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Abstract of the Dissertation

Re-examining Diversity Policy at University of California, San Diego: The Racial Politics of Asian Americans

by

Angela Wai-Yin Kong

Doctor of Philosophy in Ethnic Studies

University of California, San Diego, 2014

Professor Yến Lê Espiritu, Chair

My research examines how Asian Americans at University of California, San Diego engage in a discourse around self-determination, internationalization, and diversity from 1960 to the present. In a post-racial era where colorblindness and meritocracy shape diversity policy at an elite California public university, the growth of Asian
American college student continue to baffle university administrators and educators in how to create diversity policy that tackles their needs and concerns. From locating the first political Asian American student organization, movement to create the Lumumba-Zapata College and an Asian American Studies minor, to the student actions against the racist Compton Cookout incidents mocking Black History Month, I address how a university administration responded to the racial discourse around diversity at an historically white institution. Research results indicate that the university administration failed to recognize Asian American student needs and concerns in developing diversity policy. The university’s narrow understanding of Asian Americans is rooted in a black-white framework of tackling the achievement gap, which allowed them to understand Asian American student experiences only in relation to white student success and black student struggles. Asian American racialization as model minorities and yellow perils erases their experiences as an undeserved minority group. The dissertation provides counter-stories and research data that challenges UC San Diego to re-examine diversity policy to consider Asian American student experiences and needs. Using a mixed-methods approach of ethnography, interviews, surveys, archives, and a discourse analysis, this study offers insights to creating a more transformative diversity policy that positively shapes the experiences of all students on campus.
Chapter 1
Introduction

Despite the volume of research devoted to the decades-old debate about the causes of and solutions for the racial divide in American society, Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders (AAPIs), remain in the margins, as an outlier in our national conversation about race.


In a post-affirmative action era where colorblindness, reverse discrimination, and meritocracy shape diversity policy in higher education, a critical examination of the ways in which public universities construct diversity policy on their campuses provides us with a lens to the status of diversity in our state and nation today.¹ Focusing on Asian Americans² experiences at UC San Diego, an elite California public university, this dissertation examines their racialization as the “inconspicuous adversaries of diversity.”³ As both the “model minority” and the “yellow peril,” Asian Americans are both maligned as a group that is overcrowding college campuses and hailed as exemplifying the values of meritocracy and diversity at universities across the nation.⁴ In this dissertation, I examine how Asian Americans use their agency to transform diversity at a historically

---

¹ The passage of Proposition 209 in 1996 by California constituents declared the use of race as problematic in addressing historical discrimination. Thus, helping to shape the discourse that race is not an allowable topic to address fairness and equality. Additionally, the term “affirmative action” is first used in Executive Order 11375 issued on October 13, 1967. The term is first used in higher education policy in Higher Education Guidelines of Executive Order 11246 issued by the Office for Civil Right, Department of Health, Education and Welfare on October 1972. Swanson 1981

² I use the term Asian American to represent individuals who are Asian descent (Chinese, Filipino, Indian, Japanese, Korean, Vietnamese, and Southeast Asian groups of Cambodian, Hmong, and Laotian) who have been racialized as Asian and experience institutionalized racism in U.S. policy. I do not use the term Asian Pacific Islander or Asian Pacific American to avoid the conflation of unique histories of Pacific Islanders and the specific ways they have been racially constructed and marginalized. At times, I use the term Asian Pacific Islanders in respect to how interviewees identified the group.

³ Teranishi 2010: 12

⁴ See news articles such as “Think Outside the ‘Box’” by Kevin Kiley and “Asians: Too Smart for Their Own Good?” by Carolyn Chen
recognize their histories and struggles, and to educate people about the community needs of a growing population. At UCSD, Asian American student leaders recognize the centrality of race as it shapes their particular college experiences. Their unique racial positioning requires them to argue for policy that works around the model minority and yellow peril dichotomy, which at times has treated them as a “racial wedge” to enact and counteract diversity policy to improve students of color experiences.\textsuperscript{5}

My study examines the efforts by UCSD, one of California’s most prominent public university, to create diversity policy in the context of the growing Asian American student population.\textsuperscript{6} The Pew Research Center reports that Asian Americans are the fastest-growing race group in 2012.\textsuperscript{7} California is the state with the largest Asian alone or in combination population, 5.6 million or 15 percent in 2010.\textsuperscript{8} In addition, West Coast states comprise 46 percent of Asian Americans nationwide.\textsuperscript{9} In recent years, counties in South and Midwest states have experienced the fastest growth of Asian Americans. The growth of Asian Americans necessitates the development of effective diversity policy that supports Asian American students as well as promotes their social and political needs in regards to education, healthcare, and housing.\textsuperscript{10} With an anticipated minority population to reach 53 percent in 2050 and Asian Americans to be the fastest growing

\textsuperscript{5} Takagi 1993
\textsuperscript{6} The Asian Pacific Islander population, from 1960 to 1980 represented the overall US population from 2 percent to 5.3 percent in 1980, increasing in size by approximately 150 percent. Narrowing it down to the state’s population, the Asian Pacific Islander population from 1960 to 1980 was ranked no. 2 (in 1960) and no. 1 (in 1970 and 1980) across the United States. By 1971, UC San Diego itself, Asian Americans students represented 3.5 percent of the student population.
\textsuperscript{8} The Asian Population: 2010 from U.S. Census
\textsuperscript{9} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{10} Ibid.
racial group in the United States, it is imperative to understand the needs of this student population at the postsecondary level.\textsuperscript{11}

My research illuminates the imperative of creating education policies that take into account the heterogeneous experiences of Asian American students who are immigrants, U.S. born, English as second language learners, undocumented, underrepresented, and international students.\textsuperscript{12} A case study of Asian Americans in higher education illuminates the ways in which they negotiated and struggled alongside other racial and ethnic groups to create a transformative diversity policy, one that is rooted in the act of self-determination, in international struggle against capitalism, and in educating people, especially minorities, to create social change in society.\textsuperscript{13} An analysis of their experiences on a campus with a pan-Asian American population that ranged from 3.5 percent in 1971 (at its lowest) to 49.2 percent (at its highest) in 2012 sheds light on how to create a transformative diversity policy that moves beyond a black-white framework.\textsuperscript{14} My research indicates that the racialization of Asian Americans as model minorities and yellow perils situates them as a racial wedge to fight against affirmative action and efforts to improve diversity policy on college campuses. My dissertation uses a mixed methodology approach that includes the use of a survey, archival materials of letters, newspapers, meeting minutes, fliers, and program proposals from UCSD Mandeville Special Collections, current media publications regarding diversity at the

\textsuperscript{11} Pew Research Center 2012 and Ching & Agbayani 2012
\textsuperscript{12} Pew Research Center 2012
\textsuperscript{13} The first Ethnic Studies Program was established at San Francisco State University. Students and community members objective was to increase the population of minority students, including an ethnic studies curriculum, and establishing classes taught by “Third World people” – transforming self, institution, and society. Umemoto 1989, Omatsu 1994, and Mandeville Special Collections, University of California, San Diego
\textsuperscript{14} The year 1971 was the first time the office collected student data based on race. From Undergraduate Student Profile, UCSD Student Research and Information.
university, as well as interviews and conversations with thirty-five students, staff, and administrators.\textsuperscript{15}

**Background of UC San Diego**

Founded in 1960, UC San Diego represents one of the public universities created in the midst of the civil rights movement and the Cold War.\textsuperscript{16} Located in La Jolla, the city upon a hill, UC San Diego became defined as one of the elite public institutions in “America’s finest city.”\textsuperscript{17} Approximately fifteen miles away from downtown San Diego, the seventh UC campus was placed in an affluent city constructed by 4,200 square miles and 70 miles of beaches within San Diego County. As California’s second largest city, San Diego is a favorite place for many people to reside: in 2013, 1.3 million resided in the city and 3 million in the county.\textsuperscript{18} The university’s academic programs are renowned across the United States with accolades recognizing the institution as the nation’s 9th\textsuperscript{th} Best Public University by the U.S. News & World Report Best Colleges Guidebook, 14\textsuperscript{th} Best University in the World by the Academic Ranking of World Universities, and 1\textsuperscript{st} in the nation for Positive Impact by the Washington Monthly’s College Guide in 2013.\textsuperscript{19} In

\textsuperscript{15}Not all interviews are cited throughout the dissertation, however each conversation informed the ways in which I thought and wrote about diversity at UC San Diego.

\textsuperscript{16}Anderson 1993

\textsuperscript{17}America’s Finest City is San Diego’s longtime nickname. The City of San Diego. Retrieved October 19, 2009, from \texttt{http://www.sandiego.gov/}

\textsuperscript{18}The City of San Diego. Retrieved March 16, 2013, from \texttt{http://www.sandiego.org/nav/Visitors/VisitorInformation/AboutSanDiego,}

\textsuperscript{19}UC San Diego Campus Profile. Retrieved March 16, 2013, from \texttt{http://ucsdnews.ucsd.edu/campus_profile#rankings}
Fall 2014, the university received 73,356 freshman applications with a grade point average of 4.11 for admitted students.\(^{20}\)

Since 1960, the exclusionary nature of UCSD and the La Jolla community made it difficult for racially and ethnically diverse communities to attend. In *The Children of the Brown-eyed Sun*, UCSD literature professor Jorge Mariscal (2005) discusses the placement of the university in affluent La Jolla, which made it much more accessible to a middle class and well-to-do community rather than to working class and communities of color. The conflict between placing the university in downtown San Diego versus La Jolla was an impassioned discussion between administrators and community members. Roger Revelle, Director of Scripps Institution of Oceanography in 1957, fought to place the university in La Jolla despite of La Jolla’s Real Estate Broker’s Association’s discriminatory practice of not informing Jewish buyers of homes for sale.\(^{21}\) An article from The Official Newsletter of the La Jolla Historical Society documented a 1917 deed for a La Jolla house saying, “the said premises shall not be sold, conveyed, demised or leased to any person other than of the white or Caucasian race…” Evidence of discrimination in real estate continued in a 1926 real estate brochure that restricted non-Caucasians of owning and residing in La Jolla. It was not until the Civil Rights Act of 1968 that private discrimination in housing ended.\(^{22}\)

While there were people who were interested in building the university in Balboa Park, a neighborhood that would be more accessible to minority and working class


\(^{21}\) In La Jolla Light, A specter from our past: Longtime residents will always remember the stain left on the Jewel by an era of housing discrimination by Will Carless.

\(^{22}\) Exhibit Reviews Covenants by Judy Haxo, The Official Newsletter of La Jolla Historical Society, Summer 2013, Volume 32, No. 2
families, General Dynamics promised $1 million to the new university if it were built next to the General Atomic building in the La Jolla region. Ultimately, it was UC President Clark Kerr’s approval to build the School of Science and Engineering in La Jolla that solidified the deal to build the university in La Jolla. Revelle envisioned a university of engineers and scientists that would become the future leaders of the nation, which entailed a proposal to San Diego school officials to “identify local children with ‘IQs above 140’ for admission to the new campus.” The need to locate the university in La Jolla and the reliance on IQs and standardized testing in selecting students meant that disenfranchised working class communities without access to decent schools were kept out from the university since its inception. UC San Diego’s public mission was to assist in the production of weaponry and technology needed to win the Cold War.

The creation of a San Diego campus as a militarized institution was part of the research, planning, and development of the La Jolla campus. Nancy Scott Anderson, author of *The Improbable Venture*, which discusses the history of UC San Diego, states that the influence of the Cold War was evidenced by the investment in military research budget of 1.5 million in 1950 and 12 million in 1964, led by Revelle. San Diego military played a significant role in the way the university structured itself to utilize its

---

23 Anderson 1993: 59
24 Anderson 1993
25 Mariscal 2005: 218
26 Anderson 1993
27 The University of California has a history of relying on federal defense money. Revelle, Director of Scripps possessed a budget that mainly came from federal funding to pay for submarine research during the Cold War. During World War II, the annual federal income for University of California was approximately $1 million in 1942 to more than $26 million in 1945, and back to $100,000 in-house research money after the war. Anderson 1993: 30-34
resources, research, and expertise to fight against the Soviet Union.\(^{28}\) Therefore, the university initially allowed only researchers and graduate students through its ivory doors, and it was not until 1964 that the campus admitted 188 undergraduates.\(^ {29}\) According to Anderson, while San Diego was ranked second most deserving site for a new campus, the Liaison Committee’s “Additional Centers” Report stated that the San Diego campus would be “narrow yet extravagant.” The university’s statewide Academic Senate said this “narrow yet extravagant” campus “primarily would serve the military-industrial sector” and not the entire broader population.\(^ {30}\) The creation of the School of Science and Engineering of the San Diego campus became a hallmark of the public university to serve its country in its wartime effort.

**Cold War and Asian Americans**

The Cold War displaced and led to the migration of people from Korea, Cambodia, Laos, and Vietnam. To contain communism, the United States turned Korea into a battleground, backing South Koreans in their fight against the Soviet Union-supported North Koreans.\(^ {31}\) The war between the U.S-supported South Viet Nam against the North Viet Nam destroyed the country with Agent Orange chemicals maligning families and land, and devastated the country’s economy and government. Additionally,

\(^{28}\) Furthermore, prior to the founding of the UC San Diego campus, the U.S. Marine Corps (Camp Matthews and Camp Elliot) and the U.S. Army (Camp Callan) shaped the politics of a campus that supported military intervention as always a necessary measure in securing the nation and demonstrating the United States’ military power. The former military base where thousands prepared for rifle training, aircraft artillery replacement training, and combat training from 1917 to 1964 became a part of the conservative politics of La Jolla, the home of war veterans. Retrieved August 29, 2010, from http://libraries.ucsd.edu/about/press/from-riflemen-to-freshmen.html


\(^{30}\) Anderson 1993: 46

\(^{31}\) Kim 2010
the Central Intelligence Agency recruited Hmongs to fight in the “Secret War” against Viet Nam, but when the U.S. left the region, many suffered the devastating effects of their land and warfare, and were killed or displaced.32

The United States implemented new immigration policies that allowed Asians to migrate into the country as a way to demonstrate that equality, fairness, and democracy existed in spite of the destructive effects of the Cold War. Critical events such as the launching of the Sputnik satellite by the Soviet Union provided impetus to pass the Hart Cellar Act of 1965, which recruited scientists, engineers, and doctors to the United States to utilize their expertise to win the Cold War.33 The 1965 Act was a liberal immigration policy prioritizing professional college-educated immigrants and heteronormative relationships represented in the preference for reunification of nuclear families. As aforementioned, many Asian bodies were killed or forced out of their countries in proxy wars. As Lisa Lowe articulates the dilemma, “The material legacy of the repressed history of U.S. imperialism in Asia is borne out in the ‘return’ of Asian immigrants to the imperial center.”34 As UC San Diego is a Cold War university and a U.S. education institution engaged in inventing and developing weaponry for the war against Asian countries, the Asian return to the United States was displayed in the changing university’s college demographics, as the number of Asian American college students began to rise.

Asian Americans at UC San Diego

---
32 Kim 2010 and Vang 2012
33 The Civil Rights Movement of the 1960s also provided political pressure to pass an immigration policy that was less restrictive and more equal.
34 Lowe 1996: 16
Asian American students grew exponentially from 3.5 percent in 1971 to 44.7 percent in 2010 (See Table 1.1). As Asian Americans comprise close to 45 percent of the student population, it is paramount that we understand how a visible minority group such as Asian Americans experiences campus life.\(^3^5\) However, the data on Asian American students are not disaggregated. When I attended the university’s Retention Summit 2011, the data for the Asian American category hides the underrepresentation of Cambodians, Hmongs, Laotians, and Vietnamese students in higher education. While UC San Diego, now has “Filipino” separate from “Asian” category, UC San Diego has not disaggregated the entire data set for Asian

\(^{3^5}\) This recognizes the data for the Asian American category hides the underrepresentation of Cambodians, Hmongs, Laotians, and Vietnamese students in higher education. While UC San Diego, now has “Filipino” separate from “Asian” category, UC San Diego has not disaggregated the entire data set for Asian
organized by the Cross-Cultural Center (CCC), Office of Academic Support and Instructional Services (OASIS), Student Affirmative Action Committee (SAAC), and Student Promoted Access Center for Education and Service (SPACES), the then-Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs Penny Rue presented data regarding student retention that indicated that the retention rate for first-year Asian American students was 96 percent in 2008.\textsuperscript{36} Even with the push from concerned campus community leaders to disaggregate the data for Asian Americans, the university continues to lump all Asian and Asian Americans together, thus eliding vast subgroup differences in academic achievements. Indeed, Rue’s use of González’s 2009 work on student success, which emphasized the necessity of gathering local qualitative data to accurately diagnose a problem, did not delve into the data on Asian American students.\textsuperscript{37}

The reality is that the aggregated data mask the relatively low college attainment rates and high rates of poverty of certain Asian subgroups.\textsuperscript{38} In California, between 2006-2010, 14\% of Cambodians, 15\% of Hmongs, and 12\% of Laotians have attained a bachelor degree or higher, as compared to 22\% of Black/African Americans, 10\% of Latinos; 17\% of Native American or Alaska Native, and 30\% of the total population (see Table 1.2). The low number of bachelor degree holders among these Southeast Asian groups challenges the beliefs that all Asian Americans are seamlessly transitioning into higher education institutions.

---

\textsuperscript{36} The presentation titled, UC San Diego Retention Summit, Cross Cultural Center by Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs, Penny Rue, March 4, 2011

\textsuperscript{37} González 2009
Again, this discrepancy is reinforced when we examine the rates of poverty and low-income status within the Asian American community. Hmong, Mongolian, and Cambodian poverty rates are at 58%, 37%, and 25% respectively, compared to...
Black/African at 20%, Latino at 20%, Native American and Alaska Native at 18%, and Total population at 14% (see Table 1.3). These data help us to identify ethnic groups within the Asian American umbrella that are struggling to survive on a day-to-day basis.

Table 1.3
Poverty and Low-income in California, 2006-2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race and Ethnic Group</th>
<th>Poverty</th>
<th>Low-income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hmong</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mongolian</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodian</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tongan</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American or Alaska</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian and Pacific</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islander</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


On college campuses, Asian American students represent a hyper-visible yet invisible racial group due to prevailing assumptions about their alleged success.

UC San Diego conflates nearly all Asian groups into a monolithic category when they disseminate the College Portrait of students attending the university with additional
information regarding gender, age, major, financial aid, graduation and retention rates, and etc.\textsuperscript{39} The problem is that it lumps all Asian American (and Pacific Islander) students into the category of Asian, Filipino, or Other/Undeclared, a panethnic group that the U.S. Census says that is represented with 23 Asian American and 19 Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander groups. The UC Office of the President reports, while naming Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Other Asian, and Pakistani/East Indian, do not present data on Cambodian, Hmong, Laotian, and Mongolian students.

As I document in this dissertation, in spite of their numbers, Asian American student concerns are not integral to the planning and implementation of UCSD’s campus diversity policies. As an example, in 2010, in the aftermath of the Compton Cookout racist incident, which galvanized prolonged campus-wide protests, Asian Pacific Islanders were not invited to be a part of the Campus Climate Council, an advisory council to the Chancellor to address campus climate, equity and inclusion.\textsuperscript{40} It took students’ insistence and ongoing meetings and talks with the Vice Chancellor of Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion (VC ED&I), Linda S. Greene, before they were invited to join the council in November 2013.\textsuperscript{41} In other words, Asian American students had to assume the intellectual labor and burden of educating administrators about their struggles and experiences. The underlying assumption that Asian Pacific Islander students were not a

\textsuperscript{39} UC San Diego, Student Research and Information complies the data for the College Portrait.
\textsuperscript{40} From conversations with a UCSD student, 2014. The Campus Climate Council is an advisory council to the chancellor comprised of faculty, staff, students, alumni, and administrators. It was created in 2010, in the aftermath of the Compton Cookout incident to address issues of campus climate, equity and inclusion. From UCSD News, UC San Diego Establishes Council on Climate, Equity, and Inclusion to Advise the Chancellor by Judy Piercey, August 8, 2010, http://ucsdnews.ucsd.edu/archive/newsrel/general/08-09CouncilClimate.asp
\textsuperscript{41} Conversation with a UCSD student on December 12, 2013. It was not until Fall 2013 when two Asian Pacific Islander students were asked to participate on the Climate Council.
vital part of the discussion regarding diversity perpetuates the stereotype that they do not need or deserve institutional support, help, and student services.\textsuperscript{42}

Neither Black or White: De-minoritization of Asian Americans

To understand the complex issues of Asian American college students, I use Sharon Lee’s concept of \textit{de-minoritization} to understand how they have been racially positioned simultaneously as the “model minority” and “yellow peril foreigner” on college campuses. De-minoritization is the process by which Asian American minority status was removed, thus making them ineligible for minority services and programs in higher education.\textsuperscript{43} Lee identifies the removal of Asian Americans from affirmative action programs, the backlash against them on college campuses, the controversy over their college admissions, and media representations of them as victims of affirmative action policies as the specific ways that Asian Americans have been de-minoritized during the late 1970s to 1980s.\textsuperscript{44} With an interdisciplinary lens grounded in higher education, sociology, Asian American Studies, and Ethnic Studies, I examine the ways in which Asian Americans challenge their de-minoritization by demanding more inclusive diversity policies. I also show how their particular racialization (as model minorities and yellow perils) becomes an obstacle in student organizing to improve diversity policy. I use theories of racial formation, racial projects, and racial triangulation as starting points to understand the treatment of Asian American students at the university.

To decipher how Asian Americans are situated at UCSD today, I begin with an in-depth discussion of racial formation and racial projects. According to Michael Omi

\textsuperscript{42} Conversations with a UC San Diego student, 2014
\textsuperscript{43} Lee 2006
\textsuperscript{44} Lee 2006
and Howard Winant, racial formation is “the sociohistorical process by which racial categories are created, inhabited, transformed, and destroyed.”\textsuperscript{45} Therefore it is imperative to understand how the cultural (mis)representation of Asian Americans has shaped the university enactment of diversity policies on Asian Americans. These “racial projects” do the “ideological work” of interpreting, representing, or explaining racial dynamics in “an effort to reorganize and redistribute resources along particular racial lines.”\textsuperscript{46} Racial projects become racist when “it creates or reproduces structures of domination based on essentialist categories of race.”\textsuperscript{47} Lee conceptualizes the figures of the model minority and yellow peril foreigner as essentialist categories that enable policymakers, administrators, and the media to racialize Asian Americans college students as extraordinarily successful, which then serve to discipline other minorities who do not fit within this archetype of success.\textsuperscript{48} On the same note, it is through this particular discourse that Asian American students become de-minoritized. De-minoritization is thus a racist project that deploys Asian American perceived “success” with their outsider status to maintain institutionalized racist policies and practices, thereby alienating Asian Americans from both majority and minority communities.\textsuperscript{49}

Claire Jean Kim’s theory of \textit{racial triangulation} explains how Asian Americans are treated as neither black nor white, but in relation to both groups through “relative valorization” and “civic ostracism.”\textsuperscript{50} As a way to control blacks and Asians, the dominant white group valorizes the subordinate Asian group relative to the subordinate
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black group on “cultural and/or racial grounds” in order to exert their power. An example of this is the use of the model minority stereotype to shame and discipline black activists for protesting for their civil rights. Through the relative valorization of Asian American “success,” black economic struggles can no longer be attributed to institutional discrimination. Civic ostracism describes the process by which the dominant white group constructs the subordinate Asian group as “unassimilable” and “foreign” thus ostracizing them from both the “body politic and civic membership.” Relative valorization coupled with civic ostracism enable white Americans to maintain their dominance, in part by valorizing Asian Americans to the point of designating them as alien and foreign. Kim’s racial triangulation theory speaks to the fact that these constructions of Asian Americans constitute a racist project that essentializes Asian Americans as the model minorities who are always outsiders of the American culture.

Asian Americans are understood within a black-white binary in higher education institutions. Gonzalez (2012) notes that discussions on diversity often exclude Asian Americans because they were not perceived as “minorities.” As an example, renown education researcher Alexander Astin excluded Asian Americans from his book on Minorities in American Higher Education. The invisibility of Asian Americans reinforces the notion that they are not a “minority.” During the 1980s and 1990s, affirmative action and admissions of Asian American students were highly contested in universities nationwide. Similar to other minority groups, Asian Americans were protected by affirmative action policy in the 1960s and 1970s, but became de-minoritized
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in the late 1970s. The shift can be seen in the affirmative action case regarding Bakke v. UC Regents (1978), when Supreme Court Justice Lewis Powell commented that Asian Americans no longer needed affirmative action to protect them in admissions policies.\textsuperscript{55} However, a few years later, the Department of Labor still considered them within defined minorities group under “Negroes, Spanish surnamed, American Indians, and Orientals.”\textsuperscript{56} UC Berkeley phased out Asian Americans in the “underrepresented” category in 1984.\textsuperscript{57} As a consequence, although there was an increase in the number of Asian American students applying to prestigious universities, their numbers began to decline between 1983 and 1986.\textsuperscript{58} The pervasive images of overrepresented model minority students permeated the culture, thus impacted Asian American ability to shape university policy. The university was successful in the de-minoritization of Asian Americans in Educational Opportunity Programs and other minority related policy; the image of the model minority became harmful in the way it de-minoritized a minority group who still needed help.

Asian American students continued to be at the center of debate in terms of affirmative action and admissions during the 1990s. Their racial positionality placed them as always a reference to white success or black struggles. However, at other times, they were barely mentioned because researchers did not know where to place them in the conversation about minorities and the achievement gap. As an example, Bowen & Bok’s seminal book, \textit{The Shape of the River: Long-term Consequences of Considering Race in College and University Admissions} (1998) excludes Asian Americans from its discussion.

\textsuperscript{55} Lee 2006 and Chan & Wang 1991
\textsuperscript{56} Swanson 1981: 27
\textsuperscript{57} Lee 2006
\textsuperscript{58} At UC Berkeley, Asian Pacific American associations, student organizations, and groups challenged the misconception that they did not experience racial discrimination and lacked needs similar to other underrepresented minorities. Takagi 1993
on affirmative action and admissions. Other books such as *The Source of the River: The Social Origins of Freshmen at America’s Selective Colleges and Universities* (2006) continue to lump Asian and white student success together without deciphering the education struggles Asian Americans face, rendering their “legacy of discrimination and segregation” as null.  

In *Asians in the Ivory Tower: Dilemmas of Racial Inequality in American Higher Education*, Teranishi (2010) labels this black-white paradigm as a conceptual blockage that prevents a nuanced understanding of Asian American and Pacific Islanders in higher education. Because Asian Americans are perceived through a black-white paradigm, the goal is to “close the achievement gaps between the low performers (Blacks) and higher performers (Whites).”  

This means that Asian American students enter the conversation about racial equality through a quantitative understanding of student success that measures achievement through standardized test scores, grade point averages, and college attainment. While it is still necessary to understand underrepresented Asian American students, the framing of the problem already precludes Asian American groups from entering any meaningful discussion about their experiences at the university. The black-white paradigm of analyzing higher education problems issues prevents Asian Americans from productively engaging in the current dialogue regarding diversity, fairness, and educational equity.  

*The Intimate University: Korean American Students and the Problem of Segregation* (2009) by Abelmann, focuses on a group of Korean American college students.  
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students at University of Illinois who are perceived as a “self-segregating” ethnic group, but upon further investigation challenge this black-white understanding of race in higher education. The oversimplified understanding of Asian American college students is revealed when Abelmann speaks about the journalist who assumed that Korean Americans “self-segregated” themselves because of “cultural comfort” at the university; an assumption very similar to a mainstream understanding of students of color on college campuses who “self-segregate.” Outsiders deduce their lack of participation on college campuses as an assumption that they do not care or want to engage with the campus, thus blaming individuals for acting in a non-inclusive manner. However, looking beyond the problem, we see a nuanced understanding of student experiences: “Korean Americans represent a racialized American college population grappling with liberal college dreams (namely, notions of ideal personal development), their own segregation in college, and their worries about their future.” The difficulty in attaining liberal college dreams require Asian American students such as Korean Americans to depart from their race and ethnicity because their culture oftentimes embrace collectiveness and family as valued lifelong traits. University administrators and staff often lack this understanding in Asian American college identity development, thus forcing students to choose between family and college. Despite contradictions between students and American liberal dreams, the university continues to be seen as a pathway for Asian immigrant children to compete equally to achieve the American Dream.

According to Abelmann, Asian Americans are constructed as “ideal college
subjects” who work hard to achieve the American Dream and who are “expected to add
color to the college landscape.” However in an “age that celebrates diversity even as it
is largely silent on race,” Asian Americans appear to be the “one color that does not
count.” In other words, U.S. racial politics on college campuses hail them as students
who add diversity to the campus, yet leave them out of policy discussions about diversity
and student support. Without a critical framing of how the social and political context of
the United States and the university directly shapes Korean American student experiences,
the individuals are blamed for their lack of “diverse” experiences on campus.

Critical race theory in education (CRT-E) is useful in examining the marginalized
position of Asian American students in shaping diversity policy. In response to civil
rights legislation of the 1950s and 1960s critical legal scholars argued that liberal laws
and policies such as Brown v. Board of Education was not race neutral, thus reinforced
the racial power and hierarchy existent in the United States; it ended de jure segregation
but continued de facto segregation. The development of critical race theory by legal
scholars in the 1970s greatly influenced the formation of critical race theory in education
in 1995. Through the use of CRT-E, I interrogate the idea that civil rights laws ended
systemic racism, thus reinforcing the pre-dominance of an unwelcoming campus climate
in historically white universities for Asian Americans. The theory offers an analysis of
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post-secondary institutions to provide an understanding of educational inequities still prevalent in the post-civil rights era. \(^{72}\) Furthermore, my research utilizes LatCrit, which extends Critical Race Theory in Education to take into account Latina/o pan-ethnicity, and “addresses issues often ignored by critical race theorists such as language, immigration, ethnicity, culture, identity, phenotype, and sexuality.” \(^{73}\) LatCrit examines “multidimensional identities,” allowing researchers to interrogate racism, sexism, classism, and other forms of oppression,” which occur simultaneously. \(^{74}\) While these characteristics are somewhat similar to Asian Americans, unlike Latina/os, they are still excluded from the conversation about the achievement gap. Access and retention studies discuss the need to increase the number of Black and Latino college students while ignoring Southeast Asian American students to increase the diversity make-up of a university, emphasizing the need for a supportive academic environment to increase retention. \(^{75}\) University administrators and staff continue to treat Asian Americans as model minority students because they are measured within a black and white framework of college success and achievement. The use of critical race theory in education is significant in excavating the everyday experiences and stories of Asian American students. \(^{76}\) Again, the use of “normative frameworks” such as the black and white framework of college success renders “marginalized populations” like Asian Americans as nonexistent on the education “agenda.” \(^{77}\)

\(^{72}\) Ladson-Billings & Tate 1995
\(^{73}\) Solorzano & Delgado Bernal 2001
\(^{74}\) Ibid.
\(^{76}\) Ancis, Sedlacek, & Mohr, 2000 and Loo & Rolison 1986
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The mainstream understanding of promising Asian American students at universities is lumped into UCSD’s 49 percent Asian American student population, feeding into a discourse about the group as “honorary Whites” who have achieved the American Dream.\textsuperscript{78} Their reported numbers by the university erase the struggles of many underrepresented Southeast Asian and underserved Asian students who do not feel a sense of belonging on their campus.\textsuperscript{79} And while I speak about UCSD’s unique campus in its historical and political development in 1960, the university itself represents a somewhat similar trend in the Asian American racial composition at campuses UC-wide: UC Berkley and Riverside 39%, UCLA 36%, and UC Merced 31%.\textsuperscript{80}

\textit{DISSERTATION OUTLINE}

My research critically examines how the social construction of Asian Americans as model minorities and yellow perils shapes the ways in which they are treated by the university community, particularly as a racial wedge to create and dismantle diversity policy.\textsuperscript{81} Their racial positioning as a wedge group between non-white and white students requires that they maneuver within the university to corral administrators, faculty, staff, and other students to establish programs and policies that take seriously their struggles and needs. The university has consistently ignored the educational needs of its Asian American students. The struggle continues to persist, as stated in the recent open letter to the university from The Coalition for Critical Asian American Studies at UCSD (dated
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\textsuperscript{80} In the U.S. Census, Asian Americans currently occupy 4.8% of the U.S. population and 10.9% of San Diego County from U.S. Census Bureau, Profile of General Population and Housing Characteristics: 2010 Demographic Profile Data. University of California undergraduate enrollment numbers are from Statistical Summary of Students and Staff, Fall 2012, Department of Information Technology Services, Office of the President University of California.
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April 2014), which demands the establishment of an Asian American Studies Minor, new faculty lines in the field of Asian American Studies, funding for an Asian Pacific Islander Middle Eastern Desi American Research and Resource Center (APIMEDA RRC), the hiring of Asian Pacific Islander staff, and the disaggregation of Asian American student data.  

A case study of Asian American students at UC San Diego challenges the idea that increasing the numerical representation of “minority” students at a historically white institution automatically transforms diversity on college campuses. Each body chapter critically examines the ways in which Asian Americans have attempted to work within the confines of the university to address issues to improve the lives of marginalized students and communities. Cumulatively, the chapters reveal that while Asian Americans have repeatedly demonstrated a need to revamp educational policy, UC San Diego has consistently failed to understand and develop policies to serve its Asian American students.

Chapter 2, *Locating Asians and Americans at the University of California, 1960s to 1970s*, discusses the historical moment of the 1960s and 1970s when the Cold War ushered in a large number of Asian immigrants as proof that the U.S. was a democratic nation, and when the Third World Movement served as an international movement that viewed a college education as an important tool to educate students to fight against capitalism, racism, and sexism. The Third World Movement at UC San Diego called for
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self-determination that spoke to the worldwide struggle against capitalism, to the importance of studying the contemporary social problems of all people, and to the need for a relevant education that equipped students with the skills to create social change in their communities. University policy towards Third World or minority students was an affirmative action policy that prevented colleges from discriminating in admissions against applicants based on color, religion, sex, or national origin; however it did not make an impact at UC San Diego. Despite their low number, Asian Americans worked alongside other Third World communities in the Lumumba-Zapata College to fight for self-determination and a relevant education. Asian American students helped to create the first political student organization at UC San Diego that focused on combatting ignorance regarding Asian Americans, raising awareness of the struggles of Asian Americans, recruiting more students to the Lumumba-Zapata College, and bringing Asian American Studies on campus.

Chapter 3, *Institutionalizing Asian American Studies, 1980 to 1996*, discusses the historical moment of 1980s to 1990s when there was a backlash of university admissions policy from a strong conservative political climate that called affirmative action policy a form of reverse discrimination against whites and Asians. Asian Americans became de-minoritized during the late 1970s and 1980s. There was strong resistance that banned affirmative action across the UCs SP-1 and SP-2 in 1995 and California’s Prop 209 in 1996. Diversity and internationalization were now significant in determining university
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policy because globalization and capitalism shaped the ways the university wanted to teach students about different cultures in order to become productive citizens in the U.S. economy. Many students of color fought for affirmative action policy to continue admitting diverse students at universities. The Asian American community worked together with the intention of establishing an Asian American Studies Minor Program at UC San Diego. They worked six years petitioning and proposing an Asian American Studies Program, which resulted in hiring Math Professor Jim Lin to teach a 10-week course on Contemporary Asian American Studies. Asian American students, student organizations, and community supporters fought for a permanent Asian American Studies Program to encounter resistance from academic departments and the Committee on Academic Personnel in hiring faculty, the Vice Chancellor and Chancellor. Whereas, Chicano Studies was established in 1973, Contemporary Black Arts was established in the late 1970s, Third World Studies was established in 1969, and later, a Chicano/a–Latino/a Arts and Humanities Minor was offered in 2002 and African-American Studies Minor in 2005.

Chapter 4, *Voices of Asian American Students and the Politics of Diversity Policy,* discusses the late 1990s to 2000s when race continued to shape the way people of color were treated in the United States. California’s Proposition 227 in 1998 required that public schools taught students only in English even when effective bilingual education required the use of the students’ native language to learn English. The al-Qaeda terrorist attacks in 2001 brought about the passage of the Patriot Act to enhance law enforcement and increase surveillance of suspected “terrorists,” often racial profiling South Asians as a strategy towards enforcement. While the Pew Center states that the United States will
Chicano/a–Latino/a Arts and Humanities Minor was offered in 2002 and African-American Studies Minor in 2005.

Chapter 4, *Voices of Asian American Students and the Politics of Diversity Policy*, discusses the late 1990s to 2000s when race continued to shape the way people of color were treated in the United States. California’s Proposition 227 in 1998 required that public schools taught students only in English even when effective bilingual education required the use of the students’ native language to learn English. The al-Qaeda terrorist attacks in 2001 brought about the passage of the Patriot Act to enhance law enforcement and increase surveillance of suspected “terrorists,” often racial profiling South Asians as a strategy towards enforcement. While the Pew Center states that the United States will be a majority-minority nation by 2050, the nation continues to struggle to fully embrace the racially and ethnically diverse population often suspecting language, religion, and other factors as testimony to disloyal denizens. University policy towards students of color promotes tolerance in the way people treat each other. Diversity reports from the Chicano & Latino community along with the Black community reveal the university to contain a hostile campus climate. In 2010, UC San Diego students organized a racially themed party that invited guests to dress in stereotypical black ghetto costume. The response from the university was a letter disapproving the party, but student response comprised of protests, sit-ins, a teach-out, and a march on campus demanding the university improve diversity policy at UC San Diego. Some Asian Americans fought alongside BSU and MEChA serving as leaders and allies, while others attempted to
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functions in order to serve the campus and higher education.” To create campus-wide change, it is necessary to move beyond a reactive approach regarding the needs of a list of groups and identities as a way to become more equal and inclusive. Smith’s framework helps us to begin understanding how an institutional approach complicates our visions of effective diversity policy and challenges us to re-imagine how we can create a transformative diversity policy that emphasizes the need for social change in our communities. The chapter provides policy recommendations to create change on college campuses in relation to understanding the heterogeneous Asian American group.

Overall, the three historical moments I analyze display the struggles and outcomes of how Asian Americans at UC San Diego shaped the conversation about diversity policy. The 1960s & 1970s demonstrated a radical policy that called for self-determination and challenged elitism worldwide, the 1980s & 1990s shifted its policy to welcome internationalization and diversity in order to prepare its students for globalization, and the 2000s return to equality through colorblindness and meritocracy in its call for equality. Through these moments, Asian Americans’ racialization as hyper-visible and invisible students of color on campus played an important role in how fairness, equality, and diversity were implemented in university policy. Their racialization as model minorities and yellow perils constructed them as ambiguous players often serving as friends or enemies in constructing campus diversity policy. My research pushes past these conceptual blockages of understanding Asian Americans only relation to white success and black struggles. Their racial positioning serve as a racial wedge that make it difficult for them to politically organize with other communities of color towards the path to
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transformational change. I challenge administrators, academics, and educators to move beyond the normative framework of examining their success through the achievement gap to create an academic, physical, and intellectual space that allows Asian Americans and all students to thrive.
Chapter 2
Locating Asian Americans at the University of California, San Diego
in the 1960s to 1970s

Focusing on the 1960s and 1970s, this chapter examines how Asian American student activists at UC San Diego attempted to transform the educational system. Student activists created the political Asian American Student Alliance (now Asian & Pacific-Islander Student Alliance) in 1970 to “combat the ignorance of other people on campus about Asians, to make people aware of the problems that Asians do have, recruit more Asian American students to Third College, and get Asian American Studies on campus.” They also allied with other Third World students, as part of the Lumumba-Zapata Coalition, to fight for the establishment of ethnic studies, influence minority faculty hiring, and control minority admissions in Third College.

The chapter is organized into three sections. The first section examines how the historical-political-sociological context of the Cold War and Third World movement influenced diversity policy at UC San Diego, shaping the experiences of Asian Americans there. The second section utilizes archived letters, newspapers, meeting minutes, fliers, and recent interviews to document how Asians and Asian Americans united around education and political issues in the Lumumba-Zapata Coalition and Asian American Student Alliance. The final section analyzes the challenges they faced in their racial and political positioning as Asian Americans at UC San Diego. The research calls attention to the start of Asian American political development on campus and enables us

89 Interview with Phyllis Chiu on October 7, 2011
to understand how the model minority myth and yellow peril shaped how they organized collectively.

Section 1: The Context, The Cold War: The Asian Return to the Imperial Center

During the 1960s and 1970s, political revolutions taking place worldwide changed the way young Americans understood and interpreted the world. During this period, the Vietnam War intensified; John F. Kennedy, Martin Luther King, Jr., and Malcolm X were assassinated at a relatively young age; Revolutionary Nelson Mandela was sentenced to life in prison; Mao Zedong’s cultural revolution in China challenged youth to fight the bourgeois class; and the socialist revolution in Cuba shocked many across the world. In totality, these events became a part of the collective consciousnesses challenging the hegemonic structure of an elitist class and a white dominant society via anti-war protests, sit-ins, boycotts, and walkouts.

In the midst of a nuclear arms race and communist threat from the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR) during the Cold War (1947-1991), the United States created proxy wars in Asian countries to prevent communism from spreading, known as the domino theory. Jodi Kim states, “While the Cold War is metaphorically cold when seen from the vantage point of the United States and (Western) Europe, it was literally hot and bloody in much of the rest of the world, the terrain on which the West’s Cold War was actually waged and fought.” Kim refers to the Asian countries in her reference to the “rest of the world.” The war between the USSR and the United States created the
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“vexed triangulation” of Asia in the Cold War bringing forth an influx of Asian immigrants to the United States.\textsuperscript{92} This triangulation, often left out of discussion of the Cold War history, creates a particular racialization of Asian/Asian American bodies as a homogenous educated immigrant group leisurely migrating to the United States compared to the reality of thousands of Asian ethnic groups fleeing their homeland in response to U.S. imperialism.\textsuperscript{93}

A careful examination of the precarious position of Asian Americans during the Cold War provides us with an understanding of how they arrived on the campus of UC San Diego. U.S. involvement in Asian countries created an economic and political pull of Asian immigrants to California and the United States. As stated in Chapter 1, the Cold War attempts to contain communism destroyed the land and people through proxy wars in Asian countries, thus drawing forth a large Asian immigration return to the imperialist center of the United States.\textsuperscript{94} After Asians migrated to the United States, they began to take part in social movements, playing an influential role as part of the Third World Liberation Front (TWLF), the longest student strike in the nation at San Francisco State College Strike in 1968.\textsuperscript{95} UC Berkeley Asian and Asian American students played a prominent role as Third World students to establish an Ethnic Studies Department in
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\textsuperscript{95} The Third World Liberation Front was comprised of African Americans, Asian Americans, Chicano, Latino, and Native Americans. They “advocated the right of all Third World students to an education,” “challenged the fundamental purpose of education by demanding a School of Ethnic Area Studies,” and “demanded the right to have ethnic studies classes taught and run by Third World peoples” – defining the essence of a transformative diversity. Community members also played a significant role in the success of the student movement. They protested alongside students, faculty, and staff. Umemoto 1989. http://www.sfsu.edu/~100years/history/long.htm#6769 retrieved on August 19, 2011.
Social movements on college campuses nationwide demanded the right to self-determination.

Section 2: Asian American Student Alliance and Lumumba-Zapata College

Students and faculty at UC San Diego were deeply impacted by the national and international events that took place in the 1960s and 1970s. For example, in protest of the Vietnam War, UC San Diego student, George Winn, Jr. set himself on fire at Revelle Plaza in 1970, dying ten hours later. Professor Herbert Marcuse, scholar of Marxist philosophy and a socialist, alarmed the university community with his left-wing politics and activism. Marcuse brought with him from Brandeis University a graduate student and political activist, Angela Davis, who was a member of the Black Panthers and the Communist Party.

In 1969, members of the Movimiento Estudiantil Chicano de Aztlán (MEChA) and Black Student Council (BSC) formed a multi-ethnic coalition of students to demand UC San Diego Third College be named Lumumba-Zapata College in honor of Patrice Lumumba, an important African nationalist, and Emiliano Zapata, a land reformist and a
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major figure in the Mexican Revolution. The Lumumba-Zapata College movement illuminated the ways in which Third World students felt alienated at a historically white university. In 1971, at UCSD, Asian Americans comprised only 3.5 percent of the student population, the lowest in the university’s history. In comparison, African American students represented 4.8 percent, Mexican Americans 3.9 percent, Latinos 0.8 percent, Native Americans 0.5 percent, Caucasians 70.7 percent, and Others/Undeclared 15.9 percent undergraduates.

In an important text about the student movements to transform diversity at UC San Diego, UCSD Literature Professor Jorge Mariscal documents the role Chicanos played in the attempt to create Lumumba-Zapata College. The lack of coverage of Asian American students’ role in this multi-ethnic effort is glaring. According to Mariscal, “…the UC San Diego experience embodied one of the most radical attempts by students and faculty of color to transform the elitist and Eurocentric university into an inclusionary and democratic space that reflected the concerns of traditionally excluded communities.” He noted that the Black Power Movement and Chicano Movement incited UCSD students to create the Lumumba-Zapata Coalition, but failed to mention the role of Asian Americans in this Coalition. The absence of Asian Americans in the
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written history about student activism reinforces perceptions of Asian Americans as caring only about their education and not about social change. In my conversations with Asian American students across campus today, they often wondered where Asian Americans were when Third World students were fighting for social change on campus.

When I began my search on Asian American activism at UCSD, I found no written materials on the topic. I then talked to staff and faculty, and searched the library and people’s personal archives for anything. The Director of the UCSD Summer Bridge Program, Patrick Velasquez, recommended I speak with Mariscal, who provided a list of contacts, which allowed me to piece together the contributions and nuances of the Asian diaspora in regards to the Lumumba-Zapata College, and Asian American political development at UCSD.

Keith Lowe was a pivotal figure. Lowe, of Chinese and Jamaican descent, was a professor in the Literature department from 1967-1969, teaching English and Neo-African Literature. He worked alongside black political activist Angela Davis to write the original Lumumba-Zapata College demands and create the African and black reading lists for the Third College Proposal. Born in Jamaica, Lowe’s childhood years there shaped his social and political worldview. He earned a high school certificate in Jamaica, Bachelor of Arts degree from Harvard University, a doctor of philosophy degree in modern English and American literature from Stanford University, taught high school for two years in Ghana, and served as a professor at Howard University and then UC San Diego. He wrote *Towards a Black University (1968)* as part of his participation in the Southern Student Organizing Committee, an organization dedicated to social change in
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the American south and worked towards black liberation.

In our conversation, Lowe described his work with students after the assassination of Martin Luther King, Jr. when Lowe and Angela Davis gathered UC San Diego undergraduate students to the “black ghetto of San Diego” instead of staying on their college campus.\(^\text{107}\) It was a symbolic move that demonstrated their connection to the everyday experiences of a community struggling to create radical change. Their collective effort towards black liberation continued with Davis organizing students to attend a Black Panther Party event and Lowe driving a carload of students to the event. Reflecting on his experience at UC San Diego, Lowe notes that as a mixed-race person, he was able to build bridges between the Chicano and black community. His Spanish language fluency and Jamaican upbringing allowed him to relate to Chicano and black

\(^{107}\) Interview with Dr. Keith Lowe on October 4, 2011.
students at UC San Diego. While phenotypically Asian, the Jamaican-Chinese
professor’s life experiences allowed him to transverse racial and ethnic boundaries in
creating social change. In a follow-up interview, I asked about his connection to the
Asian American community. He had difficulty identifying with his Asian roots and
Asian struggles during that period.  

Through my conversations with Lowe, he introduced me to an Asian American
graduate student who worked with the Lumumba-Zapata Coalition. Ranadir Mitra, a
South Asian from Bengali and an international graduate student in the Literature
Department, shaped the student demands for the Lumumba-Zapata Coalition and helped
defend Angela Davis’ sister from police harassment. He worked as a Teaching Assistant
from 1970 to 1972 in Third College and Communications (graduated with a Ph.D. in
1972). He also participated in many meetings with students, faculty, and administrators
regarding the Lumumba-Zapata College. Recollecting past events he said,

The more I meditate on those days the more I see two things. One, with a
war raging and UC students (including mine) being drafted, the general
climate was soooo different from anything you can imagine. Two, at
UCSD the politics of student voice and empowerment were very much
dominated by Black and Chicano students and a segment of white ‘lefties’.
I simply cannot recall the Asian-American students as a force-- at least as
long as I was there-- through spring quarter of 1972.  

While there was not a “force” of Asian and Asian American activism at the university,
both Mitra and Lowe did shape the Lumumba-Zapata Coalition in significant ways.

Mitra advised students and faculty regarding the issues and demands of Third College.

---

108 Lowe’s Asian identity did not come to fruition until later in life. He is currently a part of organizing an
annual mini-conference at Miami-Dade College in Florida titled Chinese Migration to the Caribbean Basin.
He presented lectures titled, “Traditional Emigration from China to Jamaica/Caribbean,” “Chinese
Communities in Central America,” and “Jamaica & Panama – Chinese Twins” from 2012 to 2014.
Correspondence with Dr. Keith Lowe on January 9, 2014.
109 Email correspondence with Ranadir Mitra on August 24, 2011.
Lowe’s internationalist and social justice lens shaped LZC’s demands to the university administration and curriculum development of Third College. The Lumumba-Zapata College’s vision called for a “relevant education for minority youth and to the study of the contemporary social problems of all people.” To do this, the “college must radically depart from the usual role as the ideological backbone of the social system, and must instead subject every part of the system to ruthless criticism.” Core requirements included topics such as third world liberation, civil rights movement, Black Nation, Chicano Nation, U.S. class struggles, imperialism, colonization and de-colonization liberation movements, class/race/gender, Marxism, major third world revolutionary thoughts, internal colonialism, enrolling approximately 100 students in each course. From changing the physical landscape of the university to providing financial aid to students, the vision was for American and Third World students to gain a critical education to fight against military technology and imperialism, and work to help their communities.

While Mariscal states that the Black Student Council (BSC) and Mexican American Youth Association/El Movimiento Estudiantil Chicano de Aztlan (MAYA/MEChA) led the movement to transform Third College, Ranadir Mitra and Marlene Tuyay Scott (a founder of the first Asian American political organization at UCSD, Asian American Student Alliance (AASA)), note that Asian American, Native American, and White students were a part of the Lumumba-Zapata College during the

112 Correspondence with Paul Wong on April 24, 2014
later years of the student movement.\footnote{Interview with Ranadir Mitra on July 15, 2011 and Marlene Tuyay Scott on August 27, 2011.} In a letter written to the chancellor at a Third College Board Meeting in February 1972, undergraduate student representative and AASA member Mark Masaoka vocalized his discontent regarding the absence of Asian American faculty members in Third College and the faculty Full Time Equivalency Priority List ranking of an “Asian Americanist” or faculty specializing in Asian Americans, as number twenty.\footnote{Mandeville Special Collections, RSS 1130, Box 35, Folder 11.} He noted that in previous discussions, Provost Joe Watson had pledged to make a sincere effort to hire Asian American faculty.\footnote{Asian Americans were also “poorly represented in Teaching Assistant and Guest Lecturers.” Mandeville Special Collections, RSS 1130, Box 35, Folder 11.} Masaoka requested that the Board of Third College restate their intention to recruit Asian American faculty, and handed out the curriculum vitae of potential faculty candidates, Sucheng Chan and Winston Hsieh. In response, Watson remarked that the priority lists were developed within course groups based on the needs of the college; it was not the Board of Directors’ responsibility.\footnote{Page 2 of 2 meeting notes. Mandeville Special Collections, RSS 1130, Box 35, Folder 11.} The Board agreed to write a letter of support the hiring of an Asian Americanist.

In 1972, a group of Asian American students worked tirelessly to hire a faculty member with a focus in Asian American Studies in the disciplines of anthropology, history, and sociology.\footnote{Interview with Phyllis Chiu on October 7, 2011.} Provost Watson’s inability to follow through on his pledge to hire an Asian Americanist created doubt within the Asian American community regarding his commitment to build a Third College that would be based on the self-
determination of its students, and to reshape the academic canon to include relevant and
critical courses pertaining to Asian Americans. Chicano students also criticized Provost
Watson’s inability to lead the college to admit over 35% Chicano students in the
Lumumba-Zapata College, to secure funding from outside sources to lower class size,
and to create special programs such as bilingual and community programs. Thus, the
rhetoric from Provost Watson and the UC San Diego administration fell short of any
systemic change to transform the foundational structure of the college and university.

In a 1972 letter addressed to Chancellor William D. McElroy, the Asian American
Student Alliance, United Native Americans, and White Caucus of Third College stated,
“We the so-called ‘Others’ of Third College, charge that Dr. Watson’s actions this year
have been totally inconsistent with the ideals and spirit on which Third College was

118 Chicano Position Paper on Third College, May 1972. Mandeville Special Collections Library, RSS
1130, Box 27, Folder 7
founded. We charge that our rights to self-determination within the college are being totally disregarded by Dr. Watson."119 While there was support from the Black Student Union (BSU) for Provost Watson’s leadership in their letter of support stating that, “We feel Dr. Watson is the most competent man to see Third College grow as an institution dedicated to the education of minority people” and “on numerous occasions, made sure that EOP gave Third College its necessary consideration,”120 there was discontent from Asian American students who felt that the provost failed to admit Asian American students, and recruit and hire Asian American faculty on a fair and equal basis. The Lumumba-Zapata College Steering Committee spoke with the chancellor to rectify the problem, however no satisfactory resolution was given to address student concerns.121 In April 1972, “approximately two-thirds of the college called for the resignation of Provost Watson, even without the support of the Black Student Union. Letters were sent to the chancellor from MEChA, the United Native Americans, the Asian American Student Alliance, the White Caucus, and a substantial majority of the faculty presently on the college campus.”122 Both students and faculty envisioned a Lumumba-Zapata College as a unique space that was a part of the social change occurring during the 1960s and 1970s.

To further comprehend Asian American student activism at UC San Diego, I examined the Asian American Student Alliance (AASA) and its founding leaders. Phyllis

119 Provost Joseph Watson, a chemistry professor was the Black Student Council’s faculty advisor. Provost Watson did not want to be away from his research and admitted he was forced into the position but served the college from 1971-1980. From Mandeville Special Collections, Letter to Chancellor McElroy, cc: Dr. Joseph Watson
120 The Black Student Union noted the resistance of white faculty that prevented Provost Watson from meeting the needs course and major requests from minority students. Mandeville Special Collections Library, 0175S, at UC San Diego, RSS 1130, Box 45, Folder 2.
121 Mandeville Special Collections, RSS 1130, Box 27, Folder 7.
122 In May 1972, the letter to the Third College Community from the Asian American Student Alliance confirmed a statement calling for the resignation of Provost Watson of Third College. Mandeville Special Collections Library, RSS 1130, Box 27, Folder 7
Chiu, Ayda Lucero, and Marlene Tuyay Scott formed the first political Asian American student organization in 1970 (now known as the Asian & Pacific-Islander Student Alliance, APSA). These three Asian American women created the organization to educate both Asian American and non-Asian American students and staff regarding Asian American problems, to recruit more Asian Americans to Third College, and to establish Asian American Studies at UC San Diego. Chiu noted that they would work directly in Asian American communities such as Paradise Hills and National City when volunteer opportunities arose. With the 3.5 percent Asian American undergraduate population in 1971, Chiu indicated that there were few Asian American students represented at Third College; other Asian American students were focused on obtaining a degree, graduating, and getting a good paying job. The Asian American Student Alliance with its eight to nine active members hoped to create and build a strong Asian American community on campus concerned with social and political issues.

The interviews with founders Phyllis Chiu and Marlene Tuyay Scott reveal the heart and sentiment behind the political student organization that sought to transform the educational experiences of students by challenging local and worldwide injustices against Third World people. Phyllis Chiu, a second-generation Chinese American undergraduate student who transferred from Northwestern University, was a sophomore majoring in Third World Studies and Chinese Studies in Fall 1970. Originally from Philadelphia, she

---

123 In 1986, the name changed to Asian and Pacific-Islander Student Alliance to reflect the changing demographics that moved beyond the ethnic groups of Chinese, Japanese, and Pilipinos. From A Brief History of APSA, APSA Documents Binder.
124 Interview with Phyllis Chiu on October 7, 2011.
125 The student organization met at least once a month. The organization was political in nature, and met together participating in informal events as a way to create a sense of community on campus. They had up to twelve members at a time.
participated in anti-war protests and marches in her high school years. However, the Kent State Massacre in 1970 where Ohio National Guards shot unarmed college students protesting the American invasion in Cambodia propelled her to become more personally and politically involved. Chiu became interested in the Asian American movement in 1969 and participated in anti-war protests and the campaign to save Third College at UC San Diego. Since Chiu and Lucero represented the very few Asian American students at Third College, they organized a meeting to bring together other Asian American students and met Tuyay Scott for the first time. Chiu and Tuyay Scott connected instantly, eventually becoming roommates.

Marlene Tuyay Scott, a Filipina undergraduate U.S. history major came to UCSD in 1970. She was an active member of the Lumumba-Zapata College, a student who protested Provost Watson’s control of Third College in a hunger strike, and helped to form the Asian American Student Alliance with fellow students Phyllis Chiu and Ayda Lucero, and with Benjamin K. T’sou as the advisor. Tuyay Scott was first politicized when she was an Educational Opportunity Program (EOP) student hired to recruit minority students. She described a time when she visited an Indian reservation to recruit students where she noticed that by “crossing the street” of the reservation, there existed great economic disparity in neighboring communities. She began questioning the claim of an egalitarian and meritocratic society. She came from a conservative background; she grew up Catholic and a child of a navy officer, with the hopes of being the first in her family to graduate college. Her involvement with Third College took shape as she

126 Benjamin K. T’sou was a faculty member in the Literature Department and the Chairman of the Chinese Studies Program at UC San Diego.
127 Interview with Marlene Tuyay Scott on August 27, 2011.
participated in the fight for a Lumumba-Zapata College and the establishment of an activist-oriented Asian American Student Alliance at UCSD. Although her politicization did not begin directly with Asian American issues, it was a starting point for her to analyze social and political issues more critically. Passionate about creating social change in her community, in June 1972, she participated in a hunger strike alongside fifteen other Lumumba-Zapata College students and a Muir student in front of the chancellor’s office in order to “protest the bad publicity received by the Lumumba-Zapata Steering Committee” and to support “realist negotiations between the administration and the Lumumba-Zapata Steering Committee.”

Tuyay Scott’s political activism did not just begin or end with the Lumumba-Zapata College, she concerned herself with both domestic and transnational issues, protesting the closure of the I-Hotel (International Hotel) in San Francisco, Ferdinand Marcos’s declaration of martial law in the Philippines, and the US war in Vietnam.

It was conversations between Chiu and Tuyay Scott that led to the idea of forming the Asian American student organization. Chiu recalls,

We first started the group because there weren’t any Asian American student organizations on campus and at that time there were a lot of identity kinda stuff going on, Asian American identity. Now everyone takes it for granted. That back then…what was the question, ‘Are we even considered a minority? Have we made it? Are we a success already? Are we assimilated?’… that kind of a thing.

---

128 Paul Saltman, UC San Diego Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs, did not take the hunger strike seriously, commenting that he saw students “drinking fruit juices and eating crackers” (The San Diego Union, June 6, 1972). A one-page document from the Mandeville Special Collections Library, 0175S, at UC San Diego, titled “Saltman Lies” indicates the vehement objection to his accusations in a news article, along with seven clarifying statements regarding the hunger strike. Some student hunger strikers included Martha Lomeli, Petra Gonzalez, Boris Larrata, Karla Padilla, Jose Lopez, Richard Lopez, Richard Flores, and Manuel Briseno. Cite Mariscal’s book. UCSD MSC, Third College files (Dorn project). Mandeville Special Collections, RSS 1130, Box 27, Folder 7

129 Habal 2008
These Asian American students became politicized at the very same moment that the media invented the *model minority* myth, first publicized in a 1966 *New York Times* article about Japanese American alleged success.\(^{130}\) The model minority myth hailed Asian American achievements in an effort to instruct blacks and other minorities to pull themselves up by their own bootstrap, in effect reprimanding them for using public assistance.\(^{131}\) The construction of Asian Americans as an affluent and thriving racial minority barred them from connecting and organizing with other minority groups against racism. The model minority myth impacted Asian American efforts to create the first Asian American political student organization and to work towards a new vision of Third College as Lumumba-Zapata College as a way to transform the university. An examination of the Asian American Student Alliance recruitment flyer reveals the identity issues Asian American college students were grappling with in the midst of the Yellow Power Movement.\(^{132}\) The following quote from the flyer pointed out the futility of Asian Americans trying to fit in the white culture:

> You may go for years without realizing your identity. You may only sense ‘not fitting in’ the white culture. The truth of your identity comes close to surfacing when people call you ‘Flip,’ ‘Chink,’ ‘Nip,’ ‘or ‘Gook.’ Why do they call you these dirty names? To you these names meant people killed in movies to protect freedom and justice for all. It is too difficult to accept that you are not one of the beautiful people. You try to ignore these assaults and continue to accept white culture and to prove how white you really are.\(^{133}\)

---

\(^{130}\) There were also other news articles about Chinese Americans such as “Success Story of One Minority in the U.S.” from *U.S. News and World Report* in December 1966.

\(^{131}\) Chou & Feagin 2008

\(^{132}\) Louie and Omatsu 2001, Espiritu 1993

\(^{133}\) Asian American Student Alliance flier, 1971
It was also during the late 1960s and early 1970s when Asian American youth created a strong pan-Asian coalition to fight for rights and resources in the United States.\textsuperscript{134} It spoke to the racism many students experienced during the historical moment with the Vietnam War and civil rights struggles. While past generations of Asian Americans experienced “ethnic disidentification” because of racist policies targeting specific Asian groups (e.g. Chinese, Japanese) from immigrating, voting, employment, and obtaining the full rewards of citizenship, the college-going second generation Asian Americans of the late 1960s and early 1970s shared, struggled, and coalesced in a pan-Asian ethnic solidarity against internal colonialism and racist policies.\textsuperscript{135} The Asian American Student Alliance at UCSD represented a part of the Asian American Movement that challenged institutional racism, which pushed for hiring Asian Americanist faculty, renaming Third College, admitting more Asian American college students, and challenging the model minority.

As we see in the fight for Lumumba-Zapata College, Third World students worked alongside each other to enact their self-determination and the right for a relevant and political education. However, Asian American students at UC San Diego who identified with the movement struggled to find other students who identified with their experiences. More often, Asian Americans were distinguished as a group who were not minorities and who did not experience

\textsuperscript{134} Espiritu 1993
\textsuperscript{135} Espiritu 1993: 20
racism. Most Asian Americans during this time began to critically challenge the ideas of the American Dream, democracy, and meritocracy. An AASA’s flier read,

Asians succeeding financially quickly moved away from other yellow people and into white areas, hoping to be swallowed by the Great American Melting Pot and Acculturation Machine. But as we can see from the Black and Chicano experience, only white melts into society. People of color remain people of color.136

With the Civil Rights Movement and the other race-based social movements, it was a ripe time for political consciousness-raising. And yet, it was a difficult endeavor for Asian Americans at UCSD to bond with other students of color for several reasons: their status as model minorities, their lack of experience in political organizing, and their relatively low number in the university and nation.

In 1972, Paul Wong was hired to become a tenure track Assistant Professor in the Department of Sociology, and assigned to teach in Third World Studies. Wong mentioned that he was hired because the department was interested in faculty who could teach about issues regarding China, which led to him teaching a course from the late Ch’ing Dynasty to the 1970s. And at the time, he was finishing a book on Chinese leadership, titled China’s Higher Leadership in the Socialist Transition (1976). However, he also taught the 9-unit core sequence courses in Third College that tackled topics from imperialism to class struggles to third world revolutionary thoughts. He served as the Program Coordinator for Third World Studies from 1973-1974 and a part of the Asian American Student Alliance. He mentioned that he taught a class on Asian Americans but the enrollment was as small as ten students. He taught about anti-colonial struggles in

136 A special thanks to Phyllis Chiu for sharing the Asian American Student Alliance flier from her personal collection.
Asia and internal colonialism of Asian Americans. When asked if the student effort to hire an Asian Americanist was the reason for his hire, he said it was most likely for his expertise in survey research and statistical methods (having worked at UC Berkley’s Survey Research Center for five years), their need for a China Scholar, and possibly his expertise on Asian Americans. 137 Wong concluded, “But, they didn’t expect an activist.” 138

Prior to his arrival, Wong worked as a principal investigator and project director for the Asian American Community Project at UC Berkeley, Acting Assistant Professor for the Department of Sociology at UC Berkeley, and Assistant Professor in Sociology and Research Associate for the Center For Asian Studies at University of Illinois at Champaign-Urbana. Wong was heavily involved in activism in the Third World Liberation Front, Asian American Movement, and labor and community organizing around the nation. In the midst of political and social movements, Wong recalled being drawn to UC San Diego due to the ideals of Third College. He says,

> It was kinda like a calling you know and I think it was promising at the time to build a Third College...We had the mission to really change the university significantly so that it is responsive to Third World communities, responsive to world affairs…anti-war movement. Also, to produce a curriculum that would be much more reflective of what students learn about social sciences, humanities, the role of science so we were very ambitious. 139

However, his stay at UC San Diego lasted only two years. La Jolla was an isolating place where a wealthy community resided, and where he was unable to call home. During those days, he commuted to the Crenshaw District in Los Angeles to organize a Third

---

137 Correspondence with Paul Wong on April 24, 2014
138 Ibid.
139 Interview with Paul Wong on May 10, 2011 and May 31, 2011.
World Center. He worked with gangs, helped build a food co-op for poor families, and worked with the summer youth program that included films and lectures. It was a racially and ethnically diverse community. The university was another story. It was an elitist institution surrounded by a neighborhood that condoned discriminatory housing practices for Jews and Third World communities. Additionally, UC San Diego was a tough place to call home because the lack of Asian Americans and other Third World students attending the university. He was able to contribute to the strengthening of other non-academic communities outside La Jolla. Not having a strong tie to UC San Diego and La Jolla, Wong eventually moved to San Francisco State University to teach in their Sociology Department.

Section 3: Analysis of a Transformative Diversity

The precarious racial positioning of Asian Americans as minorities, yet excluded from the “historically underrepresented” category, provides insight for us to understand diversity policy during this historical period. The shift occurred during the late 1970s when Asian Americans were de-minoritized as “underrepresented minorities” in university and admissions policies. They no longer were treated as a minority group who needed affirmative action and educational support programs at the university. From 1971 to 1979, Asian American undergraduates at UCSD grew from 3.5 percent to 7.2 percent of the student population. It was this dramatic demographic shift that led to their efforts to transform university policy regarding Third World people. The Third World Movement, Civil Rights Movement, and Black Power Movement of the late 1960s forced universities to reflect on racial and ethnic issues, as well as embody equality and fairness

Lee 2006 and Chan & Wang 1991
in curriculum, hiring faculty, and admissions policies. Similarly, UC San Diego’s Asian American students were inspired and (sometimes) forced to examine their lives that were intricately connected to race, yet crucial to understanding their social and political identities. This is reflected in the creation of the first Asian American political student organization at UC San Diego, named Asian American Student Alliance.

The Asian American Student Alliance was created out of a necessity to form a community of students that recognized their racial identity as a dominant factor in understanding their everyday experiences both on and off campus. With the long history of anti-Asian discriminatory policies, Asian American students began to acknowledge that race shaped their experiences; yet they also felt interconnected to other Third World students due to U.S. racist policies. They came together as “Asian Americans” to protest the Vietnam War, support Third College, and participate in the driving issues of the time.

The goals of the Asian American Student Alliance were congruent with the UC San Diego mission of a land grant and public university, which holds the university administration accountable to the needs of the local community. The organization’s demand to increase admissions for Asian American students reflected the growing Asian American population. Despite the growth, Asian Americans were unable to generate enough concern and attention from the administration. They represented a small portion of the US population and were depicted in the media as the model minority. In the organization’s letter written to the Office of Civil Rights in San Francisco dated May 8, 1972, they claimed that “the university has not attempted to actively recruit Asian-American students. Of 660 applicants to one of the colleges at UC San Diego, only 34 are Asian-Americans.” On top of that, Asian international students were lumped together
with Asian Americans, even though the former had the financial resources to attend UC San Diego while the latter often faced obstacles. AASA also touched upon the fact that the university did not hire any full-time Asian Americans to recruit potential Asian American students. Even with their formal complaint, there was no serious consideration of revamping policy for Asian American students. The discriminatory policy of UC San Diego towards Asian Americans reflected the historical period.\textsuperscript{141}

Phyllis Chiu reflected on the Lumumba-Zapata College, “It was started by a black and brown coalition, and Asians were not included. There was basically no Asian input. We got there, there was a couple of us, so we thought ‘Okay, what do we do now?’” So Phyllis Chiu, Ayda Lucero, and Marlene Tuyay Scott decided to form the first political Asian American student organization at UC San Diego. They were forced to quickly understand their racial positioning in local and global politics as Asian Americans and Third World people. The Asian American Student Alliance responded to the necessity to address their Asian American identity as related to the anti-war movement, Black Power Movement, Third World Movements, and the Cold War. Their small numbers required them to organize within their own group due to their racialization as model minorities and yellow perils; their activism always requiring the education of Asians and non-Asians to understand the struggles they face. Simultaneously, it required them to grapple with the needs of other Third World communities in the attempt to build a larger social movement to challenge class and racial oppression in communities.

Representative of the Asian Diaspora, Keith Lowe and Ranadir Mitra worked closely with the formation of the Lumumba-Zapata Coalition to create a new vision for

\textsuperscript{141} Mandeville Special Collections Library, RSS 1130, Box 27, Folder 7
Third College in the earlier years, and Paul Wong hoped to transform the university in providing relevant curriculum in the realization of a Lumumba-Zapata College. Their goal in building a university responsive to Third World communities was significant. Their contributions were important in understanding the different roles Asians and Asian Americans played in building a university critical to the survival of not only the Asian American community, but society-at-large. They represented a part of the diaspora in a historical moment that brought about a critical consciousness for Asian Americans. However, there was not a dramatic shift in how Asian American students and faculty were treated by the university administration without a long-term political leader who had in-depth knowledge about the Asian American community at UCSD.

Asian Americans worked within the formal structure of the land grant university to demand that their histories and stories be taught in the classroom as part of enacting their self-determination. Students were interested in understanding how their racial and ethnic identity was connected to a history of discriminatory policies that shaped their experiences, revealing a desire to analyze the relationships between education, history, and power. Chiu and Tuyay Scott from the Asian American Student Alliance wanted a relevant education that explored history, current events, and their communities residing in the United States. Asian and Asian Americans were not absent. Third World student activists promoted a radical policy of self-determination, which during this historical period when we began to see Asian and Asian American activists who participated in the anti-war movement, Lumumba-Zapata College and other Third World movements. As UCSD is a land grant university responsible for solving the problems of our society such as poverty, healthcare, and education, students’ demands to hire faculty to teach Asian
American Studies and support of a Lumumba-Zapata College conveys the necessity to reconceive the academic canon that represents America. Asians and Asian Americans worked across campus to carve out a political space that spoke to their life experiences racialized as the model minority and yellow peril in the United States. They continued to choose UC San Diego as their university in the 1980s and 1990s, yet the university continued to ignore the needs of the community. The following chapter addresses the struggles they continued to face in creating an Asian American Studies Program at UC San Diego.
Chapter 3
Institutionalizing Asian American Studies in the 1980s to 1990s

Although the claims of discrimination identify Asian applicants as racially disadvantaged subjects, the rebuttals by university officials construct Asians as (nonracial) advantaged subjects. And from the perspective of many admissions officers and university officials, Asians were not minorities, racial or otherwise. ~ Dana Takagi, *The Retreat from Race: Asian American Admissions and Racial Politics*, 1992, p. 55-56

San Diego has acquired a reputation nationally of not being receptive to Ethnic Studies or Asian American Studies. We remain the only UC campus that has not hired a permanent FTE [Full Time Equivalent] in Asian American Studies despite petitions by hundreds of students, faculty, and community people as well as personal letters from the state legislature (Willie Brown) and regents (Yori Wada). ~ James Lin, *Department of Mathematics, UC San Diego, January 26, 1989*

During the 1980s and 1990s, California’s public universities began to grapple with the growing racial and ethnic populations through policies that promote “diversification” and “internationalization.” Whereas Third World students in the late 1960s and 1970s demanded a radical transformation of the university, which would grant them the right of “self-determination” and re-shape the power structure in college admissions, faculty hiring, and curriculum, the shift in the 1980s and 1990s exhibited a more benign politics of diversification and internationalization. “Diversification” included the growing racial and ethnic make up of the state and nation. “Internationalization” addressed the reliance on knowledge and culture from other nations in adapting to a globalized market. During this period, affirmative action

---

142 Mandeville Special Collections Library, RSS 1130, Box 44, Folder 19
143 Smelser 1986
144 Ibid.
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debates were heated and universities added “diversity courses” to their curricula to appease student demands.\(^\text{146}\)

By 1990, Asians at UCSD represented 20.3 percent of the student population, in comparison to African Americans at 2.8 percent, Mexican Americans at 7.1 percent, Latinos at 3 percent, and Native Americans at 0.8 percent.\(^\text{147}\) In this chapter, I examine the Asian American student struggle to establish an Asian American Studies Minor at UCSD as an example of their effort to determine the type of university education they wanted to receive. Although the number of Asian American students at UCSD doubled each decade from 3.5 percent in 1971 to 7.9 in 1980 to 20.3 in 1990, their fight to establish Asian American studies was largely ignored.\(^\text{148}\) My research not only documents the activities and experiences of Asian American students and faculty on campus, but also analyzes the role that Asian Americans played in promoting transformational change in higher education. Asian Americans not only pushed to hire Asian American faculty, they wanted to institutionalize curriculum that would challenge the academic canon and institutionalized racism. Although the Asian American community garnered support from a non-Asian American community, they still struggled to convince the university administration the importance of establishing an Asian American Studies Minor Program. Although their demand was not outright denied, the slow response from the administration indicated lack of serious interest. I argue that their racialization as model minorities and yellow perils required the community to gather a

\(^{146}\) Smelser 1986, Takagi 1992

\(^{147}\) Asians represented 16.1 percent and Filipinos 4.2 percent. Caucasians represented 59.3 percent, and Other 6.7 percent of UC San Diego’s student population. UCSD Student Information and Research

\(^{148}\) UCSD Student Information and Research begin collecting the racial group data beginning in 1971.
broader community of support as a way to convince the administration that their issues and struggles were relevant and important.

The chapter is organized into two sections. The first section examines the historical-political-sociological context that influenced diversity policy, shaping the experiences of Asian Americans at UCSD. The second section utilizes archived letters, newspapers, meeting minutes, fliers, program proposals, and an interview to understand how the Asian American campus community attempted to establish an Asian American Studies Program. The chapter concludes with an analysis of the administrative challenges they faced in the attempt to institutionalize an Asian American Studies Program as part of reshaping the academic canon.149

Section 1: “Diversification” and “Internationalization” of the University

In Bakke v. The Regents of the University of California (1978), the Supreme Court declared that the use of “quotas” to improve minority access to undergraduate and post-graduate studies was illegal,150 and that special admissions policies could not be used to rectify past discrimination because the Constitution provided equal protection to white students under the 14th Amendment. However, in the same ruling, the Supreme Court determined that race and ethnicity is one important factor that can be considered in admissions decisions. While the use of race-based set asides or quotas was revoked, Justice Powell noted that diversity could be proved to be a compelling interest due to “the educational benefits that flow from a racially diverse student body.”151 After the Civil

---

149 See Sucheng Chan’s book that discusses the politics of establishing Asian American Studies Program at the college level.
150 A white student who applied to UC Davis Medical School was twice denied on separate occasions, leading him to challenge affirmative action policy in 1978. Takagi 1992
151 Palmer 2001
Rights Act of 1964 and Affirmative Action of 1965 attempted to open the doors for students of color to attend college, the Bakke decision was an important marker that validated the importance of “diversity,” rather than racial justice, in institutions of higher education in the 1980s and 1990s.

Justice Powell’s emphasis on “the educational benefits” of a racially diverse student body suggested perhaps for the first time that students of color were useful and beneficial to the university, as well as important to the future success of a historically white middle class student population and its administration. As a consequence, the concept “diverse student bodies” has become a mantra and even a bragging right on college campuses, deployed to advertise the university as a place that trains future leaders to work with a culturally diverse workforce, locally and internationally. In *A Brief History of University of California*, Nancy Pelfrey states, “In effect, the Court said, the Davis program’s goal of enrolling a diverse student body served ‘a substantial [state] interest’ and was legally valid, but the means it employed were not.” The shift in our understanding of diversity from “radical” politics that corrects past racial injustices to one that touts multiculturalism was apparent in this historical moment.

The Bakke case is significant in understanding how the concept of “diversity” has shaped the experiences of Asian American students at California’s public universities. During the 1980s, Asian American students were placed in the center of the debate on America’s ideals of meritocracy and diversity in the use of affirmative action at elite public universities. When sociologist Dana Takagi interviewed L. Ling-Chi Wang, chairperson of Ethnic Studies and faculty of Asian American Studies at UC Berkeley, he

---

152 Pelfrey 2004: 59
noted that the reports from the UC Berkeley Admissions and Financial Aid Office stated that “the absolute number of newly enrolled Asians had dropped from 1,303 in 1983 to 1,031 in 1984, a 21 percent drop in a single year.”\textsuperscript{153} Shocked by the data, Professor Wang organized the Asian American Task Force on University Admissions in 1984. The Task Force found UC Berkeley guilty of admissions policies that led to the decrease in Asian American enrollment.\textsuperscript{154} The university administration did not admit fault in their admissions policy until three years later, when the chancellor apologized for not being sensitive to how the policy directly impacted admissions for Asian American students.\textsuperscript{155} UC Berkeley’s response reflected a nationwide trend of universities that began to view the increased presence of Asian Americans on their college campuses as a problem. Although racial and ethnic diversity was touted as a benefit to a multicultural learning environment and world, Asian Americans were often derided as being “overrepresented” on college campuses.

Whereas neoconservative politicians and college officials opposed affirmative action, liberals were adamant that affirmative action was needed to improve minority achievements. Neoconservatives disingenuously held up Asian Americans as the “new victims” of affirmative action, pitting them against other groups of color and touting that individual merit, not race, should determine admission decisions. As Takagi reports, “Highlighting the achievements of Asians as a racial minority, neoconservatives used Asian American students as an important racial wedge in the debate in order to criticize

\textsuperscript{153} Takagi 1993:25
\textsuperscript{154} See Takagi (1993) for criticisms of Berkeley’s admissions policy discussed in the Asian American Task Force Report
institutions for favoring blacks at the expense of Asians and whites.”

At the other end, those who were vested in improving diversity considered Asian Americans to be “overrepresented” on college campuses. In other words, both neoconservatives and liberals treated Asian Americans—the purported “model minorities”—“as a wild card in the racial politics of higher education.” The de-minoritization of Asian Americans has impacted their inclusion in higher education studies; scholars seldom examine their experiences, opting instead to focus on how they relate to white-student success or black-student struggle. In her seminal work, *The Retreat from Race: Asian American Admissions and Racial Politics*, Takagi concludes that the admissions controversy that “started out as an almost exclusive concern of Asian Americans” in admissions “evolved into an issue that held profound consequences for other underrepresented minorities.”

The emphasis on the “educational benefits” of a diverse student population also led universities to offer ethnic studies courses and programs. The Executive Summary from the Task Force on Lower Division Education in the University of California (1986) called attention to the “growing interdependence along economic, political, and cultural lines” of California’s “economic and geographic situation.” Thus, reforming the university’s curriculum was paramount in creating positive change to adapt to local and global economies and communities. Such mandate supported the institutionalization of ethnic studies courses as part of the “diversification” and “internationalization” of
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California: to “enhance the international, multicultural, and global learning experiences of students.”\textsuperscript{160} In contrast, during the 1960s and 1970s, students demanded a Third World education that would prepare minority students to solve social problems worldwide, rejecting a system that thrived on military technology and imperialism, and promoting a university in which Third World people would occupy positions from architects to faculty to administrators.\textsuperscript{161} By 1991, forty-eight percent of four-year colleges nationwide had implemented multicultural general education requirements, defined as courses that focused on issues such as race and ethnicity, cultural diversity, cultural pluralism and ethnic studies.\textsuperscript{162} At the same time, thirty-five percent of these institutions offered Asian American Studies courses and seven percent of institutions had Asian American Studies Departments and Programs.\textsuperscript{163} Public discourse was filled with liberals who fought for curricular change to study more than “dead white men” and for affirmative action policy to “equalize the playing field,” while conservatives treated “diversity” and “race issues” on college campuses as a challenge to the “most fundamental and cherished reserves of the academy – meritocracy in admissions, a curriculum of classics, peer review in faculty hiring and promotion, and academic stands.”\textsuperscript{164}

Section 2: Fighting for and Resistance against Asian American Studies at UCSD

From 1983 to 1989, Asian American students, faculty, staff, and community members attempted to work with university administration to establish Asian American

\textsuperscript{160} Smelser 1986
\textsuperscript{161} Lumumba-Zapata College, BSC-MAYA Demands for Third College, 1969
\textsuperscript{162} Represented by a survey of 196 public and private two and four-year colleges and universities. Levine & Cureton 1992
\textsuperscript{163} Levine & Cureton 1992
Studies at UC San Diego. Their collective journey began in Spring 1983, when Visiting Professor Ling-Chi Wang of UC Berkeley taught an Asian American History course that enrolled thirty-eight students. The success of the class, the tremendous community support for it, and positive student feedback led to a meeting between UCSD Chancellor Richard C. Atkinson and Asian American community leaders, Beverley C. Yip, Executive Director of Union of Pan-Asian Communities and a member of the Board of Overseers of UCSD, and representatives of Asian and Pacific-Islander Student Alliance (APSA). Community leaders requested more Asian American studies courses by the end of the academic term. By the end of the year, community members petitioned the Chancellor, Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs, Dean of Arts and Sciences, and the Council of Provosts to have more Asian American Studies courses. However the chancellor was not receptive to their request, citing that there was no organized faculty to support the program in specific departments.

During Winter 1984, motivated by the growing number of Asians in the United States, eleven Asian and non-Asian UCSD faculty from various disciplines submitted a 4-page proposal to create a core curriculum of Asian American Studies to Chancellor Atkinson and Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs Harold K. Ticho. They requested the addition of the following three courses to the university curriculum: Asian American History, Contemporary Issues in the Asian American Community, and Asian American
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165 Community leaders include Peter Quon (Attorney, Chairman of Union of Pan-Asian Communities), Jesse Quinsaat (Attorney, UCSD alumnus), and Yoshito Kawahara (Clinical psychologist).
166 Interview with James Lin on May 2, 2011.
167 Faculty members included: M. Chen (lead contact person, Linguistics), J. Chen (Physics), M. Chen (Linguistics), T. Dublin (History), D. Jordan (Anthropology), S. Kuroda (Linguistics), R. Madsen (Sociology), P. Pickowicz (History), R. Rumbaut (Sociology), M. Okamura (Physics), N. Xuong (Biology/Chemistry/Physics), and W. Yip (Literature).
Literature. The language of the proposal focused on Asian Americans Studies as a new, but established “field of scholarly inquiry,” and reiterated the need for teaching and researching that focused on an “Asian American perspective” and “Asian cultural traditions both within UCSD and in the local community” to a “sizable potential audience.” With Third World students and faculty in the late 1960s and 1970s demanded a radical transformation of the university, which would grant students the right of “self-determination” and re-shape the power structure in college admissions, faculty hiring, and curriculum, the shift in the 1980s and 1990s exhibited a more benign politics of diversification and internationalization. Their argument for the new courses was based on the growth in Asian American undergraduate enrollment from 7.9 percent in 1980 to 16.1 percent in 1990. Moreover, the impetus for the proposed courses adhered to the notion of “diversification,” focusing on the large influx of immigrants from Indochina and Pacific Islands. Although the university had a Chinese Studies Program, faculty, students, and community members demanded relevant courses with an Asian American perspective. Additionally, the proposed program would be supported by the existing faculty already involved with research on the Japanese American Internment, and had work experience with the Board of Directors of the Union of Pan-Asian Communities and Indochinese Health and Adaptation Project in San Diego County. Asian American faculty and supporters wanted to institutionalize an Asian American Studies minor that would focus on the social, political, and economic needs of Asians in

168 Mandeville Special Collections, RSS 1000, Box 8 Folder
169 “Diversification” included the growing racial and ethnic make up of the state and nation. “Internationalization” addressed the reliance on knowledge and culture from other nations in adapting to a globalized market. Smelser 1986
170 UC San Diego, Undergraduate Demographics of Asian Students
171 Smelser 1986
the United States. The resistance of university administration to fully support and fund the program led to another submission of a 9-page proposal for an Asian American Studies Minor Program by the Advisory Committee for Asian American Courses in 1988.\textsuperscript{172}

During the 1984-85 academic year, the UCSD administration formed a Faculty Steering Committee to undertake the hiring of faculty for Asian American Studies. It was a small success, but the late funding allocation from the Council of Provosts (COP) delayed the faculty search until the following academic year.\textsuperscript{173} Sadly, the search resulted in Dr. Lawson Inada declining the position because the committee reduced his original offer at the last minute. Due to the limited budget and the slow hiring pace of the university administration, the institutionalization of Asian American Studies was further delayed until 1985-86.\textsuperscript{174} Eager to launch the new Asian American Studies course and frustrated by the slow hiring process, Professor James Lin, a professor of Mathematics, stepped in to teach the first course and lead the fight for the establishment of an Asian American Studies program.\textsuperscript{175} As the faculty lead, Lin decided the best way to utilize the $14,000 budget was to create a 10-week lecture series. In Spring 1986, Lin taught the first Contemporary Issues in Asian American Studies course at UC San Diego. The

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{172} Faculty members in included: J. Lin (Chair of Committee, Math Department), M. Chen (Linguistics-Chinese Studies), R. Madsen (Sociology), M. Miyoshi (Literature), and J. Dower (History). Mandeville Special Collections, RSS 1, Box 200, Folder 1
  \item \textsuperscript{173} Mandeville Special Collections, RSS 1000, Box, 8, Folder 6
  \item \textsuperscript{174} Dr. Lin notes that the Asian American Studies Committee was approved to hire two professors. Interview with James Lin on May 2, 2011.
  \item \textsuperscript{175} Lin was personally impacted by the Asian American History course Visiting Professor Ling-Chi Wang taught in 1983. The math professor sat in Wang’s history lectures that deeply connected to Lin’s life experiences as a Chinese Asian American. His father was a Professor of engineering with his brothers also following in the footsteps of being professors in the sciences. The knowledge he learned in the history course put his life in perspective in regards to his personal experiences as an Asian American living in the United States but this hardly prepared him to teach the first contemporary Asian American Studies course.
\end{itemize}
lecture series included prominent speakers: a UC Regent, a U.S. House of Representative, an Asian American children’s books novelist, the first Japanese American to legally resist World War II internment, a UC Chairwoman of Asian American Studies, and the editor of the first major anthology of Asian American literature.176

These speakers generated tremendous excitement and support from the Asian American community at UC San Diego. The Contemporary Issues in Asian American Communities course enrolled fifty-seven students. Newspapers talked about the new course, describing the visit by Lawson Inada, editor of the first major anthology of Asian American literature, as a lecture followed by “an evening of festivities: an informal reception with students and community and an impromptu poetry/music jam session with a local jazz band.”177 Students helped in different ways from writing press releases to picking up speakers from the airport. It was a collaborative effort that brought the Asian American community together. To be able to see political figures and leaders such as Japanese American internment resister Minoru Yasui brought forth a sense of pride and self-discovery for many students.178 An anthropology major and Asian Pacific Student Alliance179 (APSA) student, Ming Leung appreciated “being in a class with other Asians and viewing topics from an Asian American perspective.”180 He also spoke of self-discovery: ‘It’s like meeting someone that you know, that you hadn’t seen for a while –

176 Mandeville Special Collections, RSS 1, Box 200, Folder 1. “1st Asian Studies Course Offered at UC San Diego,” Asian Week, April 25, 1986. “UCSD class aimed at Asian Americans,” La Jolla Light, April 24, 1986.
177 “A Lot of Class,” Pacific Citizen, May 9, 1986
178 Minoru Yasui was a UC Regents Scholar.
179 Formerly known as Asian American Student Alliance, the first political Asian American student organization was founded in 1970 at UC San Diego by three Asian American women. See chapter 2 for a detailed history of the organization.
180 “A Lot of Class,” Pacific Citizen, May 9, 1986
like meeting a lost friend.’”

Professor Lin added, “The students were excited. They would pick up the speakers at the airport. We would put them up in the hotel. Next morning we would have breakfast with them. So you got to really have a feeling of Asian American Studies coming alive.”

Figure 3.1 Minoru Yasui’s Lecture on April 9, 1986, 8pm at UCSD Peterson Hall
Poster in Professor James Lin’s Office, UCSD (2011)

Throughout the semester, the fervor continued to build in the classroom with topics that addressed their Asian American identities, and how they were historically situated in the U.S. Student Suong Tuyet Nguyen noted the student enthusiasm about the course,

The feeling among the students who attended this class is unlike that of most classes…Sharing a common identity - Asian American identity - draws the students closer together. Jim Lin and the multitude of guest lecturers will hopefully give Asian American students a better understanding of their identity, not only as Asian Americans, but as
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Japanese [Americans], Chinese Americans, Vietnamese [Americans], Filipino American, and Korean Americans as well.¹⁸³

For many students like Nguyen at that time, it was their first time to be in an academic classroom that provided a space to discuss Asian American issues, concerns, and experiences. Some students embraced the opportunity to understand their identity as Asian Americans, while others looked at these courses as a way to critique institutionalized racism; for Nguyen it provided a space for him to understand his cultural background and its relations to the United States.

It was only less than twenty years ago when the first political Asian American student organization, Asian American Student Alliance, formed and the political consciousness of a pan-Asian identity on campus began to form. The grassroots effort in building an Asian American Studies Program during the 1980s resonated with many Asian American students, staff, faculty, and community members. Although past Third World Asian American students desired some of the events and education that took place around politics and identity of the 1980s, it was impossible for a substantial movement to occur in the 1960s and 1970s due to their small population on campus.

The success of the Contemporary Issues in Asian American Studies lecture series energized the Asian American community to build a permanent Asian American Studies Program. James Lin, Ling-Chi Wang, and Sucheng Chan met numerous times with Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs Ticho to allocate Full Time Equivalent faculty for the program. He yielded tremendous power to allocate the funds quickly toward the program, however his inaction signaled his lack of support for the minor. UCSD focused on hiring

¹⁸³ Mandeville Special Collections Library, “Asian American Studies: A Second Look” by Suong Tuyet Nguyen, Spring 1986
temporary faculty. In Spring 1986, the Asian American Studies Steering Committee petitioned the Council of Provosts to assign $30,000 for a temporary FTE which would allow them to hire a senior faculty for two quarters or a junior faculty member for three quarters. During the following month, the steering committee met to discuss pressing issues regarding possible candidates for the temporary faculty appointment, plans to request a regular full time professor, and the election of Professor Lin as steering committee chairperson for 1986-87. Within a month, the steering committee met twice with Ticho who informed the committee that the university planned to appoint a one-quarter open rank full time equivalent faculty “each academic year for the indefinite future” and “appoint a new Steering Committee” to address specific charges or goals of the university. Steering committee member, Professor Matthew Y. Chen responded, “VC Ticho left open the question of a regular appointment of an Asian American specialist in the future.” His inability to support Asian American Studies prevented the establishment of a stable and long-term program on campus.

With no permanent assurance from the administration, students, faculty, and community members continued to push for the institutionalization of the program. After a three-year battle more support was generated from the student community to build Asian American Studies on campus. In Winter 1987, the Associated Students Council passed Resolution #11 regarding Asian American Studies stating,

THEREFORE LET IT BE RESOLVED, that a full FTE be set aside for the sole purpose of teaching Asian American Studies courses which will examine the cultural and historical experiences of Asian Americans, and

LET IT FURTHER BE RESOLVED, that this FTE be initially committed
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over a three year period, beginning with the academic year 1987-88. The continuance [of] the course offerings beyond the initial phase will depend in part on the quality of the courses, students’ interest and community support, and LET IT FURTHER BE RESOLVED, that students be given a participating role in the research and curriculum development process.187

Asian American students of this period recognized the need for the courses to address the history and contributions of Asian Americans in order to prevent racial discrimination, stereotyping, and mistreatment of Asian Americans. Asian and Pacific-Islander Student Alliance formed the Asian American Studies Committee (AASC) to develop Asian American Studies as a “permanent fixture within the UCSD curricula.”188 The committee focused on the importance of creating an Asian American Studies Program in order to teach about the many contributions that Asian and Pacific Islanders had made to the development of the United States.189 APSA and AASC also fought to create a program that called for the studying of contemporary problems to prepare minorities to create social change.

Similar to the Lumumba-Zapata Coalition demands of two decades earlier, APSA demanded an education that would address the concerns of the Asian American and Pacific Islander community. In a bulletin report to the general campus, APSA called for intergroup solidarity:

We feel that Asians and Pacific Islanders, African Americans, Chicanos/Latinos and Native Americans have a claim to U.S. history—our story. We want education that addresses our concerns, but to make this happen, we must join together as one. We need your help to spread the word about AAS [Asian American Studies], to publish a bulletin to inform our supporters of the latest developments in the campaign, and to reach out and organize people from all corners of the campus and communities. If you want to do something that is fun, rewarding and just plain righteous,

187 Mandeville Special Collections Library, RSS 1, Box 200, Folder 1
188 Mandeville Special Collections Library, RSS 1, Box 200, Folder 1
189 The term Asian and Pacific Islanders was used by the Asian American Studies Committee.
The student committee recognized the significance of knowing the history of all people of color in the United States. They determined that a cross-racial strategy was needed to build a broader community of support who also struggled with institutionalized racism. Their racialization as model minorities always necessitated that they unify their efforts with other oppressed communities, especially in working against a university administration that did not recognize their needs as Asian American students. In the Asian and Pacific Islander Student Alliance Newsletter of Spring 1986, the student organization recognized the “mutual support/resource-sharing/collective betterment” of Associated Students, Students for Affirmative Action Committee (SAAC), El Movimiento Estudiantil Chicano de Aztlan (MEChA), Affirmative Action Retention Committee of Third College, Revelle Third World Alliance, and the statewide Asian Pacific Student Union.

Through the leadership of the Asian American community, the culmination of their efforts resulted in the formal proposal for a minor in Asian American Studies. The minor proposal was submitted to the Chancellor’s Office on March 3, 1988 by the Advisory Committee for Asian American Courses, chaired by Dr. James Lin. The proposal laid out a plan for which courses should be included as part of the minor program. Three courses would be selected as the core curriculum: two focused on history
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Figure 3.2  Asian Pacific Student Union, Annual Statewide Conference at UC San Diego, February 28, 1987, Peterson Hall, Room 108, Photo from Dr. James Lin Office, UCSD (2011)

Figure 3.3  Asian American Film Series, Instructor: Sucheng Chan Winter Quarter 1988, UC San Diego Muir College Campus Humanities & Social Science Building, Room 2250 Photo from Dr. James Lin Office, UCSD (2011)
and one on contemporary Asian American communities. Other courses would supplement the curriculum with the first consisting of an upper division course with Asian American content, and the latter would consist of History, Cultures and societies of East and Southeast Asian nations, U.S.-Asian Relations, or Racial minorities or race relations in the U.S.\footnote{Mandeville Special Collections, RSS 1, Box 200, Folder 1} Additionally, the advisory committee requested funding to recruit a tenured faculty to the History Department to teach the core courses, and a 0.5 or part-time non-recurrent full time equivalent for at least three years to be responsible for recruiting and appointing lecturers from various programs and departments on campus.\footnote{A Proposal for a Minor Program in Asian American Studies, March 3, 1988, Mandeville Special Collections, RSS 1, Box 200, Folder 1}

APSA’s Asian American Studies Committee continued to push the university to institute the minor program at UC San Diego. A letter written to Chancellor Atkinson from the committee, dated March 16, 1988, requested that the UCSD administration institutionalize “Asian American Studies as an equal part of its curriculum,” and appoint one to two more faculty to the Asian American Studies Program.\footnote{Mandeville Special Collections, RSS 1, Box 200, Folder 1} The letter stated that UC San Diego “is the only UC campus without a single individual on its ladder rank faculty who can offer courses in Asian American Studies” and urged the university administration to “allocate the resources needed to establish an Asian American Studies Program at UCSD immediately.”\footnote{Colleges included UC Los Angeles, CSU Hayward, San Jose City College, UC Berkeley, CSU Chico, Compton Community College, Chancellor’s Office of California Community Colleges, Glendale College, Long Beach City College, University of San Francisco, CSU Northridge, and College of San Mateo. Mandeville Special Collections RSS 1, Box 200, Folder 1} Attached to the letter were one hundred fifty signatures from California State Assembly Member Willie Brown’s Asian Americans in Higher Education Conference. Petitioners included a range of universities representing
California Community Colleges, California State Universities, and University of California. A response was requested by April 4, 1988; however, none was given by the Chancellor’s Office. Three months later, the Asian American Studies Committee wrote a letter to the Chancellor denouncing the four-year delay in establishing an Asian American Studies Program at UCSD. A petition demanding three permanent faculty to teach and develop an Asian American Studies program and a minor in Asian American Studies was signed by four hundred students representing a cross section of racial and ethnic groups at UCSD and across the state. Although the Asian American Studies Committee requested a reply from the chancellor by June 27, 1988, it took the Chancellor four months to do so.

That summer, the Chancellor apologized for the delayed response, stating that he had appointed a special committee chaired by Vice Chancellor Watson to advise him on Ethnic Studies Programs at UC San Diego. It had been two years since the Task Force on Lower Division Education in the University of California reported the need to develop ethnic studies courses to meet the goals of “diversification” and “internationalization.” The newly appointed committee reported that they supported the university’s Ethnic Studies Programs, of which Asian American Studies was an integral part. The letter confirmed the assignment of one permanent faculty position to the Asian component; however two additional positions would be given only as needed.

---

196 Only one page of the petition was found in Mandeville Special Collections.  
197 Mandeville Special Collections, RSS 1, Box 200, Folder 1  
198 It was over a decade earlier that Joe Watson did not receive support from the Asian American, Chicano, Native American and White community members in his leadeership as the Provost of Third College.  
199 Smelser 1986  
200 Ibid.
The chancellor noted that the Academic Senate Committee on Education Policy approved the commitments.\(^{201}\)

As part of the Ethnic Studies initiative, the Chancellor appointed Provost of Third College, Cecil Lytle, to be in charge of developing an Ethnic Studies Department at UCSD, which would absorb the Asian American Studies Minor Program under its broad umbrella.\(^{202}\) At that time, there were single-group programs across the campus: Chicano Studies established in 1973, Contemporary Black Arts established in the late 1970s, and Third World Studies established in 1969. However, the initiative pulled all programs together under one department.\(^{203}\)

Concerns arose about the fate of the existing stand-alone programs at the university. In late summer 1988, Provost Lytle responded to a letter from concerned History and Literature Professors, affirming his commitment to establish an official ethnic studies department,\(^{204}\) and to find the resources necessary in “defining the curricular, research, and community ventures of the ethnic studies area.”\(^{205}\)

Approximately two months later, Lytle informed Asian American Studies, Chicano Studies, Contemporary Black Arts, and Third World Studies faculty of the followings: allocation of six faculty and two full-time staff, Instruction & Research allocation of $7500, and offices in the new Instruction & Research facility.\(^{206}\) In the same letter, he
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called for a general meeting to discuss the structure and timeline to develop the Ethnic Studies Department.\textsuperscript{207}

In Fall 1988, the leaders of Asian and Pacific Islander Student Alliance, Afro-American Student Union, and MEChA were informed that the ethnic studies programs would be a part of a new academic unit.\textsuperscript{208} The letter requested each student organization to appoint one student representative to discuss and draft the proposal for an Ethnic Studies department. Soon after, a reminder was sent to Professor Lin and other faculty to meet and discuss potential faculty to hire for the proposed Ethnic Studies Department.\textsuperscript{209} The work towards building a strong Asian American Studies minor achieved by the Asian and Pacific Islander Student Alliance and Professor Lin overlapped with the creation of a Department of Ethnic Studies.

In Lin’s letter to Nolan Penn, Vice Chancellor of Affirmative Action, he noted the struggles of working with the administration and departments in hiring faculty for the Asian American Studies Program. Although Lin worked tirelessly to recruit academic leaders to UCSD, the stellar candidates—Elaine Kim from UC Berkeley (Literature/Ethnic Studies), Evelyn Nakano Glenn from SUNY Binghamton (Sociology), Gary Okihiro from University of Santa Clara (History), and Michael Omi from UC Berkeley (Sociology/Ethnic Studies)—did not feel welcome by recruiting departments. The Sociology Department, initially interested in Nakano Glenn, decided not to move forward because they could not hire her as a full professor. Both the Sociology and

\textsuperscript{207} This included a discussion of the interim organizational structure, department voting membership, department advisory committee, timetable for action on department status, faculty search committees, and any new business of ethnic studies. Mandeville Special Collections Library, RSS 1130, Box 44, Folder 18
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\textsuperscript{209} Other professors included Susan Kilpatrick (Literature), Alden Mosshammer, and Andrew Scull (Sociology). Mandeville Special Collections Library, RSS 1130, Box 44, Folder 18
Political Science departments expressed interest in Omi, but did not invite him for an interview for three months. The previous year, the university administration moved very slowly to offer Sucheng Chan a faculty position; however the offer was not comparable to UC Santa Barbara’s offer to Chan.\textsuperscript{210} It was after the series of rejections did the faculty group march to Chancellor Atkinson’s office to protest the university’s efforts to hire faculty. Lin expressed his frustration in a letter to the Vice Chancellor, decrying the lack of institutional support throughout the search and recruitment process.\textsuperscript{211} He referred to the amount of personal time and money he devoted to recruiting faculty from across the nation, talking to departments about candidates, teaching the Contemporary Issues in Asian American Communities course, and countless other office tasks that went beyond his job as a mathematics researcher and teacher. He expressed great concern with hiring one faculty member with the approved three Full Time Equivalent faculty as recommended for the minor. At the same time, in the hopes of keeping Asian American Studies alive, graduate student Wendy Ng was hired to teach two courses, one being Asian American women, during Winter 1989.\textsuperscript{212} The provisional hire continued to challenge the need to create a permanent place for Asian American Studies on campus.

The letter written to Vice Chancellor of Affirmative Action was Lin’s final effort to hire at least one Asian American faculty member to take on the leadership position before he took his sabbatical beginning Summer 1989. The Asian American Studies Search Committee unanimously requested temporary lectureship monies as a back up

\textsuperscript{210} Mandeville Special Collections Library, RSS 1130, Box 44, Folder 19
\textsuperscript{211} Letter to Nolan Penn, Vice Chancellor of Affirmative Action from Math Professor and Chair of Asian American Studies Search Committee, James Lin. Dated January 26, 1989 from Mandeville Special Collections Library, RSS 1130, Box 44, Folder 19
\textsuperscript{212} Communication with Linda Trinh Vo on May 19, 2014 and James Lin on May 25, 2014
plan due to Lin’s leave. The request was relayed to Provost Lytle, who replied to Penn stating that after meeting with the Ethnic Studies Executive Committee, he was confident that they could make an attractive offer to both Kim and Omi. On that same day, Lytle informed the Chairperson of the Literature Department that the Executive Committee of Ethnic Studies unanimously endorsed Professor Elaine Kim as the first appointment of the six FTEs allocated to Ethnic Studies. Lytle noted that the executive committee hoped that she would become the director of the Ethnic Studies initiative, helping to create an academic department.

Even with support for the Ethnic Studies initiative, there was still an ongoing struggle to hire faculty for the Asian American Studies program. On February 23, 1989, Nakano Glenn gave a job talk on “Race, Gender, and Reproduction.” The following month, Omi spoke about “The New Racism – Racial Ideologies in the 1980s.” It was April 10, 1989 when news broke in a San Diego Tribune article titled, “UCSD’s Program for Ethnic Studies Caught in Dispute,” stating that the university missed an opportunity to build a strong program because the Sociology Department rejected the Asian American candidates. Ann Levin, a San Diego Tribune Education Writer, referenced the five years James Lin contributed to building the Asian American Studies Program and reported that the Sociology Department had decided against hiring the committee’s top candidates. Lin informed the university administration that he would resign from the

---

213 The Asian American Studies Search Committee consisted of Professors James Lin (Math), John Dower, Masao Miyoshi, Matthew Chen, and Tracy Strong.
214 On the same note, they did not interview Michael Omi as of the date of the letter, February 14, 1989. Mandeville Special Collections Library, RSS 1130, Box 44, Folder 19
215 Mandeville Special Collections Library, RSS 1130, Box 44, Folder 19
216 Mandeville Special Collections Library, RSS 1130, Box 44, Folder 19
217 Mandeville Special Collections Library, RSS 1130, Box 44, Folder 19
218 Mandeville Special Collections Library, RSS 1130, Box 44, Folder 19
faculty search committee unless they hired Nakano Glenn, Kim, and Omi. Levin said he “took an uncompromising stand” stating that he felt that “[He didn’t] see any other possibility. These are the best people in the country and I’ve been all over to look. It’s a real unique opportunity for the university and they’re going to pass it by.”

A couple of days before the news report, approximately thirty professors who supported the hiring of the Asian American faculty met with Chancellor Atkinson and Vice Chancellor Ticho to ask them to consider hiring Nakano Glenn and Omi. After the meeting, both Nakano Glenn and Omi’s files were sent to the Committee of Academic Personnel for approval. Again, their files were rejected. According to Levin, Cecil Lytle, Interim Chair of Ethnic Studies and Provost of Third College, reported by Levin, exclaimed, “This was a window of opportunity to recruit significant scholars in Asian-American studies, and I think the campus may lack the courage to take the chance. It has compromised our ability to recruit in the field of Asian-American studies in the future…” Little did he realize that he was foretelling the future of Asian American Studies at UC San Diego.

In Spring 1989, Evelyn Nakano Glenn sent a letter to James Lin to withdraw her candidacy for the position in Asian American Studies. She cited the following reasons for her decision: the Sociology Department declining to interview the co-author (Omi) of a highly respected book about race and racism in America; the chair stating that the department was not interested in developing expertise in a “narrow topic as race and ethnicity”; the department never voting on her candidacy; and the cursory review of her
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Nakano Glenn articulates the lack of institutional support for faculty of color at UCSD: “Even if a sociologist gets appointed independently to Ethnic Studies, the exclusion of faculty of color from mainstream departments, such as sociology, needs to be addressed.” She explicitly tackles the department’s reluctance to address issues of race, “Race and racism have been central topics throughout the history of American sociology. The time is long past when a social science department located in a major urban center with a substantial minority population can ignore one of the most explosive issues of the day, racial inequality.” Clearly, the lack of interest from the Sociology Department regarding Nakano Glenn and Omi was a significant obstacle in the effort to build an Asian American Studies Minor at UC San Diego.

The chancellor’s vision of placing Asian American Studies faculty across various departments on campus halted. The culmination of actions from academic departments and the Committee on Academic Personnel prevented the hiring of faculty for the Asian American Studies Minor. Approximately a month after Nakano Glenn’s withdrawal, Lin resigned from the Chair of the Asian American Studies Search Committee. The six years of work developing an Asian American Studies Program was for naught. In his letter of resignation, Lin charged that the lack of respect for Asian American candidates by departments and the administration reflected the university’s lack of commitment to diversity. He concluded his letter with this warning: “Because these candidates are
recognized nationally as the best in their field and have been treated poorly by UCSD I cannot in good faith imagine that other candidates of similar stature would be willing to apply.”

In sum, different groups had different reasons for supporting the establishment of Asian American studies at UCSD. Many liberal faculty supporters explained the need for Asian American Studies using the official university language of “internationalization” and “diversification”—that the changing demographics required that the university adapt to its population in order to address social, economic, and political issues. The Union of Pan Asian Communities (UPAC) wanted courses that would educate the public about Asian American history, experiences, and issues in order to prepare them to work with Asian Americans in resolving economic, education, and healthcare issues. APSA’s Asian American Studies Committee fought for a program that would challenge racial discrimination against Asian Americans both on and off campus. Students took it one step further with their critiques of the ways Asian Pacific Islander labor, land and bodies have been exploited by the U.S. Somewhat reflective of the 1960s and 1970s, students during the 1980s examined more local affairs while still denouncing U.S. discriminatory systems. The faculty-led Asian American Studies Steering Committee proposed to bring in new scholarship in the fields of ethnic studies, history, literature, and sociology with a specialization on Asian Americans. Lin led the effort to hire renowned faculty to build the program. However, impassioned debate on whether race relations was a worthy
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academic topic revealed departments’ unwillingness “to address the pedagogical, curricular, and scholarly work of diversity.”\textsuperscript{228} The failure to establish the Asian American Studies program also resulted from Chancellor Atkinson and Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs Ticho’s lack of leadership to push through the minor program at UCSD.

Ultimately powerful stakeholders in academic departments prevented the establishment of an Asian American Studies Minor at UC San Diego. Toward the end of Spring 1989, the Search Committee James Lin, Matthew Chen, and Masao Miyoshi resigned. In the \textit{San Diego Tribune}, Levin reported Miyoshi expressing the following sentiment, “It seems to me that the clock’s been turned back 20 years” with the struggle of hiring these faculty.\textsuperscript{229} He noted the struggle was reminiscent of the historical era of Civil Rights and the Black Movement, including the fight to establish Black Studies and Third World Studies across college campuses. In other words, liberal faculty supporters explained the need for Asian American studies using the language of inclusion and diversity and Asian American Studies Faculty appeared to be more interested in research and teaching interests that critiqued institutionalized racism and social hierarchy. It was a long hard battle fought with students, faculty, staff, and local community members to hire their selected faculty candidates. However, despite the ways in which it was rationalized, the university administration ultimately resisted its institutionalization.

UCSD’s failure to hire Asian American studies faculty is indicative of the larger struggle by Asian Americans at UC San Diego to be recognized as legitimate political

\textsuperscript{228} Smith 2009: 74
\textsuperscript{229} Three resign UCSD panel in ethnic-studies protest by Ann Levin. Levin continues to add that in the midst of establishing a department of ethnic studies “a number of professors are saying privately that ethnic studies is not a ‘real discipline.’” Mandeville Special Collections Library, RSS 1000, Box 2, Folder 2
subjects when situated alongside other minority groups. Since Asian Americans were considered “overrepresented” at UCSD, the refusal to establish Asian American Studies Program at UCSD could not be interpreted as a form of institutionalized racism. As a consequence, Asian American students have continued to be dispersed across the UCSD campus without an intellectual and physical space to discuss, challenge, and collaborate with other Asian Americans on common issues and goals. It also leaves an imprint on the lives of Asian Americans, resulting in the lack of knowledge on Asian American histories, inability to access safe spaces, and difficulty in feeling a sense of belonging on campus.

Public policy continued to shape the ways in which Asian Americans experienced their lives throughout the 1990s. The University of California Regents passed Special Policy 1 (SP-1) and Special Policy 2 (SP-2) in 1995, eliminating the use of affirmative action in admissions, hiring, and contracting in the University of California system. The passage of SP-1 and 2 in 1996 soon led to the passage of Proposition 209 or the California Civil Rights Initiative, which eliminated affirmative action policy in California.

This chapter has shown how Asian American students, faculty, staff, and community members struggled to create a transformative diversity that could reshape the academic and physical landscape of UCSD. In 1995, faculty members, Asian and Pacific-Islander Student Alliance, African American Student Union, Movimiento Estudiantil Chicano de Aztlan, Kaibigang Pilipino, Native American Student Alliance, and the Cross Cultural Coalition united to demand the creation of the Cross Cultural Center. In the 1990s,
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230 The movement was ten years in the making, beginning with a request for an Intercultural Center in 1984, the Centro Cultural de la Raza UCSD in 1990, and the final push for the Cross Cultural Center in 1995. From Capturing OURstory: Activism at UCSD in the 90s by Josue A. Castellon
university officials touted diversity yet worked within the narrow concepts of “internationalization” and “diversification” and advocated for a globalized workforce.231

The next chapter examines how the racial politics of Asian Americans shaped the response to a racist campus event of the Compton Cookout Party in 2010.
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A lot of us knew that this was the moment. We had a moment. And we had to take it, not take it away from black and Chicano/a students, not even to tack on a list of other demands or anything like that but to really change how the university could look like and feel like. I don’t think we were given the opportunity to be included after all that time and all those conversations…I don’t think it happened.

~ Filipina, 1st generation college student

The philosophy from day one with Roger Revelle is ‘Look you don’t need any of the social science or community to successfully create what we want to create. That’s been done.’ [That’s the] prevailing opinion. Then you keep going in that direction and you have social crisis that come up. This guy kills himself [with fire to protest the Vietnam War], you have freeway 5 [to protest the Rodney King verdict], you have the Compton Cookout. There’s no… or minimal efforts to factor in the kinds of social issues that come up. Once you do that, then it’s pretty predictable that you are going to have these different incidents.

~ James Lin, UCSD Math Professor

This chapter analyzes a series of racist events which included a “Compton Cookout” Party, a noose found hanging in the university library, a university student-televised show calling black students “n____r,” and a KKK hood placed on a campus statue, which mocked Black History Month during February 2010. The racist events serve as a critical moment to examine the response from some of the forty-nine percent Asian American student population and its university administration at UCSD.
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234 Undergraduate demographics by ethnicity represented Asian 44.3% and Filipino 4.5%, 1.6% African American, 10.1% Mexican American, 2.9% Latino, .04% Native American, 25.9% Caucasian, and 10.4% Other/Undeclared at UC San Diego. From Undergraduate Enrollment, Fall 2009 published by UCSD Student Research and Information, Student Affairs, Fall 2011. In the 2010 U.S. Census, California represented the state with the highest “Asian alone or in combination” population. The fastest growing immigrant group, also comprised of the university population necessitates a revised diversity policy that addresses the needs of a changing racial and ethnic population.
The Compton Cookout incident and ensuing student protests made visible the racial positioning of Asian American students at UCSD, especially in relation to the university’s diversity practices. The eight Asian American student leaders I interviewed represented a cross-section of students who self-identify under the pan-Asian category: Black-Filipino, Chinese, Filipino, Filipino-Chinese, Korean, and Vietnamese-Chinese.\(^{235}\) I conducted four additional interviews with non-Asian American students who were key players in the student actions against the Compton Cookout events; these additional interviews provided important insights into the goals of the larger student protest. In total, there were four males and eight female identified students. The interviews ranged from thirty minutes to close to three hours, depending on the availability of the students; however most interviews lasted approximately 90 minutes. I also conducted a discourse analysis of speeches and various media surrounding the Compton Cookout events, and administered a 36-question survey to capture a broader spectrum of Asian American perspectives in relation to UCSD diversity policy. Forty-four out of two hundred students who attended the Asian Pacific Islander Forum, which was organized in response to the Compton Cookout incidents, filled out the survey to share their perspectives on being Asian Americans at UC San Diego.\(^{236}\)

The interview and survey results reveal three pervasive themes: 1) the homogenization of Asian Americans as model minorities, which excludes them from

\(^{235}\) My interviewees were all undergraduate students.

\(^{236}\) The survey was sent to forum attendees and later opened to the general population to answer. The forum took place on March 2, 2010 and the survey was sent on June 1, 2010. Survey demographics represented Cambodian 2.3 percent, Chinese 25 percent, Filipino 27.3 percent, Hmong 2.3 percent, East Indian 4.5 percent, Japanese 6.8 percent, Korean 13.6 percent, Laotian 4.5 percent, Vietnamese 15.9 percent, Other 11.4 percent (Mixed: Filipino-Mexican, Chinese-Dutch-Indonesian, Chinese-Taiwanese, Chinese-Indonesian, American-Taiwanese-Chinese), average age 21.1, 13/44 1\(^{st}\) generation, 31/44 female, 13/44 male, 34/44 undergrad, 10/44 graduate, all majors.
diversity consideration and programs; 2) the lack of courses on Asian Americans, which prevents UCSD students from gaining a critical awareness on Asian American historical, social, and political positioning at the university; and 3) the absence of institutional memory on cross-racial activism with Asian Americans on campus, which prevents the recognition of Asian Americans as important community stakeholders and collaborators in race-based struggles.

In this chapter, I analyze how Asian American student leaders struggled to work alongside other students of color to demand more effective diversity policy, while simultaneously fighting for their specific needs as a numerically represented yet highly underserved group. The chapter is divided into two sections. The first section examines how the historical-political-sociological context of affirmative action policy influenced diversity policy, shaping the experiences of Asian Americans at UCSD. The second section utilizes twelve activist interviews and forty-four student survey results to examine the ways in which students challenged diversity policy.

Section 1: The Stakes

As discussed in Chapter 3, Asian American students, as the purported “overrepresented” minorities, served as a “racial wedge” in the debates over efforts to “diversify” and “internationalize” the university in the 1980s and 1990s. During the late 1990s, opponents of affirmative action once again charged that these policies compromised the “excellence” of the university. In the midst of these contentious debates over access, retention, and graduation of underrepresented students, Asian Americans
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237 I continue to argue that numerical representation is necessary but not sufficient for a transformative diversity policy.
stood out as an example of “minority success.” The perceived numerical (over)representation of Asian Americans excludes them from diversity programs, curriculum, and policies. As I will argue below, the particularity of the Asian American experience—a numerically represented group that continues to encounter racialized challenges on a daily basis—provides a pointed critique of prominent diversity initiatives that focus solely on increasing the number of underrepresented students. In spite of their representation on campus, the university administration’s lack of interest in addressing Asian American student needs re-figures them as an underserved minority group.

The anti-affirmative action policies of the late 1990s shaped diversity policies at California’s public universities. In 1996, voters passed Proposition 209 or California Civil Rights Initiative, which eliminated the use of affirmative action in college admissions, employment, and contracts at public institutions. At the behest of UC Regent Ward Connerly, the UC Regents voted for Special Policy 1 and 2 to eliminate the use of affirmative action in hiring and college admissions across University of California campuses. During this period, affirmative action was recast from a policy that challenged systemic discrimination to one that promoted reverse discrimination. While scholars argued that these policies represented a backlash to the New Deal Program and civil rights movement from decades passed, HoSang, author of Racial Propositions: Ballot Initiatives and the Making of Postwar California notes that this is only a continuation of California’s “racial liberalism” that did not push far enough to rectify social inequities, thus perpetuating the uneven “distribution of rights, resources, and recognition.” The issue of diversity continues to be contested terrain in court cases seen in Gratz v.
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Bollinger (2003), Grutter v. Bollinger (2003), and Fisher v. University of Texas (2013), reinforcing the importance of a college education as one with students learning from a diverse student body.

The Compton Cookout case study serves as another event that reinforces the university administration’s inability to address issues of diversity not only to African American students, but also in relation to Asian Americans. I argue their racialization as the model minority and yellow peril serve as an important marker in how the administration perceives and treats them. The administration’s cumulative failure to address the concerns of the Asian American community throughout the history of the university prescribed the treatment of Asian American students during the Compton Cookout events. Asian American students, a seemingly successful minority group, complicate current campus diversity policy, providing needed insights on the interactions between students of color, university administration, and the complex effort to productive change in diversity policy.

Section 2: The Context: The Compton Cookout Incident

On February 15, 2010, members of a UCSD fraternity organized a ghetto themed party called the Compton Cookout Party “to celebrate…in hopes of showing respect” for Black History Month. In showing “respect,” party organizers asked students to dress in costume as ghetto men and women. “Guys” were asked to dress in clothes that mimicked rap and hip hop videos. “Girls” were asked to dress and act in a stereotypical way, stating that “Ghetto chicks usually have gold teeth, start fights and drama, and wear
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239 This is one of many racist themed parties that is taking place on college campuses nationwide. See “The Rise of the Ghetto-Fabulous Party” by King and Leonard from Colorlines: The National Newsmagazine on Race and Politics
cheap clothes…They also have short, nappy hair, and usually wear cheap weaves…speak very loudly, while rolling their neck, and waving their finger in your face.” Further reading of the invitation continues to construct black women as angry and ignorant people with limited education and vocabulary.

UC San Diego students quickly discovered the racist party advertised on social media website, Facebook. News about the party spread quickly within the student community. A few days after the party, a campus newspaper aired on a student-run TV station calling their black peers “ungrateful n____rs” for being upset about the Compton Cookout Party. A sign stating “Compton Lynching” was found at the television station the day after. Days after the party, student leaders handed Chancellor Fox of UC San Diego a list of policy demands to improve campus climate. The policy demands were named “BSU Demands,” however many non-Black Student Union members helped write the set of demands to improve the racial climate for all underrepresented students on campus.

The demands were met with no response from the university administrators or other top university administrators. The following week, the Black Student Union held a press conference with an updated list of policy recommendations demanding the administration take action to improve campus diversity. On the same day, students walked out of the university-organized teach-in to make a statement to the university administration that “real action” must be taken. “Real pain” and “real action” was a theme student leaders communicated to university administrators to express disdain for the hostile campus
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241 The “party” is symptomatic of broader issues surrounding students of color on campus. People of color communities stated in research reports that UC San Diego contains a hostile campus climate.
climate. The BSU released a report, *Do UC Us?: Campaign to Increase Numbers of African-American Students at the University of California, San Diego, 2009*, which documents the low yield, retention and graduation rates of black students, and offers a list of suggestions to improve the university’s diversity efforts. Tragically, the day after the teach-in/out, a hanging noose was found on the 7th floor of the university’s Geisel Library. The university police department sent out a crime alert bulletin stating that the noose had the “intent to terrorize.”

On February 26, 2011, approximately three hundred students, staff, and faculty came together to protest the series of racist incidents through a sit-in at Chancellor Mary Anne Fox’s office. Protestors comprised of a coalition of student organizations: the Asian and Pacific Islander Student Alliance (APSA), Black Student Union (BSU), Movimiento Estudiantil Chicano de Aztlán (MEChA), Kamalayan Kollective (KK), Native American Student Association (NASA), Queer People of Color (QPOC), and the
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242 The crime alert was sent on February 26, 2011. A UC San Diego student confessed that she committed this act. She apologized for not being aware of the racial implications of tying the rope into a knot. Again, this is a symptom of the university purporting to value diversity without teaching its students about the ever increasing racially and ethnically diverse campus community at the university and world.
Students Affirmative Action Committee (SAAC). There were also other student participants who were connected to campus centers such as the Cross Cultural Center, Lesbian Gay Bisexual & Transgender Resource Center, and the Women’s Resource Center with many students who were affiliated with the Department of Ethnic Studies and the OASIS Summer Bridge Program. A broad base of students identified with the movement because many understood the racist events as assaults on underrepresented students, LGBT, and all students at UC San Diego, while others wanted to support black students to improve their condition at the university. The sit-in expressed to the administration that it was imperative to take their demands seriously.

Table 4.1 Compton Cookout Incidents and Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeline of Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2/15/10 (M):</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2/16/10 (T):</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2/18/10 (Th):</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2/19/10 (F):</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2/24/10 (W):</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2/24/10 (W):</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2/25/10 (Th):</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2/26/10 (F):</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3/1/10 (M):</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3/2/10 (T):</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3/4/10 (Th):</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The tense campus racial climate continued into the month of March with a Ku Klux Klan hood found on the head of the Dr. Seuss statue located outside the UC San Diego Geisel Library.

The series of racist events provoked a coalition of students to request a response to the demands by March 4, 2010, coinciding with the Day of Action nationally and internationally. The Day of Action and the string of racist incidents on campus brought forth hundreds of students who came out to demonstrate the need for university-wide, statewide, and worldwide change regarding the status quo of the current public university climate.

Figure 4.2 Day of Action at UC San Diego
March 4, 2010
Photo courtesy of Maureen Abugan

It was this day that the common goals were signed between the multi-ethnic student
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The list of agreed upon policy demands would attempt to improve the experiences of black and African American students, Latino and Chicano students, and Native American students at UC San Diego. The first five policy demands illustrate the ways in which black student leaders wanted to reshape diversity policy. Student leaders requested administrators to fund more: outreach efforts to hire African-American Faculty, events sponsored by the Black Student Union, staff and programs for the Student Promoted Access Center for Education and Service (SPACES), and research based scholarships for African-American students. While policies would benefit all students at the university, Asian American students’ needs were not a part of the policy demands reflected in items such as funding for an Asian American Studies Minor or an Asian American Resource Center. Asian American student leaders talked within their student organizations and circles about the need to fund the minor and center, yet found it difficult to pursue the list of demands when black students were struggling. They fought alongside community members, knowing that diversity at UCSD needed to be improved.

Asian Americans were not considered an important part of a community of minority students who had relevant concerns in regards to diversity at the university. Rather, the university administration was able to create a racial wedge between Asian Americans and blacks by excluding them in talks around improving the racial climate in regards to funding programs and student services. While a Black Resource Center, Raza
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244 The first five policy demands illustrate the ways in which black student organizers wanted to reshape diversity policy. Student leaders requested administrators to fund more: outreach efforts to hire African-American Faculty, events sponsored by the Black Student Union, staff and programs for the Student Promoted Access Center for Education and Service (SPACES), and research based scholarships for African-American students.
Center, and Inter-Tribal Resource Center were created and funded through the Compton Cookout Events, an Asian American Resource Center still does not exist. The Compton Cookout events highlight how Asian Americans were perceived and treated as model minorities and yellow perils on a UC campus. In the survey I conducted in June 2010, I asked Asian Americans on campus, “Does UC San Diego address concerns and issues relating to Asian American students?” results indicated that 94.6% said “No.”

Section 3: Resistance from Students, Faculty, Staff, and Administration

It is with an institutional memory regarding the lack of support from the university administration regarding Asian American issues that we begin to understand why it is important for Asian American student leaders to garner support from other student communities at UCSD. This section analyzes how Asian American student leaders struggled to work with other students of color to improve campus diversity policy while simultaneously fighting for their needs as a numerically represented but underserved pan-Asian American group. The interviews produce three interrelated themes: Asian American Homogenization: 49%, misunderstandings about Asian Americans; and un-written history of cross-cultural activism.

Theme 1: Asian American Homogenization: 49%

A 2012 Pew Research Center report on Asian American success created uproar in the Asian American community, as it reinforced the model minority myth without providing an in depth examination of the disparities experienced by Asian American subgroups. As discussed earlier, on college campuses, the model minority myth leads to
the (mis)perception of Asian Americans as a distinctive immigrant group bestowed with superhuman abilities to naturally rise, while other minorities falter.  

Asian American hypervisibility as numerically (over)represented model minority students makes invisible their unique struggles such as being low-income, queer, and/or first-generation college students. Scott, a first-generation college student, queer, and Chinese American recounts the experiences with his peers and professor during the Compton Cookout events. He recollected a time when he received the highest grade and set the curve for an organic chemistry course. When classmates discovered that he was the student who set the grade curve, he was twice threatened to drop the course and his mom received strange calls from individuals. Scott said:

Other than that threatening issue, people responded with a lot of mean words calling me names like faggot. They don’t necessarily know my orientation but it did impact me because I am queer. So from the first threat I had, ‘You are API [Asian Pacific Islander], you would be doing well anyway’ to calling me ‘faggot’ to my professor during the day of the chancellor sit-in…I had talked to my professor beforehand, and my friend too, told him ‘This is what is happening, do you think it is okay to postpone the midterm for us, if we can take it later?’ But he said ‘No because it shouldn’t impede on your social life. You are API, you are Asian folks, you should be able to handle this.’ But [my classmate] ended up dropping the class and the whole quarter, which set her behind so she has to stay an extra year. That impacted her a lot and she’s Filipino American. And for me, I took the test anyway. But it was really tough, mentally draining.

Scott’s story reveals the breadth and depth of Asian American experiences beyond their perceived educational “success.” As a queer Asian American student, Scott was
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245 Teranishi et. al 2011. See news articles such as “Think Outside the ‘Box’” by Kevin Kiley from Insider Higher Ed, “Asians: Too Smart for Their Own Good?” by Carolyn Chen from The New York Times Opinion Pages.

246 Pseudonyms have been used to protect the privacy of student interviewees. Interview on May 5, 2011

247 Till this day, the student does not know how his number was made available to other students. He suspects it was when student profiles could be searched on the UCSD website.
threatened and mocked by fellow classmates for scoring well on an exam; and his academic concerns were dismissed by his professor who expected all Asian American students to do well, regardless of the circumstances.

Treated as “model minorities,” perceived as “overrepresented”, and constructed as “inconspicuous adversaries of diversity in higher education,” Asian American student leaders encountered suspicion from other students of color leaders during the Compton Cookout protest. According to Liz, a black-Pinay student, 

There is a divide how the black student leaders perceive API struggles. Also their consciousness in being in solidarity when they need the bodies but when it is time for negotiations or time to strategize…there is a few that are invited…API voices tend to be left out of that discussion. I feel that the model minority myth…contributes to the construction of API students not being welcomed into these spaces and how black student leaders…are not recognizing their own privilege. They are creating divisions within the community, [making it difficult to] build bridges within the community.

A majority of the Asian American leaders I interviewed noted that they were not invited to all the meetings. Many felt that at 49 percent of the undergraduate population, Asian Americans were perceived as contributing to black students’ isolation on campus. The de-minoritization of Asian Americans during the late 1970s and 1980s, which constructed them as no longer needing assistance and resources as a minority group, has continued to shape their experiences in 2010. Liz and other Asian American student leaders felt frustrated and unwelcomed in meetings, often blaming black student leaders instead of the university administration who controlled the terms of the discussions.
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250 I use the category “Asian American” to speak distinctly to their unique experiences and not over generalize the student experiences of “Pacific Islanders.” However, the students I interviewed often referred themselves as “Asian Pacific Islander” to symbolize their collective pan-ethnic identity.
Many students felt conflicted on how they could both support black students and improve conditions for Asian and Pacific Islander students and other marginalized groups. Alicia, a student who identifies as a queer Korean American states that because the Compton Cookout was targeting the black community, there was a dilemma in pushing for policy reform to address issues regarding Asian American and queer students. She says, “I think it’s hard because you want to or I want to avoid tacking on the BSU [list] to take on everyone’s struggles you know. I think that’s kinda what created some of the resentment that BSU didn’t represent everyone in the ways they wanted to be represented, because they can’t. But they were also the only ones seemingly given this window of time to speak.” Both Liz and Alicia recognized that administrators provided a space for black students (and sometimes Chicano/Latino students) to speak about their concerns over diversity on campus. However they, and many interviewees, felt conflicted because they also wanted to share their own experiences and reshape diversity policy on campus. The strategy to organize students around the Compton Cookout events as a racist event that “affects all people of color” resulted in many students and student leaders pondering if the list of demands fully addressed issues regarding all people of color on their campus. Alicia continued to emphasize the predicament black leaders faced as “having the most power and visibility and because they are hypervisible in this way, as being the legitimate organizer, the legitimate oppressed that this hypervisibility erases so many different nuances within that group.”

251 Interview on August 2, 2011
252 Interview on August 2, 2011
253 Interview on June 7, 2011
254 Interview on August 2, 2011
Both the hypervisibilities of Asian Americans as extraordinary students and black students as in need of academic support construct the particular way students understood and worked with each other in the fight for diversity policy reform. Although both groups were sympathetic to each other’s struggles, their racialized experiences made it difficult to envision and create a shared platform on diversity initiatives. Liz expressed her frustration regarding the perceived lack of concern for underrepresented Asian American subgroups at UCSD,

API students tend to be overlooked especially at the university level. Because I know Kamalayan has been doing a lot of work. San Diego has a large Filipino American population and opposed to UCSD it is not reflected. KP’s outreach program just started in Morris High School so just how there is little support for access for API students as opposed to black students. So just seeing, I feel like…I don’t know how to word this. I think the needs are definitely similar but for both communities but especially within the API community it is less visible, less seen as not important, not needed because of the constructions of API within the U.S, the model minority myth.

The struggle of working to improve access to college for Filipino American youth is laced in her work to recruit students who are often overlooked as needing college preparation and academic support. She connects the experiences of black students to those of Filipino students, citing both groups’ low numerical representation, feelings of isolation on campus, and need for college resources to help them succeed. However, unlike black students, Filipinos are often misrepresented as superstar students born with a college diploma in hand, which hinder their ability to access needed student services.²⁵⁵

²⁵⁵ This does not erase the struggles that black students continue to experience in getting the university administration to listen and revise diversity policy at the university. Even while Filipino Americans are lumped together with Asian Americans, at times they are also looked as less smart than their East Asian counterparts. Bonus and Maramba 2012
The Compton Cookout events were a pivotal moment to understand the struggles of working within and across racial lines regarding higher education issues. The events exemplified how the racial identities of Asian American and black students conjured up perceptions of merit and diversity that created obstacles in understanding their lived experiences. In the need to act urgently to address the Compton Cookout crisis, black students were unable to share the multitude of views about their experiences, shifting their energy and resources to quickly address the problem. Simultaneously, Asian American student organizers sought to understand, educate, and fight against the racism against them that also occurred at UCSD. The majority of the Asian American interviewees perceived the Compton Cookout events as a microcosm of the state of diversity regarding their personal experiences at UCSD, while many black students felt that the racist events exemplified the less than 2% student demographic and the estrangement they felt on their campus.

The homogenization of the Asian American student population on campus inadvertently structured the discussions on diversity in meetings, informal conversations, and campus hallways. However, these discussions overlook the underrepresentation of Cambodian, Filipino, Hmong, and Laotian students at UCSD, and their corresponding issues and needs such as the lack of financial support to attend college, low college attainment, and bilingual translators for parents who attend orientations. The differences in gender, income, parents’ education, and sexual orientation were some of the ways that Asian American students struggled individually and collectively.

---
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The Compton Cookout events revealed a tense and hostile campus climate for students of color. Whether students perceived the racist incident as a black issue or as a diversity issue affecting all students, it exposed the overall problems regarding the university diversity policy and racial climate. Testimonies from Asian American, black, and other diverse communities expressed that they were made to feel ignored, marginalized, and unwelcomed at UCSD. Though student leaders respected one another, they had difficulty comprehending each other’s struggles in relation to issues of access, retention, graduation, and campus climate on their college campus. The next theme addresses the lack of knowledge students, faculty, and administrators continue to have about Asian American students.

**Theme 2: Misunderstandings about Asian Americans**

The lack of knowledge about Asian American student experiences reflected the university’s disinterest in spending resources to establish an Asian American Studies Minor at UC San Diego. The burden fell upon the shoulders of Asian American students to “educate” the university community about their experiences, to locate scholarly works on Asian Americans, and to demand diversity initiatives for Asian American students. The problems with organizing Asian American students under a pan-ethnic group came to the forefront during the Compton Cookout events. The diverging interests of many Asian ethnic groups lumped under a single category made it difficult to act collectively against racism and toward diversity policy reform in 2010.257 This section focuses on the difficulty and pressure students face in providing a political education for and about

---

257 The U.S. Census noted that there are currently forty-eight ethnicities and three hundred languages that fall under the Asian American and Pacific Islander category. Asian Americans alone represent over 20 groups.
Asian American students through informal networks such as student organizations. Furthermore, it grapples with the lack of knowledge students, faculty, and administrators have about experiences and struggles of Asian American students.

*Asian American Student Organizations: On the Continuum of Political*

Student interviewees represented ordinary students who dedicated a large part of their college careers to build a more inclusive, socially conscious, and diverse campus. They worked within and outside of Asian American student organizations and campus centers to create a campus environment where all students could thrive. However, the way in which Asian American students worked amongst each other during the Compton Cookout events represented the fragile nature of student political mobilization in 2010. While the interviewees worked with non-Asian American and Asian American students alike, they had a difficult time rallying their fellow Asian Americans during the Compton Cookout events. Asian American activist Diana states that prior to the Compton Cookout events, “Asian American identified organizations primarily focused on cultural activities. They really wouldn’t address a current issue. I know they would do…around new year’s they would have cultural festivals… What makes the Hmong people different from the Cambodian people from Thai people?” She expressed her frustration with students electing board members to lead the organization to focus on social rather than political education and current political organizing activities.

The struggle she encountered working with Asian American students is expressed in her disappointment with student organizations. Assigned to work as a retention coordinator with the Asian American community, she spoke about her struggles working with the group: “Who is this group I am addressing and how can I help them? What do
they need?” Her thoughts speak to the heterogeneous student population who can have drastically different college experiences. Their focus on cultural activities reflects the importance of expressing the group’s ethnic identity on campus. Their need to convey their identity through cultural activities is a significant part of how they chose to create an academic home to survive and thrive (retention and graduation) at their university.

While the interviewees did not object to the planning of cultural activities, they were dismayed that the student organizations were unaware of important political issues concerning their communities. Diana said, “I think a lot of orgs went back to…even if they did address Compton Cookout issues for a little bit, they just went back to ‘It’s almost new years. It’s almost time for culture show.’ They are in their own little world.” Similar to many other interviewees, Diana distinguished herself politically from the students from Asian American student organizations. She said, “I’m still a person of color and I deal with racism. And [racism against Asian Americans] is never really addressed and it is often times considered less harmful.” Her disconnection with Asian American and non-Asian American students created a feeling of isolation at the university. The leaders I interviewed conveyed their stress, hurt, and frustration in their work with Asian Americans and other students of color who often did not understand how the events symbolized personal experiences on a campus where they did not feel welcomed.

Asian Americans struggled to understand the “power” they carried collectively in the way they attempted to organize around a common cause. Some recognized their role in the protests, sit-ins, and meetings with peers and administrators, however many students grappled with how to work within a heterogeneous panethnic group. When I
asked about the status of Asian American students on campus before and after the Compton Cookout, Michelle, a Pinay student said, “a lot of the student responses from Asian Americans has been confusion. Because I feel like people were not on the same page on what they wanted to do or what they wanted to say. Or even what their roles were and that's spilled into the aftermath.” Like Diana, Michelle noted the difficulty in organizing Asian American students at the university because Asian American organizations appeared to focus primarily on cultural and social activities. Michelle noted the inability for Asian American student organizations to quickly unite together under a common front. The “aftermath” she referred to represented Asian American students’ inability to understand what happened during and after the Compton Cookout events. The heterogeneity of Asian American students made it difficult to pull together under common issues regarding diversity policy at the university. Asian American student needs were hardly ever examined or taken seriously on the college campus, thus the spaces at UCSD that allowed for a conversation about the struggles they experienced were missing.

Kevin, a Chinese-Filipino student spoke to the lack of cohesion within the Asian American and Asian Pacific Islander community, emphasizing the need to institute an Asian American Studies Minor as part of their political education. He said,

I think a lot of API [Asian Pacific Islander] students have the potential to be really strong activists, be more in the social justice space, it’s just that we don’t have that outlet to really educate students. We have our orgs [student organizations] and stuff but our orgs can only do so much. We have gbms [general body meetings]…but we also need to retain members.
He addressed the difficulty in balancing social and cultural activities with a political education about their histories and experiences. In *Asian American Panethnicity*, Yen Le Espiritu notes that Asian American panethnicity is utilized in social movements as a way to build a coalition among Asian groups to demand for needed resources. In this particular case, the desire for some Asian American students to revamp diversity policy in connection to the Compton Cookout events was insufficient and short-lived. Asian American student experiences as first generation college students, newly arrived immigrants, international students, undocumented, and 3rd/4th/5th generation Americans is part of the complex experiences that shape their perspective and opinions. The next section speaks to the reasons Asian American students found it difficult to organize along racial lines.

*Absence of Asian Americans History and their Higher Education experiences*

The confusion, frustration, and disappointment expressed by the interviewees represented the struggle to organize Asian American students together to reform diversity policy at UCSD. As stated previously, the interviewees spoke to how Asian Americans maintained a seemingly passive stance during the Compton Cookout events. My research with Asian American student leaders reveals some of the underlying issues of their perceived inaction or unresponsiveness: the absence of an Asian American Studies Program to educate students about the relevance of race and history in the United States; the lack of curriculum emphasizing the role of Asian Americans as active agents in the formation of American society; the absence of available courses at the university regarding Asian American college experiences.
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Kevin reflected on the dilemma of working with Asian American students to engage in social justice issues in an API student organization at UCSD, “Social injustice is something that is very deep and people might be overwhelmed by it. And I noticed that too, being involved in APSA when we do gbms [general body meetings] about anything like social justice related, there’s lost members because people get overwhelmed and people don’t want to talk about that stuff.” He continued on to say that not all members were turned off, but that many enjoyed socializing. He recognized that college was a time to be a student: to study, to work hard, and to have fun. But, the lack of knowledge about Asian American history and political awareness made it difficult to talk to these students about how their experiences connected to educational, political, and social issues.

There is an assumption by educators and student of color leaders that Asian Americans know their histories upon their arrival to college, however U.S. History courses seldom include Asian Americans as integral and contributing members of American society. Sometimes this education begins with taking an ethnic studies course at UC San Diego, which utilizes a comparative lens to understand the similarity in fighting institutionalized racism. While effective in taking a systemic approach analyzing systems of power and oppression, this prevents an in-depth approach to learning about the heterogeneous experiences of over 20 Asian sub-groups. Students felt the importance of taking ethnic studies courses to learn how communities are connected together, however it was insufficient in addressing the specific histories and experiences of the Asian American community. Both ethnic studies and Asian American Studies serve as an important vehicle in creating a transformative education that can lead to a
transformative diversity policy that teaches students to challenge societal and racial hierarchies to produce a more egalitarian world.

Students’ inability to mobilize during the Compton Cookout events is rooted in the lack of education about how their group struggled against discrimination, contributed to the formation of America, and mobilized as a panethnic group to fight for their rights, liberties, and resources. Kevin explained why it was important to learn about Asian American history as a way to build coalitions, partnerships, and connect with each other,

Their history, our history is first of all is not taught to us, then how are we supposed to have the fuel to do social justice work. That’s already a big barrier in terms of how we are going to mobilize APIs for any social justice movements. If we are not taught about our histories, our struggle, then it is hard to connect. So that is why it is really crucial that our history are taught first and how our histories connect to other histories with other communities of color. Cuz that’s something that needs to happen before students get engaged. The thing is that we have these …all these movements, but if you don’t see yourself connected to the movement, you’re not going to engage yourself, you’re not going to be as spoken, you’re not going to be as involved, you’re not going to be in the frontline because you don’t know how this works and how that connects to your identity or your struggle.  

Asian American and non-Asian American student leaders often wondered where all the Asian Americans were in the movement to fight against the Compton Cookout events.

As one student stated, institutionalizing an Asian American Studies Minor is “a strong response to how we were silenced throughout history. It’s a response to how our institution has not validated these histories and it’s crucial for Asian American students to understand their history.” This important fact regarding the fight to institute an Asian American Studies Minor during the 1980s continues to be reflected in the student
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struggle to shape academic canon and student services. Thus, to institute an Asian
American Studies Minor is anti-racist move to challenge the university administration to
transform the education of Asian Americans and the campus community.

**Theme 3: Un-Written History of Cross-Cultural Activism**

The way the university administration excluded Asian Americans from the
conversation about campus climate and diversity during the Compton Cookout events
strained the relationship between black and Asian American leaders in organizing
together. While some students, staff, faculty, and administration believed the racist
events targeted the black community, others believed that the events targeted all
communities. Additionally, while some believed in revamping diversity policy to help
support black students, others felt it necessary to fight to reshape policy for all minorities
and underserved communities. To gather support from students, the mobilization strategy
of black student leaders pointed to the events as an issue affecting all minority
communities stated by one of my interviews with a BSU leader. The disconnection
among organizers arrived at how an issue impacting all communities translated to policy
demands given to the university administration. The demands focused particularly with
black, Chicano/Latino, and Native American students, without any mention of Asian
American students

The point of contention is not who was right or who was the most deserving in
acquiring university resources, rather it is more important to examine how Asian
American students tried to work independently and collectively with other students of
color to transform university diversity policy to improve campus climate, intergroup
relations, and retention-graduation rates of minorities at UCSD. Thus, the Compton
Cookout event, while painful to many becomes an important case study that informs us about how a pre-dominant Asian American campus engaged in activism can change the university. My interview data of Asian American leaders reveal the misperceptions, struggles, and limitations of organizing cross-culturally with communities of color and ideas on how to strengthen relationships with this largely misunderstood group.

To begin, there is an absence of literature at the university regarding Asian American and black students working together to fight for common social justice issues. While there was a general sense that they might have worked with each other during the civil rights movements of the 1960s and 1970s, a BSU leader named Brandon expressed his knowledge of the cross-cultural activism between Asian and black. It was not until after the Compton Cookout events did he learn about Asian American activism. And when questioned if there was a divide between Asian American and black students, he responded, “I wouldn’t say there is a divide. I don’t [think] there is any clear connection…cohesion between black and Asian students I would say.” He explained further,

I think maybe because this campus isn’t aware of how historically Asian Americans and blacks have been linked in terms of organizing. Another example, May Fu [former UCSD graduate and guest speaker] talked about how the Black Panthers were formed by two blacks and an Asian American guy…I forgot his name. He had to be low key because he did the arms dealing. I was like ‘What?! Are you serious?!’

I continued the conversation sharing with him about the work of Yuri Kochiyama and Malcolm X. He replied, “I think if people knew more information about Yuri and the guy in the Black Panther Party, I think that would create a space for that.” He points to the need to hear and see Asian American and black leaders working together in the
struggle for equality and justice. Although an Ethnic Studies major, the first time he recalled learning about cross-cultural activism was after the Compton Cookout events.

The absence of literature regarding cross-cultural activism at UCSD becomes a part of the hypervisibility of Asian Americans as model minority students who are only concerned about good grades. This perception is perpetuated by a clear absence of literature and reports that focus directly on Asian American student experiences at the university. Diana, who was assigned to work as a retention coordinator with the Asian American community expressed frustration because she did not completely understand the diverse needs of the student community. She also spoke about the cross-cultural activism that took place during the Compton Cookout events, which simultaneously brought together and tore apart the student community. She said,

We all relied on each other for support but also BSU [Black Student Union] and MEChA [El Movimiento Estudiantil Chican@ de Aztlán] were a tight knit already. Not just together but also within their own organizations. It was easy for them to communicate because they already established those lines of communication. And there were a few people from KP [Kaibigang Pilipino] who were the same…who would go in and out of MEChA or BSU. There was already that connection too.

Mentioned by a majority of interviewees, UCSD student organizations fighting for social justice was unique in the way they organized joint programs together, struggled together, and kept lines of communication open with each other. The presence of Ethnic Studies and some Asian American Studies courses allowed students to enroll in the courses and challenge themselves to think critically about each other, social problems, and the history of oppression relationally. Ethnic Studies created a space where students could learn about marginalized communities in regards to economics, politics, and society. However,
the Compton Cookout events highlighted the specific ways black and Asian American student organizations did not fully understand each other.

…I’m imagining from the viewpoint of BSU students or MEChA students ‘I’m gonna use all the support I know I have.’ Instead of risking ‘Oh okay, maybe we can reach out to this org or maybe we can publicize and see who comes out.’ It’s like ‘No, we are gonna use what we have right now.’ And APSA [Asian and Pacific Islander Student Association] wasn’t a part of that…So I feel like it did go both ways…APSA at first didn’t make the effort.

She expressed the frustration of working with both the Asian American and black communities during the events while recognizing that BSU and MEChA did not have the perfect relationship as student organizations. She was caught in the middle trying to explain to Asian American students why they should care, yet felt precluded from organizing alongside black student leaders in an important and time-sensitive period of student mobilization. The racist events triggered Asian American interviewees and survey respondents to reflect on how it connected to their experiences, how to also support black students, and what they wanted to improve diversity policy at UCSD.

The absence in literature is glaring with even Asian American students struggling to understand themselves and cross-cultural activism. The absence existed in well-intentioned spaces on campus where course readings emphasize the powerful coalition between blacks and Chicanos/Latinos fighting together for social justice issues. As one of the lecturers of a program, I often observed Asian American students wondering where Asian Americans were during the struggle to name UCSD’s Third College the Lumumba-Zapata College during the late 1960s to 1970s. The desire to understand their unique experiences in relation to other students of color became a part of who they were and how they felt connected and rooted to the university community. Without professors, student
affairs professionals, and leaders sharing and teaching students about Asian American participation in student activism at UC San Diego and stories of coalition building with Asian Americans, they get re-inscribed as those who only care about their studies and who have always been apathetic in important social justice movements; they become perceived as a monolithic group of academic robots.

The university administration shaped the particular ways Asian Americans were seen and understood as model minorities and yellow perils at UCSD. While the Compton Cookout events could have been a teaching moment to transform diversity and the experiences of all marginalized communities, they tried to quickly rectify the problem by focusing on black students. As a result, the institutional memory of exclusion regarding diverse communities such as Asian Americans, Chicanos/Latinos, Native Americans, LGBT, and other students becomes even more visible. And, while some groups were included in the BSU Demands, Asian Americans continue to battle with the university administration to recognize their struggles and fund pertinent programs and services for the Asian American community. Chapter 5 will continue the discussion about the status of Asian American Movement in 2014.
Chapter 5
Asian Americans in Diversity Policy

My research argues for a nuanced understanding of a heterogeneous Asian American group to interrogate the racial politics of the model minority and yellow peril in how it determined the response of a university administration regarding their college experiences. My research discusses what diversity looks like when considering Asian American student experiences and why Asian Americans are important in understanding how diversity works. Their de-minoritization in the 1970s, which resulted in their treatment as non-minority students in affirmative action policy, education opportunity programs, and student services for underrepresented students, shaped the particular ways they are now viewed as model minorities and yellow perils. The resistance from the university administration to establish an Asian American Studies Minor Program during the late 1980s demonstrated the need for an Asian American community to gather support cross-racially and campus-wide to institute the academic program. Lastly, the racist events during 2010 underline the disregard of Asian American student experiences in the determination of diversity policy. My dissertation attempts to ask how Asian American experiences inform the current discourse on improving diversity in universities nationwide.

The dissertation shall not be read solely as a documentation of Asian and Asian American experiences at the university. My intervention is part methodological and interdisciplinary. The intervention is three-fold: 1) an interdisciplinary framework of Higher Education and Ethnic Studies critically examines Asian American student experiences, 2) the interviews speaks to the struggles of cross-racial activism at the
university, and 3) and a mixed methodology examines how Asian American students worked with the university administration to address their needs and concerns of a diverse community. As with critical race theory in education, I capture the counterstories that are often left outside the main discourse of education. The case regarding Asian Americans is important in that they are considered extraordinary students that still struggle at the university; they are always understood in relation to black struggles and white success in closing the achievement gap within a black-white framework. Their racial positioning in diversity discourse relegates them as the minority group who has arrived at the ivory tower, too selfish to consider other minority students experiences or proof that all students can attain the same results if they rolled up their sleeves to dig in. My analysis unearths the deep-seated structure that created an unwelcoming campus climate for Asian Americans, as well as a space that is complacent of Asian American concerns and needs.

Over twenty-five years later, we witness the Asian American student community demanding that the university listen to their concerns and needs at UCSD. On April 24, 2014, the Coalition for Critical Asian American Studies (CCAAS) wrote an open letter in solidarity of UC Los Angeles and University of Southern California in condemning violent racist and sexist acts against the Asian Pacific Islander community with a list of twelve demands directed to the UCSD administration. On May 5, 2014, the letter was
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261 Represented by Irving Ling, Lilianne Tang, Maggie Quan, Jayne Manuel, Donald Donaire, Shelley Kuang, Thomas Thao, Katie Huang, Brian Lien, Kevin Le, Anthony Jongco, Hanh On, Sandra Amon, Yahya Hafez, and Diana Li. With the support of the following student organizations: Asian & Pacific-Islander Student Alliance, Cambodian Student Association, Coalition of South Asian Peoples, Hmong Student Association of San Diego, Kaibigang Pilipin@, Kamalayan Kollective, Nikkei Student Union, Southeast Asian Collective, Vietnamese Student Association, Anakbayan SD
published in *The Guardian*, the university newspaper. They expressed their frustration as Asian American and Pacific Islander students:

> We are always assumed to have access to all resources we need socially, mentally, academically, and financially and that we feel safe on this campus. We can no longer hold on to these damaging stereotypes, because we have our struggles, we need support, we need resources, we have our stories, and we are not silent! We advocate against the willful apathy of institutions of higher education that would take the safety and experiences of API students for granted. Through the smokescreen of rhetoric that constructs API students as ‘overrepresented,’ we see the truth that the API community is critically underserved through the lack of representation in administration, faculty, staff, student services, and curriculum.

CCAAS holds the university accountable for the absence of diversity policy and programs that takes into account Asian American student experiences. The administration’s lack of knowledge and concern are seen on the list of demands that included the establishment of an Asian American Studies Minor program and Asian Pacific Islander Middle Eastern Desi American Research and Resource Center (APIMEDA RRC), hiring of API staff to serve as resources for the API student population in campus life, increasing college access and outreach efforts and resources for API students, increasing funds for and permanent investment in SPACES, Ethnic Studies, Critical Gender Studies, and Literature, disaggregation of API student needs in the United States with Asian international student needs, utilizing disaggregated statistics for admission and retention of API students, and the installation of Asian American and Pacific Islander Art on campus.  

These changes point to the historical legacy of their exclusion and the needs of the underserved community.
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262 The complete list of demands: “The creation, establishment, and sustained funding of an Asian American Studies Minor program; new faculty hiring lines that will teach and advise students pursuing Asian American Studies; new classes that span topics such as Asian American Women’s Studies, Asian American Sexuality, Asian American Health, and Southeast Asian American History and Contemporary
UCSD Associated Students in 1987 and 2014 passed a resolution to support the Asian American community. The earlier resolution supported the creation of Asian American Studies courses and hiring one Full Time Equivalent to commit three years of teaching cultural and historical experiences. The current “Resolution for Sustained & Accountable Action for Asian American Studies and Campus Climate Resources” supported the CCAAS’s Open Letter, Asian American Studies Minor Program, South Asian Studies Minor Program, Islamic Studies Minor Program, and resources to improve campus climate and retention of API students. Associated Students passed the resolution with a 24-0-0 vote on April 30, 2014. Asian American students continue to garner support from campus-wide community to support their cause.

Smith’s diversity framework (2009) is instrumental in determining the effectiveness of UC San Diego’s diversity policy as it relates to Asian American student experiences. She uses the four dimensions of institutional viability and vitality, education and scholarship, climate and intergroup relations, and access and success of historically underrepresented students to understand and evaluate university policy. In an analysis of UC San Diego’s growth, the needs of an Asian American community on campus were
expressed in the attempt to establish a Third World Studies curriculum and create the first political Asian American student organization in the late 1960s to 1970s, institute an Asian American Studies Program in the late 1980s to 1990s, and fight against contemporary racism on campus in the 2000s. In order to have the capacity to engage in diversity policy is to have “the human and institutional resources and expertise to fulfill the institution’s mission internally as well as to fulfill its mission for society.”

For an elite public university to demonstrate viability and vitality in the 21st Century, the university administration must not enact policy only in response to student demands in protests and petitions, instead lead the university as forward thinkers who are able to think one step ahead of students to develop strategies that broadly and comprehensively engages the diverse campus community to participate in cutting-edge research and fulfill its mission as a land grant university in serving the education, health, housing, and social and political needs of the community. This is significant in looking this as an institutional issue instead of individual students not getting along with each other because of personality traits. Instead of blaming students for creating an unwelcoming climate, it is the role of the university to examine institutionally why their campus feels hostile for students of color and other marginalized groups.

Smith’ framework for diversity offers a foundation in how we can create effective diversity policy that is interconnected, inclusive, and differentiated. Each dimension offers a way to analyze education policy at the institutional level, which creates a trickle-down approach to how the university administration understands and
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implements diversity policy. At the crux of her framework is the importance of the university to convey the seriousness of diversity through the building of an institutional capacity to support diversity efforts in teaching, scholarship, campus climate, intergroup relations, and access and success of historically underrepresented students. The end result is a vanguard university that is at the fore of diversity in the 21st century. However, what is missing in her framework is the mission of an elite research land grant university to utilize its research and resources to aid in resolving state and regional problems such as racism and oppression. I push Smith’s framework to ask: Is the university leading the charge in providing a relevant education necessary to equip students with critical thinking skills to engage in conversations and solve problems that combat racism and other forms of oppression to serve the community? Eckel and Kezar (2003) note that it is only when the university “transformation” is deep, pervasive, intentional, and occurs over time will it transform the institutional culture that creates structural change at the university. I push this further by arguing that part of the deep transformation needs to challenge racism, capitalism, and multiple forms of oppression in the broader community as part of the mission of a land grant university. With Smith’s framework for diversity, I examine the way in which Asian Americans worked to create a public university that is responsive to the needs of their growing ethnic and racial population.

Over fifty years after the founding of the San Diego campus, there is now a Cross-Cultural Center, Department of Ethnic Studies, Lesbian Gay Bisexual Transgender Center, OASIS, S.P.A.C.E.S, Women’s Center, Black Resource Center, Inter-Tribal Resource Center, and Raza Resource Centro. The creation of these campus centers and programs were all based on the demands and needs of students of color. Students
expanded and redefined the meaning of diversity that moved beyond the achievement gap; it helped to create safe spaces for students of color to thrive. For Asian Americans, they continue to fight for their rights to transform the university campus. The Coalition for Critical Asian American Studies presented to the Campus Climate Meeting on May 29, 2014 with a list of demands to develop policy to support Asian and Pacific Islander students at the university. It was stated that a response would be provided to CCAAS ten days after the meeting. While students continue to gather support across the campus for the creation and funding of minor programs and resources to work with the student population, there continues to be resistance and a lack of understanding of Asian American student struggles. It is an unfolding story of Asian American racialization as model minorities and yellow perils on a college campus.
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