programs which will offer ethnic studies courses and (e) development of a new major and minor in Ethnic Studies.
2. A new Ethnic Studies program will be developed through courses in existing program areas. Three categories were identified for determining areas to accommodate Ethnic Studies: (a) academic areas already including Ethnic Studies on an extensive basis--e.g.Anthropology, Sociology; (b) areas which can offer occasional courses in Ethnic Studies--e.g. Huxley, Economics and (c) program areas that do not have assigned teaching positions but which offer courses leading to a major or a minor--e.g. American Studies Program, Women's Studies Program.
3. Reallocation of the eight positions should be as follows

    (a) four or five positions be tenure track and allocated to areas which establish need and reflect serious interest in offering courses appropriate to an Ethnic Studies program.

(b) two or three positions will be placed in a non-tenure track and be allocated to program areas listed in 2 above.

c) one FTE used for TA position for the ethnic minority

4. Ethnic Studies should have a director with 1/2 released time. Should have a sufficient operating budget, and some support should be given to the Office of Minority Affairs and the Journal of Ethnic Studies. Secretarial and clerical support must be adequate.
5. Assessment of current faculty in Ethnic Studies should take place in 1976-77 and that 77-78 be the final year for those terminated. No transfer to a program area shall take place without the consent (majority) of the program area faculty where tenure track positions are concerned. In the case of faculty already tenured, they will be placed in their appropriate academic disciplines. (Stephan, 1976)

The Registrar, Gene Omey, wrote to the Deans on August 4, 1977 that after summer 1977, students would receive diplomas from the College of Arts and Sciences. During 1977-78, all scheduled Ethnic Studies courses would be offered. After 1977-78, 5 or 6 would be offered as Ethnic Studies. Other required courses would carry appropriate department titles. (Omey, 1977)

Jim Davis, Dean of Arts & Sciences, on September 17, 1976 noted that decisions on tenure and promotion for the non-tenured Ethnic Studies faculty would be made jointly by the Ethnic Studies Program Committee and the department concerned. This type of arrangement was already in operation for Science Education faculty, who must

be recommended for tenure and promotion by both the Dean of Arts and Sciences and the Dean of Education. (Davis, 1976)

Only Four areas expressed interest in Ethnic Studies, Education, Fine and Performing Arts, Economics, and General Studies. Hiraoka recommended that priorities be given to Education's request for an American Indian counseling position and to the Fine and Performing Arts request for Black Arts or Minority Arts (Music, Dance). There was sill considerable misunderstanding about the relationship of the Ethnic Studies positions to the departments. (Hiraoka, 1977).

Dean Hiraoka expressed his concern to the new Provost Talbot that, "If . . . administrative units which house programs are to be judged in the future, considerable care should be taken to define what their specific role is to be in relation to the total program operation at Western Washington State College, for this has been a major shortcoming of the institution" (Hiraoka, 1977).

SUMMARY

Leadership impacts an organization. Each shift in the leadership of CES brought a distinctive flavor to the life of Ethnic Studies. The College was also affected by student leadership, not only in its origins, but throughout its history.

Each phase of CES's history is a story within itself, especially the year of 1972.

This chapter can only be a brief overview, a snapshot of nine challenging, exciting, frustrating years in the life of the College of Ethnic Studies at Western Washington University.

# CHAPTER FIVE

# DISCUSSION

## Introduction

This study was undertaken as an inquiry into the rise and fall of the College of Ethnic Studies. I assumed going into this study that budget and bigotry played a role in the fate of Ethnic Studies. Despite the power of those two factors alone to affect the fate of CES, I was curious to delve a little deeper. Even if money and attitude were the key forces in this story, how did they manifest themselves.

I was not surprised to find support for my assumption regarding bigotry and budget. However, there were surprises. I did not realize to what extent Western did not support the College, nor how much the structure was set up against them, nor how pervasive the attitude was against viewing Ethnic Studies as a discipline. I also had very little awareness of the first two Deans of the College of Ethnic Studies.

Leadership is important in any organization but especially in an innovative, experimental operation that is going against the grain. It is interesting to speculate what might have happened if Dean Williams could have stayed a few more years and laid a good foundation, or if Dean Elizondo could have built upon what Williams had established; perhaps CES would have been in a stronger position when they came under final scrutiny. By the time Dean Hiraoka came, however, political positions were fixed, structure remained crippling, budget unstable, and staff insecure. The foundation was crumpling. Still it might have survived, if it had been allowed to

evolve into a College of Human Studies as Dean Hiraoka had proposed. But then there was a change of Presidents, and a shift in commitment.

Discussion of Findings

Several factors led to the demise of the College of Ethnic Studies: (a) three Deans within three years; (b) high faculty turnover within that same time period; (c) loss of core faculty who helped usher in the college (the loss of key faculty like Thaddeus Spratlen and Curmie Price was a critical blow to the momentum of CES); (d) budget reductions; (e) change in top administration, particularly presidents and (f) bias against the concept of ethnic studies.

The Western experience of Ethnic Studies certainly fits within the experience of many institutions throughout the nation. The debate over structure, issues of autonomy, who was the program for, debates over legitimization, was it a discipline and confusion over definitions.

However, lack of commitment remains one factor that needs highlighting. From the beginning and throughout its entire history a vocal core of faculty, and some administrators, opposed Ethnic Studies and allowed structural barriers to block the College's success. The College of Ethnic Studies was kept out of the General College Requirements loop which would have been an excellent way to introduce large numbers of students to Ethnic Studies. Although President Flora was committed this cannot be said for everyone in his administration.

When President Olscamp arrived it was fairly easy to support the faculty recommendations of elimination. There was room, even within budget restraints, to shore it up, to strengthen it, instead of dispersing it through the university, into areas that historically had shown minimal commitment.

I return to budget and bigotry. Budget certainly played a role. The 1970s was a time of reductions. Yet, why was Ethnic Studies identified for elimination and not the other cluster colleges? Was it because Fairhaven had passed the experimental stage? Or was it that Huxley was further along in its experimental stage? I'm not saying the other cluster colleges should have been under the chopping block, however, I cannot escape the comparison of the fate of Ethnic Studies to that of individual underrepresented minorities who are subject to "last hired, first fired."

Although difficult to prove, I believe racism, or as Flora has commented "closet bigots" was likewise a factor. In Academe this is often masked behind academic assessments claiming objectivity. Was bigotry masked behind institutional structures that were designed to restrict Ethnic Studies from succeeding? Why would Western allow courses to be accepted by an outside community college and not their own cluster college? Were the course proposals really that inferior? And by what criteria were they being judged?

Recommendations

Should Western try again to establish a College of Ethnic Studies? A strong structure is needed, with some sense of autonomy. With the steady re-emergence of

the American Cultural Studies program this would be an appropriate time to examine where we want to go.

One ambitious proposal might be a college of International Studies. In this college could go all of the International programs, plus American Cultural Studies, with academic support services for International and American ethnic students. A major plus to this would be to place American cultural issues into a International arena. The major concern might be that American ethnic issues could get lost. At times it is easier for Americans to address issues more removed from them than to deal honestly and directly with challenges facing them at home.

I am not absolutely clear what the specific structure should look like for a new "ethnic studies program." What I am clear about are some of the following essential ingredients: (a) visibility; (b) FTE specifically assigned to the "program" plus money to buy resources from other disciplines; (c) ability for students to major in ethnic studies along with a traditional major; (d) commitment of time to make the program work and (e) a supportive rather than crippling structure.

Limitations

This study is limited by the small number of people interviewed. A great deal of material was accumulated during the nine years of CES's existence. For my thesis I had to lower my scope. There is ample room to do a thesis on various segments of the Ethnic Studies years. Trying to give a full overview prevented deeper development in some areas of interest, such as the turmoil of 1972.

Suggestions for Further Research

There is room to do an extensive study of the College of Ethnic Studies. Although some key players are unavailable, others are around in different parts of the country. A full oral history would be fascinating.

A comparative study of other Ethnic College experiments would also make a good study and add to Western's picture. Few Ethnic Studies programs organized themselves around the college model.

Summary

This paper explored some of the issues that impacted the implementation of Ethnic Studies at Western Washington University. The battles were similar on all fronts in higher education: (a) problems of definition; (b) struggles to design an appropriate structure; (c) questions about who the program was for; (d) challenges over autonomy and (e) resistance to viewing Ethnic Studies as a discipline.

Many of these issues remain with us today? Instead of Ethnic Studies we talk about diversity. How do we define diversity? How do we integrate diversity into the academy? Who is included in diversity and who benefits from the emphasis on diversity? The resistance to diversity, especially its place in the curriculum, has even prompted the establishment of a national organization, the National Association of Scholars.

The importance of this area of study needs constant emphasis. I share the conviction Washburn (1981) expressed when he said:

> There are over two-thousand postsecondary institutions in the United States with no ethnic studies programs. To the extent that these schools do not provide their students with a pluralistic view of life within the United States and beyond in their general education curricula, and to the extent they maintain an ontological commitment to an Anglo-Teutonic perception of the world, they are agents for the perpetuation of cultural deprivation. (p. 150)

## REFERENCES


Academic Council. (1969a, January 28). Minutes of the Western Washington State College Academic Council. Bellingham, WA: Western Washington State College.

Academic Council. (1969b, February 4). Minutes of the Western Washington State College Academic Council. Bellingham, WA: Western Washington State College.

Academic Council. (1969c, April 15). Minutes of the Western Washington State College Academic Council. Bellingham, WA: Western Washington State College.

Ad Hoc Committee for Programs on Minority Cultures. (1969a, January 23). Interim Report to the Academic Council. Bellingham, WA: Western Washington State College.

Ad Hoc Committee for Programs on Minority Cultures. (1969b, April 7). Second Report to the Academic Council. Bellingham, WA: Western Washington State College.

Allen, R. L. (1974). Politics of the Attack on Black Studies. Black Scholar, 6(1), 2-7.

Altman, R. A. & Snyder, P. O. (Eds.). (1971). The Minority Student on the Campus: expectations and possibilities. Boulder: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education.

Associated Students of the College of Ethnic Studies. (1972, May 16). An open letter to the Administration. Western Front, p. 7.

Ballard, A. B. (1973). The Education of Black Folk: The Afro-American Struggle for Knowledge in White America. New York: Harper & Row.

Billingsley, A. (1970). The Black Presence in American Higher Education. In N. Wright (Ed.), What Black Educators are Saying (pp. 126-149). New York: Hawthorn Books, Inc.

Blassingame, J. (Ed.). (1971). New Perspectives on Black Studies. Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

Brossard, C. A. (1984). Classifying Black Studies Programs. Journal of Negro Education, 53, 278-295.

Brown, R.D. (1969) Memorandum. College of Ethnic Studies Papers. Western Washington University

Chavarria, J. (1970). Chicano Studies. In R. A. Altman & P. O. Snyder (Eds.), The Minority Student on the Campus: expectations and possibilities (pp. 159-171). Boulder, Colorado: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education.

Chicano Coordinating Council on Higher Education. (1969). El Plan de Santa Barbara: A Chicano Plan for Higher Education. Oakland, CA: La Causa Publications.

Churchill, W. (1982). White Studies: The Intellectual Imperialism of Contemporary U. S. Education. Integrateducation, 19, 51-57.

Clark, K. B. (1971). A Charade of Power: Black Students at White Colleges. In J. Blassingame (Ed.), New Perspectives on Black Studies (pp. 116-122). Illinois: University of Illinois Press.

College of Ethnic Studies. (1971-72). Brochure. Western Washington State College, Bellingham, WA.

College of Ethnic Studies. (1976, June 2). Annual Report. Western Washington State College, Bellingham, WA.

College of Ethnic Studies. (1974, November 18). Narrative. Academic Planning Process: September 1974--June 1975. Western Washington State College, Bellingham, WA.

Colon, A, K. (1984). Critical Issues in Black Studies: A Selective Analysis. Journal of Negro Education, 53, 268-277.

Crouchett, L. (1971). Early Black Studies Movements. Journal of Black Studies, December, 189-200.

Crowl, J. A. (1972). Black Studies: The Bitterness and Hostility Lessen, but Criticism Persists. Chronicle of Higher Education, VI(34), p. 6-7.

Davis, J. (1976, September 17). Memorandum to Department Chairs. Western Washington University, Bellingham, WA.

Deloria, V., Jr. (1986). Indian Studies -- The Orphan of Academia. Wicazo-Sa-Review, 2(2), 1-7.

DuBois, E. E. (1970, May). Toward A Rationale For Black Studies As An Academic Discipline. Adult Leadership, 19, 7-8, 23-24.

DuBois, W. E. B (1903). The Souls of Black Folk: Essays and Sketches. Chicago: A.C. McClurg and Company.

Epps, E. A. (1972). Black Students in White Schools. Worthington, OH: Charles A. Jones.

Fashing, J. & Deutsch, S. E. (1971). Academics in Retreat: The Politics of Educational Innovation. Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press.

Fischer, R. A. (1971). Ghetto and Gown: The Birth of Black Studies. In J. Blassingame (Ed.), New Perspectives on Black Studies (pp. 16-27). Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

Flora, C. J. (1971, March 11). State of the College. FAST, 3(21), pp. 105.

Flora, C. J. (1991). Normal College Knowledge. Everson, WA: Jero Enterprises.

Forbes, J. (1971). Native American Studies. In R. A. Altman & P. O. Snyder (Eds.), The Minority Student on the Campus: expectations and possibilities (pp. 159-171). Boulder, Colorado: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education.

Ford, N. A. (1973). Black Studies: Threat--or--Challenge. Port Washington, New York: Kennikat Press.

Franklin, J. H. (1989). Race and History: Selected Essays 1938-1988. Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State University Press.

Garcia, E., Lomeli, F. A., Ortiz, I. D. (Eds.). (1984). Chicano Studies: A Multidisciplinary Approach. New York: Columbia University Press.

Garcia, M. T., et. al. (1983). History, Culture and Society: Chicano Studies in the 1980s. New York: Bilingual Review Press.

Gawrys, S. (1972a, February 4). Blacks would like more white interest. Western Front, p. 7.

Gawrys, S. (1972b, February 4). Chicanos emphasize their culture. Western Front, p. 6.

Glass, G. V. (Ed.). (1972). Evaluation Studies Review Annual (Vol. 1). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Glazer, N. (1983). Ethnic Dilemmas 1964-1982. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Gordon, V. V. (1981). The Coming of Age of Black Studies. Western Journal of Black Studies, 5(3), 231-236.

Gowrylow, M. (1969, September 30). Trustees deny college status for ethnic studies. Western Front, p. 3.

Hare, N. (1969). Questions and Answers about Black Studies. Massachusetts Review, 10(4), 727-736.

Hare, N. (1970). Nathan Hare on Black Studies. Integrated Education. 8, 9-10.

Hicks, A. C. (1974). Western at 75. Bellingham, WA: Washington State College Foundation

Hill, C. (1972, April 4). Hiring more professors unlikely. Western Front, p. 5.

Hiraoka, J. (1975, October 31). Memorandum to the Program Study Committee. College of Ethnic Studies papers. Western Washington State College, Bellingham, WA.

Hiraoka, J. (1976, March 8). Memorandum to the Program Study Committee. College of Ethnic Studies papers. Western Washington State College, Bellingham, WA.

Hiraoka, J. (1977, May 12). Memoranda to Provost Talbot. College of Ethnic Studies papers. Western Washington University, Bellingham, WA.

Hively, R. (Ed.). (1990). The Lurking Evil: Racial and Ethnic Conflict on the College Campus. Washington, D.C.: American Association of State Colleges and Universities.

Huggins, N. I. (1985). Afro-American Studies: A Report to the Ford Foundation. New York: Ford Foundation.

Jaimes, A. M. (1985). American Indian Studies: An Overview and Prospectus. Wicazo-Sa-Review, 1(2), 15-21.

Jaimes, A. M. (1987). American Indian Studies: Toward An Indigenous Model. American Indian Culture & Research Journal, 11(3) 1-16.

Johnson, R. (1972). The College of Ethnic Studies: An Educational Reality or Western's Spook Who Sat by the Door. Unpublished paper, College of Ethnic Studies Papers, Western Washington University, Bellingham, WA.

Johnson, W. W. (1970). Black Studies: The Case for and against. Civil Rights Digest, 3(4), 30-35.

Jose, C. T. (1985). Contemporary Indian Issues: A Course Syllabus. Wicazo-Sa-Review, 1(2), 36-40.

Kelly, S. E. (1971). A Model for Emerging Black Studies Programs: An Analysis of Selected Black Studies Programs Viewed in Historical Perspective (Doctoral dissertation. University of Washington, 1971). Dissertation Abstracts International, 32, 6157A.

Kilson, M. (1973). Reflections on Structure and Content in Black Studies. Journal of Black Studies, March, 297-314.

Kilson, M. (1969). Anatomy of the Black Studies Movement. The Massachusetts Review, 10(4), 718-725.

Knight, C. (1972, March 3). Black View. Western Front, p. 2.

Lythcott, S. (1971). Black Studies at Antioch. In J. Blassingame (Ed.), New Perspectives on Black Studies (pp. 123-132). Illinois: University of Illinois Press.

Merriam, S. B. (1988). Case Study Research in Education: A Qualitative Approach. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Miller, L. (1972). An Analysis of Objectives of Institutes and Departments of Afro-American Affairs. In E. A. Epps (Ed.). Black Students in White Schools (pp. 84-101). Worthington, OH: Charles A. Jones.

Mootry, M. K. (1983). J. Saunders Redding: A Case Study of the Black Intellectual. The Western Journal of Black Studies, 7(2), 62-67.

Morris, C. P. (1986). Native American Studies: A Personal Overview. Wicazo-Sa-Review, 2(2), 9-16.

Muñoz, C. Jr., (1983). The Quest For Paradigm: The Development of Chicano Studies and Intellectuals. In M. Garcia, et al. (Eds.), History, Culture and Society: Chicano Studies in the 1980s. (pp. 19- 36). New York: Bilingual Review Press.

Muñoz, C. Jr., (1984). The Development of Chicano Studies 1968-1981. In E. Garcia, F. A. Lomeli, & I. D. Ortiz (Eds.), Chicano Studies: A Multidisciplinary Approach (pp. 5-18). New York: Columbia University Press.

Obichere, B. I. (1970). The Significance and Challenge of Afro-American Studies. Journal of Black Studies, December, 161-177.

Omey, G. (1977, August 4). Memorandum to the Deans. College of Ethnic Studies papers. Western Washington University, Bellingham, WA.

Parlett, M. & Hamilton, D. (1972). Evaluation As Illumination: A New Approach to the Study of Innovative Programs. In G. V. Glass (Ed.). Evaluation Studies Review Annual(Vol. 1). (140-157). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage

Program Study Committee. (1976a, March 23). Report to President Olscamp. Unpublished report. Western Washington State College, Bellingham, WA.

Program Study Committee. (1976b, March 23). Report to President Olscamp. Appendix--Category B. Unpublished report. Western Washington State College, Bellingham, WA.

Rochin, R. & de la Torre, A. (1986, April). The Current Status and Future of Chicano Studies Programs: Are They Academically Sound? Paper presented at the 14th Annual Conference of the National Association for Chicano Studies.

Russell, J. J. (1975). Afro-American Studies: From Chaos to Consolidation. Negro Educational Review, 26(4), 181-189.

Rustin, B. (Ed.). (1969). Black Studies: Myths and Realities. New York: A. Philip Randolph Educational Fund.

Sánchez, C. J. (1970). A Challenge for Colleges and Universities Chicano Studies Civil Rights Digest, 36-39.

Sandboe, K. (1974, April 30). Degree offered to human services workers. Western Front, p. 9.

Schlesinger, A. M. Jr. (1992). The Disuniting of America. New York: Norton.

Shapiro, J. P. (1988). Participatory Evaluation: Towards a Transformation of Assessment for Women's Studies Programs and Projects. Educational Evaluation & Policy Analysis, 10(3), 191-199.

Smith, W. D. (1971). Black Studies: A Survey of Models and Curricula. Journal of Black Studies, March, 259-272.

Spaights, E. (1971). Black Studies Programs: Issues and Problems. The Urban Review, 5(1), 38-41.

Staff. (1969a) Special admission. Klipsun, p. 95.

Staff. (1969b, September, 30). Trustees approve ethnic studies program. Western Front, p. 3.

Stephan, G. E., (1976, August 25). Final Recommendations on Ethnic Studies. Unpublished report to President Olscamp. College of Ethnic Studies papers. Western Washington State College.

Thornton, R. (1978). American Indian Studies As An Academic Discipline. American Indian Culture & Research Journal, 2(3 & 4) 10-19, 35-40.

Vontress, C. E. (1970). Black Studies -- Boon or Bane? Journal of Negro Education, 39, 192-201.

Washburn, W. E. (1975). American Indian Studies: A Status Report. American Quarterly, 27(3), 263-274.

Washburn, D. E. (1981). Ethnic Studies in the United States: Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: Office of Education.

Western Washington State College. (1971-1973). General Catalog. Bellingham, WA.,

Western Washington State College. (1978). Factbook. Bellingham, WA., p. II-7.

Western Washington State College. (1966). No Longer A Wasteland: The Story of Project Overcome. Bellingham, WA: Western Washington State College & Office of Economic Opportunity.

Western Washington State College. (1967). A World of Shadows: The Story of Project Catch-up. Bellingham, WA: Western Washington State College & the Rockefeller Foundation.

Wilson, T. P. (1979). Custer Never Would Have Believed It: Native American Studies in Academia. American Indian Quarterly, 5, 207-227.

Wright, B. (1990). American Indian Studies Programs: Surviving the '80s, Thriving in the '90s. Journal of American Indian Education, 30(1), 17-24.

Wright, N. (Ed.). (1970a). What Educators are Saying. New York: Hawthorn Books Inc.

Wright, S. J. (Ed.). (1970b). Black Studies and Sound Scholarship. Phi Delta Kappan, 51(7), 365-368.

# APPENDIX A

## FACULTY AND STAFF OF THE COLLEGE OF ETHNIC STUDIES

## APPENDIX A

## FACULTY

Abrams, George

September 1972--December 1976
American Indian
He was hired to teach in the AIS program. Was working on his Ph.D. In 1975 he applied, without college support, for Tenure and was denied. His appeal was also denied.

Arellano, Raul

September 1972--June 1984 (Retired)
Hispanic
Arellano taught a number of years at Shoreline Community College. He was first appointed in 1972-73 as a Visiting Associate Professor, then hired on the next year as an Associate. In July 1975, he was granted tenure. At the end of 1977-78, .5 of his FTE was split evenly between Foreign Languages and Ethnic Studies. He had an M.A. in Anthropology. Was in the Department of Social Sciences at Shoreline. Thirteen years full-time teaching experience. Taught Latin American History, Anthropology, Sociology and the Culture of Mexico.

Butler, Reggie

September 1968--March 1977
Black
Although he did not have a masters, he was working on a Ph.D. Butler graduated from Western as a history major in June 1968. He organized the first chapter of the Black Student Union during the fall of 1967. Butler was initially hired Fall 1968 to teach a course on Afro-American culture under the direction of the History and Sociology-Anthropology departments. He also had responsibility to counsel disadvantaged students who were to be admitted that fall. Butler was on leave Fall 1974 and 76-77. In 1977 he was denied tenure.

Castillo, P.

September 1971--June 1972
Completing Ph.D. in American History with emphasis in Chicano and Black history.

Deloria, Vine

September 1970--March 1972
American Indian
He had recently made national notoriety with his book Custer Died for Your Sins. He had been Executive Director of the National Congress of American Indians. JD from University of Colorado. He first resigned in March 2, 1971; agreed to remain two more quarters, Fall 1971 and Winter 1972. Final resignation was March 17, 1972. The spring of 1972 he was Adjunct Associate without salary.

Elizondo, Sergio
July 1971--June 1972
Hispanic

Guajardo, David

September 1971--July 1972
Hispanic
Teaching assistant in Spanish and Portuguese at UC Riverside.

Harris, William

September 1971-March 1976
Black
Appointed to direct the Afro-American Studies program after Curmie Price's departure. He had his M.A. from Yale in Asian Studies. He was in a Ph.D. program at Stanford. He took a leave of absence to work on his Phd in 1974-76. He went to Wesleyan to teach.

Hinojos, Francisco

September 1970--June 1973
Hispanic

Hiraoka, Jesse

October 1972--August 1992 (Retired)
Asian

Specialized in French, foreign languages and literature, general studies. Came to Western from a post as Professor at California State College, San Bernardino. BA from Roosevelt University, MA from Univ of Chicago, Phd from Northwestern University in 1962. Served as chair, Division of Humanities at San Bernardino. Helped initiate the Equal Opportunity Program at San Bernardino. French Professor. Arrived at Santa Barbara in 1965, the year it opened. Taught at Roosevelt University in Chicago several years. Chaired Faculty Senate at Santa Barbara.

Hodgson, W. Jay

September 1971--June 1972
White

Ph.D. from Berkeley. Masters from McGill. Taught science as a cultural force.

Kim, Robert

September 1971--present
Asian

Kim was hired for 1 year appointment by Education in 1971-72. Applied for an opening in CES for Asian American Studies position and was hired in 1972-73, as an Assistant Professor. He served as interim Dean of CES for two months during the summer of 1972. Became Associate professor in 1973-74, and was granted tenure in 1974.

Lopez-Valadez

September 1973--June 1974
Hispanic

Price, E. Curmie

September 1968--June 1971
Black

Initially hired by the English Department in 1968 in a Non-tenure track position. Price became one of the movers for the College of Ethnic Studies. First director of Afro-American Studies in 1969 when the College was approved by the Board of Trustees. He resigned after the 1970-71 academic year. Taught at Ohio University. Pursued Phd. at Chicago.

Rogers, James

September 1971--July 1972
Black
M.A. from University of Iowa writers workshop. He left to finish his PhD. at University of Iowa in Afro-American Studies.

Smith, (Scott) Pam

September 1972--June 1978
Black (Nigerian)
Received her M.A. in English from WWSC in August 1972. Worked on Ph.D. at UW. In september 1975 she became 1/2 time Affirmative Action Officer. She was terminated from CES in June 1978. Went to University of Nebraska.

Symes, Martha

September 1972--December 1976
White
Martha Symes initially came in spring 1972 with her husband George Abrams. She was riffed at the end of spring 1974. For the 1974-75 academic year she filled in for William Harris's position while he was on leave, and in september 1975 filled in part-time for Pam Smith. and again part-time for Butler in Fall 1976. Served principally in Comparative Culture Studies. Developed Cultures and Poverty course and taught research methods to Ethnic Studies students.
M.A. in 1965.

Tagatac, Geronimo

Filipino

Valenzuela, Alphonso

September 1972--June 1973
Hispanic
He had taught on a part-time basis less than one year before being employed at Western.

Wasson, Wilfred

July 1969--June 1972
American Indian
Wasson hired in 1969-70 as a Lecturer in Anthropology. Became Assistant Professor in 1970-71. First Director of AIS. He resigned at the end of spring 1972 to resume PhD. work at University of Oregon.

Weber, Kenneth

September 1973--June 1977
White
Ph.D. from University of Oregon. Part-time instructor in American Indian Studies.

Williams, Ron

September -- June 1971
Black
Dr. Williams had arrived from Ohio University where he was an Associate Professor at the School of hearing and Speech Sciences and Dean of Afro-American Affairs. He received his Ph.D. in 1969 from Ohio State University.

Wilner, Jeffrey

September 1971--June 1978
White
Taught in AIS. On leave 1973-74 and Winter 1976. Denied promotion to Associate in 1975 and denied tenure in 1976.
Terminated. He was co-editor of Journal of Ethnic Studies. Worked on PhD. in American History at University of Washington. He left after 1977-78 academic year.

YBarra, Tomas

?--June 1970

Yen, David

September 1972--March 1973
Asian
Assistant Professor. Specialized in comparative government, Asian studies. Comes to Western from post of faculty chairman of Asian -American studies, CAL ST University, Los Angeles. MA and Ph.D from Claremont--1972.

Hansen, Donna

Executive Secretary
1969-1977
White

Roehl, Jan

Registrar
1971-1978
White