

The State of Asian American Studies and
Latino Studies at Princeton
A Report by Princeton Latinos y Amigos and the
Princeton Asian American Students Association



April 3, 2015

Table of Contents

I. Introduction	3
II. Executive Summary	3
III. Proposal	4
IV. The History of Latino Studies and Asian American Studies at Princeton	5
V. The Current Status of Asian American Studies and Latino Studies at Princeton	8
VI. Why and How the University Should Expand its Support for Asian American Studies and Latino Studies	10

Authors

Briana Christophers '17
 Nicole Gonzalez '16
 Andrew Hahn '17
 Cailin Hong '17
 Evan Kratzer '16
 Michelle Mui '16
 Emily Tu '16
 Rebecca Weng '18
 Nicholas Wu '18
 Linda Zhong '15
 Special thanks to Arlene Gamio '18

I. Introduction

This report aims to express student interest in and support for the development of ethnic studies at Princeton University. In commemoration of the 20th anniversary of the Ethnic Studies Sit-In of Nassau Hall conducted by seventeen undergraduate students in April 1995, the report provides a history of the University's investment in ethnic studies and updates on the current status of Latino studies and Asian American studies at the University. We seek to articulate the challenges currently confronted by Asian American studies and Latino studies, discuss the implications of the University's inconsistent support, and offer suggestions on what would be the best approach to improving these areas of study to benefit research, students, faculty, and the institution as a whole. The report promotes and contributes to continued conversation about Latino studies and Asian American studies, and calls upon the University to house both of these programs in the Program in American Studies and increase resources for the Program in American Studies to make Asian American and Latino studies at Princeton robust and more sustainable.

II. Executive Summary

Our report has four sections: our proposal; a chronicle of the development of Latino studies and Asian American studies at Princeton; an examination of the current Program in Latino Studies and the status of Asian American studies, which does not have a program; and an explanation of why we believe the growth of ethnic studies is vital to the university's status as a leading research institute. It is this history of ethnic studies at Princeton and the programs' current stagnation that drives us to suggest filling this gap in Princeton's curriculum.

In the history of Latino studies and Asian American studies at Princeton, we detail the student-led effort for these programs that stretches back four decades to the 1970s. Unfortunately this history is a story of constant stalling on the part of the University, with the most minimal steps taken forward whenever possible. Often times this stalling has frustrated students, and at no time was this frustration more apparent than during the 1995 sit-in of Nassau Hall, the twentieth anniversary of which this report marks. Despite this sit-in, the protestors outside Nassau Hall, and the hundreds of signatures in support of creating tenure-track faculty positions in Asian American studies and Latino studies, there was still no progress for Asian American Studies until 2000, when a professor was hired, and little sustained progress for Latino Studies until 2009 when the Program in Latino Studies was created. Since the 2000s, however, progress for both programs has slowed down.

As evidence of this, we ask you to consider the current status of Asian American studies and Latino studies. First, an Asian American studies program does not exist. This is despite continued urging by the Asian American Students Association and the Asian American Alumni Association of Princeton (A4P), as well as acknowledgement by leading administrators that Asian American studies is a program that ought grow on campus. As for Latino studies, while ostensibly a program exists, it needs more faculty and more courses. Currently, the Program in Latino studies is short on resources, requiring it to cross-list a large number of its courses with the Program in Latin American studies and preventing the Program in Latino studies from offering courses that focus on Latino-specific topics. This is troubling considering the philosophical distinctions between Latin American studies, a field of *regional* studies, and Latino studies, a field of *ethnic* studies.

The disappointing status of these two fields of study is a major blemish on Princeton's record as a leading research and liberal arts institution. Without robust programs in both of these fields, the University is falling behind its peer institutions, such as Stanford, Columbia, and Penn, who have had such programs for over two decades. Asian American studies and Latino studies provide rich opportunities for research, for graduate study, and for academic careers. By not ensuring the development of these two fields of study Princeton is missing out on an opportunity to produce some of the nation's top research and scholars who will provide invaluable insight into our society as the United States becomes an increasingly diverse and globalized nation. In many ways this increased diversity also hits back home, and ties into Princeton's current focus on increasing diversity on our own campus. Ethnic studies programs bring the opportunity to hire diverse faculty who bring a range of diverse perspectives to campus. This diversity of perspective is key if Princeton hopes to create an inclusive atmosphere not only outside the classroom, but within it too.

But institutionally, strengthening these fields of study has run into many problems. As such we propose that Latino studies and Asian American studies be based in the Program in American Studies, as many of the university's peer institutions have applied this model. Critically, this will ensure that faculty hiring, the key means by which the University can improve its communities in Asian American studies and Latino studies, will be controlled by the academic program that wants to build a strong forum that will give voice to diverse perspectives about America. The details of this recommendation we provide in the proposal below.

III. Proposal

We call on the Princeton University administration to implement the following steps:

1. Merge the Program in Latino Studies with the Program in American Studies.
 - a. Provide undergraduates who wish to study Latino studies or Asian American studies with courses primarily focused on Latino studies or Asian American studies listed within the Program in American Studies, and with the option to declare a track in these fields of study within the American Studies undergraduate certificate program.
 - b. List all Latino studies courses and Asian American studies courses under two distinct three-letter subject headings in the course catalog.
2. Provide the Program in American Studies the necessary space, administrative staff, and faculty hiring lines to sustain continued development of Latino studies and Asian American studies research capacity, graduate programs, and undergraduate programs.
 - a. Allow the Program in American Studies to have two faculty hiring lines and one additional administrative staff member by the end of the fall semester of AY 2015-2016.
 - b. Provide the Program in American Studies with additional funding as necessary to support these additional faculty and administrative hires and to fund an increase in University research, talks by outside faculty, and other related academic programming in Asian American studies and Latino studies.

IV. The History of Latino Studies and Asian American Studies at Princeton

From the beginning, the push for ethnic studies at the University had a dedicated and formidable student force behind it. Beginning in the 1970s, Asian American and Latino students initiated and, in some cases, led, seminars addressing issues of political identity—issues they felt had been ignored by the University’s traditional offerings. Examples of these seminars include one on the position of Asian American women in society and one on the history and politics of Puerto Rico, the histories of which are recorded by Helen Zia ’73 and Sonia Sotomayor ’76 in their books respectively.¹ For these classes, strong student involvement was vital to demonstrating undergraduate interest and ensuring the creation of academic spaces that fostered dialogue on the unique experiences of so-called “hyphenated Americans.”

Ethnic studies only continued to grow: 1978 marked the arrival of the first course in Asian American studies in the University’s history and by the 1980s, courses in both Asian American and Latino topics appeared on the University registrar.² Still, course offerings were inconsistent and lacked an academic home without an associated department or certificate program. In 1982, the Ad Hoc Committee on Chicano/Boricua Studies submitted a proposal to the American Studies Program for a permanent seminar series, followed by a request to President William Bowen *58 for monies to “fund the establishment of courses and faculty to educate the University regarding the Latino experience in the U.S.” and periodically meet with Latino students on campus.³ The work of these students and the collaboration of the administration culminated in the creation of a Latino Task Force and three Latino Professorships between 1986 and 1991.⁴

Meanwhile, Students for Asian American Studies formed in 1988 and would lead the parallel student initiative for creation of a program in Asian American studies.⁵ They too created a task force that submitted a report calling upon the administration to develop Asian American studies that was released in 1993.⁶ The report was followed by an open letter to the Board of Trustees calling for the creation of a tenure-track position in Asian American studies in 1994.⁷

Throughout 1994 and the spring of 1995, students from the Asian American and Latino task forces independently met with various stakeholders in the administration including President Harold Shapiro *64, various department heads, and the incoming director of the Program in American

¹ Helen Zia, *Asian American Dreams: The Emergence of an American People*, (New York, NY: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2000), 19; Sonia Sotomayor, *My Beloved World*, (New York, NY: Knopf, 2013), 150.

² Stanley Kwong, former director of the Princeton Third World Center, interview by Cailin Hong, December 18, 2013.

³ “Report to President Bowen on the status of Latinos,” May 2, 1985.

⁴ Association of Latino Princeton Alumni, “Latino/a Studies Program History,” accessed March 17, 2015, <http://www.princetonlatinos.com/dynamic.asp?id=LSPHistory>.

⁵ Darryl D. Chiang, “The Princeton University Asian American Students Association: A History and Analysis,” (Term Paper, Asian American Studies Seminar, Princeton University, 1990), 6.

⁶ Asian American Student Task Force, “Preliminary Proposals and Recommendations on Issues Related to the Princeton University Community,” March 26, 1993.

⁷ “An Open Letter to the Princeton University Board of Trustees from the Asian American Student Task Force,” April 16, 1994.

Studies about the development of a program in Asian American studies and Latin American studies, respectively.⁸

Despite the persistence of the student organizers, the initial accommodations offered by the University failed to bring into fruition actual certificate programs as requested. Of the three Latino professors hired as a result of the task force, only one, Jorge Klor de Alva, actually taught about Latino topics. He left Princeton in 1994.⁹ Professor James T.C. Liu, a historian of Song Dynasty China and not Asian America, taught the 1985 course "HIS 410: Asians in America," which would be the last course in Asian American history offered by a University professor until Professor Beth Lew-Williams' course this spring.¹⁰

In light of the minimal progress made by the University, on April 20, 1995, seventeen undergraduate protesters broke into President Shapiro's office at One Nassau Hall to call for the creation of programs in ethnic studies. The diverse group of Asian, Latino, African American, Caucasian, and mixed-race students were supported by twenty protesters who simultaneously gathered outside Nassau Hall and 548 students, faculty, and staff who signed a petition to create tenure-track faculty positions in Latino and Asian American studies.¹¹ In response, the following day Provost Stephen Goldfeld released a letter to the protestors articulating the University's goal to make "2 to 4 faculty appointments which will be directed to Latino and Asian American studies."¹²

The year after the sit-in, student enthusiasm remained strong. Over a hundred students attended a rally outside Nassau Hall to commemorate the events of the previous year and reassert their ongoing interest in ethnic studies.¹³ Faculty changes, however, were prolonged and incremental. Professor Patricia Fernandez-Kelly joined Princeton's sociology department as a lecturer in 1997, but her Asian American studies counterpart, Grace Hong, was not hired by the English Department until 2000. A lack of support would prompt Hong to leave within several years, and she now is based at UCLA, which boasts the largest program in Asian American studies in the country. Princeton's stunted growth during this period is highly disappointing, especially considering that both of these

⁸ Okiyoshi Takeda, "One Year After the Sit-In: Asian American Students' Identities and Their Support for Asian American Studies." *Journal of Asian American Studies* 4, no. 2 (2001): 150; Association of Latino Princeton Alumni, "Latino/a Studies Program History."

⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰ Students for Asian American Studies, "Key Events in the Struggle for Asian American Studies at Princeton," date unknown. <https://asamatprinceton.files.wordpress.com/2014/04/asian-american-studies-timeline-1985-1996.pdf>.

¹¹ See: Okiyoshi Takeda, "One Year After the Sit-In: Asian American Students' Identities and Their Support for Asian American Studies," 151; Eric Emmons, "Protesters Call for Creation of Courses in Ethnic Studies," *The Daily Princetonian*, April 21, 1995, 1; "Princeton University Petition for Asian American and Latino Studies," <https://asamatprinceton.files.wordpress.com/2014/04/1995-petition.pdf>.

¹² Stephen Goldfeld, letter to 1995 sit-in protesters, April 21, 1995, <https://asamatprinceton.files.wordpress.com/2014/04/promise-to-hire-asam-faculty.pdf>.

¹³ Christine Whelan, "Protesters Reunite for Ethnic Studies: Anniversary Draws 100," *The Daily Princetonian*, April 23, 1996, 1.

fields of study were by this point firmly established at such peer institutions as Stanford,¹⁴ Columbia,¹⁵ and the University of Pennsylvania.¹⁶

The failure of the University to hire a robust faculty contingency to support the creation of programs in Asian American studies or Latino studies sparked the growth of a movement in the mid-2000s. In 2007, several student groups—including Acción Latina, Ballet Folklórico de Princeton, CAUSA, Chicano Caucus and the Latino Graduate Students Association—joined under the title of the Latino Coalition of Princeton. Together they published a Report on the Status of Latino/as at Princeton University in September 2007 that highlighted the current status of the University with regards to Latino/as in representation, academics and campus life, and gave recommendations on how to improve this status.¹⁷ One main recommendation was to “begin immediate discussions between University administration, faculty, and students on a plan for the incorporation of a Latino Studies Program at Princeton University.” Then in 2008, alumni began calling upon administrators to stay true to their word and create the two programs in two separate petitions with signatures totaling over 700, echoing the requests students had made over the past three decades.¹⁸

This activism and the work of several faculty members at the University led to the creation of the Program in Latino Studies in 2009.¹⁹ It took an additional five years for any work to begin formally developing Asian American studies at Princeton. But the history of the relationship between Princeton University and these two fields of study reveals that for decades the University moved slowly to build Latino studies and Asian American studies. This delay was despite the constant urging of the Princeton University community and the movement of the academic community—Princeton peer institutions in particular—to accept these two fields as critical components of any liberal arts institution’s curriculum. Indeed, the 2000s in many ways could be seen as a period during which the University backtracked on progress it had made developing these fields as Professor Hong left Princeton and the growth of an academic community in Latino studies stagnated. It is this history that convinces us of the need to ensure consistent strong growth in these two fields so that Princeton does not backtrack once again, but rather becomes a leading institution for research in these two fields of study. To articulate our exact concerns with the current development of Latino and Asian American studies, we now turn to an analysis of the current status of these programs.

¹⁴ Asian American Studies, Stanford University, <http://aas.stanford.edu/>; Chicana/o-Latina/o Studies, Stanford University, <http://chs.stanford.edu/>.

¹⁵ About Us, Columbia University Center for the Study of Ethnicity and Race, <http://www.columbia.edu/cu/cser/about.html>.

¹⁶ Asian American Studies Program, University of Pennsylvania, <http://asam.sas.upenn.edu/>.

¹⁷ Latino Coalition of Princeton, “Report on the Status of Latino/as at Princeton University.” *Chicano Caucus, Princeton University*, September 2007. http://www.princeton.edu/%7Ecaucus/Coalition_Report.pdf.

¹⁸ Aldo Lauria Santiago et. al., letter “Latino Studies at Princeton” to Shirley Tilghman, May 27, 2008, <http://www.princetonlatinos.com/Sites/ALPA/Folders/images/pages/dear%20president%20tilghman-lsp2.pdf>; Princetonians for Asian American Studies, letter “Supporting a Sustainable Program in Asian American Studies at Princeton University” to Shirley Tilghman, December 22, 2008, <https://asamatprinceton.files.wordpress.com/2013/02/asian-american-studies-at-princeton-08-1222.pdf>.

¹⁹ Hyung Lee, “University to Launch New Latino Studies Program,” *The Daily Princetonian*, April 7, 2009, 1.

V. The Current Status of Asian American Studies and Latino Studies at Princeton

Latino Studies

LAO is directed by Professor Marta Tienda and has an executive committee of seven professors and lecturers. The increase in professors for the program has resulted in LAO courses growing larger in number and more varied in subject matter. Five LAO courses are being offered in the spring of 2015, including courses cross-listed with Spanish, Sociology, History, English, the Program in African American Studies, and/or the Program in Latin American Studies. While the variety of courses cross-listed with LAO is a signal of the program's improving health, the continued appearance of courses cross-listed with the Program in Latin American Studies (LAS) makes it difficult to determine how the Program in Latino Studies is different from the one in Latin American Studies. Latino Studies should cultivate a unique emphasis on the growing Latino population of the United States and this population's experiences with ethnicity and race in this country, but often in courses cross-listed with LAS the focus on Latino studies is less apparent. While LAO and LAS have overlap in some parts of their subject matter, a field of regional studies like LAS does not have the same focus on issues faced by Latinos once they are in the United States. In recent years, about half of all Latino Studies courses have been cross-listed with LAS. While the story of Latinos in America is of course heavily tied to migration, the close ties between the two programs risks conflating the differing goals and theoretical contributions of ethnic studies and regional studies. Ethnic studies courses are focused on the experiences of individuals with race, identity, and power in the context of a diverse and often harsh racial landscape. By contrast regional studies focuses on an understanding of a section of the world apart from the United States; regional studies examines the whole of a country and not necessarily the experiences of a few. An analogy here would be apt: no one would conflate the philosophical goals of the Program in African Studies and the Center for African American Studies. It is this kind of theoretical and philosophical distinction that should exist similarly between the Program in Latin American Studies and the Program in Latino Studies.

Yet this has sadly been far from the case at Princeton. While the number of courses offered in the Program in Latino Studies has increased over the past four years, over 41% of the courses (5 of 12 total courses) offered in the 2014-15 year were cross-listed with Latin American studies. Four of the five cross-listed courses placed LAS before LAO in their course numbers, indicating more emphasis is placed on LAS topics in the class. While having cross-listed courses in itself is not the problem, there needs to be an active effort to make sure the Latino studies angle is explored in these classes where it is cross-listed but not the main subject matter of the course. This way cross-listed courses will contribute substantially to a student's understanding of Latino cultures, history and current events.

Asian American Studies

The status of Asian American studies at the University is very easy to describe for a simple reason: Princeton has no program in Asian American studies. In 2013, the Asian American Students Association's Asian American Studies Committee submitted a report to administrators recounting and detailing the state of the field of Asian American studies in comparison to the offerings of the University. As in 1995, these students also met with administrators, including then-Provost Chris Eisgruber '83, to express their concerns. Following this revamped student initiative and the

continued activism of the Asian American Alumni Association of Princeton, 2014 saw renewed progress on Asian American Studies on a scale not before seen at Princeton. A University fundraising campaign raised over \$265,000 for a fund to support Asian American programming, which then inspired other individual funds like the Eric Pai '83 Fund for Asian American Student Research and the Jacquelyn Alexander '84 P14 Fund for Japanese American Studies. Most importantly, the History Department hired Beth Lew-Williams as an Assistant Professor specializing in Asian American history. This was the first hire specifically in Asian American studies that any program at the university had made since the hiring of Grace Hong in 2000 and brought the total number of faculty specializing in Asian American studies to two.²⁰ She is now teaching HIS270/AMS370 Asian American history.

But while this did amount to substantial progress for the program, these recent developments of the past couple of years amount to almost the entirety of the University's infrastructure for Asian American Studies. As mentioned above, there are still only two professors at the University with research interests related to Asian American studies: Beth Lew-Williams and Anne Cheng, Professor of English, American Studies, and African American Studies. There is also no program with associated graduate students that would help to build a larger academic community in Asian American studies. Course offerings are limited. Last semester in the Fall of 2014 there was one course in Asian American studies, MUS 255/EAS 255 Japanese Taiko in Trans-Pacific Perspective.²¹ This spring, there are three courses being taught that interact with the field, one taught each by Professors Cheng and Lew-Williams and one taught by Professor David Leheny, a specialist in Japanese politics who is not a core faculty member in Asian American studies. Though we appreciate that Professor Leheny is taking the time to teach this course, this demonstrates the lack of tenured faculty within the field at Princeton.²²

Summary

The current deficits that exist in both of these programs are readily apparent: Latino Studies as a program is not well differentiated from Latin American studies while Asian American studies still does not have a sufficient number of faculty on campus. By conflating the philosophical goals of ethnic and regional studies, the overlap of LAO and LAS is depriving the University of detailed study of the issue of race and power that should be considered in our understanding of Latinos in America. The absence of faculty in Asian American studies on campus has a wide range of implications, including deficient course offerings, a lack of graduate students, and the overall lack of an academic atmosphere that promotes this field of study. To ensure that there are sufficient courses

²⁰ While it is true that Franklin Odo has taught two courses related to Asian American history (in 1995 and 2013), he taught each as a visiting faculty member and so his courses are not part of the University's consistent offerings in Asian American studies.

²¹ In a previous version of this report, the authors stated that there were no courses offered in Asian American studies during the Fall of 2014. We apologize for this error.

²² In a previous version of this report, the authors stated that Professor Leheny had to be persuaded by the University to teach this course:

...one taught by Professor David Leheny, a specialist in Japanese politics who does not have research interests particularly focused on Asian America. Though we appreciate that Professor Leheny is teaching a course relating to Asian American studies, the fact that the University has had to persuade Professor Leheny to teach this course exposes the lack of professors at the University with interests relating to Asian American studies, particularly in the social sciences.

In fact, Professor Leheny had previously taught a version of this course in 2012 and had intended himself to incorporate Asian American studies content into the course. We apologize for this error.

in each of these fields of study, the University must currently resort to persuading professors to teach courses in these fields in which they do not specialize. This academic model is unsustainable.

As our section on the history of these two fields of study at Princeton shown, the University has a dynamic history related to Asian American studies and Latino studies that stretches back for decades. With recent developments, the University is poised to make tremendous progress and develop the permanent, well-supported programs in these fields that many of our peer institutions have had for twenty years or more. The University must continue to expand rapidly in these fields. Professor Hong's departure a little over a decade ago serves as a reminder that without support, faculty may feel inclined to leave for stronger programs elsewhere and our programs will regress. As such, we strongly urge Princeton to give the Program in American Studies support to develop these fields of study. We detail our reasons why in the section below.

VI. Why and How the University Should Expand its Support for Asian American Studies and Latino Studies

Universities across the country recognize the importance of having strong and well-supported Asian American and Latino studies programs. This is, in part, due to the variegated nature of ethnic studies. For instance, in the past few decades, Asian Americans and Latinos have been the two fastest growing ethnic groups in the United States.²³ This fact has had wide-ranging implications for fields of study that have a direct relationship to American domestic policy-making. Hence, political science departments, health policy programs, behavioral economics working groups, public policy schools, and psychology departments are fertile grounds for Asian Americanists or Latino studies scholars to pursue their research interests and shape conversations in Congressional and statehouse offices across the country. It would be difficult to argue that Princeton acts in the service of the entire nation if it does not provide substantial opportunities for its undergraduates to study Asian American or Latino studies, even in a domestic policy context. Indeed, the rapid growth of both the Latino and Asian American populations means that research of these minority groups will only become increasingly central to our understanding of the United States and the country within an interconnected, global context.

Needless to say, Asian Americanists and Latino studies scholars in a thriving liberal arts university are promising researchers in a wide range of departments and programs, even outside of the realm of policy.²⁴ Naturally, then, the creation of any meaningful Asian American studies or Latino studies program requires substantial and substantive support from university administrators, particularly in the hiring process. Without such collaborative efforts, a program effectively exists in name only, which is particularly hurtful to a liberal arts institution in a variety of ways:

²³ Anna Brow, "U.S. Hispanic and Asian Populations Growing, But for Different Reasons," *Pew Research Center*, June 26, 2014, <http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2014/06/26/u-s-hispanic-and-asian-populations-growing-but-for-different-reasons/>.

²⁴ See, for instance, "Princeton University and Asian American Studies," *Princeton Asian American Students Association*, pp. 14-5; or the latest issue of *Latino Studies*, published by Palgrave Macmillan: <http://www.palgrave-journals.com/lst/index.html>.

1. Undergraduate students, particularly those of color, who seek graduate study and hope to enter an academic career in Asian American studies or Latino studies are effectively denied the preparation needed to enter the “academic pipeline.” The lack of diversity among the graduate, postgraduate, and faculty ranks at this University has been acknowledged by the Board of Trustees and the University President, and the stagnation of ethnic studies programs squanders a long-term opportunity for early intervention at the undergraduate level.²⁵
2. The potential arises for other undergraduate students, particularly those of color, to become disaffected and question the institution’s commitment to the liberal arts.
3. Promising graduate students, postgraduate fellows, and professors in Asian American studies and Latino studies, particularly those of color, come to believe that they have no future in the institution. They then avoid the institution, and a poor reputation for the institution arises in relation to its ethnic studies programs. This, in turn, makes it more difficult for the ethnic studies program to maintain its current staff, resources, and grants. At Princeton, particularly, this has a direct effect on the abovementioned goals relating to diversity in the graduate, postgraduate, and faculty ranks.

In short, keeping ethnic studies departments suspended in the early stages of its development does not yield in stasis: it incurs harm on the home institution as a whole.

On the other hand, providing sufficient resources for healthy growth in an ethnic studies program creates the potential for “compound interest.” Undergraduate students, particularly students of color, are able to pursue graduate study in an academic field where their experiences provide natural intuition and guidance. Alumni of color see more clearly their university’s commitment to diversity and pursuit of the liberal arts. Those seeking an academic career in Asian American studies or Latino studies are attracted to the University’s resources. This turns the institution into a vibrant center for intellectual inquiry in these fields of study, as a strong program tends to attract more graduate students, postgraduate fellows, and professors.

It is also important to note that furthering support for Latino studies and Asian American studies at the University would be a particular boon in achieving Princeton’s aim to increase diversity among its graduate, postgraduate, faculty, and administrative ranks. This is particularly true if we remember that diversity is not important just for adding different faces to the University, but also for fostering a diversity of thought on campus. The goal of ethnic studies is to provide an outlet to and a focus on diverse points of view, and thus promoting Asian American studies and Latino studies at Princeton would further strengthen our University’s culture of inclusion. Strong programs would lead to these benefits not being restricted to one or two academic programs because of the interdisciplinary nature of ethnic studies. Students and faculty in these fields would be affiliated with at least one other primary department, thereby promoting diversity in a range of academic fields throughout the University.

Admittedly, increasing administrative support for faculty hiring raises a delicate concern. While an institution may believe Asian American and Latino studies to be a priority, it must also respect the autonomy of its academic departments in their faculty hiring decisions. Hence, it cannot force

²⁵ Princeton University Trustee Ad Hoc Committee on Diversity, “Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Diversity,” *Princeton University*, pp. 2, 6. <http://www.princeton.edu/reports/2013/diversity/report/PU-report-on-diversity.pdf>; “Admission & Hiring,” *Princeton University*. <http://inclusion.princeton.edu/progress/admission>.

departments to hire or admit interdisciplinary ethnic studies faculty or graduate/postgraduate candidates who need a home department for their “primary” field of inquiry.

To resolve this issue, we believe that the most effective and sustainable way for this University to prioritize Asian American studies and Latino studies while maintaining the academic freedom of individual departments is to base these programs and the prerequisite resources in the Program in American Studies. In the model we propose, the Program in American Studies is empowered to have control and influence over faculty hires, reducing the burden on other academic departments in bolstering these fields of study. We know that the Program in American Studies believes that the development of Latino studies and Asian American studies should a priority for the University and has been receptive to assisting in the development of these two fields of study in the past. On a practical level, the Program in American Studies is one that would ensure this form of long-term sustainable growth that we believe is necessary.

This structuring of Asian American and Latino studies has a long intellectual and institutional history in universities across the United States. The University of Michigan’s Department of American Culture, the oldest formal academic program in American Studies in the United States,²⁶ contains its Latino Studies, Asian/Pacific Islander American Studies, and Native American Studies Programs, in addition to a program in Arab and Muslim American studies. The Department attributes the stability of its associated ethnic studies programs to its hiring structure for ethnic studies within the Department:

American Culture truly entered a new era at the turn of the twenty-first century, with changes in program status, and a hiring initiative in the three ethnic studies fields. American Culture began holding its own tenure lines, which gradually transformed its faculty base from an organizational model dependent upon the donated labor of a pool of generous faculty associates to a more stable model with core budgeted faculty.²⁷

In fact, the Department was able to use this model to rapidly expand its faculty in their ethnic studies programs. Native American Studies at Michigan, for instance, expanded twelve-fold from a single core faculty member to eight budgeted faculty members and four faculty associates, all within the span of a few years.²⁸

The University of California at Berkeley is another public university that has utilized this model of creating an umbrella program housing Latino studies and Asian American studies. Like Michigan, its Department of Ethnic Studies includes undergraduate programs in Asian American studies, Chicano/Latino studies, and Native American studies.²⁹ It also offers undergraduate and graduate programs in comparative ethnic studies. While this program structure arose directly from student protests in 1969, it has also mostly maintained its structure since then. As of March 2015, there are 6 professors each affiliated with the Asian American studies program and the Chicano/Latino studies program.³⁰

²⁶ “Department History,” *American Culture: The University of Michigan*.
<http://www.lsa.umich.edu/ac/aboutus/departmentshistory>.

²⁷ Ibid.

²⁸ Ibid.

²⁹ “Programs,” *Department of Ethnic Studies: University of California, Berkeley*.
<http://ethnicstudies.berkeley.edu/programs/index.php>.

³⁰ “Faculty,” *Department of Ethnic Studies: University of California, Berkeley*.
<http://ethnicstudies.berkeley.edu/faculty/>.

Peer institutions on the East Coast follow this model as well, and have seen similar institutional success from a faculty perspective. Columbia University's Center for the Study of Ethnicity and Race, for instance, formed after a 1996 student strike, initially offering majors in Asian American studies and Latino studies.³¹ The Center began with four faculty members, and over the following decade, grew its faculty ranks to include eleven core professors and over forty additional associated faculty, adjunct faculty, and fellows. The association of American studies to these ethnic studies field was natural enough for the University to recently transfer its master's program in American Studies into the Center:

This new institutional situation recognizes the fundamental importance of race and ethnicity as organizing categories for thinking about American life. It also means that students in the M.A. program will have access to the rich array of conferences, seminars, exhibits, and film screenings that take place at the CSER.

Indeed, this department transfer signifies the recognition on the part of the Columbia University administration that ethnic studies is pedagogically and intellectually crucial to a strong program in American studies.

Similar institutional arrangements are seen in a variety of other universities. New York University's Department of Social and Cultural Analysis offers undergraduate programs in American Studies, Asian/Pacific/American Studies,³² and a PhD program in American Studies.³³ UCLA's Institute of American Cultures is home to its Asian American Studies Center and Chicano Studies Research Center.³⁴ There is enough precedent for Princeton to adopt this sort of model, and particularly because it is the best institutional arrangement available for fostering strong and rigorous programs in Asian American studies and Latino studies while also respecting departmental autonomy, we strongly push the University administration to provide the Program in American Studies the space, staff, and faculty lines it needs to develop Asian American studies and Latino studies at Princeton.

³¹ "About Us," *Center for the Study of Ethnicity and Race: Columbia University*.

<http://www.columbia.edu/cu/cser/about.html>.

³² "Undergraduate Programs," *Department of Social and Cultural Analysis: NYU*.

<http://sca.as.nyu.edu/page/undergradprogram>.

³³ "Graduate Programs," *Department of Social and Cultural Analysis: NYU*.

<http://sca.as.nyu.edu/page/gradprograms>.

³⁴ "Home page," *UCLA Institute of American Cultures*. <http://www.iac.ucla.edu/>.