



# FOR ACUÑA

## ¡TAKE BACK OUR HISTORY!

Volume 1 Number 1

-9

Summer 1994



### UC Out of Control; Chicanos Demand Lawmakers Check Plunder

## Acuña v. UC; Nothing But the Facts

Dr. Rodolfo Acuña applied for a position in the Chicano Studies Dept. at the University of California Santa Barbara in December 1990 at the urging of El Congreso students and his wife. After 25 years, Acuña reluctantly agreed to considered moving from Cal State Northridge.

Acuña, a popular choice among students and the community, became the sole candidate of the department. But, unknown to Acuña, an attempted coup of the chair changed the original unanimity. When the vote went up, three professors strongly supported Acuña's appointment and three abstained alleging flaws in the

process.

Documents recovered in discovery show that administrators aided and abetted this division. The administration blatantly violated its own procedures, meeting with dissidents, engaging in the backroom governance that has kept Chicano Studies weak and divided.

(Four previous searches were unsuccessful. Members of Chicano Studies rarely agreed on anything. The department, a revolving door, was unable to retain a critical mass of professors to develop a first class program. The result was that it had 3.5 tenured track appointments.)

On June 20, 1991, two students called Dr. Acuña, and told him that they had

heard that the administration turned him down. Dr. Acuña then called Vice-Chancellor Gordon Hammes who coldly told him that he could not cut it in the UC.

At Dr. Acuña's request, the administration on July 30th sent him an aggregate summary of the various review committees' findings. Martha Cody-Váldez, the analyst processing the case, called attention to the emotional and angry tone of the reviews to Associate Vice-Chancellor Julius Zelmanowitz who cavalierly dismissed the warnings. Dr. Acuña requested a meeting which UCSB Chancellor Barbara Uehling turned down. Other administrators stonewalled Acuña.

Naively, Dr. Acuña sought to enlist the

support of UCLA alumni Regent Ralph Ochoa. According to discovery documents, Ochoa was helping UC officials. Ochoa had close ties to UC lobbyist Steve Arditti (they often went sailing together) and Vice-President of Governmental Affairs, Bill Baker. Ochoa's firm acted as UC bond attorneys, and served as outside counsel for the UC. (Ochoa had played a similar role at UCLA when students wanted to establish a Chicano Studies Department).

On October 3, El Congreso organized a march and rally on the UCSB campus. Discovery documents show that there was extensive police surveillance of Dr. Acuña and two undercover police attended a lecture

(See Nothing on page 4)

## FOR Acuña Committee

The call to form Friends of Rudy (FOR) was sent out by María Elena Durazo, president of Local 11, and Gilbert Cedillo, general manager of Local 660. Trade unions, community, academes, and student activists came to the first meeting at Local 11 Hall to support Dr. Acuña in his suit and to bring about social change in higher education.

The participants, veterans of the fight to keep the East LA Prison out of the Eastside, the Olvera Street conservancy, Chicana (o) Studies at UCLA and pro-immigrant groups, wanted to link progressive Chicanos and Latinos and take on the UC system.

Dr. Rodolfo Acuña was an ideal plaintiff to sue the UC and strip it of the mystique that the UC was a world class institution that searched for knowledge and objectivity and served all Californians equally.

A nationally and internationally known scholar. Acuña became a rallying point for Chicanos. *Occupied America* is known to two generations of Chicano students. Supporters believed that Acuña could raise enough money to fight the UC. Money, or lack of, was one of the barriers that had doomed past Chicano litigants.

Many of the supporters, participants in rallies and hunger strikes, wanted to use the courts to bring about social change. They believed that this landmark case would impact Chicano access to higher education.

The state court's order to the UC to produce and to identify documents written by a secret committee and to identify the people on the secret com-

mittee set this case apart from other efforts. This was one of the first times that the UC could not hide behind a shield of confidentiality. For the first time, a plaintiff had access to the written reports and knowledge of the committee members, and their opinions of Dr. Acuña.

The identities of the committee proved what most Mexican-Americans had believed for years: the UC was run by an all white male network that systematically discriminated against and excluded Chicanos and other peoples of color.

Indeed, this case would have been over long ago except for our lawyers. Our largest stumbling block has been the UC's access to very large sums of taxpayers' money to pay private attorneys aside from the regular UC lawyers. Our side does not have this kind of money.

This experience has inspired this edition of FOR Acuña. We are calling upon all of you to demand a cap on the amount the UC pays outside firms to fight discrimination cases. It is the only way people of modest means have a chance to stand up to the UC system and demand justice.

Oversight must be exercised by the legislature. It is time for the people to demand that the UC charter be revised. The UC's autonomy must be checked for the good of society.

The following articles explain the *Acuña v. The Regents of the University of California et al.* stands in this picture and what we as a community are doing to "Take Back Our History!"

Only united can we make a difference.

## Attack on Chicana(o) Studies

Professor Broyles-González, appointed chair of the Chicano Studies Department by the UCSB administration in the fall of 1990, was never popular with administrators. The department's majority support of Professor Broyles-González forced the reluctant corporate managers to respect the department's autonomy and appoint the first Chicana chair to that department.

Over a 25 year period, the number of appointments had increased to 3.5 FTE (full time equivalent positions), making it

the smallest department in the university.

Professor Broyles-González quickly broke with the UC policy of joint appointments in ethnic studies departments and moved toward core (full time) appointments for the Chicano studies department. Full-time, sole appointments gave Chicanos control over the appointment of faculty and the scheduling of classes. Broyles-González also intended to establish a Ph.D. in Chicano Studies and to implement a balanced curriculum that would incorporate gender issue. Broyles-González

supported the hiring of activist Chicanoist Dr. Rudy Acuña to complement the previous recruitment of Dr. Antonia Castañeda, a popular teacher and activist in the field of Chicano studies.

When UCSB denied Dr. Acuña employment, Professor Broyles-González incensed about the violation of Acuña's rights, did not fall into line. Both Broyles-González and Acuña recognized that the denial was based on reasons other than scholarship.

As the Acuña case heated up and the courts peeled off the veil of secrecy surrounding the review

(See Attack on page 6)

## Strategy Keeps UC Snow Blind

The University of California, one of the largest public corporations in California, spends millions of dollars in legal bills to maintain this privileged status and the image that it is color blind. (In reality, it is snowblind because it sees only white.) The UC is as formidable opponent as General Motors, with even the most altruistic of attorneys are being intimidated by the UC's deep pockets.

The San Francisco Chronicle reported that in 1992 the UC had a staff of 35 attorneys at its Oakland headquarters and another 12 lawyers based at several campuses and other locations, earning from \$70,000 a

year to over \$100,000. UC general counsel James Holst draws \$168,000.

Aside from its own staff, the UC employs more than 100 outside firms, paying them anywhere from \$100 to \$300 an hour for each attorney. In 1992, the UC paid these firms some \$23 million. This figure does not include the millions of dollars paid in settlements intentionally hidden from the public by "gag" orders.

One of the few cases that was made public was the \$1 million paid to women who were raped, harassed or discriminated against on the UCLA campus. The settlements came to light

when the *Daily Bruin*, the UCLA student newspaper, filed a suit. This leads one to ask how many other settlements has the UC made that we do not know about?

Although the UC publicly denies it, outside firms are regularly used. In discrimination cases, it is part of its strategy to bury plaintiffs who seek redress through the courts. Unlimited access to taxpayers finds, allows the UC to hire powerful law firms who crank out the paper work and the bills.

Take *Acuña v. The Regents of the University of California et al.*; the UC has spent over \$1 million defending the University of

(See Strategy on page 3)



# Academic Freedom on the Run and in Jeopardy

During the first days of June 1994, the Acuña legal team lost a motion to protect Acuña from having to hand over his unpublished manuscript as well as his note cards for future work. The court order attacks the foundation of academic freedom within the Academy, and sets a precedent that places the rights of all scholars in jeopardy.

After the hearing Acuña admonished Judge Robert Soares that the order violated his academic freedom and harassed him. Soares said he didn't care about academic freedom — he cared about employment law. Acuña and his supporters were surprised that the University of California, which prides itself as being a premier research institution, sponsored a motion that endangered the ownership of intellectual property within the Academy.

With the judge's order, Acuña's ideas and notes, including 50,000 cards and thousands of primary documents and microfilm representing 30 years diligent effort and sacrifice, will be scrutinized by defendants and

experts whose purpose is to denigrate his work. It is data foundation for at least five books and yet another, 4th edition, of *Occupied America*, which will include a fuller narrative on Chicano Studies.

They are so important to him that after the January 17, 1994 Northridge Earthquake, Acuña only entered his condemned office to retrieve those research materials, leaving books, awards and personal files behind.

Colleagues teased him because he entered the building with two 50 gallon drums on wheels, a large dolly with balloon tires and 20 storage boxes. For the only time in his life, he said, he empathized with Alexander Solzhenitsyn who reportedly would not leave the Soviet Union without his research cards.

The defense alleged that it had a right to these documents because Acuña claimed that the emotional shock of his rejection delayed publication of his forthcoming book, *Anything But Mexican: Chicanos in Contemporary L.A.* He submitted proof of

a contract with Verso Press, a well known academic press, in London, England, which defendants should have respected. Instead, the UC has harassed Verso editor, Mike Davis, author of the prize winning *City of Quartz*. In doing so, it has jeopardized Acuña's contract.

Acuña never claimed that the quality of his research had diminished since his rejection. Since the notes in and of themselves are worthless in proving or disproving the quality of Acuña's research, it must be concluded that the strategy of the UC is intended to intimidate and harass Acuña.

In highly political work such as Acuña's, to allow third parties to discover what he is going to say, has the potential of intruding on his rights of free speech. It would also give the UC leverage at the time of settlement to put a gag order on its publication.

Corbett & Kane, the UC counsel, has inundated the court with every conceivable type of motion. Nearly every ruling has been met with objections and motions for

reconsideration. Indeed, the defendants are more anxious to bring about the financial collapse of Acuña, the FORACUÑA defense team and support committee than to move this case toward final solution.

This tactic of bringing about the financial collapse of the plaintiff is unethical. It is only possible because the courts and the legislature allow it to happen. The Santa Barbara Superior Court has allowed the UC to run wild. It has allowed it to bring frivolous motions without sanctions; it has allowed it to trample on the plaintiff's rights; and it has not demanded that the UC produce the agreed upon discovery materials.

The legislature, through the state constitution, gives UC the autonomy to squander taxpayers' money. In spite of the reluctance of legislators to question the practice and put a cap on spending, *Acuña v. The Regents of the UC et al* continues in the pursuit of justice.

*Injustice anywhere is injustice everywhere.*  
Martin Luther King

## Twelve Angry Men

It was clear that from the beginning that Corbett & Kane intended to blame the UCSB Chicano Studies Department and Dr. Yolanda Broyles-González in particular, for UC misconduct.

The facts, however, contradict this distortion of fact. At any stage of Dr. Rudy Acuña's review, the administration, the faculty senate or the ad hoc committee could have abandoned the search. Instead, the reviewing agencies attacked Dr. Acuña in a malicious and mean spirited way.

Records show that the reviews were neither academic nor serious. Only one of the dozen or so reviewers even claimed expertise in Chicano studies.

Indeed, Provost David Sprecher, who everyone cited as an expert, changed his testimony during his deposition, attempting to rehabilitate his testimony by deleting references to Acuña's political activities.

Following are a few of the excerpts found in the aggregate summary citing what the reviewing agencies said of Acuña and what led to Acuña to look for the real reasons for his denial:

*"Occupied America is a 'cult book' — and certainly, as [this reviewing agency reads] in the comments of outside evaluators, it has had an immense impact on the conceptualization and teaching of Chicano history. So too, [this reviewing agency concludes], Acuña himself may with accuracy be termed as a 'cult professor.' Occupied America, which appeared just at the time Chicano Studies was emerging as a teaching field and therefore when it was in great need of a core book, lifted Acuña from relative obscurity to the position of almost solitary intellectual leadership in the Chicano*

*movement and community...*

*A person of Professor Acuña's stature and experience would stand so far above the rest of his colleagues that his position could verge on being dictatorial.... This would have a potentially dominating influence on the kind of research and writing that would be smiled upon, or rejected as wrong and unacceptable...*

*As the output of a 23-year career, the scholarly substance and significance of the materials accompanying this case are very meager. Much of the work does not fall into our usual basic research category, and more than some does not appear to be of major scholarly significance. Professor Acuña has produced an angry special-pleading, moralizing work entirely lacking in distanced, critical stance toward his subject...*

*An inveterate polemicist and pamphleteer who ignores the rules of evidence, Acuña fills his work with angry pronouncements on a wide array of subjects, and flagrantly, openly, and apparently on purpose shapes his analyses and narrative to serve political purpose...*

*Believing that such a person [Acuña] might be insulated in a large established Department.... 'in a field so inchoate' as Chicano Studies, that kind of appointment would be an error, and one difficult to correct...*

As incredible as it may seem, the 12 Angry White Men dismissed the recommendations of leaders in the field of Chicano studies, calling them non-analytical and Dr. Acuña's political cronies.

The 12 Angry Men made it clear that they did not believe that Chicanos were able or professional enough to objectively review other Chicano scholars.

The white male reviewers showed a further contempt for the field of Chicano studies, implying that they did not consider it to be a legitimate discipline. The UC hired Corbett and Kane, a union-busting firm, to win at any cost.

## End Of The Millennium

The 1990s witnessed increased political activism among minority students. Chicano and Latino students are in the forefront of this unrest, protesting the lack of representation of Chicanos on our campuses. Understandably, they fail to appreciate the distinction between "underepresented" and "underutilized." (see 'Liars Figure' p. 5) They know that Chicanos are systematically excluded from higher education because of higher tuition costs and the de-facto racist policies of the universities.

Syndicated columnists Roberto Rodriguez and Patricia Gonzales write in the May 22, 1994 issue of the El Paso Times:

"It's been more than 25 years since African Americans and Latinos first began attending all-white colleges in large numbers. Yet recent hunger strikes and student demonstrations underscore that they feel their presence at institutions of higher learning is still unwelcome and the right to study their own history is still questioned."

Recent protests at Stanford University, the University of California at Santa Barbara (UCSB), the University of Colorado-Boulder, Fullerton College, Harvard, Michigan State University (MSU) and other schools have called attention to racist acts on their campuses and inability to recruit and retain adequate numbers

of Latino students, professors and administrators.

Their demands also have included more university support for Chicano and Latino studies, investment in their surrounding communities and a halt to immediate immigrant bashing.

Racially hostile acts against non-whites have long been tolerated on college campuses. A quarter of a century ago, racist acts — such as slave and anti-Mexican parties — were generally regarded as harmless fraternity fun.

When colleges finally cracked down on racist speech and behavior, white students objected, claiming their right of free speech was being imperiled.

Professors of Chicano and  
(See The End on page 6)

## UC to Hand Over Smoking Gun

The right to confidentiality in the review process has ruined the careers of many minority professors as well as women and gays. This right has encouraged the routine use of secret files and secret committees, making it impossible for victims to confront their accusers.

What makes *Acuña v. The Regents of the University of California et al* different is the *University of Pennsylvania v. EEOC*, which allows plaintiffs to find the smoking gun.

The University of Pennsylvania v. EEOC held that institutions of higher learning were entitled to confidentiality except in discrimination cases. Based on the Pennsylvania case, Judge Ronald Stevens, the Santa Barbara Superior

Court judge in Dr. Acuña's state case, reluctantly ordered the UC to hand over the smoking gun to Dr. Acuña, i.e., the underrated UCSB committee reports, the identities of the ad hoc committee and other secret documents that prove the disparate impact that UC discrimination has had on Chicanos.

Reviewer, Associate Vice-Chancellor Julius Zelmanowitz, insisted that confidentiality insured a fair and objective review, and that secret reviewers were carefully chosen from related fields: "... the ad hoc committee members are from closely related disciplines so that they can fairly and knowledgeably evaluate the candidate. Dr. Acuña was reviewed by the same system we use to review any other profes-

sional appointment."

What Zelmanowitz failed to add was that the fairness of the system has never before been tested, since candidates have never known the names of the "secret" ad hoc committee members reviewing their cases. The candidates had to rely on faith that the system was just.

The Acuña case tested the UC's good faith and found it wanting. The facts show that two of Dr. Acuña's ad hoc reviewers knew absolutely nothing about the field of Chicano studies; the third only made assumptions about Chicanos in general.

It was learned that one of the reviewers had been a member of the Central Intelligence Agency for five years, which, of course, he had a perfect right to have been

(See Smoking on page 6)



# Report Exposes Academe Elitism; Students be Damned

"During the last 10 years, the faculty course load has been falling. Humanists and social scientists who once taught five courses in a school year now teach four. Lab scientists are teaching less than that.

With fewer courses being taught, class size is growing. Small seminars are disappearing. Teaching assistants are carrying more of the burden of instruction. Courses are so often closed, many undergraduates find themselves shut out of courses required for their major. Earning a degree can take five years at ever higher fees. The squeeze is now affecting not only larger campuses like UCLA or Berkeley but smaller ones: like Santa Cruz and Santa Barbara."

**SOURCE:** David Glidden, "The Incredible Shrinking Course Load at Pricey UC," Los Angeles Times March 22, 1992

What triggered UC Philosophy professor David Glidden's response was former UC President David Gardner's charge that asking UC professors to teach more would lower quality. Gardner's allegation seemed especially ludicrous since many UC full professors teach less than four courses annually and a critical mass earn in excess of \$100,000 for teaching some six hours a week, 30 weeks per year.

According to Glidden: "Requisites of research require lower teaching loads. The publication of research is what faculty are paid for. Teaching is a chore." The UC Riverside professor continues that research and publication cannot be confused.

*"Long term research is of real value. But publication drives research these days. Better research was never dependent on teaching fewer classes. Only the quantity of publication is."*

*"Faculty advancements and promotions at research universities are based on quantity of publication more than quality of research. Since more faculty don't have the time to assess specialized research in areas they themselves know little of, quantity of publications reigns supreme."*

In a November 17, 1991 Los Angeles Times article, "Why Not Reward a Political Scientist Who Helps a Neighborhood?", Glidden touches on academe's narrow interpretation of knowledge.

Professor Glidden's critique is important since not all UC professors are Nobel Prize-winners. Most UC campuses do not have a single laureate. UC campuses such as the University of California at Santa Barbara barely rise above the state universities, which have departments that are ranked higher than Santa Barbara.

Internal efforts to reform the UC have

been met with faculty resistance. Indeed many looked at the recent Pister Report of the University of California, also known as the **Report Of the University wide Task Force On Faculty Rewards, June 26, 1991**, as equivalent of hearsay.

The Pister Report recommends that faculty reviews include sufficient rewards for teaching, professional activities, public service and applied research, which are all dismissed by review committees. ("Pister's Report Calls For Broader Definition Of What Constitutes Proper Work of Faculty," Notice, A publication of the Academic Senate, University of California, October 1991).

*"In general, the task force found that there is a substantial gap at UC between what faculty advancement regulations allow and what the University actually does. APM regulations generally allow substantial latitude in faculty advancement criteria, the task force found, but advancement practice seldom reflects this openness. Some of the changes the task force recommends would have to be implemented through presidential modification of the APM, but others would simply require, in the committees's view, a greater adherence to the APM regulations that already exist."* (Notice)

The reality is that the Pister Report exposes elitism at the heart of academe:

*"Indeed, scientists and scholars increasingly write more and more about less and less and, as a consequence, know less and less about more and more. The discipline of specialization requires reading deeply instead of widely. Yet, often it is better to be well read, especially where the humanities and social sciences are concerned, since they address the ways we think and live, the values we have. Knowing everything there is to know about a single line of text or an ancient artifact can isolate scholars from the diversity of knowledge necessary to make cross-cultural connections or to take a longer view of history than simply living in the present or the past. Scholarship can become preoccupying when there's little beyond assembling Heraclitus' sayings."* (Glidden, 1991).

According to Glidden, the 1980s produced free agent marketeers with scholars "hawking innovations of their own erudite subdisciplines", which he calls the Reaganomics of higher education. The result is an obsessive preoccupation with the esoteric — the students and the public be damned. Research institutions no longer exist for the accumulation of knowledge, but to collect exotic animals to fill the zoo.

The lengthy depositions taken in the Acuña case, as well as the materials produced by the UC in discovery, validate both Glidden

and the Pister task force. UC professors, in fact, spend more keeping their resumes current than teaching and their research consequently lacks depth. It is not uncommon for professors to use the same bibliographies, the same topic and the same survey data in book after book, article after article.

Acuña v. the UC Regents of the University of California exposes UCSB's mediocrity and the obsession to preserve the past.

Take Jeffrey Russell, chair of the Committee on Academic Personnel when Acuña was denied. During his deposition, Russell testified that the mission of the University was to advance the greater glory of God.

"Abstractions — democracy, socialism, religion, communism — disguise, hide and nourish the demonic forces of hatred. Only when the abstractions are put aside can we see the face of the Devil gloating over suffering," writes Russell. His concept of radical evil, appears to target pro-choicers and the Pister report.

"In society as a whole, beyond theological circles, belief in the existence of both God and Devil has drastically declined since the eighteenth century, less because of theological arguments than because of the growing predominance of materialism," he adds. Truth is found only in the mind of God, according to Russell. Russell, in a recent book on Columbus, denies the existence of the Spanish Inquisition.

Professor Russell has a right to express his own views. But, bias does become an issue when those views spill over into the review process; it was Russell who wrote the CAP committee report. It was Russell who handpicked Dr. Acuña's secret ad hoc committee. It was Russell who tried to appoint Oits Graham to the ad hoc committee.

It was Russell who led the charge against Acuña. Russell took it upon himself to dismiss Acuña as a public scholar. It was also Russell who led the campus charge against the Pister Report—reacting as if the barbarians were at the gates of Rome.

Russell's second choice to the ad hoc committee was of like minded. U.S. historian Robert Kelley, who was obsessed with getting Acuña wrote before his death in the summer of 1993:

*"The most arresting feature in Professor Rodolfo Acuña's book is his title: Occupied America. This usage, clearly chosen with great care, bears a powerful charge. The term 'occupied' has specific historical meaning, referring, as in Occupied France or the Occupied Netherlands, to an alien oppressive force governing a land in which there is an ancient core society to which rightful rule over its homeland should someday return."*

Kelley is incensed by the title of Dr. Acuña's book "Occupied America," and adds that Acuña "is driven by a power, explicitly stated impulse to challenge the emerging Chicano middle class and younger generation which, he [Acuña] laments, is becoming increasingly Americanized and indifferent to their ethnic origins."

Kelley's deep Eurocentricism distorts his objectivity. How could the United States be guilty of anything so heinous a crime as invading and occupying another territory? Kelly thus joined the growing ranks of nativist among U.S. historians who have closed ranks to defend and to become cheerleaders for "American" institutions.

*(Another member of the ad hoc committee said he was offended by a map in Occupied America, which showed the Southwest in 1822 as belonging to Mexico and not to the indigenous people of the continent. Acuña agreed that the map should have shown that this area belonged to the indigenous people. But, what standard applies? Why wasn't the reviewer offended by current and past maps which show this territory as belonging to the United States?)*

Obsessed with defending America, Kelley denies the Southwest ever belonged to Mexico, consciously distorting history by saying that government officials in the southwest, not the people, declared their allegiance to Mexico in 1821.

After reviewing Mexico's internal problems during its 50 years of existence, Kelley justifies the U.S. invasion of Mexico by blaming Mexico for the war between the two countries. Incredibly, Kelley distorts Dr. Ramón Ruiz's classic work to support his fantasies.

Kelley calls *Occupied America* polemical. Kelley even consults *Webster's Third International Dictionary* for a definition of polemical, grasping for support for his position.

Kelley angrily says that because Acuña writes that the United States invaded Mexico and committed atrocities, that Acuña is portraying the Mexican as a victim.

The bottom line is that Euroamerican scholars are scared as hell over what they see as a Mexican invasion. And, they are using their sinecures to fuel the hatred of racists who want to deny Mexicans health and educational services.

The importance of the Acuña case is that it exposes the hypocrisy and intellectual dishonesty of the Gardners, the Russells and the Kellys.

The thousands of documents and depositions taken in this case expose the subjectivity and even the corruption of the Academic review process, proving what most minority scholars already knew but could not prove.

## Strategy Keeps University of California Snowblind

(continued from page 1)

California Santa Barbara, although Acuña repeatedly asked to sit down and settle the case out of court; instead, the UC dared him to sue with Regent Ralph Ochoa threatening Acuña that the UC would throw 18 lawyers at him to assassinate his character.

The UC hired Corbett & Kane, a labor busting firm and let the taxi meter run wild. Judith Droz Keyes, its leading attorney, is one of the top labor lawyers in California, defending the rich and the powerful.

Unable to bankrupt Acuña, the UC is looking for yet another firm to represent them in the Acuña case. The UC wants a Chicano or a Chicana partner to impress

the jury with its diversity.

Like the best of the robber barons, the UC covers up its defects, rarely attempting to correct flaws in the system.

UC Vice-President Bill Baker has tremendous power charged with lobbying. He uses alumni to pressure legislators and rewards the firms of alumni and friends of the UC.

During the deposition of Ralph Ochoa, a former chair of The Regents Affirmative Action Committee and a prominent Chicano attorney, Ochoa said that he volunteered 10 to 15 hours weekly for the UC. Ochoa denied that he was paid for services, but admitted that his firm acts as bond attorneys for the UC and as outside

counsel.

Acuña learned just how hard it was to sue the UC. Yes, he had a good case but it took resources to litigate. It would take millions to beat the UC. According to attorneys he consulted, the UC unsuccessfully appealed one case up to the U.S. Supreme Court, to prevent UC Berkeley janitors from using the campus mail system.

The Center for Constitutional Rights filed suit for Acuña, which has been kept alive by the National Coalition of Universities in the Public Interest, along with the ACLU and a team of solo practitioners.

From Acuña's experience, the only way to level the playing field and to end this inequality is to put a cap on the amount UC spends on outside counsel. For open-

(See Snowblind on page 6)



# Nothing but the Facts on the *Acuña v. UC Regents*

(continued from page 1)

in Dr. Ramón Favela's class at which Acuña spoke.

In late November Dr. Acuña filed a claim with the California state Dept. of Fair Employment and Housing, and received the right to sue. Three months later Chicanos marched down State Street in Santa Barbara in the largest protest there to date.

In March of 1992, the National Coalition of Universities in the public interest persuaded the Center for Constitutional Rights to take on the case. On September 25, 1992, Dr. Acuña's complaint was filed in Alameda County Superior Court.

In October 1992, the UC removed the case to the federal court, the Northern District, and attempted to get the case dismissed. The state claims were eventually remanded and Dr. Acuña ended up with federal and state cases.

The UC had hired outside counsel, Corbett & Kane. The strategy was clear — to spend Dr. Acuña into the ground. Frank Acuña, Dr. Acuña's son, joined the case as local counsel.

Corbett & Kane moved to

change venue: it wanted to get rid of Frank Acuña, an experienced litigator, who spent some 200 hours in two months answering motion after motion. The UC did not like the idea of trying the case in Alameda County — too many African Americans, Latinos and progressive whites. More importantly, defendants and their counsel wanted a Simi Valley jury which for them was Santa Barbara. Lastly, the move increased travel time for attorneys, making it a billing Disneyland.

Plaintiff decided not to appeal the change of venue. It was eating up time and money.

In the move to Southern California Frank Acuña became a casualty. In retrospect, the move was the best thing that could have happened. Dr. Acuña's base of support was in Los Angeles and Santa Barbara.

Armando Durón joined as local counsel for the federal case; Moisés Vázquez for the state case; and Beth Minsky of the National Coalition assumed a greater role. Their weakness was that they were solo practitioners, so they recruited 10 other attorneys as well as the ACLU.

Defendants' counsel motion to

drop the multiple individual defendants, arguing that Acuña's failure to list them on his claim at the department of Fair Employment and Housing meant they could not be sued. They cited the Valdez case, which held so.

Beth Minsky did a brilliant job, and Santa Barbara Superior Court Judge Ronald Stevens held for plaintiff. The court took judicial notice that the DFEH form did not call for the naming of individuals, and DFEH policy prohibited the plaintiff from filling out the application, this was the employment counselors responsibility.

Soon afterwards, Judge Stevens ruled that, although he did not agree with it, the *University of Pennsylvania v. EEOC* was the law of the land. Judge Stevens ordered the University of California to hand over confidential documents — confidentiality applied in all but discrimination cases.

Over the next year and a half plaintiff's counsel plodded through over 20 depositions. It received confidential reports. Clearly, the UC had not only denied Dr. Acuña employment because of his politics, his race and his age, but it had conspired to do

so, intentionally attempting to destroy his reputation.

The referee, appointed to manage discovery, ordered the UC to produce systemwide documents, which the UC frustrated by legal maneuvers. The referee failed to control Corbett & Kane and their attempts to intimidate plaintiff and his attorneys by spending massive sums of money.

The judge allowed the defendants to subject Dr. Acuña to psychiatric tests and to call dozens of Chicano scholars nationally in an effort to get them to testify against Acuña.

Corbett & Kane also hired an investigator to look through 25 years of student newspaper articles at California State University Northridge to dig up dirt, not only on Dr. Acuña, but on Chicano Studies and the Chicano community on campus.

The UC is now attempting to hire a Chicano attorney to trot out in front of a jury.

In June 1994 Corbett & Kane won a court order for Dr. Acuña to produce his unpublished manuscript, *Anything But Mexican*, all research notes, and research documents for future publications. Plaintiff did not appeal

because it cost too much money and resources.

Meanwhile, Judge Soares has not forced the UC to hand over some 200,000 pages of documents. Plaintiff counsel feels that they have enough to prove their case at the present, but that the unproduced documents will take them way over the top.

In the meantime, Corbett & Kane has stalled mediation, refusing to have anyone with authority present at the sessions, making a settlement almost impossible.

The UC has spent over \$1 million. It knows that an accounting will hurt its already gilded image. It believes that a trial will divert attention from its flagrant waste of taxpayers' funds. The cost of this case may very well exceed \$7 million which taxpayers' will pay. The irony is that it could have been settled by simple negotiation.

*Defense whores: attorneys who obstruct union organizing, affirmative action and justice. Psychiatrist who testify for money for corporate America without any regard for the truth.*

## Rudy Acuña and the UC Gulag

During the recent Cold War, Americans criticized the former Soviet Union for declaring dissidents mentally defective in order to throw them into "gulags," or concentration camps for political prisoners. Most Americans recognize this practice as a dangerous political precedent, which abuses psychological testing. Put into that context, it is difficult to understand why the UC is trying to create its own "gulag."

The Mexican saying puts it best, "*La zorra nunca se ve la cola*," (the fox never sees its own tail). Indeed, IQ and other mental examinations have historically been used by society to prove the inferiority of people of color.

At the turn of the century, scientists were convinced that the size of a cranium determined intelligence and used calipers to measure IQ's. California in recent times has led the way in reviving practices reminiscent of these abuses.

It was allowed the indiscriminate use of psychological testing in employment discrimination cases, tests that psychologists themselves warn should only be used to diagnose psychiatric patients, if then. One explanation is that California is an insurance state and members of the state Supreme Court have close ties with the industry.

Psychiatric tests ordered to prove or disprove emotional stress claims can rarely do so. The reality is that defense lawyers in civil cases abuse the law and psychology by hiring

what are commonly called "defense whores", psychiatrists paid to discredit plaintiffs by diagnosing them as psychotic dissidents.

In December 1993, Ian Fellerman, newly hired by Corbett & Kane, motioned the court for a mental examination of Dr. Acuña. According to Fellerman and the psychiatrist hired by the UC, the UC was entitled to give Dr. Acuña a mental exam made up of three psychiatric tests for personality disorders, because Dr. Acuña was seeking damages for emotional distress. Judge Robert Soares, the discovery referee, automatically sided with the defendants, reasoning, "It's done all the time in these cases!"

Judge Soares dismissed arguments about the dangers to academic freedom, privacy rights and the potential for abuse. Beth Minsky, an attorney from the National Coalition of Universities in the Public Interest and an attorney for Dr. Acuña, told *The Chronicle for Higher Education*:

"We're talking about average stress — tiredness, fatigue, litigation-associated stress. Those claims are normal and usual. They do not mean you should be given a psychiatric test that is invasive."

According to Minsky, Corbett & Kane had other options. It could call other candidates who were rejected to testify that they did not experience stress after being denied a job. Additionally, test results for such an evaluation of Dr. Acuña would be worthless anyway. Dr. Acuña has never taken a psychiatric exam before — so there is no standard to measure his

stress today, three years after the rejection of candidacy. The bottom line: these tests were never meant to measure stress, but to find personality disorders in psychiatric patients and determine whether their condition warranted institutionalization.

Recognizing the political importance and abusive nature of the tests, Beth Minsky appealed the court's order for a mental exam with a writ to the appellate court for the Second District. The appeals court denied the writ without prejudice and sent Dr. Acuña back to the superior court. The referee was unmoved and ordered the exam to go forward with the three psychiatric tests. Once again, Dr. Acuña appealed to the appellate court, which he again lost.

Aside from the fact that the UC and the psychiatrist will distort the findings and use the exams to assassinate Rudy Acuña's character — the main reason for spending a considerable amount of resources — time and money — fighting the mental examination — is political. The FOR Acuña Committee and the legal team believe that it is their duty to resist the drift towards a gulag system where the large corporations use harassing tactics and intimidation to maintain corporate privilege.

Win or lose, a memory must be left. A lot of people wish that they would have done the same when Hitler's brown shirts began their rise to power, or spoken out against the Soviet Union's abuse of the gulags.

*Political liberty is earned, not given.*



Listen  
to  
**SANCHO**  
on  
**89.3 FM**  
**KPCC**  
Saturday Evenings  
6PM - 10PM



# Statistics Lie, and Liars Figure

Throughout her tenure in office, Chancellor Barbara Uehling has boasted of her tremendous strides in hiring minorities and women to UCSB. On March 1, 1989, in a memo to The Campus Community, she wrote:

"Because of the hard, and often imaginative work of so many people, UCSB has made remarkable gains. Over the last fifteen years, we have:

- . increased minority faculty from 7 percent to 14 percent;
- . increased minority undergraduate students 17 percent to 24 percent;
- . increased minority staff from 21 percent to 28 percent, and
- . increased minority administrators from 2.5 percent to 11.5 percent.

She continued, "I believe that this university must be a leader in the effort to assure that all qualified individuals, regardless of race, cultural background, participate in our society."

Specifically, in reference to Chicanos, the "remarkable gains" were made during a fifteen year period — a time when Mexican and Central American school population quadrupled! Moreover, the "Hispanic" category used by UCSB concealed

national origin and includes Basque and other Europeans. In 1988, only half of the ladder rank "Hispanic" faculty were of Mexican extraction.

To make matters worse, Affirmative Action Officer Ray Huerta stated that "Hispanics" are not underutilized at UCSB and that UCSB is in compliance and not legally bound to hire more Mexicans. In an affirmative action report, dated October 21, 1987, Huerta's Office wrote:

"Based on Ph.D. availability estimates, there is no underutilization of Hispanics or Native Americans. "Nonrepresentation" is a different issue. Presently, Native Americans are not represented in 36 out of 38 academic departments, followed by Blacks in 27 departments, and Hispanics and Asians unrepresented in 20 departments."

In another instance, Huerta opposed a Target of Opportunity hire in the School of Education because it already had 2.5 Mexicans. According to Huerta, Mexicans were overutilized and overrepresented.

Without a doubt, Huerta is extremely imaginative, since the underutilized statistic used by UCSB is based on the number of "Hispanic" Ph.D.s available nationwide, a figure of approximately 2% or 3%, and not the significantly higher regional

figures in California. This results in a dramatic undercount of Chicano Ph.D.s. Chicanos may not be a national minority, but Mexicans comprise 16 of the 24 million Latinos in the United States.

For legal purposes, under-representation has no meaning on the university campus. Underutilization data is used to justify and legalize discrimination. It is a way to avoid affirmative action, a fact that Mr. Huerta has made clear to department heads.

Let's look at Chancellor Uehling's "remarkable gains":

## UCSB's Remarkable Gains? Hispanic Faculty

	1987-88	1990-91	1991-92
Male	32	31	31
Female	8	7	9
Total Faculty	693	707	732

During this same four year period, the number of white women increased from 94 (14.2%) to 122 (16.7%), hardly "remarkable." The number of African Americans over these same years went from 13 (2%), to 16 (2.3%), to 14 (1.9%) respectively, which is tragic.

In speaking about UCSB's record in the Acuña case, Associate Vice-Chancellor Julius Zelmanowitz stated:

"Our record is one that in most respects I'm quite proud of. I think Dr. Acuña requested and I supplied some data on this. We went back three or four years. We looked at, for example, the last 13 Latino candidates (the great majority of whom were Chicano or Chicana scholars) whom we reviewed for appointments here. Of those 13, we approved offers to 12.

Of the 12 to whom we made offers, we hired seven, which is a very good hiring record because competition for Chicano/Latino scholars is fierce nationally. We wish the number were higher. Also, 23 percent of our hires over the last three years were ethnic minorities, and 32 percent were women. Overall, 48 percent were minorities and/or women. So in recent years we have a very good record."

In reviewing Zelmanowitz's numbers, one concludes that he is either a very bad mathematician or a liar.

The bottom line is that minorities do not consider the work of BSU to be "remarkable," and are impatient with the racism of Zelmanowitz. In fairness, however, UCSB is not an aberration, "imaginative" figures are standard throughout the UC system.

## U.S. Educational System Reinforces Inequities

The U.S. educational system systematically reinforces and reproduces the existing social and class inequities; it reinforces and seeks to reproduce that which has already been declared as "knowledge." Students are encouraged, taught, rewarded to expect the expected. As Upton Sinclair observed decades ago. "Our educational system is not a public service, but an instrument of special privilege; its purpose is not to further the welfare of mankind but merely to keep America capitalist."

Analyses of the governing boards of most universities and colleges in the U.S. provide support for these observations. For more than a century these have been dominated by the representatives of corporations. Many institutions owe their very survival to the million-dollar funding of special interest donors.

Betina Aptheker's classic work on rebellion in the academic factories provide a succinct historical overview of these processes. At the end of WWII, the U.S. emerged as the dominate industrial power — the same era which we saw the rise of national liberation movements worldwide — in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. The full scale shattering of colonial rule was advancing, and theoreticians, educators, students were playing more than a role of merely "integrating" cross-cultural studies; hence, several

"think-tanks" were established — sanctioned policy units which perpetuated the ideological domination of Eurocentrism.

But challenges to such ideological domination surfaced, most notably during the 1960's. Historically, if we examine the academic rebellion which paved the way for the "integration" of Chicano Studies, Afro-American Studies, American Indian Studies, Asian Studies, Labor Studies, Women's Studies, we have witnessed that the academic rebellion which created such have been intricately intertwined with the liberation movements of these communities. In examining the rise of Chicano Studies, for example, it has been intertwined with the Chicano Movement of the 60's, and was at times, led by Chicano students — in the high schools and colleges. In the process of such, the Chicano Student Movement significantly altered the fabric of American politics and education.

Colleges have been an arena of intense and sustained political activity. The classroom should be no different. With the initial creation of Black and Brown student organizations, for example, MEChA's and the BSA's, these marked a period of attack upon the racist foundations of the university, and its attendant curriculum. Mounting pressure was exerted on higher education institutions in order to force them to respond to demands for knowledge arising from the marginalized

people of color, men and women of color.

These demands for knowledge arising from the marginalized represented more than just the demands for traditional modes of knowledge — we wanted access in the dissemination of information, but more significantly, they were demands for modes of knowledge which would contribute to the development of our movements, along with liberation from the curriculum.

The vision was of Chicano Studies, Black Studies, Women's Studies, would entail a new history, a new psychology, a new social science. The potential would require a new paradigm of not only seeing the world completely different way, but indeed, shaping a new world entirely.

So what has happened? As we approach 30 years of Chicano Studies, students have grown more disempowered; Spanish-surnamed

elites who have no knowledge of, or support for, the historical processes — led by students — have come to dominate Chicano Studies. A new generation of students have gotten the shaft!

Students have responded — have held hunger strikes, marches, etc.. But until the "native elites" of academia are exposed for who they are and held accountable for their (non)actions, Chicano Studies will simply remain out of touch with realities of most students' lives.

## Racism Persists Greasers Go Home

It is sad, but the fact that the University of California spends more money keeping scholars such as Rudy Acuña out of the system than it does protecting the interests of minorities. For instance, the quality of the UC's defense in the Bakke and Bradford cases, which resulted in the loss of rights to education for Mexicans and Central Americans, is questionable.

In the late 1970s, Alan Bakke, an engineer in his late 30s, sued the UC Regents alleging he was not accepted at the UC Davis Medical School because of "reverse discrimination." Bakke blamed minorities and said that the UC denied him entrance be-

cause it accepted less qualified minority applicants based on a quota system. The UC failed to litigate the case vigorously, either in the courts or in the public.

UC counsel acted similarly in the Bradford case. Bradford, a 1990 superior court case, overturned an earlier case, Leticia A., which treated undocumented students as residents for tuition purposes. The decision excludes many of the brightest and the best Chicano students a higher education.

Much to the disgust of minority leaders, the UC regularly caves in to demands of kook groups such as that of David Horowitz, a former radical turned reactionary. Its policies encourage UC frater-

nities to insult Mexicans, Native Americans, Blacks, Asians, women and gays. At UCLA, UC counsel turned the other way when a film was made that featured a Mexican woman having intercourse with a donkey. Recently, UCLA frat brothers sang a song to "Lupe", their eight year old "cocksucking Mexican whore."

UCLA is not an aberration. UC counsel roll over and play dead when it involves the rights of outcasts. Meanwhile, firms such as Corbett & Kane get rich in keeping Mexicans in their places... which is out of the UC.



## In Retrospect

**O**ccupied America for many Chicanos has been an introduction to Chicano history and to political consciousness. *Occupied America* has been a spring board to understanding oppression of Chicanos within the borders of a supposed free "America." The first edition of *Occupied America: The Chicano's Struggle Toward Liberation*, published in 1972, has gone through two significant changes for three editions of *Occupied America*, each edition being a separate book. In each text, Chicanos have learned new perspectives on Chicano history and have gained political insight.

It is important to reprint part of the preface of the first edition *Occupied America: The Chicano's Struggle Toward Liberation* in order to return to the beginning, of a book that will forever be part of Chicano Tradition.

*"Occupied America has evolved from by belief that the history of Chicanos in the United States must be reexamined. My frame work has been the Chicano's struggle for liberation, for being a Chicano myself, I have experienced the inequalities of this supposedly democratic society; I have seen that people of Mexican extraction in the United States are, in a very real sense, captives of the system that renders them second-class citizens. As a historian, I wanted to know what has happened in the last 124 years that has kept Chicanos at the end of the proverbial stick. Traditional explanations of racism, nativism, and economic exploitation provided only a partial answer, in my opinion."*

*"As my research progressed, I became convinced that the experience of Chicanos in the United States parallels that of other Third World peoples who have suffered under the colonialism of technologically superior nations. Thus, the thesis of this monograph is that Chicanos in the United States are a colonized people. The conquest of the Mexicans, the occupation of their land, and the continued oppression they have faced documents this thesis. The story that emerges is a group of people who collectively have been losers in a society that love only winners."*

Rodolfo Acuña, 1972

## Smoking

(continued from page 2)

an employee of. But, considering the political overtones of the review, the selection of this reviewer as fair and impartial and knowledgeable about the candidate's field, is suspect.

Suspect was also the fact that the UCSB Committee on Academic Personnel had nominated UCSB Historian Otis Graham, a founding member of the Federation of Immigration Reform and a leading Mexican basher, to head the ad hoc committee that reviewed Dr. Acuña.

The Santa Barbara Independent, after reviewing documents produced to Acuña by the UC, wrote:

*"SHOOT LOW: Like the bumper sticker says, just because you're paranoid doesn't mean they're not out to get you. For example, take the case of Rudy Acuña, who has charged the entire University of California hiring system is racist to the bone — and has a lawsuit to that effect — because*

*UCSB did not hire him to run their Chicano Studies program a few years ago. The court case has provided little snippets of information showing the peculiar logic guiding the university's hiring practices, and it does raise questions about the university's intentions. Acuña was turned down by an ad hoc hiring committee, whose members had been appointed by what's called the Committee for Academic Personnel, which oversees the hiring of UCSB faculty.*

*"It's more than a little odd that CAP's first choice as chair of the hiring committee for Chicano Studies was Otis Graham, a UCSB history professor who blamed the L.A. riots on immigrants and is one of the founders of an organization leading the charge to tighten the borders. Certainly Graham is entitled to his opinions — and for whatever reason he did not accept the appointment — but that CAP sought to appoint him indicates an almost conspiratorial lack of sensitivity. To put it in some perspective, it's as if they tried to appoint an engineer*

*specializing in the techniques of strip mining for the head of Environmental Studies. And these people are supposed to be smart."*

A fair scholar would have questioned the propriety of the CAP's nomination of Graham. Apparently, Zelmanowitz believed the selection of Graham was perfectly OK. Zelmanowitz also told Acuña that he himself had background in history and had taken many history classes in college, implying that he had given Dr. Acuña an objective review. Zelmanowitz testified that based on reading three pages of one of Acuña's works, he made his evaluation.

Evidently, reason does not interfere with Zelmanowitz's snow blindness. When Zelmanowitz' program analyst told him that the reviews of Acuña's work were emotional and angry, Zelmanowitz saw it as an indication that the system was working.

It was — if you belonged to the clique.

A postscript: Zelmanowitz doctored documents relating to the Acuña case.

## The End

(continued from page 2)

ethnic studies confront academic backlash because they challenge the mainstream view of the world. 'It's a real war over what constitutes knowledge,' says Estevan Flores, assistant professor of sociology at Boulder. His recent denial of tenure triggered protests there.

Last year, thousands of students from throughout California rallied to the support of California State University Northridge (CSUN) professor Rodolfo Acuña in his unsuccessful bid to secure a tenured

position in Chicano studies at UCSB.

Though he is considered the dean of Chicano studies and authored *Occupied America*, the bible of Chicano studies, he was deemed unqualified. Acuña has sued the university. The trial is expected to convene this fall.

Acuña's rejection represents an attack on the legitimacy of both Chicano studies and ethnic studies, says Flores.

If Acuña wins his case, it will put a dent into the secretive nature of evaluations. 'It has potential implications for the entire hiring and promotional process,' says Teresa Cordova, a University of New

Mexico professor."

Professor Flores is on the money when he says that it is a war over what constitutes knowledge. Indeed, most mainstream scholars give little value to knowledge about Chicanos and Latinos, despite the fact they make up almost 1/3 of all Californians and 40% of Los Angeles City. What they are concerned is about preserving their "America," not realizing or caring about the end of the millennium and the demographic changes that it brings.

The bigger the lie, the more people accept it, and the biggest lie is that the university looks for objective truth.

## Mark Your Calendars !

**Pro-Immigrant March  
Sunday  
October 16, 1994**

**Along Cesar Chavez Blvd.  
to Los Angeles City Hall**

**Oppose Proposition 187  
Rights for Immigrant Workers  
Solidarity with Haitian  
Brothers and Sisters**

For more information: The Coalition meets every other Monday at 6:00PM at ILGWU Hall on 675 S. Park View across the street from MacArthur Park in Pico Union.

## Attack

(continued from page 1)

process, the administration picked its scapegoat and focused its wrath on Broyles-González. She was repeatedly harangued and harassed by top level administration.

On June 7, 1994, the dean of the UCSB College of Letters and Sciences recommended the removal of professor Yolanda Broyles González as chair of the Department of Chicano Studies. This attack on Chicana/o Studies followed the nine-day student hunger strike at UCSB, ending on May 6th.

Even before the hunger strike ended, UCSB's administration of Vice-Chancellor of Academic Affairs Don Crawford, formerly from the University of Wisconsin-Madison, began to spread dissension among the students.

Dean Don Zimmerman, a decent man, nonetheless oversaw the administration's move to assign five Chicano professors to Chicano Studies on a temporary basis for .2 of their

teaching load. This reassignment gave the pro-administration Chicano faction a majority vote and potential control of the department.

Broyles-González opposed the administration's decision as an attack on the autonomy of Chicano Studies. This temporary reassignment of personnel was indeed unprecedented and would not have been tolerated in any other department.

Broyles-González understood the future autonomy of Chicano Studies at UCSB was at stake and mobilized support for her opposition to the reassignment. The result? Effective June 30th, the UCSB administration removed Broyles-González from the chairship.

The administration's interference with the department sparked community and faculty protest. As of this writing, the dean's recommendation is in the Office of the Vice-Chancellor, Crawford. Crawford had a reputation at the University of Wisconsin for dividing and conquering minorities and for catering to reactionary elements — a reputation that he is continuing at UCSB.

## Snowblind

(continued from page 3)

ers, outside counsel does not have an interest in settling a case, as long as a controversy exists, the state pays them. Corbett & Kane's billing practices, for instances, are only paled by the best selling novel the *FIRM*.

To end this injustice, the public must monitor harassment and discrimination cases. Oversight would not infringe on the UC's academic freedom. It would check the abuses regularly reported in the press.

The UC gets between 28% to 32% of its budget from the taxpayers. The state pays for it's buildings. Moreover, taxpayers provide almost all of the UC's teaching budget, the University of California's forgotten mission.

It is time to take back the UC. *Si Se Puede*, it can be done, by pressuring the legislature to do what the people pay for. Cut expenses by putting a cap on spending. Lastly, if UC officials and faculty are guilty of non-feasance, malfeasance, or discriminate, let them pay for their own legal expenses.

Write your legislator! End UC Racism!



# Acknowledgements

A Special Thanks and Un Abrazo to all those that have contributed to FOR Acuña

## Comedians

Larry Omaha  
Brandon Scott  
Raul Martinez  
Rudy Moreno  
Denny Mora  
Chacha Sandoval  
Ann Marie Williams  
Lydia Nicole  
Alex Valdez

## Poets

Victor Carrillo  
Freddy Heredia  
Gloria Alvarez  
Sesshu Foster  
Evangeline Ordaz-Nichols  
Maria Elena Fernandez  
Frankie Estrada  
Maria Calbildo

## Muscians

Marcos Loya and his Band  
Quetzal  
Desborde  
Al Reyes accompanied by Willie & Marcos Loya  
Roberto Haro & Secret City  
Manuel y Los Playeros  
Indyka - Jaime Corral, Fernando Corral, Eliseo  
Villanueva, Dulio Chavez, Damie Villanueva

## Artists

Leo Limon  
Malaquias Montoya

Muchas Gracias and Un Abrazote to  
the FOR Acuña Committee and the Legal Team

The *FOR Acuña Newspaper* was a collaboration of the FOR Acuña Committee.

The issue is published by the *FOR Acuña Committee*

Editor: Carlos R. Guerrero

Artwork/Logo: Leo Limon

Layout/Design/Typeset: *AMOXTLI Publications*  
North Hills, CA

Vol. 1 No. 1, Summer 1994

© 1994

Special Thanks to Carlos Guerrero. This Issue would not have been published without his diligence





A mediation conference was scheduled for Aug. 5 & 6th. It has been postponed to Sept. 23-24. Ms. Alma Flores, chair of El Congreso, the UCSB Chicano student organization, and community leaders will participate.

## FOR ACUÑA

This case is not about getting Dr. Rudy Acuña a job, he has a job. This is a landmark case about discrimination, the denial of political, racial and age rights. This case was only filed because of the UC's outrageous arrogance and its history of racism towards Chicanos. It is about the disparate impact that UC practice has had on Chicanos. Even, the name, FOR ACUÑA, is transitional, and, at the conclusion of this case, will be changed to FOR CHICANA(O) STUDIES.

Neither Rudy Acuña nor the committee could have survived without the support of the Chicano, Latino and progressive communities. Acuña's attorneys have given unselfishly. We are now asking you to support even more through small or large donations, which are needed for a four to six week trial. Even a dollar at this point will help defray the expenses of this publication.

**FOR ACUÑA COMMITTEE**  
**P.O. BOX 33523**  
**GRANADA HILLS, CA 91394**

\_\_\_\_\_ \$5.00 \_\_\_\_\_ \$10 \_\_\_\_\_ \$50 \_\_\_\_\_ \$100 \_\_\_\_\_ Other

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Address: \_\_\_\_\_

City/Zip: \_\_\_\_\_

Phone: (h) \_\_\_\_\_ (o) \_\_\_\_\_

Politicos who I'll Contact \_\_\_\_\_

Ways that I can help \_\_\_\_\_

\*Please make checks payable to Acuña Fund; So Cal ACLU  
Thanks

Please cut out the following letter, photocopy it, sign it and send it to the politicos listed below. Feel free to write your own letters. Make extra copies and distribute to friends so the can also lobby politicos.

### Assemblymembers

Hilda Solis  
Diane Martínez  
Richard Polanco  
Bob Campbell  
John Vasconcelos  
Marquerite Archie-Hudson  
Jack O'Connell  
Joe Baca

### Senators

Nicholas Petris  
Gary Hart  
Bill Lockyer  
Teresa Hughes  
Patrick Johnston  
Diane Watson  
Tom Hayden  
Art Torres

cc: Jack Peltson  
Office of the President  
University of California  
300 Lakeside Drive  
Oakland, CA 94612

Henry Young,  
Office of the Chancellor  
University of California  
Santa Barbara, CA 93106

Date:

TO:

FROM:

Address:

Phone:

True diversity is accepting one another's differences. In rejecting Dr. Rodolfo F. Acuña, reviewers attacked his kind of research, which is essentially applied — the kind of work that brings about social change. The wrongheaded idea of UCSB administrators and the faculty senate that there is a difference between pure research and public scholarship short changes society.

Dr. Acuña has had to challenge this elitism in the courts. The UC hired outside counsel in an attempt to bankrupt Dr. Acuña, assassinate his character, put him under excessive surveillance, force him to undergo a psychiatric examination, and called people throughout the country with the express purpose of trying to destroy his reputation.

By employing Corbett & Kane, a labor busting firm, the UC has spent around \$1 million to deprive Dr. Acuña of his day in court. This travesty, as well as recent reports of UC scandals and backroom deals, is eroding the moral authority of our university system.

We are horrified that you as an elected official have not prevented the ongoing injustice. Until you put a binding cap on what the UC spends on outside counsel and change its charter to make it responsive to the legislature and the people of this state, you will be condoning and abetting racism and corruption.

Whether the UC likes it or not, Dr. Acuña is one of the leading Chicano scholars. His research is in the spirit of the UC Pister Report, which encourages applied research.

Enough is enough. End the UC's Inquisition of Acuña and others. Control the University of California system... it is out of hand.