

II. CRITICAL ETHNIC
STUDIES PROJECTS
MEET THE NEOLIBERAL
UNIVERSITY

A Better Life? Asian Americans and the Necropolitics of Higher Education

LONG T. BUI

This essay considers the vexed position of Asian Americans within higher education, focusing on questions of institutional representation, complicity, and privilege. Such issues stood out to me during my early induction into student activism at the University of California, Irvine, a campus that has the distinction of having the largest percentage of Asian-identified students in any U.S. university.¹ As a freshman I participated in my first public rallies and marches for Wen Ho Lee. Wrapped in the aura of a “man of science,” Lee was the Taiwanese American nuclear scientist arrested in 1999 as a suspected spy for communist China and detained for a year in solitary confinement in a federal detention facility by the U.S. government. The case spotlighted the persisting view of Asians in this country as “perpetual foreigners” and “alien outsiders.” A wellspring of support came from Asian American national advocacy groups and community organizations that came together to confront this prominent instance of racial profiling. As a young person coming into my own political consciousness, I joined thousands of students shouting the slogan “Free Wen Ho Lee,” exposing yet another example of discrimination against Asian Americans due to constant suspicion about their national loyalties and cultural foreignness. However, throughout this time a nagging question burned in the back of my mind: What exactly does this man do for a living, and why does it matter?

As it turns out, Lee constructed computer models to make nuclear missiles and warheads to abet the United States in continuing its dominance as the world's preeminent military superpower. In the grassroots fight against state racism in the Lee case (protests by college students were instrumental in helping to publicize the case), the sensitive nature of this man's job was never critically examined or brought up in activists' desire to liberate him from prison (and us from our imagined prisons of communal oppression). Many supporters cast Lee in the innocent role of a proud citizen and American patriot unfairly subjected to anti-Asian bigotry.² Today the Wen Ho Lee case is taught around the country in ethnic studies classes as a textbook example of how, "no matter how smart you are, no matter how hard you work," as Lee writes in his autobiography *My Country versus Me*, Asian people "will never be accepted [since] we always will be foreigners."³ The racialized charges leveled against this hard-working scientist and the racialized labor that many scientists like Lee perform as what Ling-chi Wang calls "high-tech coolies" obfuscate the more serious question of how Asian American professionals enable government operations and military agendas.⁴

The fallout from the Lee case led to a chilling effect on the number of Asians applying to work at the Los Alamos National Laboratory, even as the number of Asian scientists and professionals grew nationally.⁵ After the state ban on affirmative action in 1997 under California's Proposition 209, the University of California was devastated by the plummeting enrollments of historically underrepresented minorities, while the proportion of Asian students stayed pretty much the same (though many predicted the numbers would soar after the policy's end since Asians would somehow benefit from color-blind standards). Meanwhile the Los Alamos National Laboratory, where Lee was employed, remained an affirmative action employer (EEO/AA). Such preferential targeting of minorities twisted a domestic policy used to rectify past racial discrimination against aggrieved groups by turning it into a political tool to recruit foreign scientists and talent for the U.S. security state. I believe the state racism found in Lee's case and the "color-blind" post-affirmative action state university form the critical nexus for grasping tricky issues about differential institutional treatment that should inform our identity politics but often get ignored or swept under the rug in the general fight against anti-Asian racism. Without addressing these underlying tensions, we end up deifying what the feminist scholar Grace Hong describes as "the hero of a privileged historical narrative, the telos and resolution of which is the eventual and complete attainment of the rights and privileges of citizenship."⁶

By adopting the concept of necropolitics from the postcolonial theorist Achille Mbembe, I bring into discussion militarism and empire, which are rarely broached in education studies. Mbembe argues that the traditional investment of modern societies in developing educated healthy populations (what Foucault describes as biopolitics or biopower) works as necropolitics in Third World contexts in which violence is profligate and members of non-white populations are frequently killed indiscriminately. While he speaks about colonies, war zones, and slave plantations, we can extend his theorization of necropolitics as the prioritizing of death over life to privileged First World civilian spaces deemed peaceful but where nonwhite bodies can also be found targeted for death in large numbers. Such an application of necropolitics can illustrate “the classification of people according to different categories; resource extraction [that constitutes] a large reservoir of cultural imaginaries [that give] meaning to the enactment of differential rights to differing categories of people for different purposes within the same space.” Inasmuch as necropolitics is not simply about wanton murder and human destruction but the manufacturing of “enclave economies,” the cycles of crisis and risk management in the corporatizing public university continue to push all of us to (dis)articulate an educational discourse that already employs the rhetoric of life and death.⁷

In this essay I sketch out some thoughts on the fraught place of Asians and Asian Americans within the University of California, considered the most prestigious public educational system in the world, discussing how the life-affirming and value-added privileges of getting a college education loop back into the political economy of death. In general much of the popular discourse on Asians within American higher education tends to focus on their accomplishments and numbers, crystallized within debates on the affirmative action policies in which Asian American students represent examples of how a “postracial” society works to help minorities improve their own lives without government support or intrusion. Such views hold up Asian Americans as a “model minority” ideologically fueling the modern university’s desire to retreat from remedying its history of racism and the state’s wish to escape blame for social inequality.⁸ Countless academic experts have spent considerable energy debunking this model minority myth and how Asian Americans cannot be easily classified or lumped together as a model minority, but such criticisms lack a more critical edge. At best there is an expectation that academic institutions need to become more sensitive toward the diversity and specific needs of Asian Americans, but the university itself remains intact as an unproblematized model of the better life we all supposedly deserve. Beyond

the necessary project of advancing minority representation and voices there needs to be further elaboration as well as scrutiny in terms of what I am describing as the necropolitics of higher education, defined as the conflict between life-and-death forces found within the modern university, a contradictory place of social enlightenment and uplift as well as death making.

The Military-Academic-Industrial Complex

If the task of critical ethnic studies scholars is to think about the genocidal contexts and conditions that undergird our precarious lives, it is imperative to consider the public university as more than an educational system and as a productive site for the war machine. Indeed the first computer networks, which helped give birth to the Internet, were linked together at UCLA, a project funded by the U.S. Defense Department, giving heft to the University of California as a powerhouse and node of technological innovators, whose products of creative innovation feed directly into the warfare state.⁹ For six decades the University of California held primary responsibility for managing the nation's two major research centers under the Department of Energy: Livermore and the Los Alamos National Laboratory. Based in remote, clandestine locales, these laboratories employ an army of researchers conducting classified research and manufacturing, among other things, military arsenals under the protective cloak and aegis of national security. UC faculty helped establish these laboratories, embedding them in the university's high-research culture.¹⁰ For decades the university played an illustrious role as the primary institution of education running those top-secret sites, developing the first nuclear weapons and atomic bombs under the Manhattan Project. While UC formally ended its ties to the laboratories in 2006, it succeeded in the contractual rebid to lead the autonomous corporate entity created in the wake of this split, called Lawrence Livermore National Security, a shrewd move that enables the hiring of UC scientists in coveted government jobs.¹¹

These shadow research campuses broker institutional links between the corporate, military, and governmental networks and the university. While the University of California is no longer in charge of the production or storage of nuclear weapons, it is still a central player in overseeing the maintenance of U.S. nuclear technology. At the same time as a student movement has emerged to bring visibility to the plight of undocumented students, Janet Napolitano, the former head of the Department of Homeland Security in charge of monitoring terrorist activities and border patrol, assumed the

presidency of the UC system in 2013—an “unusual choice,” according to the *Los Angeles Times*, that “brings a national-level politician to a position usually held by an academic.” For UC officials Napolitano was a wise choice because her background could enable her to fluently administer the nuclear energy and weapons labs already run by the university.¹² Before Napolitano other UC presidents were entangled in U.S. imperial projects; for example, as superintendent of tribal education in the Philippines, David Barrows was responsible for forcibly assimilating and reforming America’s largest colony at the turn of the twentieth century. The study of necropower in higher education necessitates not just a demilitarizing plan of action but what Sarita See calls a “decolonized eye” open to seeing and unwinding the imperial structures that bind us.¹³

The fight for life over the machinery of death continues to make waves. Inspired by the principles of nonviolence, the Coalition to Demilitarize, composed of community leaders and students, since 2002 has been throwing light on the crisis situation bubbling under the veneer of intellectual work and academic enterprise. The nuclear abolitionists find it is their responsibility to “do whatever they can to prevent the UC Regents from facilitating nuclear militarism.”¹⁴ This prompted a “No More Nukes in Our Name!” hunger strike at UC Berkeley in 2007 during a meeting where the regents were discussing cutbacks in employee pensions and when the United States was planning to upgrade its nuclear weaponry to possibly fight North Korea and terrorism around the world.¹⁵ The current U.S. nuclear weapons program, called the Reliable Replacement Warhead, hinges on UC’s for-profit business partnership model with the Bechtel Corporation and other industrial development companies to facilitate the proposed construction of hydrogen bomb and plutonium bomb pits (not manufactured since 1949).

It is no coincidence that the reinvigorated militarization of the country and necropoliticalization of higher education occurred at a time when the number of foreign-born scientists working in the United States had doubled and college students from militarizing countries like China, Japan, India, and South Korea soared. (International students account for 40 percent of all doctoral degrees in science and engineering granted in the country.)¹⁶ Almost 70 percent of Asian PhDs in the United States earn their degrees in the life sciences, physical sciences, and engineering, an upward trend as the hard sciences receive heavier promotion and funding to bolster the number of potential workers able to directly enhance America’s global standing as the most powerful nation. In the so-called post-American Asian Century, when

scientific know-how gives industrializing Asian nations a comparative advantage in their bidding for world power against the United States, skilled Asian workers are valuable players in leveraging a new world order. In light of all this, it behooves scholars to move away from discussing the Asian model minority myth as a false stereotype or fixating on the “bamboo ceiling” faced by Asian professionals in their lucrative careers and begin initiating tough conversations about the lethal costs of their labor productivity.

The Rise of the Model Majority:
Asians as a New (Post)Racial Preference

During the late 1960s and 1970s student-led antiwar movements exposed the collusion of state-funded universities and the U.S. military state.¹⁷ The radicalism of the Yellow Power movement built around what Yen Le Espiritu calls panethnic “reactive solidarity” to societal racism has been greatly anaesthetized,¹⁸ co-opted by the university in its quest to reduce racial turmoil on campus. The Asian American scholar Glen Omatsu maintains that there has been a steady decline in progressive Asian American politics, which were initially not “centered on the aura of racial identity but embraced fundamental questions of oppression and power . . . not of seeking legitimacy and representation within American society.” For Omatsu there has been an enlarging of the Asian American presence in American society and colleges but not “a corresponding growth in consciousness—of what it means to be Asian American.” This absence of radical thinking is due to an ideological-political vacuum as the community now finds itself stuck between the goals of “empowerment solely in terms of individual advancement for a few, or as the collective liberation for all peoples.”¹⁹

The historical push for more public accountability from the university has failed to disrupt positivist ideas of public education and illuminate its origins as an engine of war. The fast evolution of the University of California into an Asian-serving institution (seven of its ten campuses are majority Asian) owes much to the history of U.S. colonialism and military wars in Asia that set the precedence for the government’s preference for skilled Asian labor in the post-1965 period and liberal immigration policies that favored the kinds of professional college-educated immigrant families from which many Asian American students originate.

The meteoric rise of the University of California to become an internationally renowned brand owes much to the establishment of new labor, migration, and consumer markets, technological transfers, and global trade between the

United States and Asian nations. After World War II the federal government awarded millions of dollars to support research for military weapons manufacturing, recruiting high-tech workers from Asia but also poor Asian and Latino workers to form a segmented labor force, buttressing the alliance between the military establishment and universities like UC Berkeley to build an invincible war industry.²⁰ Geopolitical realignments and economic restructuring allowed the American research university to establish close ties with state entities in Japan, Singapore, China, and South Korea to create a professionalized global economy built not on political neutrality, as the sociologist Manuel Castells finds, but on a field of networks.²¹ Under the U.S. pivot toward Asia, research universities will continue to grow exponentially, just as they did during the cold war to expand the academic-military-industrial complex. The dream of higher education and the American Dream pursued by so many Asian youths today reflects what Jodi Kim calls the “protracted afterlife” of U.S. imperialism in Asia, a fact of historical reality that prompts an Asian American politics that does not solely look toward a better future but also looks back at how things came to be.²² As Mbembe tells us, when subjects are found “laboring under the sign of death, the future is collapsed into the present.”²³ The hopes for a better life are circumscribed by the martial laws under which we operate.

While more young people are attending college than ever before and the U.S. military is focused on finessing an all-volunteer fighting force since the ending of the draft after the Vietnam War, it would seem there is a dissociation between military servicemen and college-going youth. However, this faulty divide fails to grasp the blurred boundaries between civilian workers and military employees as well as the porous traffic between the ivory tower and the armed services. Colleges are still a major source for direct military recruitment, as David Pellow observes: “In higher education systems, military recruiters tempt students with the chance to join the armed forces and be frontline participants in the killing machine that stands in for U.S. diplomacy.”²⁴

This recruitment of students for war efforts is not always obvious. In 2005 *Time* magazine published an article titled “China’s Big Export,” in which FBI officials revealed their anxieties about U.S. universities as “soft spots” for penetration by foreign spies. The officials pointed to the more than 150,000 Chinese students studying in the United States as possible informants and agents of the PRC, which pilfers information from its vast overseas network of tourists, students, and workers.²⁵ After the Wen Ho Lee incident, several cases emerged involving Asian American researchers at UC Davis and UC San

Diego charged with selling sensitive information to foreign countries.²⁶ Secretly infiltrating and probing campuses, the FBI relies on embedded informants “to help sort the few who go to America to spy from the thousands who go there for a better life.”²⁷ Seven out of ten of the top student-exporting countries to the United States are in Asia, and the University of California is the top choice for most Asian international students matriculating in the United States. Given the wars raging on college campuses, it becomes imperative I believe to not accept higher education as a good thing that should always grow exponentially and be open to everyone, unless there is an added awareness of the growing dangers and threats to our world-class education.

Compromising the Socially Dead for the Living Few

The University of California is slowly moving away from its historic legacy as an all-white institution (though the faculty remains overwhelmingly white and male); now Asian students are not simply model minorities but institutional model majorities, paragons of academic excellence and the upstanding good life offered by higher learning. The fact remains that many Asian American students are the children of war. When I asked students in my ethnic studies class about their family background, many of them told of their parents overcoming war and conflict to come to the states. Yet while many claimed ancestry in the former war zones of Taiwan, Cambodia, or the Philippines, they disassociated their violent Asian past from their improved American lives. One female student put it simply, “My parents left the civil war in China so I could come here to have a better life, and that means getting a good education.”

This premise of public education as offering a better life has been challenged by critical race legal scholars such as Cheryl Harris and Devon Carbado, who suggest that the desire to make college more accessible to all citizens deploys the language of progress, neutrality, and merit to mask our public educational system’s massive failure to boost social mobility and diversity in general.²⁸ In the aftermath of Proposition 209 there remains a “new racial preference” for certain minority groups (e.g., Asian Americans) able to capitalize on the university’s demands for a diverse pool of talent targeted not because of their race but because of their skills. In this manner Asian Americans, as a desirable or worthy minority group, are rewarded with education.²⁹ This new preference ironically favors upwardly mobile Asian global elites, a phenomenon that ends up negatively impacting native-born Asian Americans who need the University of California as a less expensive alterna-

tive to private schools. According to the scholar-activist Don Nakanishi, “the University of California has been the major vehicle for social mobility for the Asian-American community,” which values an affordable, high-quality public education.³⁰ The complex relationship between Asians and Asian Americans, which for decades has gone unnoticed due to the lumping of all Asians into one group, has now reached a turning point. While the number of U.S.-born Asian students in the UC system has reached critical mass and plateaued after decades of explosive growth, the number of foreign students from Asia has skyrocketed, particularly in the 2000s, due to increased allotment of spaces for them over in-state residents as a means of getting more outside sources of revenue. In 2009 the administrators at the San Diego campus reduced its number of in-state freshmen by five hundred and filled those spots with out-of-state and international students. As a result close to two hundred freshmen from China enrolled in the school, a twelvefold increase from just barely sixteen individuals the year before, while the number of Asian American California freshmen fell by almost 30 percent.³¹ Asian American students must now fight against rising tuition prices and systematic efforts to push them out from the very place they helped build into prominence.³²

That the university is a conduit for life-restricting forces and projects can be seen in a range of issues, such as the institution’s ongoing diminishment of organized labor union rights, the erosion of indigenous tribal sovereignty and land rights, the restriction of student dissent and free speech protest on campuses, and the administration’s resistance to calls for divestment of university capital funds in corporations operating in countries with a history of human rights abuses.³³ The battle over life-and-death matters can be discerned in the balancing act between state funding for prisons and schools. California’s governor Arnold Schwarzenegger made this obvious when he publicly stated his interest in outsourcing the care and housing of inmates in California’s overcrowded prisons to Mexico to pay for the state’s insolvent college system. He hoped to restore the University of California to its former rightful place as the number-one public school system in the world lest it slip into obsolescence and face its own demise.³⁴ Such overtures to institutional martyrdom, sacrifice, and survival gesture to what Mbembe calls the “state of siege” characteristic of our everyday realities in late capitalist society.

Recognizing the necropolitical logics inherent in such neoliberal rationales serves to explain necropolitics at a broader level, which disavows certain undesirable populations to save the most productive and privileged groups in society. As state investment in public schools decreases every year, the ballooning funding deficit in California’s prison system siphons precious

monies and resources away from poorer schools, which in turn further reduce the chances of marginalized youth and poor communities to get a basic education. (In 2010 state funding for education was 7.5 percent of California's total budget, with prisons receiving 11 percent, but ten years earlier universities received close to 10 percent and only 3 percent went to the penitentiary system.)³⁵ The interrelationship between state prisons and public schools is a moral crisis not addressed by many educational advocates, who focus only on the bureaucratic problems of schooling. That the steadily gaining numbers of Asian-identified students who make up more than 40 percent of the total UC undergraduate population might also speak to the growing incarceration of black, brown and indigenous youth (as well as Pacific Islanders and Southeast Asians) who make up the supermajority of the state's jails and prisons is a teachable moment that needs to be deconstructed. Left alone, we become blind to what Dylan Rodríguez describes as the "genocidal logics" buttressing the push toward a multicultural liberal society.³⁶ Schwarzenegger's wish to "terminate" California's responsibilities to its prisoners for the sake of assisting the college-bound pits those already consigned to "social death" against those with better life opportunities, enabling certain educated subjects prejudged as having the right to life, liberty, and happiness to receive more state entitlements and protection than criminalized people of color deemed undeserving in their "rightlessness" as nonwhite racialized subjects.³⁷

Racialization of Asians is concealed, even though their overrepresentation at the University of California makes them powerful cultural liaisons (or potential disruptive spies) between the American university and Asian nations at a crucial time, when cash-strapped public universities with dwindling state financial support seek to magnify their outreach and partnerships in the East (e.g., UCLA-National University of Singapore). Coincident with the greater demand for more math and science education to bolster national security, there is increasing stress at the University of California on STEM fields (science, technology, engineering, mathematics), where students of Asian descent can be found in disproportionate numbers.³⁸ Asian minds and bodies, perceived as easily assimilated into neoliberal and neocolonial ideas of educational competitiveness, embody the type of modular (post) racial subjects able to fill the globalizing necropolitical economies of a multi-tiered U.S. college system skewed to match the competitive talents of graduates from Asia. This is not to suggest a direct causal relationship between the corporatization, militarization, and globalization of the university and the enlarging of the Asian presence in college, but there exists a connection between what the research university represents as the "best and brightest" and

what particular racial *groups* appear to fit its high standards of excellence. The boundary between Asians' reliance on the life force of education and their inadvertent contribution to the military-academic industry is a testy relationship; as the activist Helen Zia notes, Asian Americans are "part of the problem [as] collaborators in our own oppressions."³⁹ Asians are not simply another minority easily lumped together with other nonwhite groups, since their de facto status as an institutional model majority essentially demoralizes them in a state apparatus that wants to exploit them as racialized human capital but does not consider them racially marked in some way.⁴⁰ Within the blurred lines of academic life and death, one finds that higher education can be the pathway to our salvation or to our destruction.

Toward a Critical Pedagogy of Life and Death

If we view college education only as an exalted public domain for improving quality of life, this limited perspective misses out on a larger critique that implicates us all profoundly. According to the Chicana scholar Rosaura Sanchez, "The discourse of ethnic power, opportunity, and pluralism led to an unrealistic assessment of the extent of struggle possible at the institutional level and masked our incapacity to avoid serving privilege and class domination within academia."⁴¹ Sanchez says the pressure to address educational social justice through ethnic empowerment is unsustainable once administrative concessions are made toward students, staff, and faculty. Identifying the institutional absorption of Asians and Asian Americans within the academic-industrial complex helps undercut the myth of educational meritocracy but makes noticeable the necropolitical forces through which the university derives its broad powers. Critical attention must be paid here to the defunding of the arts and humanities (fields often critical of institutional power schemes)—a revamping of the traditional liberal arts curriculum that relates to Asian Americans because their stunning success in vaunted niche science industries has augmented the university's desire to extract more foreign capital and value from Asian labor while diminishing the cultural capital of ethnic studies and Asian American studies in their longtime advocacy for the oppressed. Perhaps owing to the field's emphasis on professionalization, many ethnic studies scholars have argued that Asian Americans are *not* model minorities, for although many have been successful, many still face racism and some, such as Southeast Asians, have not found success. There is a flaw to this pedagogical-political strategy since it fails to critique the institution beyond not doing a good job for its clients, as students are called these days by

school administrators. Acknowledging the crucial role that Asians and Asian Americans play in the necropolitics of higher education serves to redefine the vague parameters of ethnic studies to forge new philosophies, ethics, and forms of consciousness raising.

This chapter touched upon the ambiguous and thorny place of Asians and Asian Americans in higher education. It demonstrates how our sense of moral crisis regarding the public university as an endangered public good might relate to the specter of death that lurks within the dark corridors of learning. If Asians are the new preferential subjects within the neoliberal “postracial” university, how do ethnic studies scholars, students, and activists promote antiracist politics and educational policies beyond *prima facie* concerns with minority discrimination and representation? How might we better teach critical ethnic studies by drawing attention to the shifting demographic composition and reconfiguration of our classes produced as a historical byproduct of the American war machine and U.S. geopolitical relations in Asia? How do we advocate for improving education without dealing with the uncomfortable fact that our educational system participates in lethal practices and processes? To even attempt to answer these hard questions there needs to be a reeducation in the meaning of ethnic studies to launch a radical critique enabling new lessons in matters of both life *and* death.

NOTES

1. Asian Americans are the largest non-white minority racial group in the University of California (approximately 30 percent), even though Asian Americans as a whole make up only 12 percent of the state and 5 percent of the national total population, California Postsecondary Education Commission, accessed September 16, 2015, <http://www.cpec.ca.gov/StudentData>.

2. Lee was eventually indicted for one count of mishandling sensitive government documents of the original fifty-nine indictment charges made against him. He received a financial settlement from the government and major media outlets that made a scapegoat out of him.

3. Lee and Zia, *My Country versus Me*, 252.

4. Wang, “Model Minority, High-Tech Coolies, and Foreign Spies.”

5. Normally four or five of the top finalists for a job at Los Alamos would be Chinese, yet lab director John Browne said that in the round of applications after the Lee case, there wasn’t a single Chinese name. “I looked further down the list, and there weren’t any Chinese names down there, either,” he said. See Stober, “Lee Case Discourages Asian American Scientists.”

6. Hong, “Past Legacies, Future Projects,” 123.

7. Mbembe, “Necropolitics,” 26, 33.

8. The University of California has been the target of numerous famous legal battles over race-based admissions policies in the past two decades, such as the landmark Supreme Court case *Regents of the University of California v. Bakke* (1978), which found unconstitutional race-based admissions for black students in law schools like those at UC Davis. Proposition 209 helped end affirmative action in California; the campaign was led by a former University of California regent, Ward Connerly. See Takagi, *The Retreat from Race*.

9. Castells and Hall, *Technopoles of the World*.

10. The Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory (LBNL) represents the most direct collaboration with UC as a research campus; it lies next to the Berkeley campus. Over two hundred LBNL researchers are Berkeley faculty members, and four hundred graduate and undergraduate Cal students conduct their research at the laboratory. Sited proximally to Asian-dominated enclaves in Silicon Valley and nearby UC campuses, Lawrence Livermore has extensive UC connections. While more physically isolated, Los Alamos in New Mexico draws UC faculty and students through the National Security Education Center, composed of institutes with partner universities in UC Santa Cruz, UC Davis, UC Santa Barbara, and UC San Diego. The university sets aside federal grant money it receives for managing the laboratories to fund research collaborations among national laboratory scientists with researchers and students across the UC system. See President's Executive Office, "University of California Briefing Binder," 122.

11. The UC regents retain primary responsibility for appointing three positions to the board of governors, a group of academic, national security, and business leaders that jointly own and control Lawrence Livermore National Security. The University of California also gets to appoint three governors to the executive committee out of a total of six, including the chair, who has tie-breaking authority over most decisions of the executive committee.

12. Larry Gordon, "Janet Napolitano, Homeland Security Chief, to Head UC," *Los Angeles Times*. July 12, 2013.

13. See, *The Decolonized Eye*, 173

14. University of California Santa Barbara against War, "Students Arrested for Blocking UC Nuclear Labs," Los Angeles Indymedia, November 18, 2006, accessed January 9, 2013, http://la.indymedia.org/news/2006/11/188301_comment.php.

15. BB, "Statement put out by Coalition to Demilitarize," LA Indymedia, November 18, 2006, accessed December 13, 2013, http://la.indymedia.org/news/2006/11/188301_comment.php.

16. Kent, "More U.S. Scientists and Engineers Are Foreign-Born."

17. This collusion included the pervasive influence of police and military personnel on college campuses, the heavy recruitment of youth for military service, and the expansion and contracting of government-funded disciplines like area studies to contribute to U.S. intelligence operations.

18. Espiritu, *Asian American Panethnicity*, 198.

19. Omatsu, "The 'Four Prisons' and the Movements of Liberation," 165, 184, 194.

20. Pellow and Park, *The Silicon Valley of Dreams*.

21. Castells, "The University System."

22. Kim, *Ends of Empire*.

23. Mbembe, "Necropolitics," 37.

24. Pellow, "Activist-Scholar Alliances for Social Change," 107.

25. Brian Bennett, "China's Big Export," *New York Times*, February 13, 2005.

26. Chen, "The Spy Who Shanghaied Me," 3.

27. Bennett, "China's Big Export."

28. Carbado and Harris, "The New Racial Preferences."

29. A wave of new Asian professionals immigrating to the United States in the 1970s and 1980s helped to rejuvenate the civil rights discourse of the model minority. The U.S. media's fixation on Asian "whiz kids" turned the designation of this racial minority group from a historically underrepresented racial minority to merely a numerical minority. The focus on high-achieving Asian students at elite schools masks the fact that most Asian Americans are enrolled in state and community colleges, not elite four-year universities, and that many study business, human sciences, or social sciences rather than STEM fields.

30. Quoted in Oliver Staley, "Lure of Chinese Tuition Pushes Out Asian-Americans," *Bloomberg News*, December 28, 2011, accessed June 19, 2015, <http://www.bloomberg.com>.

31. Staley, "Lure of Chinese Tuition Pushes Out Asian-Americans."

32. New changes include raising college tuition despite income stagnation, outsourcing work and classes to independent contractors, firing or forcing into early retirement many staff members (many of whom are racial minorities or women), and entrenching forms of hierarchy that divide tenured full-time faculty and the large corps of temporary adjunct lecturers who teach a large bulk of undergraduate courses.

33. At UC San Diego and other campuses there has been a long drawn-out fight for repatriation of Native remains, which have been "discovered" and kept for scientific study at the university upon their exhumation on campus grounds. Similar to the student-led divestment movement against South African apartheid during the late 1980s, UC student activists are trying to force financial divestment in companies promoting violence by providing technology to warring countries around the world, such as Israel. For more on these issues and more at a national level, see Chatterjee and Maira, *The Imperial University*.

34. Nicole Allan, "Arnold: Send Convicts to Mexico," *AtlanticWire*, January 27, 2010.

35. Jimmy Carter, "Call Off the Global Drug War," *New York Times*, June 16, 2011.

36. Rodríguez, *Suspended Apocalypse*, 193.

37. Patterson, *Slavery and Social Death*. For more on rightlessness as a product and a legally unprotected status of being racialized, see Cacho, *Social Death*.

38. While there is an overrepresentation of Asian faculty members in the hard sciences, there is a serious underrepresentation of Asian faculty in the humanities, arts, and social sciences. Asian American students are overwhelmingly enrolled in the hard sciences, but this phenomenon is gendered since mostly men are found in these technical fields, attesting to a subtle gender bias in scientific training and recruitment. See Simpson, "Segregated by Subject."

39. Zia, "Oh, Say, Can You See?," 9.

40. Lee, "The De-Minorization of Asian Americans."

41. See Sanchez, "Ethnicity, Ideology and Academia," 301.