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FROM THE EDITORS

During these times of global conflict and uncertainty, understanding diversity both here and abroad is paramount to promoting a more just and equal society. The Asian American Policy Review provides a particular forum on Asian Pacific American issues that arise from the intersection of our heritage and history in the United States. As our world and community change, we hope to continue to educate and challenge ourselves and others to look critically at policies affecting Asian Pacific Americans.

We are pleased to present the Twelfth Volume of the Harvard University Asian American Policy Review. This year’s journal content is diverse, addressing numerous interests and issues. We have expanded this year to include a census fact sheet on the Asian Pacific American community and a review of websites, reflecting our rapidly changing demographics and the increasing role of technology in connecting our lives.

This year’s interviews provide a range of perspectives from Asian Pacific American leaders at the state and national level. The Honorable Gary Locke, Governor of the State of Washington, shares his views on a number of issues, including affirmation action and immigration, and speaks of the strides that Asian Pacific Americans have made in politics across the country. He describes his historical opportunity to give this year’s Democratic response after the President Bush’s State of the Union Address.

The Honorable Lon S. Hatamiya, California Secretary of Technology, Trade and Commerce, recounts the educational experience and mentoring that helped him challenge stereotypes of Asian Pacific Americans and access unique work opportunities. Christina Lagdameo, chair of the National Asian Pacific American Women’s Forum DC Chapter, shares her experiences working on a progressive policy agenda to empower Asian Pacific American women and girls and her involvement in establishing an Asian American studies program at the University of Maryland.

Most studies involving race issues and the labor market focus on African Americans and Whites while relatively few have been published specifically on Asian Pacific Americans. Arthur Sakamoto and Changhwan Kim explore William J. Wilson’s controversial theory on the increasing significance of class and declining significance of race by applying Wilson’s analysis to Asian American men from 1940-1998 to see how race and class affect wages.

In the post September 11 environment, immigration policy has become restrictive and numerous issues have arisen that affect the Asian Pacific American community. In order to encourage dialogue and address these concerns, an immigration conference held in March 2002 convened over 130 representatives from universities, community organizations, and unions. Katie Quan provides an overview of the eight key issues identified and highlights recommendations from the conference.

Although Asian Pacific Americans are stereotypically not associated with civic participation, record numbers are running for public office and diversifying the
landscape of American politics. **Rodney Jay C. Salinas** summarizes results from the midterm elections and reports on how Asian Pacific American candidates fared at the ballot. He provides an extensive recap of the elections results of Asian Pacific American candidates nationwide as well as key statistics.

With the defeat of anti-bilingual education measures in Colorado and Massachusetts, the debate revolving bilingual education is resurfacing as English-only movement proponents take their initiatives around the nation. **AAPR’s managing editor, PJ Gagajena**, provides a brief update on recent activities.

We recognized that information about our community is often difficult to find and that the web is a critical avenue to providing access to resources and knowledge on a large scale. The **AAPR** staff contributed to reviewing some of the top Asian Pacific American web sites on the internet. Although there were many to choose from, we narrowed the list to the Top 10 web sites that provide important information on issues surrounding Asian Pacific American policy, current events, culture, and arts. We encourage our readers to email us with suggestions for other websites to review.

**AAPR** staff member, **Neal Parikh**, has written a thoughtful book review on *Everybody was Kung Fu Fighting: Afro-Asian Connections and the Myth of Cultural Purity* by **Vijay Prashad**. Prashad connects and recounts a shared history of oppression between Asians and Africans and promotes a new paradigm of race “polyculturalism” that is rooted in antiracism.

Finally, this year’s journal reflects upon and pays tribute to the **Honorable Patsy Mink**, former Congresswoman of the State of Hawaii, and the **Honorable Chang-Lin Tien**, former Chancellor of the University of California at Berkeley, who both passed away last fall. Herb Lee, a member of Mink’s Congressional staff shares his thoughts about the former Hawaii State U.S. Representative who worked tirelessly to fight for equity and justice during her 12 terms in the U.S. Congress. We highlight the life and contributions of Tien, an internationally renowned engineering scholar and the first Asian American to head a major research university, U.C. Berkeley, in the United States.

We would like to thank the editorial staff for their energy, enthusiasm, and tireless devotion who worked to provide a space for Asian Pacific American issues to be published. We extend special thanks to Fred Wang and the Wang Foundation for supporting us throughout the years during the course of our growth and improvement. Lastly, we would like to thank our readership and encourage feedback and ideas on the journal and hope that more people will spread the word. There are few forums for discussion on Asian Pacific American policy issues which makes your support for this journal critical.

**AAPR**’s staff has enjoyed contributing to this year’s journal and has worked hard throughout the year to conduct interviews, review books and web sites, and provide useful information on current issues. We hope that you are enriched by the perspectives found in Volume XII and that the information will be used to spur policy debate and increase knowledge about critical issues that affect the Asian Pacific American community.

A. Anne Im
Emily S. Lam
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Into the National Consciousness of America: An Interview with the Honorable Gary Locke, Governor of the State of Washington

Georgette Bhathena

Introduction

AAPR revisits a conversation about Asian Pacific Islander American (APIA) leadership with the Honorable Gary Locke, Governor of the State of Washington, who wrote the prelude to “APAs in the New Millennium” in Volume IX of the AAPR, published in 2000. Governor Locke established yet another great milestone in APIA history in delivering the Democratic Party’s response to President George W. Bush’s State of the Union Address on 28 January 2003 as the chair of the Democratic Governors’ Association. In this interview, he describes his rise to political leadership and his experience in delivering the response. He also shares his thoughts on affirmative action and immigration. The following is an excerpt from the interview conducted on February 18, 2003.

Interview with the Honorable Gary Locke

AAPR: Please tell us about your background and career path that led to your current position. Who were your mentors and why have you chosen public service as your life’s work?

LOCKE: As an Eagle Scout, I was always interested in service. During the Vietnam Era, I helped on several campaigns. I saw everyday people making laws and realized it was something I wanted to do.

Then, through a combination of part-time work, financial aid, and scholarships, I obtained an undergraduate degree in political science from Yale and earned a law degree from Boston University. I never imagined my career would lead to the governor’s office.

Georgette Bhathena is a Master in Public Policy candidate at Harvard University’s John F. Kennedy School of Government.
When I ran for a seat in the legislature in 1982, my goal was to help improve our public education system. I believe that public service is profoundly important, and that the public's faith in its public institutions is the cornerstone upon which democracy rests. Education is my top priority as governor.

I certainly learned the values of family and hard work from my mother and father. But I had other mentors as well. One in particular is Daniel Grefton, my sixth-grade teacher. Mr. Grefton inspired me and made me want to work hard and do my best. His support and encouragement served me well throughout my schooling.

AAPR: Please describe your experience in giving the Democratic response.

LOCKE: It was truly an honor to deliver the Democratic response to the State of the Union. I tried to serve my fellow Democrats, and the citizens of Washington, well. I have to admit I was a little nervous in the days leading up to the response, but when it came time to deliver the speech, I was excited.

While delivering my response, I wanted to make sure I remained respectful of the president, while still presenting differing views on the economy, war with Iraq, and the need to find a national solution to the skyrocketing costs of health care.

We Democrats have a plan to restore prosperity—so the United States once again becomes the great job engine it was in the 1990s. Our plan is rooted in three principles. It must give our economy an immediate jump-start; it must benefit middle-class families rather than just a few; and it must be fiscally responsible, so we have the savings to strengthen social security and protect our homeland. Our plan provides more than a hundred billion dollars in tax relief and investments, right now. [for]:

*Tax relief for middle-class and working families*—immediately,

*Incentives for businesses to invest and create jobs*—this year,

*Substantial help for cities and states in the areas of police, education, and health care*—now,

*Extended unemployment benefits*—without delay—for nearly a million American workers who have already exhausted their benefits, and

*All without passing on the bill to our children and grandchildren through explosive budget deficits for years to come.*

AAPR: Where do you stand on the issue of affirmative action?

LOCKE: I do believe colleges and universities need to consider race as one of many factors to achieve the educational benefits of a diverse student body. I have often used my own experience of receiving a scholarship as a minority student at Yale to explain my position.

I had to have the good grades, good character and citizenship, and involvement in high school activities to earn the scholarship. I did not receive it simply because I was an Asian American. Once I earned the scholarship, I had to keep my grades
up. But without this affirmative action minority scholarship program, it is unlikely that I would have had this equal opportunity.

I believe in affirmative action because I am a product of affirmative action.

AAPR: How would you balance national security interests against immigration policy, given our current political environment?

LOCKE: I have every confidence in our state and federal officials who are in charge of immigration. We must remain vigilant against terrorists who try to enter our state and our nation, but we can’t let that vigilance violate civil rights. It’s a fine line.

We also need to make sure the federal government fully reimburses the states for the money they’ve already spent on homeland security. We need a true partnership with the federal government.

Asian Pacific American Community

AAPR: What do you think are the top three most pressing policy issues and concerns of the Asian Pacific American community today?

LOCKE: I don’t think the issues for Asian Pacific Americans are any different for any other Americans. We need to create more jobs to turn our economy around, we need to continue to improve education for our children and grandchildren, and we need to find a national solution to the skyrocketing costs of health care and prescription drug coverage.

AAPR: For our ninth volume, you contributed a strong piece calling more Asian American leaders into action. What are the prospects of increased Asian Pacific American representation in your field?

LOCKE: Asian Pacific Americans are making great strides in politics. Congressman David Woo of Oregon is a good example. And there are an increasing number of Asian Americans serving on city councils and as mayors across the country. We have broken new ground for Asian Americans in the field of politics. Now a new generation of Asian Americans continues to make even greater strides than our generation could have ever imagined.

I am proud to be an Asian American. I am proud to be a Democrat. And I am very proud to be the governor of the great state of Washington.
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Sowing Seeds: An Interview with the Honorable Lon S. Hatamiya, Secretary of California’s Technology, Trade, and Commerce Agency

T. Linh Ho

Introduction

While growing up in a small California farming community, forty miles north of Sacramento, Secretary Lon S. Hatamiya never expected to lead the fifth largest economy in the world. As the first APIA cabinet-level member in California’s history, he inspires a new generation of APIA leaders. In this interview, Secretary Hatamiya recognizes not only education and the Japanese internment experience as critical factors in defining his public service career, but also attributes his success at a relatively young age to mentors such as U.S. Transportation Secretary Norman Mineta and former U.S. Agriculture Secretary Dan Glickman. A greater movement towards mentorship appears to be the important link in shaping the rise of APIA leaders in their twenties and thirties. As head of the California Technology, Trade, and Commerce Agency, he serves as the state’s principal catalyst for innovation and investment and economic opportunity to enhance the quality of life for all Californians. Secretary Hatamiya’s leadership role is even more critical than ever as the state faces its most serious fiscal crisis in history. The following is an excerpt from the interview conducted on 7 January 2003.

Interview with the Honorable Lon S. Hatamiya

AAPR: What were some influential events in your early political development?

HATAMIYA: I have always been interested in politics as far back as I can remember. My mom says that when I was in high school, she knew I wanted to get involved in elective politics. Growing up in a community that was very diverse gave me the ability to exercise leadership skills in a way beyond just my commu-

---

*T. Linh Ho is a Master in Public Policy candidate at Harvard University’s John F. Kennedy School of Government.*
nity. I grew up in Marysville, which is about forty miles north of Sacramento. Even though it’s such a Central Valley farming community, it’s probably one of the most diverse places. We have a considerable Asian population, Latino population, and African American population. So it was a good place to grow up because it had people from all different backgrounds. I always had, in my mind, no barriers, in spite of the fact that my family had been interned from that area and had gone back. We were one of the few Japanese American farming families that actually reclaimed our land.

For the most part, my family is not that political, and I think it’s like most Asian families. First and foremost, they focus on their children and their businesses, and so it leaves them very little time for anything else although they have been involved in the community. For example, my family was involved during reparations and redress for Japanese Americans, which is really where I got my start politically.

I think a lot of the leadership skills I developed were through a number of community activities—through my church, Boy Scouts, and sports. I was always given the opportunity to do many of those things. Then I think it comes from my family’s emphasis on education. The best way to improve yourself is to get the best education possible. And coming out of a small farming community, I never thought I was going to go to Harvard, but I had a number of mentors growing up. There actually was a neighbor of mine who was a Princeton graduate, who from the time I was a small child had always encouraged me, “You should think about going to an Ivy League school.” I thought, “That’s not going to be doable.” But as I developed, that became more and more possible. I did well in school, I did well in community activities and sports, and so I went to Harvard.

I talk about the fact that there were about 3 or 4 percent Asians when I was at Harvard. There wasn’t any community support there. Many of us that came from the West Coast became very close and congregated together. However, some of my closest Asian friends from Harvard aren’t even from California. One of my best friends who was in my wedding party is from Chicago. And it’s interesting how you grow up in different areas of the country, yet you find people that had similar values and backgrounds as you.

At that time, I think opportunities for Asians were still developing, especially in the political arena. We had very few people that were elected officials, even at the local level. I think over the last decade or so you’ve seen more become elected, but at that time there was Bob Matsui and Norm Mineta, who were in Congress, and Bob had just been elected.

If I look to mentors, both of them have been my mentors since that time. Norm is a family friend. He went to Berkeley with my mom, so he goes way back. Bob has been a friend because he’s a native of Sacramento. I live close by, so I’ve always followed his career and have become very close to him subsequently because our paths have crossed so much.

But when I make decisions politically, I always talk to them. When I went back to Washington, when I ran for the assembly in 1990 and ’92, it was because of their influence. They convinced me that I should do so. When I went back to the administration, it was because of their support and efforts to help me that I was
there. And when I came back to California, I talked to both of them, got their advice about what I should do. It’s great to have them as not only friends, but as mentors, and I continue to talk to them on a regular basis about various things. I talk to them about what barriers they had to go through, what I should be aware of, how should I address these issues.

Another person, Congressman Mike Honda, is a good friend of mine, too. Mike is older certainly in age than I am, but he and I were involved in the Japanese-American Citizens League at the same time, so I kind of came up through the ranks with Mike. I look at him probably as more of a peer because we developed our political careers together.

The same holds true for the Asian members of the legislature. I fill a different role because I’m part of the executive branch and a cabinet member. I still talk with assembly members Wilma Chan, George Nakano, Carol Liu, and Judy Chu. I have not yet met the new Asian American members, but I hope to get the chance to know them better. Because there are so few of us, it’s important to build upon experiences that we have.

AAPR: Please tell us about how you got to the California Technology, Trade, and Commerce Agency.

HATAMIYA: I think what opened the door most for me was the education that I received. I think at that time having a Harvard degree was more unique for an Asian American. My path was a little different than most because not only did I go to Harvard, but I also worked in the Midwest for a few years at Procter & Gamble. So I went to the corporate business side first, with the knowledge that I was going to go back to graduate school, and always had that political ambition driving me. I thought having a business background was something that was a little different than just having a political activist background.

I think that’s one reason why I’m here today. It’s because I acquired an educational background and professional experience, which enabled me to do many different things. Oftentimes, I think Asians get stereotyped in certain areas. I think all the positions I’ve held are nontraditional, and they’ve kind of broken through. If you really think about it, when most Asians initially came to this country, they were involved in agriculture. That’s one of the reasons why I went back to the United States Department of Agriculture and worked for the Clinton administration. Because of the experience I gained there, I got increasing levels of responsibility with Secretary Dan Glickman.

Dan was highly instrumental in my career because he gave me the opportunity to do things that were nontraditional. A lot of times we get stereotyped as Asians—maybe certain scientific kinds of things, or things that are not related to advocacy, where you’re out in front negotiating trade agreements. He gave me the opportunity to do other things beyond what I think many people would stereotype, and that’s why I was able to get the national trade experience under his leadership.

So he appointed me to head up the Department of Agriculture Service, and that’s what led to me coming back here because I had been exposed to a number areas. The governor [Gray Davis] asked a number of his closest friends, “I’m looking for
Californians that can be part of my administration,” and a number of people recognized that he talked to me, and so here I am in my second term.

Again, it all gets back to the fact that if you don’t have the educational background that then leads to professional opportunities and experiences, it makes it very difficult to move to different levels. I’ve been very fortunate because I’ve had mentors and people that have helped me throughout my career.

On the flip side, too, as an Asian, I think we finally faced down the racial barriers, but again stereotypical barriers are what we should be going toward. I’ve had to work very hard, and oftentimes it’s much like many other ethnic minorities. You almost have to work harder to prove yourself even more to be able to advance, especially when you’re the first. I was the first Asian in a high-level administration position and became the first Asian cabinet member.

So those barriers are always there because you always have to continually prove that you were selected based upon your experience and abilities, and not based upon some sort of diversity issue. I’ve been always able to overcome that.

I think another barrier that I was probably faced with was that I was also the youngest cabinet member. I wasn’t even forty [years old] when I was appointed to this position. That could be a benefit—it’s oftentimes a detriment, but I think it’s been a benefit. I haven’t found too much of a problem with that.

Again, I’ve been very fortunate to gain the kind of experiences that continue to develop over time. I think one of the things I learned from my parents is that you can’t sit back on your laurels. You have to continue to improve and move forward.

AAPR: Being that you are still relatively young, what do you see in your political future?

HATAMIYA: That’s a good question. And that’s a difficult question because it’s hard to predict. In politics you don’t know which direction you’re going to go. In ’92, I was expecting to serve in the legislature. I didn’t win that election, yet I was appointed and went to Washington. Never in my wildest dreams did I think I’d go there.

So my career here has been a progression of those kinds of events. Never thought I would go to Harvard, never thought I’d be working in the Midwest, I never thought I’d go to business and law school. It just progressed that way. And I never thought I’d come back and be a state official in California.

So I am not certain what lays ahead for me, but I will build upon the experience that I have. I don’t think elected office is in my future, at least not in the near term. I’ve done that, and I enjoyed doing it. One of the most fun parts of my career was when I ran for office, but my kids are young right now. I think your priorities change as time goes on. Maybe when they’re older, I may contemplate that, but at this point I enjoy what I’m doing and have committed to two terms.

We’ve got some huge challenges before us, and I think we’ll be able to overcome them. It’s going to take a lot of hard work, but we’ll see where we go from there. Again, it’ll probably open a new chapter in my life that I hadn’t thought about. So we’ll see what happens.

On the other side, I’m also torn because my background is in business. I started my own business. At some point in time, I probably would like to get back to the
private sector, but who knows when? I’m still enjoying what I’m doing now, in spite of the challenges we have before us. When I get tired of doing this, I’ll look at something else.

AAPR: What is your political forecast for the Asian Pacific American community?

HATAMIYA: I think it’s a great time for Asians in politics. We have more elected officials in California, and across the nation. I think it is important. We’re probably at a time [when] we need to develop further leadership. If you take a look at the folks that have been elected, they’ve been around for some time. It’s not that they’re old, but they’ve been around for some time and I think we need another generation of elected officials, I would say in the thirty- to forty-year-old range—not only for elected positions, but also for appointed positions.

The Bush administration has appointed a number of Asians to positions there, and it’s good the Republican Party is developing that, but I think the Democratic Party did a great job also in the Clinton administration. No other governor has done the kind of a job that Governor Davis has done, not only in terms of the executive branch but also the judicial branch. We have more Asian judges now, and he’s continuing to appoint not only Asians but also women, other minorities—a Korean American and a Vietnamese American.

I think that we have a tremendous wealth of talent; it’s just a matter of identifying it. One of the things I’ve tried to do is also bring on in my staff talented Asians. If you take a look at my staff, I have probably more Asians proportionally than any others, but it’s because it’s important for me to identify the most talented people possible and give people opportunities that they would not have had in the past. Since others have given me that opportunity, I want to do the same thing. So not only do I have Asians, but I also have African Americans, women, folks who have not had these opportunities.

So the long answer to your question, I think that there are some tremendous opportunities. We just need to continue to develop networks.

AAPR: Can you identify three main challenges that Asian Pacific Americans are currently facing?

HATAMIYA: That’s a good question. I think, again, I pride myself on maintaining my ethnic culture and my background, but I think in order for Asians to become much more successful and political, we need to become more assimilated into more mainstream politics. Assimilated, not to give up their ethnic background, but to have a better understanding of what it takes to succeed. I think that’s the major challenge we have.

A second challenge is, again, maintenance of that ethnic pride. That might sound in conflict, but I think it’s really important that you can continue to maintain your ethnicity and cultural foundation and at the same time [succeed]. That’s the beauty of the United States. You have that ability to engage in much beyond your community, and I think we need to be—we have so much to contribute to this society, and I think the major challenge we continue to have is discrimination. People continue to see us as foreigners, whether we’ve been here for three or four generations, or
one generation. I experience the same discrimination. I think that that is a challenge.

Part of that will come from communication skills. I think...one thing that we as Asians lack is the ability to communicate our thoughts in a concise and clear fashion. I think having people educated at some of the top graduate schools and universities in the nation will allow us to do that. For instance, I think you're exposed to things at Harvard that you would not have been exposed to if you had gone to Berkeley Public Policy School or UCLA. In fact, it's the same point I was saying before—you become too comfortable within your environment. At Harvard, you're forced to do more than you would have even if you may not enjoy it.

When I was there I thought, what am I doing here, is this the best choice I could have made? Now, it's the best choice I've made because it forced me to think of things differently. I have a different perspective when I make decisions than I think I would have had I stayed in California, and I think also from my time in Washington. I don't want to say it hardens you, but it enables you to do things differently.

AAPR: In terms of community activism, do you see a lot of opportunities in politics for Asian Americans? Do you see the community being an influential body?

HATAMIYA: I think so. I think the Asian community can be an influential body, but it depends in what sort of fashion. If it's in local government, certainly, there's no doubt about it. For example, the Vietnamese American community in Orange County can be very influential because of its ability to marshal support. Now, more on a statewide level, it would be more difficult because people clump us all together. But do we vote together? No.

I think, overall, education, family, and community are all important to all Asian communities but where ultimately does that take us? I think for a third- or fourth-generation Japanese American family, their values are going to be very different than a first generation Chinese immigrant family. So you can't clump us all together.

I think we will have much more influence over local elections and regional elections. Statewide, it's going to take more time, unless, again, we get more people involved in the process. But I'm not confident that that's going to show through any time real soon. I think people look at the most recent presidential elections and Asian Pacific Americans and do not see any patterns.

AAPR: A lot of people criticize our youth today as apolitical and apathetic. What do you think that we can do you change this?

HATAMIYA: What I think may get Asian Americans involved is if in fact we go to war with Iraq, there will continually be a backlash against Arab Americans—potentially, then, further backlash against Asian Americans. And especially with the whole dispute issue in North Korea now, there may be some backlash against all of us.

I spoke out very loudly after September 11, I spoke around the state, asking people for greater tolerance. I spoke from first-hand experience. When Japan invaded this country many years ago, my family was put away in internment camps. But
we proved that we were loyal to this country. Don’t make that same mistake again; just because an Arab American may have an Afghani name doesn’t mean [he is] not a loyal American. I think that that’s something that we may be faced with in the future. In spite of the fact that some Asian Americans feel more assimilated. So I think that that’s the challenge we’re going to be faced with if in fact we go to war and things that spill over into other Asian countries.

AAPR: What are some other ways in which you and your agency outreach to the Asian American community?

HATAMIYA: Well we try to do as much as we can to, for example, provide small business assistance to Asian-owned businesses. We try to provide as much information about national trade activities to ethnic communities, within obviously the context of the law in California.

Because many of the small businesses in California are owned by Asian and Latinos and other minorities, we can make special efforts to reach out and provide as much information as possible. But the budget deficit we’re faced with, it makes outreach much more difficult. I think that those communities and the communities that have been underrepresented in the past and have lacked access to these programs will be hurt the most.

AAPR: Thank you for your time.

HATAMIYA: My pleasure.
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Rising to Leadership: An Interview with Christina Lagdameo, National Asian Pacific American Women’s Forum

Therese Leung

Introduction

Many academic articles previously published by the AAPR have abstractly grappled with the topic of Asian American political participation, but few have explicitly explored the roles and contributions of young, emerging activists. In this issue, the AAPR intends to fill the void and focuses the spotlight on one young Asian Pacific Islander American leader, Christina Lagdameo, chairwoman of the Washington, D.C., chapter of the National Asian Pacific American Women’s Forum (NAPAWF). NAPAWF strengthens the voice and increases the political participation of Asian Pacific American women and girls through advocacy, leadership development, and networking. The following is an excerpt from the interview conducted on 3 February 2003.

Interview with Christina Lagdameo

AAPR: Could you tell us a little bit about your experience as a college student spearheading the establishment of an Asian American studies program at the University of Maryland?

LAGDAMEO: I went to the University of Maryland in 1994. I was about to enter my second semester as a budding pre-med and honors student. As I was picking out my honors classes, I noticed this class called “The Asian American Experience.” I had never seen anything like this before; this was apparently a very new class. Unfortunately, the word Filipino was spelled incorrectly in the course description. So being my outspoken self, I wrote a letter to the director of the
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honors program saying, "This is supposed to be a ground-breaking class about the Asian American experience, yet you don't even spell Filipino correctly. What does that say about the class?" So, of course, he responded very apologetically, admitting that it was a mistake, but encouraged me to take the class. So I decided to take it, and it turned out to be a very enlightening experience. Eventually, within that class a bunch of students began questioning why this was the first time the class was offered. Apparently, it had been offered once before in the '70s, but we questioned why it hadn't been offered in twenty-five years.

After class, our professor and our teaching assistant taught us about the history of Asian American studies, in general, and the Third World Strike in San Francisco. So we were getting very excited about it and also, frankly, quite angry that we hadn't known about this before and wondered why it's a privilege to the West Coast but not to the East Coast.

So from there we decided that it just wasn't fair, especially since 14 percent of the population at the University of Maryland was Asian or Asian American, so we coalesced a group together from that class. There was only a handful of us, and we started this group called WAASP—not White Anglo-Saxon Protestants, but Working for an Asian American Studies Program. Our name was purposefully counter-hegemonic. We used it to spark our campaign across the campus, and we began meeting with administrators, staff, and teachers who were interested in supporting this campaign for Asian American studies.

AAPR: Now, for context, the majority of schools in the nation don't have Asian American studies programs, right?

LAGDAMEO: Right. At that time, a few schools like NYU, Cornell, and Columbia were also working toward establishing a program. I think the students at Columbia had just protested the lack of an ethnic studies department with a hunger strike. It was good to see that example because we did not want to take extreme measures unless we had to. In general, it was helpful for us to follow other school campaigns to provide support and also learn from their successes and failures. In the end, every school is different in terms of size, administration, student involvement, etc. So, to each their own.

Because Maryland is a large, public institution with over forty thousand undergraduate and graduate students, we felt that we had to just go through the normal channels and follow the school bureaucracy. So we did, but we also had our active plan, and we were chalking up the campus, and doing teach-ins, and meeting with staff, teachers and students; in general, we were organizing the campus and raising awareness.

At the end of that semester, we met with the administration, and we put together a proposal and asked for more classes. We knew we couldn't start a program right away, but of course you just ask for that. The administration gave us forty-five thousand dollars to start to the program, which is really a huge deal for Asian American studies. It usually takes years of prodding.

I think it happened this way because we made compelling arguments, we had a strong presence on campus, and we had a great coalition of not just APA students, but other students, staff, and faculty of different groups. But unfortunately that
was the beginning. I mean, it was a great beginning, but after that things started to slow down. The administration basically used the seed money to placate us, which worked—we were pretty content for a good semester.

We brought in attorney and activist Phil Nash to teach Asian American history and APA artist Dana Tai Soon Burgess to teach a history/dance class. We had really great classes. So we had this through the whole year, and then we realized that we weren’t really getting anywhere with institutionalizing the program; therefore a task force was started. It was a lot of talk, but, again, not a lot of action. So in my junior year we started to organize again, and we were trying to get meetings with the administration, and it wasn’t happening. So finally it just happened at one of our protests—which were all very creative and well attended. We had a strong coalition of student groups rallying and getting excited and angry. Finally, the president of the Black Student Union suggested we storm the administration. It was one of those mass psychology moments with a critical mass of people... so we all marched down there with our bullhorns. We got to the main administration building and yelled, “We demand a meeting.” Well, we got one.

AAPR: With whom did you get the meeting?

LAGDAMEO: With the president at that time and with administrators like the provost and other bigwigs on campus. So basically, after that, then they committed to a program. My younger sister, Angela, actually came on campus afterwards. They just couldn’t get rid of us! She was a freshman when I was a senior, and she took up the campaign. And by the time I think she was a sophomore or junior, we finally had a program established. I went back two years ago and received my certificate (like a minor) in Asian American studies... You can get a minor in Asian American studies right now. They offer at least five classes each semester. Their current website is http://www.aast.umd.edu/.

AAPR: That’s great.

LAGDAMEO: Yeah, it’s really great, and people are in awe of how we pushed for the program. I know we have a lot of people signing up to get their certificate now. It’s really fantastic.

AAPR: Tell me about your involvement with the National Asian Pacific American Women’s Forum?

LAGDAMEO: NAPAWF is a national organization with about seven chapters throughout the country. I am the chair of the D.C. chapter. We have a board with about seven members.

AAPR: What types of activities does NAPAWF conduct?

LAGDAMEO: We’re a grassroots organization with a progressive agenda revolving around issues relating to the empowerment of APA women and girls. For example, economic justice issues, labor issues, welfare—anything that affects these women.

AAPR: So give me an example.
LAGDAMEO: Well, what we’ve done in the past, we’ve worked on, for example, a comfort women campaign, and it’s basically demanding redress for the thousands of Korean, Filipino, and other women during World War II who were forced into sexual slavery by the Japanese. There were so many different women. And there’s a case that’s going through, and we were following the case, and we submitted an amicus brief for the case.

Unfortunately, I’m not sure where it’s going now. They had a hearing, and we’re waiting to hear the court’s ruling. We organized around the case to inform the public about the issue. For example, we screened Dai Sil Kim Gibson’s film on the comfort women. We also organized some protests in front of the Japanese Embassy and the state department because the U.S. basically said that they cannot get involved, which is total BS. They’ve gotten involved with other types of redress such as the Holocaust. It’s all about politics. So we’ve covered all fronts, whether it was writing press releases or protesting or using the legal skills of the committed women involved. This is what’s really great about NAPAWF—most are professional women who are involved either in the government or nonprofit organizations and are absolutely committed to these issues.

We have lawyers, we have analysts, and we also have grassroots activists—and all of us are grassroots organizers also. So we’re all ready to do the work and also ready to take risks and go out there and make some noise by whatever means. But at the same time, we all do have full-time jobs, family, and other commitments... yet they’re all so committed. The women all bring amazing skill sets and passion to the table. They are one of the most dedicated and inspiring group of women I’ve worked with... I feel like they are truly sisters and good friends. That’s why I feel like it’s a very effective organization.

AAPR: How do you consider yourself a leader in the Asian Pacific American community?

LAGDAMEO: I think when you put yourself out there, and you make your position public and are willing to speak for at least yourself and others for a community or an issue, I think that automatically makes you a leader whether you like it or not. I definitely chose to be in leadership positions mainly because I think I’m impatient. I can be a control freak also, but it’s mostly because I just want to get something done, and I’m willing to put forth the time and effort to do it for something that I’m passionate about.

You have to have a group with you to do it because what I’ve learned from my time at the University of Maryland is that, literally, there were only like five very, very, very strongly committed people who were full-time students, had jobs and other commitments... yet they were absolutely determined to see us succeed. I definitely became a believer in social change and in the idea that it only takes a small group to make a difference when I saw what we were able to accomplish. While there were other people, of course—you need a critical mass for movement. I think I’ve recognized my skills that I’m not afraid to speak to people. I’m not afraid to take those risks. And I think other people have recognized that and encouraged me to become a leader. I think there are definitely a lot of mentors out
there who have helped my confidence and directed me in that way… and I am forever grateful of them.

You need that. You often can’t recognize that for yourself. But when people encourage you, you definitely feel more confident about yourself, and you’re able to put yourself out there. Perhaps it’s just kind of been a part of me, and that’s just how I am. I’m just not afraid to say what’s on my mind and take the necessary steps to actualize activism.
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The Increasing Significance of Class, the Declining Significance of Race, and Wilson’s Hypothesis

Arthur Sakamoto and Changhwan Kim

The central argument of William J. Wilson’s *The Declining Significance of Race* is that, in contrast to earlier periods of race relations, class has become more consequential than race in determining the labor market rewards of African American men during the modern industrial period. Despite its importance, this hypothesis has not been sufficiently investigated in the empirical literature. In this paper, we seek to improve our understanding of historical changes in the effects of race and class in determining wages. In order to provide a broader comparative analysis, we extend Wilson’s analysis to Asian American men, who have been largely ignored in analyses of racial effects on labor market outcomes. Using high school graduation as an indicator of social class, we compare the net effects of race and class on the wages of African American and Asian American men in 1940 and 1998. The results strongly support the hypothesis of the declining significance of race, and an increasing significance of class is also generally evident. Furthermore, most of the findings are consistent with Wilson’s claim that race is the greater disadvantage in the earlier period while class is the greater disadvantage in the latter period.

“Race relations in America have undergone fundamental changes in recent years, so much so that now the life chances of individual blacks have more to do with their economic class position than with their day-to-day encounters with whites.” (Wilson 1980, 1)

William J. Wilson’s *The Declining Significance of Race* (1980) has generated much debate (e.g., Austin and Stack 1988; Cancio, Evans, and Maume 1996;)
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Farkas and Vicknair 1996; Feagin 1991; Maume, Cancio, and Evans 1996; Morris 1996; Payne 1989; Pettigrew 1980; Wilson 1989) but little consensus. Given this academic quagmire, we seek to provide some solid ground by carefully analyzing high-quality data about historical changes in the effects of race and class on the wages of white, African American, and Asian American men. We believe that such evidence is useful in improving our understanding of the extent to which there may have been important changes in these effects during the twentieth century.

The Declining Significance of Race

In his historical analysis, Wilson (1980) identifies three stages of black-white race relations. The preindustrial period ranges from colonial times until the Civil War. The industrial stage refers to the period from the latter part of the 19th century until about the time of World War II. The modern industrial period refers to the post-World War II era, but “really begins to crystallize during the 1960’s and 1970’s” (p. 3) with the passage of civil rights legislation.

During the preindustrial stage, African Americans suffer racial-caste oppression in the form of legalized slavery that is organized primarily to serve the interests of plantation owners. Wilson applies Marxist theory to analyze this period and argues that plantation owners promote racial oppression, racial prejudice, and racist ideology in order to improve the profitability of the plantation economy. African American slavery increases the capacity of owners to extract surplus value from African American slaves, to counteract the demands of white workers, and to generally reduce the solidarity between the working class segments of the plantation economy.

African Americans also face direct racial oppression in the industrial period, but Wilson argues that, during this stage, split labor market theory is more applicable. In the industrial period, the interests of the higher-paid white working class (rather than those of the plantation owners as in the antebellum South) are primarily promoted by racial discrimination and racist ideology. That is, the white working class is able to obtain higher wages by using racism as a tool to monopolize the higher-skilled work positions; to prevent African Americans from developing the higher skills necessary to compete for better jobs; to ban African Americans from joining labor unions; and to deny African Americans the political resources that would enable them to press for public policies designed to promote open competition in the labor market.

By contrast, Wilson describes the modern industrial period as the “progressive transition from racial inequalities to class inequalities” (p. 3). One major reason for this transition is the passage and enforcement of civil rights legislation which has reduced racial discrimination in the labor market. As stated by Wilson, “the equal employment legislation in the early sixties have virtually eliminated the tendency of employers to create a split labor market in which black labor is deemed cheaper than white labor regardless of the work performed…” (p. 110). During this period there has accordingly been “the collapse of traditional discriminatory patterns in the labor market” (p. 120). In short, civil rights laws that prohibit racial
discrimination have contributed to a declining significance of race in that employers are now less likely to highly penalize a worker (in terms of job promotions or wages) for being a racial minority.

The Increasing Significance of Class

Although Wilson (1980) does not use the phrase “the increasing significance of class,” we argue that it is implied by his description of the modern industrial period. This trend involves two aspects of the labor market that are most evident in Wilson’s discussion. The first refers to the increased job differentiation in the labor market which results from the rise of the “corporate sector” and the growth of other upper white-collar jobs in the expanding government sector. Concurrent with this increase in what others have similarly referred to as “primary” or “core” sector jobs (Dickens and Lang 1985; Doeringer and Piore 1971; Sakamoto and Chen 1991), Wilson also describes how well-paying blue-collar jobs in the manufacturing sector—which traditionally had provided relatively attractive work opportunities for less-educated workers—have declined (p. 93). As a result, this trajectory of labor market segmentation has led to an increased job differentiation between the higher-paying jobs of the “corporate sector” versus the “low-wage labor market” which are “nonunionized, low-paying, basically undesirable jobs that nobody really wants or readily accepts...” (p. 110).

The second aspect of the labor market that Wilson refers to is the increasing importance of education. “More specifically, there has been a long-run decline in the demand for low-skilled, poorly educated workers and a long-run rise in the demand for high-skilled, well-educated workers...” (p. 95). Most especially, gaining employment in the desirable jobs of the “corporate sector” depends on having relatively high educational attainment as these jobs “have rigorous prerequisites that eliminate the poorly trained and educated regardless of race” (p. 110).

The increasing significance of class derives from these two aspects of the labor market—increased job differentiation and the increased importance of education in gaining access to many of the better jobs. Wilson’s discussion implies that this trend should be evident for whites as well as for African Americans. Regarding the latter group, Wilson notes that “I do assume a rough correspondence, in the sense that middle-class blacks can be represented by the highest income category and underclass blacks by the lowest. A similar assumption can be made with respect to education and training, with the most highly educated and trained blacks associated with the middle class and the least trained and educated with the underclass” (p. 157). In short, according to Wilson’s analysis, middle-class African Americans are relatively more highly educated and can therefore obtain better jobs and incomes while lower-class African Americans are poorly educated and relegated to the low-wage sector.
Wilson’s Hypothesis

The declining significance of race when combined with the increasing significance of class results in what we refer to as Wilson’s hypothesis. Wilson’s (1980) main thesis is that, during the modern industrial period, the disadvantage of race for African Americans is less deleterious than is the disadvantage of class. In contrast to earlier stages of race relations, the net effect of class is now more negative than is the net effect of race. Therefore, the modern industrial period is characterized by “a shift which has increased the importance of economic class position, thereby decreasing the importance of race in determining the extent to which individual blacks have access to or able to develop resources deemed important for life chances and survival” (p. 88).

Although poverty and unemployment still remain relatively high among African Americans when compared to whites, this differential derives less from direct racial discrimination per se in the contemporary labor market than from class characteristics that are, on average, relatively lower (in particular, lower educational attainment). Thus, less-educated African Americans are likely to have their job prospects limited to the secondary sector of the labor market, and such employment increases their chances of becoming unemployed or of falling into poverty. However, according to Wilson’s analysis, less-educated whites also have dismal labor market prospects, and more highly educated African Americans should be able to compete effectively with whites for better paid, white-collar employment. Thus, “it would be nearly impossible to comprehend the economic plight of lower-class blacks in the inner city by focusing solely on racial oppression, that is, the overt and explicit effort of whites to keep blacks in a subjugated state…. unlike in previous periods of American race relations, economic class is now a more important factor than race in determining job placement for blacks” (p. 120).

Morris (1996) argues that one major reason why The Declining Significance of Race has had such a “huge impact” is that its title “skillfully alerted the public to its message” (p. 309). We argue, quite to the contrary, that this title is somewhat misleading and has actually reduced the appeal of Wilson’s book. Wilson’s fundamental message is not that race is no longer important in any way in American society, but rather that the net impact of class in the contemporary labor market is now greater than is the direct impact of race. A title such as How Class Has Become More Important in Determining the Wages of African Americans would have been a more accurate summary of the fundamental message of the book. Given the current trend towards “multiculturalism” in American society, which has shown an increased appreciation for racial and ethnic diversity, The Declining Significance of Race is a title that appears to be presumptuous, overly abrupt, and inherently controversial.
The Declining Significance of Race Among Asian Americans

Wilson (1980) never mentions Asian Americans. His first stage of race relations is not even applicable to Asian Americans because they were not present in significant numbers in American society during colonial times and because Asian Americans were never slaves. Nonetheless, we believe that the main points of his argument about changes in the effects of race and class between the industrial and the modern industrial periods can be usefully explored in regard to Asian Americans who had achieved a nontrivial population size by the early part of the twentieth century (Barringer, Gardner, and Levin 1993, p. 39) and who had become a rapidly growing minority group by the end of that century (Kitano and Daniels 2001, p. 218). Thus, in order to provide a broader comparative perspective, we extend our investigation of the impacts of race and class in the twentieth-century labor market to this nonwhite minority group.

As was discussed above, the fundamental feature of Wilson's industrial period is that the economic relationship between the majority and the minority racial groups can be characterized as a split labor market: the racist ideology of the majority group serves to legitimate its access and control of the more desirable jobs in the labor market and to relegate the minority group to the least desirable jobs. The racist ideology promoted by the dominant white working class during the industrial period asserts the general superiority of European-origin whites. In addition to African Americans, Asian Americans are also physically distinguishable from European-origin whites and are therefore readily subject to their derogation and discrimination. Not only did such discrimination reinforce the racist ideology of white superiority, but the economic opportunities that are denied to Asian Americans are then more available to whites.

We interpret the historical evidence as being consistent with the view that Asian Americans faced considerable discrimination in the labor market before World War II (Bonacich and Modell 1980; Boswell 1986; Kitano and Daniels 2001; Lyman 1974; Okihiro 1994; Takaki 1998; Zhou 1992). Interviews with native-born Japanese Americans during that era also suggest that their employment opportunities were severely restricted during this period despite above-average educational attainment (Ichihashi 1932, pp. 356-63; Jiobu 1988, p. 364; Kitano 1976, p. 31; Mears 1928, pp. 198-99). The same basic conclusion is evident in employment data compiled by the War Relocation Authority in 1942 when Japanese Americans were being forced into internment camps (Thomas 1952, pp. 41-42, 605). A statistical analysis of data from the 1940 Census finds that Chinese and Japanese American men were clearly disadvantaged in obtaining higher-status occupations after controlling for schooling, experience, and region of residence (Sakamoto, Liu, and Tzeng 1998). In short, the split labor market theory that Wilson uses to explain black-white race relations during the industrial period seems applicable to whites' relations with Asian Americans during that time. Indeed, it is commonly forgotten that Wilson originally borrowed the split labor market theory from Bonacich (1972), whose discussion considered Chinese and Japanese Americans more so than African Americans.
Some statistical analyses of the socioeconomic attainments of native-born Asian Americans during the modern industrial period generally find that they have equaled or even slightly exceeded the attainments of whites (Chiswick 1983; Iceland and Phua 1999; Jiobu 1988; Ko and Clogg 1989; Sakamoto, Liu, and Tzeng 1998). In fact, the socioeconomic attainments of Asian Americans are often considered in the context of discussions about the “model minority myth” which is greatly bemoaned in the Asian American studies literature (Min 1995; Okiihiro 1994; Takaki 1998). In any event, given that Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 applies not only to African Americans but also to all minorities, it is reasonable to consider the issue of the declining significance of race in regard to the labor market outcomes for Asian Americans during the modern industrial period.

Data and Methods

We seek to improve our understanding of the extent to which there may have been important changes in the effects of race and class on wages during the twentieth century. For the purpose of providing evidence about the industrial period, we use the 1940 Public Use Microdata Sample (PUMS), which is derived from the 1940 Census. The 1940 PUMS is the oldest available census data file that includes a relatively complete set of socioeconomic information, which permits multivariate analysis. In regard to the modern industrial period, we use the Current Population Survey (CPS) for 1994, 1995, 1996, 1997, and 1998. We concatenate these five years of CPS data sets in order to obtain a larger sample size which is particularly necessary in the case of Asian Americans, who represented about 4 percent of the population during the 1990s (Kitano and Daniels 2001, p. 200). Our empirical results for the modern industrial stage thus refer to period from 1994 to 1998.

We use OLS to estimate log-wage regression models that are identically specified and operationalized for each of the two historical periods. In order to permit the greatest degree of precision in delineating racial differences in wage determination processes—that is, in order to provide for full interactions in the regression analysis—the models are estimated separately for each of three groups: African American men, Asian American men, and non-Hispanic white men. Because most women did not work in the paid labor market in 1940 (Bianchi and Spain 1986, p. 141), and because Wilson’s discussion of labor market trends focuses on men, we simplify this analysis by restricting it to men.

More specifically, our target populations refer to native-born, noninstitutionalized African American, Asian American, and non-Hispanic white men aged 25 to 64 who were not enrolled in school and who participated in the labor force in the year prior to the survey (which is the time period to which the earnings data pertain). We exclude the foreign born because immigrants may differ systematically from the native born in terms of accumulated work experiences, educational qualifications, and English language skills. Because of the lack of adequate information on self-employment income in the 1940 Census, we also exclude the self-employed from this study. Most of the labor force for each of these three
racial groups worked as employees in both of these time periods, so the wages of employees certainly merit detailed investigation. To the extent that wage determination processes differ between employees and the self-employed (e.g., Lazear and Moore 1984; Wright 1979), separate statistical analyses may be more informative.

Regarding the operationalization of the concept of class, there is no consensus on this complex issue (e.g., Sorensen 2000). In addition, our research objective is not to investigate the concept and measurement of class per se, but rather to evaluate the main thesis of Wilson. For these reasons, it is appropriate for our analysis to simply operationalize class in a manner that seems most consistent with Wilson’s discussion. We emphasize that we are not suggesting that our particular operationalization of class should be considered preferable to any other definitions. To the contrary, we would encourage further analyses that would extend our work using other measures of class.

Given our immediate research objectives and the current state of knowledge about the empirical facts that are relevant to assessing Wilson (1980), we begin with what would seem to be a central assumption of Wilson’s analysis: that schooling is the key resource that constitutes the proximate determinant of labor market opportunities during the modern industrial period. For this reason, we use critical demarcations in levels of educational attainment to indicate class. We define three classes: those who did not graduate from high school; those who graduated from high school but never attended college; and those who have at least some college education. We recognize that this operationalization is simplistic—for example, it does not take labor market structure into account. Nonetheless, as we noted above, Wilson’s discussion emphasizes how educational attainment has become a prerequisite for employment in the “corporate sector,” and his assumption is that better-educated African Americans have good chances of obtaining these higher-paying jobs. Therefore, our simple operationalization of class is appropriate for testing Wilson’s key claim that with better education, the wages of African Americans will be accordingly and substantially improved. While representing class in terms of these critical junctures in educational attainment is consistent with our research objective of empirically evaluating Wilson’s hypothesis, we would also argue that they are broadly perceived to be intrinsically important in American society and that they are fundamental in affecting long-term socioeconomic opportunities and outcomes; in short, class as educational-level is also intrinsically worthwhile to investigate.

Model Specification

Using the 1940 PUMS, we first estimate a regression model of log-wages for each racial group of male employees using the following independent variables: years of age; a quadratic term for years of age; a dummy variable indicating whether he has served in the military; a dummy variable indicating residence in the South; a dummy variable indicating residence in the West; a dummy variable indicating residence outside of a metropolitan area; a dummy variable indicating whether he is a high school dropout; and a dummy variable indicating whether he is a high school graduate (and never attended college).
In this specification, the reference group for the schooling dummy variables are male employees with at least some years of college. The coefficient for the variable indicating a high school dropout refers to the difference between the expected wages for that group and those with some college education, net of the effects of the control variables. Similarly, coefficient for the variable indicating a high school graduate refers to the difference between the expected wages for that group and those with some college education, net of the effects of the control variables. In short, the coefficients for the two educational groups are the net effects of class in 1940.

To investigate labor market conditions during the modern industrial period, we again estimate the same regression specification but use the 1994-1998 CPS. In these regressions—one for each of the three demographic groups—the dependent and independent variables are defined and constructed in exactly the same way as they were in the analyses using the 1940 PUMS. The only difference is that the results using the CPS refer to the modern industrial period.

The Hypothesis of the Increasing Significance of Class

Although not explicitly emphasized by Wilson, his historical discussion implies that class has become more significant in determining labor market outcomes in the modern industrial period relative to the industrial period. We empirically test this hypothesis for African Americans, Asian American, and white male employees. In particular, the hypothesis of the increasing significance of class can be operationalized as a right-sided, one-tailed t-test of the null hypothesis that the coefficient for being a high school dropout is less negative in the modern industrial period than in the industrial period. The corresponding alternative hypothesis is that the coefficient for being a high school dropout is more negative in the modern industrial period than in the industrial period. If we reject the null hypothesis, then the results indicate that being a high school dropout is more deleterious for one’s wages in the modern industrial period than in the industrial period. This hypothesis test is assessed for each of the three demographic groups.

The hypothesis of the increasing significance of class can also be investigated in regard to the net effect of being a high school graduate versus the net effect of having some college education. This hypothesis can also be operationalized as a right-sided, one-tailed t-test. The structure of the null and alternative hypotheses are analogous to those for high school dropouts stated above.

The Hypothesis of the Declining Significance of Race

The net racial effect would have been easily obtained by a single parameter estimate for each minority group had we simply estimated a pooled regression model and included minority status as a dummy variable. However, as was mentioned above, we believe that it is preferable to estimate the regression models separately by race so as to allow for the full set of racial interactions—that is, to allow the effects of the independent variables to vary by each minority group. This increased
precision is valuable in providing more exact and thorough evidence regarding our hypotheses of interest. 7

When the regression models are estimated separately by racial group, then the net racial effect is defined as the difference between the predicted value from the minority’s regression minus that from whites’ regression when the two models are evaluated at the same values on the independent variables. For the purposes of this calculation, we base our estimates on male employees who are thirty-nine-year-old non-veterans living in a metropolitan area outside of the South or West. Thus, we define the net racial effect as the difference between the predicted values on log-wages for a minority man versus that for a white man when both men are thirty-nine-year-old non-veterans living in a metropolitan area outside of the South or West.

To derive a test of statistical significance for this net racial effect, we use the formula given by Neter and Wasserman (1974, p. 232) for the estimated variance of the mean response (obtained when an estimated regression is evaluated at a set of values on the independent variables). We calculate the t-test statistic that is implied for this formula for each minority group and for each time period. Next, we extend this formula to provide a t-test statistic of the hypothesis of the declining significance of race for each of the two minority groups. For African Americans, the null hypothesis is that the net effect of race is more negative in the modern industrial period than in the industrial period. This significance test is left-sided and one-tailed. Rejecting its null hypothesis would support the hypothesis of the declining significance of race. The test is then repeated for Asian American men.

Wilson’s Hypothesis

Wilson’s hypothesis, as we have construed it, refers to the claim that the relative sizes of the net effects of race and class depend upon the particular historical period. In particular, Wilson’s hypothesis is that the net disadvantage of race is greater than that for class in the industrial period, whereas the net disadvantage of class is greater than that for race in the modern industrial period. Wilson’s hypothesis may be assessed using the same one-tailed t-test framework discussed above. In the case of high school dropouts, the null hypothesis for the industrial period is that the coefficient for being a high school dropout is more negative than is that for race. The corresponding alternative hypothesis is that the coefficient for being a high school dropout is less negative than is that for race during the industrial period. These hypotheses may then be repeated analogously for high school graduates.

For the modern industrial period, the null hypothesis for the left-sided, one-tailed t-test for high school dropouts is that the coefficient for being a high school dropout is less negative than is that for race. The corresponding alternative hypothesis is that the coefficient for being a high school dropout is more negative than is that for race during the modern industrial period. These hypotheses for the modern industrial period may again be repeated analogously for high school graduates.
Thus, Wilson's general thesis may be empirically assessed by considering these two hypothesis tests for the industrial period and the two hypothesis tests for the modern industrial period. His view would be supported to the extent that the alternative hypotheses are accepted in the data analysis because such results would indicate that the net disadvantage of race is greater than that for class in the industrial period while the net disadvantage of class is greater than that for race in the modern industrial period. These hypothesis tests are assessed separately for African American and Asian American male employees.

**Empirical Results**

Table 1 shows the means of the variables used in the statistical analysis. Regarding mean hourly wages among male employees in 1940, whites have the highest average ($90) and African Americans have the lowest average ($47) while Asian Americans are intermediate ($62). By 1994-1998, however, the mean wage for Asian Americans ($19.39) had caught up and even slightly surpassed that for whites ($18.61). Among African Americans during the modern industrial period, the mean wage is considerably lower ($14.51). It is perhaps worth noting that in percentage terms, the mean wage for African Americans in 1994-1998 is much closer to the mean wage for whites in 1994-1998 than is the case in 1940.

Table 2 shows the results from the OLS regressions with log-wage as the dependent variable. Six regression models are estimated as there is one model for each of the three racial groups in each of two time periods. In almost all of the estimated models, most of the independent variables are statistically significant at the .001 level.

The only exception is the estimated regression for Asian Americans in 1940. Because the sample size for this regression is only 57, none of its independent variables are statistically significant at conventional levels using two-tailed tests. Because our research objective is not to provide a detailed investigation of Asian American wages in 1940 per se, but rather to systematically compare them across time periods and between other racial groups, we use the same regression specification throughout the analysis, even though for Asian Americans in 1940 the parameters are estimated with a low level of precision due to the small sample size.

In general, the regression results seem consistent with well-known basic patterns regarding wages. Persons who do not have a high school diploma have lower wages than do persons who have graduated from high school while persons with college education earn the most, on average. Older male employees tend to have higher wages although this tendency is evident at a declining rate (i.e., the coefficient for the quadratic term is negative). Wages tend to be lower in the South and in nonmetropolitan areas. These basic patterns are generally evident for each of the racial groups in both time periods.

The net racial effects are shown in Table 3. The calculations assume a non-veteran who is thirty-nine years of age and living in a metropolitan area outside of the
South or West. For African American male employees in 1940, the net racial effects are highly negative as well as statistically significant at the 0.001 level. For African American high school dropouts, the net racial effect is −0.4508, which indicates that the wage of an African American high school dropout who is thirty-nine years of age and who is a non-veteran living in a metropolitan area outside of the South or West is expected to have a wage that is 36 percent less than the wage for a corresponding white high school dropout (i.e., \( \exp(-0.4508) - 1 = -36\% \)). The labor market disadvantages are slightly greater for African American high school graduates and those with some college in 1940.

For the 1994-1998 data, the net racial effects for African Americans are attenuated. For African American high school dropouts, the net racial effect is −0.1958 while for African American high school graduates it is −0.2462. These results imply that their wages are lower by 18 percent and 22 percent, respectively, as compared to white men during 1994-1998 with equivalent measured characteristics as described above. Table 3 also shows that the net racial effect for African American men with some college in 1994-1998 is very close to that for African American high school graduates.

This reduction in the net racial effects across the two time periods for African Americans is statistically significant for each of the three classes as shown in the top panel of Table 4, which is labeled the “declining significance of race.” For African American high school dropouts, the net racial effect declined from −0.4508 in 1940 to −0.1958 in 1994-1998, which implies a reduction of −0.2550 (as is shown in the top panel of Table 4). This decline is statistically significant at the 0.001 level. Slightly larger declines across these two time periods are evident for African American high school graduates and those with at least some college, and these reductions are also statistically significant at the 0.001 level. Thus, these results clearly support the hypothesis of the declining significance of race for African American men in each of these three classes.

For Asian American men in 1940, the net racial effects, as shown in Table 3, are highly negative—even more so than for African American men. For example, the coefficient for Asian American high school dropouts in 1940 is more than twice as negative as is that for African American men (i.e., −0.0982 versus −0.4508 as shown in Table 3). In fact, for each of the three classes, the net racial effects for Asian American men in 1940 are highly negative as well as statistically significant at least at the 0.01 level, suggesting a high level of labor market discrimination against this group during that time period before the Civil Rights movement. In short, the wages of Asian American men are considerably lower than are those of comparable white men in 1940.

Table 3 also shows, however, that by 1994-1998 the net racial effects for Asian American men are no longer negative. The net racial effects for Asian American high school dropouts and high school graduates in 1994-1998 are not statistically significant, suggesting that they are not unlikely to be equal to 0. This latter result may be interpreted as providing evidence that, in stark contrast to 1940, the wage determination for Asian American high school dropouts and high school graduates is not statistically different from that for white men in 1994-1998.
Indeed, the net racial effect for Asian American men with at least some college in 1994-1998 is actually positive (i.e., 0.1197 in Table 3) as well as statistically significant at the 0.05 level. This finding indicates that Asian American men with at least some college actually have, on average, 13 percent higher wages than do white men with at least some college (i.e., \( \exp(0.1197) - 1 = 13\% \)). This wage advantage for Asian American men with at least some college is unlikely to represent labor market discrimination against whites, however, because Asian American college students are more likely than are white college students to major in fields that have higher financial rewards such as physical science, engineering, computer science, and biological science (Xie and Goyette 2002), and this aspect of educational attainment is not controlled for in the statistical analysis.

As indicated in the top panel of Table 4, the change in the net racial effects for Asian American men across these two time periods implies a very strong declining significance of race in regard to wage determination. Although the declines for African American men are clearly significant both substantively as well as statistically, the declines for Asian American men are even more pronounced. For example, among Asian American high school dropouts, the decline in the net racial effect is –0.9830, which is statistically significant at the 0.001 level. For the other two classes of Asian American men as well, the declining effects are both large and statistically significant at the 0.001 level.

Table 4 also shows the results in regard to the hypothesis of the increasing significance of class. In brief, the results for this hypothesis are statistically significant at the 0.001 level for white men (both high school dropouts and high school graduates) and for African American high school dropouts. For African American high school graduates, the increasing significance of class is small (i.e., 0.0344 in Table 4) and statistically significant at only the 0.10 level. For Asian American men, the increasing significance of class is not statistically significant at any conventional level (although the estimated sizes of the effects are similar to those for white men).

In regard to Wilson’s hypothesis, these results are shown in the bottom two panels of Table 4. For African American high school dropouts in 1940, the net effect of race is –0.4508 (see Table 3) while the net effect of class is –0.3148 (see Table 2). The net effect of race is thus 0.1360 more negative than is the net effect of class. This estimate of –0.1360 is shown in Table 4 and is statistically significant at the 0.001 level. Similarly, for African American high school graduates in 1940, the disadvantage of race is more negative than is the disadvantage of class (i.e., a difference of –0.3041 as shown in Table 4), and this finding is also statistically significant at the 0.001 level. Wilson’s hypothesis for the industrial period is therefore supported by these results for African American high school dropouts and high school graduates.

As shown in the bottom panel of Table 4, the net effect of class is more negative than is the net effect of race for African American high school dropouts in 1994-1998. The net effect of race is –0.1958 (see Table 3) while the net effect of class is –0.4573 (see Table 2). The difference between these two coefficients is –0.2615, which is statistically significant at the 0.001 level, as shown in the bottom panel of
Table 4. Wilson’s hypothesis for the modern industrial period is therefore supported by these results for African American high school dropouts.

For African American high school graduates in 1994-1998, Wilson’s hypothesis is less evident. The difference between the net effects of race and class is small (i.e., −0.0262 in Table 4) and statistically significant at only the 0.10 level. This finding provides only weak support for Wilson’s hypothesis for African American high graduates in the modern industrial period.

For Asian American men during the modern industrial period, the results strongly support Wilson’s hypothesis for both high school dropouts and high school graduates. As reported in Table 4, the difference between the net effects of race and class are −0.6168 and −0.3815 respectively, and both are statistically significant at the 0.001 level. For 1940, the results for Asian American men show that the net effect of race is considerably more negative than is the net effect of class (i.e., −0.5067 for high school dropouts and −0.6746 for high school graduates in Table 4). For Asian American high school graduates, the difference is statistically significant at the 0.05 level while for Asian American high school dropouts, the difference is statistically significant at the 0.10 level.16

Discussion

"It would be nearly impossible to comprehend the economic plight of lower-class blacks in the inner city by focusing solely on racial oppression, that is, the overt and explicit effort of whites to keep blacks in a subjugated state.... unlike in previous periods of American race relations, economic class is now a more important factor than race in determining job placement for blacks." (Wilson 1980, 120)

These empirical results support the view that important historical changes have occurred with respect to racial inequality among male employees in the labor market. First of all, a declining significance of race is clearly evident in that the net effect of race has become less negative in comparable regression models of wages estimated with data representing the two different historical periods. This conclusion applies to both African American as well as Asian American men in each of the three classes that we have investigated. Indeed, in the recent data, there is no evidence that native-born Asian American men face any wage disadvantage relative to white men. This is a notable change especially given the dramatically high levels of disadvantage that are obvious in the data for 1940.

Farkas and Vicknair (1996) argue that “appropriate tests of racial wage discrimination require controls for cognitive skill” (p. 557). In our analyses, we are unable to include controls for cognitive skills as they are not available in our data sets. However, we do not believe that this omission significantly affects our findings. If the omitted variable (in this case, cognitive skills) has the same net effect in both time periods, then the estimate of the difference will still be unbiased as the omitted variable bias component will be subtracted out. For this reason, our results
regarding the hypothesis of the declining significance of race are unlikely to be significantly affected by slight omissions of control variables.

Regarding the hypothesis of increasing significance of class, we do not find strong evidence for it when class refers to high school graduates. Our results do, however, strongly support the hypothesis of the increasing significance of class when the latter refers to high school dropouts, particularly for African Americans and whites. That is, for African American and white high school dropouts, the net disadvantage of class is clearly more deleterious in the modern industrial period than in the industrial period. Although the estimates for Asian Americans follow similar patterns, they are not statistically significant perhaps in part due to their small sample size for 1940.

The results regarding Wilson’s hypothesis are generally highly supportive of it. For both African Americans and Asian Americans in 1940, race is clearly more of a disadvantage than is class for both high school dropouts as well as high school graduates. This generalization is based on results that are substantively and statistically significant. They are entirely consistent with Wilson’s description of the industrial period as an era in which the racial penalty is predominant in the determination of wages.

Most of the results for 1994-1998 support Wilson’s characterization of the modern industrial period as an era in which the net disadvantage of race in the labor market is less deleterious than is that of class. For Asian American high school dropouts and high school graduates, the results unequivocally indicate that the net effect of race is much less consequential than is the net effect of class. Furthermore, this conclusion is clearly applicable to African American high school dropouts, for whom Wilson’s hypothesis is also both substantively as well as statistically significant in 1994-1998.

The one case where Wilson’s hypothesis is not strongly supported is that of African American high school graduates in 1994-1998. For this group in the modern industrial period, the disadvantage of race is not much different from the disadvantage of class. Nonetheless, it is perhaps worth pointing out that the approximate equality of these two net effects in the modern industrial period represents a major difference from 1940 when the net disadvantage of race is clearly much greater.

We believe that it is also worthwhile to reiterate that the disadvantage of being a high school dropout in the modern industrial period is quite substantial. For example, among African American high school dropouts, the disadvantage of class in the modern industrial period is at least as negative as is the disadvantage of race in the industrial period. That is, among African American high school dropouts, the net effect of class is no less deleterious (at least in terms of wages) in the modern industrial period than is the pronounced level of racism during the industrial period. In his later works, Wilson (1987, 1996) focuses more specifically on the situations of lower-class African Americans.
Conclusion

"In the final analysis, therefore, the challenge of economic dislocation in modern industrial society calls for public policy programs to attack inequality on a broad class front, policy programs, in other words, that go beyond the limits of ethnic and racial discrimination by directly confronting the pervasive and destructive features of class subordination." (Wilson 1980, 154)

It has not been our objective to engage in what Grusky (2001, 29) might refer to as a mindless "sociological horse race" in which only one factor can be deemed important and the other unworthy of any investigation. Nor has it been our purpose to suggest that racial discrimination in labor markets no longer exists to any degree or in any form. In our results, the estimated net racial effects for African Americans in 1994-1998 are still substantively as well as statistically significant, and these negative net effects can be interpreted as evidence for continuing discrimination against African Americans in the labor market that must be combated with the vigilant application of civil rights laws. Like crime, racial discrimination in labor market processes represents deviant social behavior that will inevitably be problematic to some degree. Because of its moral repulsiveness, racial discrimination must always be taken seriously as a significant social problem whenever it is evident to any extent and in any way.

Nonetheless, we also believe that our empirical results strongly support the key claims of Wilson. This conclusion does not contradict the above assertion that racial discrimination still exists to some degree because Wilson does not argue that the net effect of race is zero in the labor market of the modern industrial period. Rather, he argues that the net effect of race has been substantially reduced in the period after the Civil Rights movement, and our results unequivocally support this hypothesis of the declining significance of race.

More importantly, our results provide considerable support for Wilson's most fundamental claim, which is that the net effect of class has a larger impact on wages than does the net effect of race in the modern industrial period and that this pattern is the reverse of the pattern for the industrial period. In other words, before World War II, the disadvantage of being a minority is more salient than is the disadvantage of being a high school dropout. After the Civil Rights movement, however, being a high school dropout is much more deleterious in terms of wages than is the net effect of being a minority.

In making this conclusion, we reiterate that our results only apply to male employees; other research is needed to investigate the patterns for employers, the self-employed, and women. We also emphasize that we have only studied hourly wages and that other indicators of labor market outcomes (e.g., earnings, occupational attainment, unemployment, job mobility) should be analyzed as well. Finally, we need more research on racial inequality relating to what Wilson (1980, 152) refers to as the "sociopolitical order" including such topics as educational inequality (e.g., Farkas and Vicknair 1996) and residential segregation (e.g., Farley et al. 1994).
Endnotes

1 Direct correspondence to Arthur Sakamoto, Department of Sociology, University of Texas, Austin, TX 78712 (e-mail: sakamoto@mail.la.utexas.edu). We thank the Population Research Center of the University of Texas for providing computer services. All opinions expressed herein are the sole responsibility of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of any other person or institution.

2 This result is not evident for Asian Americans as a whole, however, as most Asian Americans are foreign-born immigrants. Because immigrants usually receive at least part of their educational, occupational and human-capital training outside of the United States, their wage determination patterns probably differ from those of the native born (Duleep and Regets 1997; Reimers 1985).

3 The CPS files include “Asian” as a racial category but do not identify more specific categories (e.g., Chinese, Korean, etc.). The opposite is the case for the 1940 PUMS for which we define “Asian” as including the following groups that are identified in the race question in the 1940 PUMS: Chinese, Filipino, Japanese, Hindu, and Korean.

4 For some purposes, combining educational criteria with job characteristics yields class categories that are useful for the particular research objectives (Wright 1985). Given our concerns with assessing the extent of the openness of the labor market to racial minorities, however, adding job characteristics to our operationalization of class would be “overcontrolling” because that would preclude the systematic analysis of whether the desirable jobs are equally open to minorities who have high educational attainment.

5 As noted by Mare (2001, 480), the role of education in affecting stratification outcomes is generally believed to be important, and this effect is substantially significant to the individual regardless of whether the mechanism underlying this effect derives from human capital, labor market screening, or pure credentialism.

6 Wilson (1980) does not discuss his conceptualization of class at any length, but one might think of it as generally being of the sort that Sorensen (2000) refers to as “class as life conditions” (p. 1526).

7 By contrast, we believe that the results reported by Hirschman and Snipp (2001) are problematic because of misspecification in their pooled regression model.

8 Because, in our approach, men with at least some college education serve as the reference class category, we can not assess the increasing significance of class for men with at least some college education. Similarly, we do not test the hypothesis of the declining significance of race for white men.

9 An alternative approach would be to estimate the net effect of years of schooling in log-wage regression models for each demographic group across the two time periods. In this approach, the increasing significance of class is evident for African American and white men, but it is again not statistically significant for Asian American men.

10 We suggest that the 0.10 significance level is reasonable given the small sample size of Asian Americans in 1940.
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### Table 1: Means of Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1940 PUMS</th>
<th>1994-1998 CPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Whites (n=132,771)</td>
<td>Blacks (n=13,853)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wage</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log-wage</td>
<td>-0.42</td>
<td>-1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Dropout</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Graduate</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>39.14</td>
<td>38.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age-squared</td>
<td>1636.83</td>
<td>1611.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veteran</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>0.720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-metropolitan</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Whites (n=91,299)</th>
<th>Blacks (n=8974)</th>
<th>Asian Americans (n=982)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wage</td>
<td>18.61</td>
<td>14.51</td>
<td>19.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log-wage</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>2.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Dropout</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Graduate</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>41.19</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>39.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age-squared</td>
<td>1799.99</td>
<td>1734.27</td>
<td>1682.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veteran</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-metropolitan</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Wage is measured in nominal dollars except for the 1994, 1995, 1996, and 1997 CPS wage data, which were converted to 1998 dollars using the Consumer Price Index.
### Table 2: Results of Regressions of Log-Wage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1940 PUMS</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Whites (n=132,771)</td>
<td>Blacks (n=13,853)</td>
<td>Asian Americans (n=57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>-1.5132***</td>
<td>-1.1571***</td>
<td>0.4158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Dropout</td>
<td>-0.3849***</td>
<td>-0.3148***</td>
<td>-0.4015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Graduate</td>
<td>-0.2169***</td>
<td>-0.238***</td>
<td>-0.1435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.0684***</td>
<td>0.0318***</td>
<td>-0.0645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age-squared</td>
<td>-0.0007***</td>
<td>-0.0003***</td>
<td>0.0009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veteran</td>
<td>0.0501***</td>
<td>0.0127</td>
<td>-0.4517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>-0.1404***</td>
<td>-0.3057***</td>
<td>0.4974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>0.0256***</td>
<td>-0.053</td>
<td>0.335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-metropolitan</td>
<td>-0.3076***</td>
<td>-0.1622***</td>
<td>-0.2318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-squared</td>
<td>0.1531</td>
<td>0.1436</td>
<td>0.1631</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1994-1998 CPS</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Whites (n=91,299)</td>
<td>Blacks (n=8974)</td>
<td>Asian Americans (n=982)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1.0993***</td>
<td>1.4622***</td>
<td>1.099***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Dropout</td>
<td>-0.4971***</td>
<td>-0.4573***</td>
<td>-0.5419***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Graduate</td>
<td>-0.2619***</td>
<td>-0.2724***</td>
<td>-0.2337***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.0767***</td>
<td>0.0492***</td>
<td>0.0829***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age-squared</td>
<td>-0.0007***</td>
<td>-0.0004***</td>
<td>-0.0008***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veteran</td>
<td>-0.063***</td>
<td>0.0103</td>
<td>-0.128***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>-0.0474***</td>
<td>-0.0939***</td>
<td>-0.2675***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>-0.0243***</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.0971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-metropolitan</td>
<td>-0.1933***</td>
<td>-0.1085***</td>
<td>-0.1754***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-squared</td>
<td>0.1654</td>
<td>0.1498</td>
<td>0.1481</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * p < .05   ** p < .01  *** p < .001  (two-tailed tests)
### Table 3: Net Racial Effects Derived From Regression Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Blacks</th>
<th>Asian Americans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1940 High School Dropouts</td>
<td>-0.4508***</td>
<td>-0.9082***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940 High School Graduates</td>
<td>-0.5421***</td>
<td>-0.8181***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940 At Least Some College</td>
<td>-0.5209***</td>
<td>-0.8915**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994-1998 High School Dropout</td>
<td>s-0.1958***</td>
<td>0.0749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994-1998 High School Graduates</td>
<td>-0.2462***</td>
<td>0.1478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994-1998 At Least Some College</td>
<td>-0.2356***</td>
<td>0.1197*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Calculations assume 39 years of age for a non-veteran who resides in a metropolitan area outside of the south or west.

* p < .05  ** p < .01  ***p < .001  (two-tailed tests)
Table 4: Results for Hypothesis Tests Regarding the Net Effects of Race and Class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Declining Significance of Race:</th>
<th>Blacks</th>
<th>Asian Americans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High School Dropouts</td>
<td>-0.255 ***</td>
<td>-0.983 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Graduates</td>
<td>-0.2959 ***</td>
<td>-0.966 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At Least Some College</td>
<td>-0.2853 ***</td>
<td>-1.0112 ***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Increasing Significance of Class:</th>
<th>Blacks</th>
<th>Asian Americans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High School Dropouts</td>
<td>0.1425 ***</td>
<td>0.1404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Graduates</td>
<td>0.0344+</td>
<td>0.0902</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Increasing Significance of Class:</th>
<th>Whites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High School Dropouts</td>
<td>0.1122 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Graduates</td>
<td>0.045 ***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wilson's Hypothesis for 1940:</th>
<th>Blacks</th>
<th>Asian Americans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High School Dropouts</td>
<td>-0.136 ***</td>
<td>-0.5067 +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Graduates</td>
<td>-0.3041 ***</td>
<td>-0.6746 *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High School Dropouts</td>
<td>-0.2615 ***</td>
<td>-0.6168 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Graduates</td>
<td>-0.0262 +</td>
<td>-0.3815 ***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: + p<.10  * p<.05  ** p<.01  *** p<.001 (one-tailed tests)
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Advancing an Asian Agenda for Immigration Reform

Katie Quan

Introduction

Immigration policy is one of the most volatile topics of our times. Prior to 11 September 2001, the Bush administration was on the verge of agreeing to a path-breaking proposal for legalizing undocumented immigrants. However, just after September 11, that momentum halted, and immigration policies have instead become more restrictive and punitive, as evidenced in the secrecy provisions of the PATRIOT Act, the citizenship requirements of the Aviation and Transportation Security Act, and lowering of entry allotments for refugees.

Although many post-September 11 policies are targeted directly at Asian immigrants from Central Asia, South Asia, and Southeast Asia, little has been heard from Asian Pacific Islander (API) communities about their views on these matters. Even prior to September 11, their voices on national immigration policy issues such as legalization were not well known, despite the fact that Asian Pacific Islanders account for 31 percent of immigration to the United States between 1991 and 2000 (Immigration and Naturalization Service 2002a). Moreover, other concerns particular to API communities have not been heard at all.

To begin a dialogue on the immigration policy concerns of Asian Pacific Islander workers, the Center for Labor Research and Education (Labor Center) at UC Berkeley joined with community and union partners to sponsor a conference entitled “Advancing an Asian Agenda for Immigration Reform” in March 2002. The conference was attended by 130 representatives of community and labor organiza-
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tions, primarily from Northern California, but also including representatives from New York, Washington, D.C., and Los Angeles. Sponsors included the Asian Community Immigration Clinic, Asian Pacific American Labor Alliance, Alameda Chapter, UC Berkeley Center for Labor Research and Education, Chinese Progressive Association, Filipino Civil Rights Advocates, Filipinos for Affirmative Action, Hotel Employees and Restaurant Employees Union Local 2, Labor Immigrant Organizing Network, National Network for Immigrant and Refugee Rights, Northern California Citizenship Project Services, Immigrant Rights and Education Network, and Sweatshop Watch.

Planning the focus of the conference was the first challenge, as the Asian Pacific Islander community is made up of people from diverse countries with different issues. Planning committee member Lillian Galedo of Filipinos for Affirmative Action observed in her opening remarks:

"We are extremely diverse—Chinese with 2.7 million, Filipino with 2.4 million, and Indian, the fastest-growing Asian group who doubled in the last decade, are at 1.9 million. Fourth are Vietnamese at 1.2 million, and Koreans at 1.08 million are fifth. But, today the Asian community also encompasses Taiwanese, Pakistanis, Afghans, Bangladeshis and Sri Lankans, Tai, Hmong, Indonesians, Malays, Mien, Cambodians, Laotians, Maldivians, Burmese, Okinawans, Nepalese, Singaporeans, Bhutanese, and Iwo Jimans… Different Asian communities have organized on their ethnic specific issues, but few of us were working comprehensively on issues impacting our combined communities."

Over the months prior to the conference, the Labor Center along with the National Network for Immigrant and Refugee Rights, Filipinos for Affirmative Action, and the Labor Immigrant Organization Network convened San Francisco Bay Area Asian community advocates in a series of meetings to discuss the most pressing immigration policy issues facing their communities. On the basis of these discussions, eight key issues were identified for the conference to address: the impact of September 11, citizenship requirements for airport baggage screeners, backlogs for family reunification, legalization, sex trafficking, labor smuggling, contract labor, and refugee programs. Each discussion session was designed to produce recommendations for policymakers, researchers, and advocates.

The conference was by all accounts an important beginning. Participants were buoyed by a sense of historical significance; this was the first time in recent decades that API advocates had come together to discuss immigration policy. They took seriously the responsibility towards their constituencies, as stated in Galedo’s keynote speech:

"Today we need to view ourselves as leaders in the national discourse that shapes immigration reform. We need to be our own advocates, be our own messengers to Congress where these reforms are made."

This paper provides an overview of these eight issues and highlights some recommendations that emerged from conference discussions. Where historical
background and general context are not clear, the author has supplemented conference transcripts with researched information. It is not meant to be an exhaustive review of the many complexities of U.S. immigration policy, nor does it even fully reflect every idea raised at the conference. This paper does, however, provide us with a framework for addressing a number of immigration issues of concern to API communities that have not been given adequate attention in the national debate on immigration reform.

This conference was designed to integrate API voices into the broader immigration agenda. To achieve this, API organizations need to educate their base about immigration policies and their impact on the Asian community. Moreover, the community’s concerns surrounding immigration matters must be heard and heeded by legislators. Their voices can be strengthened by quantitative data as well as qualitative research that humanize the debate around immigration reform.

Following each topic section are three sets of recommendations tackling these issues. The recommendations emerged from the conference and are aimed at organizers, policymakers, and researchers. Implicit throughout these recommendations is the understanding that in order to generate more substantive API influence on immigration policy, organizers, researchers, and policymakers need to build stronger multiethnic and multiracial networks. Additionally, as Congress debates INS restructuring, conference participants stressed that the agency’s reforms must address current family reunification and refugee backlogs, its substandard quality of service, and its suspect enforcement practices.

Conference Proceedings

September 11 Impacts: Discrimination

The PATRIOT Act

The USA PATRIOT Act was enacted one month after September 11 in October 2001 and gave the government sweeping new powers to detain and deport immigrants without hearings or access to attorneys. This contributed to a sense of fear and anxiety in API communities across the country, putting immigrants on notice that they were no longer safe from arbitrary suspicion. According to Ai-jen Poo, plenary speaker from the Coalition Against Anti-Asian Violence in New York, “Starting in October, South Asian neighborhoods were invaded by FBI personnel, going door to door to gain information on residents, or searching through everything from a crumpled up brown paper bag in the street to young people walking to the corner store.”

Thousands of Central Asian and South Asian men have been detained and deported, and one person has died in detention. According to the Council on American-Islamic Relations, bias incidents against Muslims soared after September 11, and 57 percent of all Muslims reported bias or discrimination during that period (Seattle Times 2002). Those who have not been detained, even if they hold green cards or are naturalized citizens, fear that they might be. In light of this treatment, some Arab and South Asian immigrants have chosen to go
underground to escape the arbitrary detention and “military trials” that the PATRIOT Act allows. This is indeed an ironic twist, since many of them came to the United States precisely to escape the lack of democratic due process and political repression that they faced in their home countries (Poo 2002).

Unfortunately, Asian immigrants are only too familiar with discrimination based upon arbitrary suspicion. Sixty years ago during World War II, based upon suspicion that Japanese immigrants and their American-born children were aiding the Japanese government, our wartime enemy, the U.S. government rounded up all Japanese immigrants and U.S. citizens of Japanese descent on the West Coast and forced them into internment camps for the duration of the war. No Japanese American was ever found to be aiding the enemy, and today the Supreme Court has ruled that Japanese Americans are entitled to redress and reparations for the property loss and mental suffering that they endured (Yamamoto et al. 2001). Yet the PATRIOT Act now gives the government authority to repeat the same type of discriminatory actions towards Arab and South Asian immigrant Americans.

As Ai-jen Poo noted:

“As immigrant communities, our histories, present, and futures are deeply connected to the fates of our people in the Third World who are faced with the ongoing war against terror. U.S. foreign policy has in many ways determined the character of immigrant communities in the United States. The process of U.S. military intervention has compelled the migration of generations: our mothers, our cousins, our sisters and brothers, ourselves. The memories of these wars are fresh in the minds of many in our communities. Let us also learn from these memories as we begin these discussions about immigration, what our communities need, and what is possible in this new context after September 11.”

Conference participants called for the repeal of the USA PATRIOT Act.

The Aviation and Transportation Security Act

Another example of the erosion of immigrant civil rights since September 11 can be found in the Aviation and Transportation Security Act of 2001 (ATSA). Passed by Congress just two months after September 11 in an attempt to target one source of security breach, the ATSA requires that all airport baggage screeners be U.S. citizens. This legislation also mandates that screeners who were formerly employed by private companies now become federal government employees. Federalization of screeners took place in November 2002, and only those who were U.S. citizens could re-apply.

Nationally, an estimated 25 percent of the country’s 28,000 screeners were immigrants. However, in the San Francisco Bay area, some 75 percent of screeners at the three major airports were immigrants, mostly from the Philippines (Bay Area Organizing Committee 2002). At the San Francisco International Airport (SFO), where 80 percent of the one thousand screeners were Filipino immigrants who were not yet naturalized, the citizenship requirement had a devastating effect as many workers lost their jobs (Washington Post 2002; Los Angeles Times 2002).
No screeners were connected to the attacks of September 11, and there is no evidence to show that non-citizen screeners perform better or worse than citizen screeners. Citizenship is generally not equated with effective security; non-citizens are allowed to serve in such security-sensitive areas as the U.S. Armed Forces and the National Guard. Therefore, ATSA's new citizenship requirement is widely perceived by the API community as targeting immigrant screeners unfairly, in effect blaming immigrant workers for the events of September 11, according to Asian Pacific American Labor Alliance President Luisa Blue (Blue 2002).

In addition to discriminating against API immigrant workers, the ATSA's provision for federalization of airport screener jobs may also undermine a union organizing victory that screeners at SFO won to improve their wages and working conditions. Previously, screeners were paid little more than minimum wage and had no health insurance or other fringe benefits. However, after they joined the Service Employees International Union (SEIU) and won a collective bargaining agreement in 2000, their wages jumped from $6.25 per hour with no benefits to $13 per hour with full benefits. Turnover rates plummeted from 95 percent to 15 percent. As turnover declined, morale and productivity increased (Reich et al. 2002; Bay Area Organizing Committee 2002). While it is still not clear whether screeners' jobs will be union jobs once federalized, most of the Filipino immigrant workers who fought hard to organize a union and improve their conditions will not be able to enjoy the fruits of their struggle.

Beyond baggage screeners, there has already been suggestion of extending citizenship requirements to other sectors, including computer specialists at the Department of Defense, many of whom are Asian immigrants. SEIU and the American Civil Liberties Union have filed a lawsuit on behalf of screeners at SFO and Los Angeles airports, and Representatives Solis, Pelosi, and Honda have proposed a full repeal of the citizenship requirement (HR 3505). In mid-November 2002, U.S. District Judge Robert Takasugi of Los Angeles issued a preliminary injunction blocking enforcement of the citizenship requirement for airport screeners, questioning the constitutionality of the law. Although this injunction may eventually have a widespread impact, the decision will not have an immediate effect because most immigrant screeners have already lost their jobs (Egelko and Gathright 2002). The final outcomes for both the ACLU lawsuit and the Congressional repeal proposal are still difficult to determine.

Participants at the conference strongly denounced the anti-Asian immigrant implications of the ATSA and called for the repeal of its citizenship requirements.

Restricting Refugee Entry

Immediately following the September 11 attacks, the federal government banned entry of all refugees for two months. Once the ban was lifted, the annual allotment went down from eighty thousand to seventy thousand. According to Phillip Nguyen of the Southeast Asian Community Center, resettlement experts predict that close to half of the available refugee slots will go unused in 2002 (Nguyen 2002).
These slots stay open because of refugee admittance and processing backlogs, especially after the events of September 11. At the time the refugee ban was imposed, approximately twenty-two thousand refugees were approved for resettlement in America, and by the date of the conference, the vast majority was still waiting to enter the United States. Nguyen (2002) discussed how INS officials responsible for conducting background checks of refugees have yet to resume these screenings in many countries because of security concerns.

Even before September 11, refugees were required to pass through more stringent security screenings than others seeking to immigrate to this country. Conference participants expressed concern that many of the measures now blocking refugee admissions are carried out in the name of security but do not in fact make Americans safer.

Other Discrimination

In addition to discriminatory laws and regulations that target Asian immigrants, conference participants reported post-September 11 discrimination in employment opportunities and access to services.

In Silicon Valley, the effects of the general economic recession and decline in the information technology sector had already led to widespread layoffs, especially of South Asian and Taiwanese H-1B contract workers. After September 11, the economic health of Silicon Valley suffered further decline, and the entry of Asian H-1B workers halted. The events of September 11 also led to discrimination against South Asians in hiring. According to Raj Jayadev (2002), instead of being the “model minority,” Asian immigrants became the “model terrorists.”

In New York City, Ground Zero is less than a mile from Chinatown, where more than fifty thousand immigrant workers earn their living in the garment and tourism industries. According to an interim report by the Asian American Federation of New York, Chinatown businesses such as garment, restaurant, retail, and jewelry suffered declines in the 50 percent range during the three months after September 11. Twenty-three percent of the working population in Chinatown were laid off, with total wage losses estimated at $114 million. Many Asian immigrants who were eligible for emergency services had difficulty accessing those services because of language barriers (Asian American Federation of New York 2002).

Conference participants expressed the need to monitor anti-Asian hiring discrimination for possible future action, and to increase advocacy for access to services related to September 11.
Conference Recommendations

Policy Recommendations:

- Repeal the USA PATRIOT Act
- Repeal the Aviation and Transportation Security Act’s (ATSA) citizenship requirement for airport screeners

Recommendations for Organizers:

- Organize against the PATRIOT Act; reach out to and work with Arab American and civil rights organizations to:
  - Educate the public about injustices committed against Asian immigrants in the aftermath of September 11
  - Monitor and challenge unlawful INS detentions associated with the “War on Terrorism”
  - Oppose anti-immigrant measures that derived from the PATRIOT Act, such as:
    - Deputization of local and state law enforcement officials as INS officials and other collaboration between local law enforcement with the FBI and INS
    - Further militarization of the U.S. border
- Organize opposition to the citizenship requirements of the ATSA.
  - Build a campaign to repeal citizenship requirements
  - Strengthen existing programs to assist immigrants in the naturalization process
  - Oppose the expansion of citizenship requirements to other industries

Recommendations for Researchers:

- Research and publicize the economic, social, and political impacts of September 11 on Asian immigrants
  - Research the economic impact of widespread layoffs due to citizenship requirements
  - Research the relationship of citizenship to quality security

Compare the amount of money spent on military, police, and other security forces aimed at “stopping terrorism” to federal relief funds for direct and indirect victims of September 11
Linking Elimination of Backlogs with Legalization

Backlogs

The single biggest concern among conference participants was clearing the backlog of those waiting to reunite with their families in the United States, which is not surprising since more than 90 percent of Asian immigrants to the United States arrive through family-based immigration (Narasaki 2001). For Asian immigrants in particular, family reunification is a critical component of immigration policy because Asian cultures define family to include the extended rather than just the nuclear family. Families also provide critical economic and social support in impoverished immigrant communities (Narasaki 2001; Hing 1993).

The INS's family reunification program is based upon a system of preferences and quotas. A U.S. citizen may bring his/her spouse, unmarried minor children, and parents to the United States without limitations. All other family members, however, must go through one of the four preference categories: 1) unmarried adult children of U.S. citizens, 2) spouses and children of lawful permanent residents, 3) married adult children of U.S. citizens, and 4) brother and sisters of U.S. citizens.

Because no single country is allotted more than 7 percent of visas awarded in a year, families from large countries or countries with high outflows (for example the Philippines, India, and China) usually have very long waits. The average wait for brothers and sisters of citizens is twelve years, but for Filipinos it can be as much as twenty-two years (Narasaki 2001).

Therefore, because the INS sets quotas far below demand, and because it does not have the capacity to process applications on a timely basis, family members of Asian immigrants regularly wait many years before they can come to the United States. Since the program's inception in 1965, this waiting period has steadily increased and is now at an all-time high. As of 1997, more than 3.5 million people were waiting to reunite with relatives in the United States (INS 2002b; Narasaki 2001). Asians account for more than 45 percent of all those waiting to enter the country, comprising 60 percent of the 1.5 million applicants in the brother/sister category and 49 percent of the 721,000 applicants in the "adult children" category (National Asian Pacific American Legal Consortium 2002).

Permanent residents may also petition for certain categories of relatives to come to the United States, and their length of wait may differ from that of citizens. Since the backlog to petition an unmarried child averages 13.5 years for citizens but only 8.5 years for permanent residents, many Filipino immigrants often choose to delay application for citizenship until their children arrived through a permanent resident petition. Ironically, San Francisco Bay area Filipino airport screeners who chose to delay application for citizenship because of INS backlogs are now faced with an immediate citizenship requirement for their jobs, and many will have to choose between delaying citizenship for faster family reunification or becoming citizens (Blue 2002).

The INS's quota system was purportedly designed to bring about family reunification. However, it has been widely criticized for being flawed and inadequate and
in fact causing lengthy family separation rather than reunification. According to Karen Narasaki of the National Asian Pacific American Legal Consortium, “INS has clearly failed in its function and mission to deliver adequate services to its customers.”

While some Asian immigrant rights groups have called for an entire system overhaul in the quota system, conference participants also expressed concern that such overhaul may include proposals to eliminate the brother/sister preference altogether, a recurring threat that was most recently seen in the 2000 Republican Party platform.

All conference participants agreed that the immediate priority was for the INS to act quickly to eliminate current backlogs.

Legalization

Asian Pacific Islander immigrant communities have many undocumented among them, and according to plenary speaker Cathi Tactaquin of the National Network for Immigrant and Refugee Rights (NNIRR), it is important to “come out of our denial” and address the legalization and amnesty debate. Many API undocumented immigrants entered the country as temporary workers, students, or tourists and are overstaying their visas, joining the more than 40 percent of all undocumented workers with expired visas (Djavic 2001).

According to Tactaquin, it is important to understand legalization and other migration issues in a global context. Twenty percent of the world’s migrants are undocumented. Another 20 percent are refugees who never fully achieve documented status. The drive for migration is most often due to poverty and political repression and is thereby not an option that most migrants would choose if they could achieve decent living conditions in their homelands. Thus, the migrants’ diaspora cannot be viewed as the root problem, but rather a symptom of broader economic, political, and social ills.

The momentum for legalization legislation was at its height before September 11, and immigrant communities, labor, and government representatives were actively engaged in discussing various proposals. After September 11, discussions of legalization changed but did not stop entirely. Representative Richard Gephardt introduced the Earned Legalization and Family Unification Act in the fall of 2002. Even though Gephardt’s proposal did not pass, efforts such as this that tie together legalization and backlog issues are much needed (Anderson 2002). In addition, momentum continues for related forms of regularizing undocumented status, such as legislative campaigns to allow undocumented persons to apply for drivers licenses and campaigns to allow students who have been in the United States for at least five years to legalize their status and thus qualify for in-state college tuition.

Latino immigrant communities have been the most vocal about legalization, while the API community has not weighed in heavily on this issue. On the other hand, the API community’s priority concerns regarding elimination of backlogs in family reunification and refugee processing are not addressed by most advocates.
for legalization. This presents a potential for conflict and division among immigrant communities unless both legalization and eliminating backlogs are linked and advocated by all immigrant rights activists. Otherwise, as conference participant Ada Wong of SEIU Local 616’s homecare division pointed out, “How can we convince an Asian worker whose children have been waiting for twelve years in the backlog to support the legalization of a Latino undocumented worker who has been here for only three years?”

In reality, the struggle to eliminate backlogs is related directly to the call for legalization. Many people who came to the United States without documents did so because their cases were pending in the INS’s load of backlogged requests. Many Latinos—especially Mexicans—are among the millions waiting years in the backlogged system. In fact, often within the same family there are members who came to the United States and overstayed their visas, as well as those still waiting in their home countries, waiting to be processed in Asia or Latin America (Tactaquín 2002).

In her plenary speech, Cathi Tactaquín proposed:

1) Asian immigrants need to have a collective response to policies such as legalization, and

2) API immigration activists need to pro-actively engage with other groups who are facing these same issues.

Conference participants expressed a strong resolve to link the efforts to clear backlogs with the legalization movement.

Conference Recommendations

Policy Recommendations:

- Create new policies for the legalization of undocumented workers as well as measures to eliminate family reunification backlogs, including:
  - Enacting broad legalization provisions
  - Enacting related “mini-legalization” legislation, such as student adjustment and drivers license proposals
  - Implementing immediate administrative measures to shorten backlogs
  - Revising current immigration policy to relieve backlogs by increasing quotas and issuing temporary visas for hardship cases
Recommendations for Organizers:

- Reach out to legalization and family reunification backlogs advocates and link efforts to:
  - Reach out to legalization advocates and activists address family reunification backlogs and link efforts to:
    - Initiate cooperative strategy discussions among legalization advocates and those working to reduce backlogs
    - Build grassroots support for both legalization and an end to backlogs at the local and state levels

Recommendations for Researchers:

- Research undocumented workers in API communities
  - Gather statistics
  - Gather stories of immigrant families in order to humanize those seeking legalization
  - Assess economic impact of legalization on API communities
  - Propose new legislative and other strategies that would protect and assist undocumented workers
  - Articulate links between legalization and elimination of backlogs
- Investigate the source of the backlogs in the current INS family reunification system
  - Study the economic, sociopolitical, and psychological effects of the backlogs on families both in the United States and abroad
  - Propose short-term solutions to eliminate backlogs
  - Propose long-term solutions for the improvement of the family reunification system

Coerced Migration and Exploitation

Each year four million people worldwide are brought across national borders against their will to work in some form of severe exploitation or servitude, and among them are many Asians and Pacific Islanders (Coalition to Abolish Slavery and Trafficking 2002). Some are impoverished workers who have paid intermediaries to bring them to the United States to work, only to find that conditions here may include confiscation of passports and physical incarceration, as in the case of Thai garment workers in El Monte (Economist 1995; Noble 1995).

Others are deceived into thinking that their passage and their work are legitimate, only to find that they are being smuggled in and may be forced to engage in sexual servitude. Still others are trafficked for domestic servitude under the INS’s annual allotment of four thousand slots issued to diplomats for domestic servants,
and some four to six thousand others are entrapped in servile marriages when mail-order and Internet dating services turn into domestic worker or sexual slavery nightmares (Foo 2002).

The conference included separate panel presentations and workshops on sex trafficking and labor smuggling, however, most of the discussion centered on sex trafficking.

**Sex Trafficking**

With globalization—and the freer flow of labor, money, goods, and services over borders—trafficking has developed into a lucrative business that generates billions of dollars annually. Only narcotics and the arms trade are more profitable for large, organized crime networks that operate worldwide. The U.S. government estimates that of the one to two million people who are trafficked for sex annually, fifty thousand end up in the United States, and the majority are Asian. Exact figures are hard to determine, but the federal government estimates that these numbers are growing (Shekar 2002).

For the women who are coerced into the sex trade or are forced to perform sex acts for their employers as part of other employment, working conditions are horrific. They work long hours, and a portion of their wages is withheld to pay for their passage. They are kept in complete isolation, passports confiscated and their movement severely restricted by their employers. Many do not speak English or any Asian language common in the United States, and none have free contact with the outside world (Shekar 2002).

In the case of South Asians, many may be from a social caste that is lower than that of the exploiters. Moreover, many fear returning to their home countries because their experience in the United States carries a stigma that is unacceptable to their native communities. They also fear that reporting sex traffickers to the authorities may result in grave risk of further violence to their families (Lee 2002).

When a sex-trafficked woman does want to seek help, she is often confronted by numerous problems such as lack of language access, lack of services, and inadequate legal protection. Usually she does not speak English, and often she may not speak Asian languages and dialects that are commonly translated in the United States. Few social services exist to help these women, and many existing social services lack staff trained to deal with the legal, mental, and cultural issues that arise for the exploited women. Moreover, the law does not definitively criminalize the exploiter, nor does it provide adequate “whistleblower” protection for the victims. Finally, coordination between various law enforcement, legal, and other government and social service agencies remain extremely cumbersome and daunting to navigate for anyone, let alone a monolingual immigrant woman without a passport (Shekar 2002).

The Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act was passed during the Clinton administration in 2000. It provides for temporary visas and occasional permanent settlement for those who would suffer “extreme hardship” if forced to return to their home countries. In exchange, however, the victims must comply with “reasonable requests” for cooperation with law enforcement officers.
To date, the law has had a limited impact. Trafficking victims are usually under tight control and extremely dependent on their captors, making it difficult for them to break free. Despite the existence of U visas, designed for crime victims, that prevent deportation and allow for eventual permanent residency, many trafficking victims are afraid to cooperate with the authorities for fear of deportation or retribution against their families back home. Since many sex-trafficked women come from countries where police collude with traffickers, they also find it difficult to trust law enforcement. Furthermore, it is challenging for victims to prove that they would face “severe harm” upon their return.

In February 2002, the Department of Justice reported that it had ninety-one trafficking investigations pending, representing a 20 percent increase over the previous year (Department of State 2002). Nevertheless, advocates for sex-trafficked women are concerned about the Bush administration’s commitment to implementation of Clinton-era policies. Already the INS has delayed the issuance of the necessary regulations to fully implement the law. Additionally there have been complaints that the INS treats workers who come forward as accomplices instead of as crime victims. Organizations such as GABRIELA expose and oppose the global sex trade that forces Asian women and children in economically marginalized countries to engage in degrading and often life-threatening labor in their home countries and abroad. According to GABRIELA representative Jane Margold, “Our aim is to create the political will to secure basic freedoms for the world’s more vulnerable victims. [However], it is not clear that post-September 11, an administrative impetus still exists to move against sex trafficking on a national or international basis.”

Conference participants resolved to engage more actively around this issue and formed an email listserv of activists interested in this.

Conference Recommendations

Policy Recommendations:

• Strengthen visa programs that protect victims of coerced migration and simplify their amnesty process
• Increase penalties for traffickers
• Mandate special training for the INS to respond to trafficking cases

Recommendations for Organizers:

• Raise awareness of the global proliferation of trafficking and smuggling and the systems that support these activities
• Build collaboration among attorneys, service providers, trained translators, and cultural experts to assist coerced migrants
• Develop rapid response teams in local and regional areas
• Create shelters and other new services for coerced migrants
• Encourage former sex workers to organize and advocate for workers trapped in the sex industry
• Build strategic partnerships with legal and human rights groups in the countries of origin to educate people about coerced migration and its consequences

Recommendations for Researchers:

• Research the trafficking industry, people, and networks involved, primary sending countries, channels for entering the United States, and consequences for trafficking victims and their families
• Study limitations and loopholes of laws that are supposed to protect coerced migrants and determine the impact of existing penalties for traffickers
• Research linkages between trafficking and U.S. involvement (i.e., militarization) in sending countries

H-1B Workers

Over four hundred thousand immigrants are currently working in the United States on H-1B visas, most of them in the high-tech industry. Under heavy lobbying from high-tech employers, Congress has steadily raised the annual quota to a current 195,000, not including those visas issued to nonprofits, universities, and the government. More than two-thirds of all H-1B petitions approved in 2000 were for Asians, and more than half of these were for Indian and Chinese nationals (INS 2000).

According to Raj Jayadev of Silicon Valley DEBUG, despite the image of affluent high-tech workers, the H-1B program actually gives employers access to a pool of cheap labor—highly skilled, temporary foreign workers with limited labor rights often hired at lower salaries than their U.S. counterparts. Because the employer must sponsor the visa applicant (and thus can ostensibly deport the workers by firing them), the system is rife with opportunities for employers to exploit and threaten their employees.

Silicon Valley DEBUG has been trying to organize H-1B workers. Many H-1B immigrants mistakenly believe that they lack the right to organize unions because they are inappropriately classified as "independent contractors." Unions themselves do not seek to organize H-1B workers because the labor movement has long opposed H-1B and other employment-based immigration programs including guest worker programs. Jayadev argued that the AFL-CIO should view these workers as unfairly exploited, and rather than spurn them, existing unions should seek to organize them.

Conference Recommendations
Policy Recommendations:

- Change H-1B provisions to disengage employment from immigration status
- Change employer sponsorship requirement in order to allow H-1B visa holders more opportunity to switch employers and industries
- Hold companies and their CEOs accountable for labor violations at both contracting and subcontracting levels

Recommendations for Organizers:

- Reach out to H-1B workers—offer assistance and support for their efforts to organize and lobby
- Identify the major difficulties that H-1B workers face, and prioritize them
- Identify allies within the labor movement and community organizations
- Link across ethnicities, and work to defend the rights of all guest workers, including those in the agricultural sector
- Educate the public about the negative impacts of the H-1B program, including harms caused by draining a pool of well-educated professionals away from “sending countries”
- Develop new proposals for employment-based immigration, including decoupling terms of employment from immigration status, and establishing “whistleblower protection” for those workers who speak out against exploitative conditions

Recommendations for Researchers:

- Research the effects of temporary worker programs on workers’ rights
- Document abuses in the current H-1B system, including misuse of the independent contractor designation
- Examine the rights of different categories of temporary workers, including agricultural guest workers
- Propose new legislation that would guarantee the employment rights of temporary workers
Refugee Programs

As defined in the Refugee Act of 1980, a refugee is any person afraid to return to his/her country “because of persecution or a well-founded fear of persecution on account of race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group, or political opinion.” Since 1975, the United States has resettled 2.4 million refugees. Between 1975 and 1980, one million refugees entered from Southeast Asia and close to half of them settled in California (Hicks 1998).

The president and Congress set the annual number of refugees accepted into the United States. Each region of the world receives a quota, with a certain number of slots left unallocated for use in emergencies. In 2002, that limit was set at seventy thousand, a decline from ninety thousand in 2000 and eighty thousand in 2001. Quotas for Asian will regions will comprise 22 percent of that total.

According to plenary speaker Phillip Nguyen of the Southeast Asian Community Center the main concern of the API refugee community is the decline in numbers of refugees accepted each year. The government argues that reduced tensions in Southeast Asia and the fall of communism in the former Soviet Union have led to reduced demand from these key regions. But continued political and economic instability still drive millions of people to seek refuge, and overall demand in these countries continues to far outstrip U.S. admittances.

Refugee communities are presently lobbying elected officials to increase annual quotas for refugees. They are also trying to reverse the public image that refugees are potential terrorists (Nguyen 2002). Philip Nguyen and other refugee advocates called upon API immigrant activists to join their effort. Conference participants acknowledged that immigrant rights activists and refugee rights activists must learn more about each other’s issues and combine their efforts in a more systematic way.

Conference Recommendations

Policy Recommendations:

- Increase the cap on annual refugee admittances to at least year 2000 levels
- Eliminate backlogs in refugee admission processing

Recommendations for Organizers:

- Advocate for clearing backlogs in refugee processing and restoring admission quotas
- Educate the public about the unique and urgent needs of refugees as well as the recent decrease in numbers of refugees admitted to the United States
- Link with other immigrant groups to incorporate these messages into larger pro-immigrant strategies and campaigns
- Organize around other refugee concerns, including access to public benefits
Recommendations for Researchers:

- Research the impact of refugee admittance policies
- Examine refugee admittance in relation to terrorism
- Calculate the economic contribution of refugee communities in the United States

Conclusions and Next Steps

The conference helped generate a long overdue discussion of immigration policies' impacts on Asian communities. An overarching theme was the need to build stronger multiracial coalitions and networks in order to strengthen our voice. This applies to both coalition building between API community and advocacy organizations as well as constructing networks with allies outside the API community.

Perhaps the most far-reaching new recommendation was the call for linking the campaign for legalization of undocumented workers with efforts to eliminate backlogs in family reunification. Other recommendations responded to current issues such as opposition to the PATRIOT Act and the Aviation Security Act. Some participants brought new perspectives to longstanding issues, such as Raj Jayadev's views on the H-1B issue. Still others called for a stronger voice on Asian community issues, such as recommendations related to sex-trafficking and refugee backlogs.

Although the one-day conference began fruitful dialogues, many issues were left for future discussion. Some topics, such as organized smuggling of undocumented workers and the employer sanctions provision of the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986 were addressed somewhat in the plenaries and workshops, but not in great depth. Other controversial issues within the Asian community, such as whether to support the continuation of H-1B and other employment-based temporary contract labor programs, were raised but not resolved.

Participants consistently stressed the need for API participation at immigration policy forums to better integrate the concerns of the API community into broader immigration agendas. At the same time, they spoke of the need to strengthen their own constituencies' voices on these immigration policy issues. Many emphasized the importance of communicating with legislators in order to hold them accountable. Others reminded us to use Asian ethnic media to educate and mobilize immigrant communities, while also utilizing the mainstream media to influence the broader public and policymakers.

Another universal recommendation was INS reform: improving its quality of service, reducing backlogs, addressing enforcement problems, and making agents more sensitive to the concerns of API immigrants. As Congress debates INS restructuring, these issues need to be addressed.

Participants departed with enthusiasm about working together to continue discussions began at the conference. They agreed to organize similar gatherings in other regions, beginning in New York, Los Angeles, and Chicago, and anticipated that
these gatherings would uncover new issues and offer new ideas for reform. Participants formed a taskforce with representatives from each region to ensure that these efforts continue to move forward.

In the Bay area, groups agreed to meet on a quarterly basis to strengthen collaboration. For the short term, Bay area representatives decided to collaborate on the airport screeners’ struggle and continue education and advocacy efforts for legalization and INS backlog reduction.

Appendix A: History of Asian Pacific Islander Immigration

First records of Asian immigration to the United States date to the 1700s, when groups of Filipinos escaped imprisonment from Spanish galleons in New Orleans and fled into the bayous of Louisiana. However, it was not until the mid-1800s that contract laborers from China began to arrive in large numbers to work in Western mines, on the transcontinental railroad, and on Hawaii’s sugar plantations. Hostility, driven by a sense of economic threat as well as cultural racism, resulted in passage of exclusion laws, beginning with the Page Law of 1875, which effectively banned immigration to the United States by Asian women. The 1882 Chinese Exclusion Act barred all immigration of male Chinese laborers for ten years, and the ban was extended indefinitely in the early 1900s. This was the first time that Congress enacted legislation to restrict a nationality group from immigrating to the United States and also represented the beginning of a “national origins” immigration policy.

The Chinese were replaced by Japanese contract laborers in California and in Hawaii, but Japanese migration was soon curtailed by the 1907-1908 Gentlemen’s Agreement between the United States and Japanese governments. Subsequently in the 1910s, several thousand Asian Indians and Filipino laborers migrated to Hawaii and the mainland United States. However, all immigration from Asia was banned in 1917 when Congress extended the Chinese Exclusion Act to include other countries in the “Asiatic barred zone.” In 1924, Congress passed the National Origins Quota Law, which prohibited the entry of groups ineligible for U.S. citizenship, thereby banning all Asian immigrants who as a “race” were not eligible for naturalization.

Asian exclusion laws were repealed in 1943 and the McCarran-Walter Act of 1952 eliminated the Asiatic barred zone but still restricted immigration to two thousand people from within the Asia-Pacific triangle. Prior to World War II, the Japanese population numbered 285,000, Filipinos numbered 100,000, Chinese numbered 100,000, and Asian Indians did not surpass a few thousand.

Aside from policies that discriminated against their entry, numerous laws discriminated directly against Americans of Asian ancestry in the United States. In 1913, the Alien Land Law was passed in California and denied Asians the right to landownership. During World War II, Executive Order 3066 forced 120,000 Americans of Japanese ancestry into internment camps for the duration of the war.
Until 1952, almost all Asian immigrants were denied the right to become naturalized U.S. citizens.

In the wake of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Congress overhauled the country's immigration system with the Immigration Act of 1965. This law repealed the previous national origins quota system, set a quota for Western Hemisphere immigration for the first time, and established a framework for entry based upon reunification of family members. As a result, the number of Asian immigrants rose significantly and accounted for approximately 30 percent of all immigration by the 1990s. However, there remains a twenty thousand per country limit on immigration, regardless of the sending country's size or demand. This has resulted in extremely long backlogs for those seeking to immigrate from Asia. Congress exacerbated the problem in 1990 when it cut by half the allotted visa slots for adult children of U.S. citizens. This occurred at a time when the waiting lists consisted mainly of children of Filipino veterans who became U.S. citizens through their service in World War II.

Refugees from Southeast Asia also constitute a segment of Asian immigration in the past several decades, following U.S. withdrawal from Vietnam in the 1970s. The Refugee Act of 1980 was a response to this influx and for the first time, placed numerical limits on refugee admissions.

Currently, the 2000 census shows that 11.9 million people of Asian and Pacific Islander ancestry currently live in the United States, and the Immigration and Naturalization Service estimates that 255,860 Asians entered the country in 2000. From 1990 to 2000, the numbers of Asian immigrants increased by 48 percent.
Appendix B: Conference Agenda

Advancing an Asian Agenda for Immigration Reform
March 8-9, 2002
Oakland, California

FRIDAY, MARCH 8

8:00 - 8:30  Coffee and registration - Lillian Galedo
8:30 - 9:00  Welcome and context
9:00 - 10:00 PANEL “Social and Political Immigration Policies”

(Moderator: Rand Quinn)
Backlog on family reunification: Frank Tse
Refugee programs: Philip Nguyen
Post-September 11 civil rights issues: Aijen Poo
Citizenship requirements and job security: Luisa Blue

10:00 - 10:20  Plenary questions and comments

10:20 - 11:30  WORKSHOPS

Backlog on family reunification: Eric Mar
Refugee programs: Tho Do
Post-September 11 civil rights issues: Warren Mar
Citizenship requirements and job security: Rhonda Ramiro

11:30 - 12:30  Report back from the workshops

12:30 - 1:30  Lunch

1:30 - 2:30  PANEL “Employment-Based Immigration Policies”

(Moderator: Gordon Mar)
Sex trafficking: Jane Margold
Labor smuggling: Nalini Shokar
Contract labor: Raj Jayadev
Legalization/amnesty: Cathi Tactaquin

2:30 - 2:50  Plenary questions and comments

2:50 - 4:00  STRATEGY WORKSHOPS

Sex trafficking: Eunice Cho
Labor smuggling: Nikki Bas
Contract labor: Stacy Kono
Legalization/amnesty: Sonah Yun

4:00 - 5:00  OPEN CAUCUS

Videos: The New Americans and Uprooted
Immigration issues for the Filipino community
Others (sign up at registration table)
SATURDAY, MARCH 9
8:30 - 9:00  Coffee and pastries
9:00 - 10:00 Report back from strategy workshops (previous afternoon) (Moderated by Katie Quan)
10:00 - 10:30 CAUCUS REPORTS
10:30 - 12:00 NEXT STEPS (breakout)
                 Organizing: Welting Huber
                 Policy and research: Katie Quan
12:00 - 1:00  Report back and concluding remarks: Katie Quan

Appendix C: Sponsors and Benefactors

Conference Co-Sponsors:

- Asian Community Immigration Clinic
- Asian Pacific American Labor Alliance (APALA), Alameda Chapter
- Center for Labor Research and Education (CLRE), UC Berkeley
- Chinese Progressive Association (CPA)
- Filipino Civil Rights Advocates (FilCRA)
- Filipinos for Affirmative Action
- Hotel Employees and Restaurant Employees Union (HERE), Local 2
- Labor Immigrant Organizing Network (LION)
- National Network for Immigrant and Refugee Rights (NNIRR)
- Northern California Citizenship Project (NCCP)
- Services, Immigrant Rights and Education Network (SIREN)
- Sweatshop Watch

Conference Benefactors:

- East Bay Community Foundation
- Ford Foundation
- Institute for Labor and Employment (ILE), University of California
- Service Employees International Union (SEIU)
- Service Employees International Union (SEIU), Local 250
- Service Employees International Union (SEIU), Local 535
Appendix D: Conference Participants

A Safe Place | Vicky Galbert
ACMHS/INCITE National | Isabel Kang
AFL-CIO Civil and Human Rights Department | Matt Finucane
Alameda City, Social Services Agency | Victoria Urbi
Alliance of South Asians Taking Action (ASATA) | Smriti Rana
Angel Island Immigration Station Foundation | Jeffrey Ow | Katherine Toy
Annie E. Casey Foundation | William Wong
API Force | Desiree Aquino
Artist Revolutionary Workshop (AWOL) | Veronica Ang-Vong
Asian Health Services | Geline Avila | Phuong An Doan-Billings | Heather Ngai | Kim Nguyen | Dong Sinh | Clara Song
Asian Immigrant Women’s Advocates (AIWA) | Ken Fong | Stacy Kono | Gin Pang
Asian Law Caucus | Helen Chen | Kyung Jin Lee
Asian Pacific American Labor Alliance (APALA) | Naoia Fanene
Asian Pacific American Legal Center (APALC) | Mark Yoshita
Asian Pacific American Network of Oregon | Nathan Thuan Nguyen
Asian Pacific Environmental Network (APEN) | Joselito Laudencia
Asian Pacific Islander American Health Forum | Jennifer Villamin
Asian Pacific Islander Legal Outreach | Ivy Lee | Kavitha Sreeharsha
Asian Perinatal Advocates | Charise Ho
Asian Women’s Shelter | Gita Mehrotra
California Governor’s Office - San Francisco Regional Office | Phung Pham
California Immigrant Welfare Collaborative | Isabel Alejandra
California Transplant Donor Network | Teresita Zaragoza
Catholic Charities of the East Bay | Sr. Elisabeth Lang
Center for Labor Research and Education (CLRE), UC Berkeley | Jeremy Blasi | Kate Blumenthal | Sara Flocks | Anahita Forati | Warren Mar | Mary Purcell | Katie Quan | Alison Webber | Carol Zabin
Center for Third World Organizing (CTWO) | Katy Nunez-Adler
Chinatown Community Development Center | Rev. Norman Fong
Chinese Progressive Association (CPA) | Angela Chin | Wendall Chin | Gordon Mar
City and County of San Francisco, Immigrant Rights Commission | Joaquin Gonzales | Diana Lau | Winnie Loi | Dang Pham
City College of San Francisco | Giulio Sorro
City of Berkeley | Yuko Leong
Coalition for Humane Immigrant Rights of Los Angeles (CHIRLA) | Susan Alva
Coalition of University Employees (CUE) Local 3, Labor Committee for Peace and Justice | Michael-David Sasson
Committee Against Anti-Asian Violence (CAAAV) | Ai-jen Poo
Community Law Center of Alameda | Susan Chacin
Colorlines Magazine, Applied Research Center | Tram Nguyen
Congresswoman Barbara Lee | Pedro Toledo
East Bay Asian Local Development Corporation | Maria Stella Sison
East Bay Community Foundation | Bob Uyeki
Filipino Civil Rights Advocates (FilCRA) | Angela Angle
Filipinos for Affirmative Action | Chris Cara | Rissa Duque | Lillian Galedo | Lisa Macapinlac | Rhonda Ramiro | Kawal Ulanday | Ed Valladares
Ford Foundation | Taryn Higashi
GABRIELA Network, Family Violence Prevention Fund | Marissa Dagdagan | Jane Margold
Global Exchange | Mariana Bustamante | Kale Fajardo
Hotel Employees & Restaurant Employees Union (HERE) 2850 | Wei Ling Huber
Hotel Employees & Restaurant Employees Union (HERE) Local 2 |Tho Do
INS Watch - La Raza Centro Legal | Heba Nimr
International Institute of San Francisco | Kevin Pimentel
Lawyers’ Committee for Civil Rights | Philip Hwang
Maitri | Nalini Shekar
National Asian Pacific American Legal Consortium (NAPALC) | Katherine Newell
National Campaign for Jobs and Income Support | Son Ah Yun
National Korean American Service & Education Consortium (NAKASEC) | SungKyu Yun
National Network for Immigrant and Refugee Rights (NNIRR) | Eunice Cho | Arnoldo Garcia | Cathi Tactaquin
Northern California Citizenship Project (NCC) | Salli Fune | Gordon Mar
Refugee Network | Rahim Auram
The San Francisco Foundation | Dee Dee Nguyen | Ron Rowell
San Francisco State University | Eric Mar
Service Employees International Union (SEIU) Local 250 | Leon Chow | Elisabeth Ortega | Richard Rubio-Bowley
Service Employees International Union (SEIU) Local 616 | Yan Qun Chen | King D.Cheung | Nuan Kan Chun | Shaolin Huang | Xin Fang Huang | Chun Nuan Kan | Lan Leong | Puling Li | Shenglan Liang | Sun Liang | Jin Sui Liu | Karen Orlando | Ivan Ortega | Hou Susang | Ada Wong | He Hui Xian | Cheng Xue Bin | Zhilong Zhangle
Service Employees International Union (SEIU) Local 790 | Luisa Blue | Daz Lamparas
Service Employees International Union (SEIU) Western Region | Josie Camacho
Services, Immigrant Rights and Education Network (SIREN) | Elaine Lai | Chi Pham | Rand Quinn
Endnotes

1 For an ironic twist on why some Filipino screeners had chosen not to become naturalized citizens, see page 7.
3 See www.sirenbyarea.org/AB540.htm for information regarding student legalization and www.newcitizen.org/english/drivers.licenses.htm for information on drivers licenses.
4 See, for example, The New York Times, 2002. Tale of Sin on West Coast with Asians Smuggled In, 19 September.
5 The T visa is designed for human-trafficking migrants who cooperate with law enforcement against those responsible for their enslavement. It allows sex-trafficked migrants to remain in the United States if it is determined that they could face “extreme hardship involving unusual and severe harm” if returned to their home countries. After three years in T status, sex-trafficked migrants may apply for permanent residency. Similarly, the U visa is a three-year nonimmigrant visa that also enables victims of crime to remain in the United States if they are willing to assist with prosecution. A key difference between the visa types is that the T visa is designed specifically for victims of severe forms of trafficking whereas the U visa encompasses many more crimes. Also, T visa holders can be eligible for public assistance whereas U visa holders can get work authorization but are not eligible for public benefits (see the Department of Justice Web site: www.usdoj.gov/crt/crim/wets/traffickingbrochure.html).
6 H-1B is a visa classification for immigrants in specialty occupations. This visa status is nonportable, meaning that an H-1B holder is obligated to remain with their initial sponsoring employer unless they received permission from INS to switch employers. Additionally, they cannot apply for permanent residency unless their employer files sponsorship.
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On the Ballot: Asian Pacific Islander American Candidates Fare Well in 2002 Elections
Rodney Jay C. Salinas

Introduction

The subject of race is not new in campaigns and elections. In the latter half of the 20th century, as more and more African Americans ran for office, the issue of race was a continual subject of controversy. In 1983, when Harold Washington became the first African American to win the Democratic nomination for mayor of Chicago, his opponent’s supporters began wearing plain white campaign buttons. The message of their button, which carried no names, no printed message, was clear—they did not support Washington, a black man.

In 2002, the same types of thinly veiled political tactics are still employed. But now the victims are not just African Americans, they include Asian Pacific Americans as well. While the vast majority of these candidates carry on their campaigns without incident, there are the isolated cases that are too blatant to ignore.

In a midterm election that seemed to buck all trends and the best predictions of analysts, Asian Pacific American candidates won several key races in states throughout the country. In recent years, these candidates have faced seemingly insurmountable challenges including fund-raising scandals, discrimination, and

Rodney Jay C. Salinas serves as founder and president of the Rainmaker Political Group LLC and is the publisher of PoliticalCircus.com (www.politicalcircus.com), a Web site about Asian Pacific American politics. He was named a “Rising Star of Politics” by Campaigns & Elections in April 2002 and is the former executive director of the Asian Pacific American Institute for Congressional Studies (APAICS). Rodney has been featured in the Washington Post, Roll Call, FoxNews.com, Atlanta Journal-Constitution, Las Vegas Review Journal, Asian Week, Philippine News, and Filipinas Magazine. He is also a frequent contributor to several newspapers and radio programs throughout the country, including Manila Bulletin USA, Monolid, KQED Radio’s Pacific Time, ABS-CBN’s Balingtang America, WBAI’s Asia Pacific Forum, and many others. Rodney earned his master’s degree in political management from the Graduate School of Political Management while on a full scholarship as a presidential administrative fellow at George Washington University.
opponent intimidation. The following analysis answers some widely raised questions about just how successful Asian Pacific American candidates are when they run for public office.

This information outlines the 2002 general elections conducted in November. Based on certified election returns, here are some key findings:

- A total of 207 candidates were on the ballot nationwide on Tuesday, 5 November 2002.
- Slightly more than half of all Asian Pacific American candidates, approximately 52 percent, won their elections. Forty-eight percent of all Asian Pacific American candidates lost their elections.
- Of the 207 Asian Pacific American candidates, 65 were incumbents — approximately 31 percent. Virtually all incumbents, approximately 99 percent, won their election, except for Jeff Ota, who lost his re-election bid for the East Side Union High School district in San Jose, Calif.
- Asian Pacific Americans Democratic candidates outnumbered Asian Pacific American Republican candidates by a two to one margin (101 to 52 respectively).
- Forty-three percent of Asian Pacific American candidates ran for offices in Hawaii, while another 30 percent of Asian Pacific American candidates ran for offices in California. The remaining 27 percent of Asian Pacific American candidates ran for offices in states including New York, Guam (territory), Maryland, Michigan, and Washington, among others.
- The vast majority of Asian Pacific American candidates, approximately 68 percent, ran for offices at the state level. Twenty-three percent of Asian Pacific American candidates ran for offices on the municipal and local levels, while nine percent of Asian Pacific American candidates ran for offices on the federal level.
- Japanese Americans and Chinese Americans are the largest percentage of all Asian Pacific American candidates with 28 percent and 20 percent respectively. Trailing not far behind are Filipino American and Indian American candidates with 13 percent each.
- With gubernatorial candidate U.S. Delegate Robert A. Underwood (D-Guam) and the late U.S. Rep. Patsy T. Mink (D-Hawaii) out of Congress, the total number of Asian Pacific Americans in the 108th Congress is seven.

Notable Victories

Texas: Former Houston City Councilmember Martha Wong (R) bested 22-year incumbent Debra Danberg (D) in the race for the state House of Representatives (District 134). Wong is the first Asian American woman to be elected to the state house in Texas.
Iowa: Even after her opponent made racist comments about her, Iowa Democrat Swati Dandekar defeated Republican Karen Balderston in the race for state representative (District 36). Balderston questioned Dandekar’s competency because she is an Indian American. (See “State Senate and State House of Representatives” for more details.)

Hawaii: The late Patsy Mink (D) won her race posthumously against Republican Bob McDermott, which triggers a series of special elections in Hawaii to decide who will represent the second Congressional district. In the end, Ed Case bested several Asian Pacific American candidates, including Matt Matsunaga, a candidate for lieutenant governor in November, and state senator Colleen Hanabusa.

Michigan: At the age of 28, Hoon-Yung Hopgood (D) won his election for state House of Representatives (District 22). Hopgood will replace his employer, State Rep. Ray Basham, who did not seek re-election.

Minnesota: Cy Thao (DFL) won his election for state representative (District 65a) against Republican Gary Wayne DeYoung. Thao is only the second Hmong American to be elected in Minnesota.

Notable Losses

Colorado: Congressional hopeful Stan Matsunaka (D) lost his bid against fellow State Sen. Marilyn Musgrave (R) in District 4. Matsunaka, who is the state senate president, would have been the first Asian American to represent Colorado in the U.S. Congress.

Hawaii: Lieutenant Governor Mazie Hirono (D) lost the race for governor to former Maui Mayor Linda Lingle. It is the first time Hawaii will be represented by a non-Asian American since 1974. (See “Governor and Lieutenant Governor” for more details.)

U.S. House of Representatives

All Asian Pacific American incumbents in the U.S. House of Representatives won their re-election bids, including the late Rep. Patsy Mink, who passed away just weeks before the election.

With Del. Robert Underwood (D-Guam) having left the Congress for a bid at governor of Guam and Patsy Mink’s death, the total number of Asian Pacific Americans in the 108th Congress will be seven.


Colorado Congressional-hopeful Stan Matsunaka, a Democrat, lost his bid against fellow State Sen. Marilyn Musgrave, a Republican. Matsunaka, who is the state senate president, had 42 percent of the vote to Musgrave’s 55 percent. Matsunaka was the best bet for an additional Asian Pacific American in the U.S. Congress. As the Colorado State Senate president, Matsunaka enjoyed wide name
recognition and a fund-raising advantage over Musgrave. He was known for appealing to Republican voters with centrist views on the issues, which was supposed to help him again in the newly created district, which included a large population of Republicans.

Meanwhile, in the Hawaiian race for the U.S. House of Representatives, the late Democrat Patsy Mink won her race posthumously against Republican Bob McDermott. A special election took place 30 November to choose a successor for the remaining few weeks of Mink's current term, then a second special election took place 4 January to elect a new representative for the full two-year term. Republican Ed Chase came out victorious in both elections.

In the race for U.S. delegate in Guam, Democrat Madeleine Z. Bordallo bested Republican Joseph F. Ada, 26,144 to 14,346.

Although incumbent Delegate Eni Faleomavaega prevailed in a three-way race in American Samoa, he failed to capture the required “50 percent plus one” vote. Faleomavaega split votes between two Republican opponents: Daniel Langkilde Fagafaga (32 percent) and Amata Coleman Aumua (27 percent). In the run-off election, Faleomavaega defeated Fagafaga for a second time. It is Faleomavaega’s eighth Congressional term, four of which were won in run-off elections.

**Governor and Lieutenant Governor**

In the minority-majority state of Hawaii, the question was whether the governor’s mansion would continue to be occupied by an Asian Pacific American named Mazie Hirono or whether Linda Lingle would pull off a historic victory. In the end, Lingle pulled off a stunning defeat that added to the Republican landslide that swept the country.

Since it became a state in 1959, the Hawaiian governor has always been a male. But this year’s election witnessed the arrival of the state’s first female governor. With a rocky economy, many Hawaiians called for change in government. While Democrats believed the passing of Rep. Patsy T. Mink in September would mobilize the strong Democratic voter base in Hirono’s favor, their estimations were off as Lingle bested Hirono by a solid margin of 17,362 votes.

In Guam, the heated governor’s race ended with Republican Felix Camacho and his running mate, Kaleo Moylan, winning the election. They defeated Democrat U.S. Del. Robert Underwood and his running mate, Sen. Tom Ada. Underwood, who gave up his seat as U.S. delegate to run for governor, was the former chair of the Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus.

**State Senate and State House of Representatives**

The bulk of state senate candidates were in Hawaii, where State Senate President Robert “Bobby” Bunda was uncontested, and Honolulu City Councilmember Jon Yoshimura lost his bid.

Minnesota State Senators Satveer Chaudhary (DFL-50) and Mee Moua (DFL-67) easily won re-election. Moua was elected in a special election nine months ago
to replace Sen. Randy Kelly, who was elected mayor of St Paul. This is Moua’s first full-term.

In Washington, Democrat Yvonne Kinoshita Ward, who ran for state senator against incumbent Republican Pam Roach, was narrowly defeated. However, State Sen. Paul H. Shin easily won his re-election for a second term.

In Texas, educator and former Houston City Councilmember Martha Wong bested twenty-two-year Democratic incumbent Debra Danberg in the race for the State House of Representatives (Dist. 134). With Republican Governor Rick Perry campaigning by her side, Wong managed to defeat a crowded field of fellow Republicans in the primary earlier this year. The newly redrawn 134th district was created to give Danberg a difficult re-election bid. Wong, a native Houstonian and second generation Chinese American, is the first APA woman to be elected to the state house in Texas.

Even after her opponent made racist comments about her, Iowa Democrat Swati Dandekar defeated Republican Karen Balderston in the race for the State House of Representatives (Dist. 36). In a recent e-mail message to a political action committee, Balderston questioned Dandekar’s competency because she is an Indian American:

“Without having had the growing-up experience in Iowa, complete with the intrinsic basics of Midwest American life, how is this person adequately prepared to represent Midwest values and core beliefs, let alone understand and appreciate the constitutional rights guaranteed to us in writing by our Founding Fathers? (not her Founding Fathers) [sic],” Balderston wrote in the e-mail.

Although Dandekar emigrated from India, she has been an Iowa resident for more than thirty years.

“Will a person raised to function in the upper caste of India, the most repressive form of discrimination on the planet, be able to shed such repressivist views and fully and effectively represent the citizens of House District 36?” asked Balderston in an interview with The Gazette of Cedar Rapids.

At the young age of 30, Hmong American community leader Cy Thao is the newest addition to the State House of Representatives, District 65A. He won with close to 80 percent of the vote. He did not face an incumbent, because Andy Dawkins (DFL) was not running for re-election. Thao will be one of the youngest legislators in the state house.

Even with an open seat, Republican Geny Del Rosario lost her bid for the state assembly, district 34. Del Rosario, a travel agency owner and education activist, had the strong backing of the local GOP in her quest to represent this northwest Las Vegas district. She also ran unsuccessfully in 2000.

Other State, Municipal and Local Offices

Incumbent John Chiang was declared the winner in the race for California’s State Board of Equalization, fourth district. Chiang garnered 64 percent of the vote, while challenger Tom Santos lost his bid in district 2.
New Yorker Doris Ling-Cohan made history this election cycle with her election to the New York state supreme court. With her unanimous vote in the Democratic Party convention in September, she is the first Asian Pacific American woman to serve on the state's second-highest bench.

In San Francisco's only majority Asian Pacific American district for the board of supervisors, four Asian Pacific American candidates were on the ballot. Only Fiona Ma was able to capture enough votes to force a run-off election with Ron Dudum. The district, referred to as “Sunset District,” has an Asian Pacific American population of 53 percent. In the end, Ma won the run-off race for San Francisco supervisor against Dudum.

In the race for the Alameda County board of supervisors (Calif.), incumbent Alice Lai-Bitker was attacked on several occasions earlier this year. Her opponent, Alameda Mayor Ralph Appenzatto (who died in September before the general election), distributed two pieces of campaign literature that were racist, xenophobic, and offensive.

One item was headlined, “What Color Is Your Supervisor?” and featured photos of the entire board of supervisors, two of whom are African American, two Caucasian, and one Asian Pacific American. To add insult to injury, the second piece of campaign literature contained a long list of contributors with predominantly Asian surnames and stated, "Alice Lai-Bitker has taken $56,000 in campaign contributions from special interests outside our community." And at the bottom of the flyer? The words “Us vs. Them.”

While the critically acclaimed spiritualist Deepak Chopra enjoys worldwide fame and stardom, it was not enough for him to win a city council seat in his hometown of Monte Sereno, Calif. Meanwhile, City Councilmember Alicia Ping easily won her re-election in Saline, Mich.

After a failed primary bid in a race for the California State Assembly earlier in the year, political veteran Christopher Cabaldon won and regained a seat on the West Sacramento city council. Cabaldon has previously served as the city’s mayor and city councilmember.

Conclusion

In the high-stakes environment of elections, the competition is fierce. But as more and more Asian Pacific Americans file their candidacies, the community needs to be more vocal about any and all iniquitous, racist attacks. Leaders ought to draw attention to these cases and hold the perpetrating candidates and their campaign staff accountable for their actions.

In fact, if they don’t already have them, boards of elections throughout the country ought to create rules and laws that forbid such actions. More importantly, they should have the courage to enforce these laws and impose sanctions on violators. That’s the only way to send a clear message that race baiting is wrong and erodes the very fabric of our democracy.

But if campaign spin-meisters are concocting these plans, it’s only because they know that they will work with voters, especially Caucasian voters who still com-
prise the vast majority of the voting population in America. And that’s the saddest part of all. These campaigns are only preying on the fears that already exist in these voters. So it is up to minority communities to educate their population on the issues, register more of them to vote and get them to the polls on election day. Until that happens, campaigns will continue to pander to the one group of homogeneous voters they’ve relied on for years—leaving minority communities out of the picture.
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The Politics of Language: Bilingual Education Review

PJ Gagajena

The bilingual education debate resurfaced in November 2002 with Colorado defeating the anti-bilingual education measure, 55 percent to 45 percent, while Massachusetts overwhelmingly passing its version, 68 percent to 32 percent. Colorado's anti-bilingual education measure, Amendment 31, was heavily financed by proponents and planned to create a one-year immersion program. Opponents who won the campaign argued that it would force school children to speak English in the classroom without adequate training. Massachusetts's Question 2 also proposed a one-year program and succeeded due to a conservative wave across the state that led to Republican Mitt Romney's gubernatorial victory. Both were surprise outcomes considering a very conservative state like Colorado and a liberal state such as Massachusetts.

The public discourse on bilingual education has risen in recent years, particularly with the passage of anti-bilingual education initiatives such as Proposition 227 in California (1998) and Proposition 203 in Arizona (2000). Both were financed by Silicon Valley entrepreneur Ron Unz, who also led the campaigns in Colorado and Massachusetts.

A growing English-only movement is eliminating all multi-year bilingual education programs with a one-year English immersion curriculum. There is serious debate on the development of children in English language proficiency, particularly for Asian Pacific Islander Americans, who constitute a population with more than three hundred languages and dialects spoken among thirty-four ethnic groups. Bilingual education supporters argue that the Unz campaign violates the Lau vs. Nichols, a 1974 U.S. Supreme Court ruling mandating that schools provide students with "a meaningful opportunity to participate in the public educational program."

PJ Gagajena is a Master in Public Policy and Urban Planning candidate at the John F. Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University. He was born in the Philippines, raised in Torrance, Calif., and received a Bachelors of Arts degree in political science and Asian American studies from the University of California, Los Angeles. He is passionate about economic development and minority politics, and enjoys fiction and nonfiction writing.
With immigrants comprising more than half of the Asian Pacific Islander American population, the debate on bilingual education continues to be one of the most important policies affecting Asian Pacific Islander Americans.
**CENSUS 2000 AND ASIAN & PACIFIC ISLANDER AMERICANS**

**BASIC FACTS**

The U.S. Total, Multiracial, and Hispanic Populations

Number of respondents and percentage of total population for the Total, Multiracial, and Hispanic populations. “Multiracial” respondents are those who marked more than one race in response to the Census 2000 question “What is this person’s race?” The federal government considers Hispanic origin separate from Race. Those of Hispanic origin could be of any race.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population Category</th>
<th>TOTAL POPULATION</th>
<th>Single Race</th>
<th>Two or More Races (Multiracial)</th>
<th>Hispanic or Latino</th>
<th>Not Hispanic or Latino</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of TOTAL POPULATION</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>97.6%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Respondents</td>
<td>281,421,906</td>
<td>274,595,578</td>
<td>6,826,228</td>
<td>35,305,818</td>
<td>246,116,089</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Percentage rounds to 0.0

The Size of U.S. Race Populations

Range in number of respondents & percentage of 2000 U.S. total population of each race category, depending on inclusion of Multiracial data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population Category</th>
<th>Single Race</th>
<th>Single Race Plus Multiracial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Respondents</td>
<td>% of TOTAL POPULATION</td>
<td>Number of Respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>10,242,998</td>
<td>61.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian &amp; Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>398,835</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian &amp; Alaska Native</td>
<td>2,475,956</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Other Race</td>
<td>15,350,073</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>34,658,190</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>211,400,026</td>
<td>75.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Percentage rounds to 0.0

States and Areas With Largest Populations of Asian Americans and Pacific Islander Americans

The charts below show where most single-race Asian and Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander Americans (NHOPi or Pacific Islanders) reside. The first chart includes data on the top 10 states with the largest Asian American population, and Asian Americans in the Western States. The second chart includes the top 10 states with the largest NHOPi population. Each set of states is listed from largest to smallest population.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top 10 States</th>
<th>% of Asian Americans</th>
<th>Number of Asian Americans</th>
<th>% of NHOPi</th>
<th>Number of NHOPi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. California</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
<td>3,697,512</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>116,961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. New York</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>1,044,076</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>113,529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Texas</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>562,219</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>23,953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Hawaii</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>503,668</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>15,145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. New Jersey</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>480,276</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>14,454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Illinois</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>423,003</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>8,816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Washington</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>322,338</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>8,626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Florida</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>266,256</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>8,426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Virginia</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>261,025</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>7,597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Massachusetts</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>238,124</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>6,733</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Percentage rounds to 0.0

NHOPI = "Native Hawaiians & Other Pacific Islanders"
### The Size of U.S. Asian Sub-Populations
Asians are persons "having origins in any of the original peoples of the Far East, Southeast Asia, or the Indian subcontinent." The Asian population ranges from 3.6% to 4.2% of the total U.S. population, 14% of all "Asians" are Multiracial.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population Category</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>% of Total Asian (Single Race) Population</th>
<th>% of TOTAL POPULATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>261,421,906</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian (Single Race)</td>
<td>10,242,998</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>2,432,585</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>1,280,314</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Indian</td>
<td>1,078,765</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>1,122,502</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>1,076,872</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>756,700</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Asian</td>
<td>1,285,234</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian (Multiracial)</td>
<td>1,055,839</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Percentage rounds to 0.0

1 Other Asian alone, or two or more Asian categories

### The Size of U.S. Native Hawaiian & Other Pacific Islander Sub-Populations
Native Hawaiians and Pacific Islanders are persons "having origins in any of the original peoples of Hawaii, Guam, Samoa, or other Pacific Islands." The Native Hawaiian & Other Pacific Islander population ranges from 0.1% to 0.3% of the total U.S. population. 54% of all "Native Hawaiian & Other Pacific Islanders" are Multiracial.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population Category</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>% of Total Native Hawaiian &amp; Other Pacific Islander (Single Race) Population</th>
<th>% of TOTAL POPULATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>261,421,906</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian &amp; Other Pacific Islander (Single Race)</td>
<td>398,835</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian</td>
<td>140,652</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoan</td>
<td>92,029</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guamanian or Chamorro</td>
<td>58,240</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>108,914</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian &amp; Other Pacific Islander (Multiracial)</td>
<td>475,579</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Percentage rounds to 0.0

1 Other Native Hawaiian & Other Pacific Islander alone, or two or more Native Hawaiian & Other Pacific Islander categories

### Leading Categories of Multiracial Asian and Native Hawaiians & Other Pacific Islanders
Over half of Multiracial Asians are "Asian and White." Many Multiracial Pacific Islanders are "Asian," "White," and both "Asian" & "White."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population Category</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>% of Each Multiracial Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial Asian Americans</td>
<td>1.7 million</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian and White</td>
<td>868,000</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian and Some Other Race</td>
<td>249,000</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian and Native Hawaiian &amp; Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>139,000</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian and Black or African American</td>
<td>107,000</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial Native Hawaiian &amp; Other Pacific Islanders</td>
<td>476,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian &amp; Other Pacific Islanders and Asian</td>
<td>139,000</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian &amp; Other Pacific Islanders and White</td>
<td>113,000</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian &amp; Other Pacific Islanders and Asian and White</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Percentage rounds to 0.0

---

LEAP, Leadership Education for Asian Pacifics, Inc., (LEAP) is a national nonprofit community-based organization founded in 1982 with a mission to achieve full participation and equality for Asian Pacific Americans through leadership, empowerment, and policy. Reprinted with permission.
APA Web sites: AAPR’s Picks for the Year’s Best

Igoo

www.igoo.com

Igoo.com is a lifestyle Web site for Gen-X/Y Korean Americans providing light and in-depth commentaries on relationships, career, and the community. With a quick, free registration, you can access a multitude of diverse viewpoints that comprise the bulk of the site’s content. The chat room and discussion pages are the most widely used in the Korean American cyber-community. If you want to have your finger on the pulse of twenty- and thirty-something Korean-America, visit the folks at Igoo.

South Asian American Leaders of Tomorrow

www.saalt.org

Bathed in the red, white, and blue of the American flag, the South Asian American Leaders of Tomorrow (SAALT) Web site has both an eye-catching appeal and a user-friendly design. As an organization dedicated to fostering the civic and political engagement of South Asians in the United States, the site’s most useful section is the scrolling breaking news on the front page. As such, SAALT is poised to become a convenient one-stop site for the South Asian American community.

National Asian Pacific American Legal Consortium

www.napalc.org

The National Asian Pacific American Legal Consortium (NAPALC) has perhaps the most comprehensive organizational Web site around. With subject matter links chock full of information on affirmative action, immigration, anti-Asian violence, and much more, NAPALC works to advance APA legal and civil rights on all fronts. If APA advocacy is your calling, start your journey with napalc.org.
Asian Avenue

www.asianavenue.com

Want to flirt with other APAs online? Want to find out about the latest in APA news and entertainment? Asian Avenue magazine is a diverse online resource for young APAs. With an absolutely massive online subscriber base that recently cracked the three million mark, Asian Avenue provides around the clock entertainment with a barrage of diverse and funny viewpoints from Asian American communities around the country.

Model Minority

www.modelminority.com

Put the label we love to hate aside for a moment. Model Minority hardly reinforces the stereotype of docile conformity; on the contrary, it rejects it. Using the “model minority” label as a rallying cry for the APA community, the site’s mission is explicitly “to educate, inform, provoke, and inspire movements by individuals and groups toward Asian American empowerment.” Stocked with the latest news on APA activism in government and the community, it is a great place to learn about Asian Americans in various mediums, as well as submit writings of your own to help inspire others to act...and act now!

Asian Week

www.asianweek.com

Available online or in print, this English language national newsweekly for Asian Pacific Americans has been publishing since 1979 and is the only one of its kind in the United States. Based in San Francisco, the publication aims to “unite the community by chronicling the Asian Pacific American experience and involving Asian Pacific Americans in the democratic process.” You will find stories on Asian Pacific Americans in the national news, arts and entertainment, business, culture, and sports, with a special Bay area news section. The consumer section is only published once a month, but the Asian Week online discussion board can keep you busy in the meantime. For those of you looking to research APA issues of recent years, the archives go back to 1996.
Asian Pacific American Institute for Congressional Studies

www.apaics.org

For all of you hard-core policy wonks out there, don’t worry. AAPR wouldn’t leave you without a review of a policy-lover’s Web site! The APA Institute for Congressional Studies is a great resource for current and future APAs in the political arena. With the latest press releases and stories on Asian American political activity, APAICS is the best way to take ten minutes out of your day to see what our APA political leadership is up to “in the room.” For students and others anxious to throw their hats in the ring, APAICS is a leading resource for information on internships and essential information on how to become involved in governance.

U.S. Census Bureau

www.census.gov/pubinfo/www/apihot1.html

Leisure reading? No. The U.S. Census Bureau’s API site is, however, a research gold mine for students and policy advocates alike. With data on everything from median income levels to fertility, census.gov puts the reader three clicks away from that final factoid or footnote!
Remembering Patsy Mink: An Interview with Herb Lee

Falan Yinug

Patsy Mink served the state of Hawaii in the House of Representatives for twelve terms. She was the first woman of Asian descent to serve in the U.S. Congress.

Mink began her political career in 1956 when she was elected to the Territorial House of Representatives. It was the beginning of a long and noteworthy political life for Patsy Mink. In 1965, six years after Hawaii became the fiftieth state, Mink was elected to the U.S. House of Representatives and began the first of six consecutive terms in office. She was the first woman of color to be elected to Congress. Mink built coalitions for progressive legislation during her tenure in Congress. She introduced the first comprehensive Early Childhood Education Act and authored the Women’s Educational Equity Act.

In the early 1970s, she played a key role in the enactment of Title IX of the Higher Education Act Amendments. Title IX prohibited gender discrimination by federally funded institutions and has become the major tool for women’s fuller participation not only in sports, but in all aspects of education. In 1977, Patsy Mink gave up her House seat to make an unsuccessful run for the U.S. Senate, but in 1990 she was re-elected to the House. She served on a variety of House committees and subcommittees. Patsy Mink passed away in September 2002.

Patsy Mink’s life is the classic story of immigrants seeking a better future in America for themselves and their families. Her four grandparents emigrated from Japan in the late 1800s to work as contract laborers in Maui’s sugar plantations. Mink was born on the island of Maui in December of 1928. She began her unofficial political career when she became student body president during her junior year in high school. In 1944, she graduated as high school class valedictorian. Mink graduated from the University of Hawaii and then the University of Chicago Law School. After obtaining her J.D. in 1951, she returned to Hawaii, where she became the first Asian American woman to practice law in Hawaii.

Over the course of her long and effective political career, Patsy Mink never wavered from her role as a proud, partisan, liberal, feminist Democrat who always

---

Falan Yinug received a Master in Public Policy degree from the John F. Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University in 2003, concentrating in political and economic development.
chose her own path, even when it was a solitary one. For nearly five decades, she advocated for liberal Democratic policies in Hawaii and Washington.

The following is an interview with Mr. Herb Lee, a former employee of Mink's when she worked in local state politics.

**Interview with Herb Lee**

AAPP: Can you tell me what you do now?

LEE: I've had my home business as a private consultant since 1987. So it's been around sixteen years. My specialty is public affairs community involvement, and generally public participation doing dispute resolution, conflict management, things like that.

AAPP: How do you know Patsy?

LEE: I first met Patsy when I was a student at the University of Hawaii back in the late 1970s. She was teaching in the graduate school at the University of Hawaii in the political science department, teaching a course about American politics, and I was a student of hers.

Then, subsequently, after I graduated in 1983, she asked me to come work for her when she got elected to the Honolulu City Council, and eventually she became the chair of the council, and I stayed with her as chief of staff for about four years, until 1987.

AAPP: What was it like to work for her?

LEE: I guess the best way to describe it is, in the four years that I worked with her at the Honolulu City Council, it was like going to graduate school all over again. It was a tremendous learning experience. Of course, she had many years of Congressional experience by then, and in the state legislature. I had a wonderful opportunity to work with an experienced and very seasoned and very principled public official.

I got to know a side of her that probably not many people get to see, both in a professional capacity and as a person. She was a lady of tremendous integrity, very principled, and very driven.

AAPP: In terms of Asian and Pacific Islander community issues, what do you think were her main contributions?

LEE: As you may know, when Patsy was first elected to the Congress in the early 1960s, she was the first woman of Asian ancestry to be elected to the United States Congress. So I think all throughout her life, both in Congress and in public office, she was very much committed to helping minorities in the United States and helping people that were economically disadvantaged.

I think equality was a very big issue for her. As you may know, she was one of the principal authors of the Title IX Congressional legislation, which allowed parity for women to compete in collegiate sports. That opened a whole range of opportunities for many young women over the last twenty-five, thirty years—since
Title IX was first adopted. I think that's probably one of her most significant contributions when she was in Congress.

AAPR: Can you give us a little flavor of what she was like as a person?

LEE: Again, Patsy was somebody that I really, really respected. She had a lot of aloha in her heart for people. She was very close to her family; family was a very important thing to her. She was very intelligent, very articulate, very passionate about public service and passionate about the things that she really fought for and believed in. She was just an amazing lady.

She had a tremendous amount of energy and focus and was able to cut through the heart of issues and try to figure out ways to make things happen. When she got on something and she believed in something, she was relentless. No matter what the obstacles, she just kept driving and driving and driving, and was, again, very passionate. A lot of times she was successful because of her tenacity, coupled of course with her experience.

The side that a lot of people did not see, I think, is the personal side. She, most of her life, was in a fishbowl because she was a public official, but at the same time she had a very private life that, I think, she kept to herself. She surrounded herself with very close friends and family members. As I said, family was very important to her.

AAPR: As a politician, what were her best qualities?

LEE: She was very intelligent, very experienced, and very articulate. There were some occasions when there were some very heated discussions with some of the top leaders on issues regarding federal issues, regarding environmental issues, and she was very, very articulate. Nobody could really get things by her. She was very perceptive, very sharp. I think that kind of sums it up.

AAPR: Can you think of a story that best exemplifies these qualities?

LEE: Patsy was a liberal Democrat. She was very passionate about the Democratic Party. In her term in office at the city council, there was a situation where some of the members of the city council decided during midterm to switch parties. They were Democrats, we had a Republican mayor, and the Republican mayor convinced three of the council members out of nine to switch parties to the Republican Party. And this is in midstream, so to speak. That started a chain of events that ultimately led to a recall of those three council members, which was led by Patsy Mink.

The reason I recall that story is because it really exemplifies her allegiance, her ideal about the importance of principles and being true to your word, true to your constituents. They elected you as a Democrat; you don’t get into office and change parties in midstream and leave your constituents behind without having that opportunity.

As it were, she led this effort that became an island-wide effort that people on both sides got involved with. There were lots of opportunities for her to argue why she felt that these three council members needed to have their decision put back before the people to decide. It was an uphill battle, but she was very persistent
again, and she felt very strongly about it. The Democratic Party backed her up. I
think, ultimately, the people also backed her up, because they, in the end, recalled
all of them. So all of them got thrown out of office as a result of that one decision.
It was because of Patsy’s efforts.

AAPR: What do you think motivated her to keep a career and stay for such a long
time in public service?

LEE: Patsy grew up on the island of Maui at a time in Hawaii’s history where
the agricultural plantations were a predominant part of the economic landscape.
She grew up in a small plantation there. Her father was of Japanese ancestry,
obviously, and he was one of the few Japanese of that era to actually, I think,
receive a college education; he was trained as an engineer. And always, I think,
he instilled in Patsy and her brother a strong sense of the value of education.

When you grow up on a plantation, I think it’s a kind of lifestyle where you
really get to appreciate everything in life and make every dollar work. And you
do without a lot of times. But there were certain things that were important, like
education, things like that. So I think in large part, her background and her
upbringing helped her to develop the kind of values and the passion to provide
opportunities for other people to receive education opportunities and to allow
people to have opportunities, especially people that came from different minority
backgrounds. In Hawaii, we’re basically all minorities.

I think she became a champion based on that kind of upbringing, fighting for the
underdog, fighting for equality, parity, and very passionate about education. In her
life, in her political life, those were, I think, some of the principal things that she
fought for—parity, equality, education, and helping the underdog.

AAPR: What do you think Patsy Mink’s legacy is?

LEE: I think I would answer that in two parts. One is the legacy of the kind of
model that she became for a lot of people personally, like myself. Living life based
on principles, living life based on strong values, and being true to oneself
in everything that you do. No matter what kind of challenges that may lie, if
you’re passionate about something, you have to go after it, and if you know it’s
right, you stand your ground and just do it.

I think from the political side, I think in terms of her legacy, she will be
remembered as a champion for minorities, champion for equal rights, and really
a very strong believer in the democratic system and what the democratic system
can offer to people that come from impoverished economic backgrounds. She
believed that there are many opportunities that can be provided by our system
of government for people of different backgrounds and races and economic status.
And she really paved the way for a lot of the Asian minorities to seek more
opportunities in life in government, and in public service, and in the business
sector, etc. To me, that’s her legacy.

AAPR: Thank you.

LEE: You’re welcome.
The Life and Legacy: A Tribute to Chancellor Chang-Lin Tien, University of California at Berkeley

Wayne Ho

Chang-Lin Tien, the first Asian Pacific American to head a major research university in the United States, died on 29 October 2002 at the age of 67.

In September 2000, Tien was diagnosed with a brain tumor and suffered a debilitating stroke during a diagnostic test. He never regained his health and retired in June 2001.

An internationally renowned engineering scholar and a respected leader in higher education, Tien was the chancellor of the University of California, Berkeley from 1990-1997. Tien faced many challenges during his tenure.

In his first three years, Tien dealt with a fraternity house fire that killed three students, a hostage-taking at a hotel bar in which a gunman killed one student and injured seven others, and an attempted murder by a local activist with a history of mental illness who broke into the chancellor’s on-campus mansion.

In the early 1990s, the California recession caused state funding to the university to decline by $70 million. Tien dedicated himself to keeping UC Berkeley a premier research university by presiding over consecutive years of record private fund raising, raising millions of dollars in donations.

A supporter of civil rights and educational equity, Tien publicly argued in favor of affirmative action when the UC Board of Regents voted to dismantle the system’s race-based admissions policies in 1995. Tien lamented the declining number of underrepresented students admitted to UC Berkeley following the vote.

In a 1996 essay in The New York Times, Tien made his case for affirmative action in university admissions. He wrote, “It would be a tragedy if our nation’s
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colleges and universities slipped backward now, denying access to talented but disadvantaged youth and eroding the diversity that helps to prepare leaders.”

In response to the elimination of affirmative action, Tien launched the Berkeley Pledge. This partnership between UC Berkeley and California’s K-12 public schools aimed to improve the academic performance of underrepresented students and was a model for Education Secretary Richard Riley in the creation of a national program.

Tien’s commitment to justice and equality originated from his own experiences growing up in Asia and studying in the United States. Tien was born in Wuhan, China, on 24 July 1935 and fled to Shanghai during World War II. In 1949, Tien’s family fled to Taiwan after the civil war won by the Communist regime.

After completing his undergraduate education at National Taiwan University, Tien arrived in the United States in 1956 to earn his master’s degree at the University of Louisville. In 1959, he earned a second master’s degree and a doctorate in Mechanical Engineering at Princeton University.

Tien joined the UC Berkeley faculty in 1959. He spent thirty-eight of his forty-year educational career at the university, leaving briefly in 1988 to serve as the executive vice chancellor of UC Irvine. Tien returned to UC Berkeley as chancellor in 1990.

Tien said that his values and ideals were shaped, in part, by the racism and discrimination which he encountered in the United States. He often shared how as a new immigrant, he lived in the segregated South. Tien said that, as a student, he had to stop a professor in Louisville from addressing him as “Chinaman” and that he avoided taking the bus for a whole year because he did not know if he should sit with black people in the back or white people in the front. He also confronted housing restrictions against “Orientals and Negros” in Berkeley in the 1950s and 1960s.

In a 1997 interview with Asian Week, Tien said that these experiences made him sensitive not only to victims of racism but also to all people who suffer disadvantage. “I went through harsh discriminatory experiences… Sometimes it’s hard for other people who never experienced [suffering and discrimination] to understand that deep feeling of commitment toward helping others, so that they don’t have to go through what I went through.”

In 1996, Tien submitted his resignation as chancellor. Feeling that he had accomplished his goals for the university, Tien wanted to spend more time with his family and with students in his lab. Tien has been credited with transforming UC Berkeley from a large, uncaring institution into a more unified, intimate campus.

Also in 1996, Tien was in the running for a presidential Cabinet appointment as energy secretary. His appointment did not materialize after the campaign finance scandal involving Asian money broke. Mochtar Riady, an Indonesian business involved in the scandal, donated $200,000 to UC Berkeley. Riady’s donation was legal, and Tien was never accused of any impropriety, but there was speculation that their connection ruined Tien’s chances to join the Clinton Cabinet.

Tien admitted to Asian Week, “Actually, I was not so enthusiastic about going to Washington, D.C. My family has been living in Berkeley for the last thirty-six-
some-odd years. But on the other hand, I certainly feel a responsibility if the community feels that we need an Asian American visible in the Cabinet.”

In recognition of Tien’s commitment and service to the university, UC Berkeley founded the Chang-Lin Tien Center for East Asian Studies in April 2001.

During his career, Tien earned international recognition for his seminal work in thermal sciences. He worked on the Saturn rocket boosters in the 1960s and helped solve problems with the space shuttle’s insulating tiles and with the nuclear reactor meltdown at Three Mile Island in the late 1970s.

Tien earned many honors, including the National Academy of Engineering’s highest honor, the NAE Founders Award, in September 2001. The Hong Kong government recently gave Tien its highest award, the Grand Bauhinia Medal, for service to the territory. Tien was also the first recipient of the UC Presidential Medal and received the Harvard Foundation Award from Harvard University.

Tien held twelve honorary doctorates, including degrees from universities in China, Hong Kong, and Canada. He was an honorary professor of the fifteen leading universities in China and received from the UC Regents the prestigious title of university professor for all ten UC campuses. One unique honor was when the Zijin Mountain Observatory in China named a newly discovered asteroid “Tienchanglin.”

While chancellor, Tien was also an unofficial diplomat in Asia, meeting with heads of state including Chinese President Jiang Zemin and Taiwan President Lee Teng-hui. He helped found the Committee of 100, a nonpartisan group of prominent Chinese Americans that promotes dialogue and understanding between the United States and China. Last year, the committee presented Tien with its Inspiration Award.

Tien was committed to the Asian Pacific American community. He served on the boards of many organizations, including the Asia Foundation, the Organization of Chinese Americans, and the Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus Institute. As a naturalized U.S. citizen, Tien said that he was grateful to be an American, but that he was also proud to be Chinese.

Tien acknowledged, “Many people regard me as kind of a visible role model for Asian Americans. And because of that, I do feel a sense of obligation and responsibility to [the Asian Pacific American community].”

Tien is survived by his wife, Di-Hwa; a son, Norman; two daughters, Phyllis and Christine; and four grandchildren.
Book Review: Everybody Was Kung Fu Fighting


Forget what they say about not judging a book by its cover. Because with Vijay Prashad’s book, *Everybody Was Kung Fu Fighting*, the cover doesn’t misrepresent in the least. A clenched fist, bathed in red and yellow, ka-pows its way off the page, reminiscent of the pulp comics of the 1940s. And the promise is audaciously clear. This will be a book that hits you head-on, that will be confrontational and radical from the start.

Prashad, an associate professor of International Studies at Trinity College and longtime activist, lays out a well-researched and provocative argument in this slim collection of essays. He selectively elaborates upon five centuries of cultural and political history to emphasize the ties Asians and Africans have built throughout their shared struggles against racial and colonial oppression. The author also uses these narratives to explore a new paradigm of race “polyculturalism”—a paradigm rooted not in diversity, but in antiracism. Prashad scathingly attacks color blindness, which asks us to ignore race, and multiculturalism, which asks us to grudgingly tolerate our diversity. Both treat cultures as bounded, pure entities; in reality, our histories overlap far more than we imagine, as Prashad convincingly demonstrates throughout the book. So, the author joins NYU historian Robin D.G. Kelley in calling for a new, polycultural vision, one where difference is critically and bravely engaged, rather than ignored.

Prashad is perhaps most sympathetic of those who use arguments of “authenticity” as a way to find value in their own oppressed cultures. This authenticity refers

---
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to the distinctive behaviors that represent the “core” of a cultural community. And yet, Prashad argues, “Authenticity may be a useful strategic way to frame fights to gain resources… [but] the trap of authenticity is set against the antiracist struggle. For culture to have an authentic core undermines our ability to articulate the intertwined cultural histories and struggles that are our legacy” (64).

Prashad frames his book as both a personal and political endeavor, a “search for a new skin.” He seeks, as an American immigrant born in India, to elucidate and rebuild lost connections between these two communities, in the hopes that his exercise will point the way for others to engage in the same practice of diving into histories to find interwoven pasts. He specifically chooses the Asian and African communities “not only because they are important to [him], but because they have long been pitted against each other as the model versus the undesirable” (x). The book, then, is not only a celebration of these groups but also a forceful refusal to validate the cultural chasm that supposedly exists between them. Instead, Prashad shows they are peoples who have long stood in solidarity.

His essays, starting in the trading world of Vasco da Gama and then quickly moving across space and time, consist of variations around this central theme of solidarity and shared traditions, even in the face of conflict and difference. Yet, the narratives also tend to be nuanced and well articulated. Together, they point to the lasting solidarities between African and Asian peoples and to the potential to see these same sorts of connections between all peoples. He startlingly locates Asian activists like Ashima Takis and Haridas Mazumdar in the movements of African American leaders Marcus Garvey, Frederick Douglass, and W.E.B. DuBois. And whether shedding light on Korean merchants in South Central Los Angeles, Indian “coolie” farm laborers in the Caribbean, or the ties between Bruce Lee and rap music, Prashad intimately and critically engages the reader’s traditional understanding of cultural history.

In the foreword, Prashad notes that “the task of the historian is not to carve out the lineages but to make sense of how people live culturally dynamic lives. Polyculturalism is a ferocious engagement with the political world of culture, a painful embrace of the skin and all its contradictions” (xii). Though many of his passages lurch between centuries and locales in an awkward attempt to link disparate traditions, by the end, it seems as if Prashad is largely successful in this task.

And yet, after reading the book, I still am not sure what I can do in action to become antiracist, rather than merely a proponent of diversity. Is it as simple, or difficult, as understanding the interweaving of historical traditions? And, as importantly, what do antiracist and/or polycultural policies look like? This is difficult for color-blind and multicultural proponents to define; for the polycultural policymaker, I imagine it will be even messier. Hopefully, then, Prashad will continue to guide our way. In the meantime, I suppose we must be satisfied with this beginning. After all, “this is a movement book, so move along”
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