"DIVERSITY" MUST GO!

By Karen Umemoto

I'm getting tired of the word "diversity." Skepticism first arose when the UCLA administration held a conference at Lake Arrowhead in the name of "diversity" at the same time Professor Don Nakanishi began his extended battle for tenure in the Graduate School of Education. Obviously, not everyone on campus was in agreement on the meaning of "diversity." And they still aren't.

There was a phrase used in the sixties which was much clearer: "self-determination." This loosely meant that people of different ethnic groups, particularly those of historically unequal status within the U.S., had the right to control or participate equally in the institutions affecting their lives. Students and community organizations fought for programs which would serve the needs of their communities, run by those who were most affected by the institution. Simply put, who better to decide the future of a people than the people themselves?

But there has been resistance to allowing ethnic minority-turning-majority groups to play a decisive role in formulating important policies affecting our communities. At the university, these policies include admissions, faculty hiring, curriculum, research, and funding. With so few tenured minority faculty and administrators (less than 10 percent and 5 percent respectively), significant changes in the process need to be made to insure the university's accountability to our communities.

This was the major problem in the Nakanishi case. Though he was a professor appointed jointly in the Asian American Studies Center and the Graduate School of Education (GSE), the GSE had the sole authority to recommend approval or denial of tenure. (Professor Nakanishi was the only Asian American and sole scholar in the field of Asian American studies within the GSE.) The reason given for this inequality was that the Asian American Studies Center was only an "organized research unit" and not a "department" or "school." But isn't that a more basic question? Until the ethnic studies centers are given greater status on campus, how can we accept the current process if we want "diversity" of any kind?

We face the same contradiction now. The Asian American Studies Center is presently searching for a new director. But administrators have selected a "Search Committee" of five faculty, four of whom have no expertise in Asian American Studies. And the sole Asian American Studies faculty on this committee has no tenure. They have invited "input" from the Center, but the Center and its constituents are not empowered to make the decision or to insure accountability.

Racism exists when there is interpersonal or institutional inequality and injustice aimed against a particular ethnic or racial group. As long as people of color are prevented from making the major decisions affecting our communities, "diversity" will only lend illegitimacy to those who use it.
The following are highlights from the Project on Californian Asians in the Year 2000. The research has been partially funded by the Public Policy Project of the Asian American Studies Center at UCLA. A full report is forthcoming. The purpose of the project is to develop detailed population projections for five major Asian groups: Japanese, Chinese, Filipinos, Koreans, and Southeast Asians. Assumptions regarding mortality, immigration, and internal migration have been developed by analyzing published and unpublished data. We use standard cohort-survival techniques to generate estimates.

Although the state’s Asian population has grown since 1960, Asians as a percentage of California’s total population declined from over nine percent in 1860 to less than two percent in 1950. This decline was due to discriminatory laws that first restricted Chinese immigration and then later immigration from all of Asia.

Only in recent years have Asians once again emerged as a numerically significant racial group in California. Following the elimination of racially biased quotas in America’s immigration laws in 1965, California has witnessed a phenomenal growth in the number of persons of Asian descent. From 1960 to 1980, the Asian and Pacific Islander population more than quadrupled, from less than a third of a million to 1.3 million. If current trends continue, this group will number over 3 million by the end of the century, comprising over ten percent of the state’s population. This will amount to twice the percentage that existed in 1980.

Projections show that Filipinos will experience the greatest increase in absolute terms, while Southeast Asians will experience the greatest percentage increase. As in 1980, Filipinos will constitute the single largest Asian population and the Chinese will remain in second place. However, there will be a reordering among the other three groups, with the Southeast Asians trading places with the Japanese. With the exception of the Japanese, the Asian groups will remain predominantly an immigrant community. Foreign-born Asians will increase their share marginally, from 61% in 1980 to 62% in 2000.

All age groups will show an increase from 1980 to 2000. The number of Asian children will grow by nearly one-half million. The Asian youth population will gain about one-quarter million more persons. And there will be a net gain of one million persons in the prime-working age population. The elderly Asian population will be the fastest growing age group. While the elderly comprised 6.6% of the Asian population in 1980, they will comprise 10.3% by the end of the century.

The dramatic increase of California’s Asian population since 1965, an increase that will continue into the next century, offers both promises and challenges. One promise is greater cultural diversity. There is no question that the revitalization of older enclaves and the development of newer ones has enriched the urban landscape. California’s art, theatre, and cuisine have gained greater breadth from the contributions of Asians. Another promise is economic. Immigrant and foreign-born Asians have provided a disproportionate share of the skilled and unskilled labor that has made the state the premier high-tech region in the world. Asians have also contributed through the establishment of numerous new businesses. As the United States and California become more integrated into the expanding Pacific-Rim economy, Asian Americans will be an important resource in building international bridges.

However, the increase of the Asian population also comes with growing pains. Over the last decade and a half, we have seen an emerging need for bilingual/bicultural services, manpower training programs for adult immigrants who otherwise would be trapped in low-wage jobs, and culturally sensitive care for the elderly. The rapid population growth of both immigrants and American-born Asians means greater needs. One of the major challenges facing California, then, is the need for better planning and enlightened policies in the areas of education, employment, and social services.

There is a much larger challenge: confronting racial hostilities. Racially motivated attacks on Asians have been on the rise. Another indication of deteriorating race relations is a nativistic reaction to immigrants and their culture. A prime example is the effort in Mon...
Asian American Studies Center Offers Rockefeller Humanities Fellowships for 1990-1993

"Asian Pacific Los Angeles ... is a layer upon layer of identity and origin, with permutations ranging from the Japanese-American whose family goes back 100 years here to the Indo-Chinese refugee who arrived here via the Philippines yesterday."

Los Angeles Herald Examiner
June 1988

The twenty-first century urbanism of Los Angeles, characterized by its "lava" of molten cultures—Asian, Black, Latino, White—can also be understood by studying the generational experiences of Asian Pacific Americans. This sparked the UCLA Asian American Studies Center staff and faculty to work together to develop "American Generations: The Asian Pacific Program." For the years 1990-1993, the Center offers residency fellowships in the humanities. Sponsored by the Rockefeller Foundation, the fellowships provide both scholars and community persons working in the humanities an opportunity to conduct research at the Center.

"American Generations: The Asian Pacific Program" focuses on the concept of generations as the key to studying Asian Pacific Americans in the United States, particularly in California. Our concept of generation encompasses both old and new immigrant and refugee Asian Pacific groups within the context of a multi-racial and multi-cultural U.S. With an estimated one million Asian Americans in the 1990s, metro Los Angeles has the largest and most diverse concentration of Asians in the U.S.

First, second, third, and fourth generation Asian Pacific American immigrants live and work together in Los Angeles. Each generation is at a different stage in its cycle of adaptation or conflict with the broader American society. The cycle manifests itself in each generation's role and response in such areas as changing educational and political initiatives.

Through the American Generations Rockefeller Fellows Program, we seek to reassess, ask new questions of, and provide new ways to interpreting conventional disciplinary approaches to studying Asian Pacific Americans.

The project's director is Dr. Harry Kitano. The project's main coordinator is Russell Leong, editor of Amerasia Journal, who worked with assistant director Tania Azores in writing and developing the program. The RockefellerSelection Committee will set policy and select the annual fellows.

Annual programs will choose a theme that will unite and describe the year's activities. The specific themes are as follows:

1990-91 First Families: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives

Examinations and comparisons of first generational and multi-generational families in Southern California, including family and gender issues, educational, political, and cultural concerns. Humanities approaches can include literary, visual, and creative analyses related to the above theme.

1991-92 Inter-generations: Generational Change

These projects focus on change, conflict, and continuity between generations within an Asian Pacific community, or on cross-ethnic and -racial group generational concerns. Contemporary and historical studies, as well as literary and cultural research are encouraged.

1992-93 Generational Identity and Sensibility

Generational representations and exploration expressed through critical and interpretative analyses of literature, the visual arts, and drama; proposals cutting across native-born, immigrant, and refugee groups; and proposals incorporating multi-cultural and multi-literary approaches to viewing generation are especially welcomed.

Fellowship Terms and Stipends

Fellowship terms range from three to ten months of residency. Fellows with ten-month terms receive stipends between $25,000 and $30,000, while quarterly stipends vary from $8,000 to $10,000 per quarter. Awards may be given for one or two quarters. Sabbatical supplements are also available. In all cases, the strength of the proposal determines the type and amount of fellowship awarded.

Eligibility and Selection

Fellowships are open to academic and independent scholars or other experienced community individuals demonstrating ability to write and to do research on humanities topics. U.S. citizenship and institutional affiliation are not required. No other major fellowship may be held concurrent with the residency.

Application Procedure

Applications are due by Dec. 31st of each year. For further info., contact the Asian American Studies Center, Rockefeller Fellows Program, 3232 Campbell Hall, University of California, Los Angeles, 90024.
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terey Park to ban Asian language signs in commercial establishments and Asian language materials in the library. Inter racial conflict is not just limited to Anglos and Asians. There are tensions between Korean merchants operating in Black neighborhoods and local residents who believe that the Asians are exploiting their communities. Even on our campus, increased Asian enrollment may have produced a backlash in the form of an informal ceiling on Asian admissions.

It would be a tragedy if the reemergence of Asians in California is met by a revival of the anti-Asian movement that marred the state until the end of World War II. Hopefully, history is on our side. The struggle for equal rights has produced greater legal protection for minorities now than in the past, and the most blatant racist ideologies have been laid to rest. Nonetheless, a more realistic reading of current trends lead us to believe that there will be a continued attack on these rights by conservatives, that some of the gains will be lost, and that racial tension will increase. Addressing these societal and political tendencies will be our biggest challenge in the nineties, and perhaps into the next century.
UCLA's Amerasia Journal Examines Legacies from Movements of the 1960s

The UCLA Asian American Studies Center just published a special, double-sized issue of Amerasia Journal commemorating the Asian American movement of the late 1960s and early 1970s.

The 384-page issue was compiled by guest editor Glenn Omatsu and guest graphics editor Mary Uyematsu Kao, both staff members of the Center.

According to Omatsu and Kao, the period of the late 1960s and early 1970s was pivotal for Asian Americans, marking the birth of Asian American Studies, the development of numerous community-based programs and organizations, and the transformation of political consciousness for one generation of activists.

Articles by Karen Umemoto and Rev. Lloyd Wake analyze the impact of the 1968-69 San Francisco State College student strike on Asian Americans.

Susie Ling traces the development of the Asian American women's movement in Los Angeles, while Mo Nishida and Merle Woo assess the contributions of community-based struggles during the 1960s on society today.

Providing perspectives on Asian American poetry and literature are four writers: Russell Leong, Al Robles, Jeffery Chan, and Janice Mirikitani.

Addressing contemporary educational issues, such as the "model minority" myth, the ethnic studies requirement, and Asian American textbooks, are James Okutsu, Arthur Hsu, Pong Gap Min, Sucheng Chan, and Augusto Espiritu.

History of the Okinawans in North America

The UCLA Asian American Studies Center and the Okinawan Club of North America announce their joint publication, the History of the Okinawans in North America.

The book, a community history, is devoted to the Japanese people on the continental United States who originated from Okinawa Prefecture. The 600-page book, illustrated with rare family and historical photos, contains sections on Okinawan immigration, the Okinawa Club, cultural, social, and political activities, profiles of individuals in North America, and a section on Okinawan literature and poetry.

The translator of this book is Ben Kobashigawa, a recipient of this year's UCLA Japanese American Scholars Fellowship.

Kobashigawa is doing research at UCLA and also teaching at San Francisco State University in Asian American Studies.

According to Kobashigawa, "the History of the Okinawans in North America embodies the issei (first generation) legacy to future generations of Okinawans in America...many fine examples of issei writing, drawn from the long tradition of writing and publishing within the Okinawan community, have been reproduced here for the first time in English."

This poem, for example, was written by Matsuji Shima in 1936:

Funatabi ni nataru iminichi wa chode ya
Udi wa sumiaiwa tage ni ikana
Immigrant brothers and sisters, who came by boat
Let us go forward together, arm in arm

Ben Kobashigawa, an Okinawan sansei (third generation) born in Idaho, grew up in Los Angeles. He received his B.A. in linguistics from UCLA, his M.A. in economics from the University of Michigan, and Ph.D. in Sociology from the University of Edinburgh, Scotland.

According to historian Yuiji Ichikawa, "The book should be of interest to all Japanese Americans and anyone else interested in the American ethnic experience."

The History of the Okinawans in North America is a hardcover book, illustrated with original Okinawan woodblock designs commissioned for the publication. This limited edition is available from the UCLA Asian American Studies Center for $25.00 plus $1.00 handling and taxes where applicable. Mailing address: UCLA Asian American Studies Center Publications, 3232 Campbell Hall, Los Angeles, CA 90024.
Taking the Lead
By Joe Virala & Jennifer Rose

In developing leadership, just as in life, there is no better teacher than experience. The qualities of leadership are not innate, but learned, and leaders are not born, they are developed, trained, nurtured, and encouraged. This is the purpose of an Asian American Studies 199 course Leadership Development within the Asian and Pacific Islander Community, a two-quarter class that began in the winter quarter and culminated in a leadership retreat during the seventh week of spring quarter.

The first ten weeks were devoted to class forums and discussions to develop an awareness of current Asian and Pacific Islander issues as well as to provide a historical background of the Asian and Pacific Islander experience.

More importantly, the first quarter addressed the subject of leadership and included discussion of topics such as “Styles of Leadership,” “Leadership Skills,” etc. Guest speakers made presentations on the social, political and economic status of the Asian and Pacific Islander communities and the lack of leaders within these communities, especially in light of California’s changing demographics.

Building Common Ground
By Belen Pascua Enriquez

On May 19-21 at Camp Valcrest, the AASC's Student/Community Projects and the Asian Pacific Coalition held a Summer Leadership Retreat which increased the awareness of ethnic diversity and common ground among the 19-group member Asian Pacific Coalition. Like a river, the Asian student movement derives its source from a variety of streams as reflected by the organizations that participated: Chinese Student Assoc., Samahang Pilipino, IndoChinese Student Assoc., Assoc. of Chinese Americans, Korean Student Assoc., Concerned Asian Pacific Students for Action, Center for Student Programming, Nikkei Student Union, Imiloa Hawaii Club, and Vietnamese Student Assoc. Each stream represents each of the 19 organizations. United, the streams mobilize and generate power capable of changing the environment on campus and in our communities.

For three days, we spent long hours of honest and open discussion covering many sensitive issues. The retreat raised everyone’s awareness of positive leadership skills such as goal setting, programming, evaluation, and conflict-resolution; improving interpersonal relationships; and addressing critical issues of Asian Pacific students such as identity, culture, education, racial conflict, Asian Pacific women’s equality and struggles, and community involvement.

In the first workshop, “Common Ground”, each ethnic group shared their concerns and discussed the stereotypes often falsely attributed to them. We gained a wider perspective of the diversity, as well as the commonalities that tie the Coalition together.

The “Organizations and Coalitions” workshop provided a reevaluation and reaffirmation of the Coalition’s importance. Increasing unity and student involvement and improving the structure and function of APC could be achieved by increasing the involvement of and accountability to the member organizations. (Some concrete ideas included expanding group representatives’ responsibilities, holding APC general member meetings, or doing more joint programming.)

The third workshop, “Programming”, used mock hearings to exhibit the programming process in detail. The fourth workshop dealt with diversity in education and campus issues. We discussed growing student empowerment and activism, especially in those goals, and then do the actual work necessary (from brainstorming the content and focus of the various workshops, to developing and implementing an outreach and recruitment plan to reach the high school participants, to arranging for food, transportation, and lodging) for reaching those goals.
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A major portion of the learning process for the members of the class was the actual “hands on” experience of organizing a program that provides real services to the youth of the Asian and Pacific Islander communities. With this in mind, it was left up to the students to develop the goals of the high school retreat, create the vehicle for attaining light of the university's increasing insensitivity towards the special needs of Asian Pacific and other minority students. We addressed the struggle for ethnic studies, and minority representation on campus.

“Conflict & Resolutions”, the last workshop, explored leadership styles, ethics, problems and solutions. Dealing with the issues of accountability, differences, motivation, support, respect, and communication, we all came out more prepared to handle next year’s challenges. We also discussed Asian Pacific women in leadership. Through skills, students confronted the need for Asian Pacific women to be respected in leadership without being labeled as a threat. Because Asian Pacific women come from a range of backgrounds that sometimes separates their experiences and concerns, it is vital for Asian Pacific women to unite, support, and understand each other.

All the workshops illustrated that the fundamental strength of APC is its members. Like every drop of water in a river, each student is a crucial part of the whole. Each of us needs to realize that whatever we have to give, regardless of the size, is always a significant contribution to making change. We all make a difference to the strength and success of APC, its member organizations, and to our communities.
Speaking For The Majority: A Clear Call By Asian Pacifics In Student Government

HERE'S a stereotype that all we do is bury our heads in the books," said newly elected General Representative Dennis Arguelles. "But seeing that Asian Pacific students were active in the elections and won 5 out of 13 seats, it's clear we're serious about a lot more." 7,183 ballots were cast out of the over 21,000 undergraduates eligible in the highest voter turnout for student government in over four years.

Asian Pacific students have become a strong voice in student politics at UCLA and many other campuses. Newly elected President John Hoang Sarvey, who is Amerasian of Vietnamese and Caucasian descent, explained that "for a number of years, it's been Asian Pacific students who have been putting progressive students into office." But recently, "they have been putting Asian students into office as well."

In addition to Sarvey and Arguelles, Asian Pacific students elected into office include Executive Vice President Maria Rabuy, Community Service Commissioner Jeannie Kim, and incumbent Cultural Affairs Commissioner Ken Wada.

Student leaders expect that the new student council will be more accountable to their diverse needs. Joon Song, director of the 19-member group Asian Pacific Coalition stated that "this is the beginning" and that "they now have a chance to work on the things they were talking about." He expressed some concern that "student governments usually tend to stay away from hot issues, instead of realizing that there are interests of students that are different from administration." He added that "student governments have the potential to advocate student issues, but this hasn't happened in the past...I'm hopeful that will change." Samahang Pilipino, Nikkel Student Union and many other member groups of the Coalition have become decisive constituents in recent elections.

In addition to breaking old stereotypes, Asian Pacific students are on breaking new ground as an evermore active voice in campus politics...for Asian Pacific Americans and for the majority.

UCLA Joins Call To Spring Action '89

By Mary Katayama

OVER 7000 students, parents and educators marched to Sacramento to demand their rights to a quality education, on March 10, 1989. Never before had such a diverse group of people from different ethnicities and ages rallied together on the steps of the Capitol.

Today, low income students and students of color are finding it increasingly difficult to obtain a higher education due to heavy cut backs in financial aid and affirmative action programs. In K-12, attrition rates are skyrocketing while bilingual classes and educational resources are dwindling.

Over 100 UCLA students participated in this action and listened to various leaders of statewide student organizations and political leaders such as Maxine Waters, Tom Hayden, and Jesse Jackson. The crowd cheered and shouted enthusiastically as the speakers addressed the urgent need for educational reforms. Jesse Jackson spoke about the power that students have had in bringing about change throughout America's history.

Inside the Capitol, UCLA students took specific educational concerns directly to State Legislators and lobbied for their support. Asian Pacific American students concentrated on two main issues: tenure for UCLA Professor Don Nakanishi and affirmative action for Filipino students. Students were able to effectively talk to many legislators and legislative aides to gain immediate support. It was very encouraging to know that many of our state legislative leaders are both receptive and concerned about the issues that are facing Asian Pacifics as well as others.

On March 10th, people united together and not only "rocked the house," but made a tremendous impact on the future of education in California. Spring Action '89 was truly an exciting, empowering experience for us all.
"THE CUTTING EDGE"

Redefining Affirmative Action
A Case Study On Filipinos

By: The Samahang Pilipino Affirmative Action Task Force

Edited By: Joe Virata

There is a growing disparity between the original intent of affirmative action and the result of current policies. Affirmative action, at the time of its inception, was a result of the struggle by oppressed people for equal access to and participation in the institutions that determined the quality of their lives. Historically denied educational, political, social, and economic opportunities to improve their own conditions, these people fought and won a commitment from the federal government to tear down barriers against race, class, and gender that had long been entrenched in the institutions of American society. In 1964 this commitment was manifested in Executive Order 11246, the Equal Employment Opportunity Program, which mandated that federally funded institutions "...promote the full realization of equal employment opportunity through a positive, continuing program..." [Code of Federal Regulations: Title 3 — The President, 1964 & 65 Compilation, US Government Printing Office, Washington D.C., 1967.] That same year, at the insistence of the Third World communities fighting for civil rights, the University of California began its efforts towards affirmative action with the establishment of its Educational Opportunity Program, which was designed to be a mechanism for achieving equality for entire disadvantaged communities.

The current concept of affirmative action is essentially a legislative interpretation of its original intent. In 1972, Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 151 (ACR 151) called for "the Regents of the University of California, the Trustees of the California State University and Colleges, and the Board of governors of the California Community Colleges...to prepare a plan that [would] provide for addressing and overcoming ethnic, economic and sexual underrepresentation in the makeup of the student bodies of institutions of public higher education...". In 1984, in the wake of the issues of "meritocracy" and "reversed discrimination" attached to the 1978 Bakke Decision, a new resolution shifted the direction of affirmative action. Assembly Concurrent Resoluti

In 1988, Filipinos were removed from "protected status" and are no longer considered an "underrepresented" group eligible for affirmative action within UCLA admissions policy. By the University's standards the Pilipino population at UCLA had achieved "parity" when its rate of incoming freshmen matched its public high school graduation rate, and was no longer in eligible for preferential admission. What resulted was a 31 percent drop in Pilipino freshman enrollment to UCLA. This drop, when linked to the university's poor Pilipino student retention record (Filipinos have a 47% attrition rate) and the rapid growth of California's Pilipino population (predicted to increase by 162.6% by the year 2000) points to a dismal future for the Pilipino community at UCLA. These actions were taken despite a 1985 study that predicted a 50 percent drop in Pilipino enrollment should admissions protection be removed. A similar 1985 study conducted by UCLA School of Education Professor Don Nakashiki put the drop in enrollment at as high as 90 percent. This called into question the institution's commitment to the intent of affirmative action in addressing racial inequality faced by Filipinos and other groups today.
Pilipinos are currently the largest Asian Pacific American group in the United States, with 46 percent of the total population living in California. In addition, Los Angeles County is home for more Pilipinos than any other county in the nation. Yet Pilipinos continue to be underrepresented in all institutions and suffer low socio-economic status. Only four Pilipino Americans have been elected to public office in a county with over 100,000 Pilipino residents. Furthermore, according to 1980 Census statistics, Pilipino American men in Los Angeles County earn only 72 percent of what white males earn; Pilipino American women earn only 48 percent, despite figures that show Pilipinos to be among the most highly educated of the Asian Pacific American groups.

Educationally, Pilipino high school students had the highest attrition rate in the Los Angeles Unified School District in the 1979-1980 school year—higher rates than for Blacks and Chicanos. The figures show little improvement at the college level. For Pilipino students admitted to UCLA in Fall 1982, only 39.5 percent had graduated by their fifth year, compared to 65.5 percent for white students. At the graduate level, a 1982 student-initiated questionnaire revealed only 28 Pilipino American students out of a total of 7,209 at UCLA; a 1979-1980 California Postsecondary Education Commission study revealed no percent Pilipinos successfully completing a doctoral program in the entire nine campus University of California system. There is only one, non-tenured Pilipino professor and no permanent faculty to teach Philippine or Pilipino American Studies. There are no Pilipino administrators.

Such a picture is not one tinged with success. Despite this, the UCLA administration no longer considers Pilipinos a target group for affirmative action. By claiming that Pilipinos have exceeded the numerical measure of parity for five years, the administration removed Pilipinos from the Early Outreach and Admissions segments of affirmative action.

This narrow and static definition allows the university to overlook the broad inequalities of any disadvantaged group, and to further lay claim to “successful affirmative action efforts” in low numbers of enrolled students. Nor does it take into account Pilipinos’ concentration in urban cities, the increasing flow of Pilipino immigrants into California at the rate of some 20,000 per year, and that Pilipino high school and college attrition rates are among the highest of any ethnic group.

THE current implementation of affirmative action is also unclear with regard to the socio-economic background of Pilipino students admitted. How many students come from the disadvantaged, low income backgrounds affirmative action was supposed to target? Clearly, this definition allows an undercutting of adequate representation in and the premature removal of ethnic groups from the very program that was created to ensure their success. Ironically, this is occurring at a time when California’s ethnic populations are increasing at such a rate that it is soon to become the first third world state in this country. Public institutions must be held accountable to the communities they are supposed to serve.

Education is a key component to achieving equality throughout society. It provides an opportunity to enter the structure of politics and economics. Without it, the likelihood of participation from minorities at all levels greatly diminishes. To cut a group from one aspect, say education, without considering the entirety of its position relative to society would be detrimental. Therefore, all aspects of society need to be taken into account when considering an effective structure for affirmative action.

At UCLA, affirmative action officials are no longer servicing Pilipinos in the early outreach and admissions segments at the educational level. But, Pilipinos have not achieved educational equality. And affirmative action has not come close to achieving economic and political equality goals it was designed to accomplish. Thus affirmative action needs to be reevaluated holistically. It needs to reaffirm its original purpose of achieving equality in not one aspect of society but throughout all aspects. Its initial intent was comprehensive. It should be implemented as such. Separating affirmative action into its component parts speaks little to alleviating the inequalities throughout society. An integrated pipeline from education to economic and political programs need be established. To eliminate a group from one aspect while it remains largely deficient in another is to break the continuum and consequently cut them off at the knees.

Currently, the University of California is redefining its admissions policies with respect to affirmative action. For example, proposed changes include weighting: 1) special talents, interests, or experiences beyond the academic criteria more heavily; 2) ethnic identity, gender, and residence (to ensure cultural, racial, and socio-economic diversity in the student population) and 3) the consolidation of all applicant pools into one. In diversifying the student body, has the University strayed from ensuring that “patterns of race, class, and gender that have correlated with low participation in the University do not continue to prevail?” These changes must be watched to ensure affirmative action at UCLA does not become ineffective in the struggle for equal access to education for all.
Asian Pacific Alumni Plans Grad School Admissions Conference

The Educational Concerns Committee of the Asian Pacific Alumni Association is now planning a conference addressing graduate school admissions for Asian Pacific Americans. The Conference, “So You Want To Go To Grad School?: An APA Perspective” tentatively set for October 1989, will be held on the UCLA campus. Representatives from various UCLA graduate programs and professional schools will be on hand to discuss their particular programs, with an emphasis on application procedures and admissions criteria. Presently enrolled graduate students also will participate in informal discussions with prospective applicants.

The Educational Concerns Committee also is planning other programs, including symposia on the political turmoil in China, Asian Pacific Americans and undergraduate admissions, Pacific Rim developments, and the role of Asian American studies in the university. If you would like to join the Committee, please contact Daniel Mayeda at (213) 277-3333 or Dolly Gee at (213) 487-5791.

Union Organizing Brochure Published For Asian Pacific Immigrants

The Alliance of Asian Pacific Labor (AAPL) in Los Angeles has published a brochure geared to union organizing campaigns involving new immigrant workers from Asia and the Pacific Islands.

Entitled “Unite: The Union Is Up To You!”, the 12-page brochure answers common questions raised during union campaigns.

Questions answered include: “What can unions do for you?”, “Can new immigrants join unions?”, “If I join a union, will I get fired?”, “If I want a union, do I have to go on strike?”, “How do I bring the union to my workplace?”, “How can I get my co-workers together to form a union?” and “Where can I get help for organizing union at my workplace?”

The brochure also includes personal testimonies by Filipino and Vietnamese immigrants about dealing with workplace problems, defending on-the-job rights, and actively participating in their unions.

Text for the brochure was written by Glenn Omatsu of the UCLA Asian American Studies Center, who is also a member of the executive board of the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees Local 3238. He is a former chief shop steward with the Teamsters union.

Design of the brochure was handled by Mary Kao of Gao Grafix. She is a former member of the United Food and Commercial Workers Local 770.

The brochure was printed through a grant provided to AAPL by the Liberty Hill Foundation.

According to Kent Wong, AAPL chairperson and staff attorney with Service Employees International Union Local 660, the current brochure is in the English language but will eventually be translated into nine Asian Pacific languages for the more than two-thirds of Asian Pacific residents in Los Angeles County who are foreign-born.

AAPL was founded in the fall of 1987 by a coalition of labor and community leaders. It functions as a standing committee of the Los Angeles County Federation of Labor (AFL-CIO).

AAPL chairperson is Arthur S. Takei, vice-president of United Food and Commercial Workers Local 770.

Copies of the AAPL brochure are free and may be obtained by writing to AAPL, c/o L.A. Co. Federation of Labor, 2130 W. Ninth St., Los Angeles, CA 90005.

For more information, call Glenn Omatsu, (213) 825-2968.

PAC/NET On Line At UCLA

The Pacific Asian Campus Network (PAC/NET) is on-line and active to bring together the concerns of Asian Pacific staff on the UCLA campus. At issue are concerns that affect students, staff and faculty. These concerns include the issue of casual vs. career employment, the “Class Ceiling” for staff, the issue of affirmative action for Asian Pacific students into graduate school, and Filipinos and Pacific Islander students into undergraduate programs at UCLA.

In December of 1988, a group of faculty and staff met to discuss the possibility of developing an Asian Pacific Islander Network at UCLA. Attendees realized that the basic concerns of students were met by the various student organizations and that a faculty and staff organization was necessary to address the growing and changing needs of the campus faculty and staff at UCLA.

The goals and objectives of PAC/NET are:

• To enhance the welfare of Asian Pacific faculty, staff, and students on the campus of the University of California, Los Angeles and within the UC system.

• To develop and strengthen the professional and social network among Asian Pacific faculty and staff. To develop and strengthen the network with other ethnic organizations.

• To increase the hiring, career development, and promotional opportunities of Asian Pacific faculty and staff. Increase Asian Pacific student success through the “pipeline.”

We encourage faculty and staff to join PACNET. For more information, contact Joe Virata at (213) 825-1006.

AAPL Omai Fa‘atasta
Save The Date!!!
2nd Annual APA Community Research Roundtable Coming Soon

The Second Annual Asian Pacific American Community Research Roundtable will be held on October 26, 1989 at UCLA's Ackerman Union from 11 am to 5 pm. This year's Roundtable theme is "Asian Pacific American Community-based Research: Networking and Strategies."

This Roundtable is designed for students, faculty, researchers, and community-based organizations to match their research needs with research interests. There is an increasing need for research which addresses many of the issues facing Asian and Pacific Islander communities in Southern California. Conference committee member Bill Watanabe of APPCON explained, "This is the time we can all come together — community and campus — to see if there is common ground to work together on action-oriented research."

The four components of the Roundtable include:

Internship fair - Students and scholars can explore internship and research opportunities with various community organizations.

Speaker panel - Speakers will address major issues of community-based research including needs, methods, funding, and support. Speakers include: Professor Paul Ong, UCLA Architecture and Urban Planning; Dr. Herb Hatanaka, Executive Director, Special Services for Groups; Paul Vandeventer, Executive Vice President, California Community Foundation; and Andrea Solorzado, Asian Pacific American Graduate Students Association.

Networking Workshop - Topics for these "mini-roundtables" will include Health; Education; Mental Health; Economic Development and Urban Issues; Politics and Law; and Art, Culture and Media.

Reception - A reception will provide time to explore ideas generated throughout the day. Computerized rosters of all participants will be made available.

Sponsors include the Asian Pacific Planning Council (APPCON) and participants from UCLA, University of Southern California, California State Universities at Northridge, Los Angeles, and Long Beach. The event is free and open to the public.

For more information, contact Karen Umemoto at (213) 825-1006.

Asian Pacific American Graduate Student Association Newly Formed

Greetings from the UCLA-Asian Pacific American Graduate Student Association (APAGSA)! We just recently organized and have already received interest from graduate students in Psychology, Sociology, Geography, Information and Library Sciences, Asian American Studies, Computer Sciences, Chemistry, Biology, Electrical Engineering and other departments. We are officially affiliated with the American Studies Center.

Our goals are to:
1. Promote the general welfare of Asian Pacific American (APA) graduate students at the University of California, Los Angeles.
2. Inform members of available resources to help their academic and professional careers.
3. Develop and present workshops, seminars, lectures, and conferences for career and personal development.
4. Play an active role in the recruitment and retention of Asian Pacific American graduate students.
5. Strengthen the professional and social relations of APA graduate students with undergraduates, staff, faculty, alumni, the greater Asian Pacific American community, and other sectors of the UCLA community.

Membership is open to all graduate students. Upcoming events include an opening reception, dinners and a welcome reception for new grad students in the fall. We hope to work closely with GSA, APC, Asian Pacific Alumni Association, Asian Management Student Association, Asian Pacific/Islander Law Student Association, Black Graduate Student Association and RAZA Grad. JOIN US! For more info contact through campus mail: Anson Gong (Biology), Leland Saito (sociology), Glen Kitayama (Asian American Studies) or Dean Toji (Geography).

1990 APAHE Conference Planned For Sacramento

Save the dates now! The Third Annual Asian Pacific Americans in Higher Education (APAHE) conference will be held on February 25-27, 1990, in Sacramento. The conference will be held at the Radisson Hotel. Part of the conference will be focused on interfacing with the Legislature and Governor's Office. An ad hoc committee has begun meeting in Sacramento to secure the dates and location for the conference. Should you want to join in on the planning of next year's conference or provide some input, please phone: Hoyt Fong at Cosmunes River College, (916) 686-7420.
READING ROOM ROUND-UP

By Marji Lee

THE Asian American Studies Center's research and instructional programs seek to develop and advance research that stimulates the development of new theoretical and methodological approaches to the study of Asian and Pacific American peoples. Specific research activities of the Center mirror this orientation in two ongoing programs: organized research projects and individual research endeavors. The READING ROOM houses an extensive, specialized collection that supports this specialized field of research and its exceptional instructional programs.

The focus of this issue's ROUND-UP lists acquisitions conducted through the University Microfilms International (UMI). UMI makes available for purchase the largest and most comprehensive selection of doctoral dissertations and masters theses. We have found UMI to be both an important indicator of and a significant resource to ongoing research endeavors conducted by junior scholars within the field of Asian and Pacific American Studies.

The titles listed below include this year's research projects as well as the READING ROOM's own targeted acquisitions. Interracial marriage, Pacific Island American experience, women and family were some of the research topics considered in this year's UMI acquisition.


Kusama, Michio. "The perception of 'shikata ga nai' and coping with aging among the first and second generation Japanese American." Wright Institute, PhD (Psychology), 1987.


Reed, Harold N. "The completion of educational goals and the returnability of Tongan and Western Samoan students: a private American university." Brigham Young U, (Education), 1982.


Yamagata-Noji, Audrey A. "The educational achievement of Japanese Americans [college]." Claremont Graduate School, PhD (Education), 1987.

NAKANISHI FINALLY WINS TENURE!!!

By Glenn Omatsu

The Daily Bruin headline of May 26, 1989 said it all: “Nakanishi Wins Tenure After 3-Year Battle.” The front-page story related Chancellor Young’s decision to grant Don Nakanishi a permanent faculty appointment in the Graduate School of Education — finally.

Don, thus, became the first tenured Asian American professor in the department and only the fifth minority professor out of fifty-two total.

Strangely, in the months following this announcement, several opponents have stated that they supported Don all along. In fact, no one now seems to have actually opposed tenure.

The true story, of course, is different. As the Daily Bruin headline perceptively noted, tenure came “after a three-year battle.”

But why did “a battle” occur? Why did it last three years? And will we have to fight future battles to achieve similar results?

From the beginning, Don Nakanishi had eminent qualifications for tenure. He was one of the top Asian American scholars at UCLA and a pioneer in the field of ethnic studies.

But blocking his faculty appointment were several high-ranking officials, headed by GSE Dean Lewis Solmon, who attacked his pioneering research in Asian American Studies as unimportant. Significantly, these people had no academic background in the field that they criticized. But for more than two-and-a-half years, Chancellor Young listened to the judgments of this powerful minority.

Thus, in the fall of 1987, Chancellor Young denied tenure to Don despite an initial review process that was marred by biases and irregularities. The case would have ended then, but Don was able to receive a new tenure review because he and his attorneys filed grievances against the University. During this same period, Don’s campus and community supporters wrote letters and submitted petitions with thousands of signatures demanding justice.

However, even by early 1989, UCLA officials still considered Don as “not sufficiently qualified” for tenure. Thus, in February, Chancellor Young mandated an unprecedented fifth vote by faculty in Don’s department.

So what happened between February and May 1989 to change the situation? First, Don’s support continued to increase. In early March, students at UCLA organized a press conference, rally and march, drawing 500 people, all demanding immediate tenure. Hundreds of organizations nationwide added their endorsements. Also, 27 California State legislators announced support and provided critical assistance. What had begun as a simple case involving tenure for one Japanese American evolved into a symbol of racial exclusion and injustice at UCLA.

Second, Don’s faculty colleagues in the GSE reaffirmed support for his appointment, with three-quarters of those attending a meeting voting in his favor, despite the opposition of Dean Solmon.

In the end, Chancellor Young recognized Don’s outstanding qualifications for tenure and rejected the opposition of the powerful few. But we wonder: would he have made the same decision in the absence of Don’s massive support?

The question is important because connected to the Don Nakanishi case are three other issues that are yet to be resolved.

1) The number of Asian American, African American, Latino American, and Native American faculty at UCLA remains appallingly low. If this problem is to be seriously addressed, UCLA officials must set goals, such as five-year plans for specific departments, and stringent penalties for administrators who do not meet goals. Will UCLA officials take these steps?

2) The problem of racism at UCLA is not limited to faculty hiring but pervades all levels of campus life. Students have eloquently raised their concerns. But much less has been said about racism affecting campus employees. For example, some Filipino groundkeepers have worked for more than a decade without promotions. Many Asian American clerks and secretaries have reached the top of their job classifications but are not reclassified despite years of experience. Moreover, the campus union reports that more than half of all employee grievances filed against the University concern acts of racism by supervisors and administrators. How will UCLA officials respond to these problems?

3) Finally, through our work on the Don Nakanishi case, students, staff, and community people discovered that there is a dangerous gap between the University’s rhetoric concerning “diversity” and actual performance. For example, UCLA officials loudly proclaim the promotion of “diversity” as their foremost priority. They point to the existence of the four Ethnic Studies centers as proof of that commitment. But the Ethnic Studies centers arose twenty years ago as “minority studies” programs and their meager operating budgets have reflected this definition. Today in California — where “minorities” have become the majority — the time has certainly come for UCLA officials to greatly increase funding for the Ethnic Studies centers and related programs. But will this happen? It will be interesting to see exactly how much of the highly-publicized $37.5 million generated by UCLA’s recent fund-raising campaign will be allocated to the foremost priority of campus diversity.

What, then, have we learned from the three-year battle around tenure for Don Nakanishi? We have learned that we face a small, but powerful, opposition at the highest levels of the University’s administration.

But we have also learned that we are not powerless. Through our actions, we play a role in shaping what will occur.

Thus, while new “battles” may be unavoidable, there are no inevitable outcomes. The University may try to deny tenure to a qualified teacher. It may try to ignore our anger over its acts of racism. But it cannot expect our compliance. And it cannot prevent our efforts to organize ourselves to protect our rights.

In the end, justice will prevail — but only if we make sure that injustice does not.

---

This article from Crosscurrents focuses on the case of Don Nakanishi, a professor who won tenure after a three-year battle. The article discusses the importance of diversity on campus and the role of students and faculty in addressing racism and promoting fairness. It highlights the significance of Nakanishi's case and its implications for broader issues of representation and equality at the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA).
The three-year battle to insure a fair review for Professor Don T. Nakamishi ended in victory as Chancellor Young announced the "promotion to the rank of associate professor" on May 25, 1989. We would like to thank the many supporters who worked so that justice was won.

The problem was complex, and the solution was elusive. But with perseverance and determination, the supporters were able to overcome the challenges and achieve a just outcome. This victory is a testament to the power of collective action and the importance of standing up for what is right.

The supporters include... (list of supporters)

In Recognition May This Be a Beginning

The victory is a significant milestone in the fight for justice. It is a reminder of the importance of standing up for our values and the need for ongoing vigilance to ensure that justice is served.

The supporters... (continue list)

The victory is a testament to the power of collective action and the importance of standing up for what is right. It is a call to action for all who believe in justice and fairness.

The supporters... (continue list)

The three-year battle was a difficult one, but the outcome was worth the effort. The supporters are... (list of supporters)

This victory is a milestone in the fight for justice. It is a reminder of the importance of perseverance and the need for ongoing vigilance to ensure that justice is served.

The supporters... (continue list)

The victory is a testament to the power of collective action and the importance of standing up for what is right. It is a call to action for all who believe in justice and fairness.
Chronology Of Professor Don T. Nakanishi’s Battle For Tenure

Edited By Belen Enriquez

1982- Nakanishi appointed Assistant Professor, UCLA Graduate School of Education (GSE).

1986- Nakanishi begins first tenure review.

1987- June- Despite community support and GSE vote of approval, UCLA Administration denies Nakanishi tenure after interpreting his research on Asian American Studies as “irrelevant”. Hundreds rally at Campbell Hall in a Candlelight Vigil. Supporters march to UCLA Chancellor Young’s residence to call for Nakanishi’s tenure and to criticize the university’s rhetorical campaign for diversity. October- Nakanishi filed his first grievance.

1988- January- Academic Senate Committee on Privilege and Tenure finds “bias and procedural improprieties” in departmental review. Students charge racial discrimination in the GSE. The Committee recommended another review. May- Over 400 students and community leaders protest campus racism asking “Diversity or Racism?”

October- The State Senate Special Committee on University of California Admissions convenes a special hearing on racism at UC campuses. Students bring attention to Nakanishi’s case. Student organizations then launch an extensive letter-writing campaign to Chancellor Young. More than a thousand letters were submitted in a few weeks.

1989- February- At the Asian Pacific Americans in Higher Education Conference, Senator Torres voices the sentiments of Nakanishi and his supporters. Chancellor Young decides not to decide on the issue and refers the case back to GSE for re-review. Organizations endorse support for tenure. Over five hundred supporters rally and demand “Tenure Now.” Chancellor Young denies charges of racial discrimination and blames delays on Nakanishi. April- The UCLA Graduate Students Association of Education again votes in favor of tenure for Nakanishi. At Sacramento’s Spring Action ’89, UCLA students lobby at the State Capitol. NSU president, Mary Katayama, testifies in support of Nakanishi before the California State Senate Committee on UC Admissions. Alexander Saxton, UCLA Professor of History and Chair of the Faculty Advisory Committee for the UCLA Asian American Studies Center, writes an editorial which becomes the first public statement by a tenured faculty member in support of Nakanishi. He critically addresses the issue of racial discrimination. The Asian Pacific Islander Student Union Conference, a statewide coalition of Asian Pacific student organizations, unanimously passes a resolution demanding tenure for Nakanishi. May-Twenty seven legislators support Nakanishi as result of over eight thousand students who lobby in Sacramento and widespread community support. USAC candidates and then-USAC council (student government) take public stands supporting Nakanishi’s tenure. May 25- After three years of battle, Chancellor Young finally grants Nakanishi’s tenure. June 9- Supporters throw a well deserved victory celebration at Centenary United Methodist Church, Little Tokyo.