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Preface

This Luskin Center report is the product of eighteen months of dedicated work by a team of UCLA graduate and undergraduate students. Beginning its effort in the wake of the murders of Breonna Taylor and George Floyd, the research team had to face the trying conditions of the COVID-19 pandemic, when in-person meetings were impossible. With great determination and ingenuity, the team undertook its work and has now produced the report below. The report points to key chapters in the history of racism at UCLA and in the struggle of people of color at our institution. The research team invites readers to revisit these struggles by thinking beyond the admission or hiring of people of color to explore how racism has shaped those individuals’ experiences and, in turn, the university itself. This report marks an important beginning that now requires additional attention, resources, and research. We express our deep appreciation to and admiration for the researchers who have opened up an essential line of inquiry which UCLA, along with other institutions of higher learning in this country, must pursue now more than ever.

Professors Eddie Cole, Aomar Boum, and David N. Myers

Faculty Advisors
Executive Summary

In March 2020, the murders of George Floyd, Ahmaud Arbery, Breonna Taylor and the numerous Black lives lost at the hands of the police resulted in a summer of anger, activism, and a cry for racial justice across the globe. Companies and institutions were pushed to reflect on how they are implicated in perpetuating racism and were presented with the opportunity to either take a stand against it or maintain the status quo. Universities were tasked with assessing whether their current Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) policies were enough, and to what extent they are implicated in maintaining racial inequality.

The UCLA Luskin Center for History and Policy took up the mantle of investigating the long history of race and racism at one of the nation’s premier public universities. The team of over a dozen graduate and undergraduate student researchers conducted research over the past year and a half to explore questions such as: What has been the treatment of Black, Chicano and Latino, Indigenous, and Asian Americans on a campus built on indigenous land over a century ago? What steps were taken by staff and administration to alleviate and/or exacerbate both opportunity and exclusion for minority communities? How did student and community activism shape the goals of the university, from admissions and hiring to the ongoing struggle to properly fund ethnic studies programs? This multipronged report is the result of these research efforts. It attempts to capture the voices of those most vital to the story of race on campus, while also leaving room for the writing of further chapters in this story.

First, this report explores the denial of indigenous land rights and housing discrimination endemic to the Westwood and Los Angeles communities. What follows is an in-depth examination of the university’s earliest Black alumni—the men and women who were few and far between but who lay the foundation for decades of Black student activism, resistance, and leadership, and who were pivotal to breaking college athletics’ color barrier. Next, we discuss the student activism, protests, and clashes with authority that culminated in the creation of the nation’s earliest ethnic studies programs. As student activists then demonstrated, and as this report discusses, the decision regarding
admission of students from populations of color – their academic merits notwithstanding – has been politically driven and economically motivated.

We then turn to a critical discussion of the role of admissions and hiring programs, focused on accepting and retaining diverse students and faculty. This includes an analysis of the politically charged anti-affirmative action legislation of the 1990s, the effects of which are still felt statewide to this day. We conclude with an analysis of the contemporary campus climate for Black students, with a special focus on the role of campus policing in perpetuating racial disparities among students, faculty, staff, and community members at UCLA. From this wide-ranging recounting of UCLA’s racial history, we derive a set of recommendations in the hope of promoting equity, equality, and justice.

**Key Takeaways**

1. There is a rich history of Black Students and students of color at UCLA that is generally unknown to the larger UCLA community.
2. This rich history began with Black female students even prior to the official founding of UCLA, when it was still a teaching institution.
3. UCLA’s earliest Black male alumni were crucial to desegregating its campus.
4. There is a history of systemic racism at UCLA from its founding that continues to affect Black Students and students of color to this day.
5. There is a need for direct action to be taken by the university to actively combat racism and promote a culture of equity on campus.
Introduction

The concurrent crises of the novel coronavirus pandemic and the ongoing plague of police violence have catapulted racism’s tragic permanence to the front of America’s conscience. In the summer of 2020, as Black Americans continued to grieve the police killings of George Floyd, Breonna Taylor, and many others, thousands of protesters took to the streets demanding justice and accountability from local and federal leadership. These protests also rang loudly in the streets of Los Angeles and at UCLA. Alongside Black Americans, other communities of color also grieved and demanded justice in an increasingly racially charged climate in the United States. In recent years alone, Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders (AAPI) in the United States experienced an increase in racially motivated hate crimes, anti-immigrant and anti-refugee policies surged, and antisemitic and anti-Muslim sentiments continued to rise. COVID-19 continues to rage, exacerbating in many ways racial disparities in health, education, and housing.\(^2\) We understand this state of racism in the United States as a reflection of a deep history of settler colonialism in the Americas and more than 300 years of racial violence and disenfranchisement of Black, Indigenous, and other communities of color.

Institutions must take the first step of reflecting meaningfully on their role in perpetuating structural racism. An exploration of the history of Black student trailblazers and activists on UCLA’s campus reveals the insidious ways in which racial prejudice and discrimination have come to permeate university systems. It is our hope that by uncovering the past, we might allow for greater intentionality in policymaking that might lead to a future of reconciliation and racial justice both at UCLA and at higher education institutions across the country.

The LCHP research team responsible for this report analyzed historical archives, oral interviews, timelines, and explored prospects of policy implementation and the renaming of spaces on campus. In doing so, we have taken an important first step in uncovering a history of racism at UCLA. We have also laid bare the needs that ought to be addressed if we are to live up to the credo of a public institution that serves the good

of the people, the communities of California, and the world. This report features people, programs, and movements that we believe have contributed to the current state of race relations at the university. We highlight moments in UCLA history that we believe might serve as opportunities for reflection and as educational tools. It is our hope that this historical analysis will catalyze the development of more just policies and practices.

Race, Ethnicity, and Land

Land Acknowledgement
The UCLA campus occupies Tovaangar, which constitutes the Los Angeles basin and south Channel Islands and is the land of the Gabrielino/Tongva peoples. Though formally labeled a “land-grant” institution, UCLA and the UC system benefited from the Morrill Act of 1862 which “turned Indigenous land into college endowments.” The history of UCLA thus begins with this occupation, which prompts some scholars, including members of this team, to describe it as a “land-grab” institution.

Violation of Lands
Although history might view the Morrill Land Grant Act of 1862 as a generous act to establish institutions of higher education, in fact this act entailed the colonization of Indigenous lands and the violation of land treaties. In our view, the founding of UCLA, like that of other land-grant institutions, was enabled by the take-over or occupation of Indigenous land. Prior to the Morrill Act, the Indigenous land on which UCLA and Westwood sit today (along with the bordering neighborhoods of Bel Air and Holmby Hills) belonged to Mexican soldier Maximo Alanis. The land was given to Alanis in 1843 by the Mexican governor of California Manuel Micheltorena. As the doctrine of “Manifest Destiny” spread through Native and Mexican lands in the

---

3 https://www.aisc.ucla.edu/
6 Ibid.
Southwest, the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo of 1848 signed between Mexico and the U.S. was violated, causing many Mexican landowners to lose their lands to U.S. occupation, solidifying white domination over the land.

Janss brothers and Alphonzo Bell

The initial location of UCLA, which was then known as the Southern Branch of the University of California, sat on Vermont Avenue in South Los Angeles. As the campus grew, university leaders sought out new locations, including “Burbank and Pasadena, Fullerton in Orange County, and on the Palos Verdes Peninsula near the Port of Los Angeles,” all locations that were far removed from the school’s original location and its growing Black population. By the mid-1920s, the university moved to its present location in Westwood. At that point, the land no longer belonged to Native communities nor to Mexican landowners. It had been renamed as the “Letts” property by Edwin and Harold Janss. The Letts property was declared fit for UCLA’s relocation by a committee appointed by UC president William Campbell. About 200 acres were owned and sold by brothers Edwin and Harold Janss, and another 383 acres were owned and sold by Alphonzo Bell.

When the Janns brothers sold part of their lands to the University of California Regents to build UCLA, they also took control of the development of Westwood Village, turning it into a community that would cater to university students at UCLA. However, access to this particular area of Los Angeles remained restricted. The Janss brothers’ investment company “developed Westwood Village and used racial covenants to ban

---

11 Ibid.
13 Racial covenants were allowed to keep People of Color from buying and owning land/property and keeping certain neighborhoods exclusively white.
people of color from owning properties or businesses in the area in the 1920s.”¹⁴ In 1922, Janss Investment Company, one of the largest developers in Southern California,¹⁵ sold a property to a man named Walden under an installment contract which stated: “No part of said real property shall ever be leased, rented, sold or conveyed to any person who is not of the white or Caucasian race, nor be used or occupied by any person who is not of the white or the Caucasian race whether grantee hereunder or any other person.”¹⁶ Walden then attempted to transfer all of his rights to the property to the Wallings, a Black family.¹⁷ In 1925, the California Supreme Court ruled against this transfer of property, reaffirming the right of Janss Investment Company to impose such racist restrictions on property ownership. The startling impact of the Janss v. Walden ruling was the validation of racial segregation tactics enacted by an overwhelmingly white and economically privileged power elite.

These restrictions also extended to UCLA students of color. In fact, UCLA’s first Asian sorority, Chi Alpha Delta, was prohibited from purchasing a sorority home on Hilgard Avenue in the 1930s.¹⁸ This was hardly the last time that students of color would face obstacles and discriminatory practices in seeking access to housing.

Wealthy real estate developer and oil millionaire, Alphonzo Bell, developed Bel Air and areas in West Los Angeles in the early 1920s. Bell’s goal was to attract wealthy buyers and create a high-end housing development.¹⁹ However, Bell was also restrictive about whom he sold land to. When a Jewish friend of his inquired about purchasing land, Bell refused to sell him property.²⁰ Los Angeles-based housing covenants prevented African Americans, Asians, and Jews from owning homes or living in them unless it was in a servant capacity; these covenants remained as law until 1948, when

---


¹⁶ Janss Investment Co. v. Walden, 196 Cal. 753, 239 P. 34 (Cal. 1925)

¹⁷ Ibid.

¹⁸ Ibid.


²⁰ Ibid.
the Supreme Court case *Shelley v. Kraemer* ruled that they were racially discriminatory.\(^{21}\) To understand the broader context in which this exclusion took place, we turn to a wider discussion of housing discrimination in Los Angeles.

**Housing Discrimination and Black Communities**

With the renovation of the San Pedro harbor and the completion of the Panama Canal in the early 20th century, Los Angeles emerged as a leading port city. During this period of increasing commercial wealth and industrial growth, the West Coast emerged as an empire of opportunity for the enactment of Manifest Destiny. Consistent with an ideology of expansion premised on white supremacy, Los Angeles developers tailored the city as prime real estate for white settlement.\(^{22}\) During the 1920s and 30s there was an influx of Japanese, Chinese, Mexican, Southern European, and Eastern European immigrants fleeing persecution and seeking economic opportunity. Although their encounter with one another has been falsely romanticized as a cultural melting pot, immigrant groups did continually face racialization, exclusion from citizenship, and pressure to conform to American (and decidedly white) cultural practices.

Despite continued racial discrimination in housing opportunities, there was a statistically significant increase in home ownership among the Black community in 1920s Los Angeles, accompanied by the increasing migration of a Black middle class population from New Orleans, Atlanta, and cities in Texas.\(^{23}\) In 1910, Black homeownership in Los Angeles reached 36%, marking the highest levels in the nation.\(^{24}\) Prior to the 1920s, many communities were integrated due to the absence of racial requirements for the distribution of housing lots and the presence of ethnically diverse populations.\(^{25}\) Despite this seeming integration, Black Americans faced regionally

---

\(^{21}\) Ibid.


unique experiences of anti-Blackness in which they were subjected to discrimination from white and non-white ethnic minorities bonded by bigotry.²⁶

Restrictive racial covenants in Los Angeles during World War II adversely impacted all Black residents, regardless of economic status. At the start of World War II, there was an observed increase in Black migrant populations from rural working-class backgrounds, unlike the predominantly Black middle class population that arrived in Los Angeles before World War I.²⁷ Restrictive racial covenants in Los Angeles began as a primary concern of the Black middle class homeowners but with increased class diversity of Black migrants the construction of public housing complexes were routinely stifled. Compton, California was once a predominantly white community that minutely tolerated the integration of Black middle-class families during the first Great Migration. White Compton homeowners then adopted racially restrictive covenants in response to increased Black migration in 1921.²⁸ Compton City Council and white neighborhood groups violently opposed the construction of a public housing complex in fear that it would attract Black residents who were perceived as posing a threat to their property value and white respectability.²⁹ As fearful white homeowners took flight from the neighborhood, and more Black communities began to move into Compton, racial covenants were further introduced to restrict the integration of residential areas and to deny home loans to Blacks and other racialized groups (e.g., Mexican Americans, Asians, and Native Americans).³⁰ Soon, more Black communities moved to South Los Angeles, making it a predominantly Black neighborhood.

Restrictive racial covenants in Los Angeles interfered with the quality of Black life in numerous ways, including that of education and economic opportunity. Black laborers often faced barriers to transportation to job sites that crossed racial lines. Race was often specified in job ads and notably Black taxi drivers were prevented from

²⁶ Ibid., 25.
²⁷ Ibid., 33.
³⁰ Ibid.
servicing white and economically privileged areas in Los Angeles such as Beverly Hills, Hollywood, and the Wilshire District.\textsuperscript{31}

Restrictive racial covenants existed in areas all over Los Angeles, including those near UCLA.\textsuperscript{32} It was in this period that Black communities moved to South Los Angeles as part of the Great Migration, during which Black communities left former slave states and headed to the North and West. Soon afterward, UCLA’s location was moved from South Los Angeles to West Los Angeles. With South Los Angeles turning into a predominantly Black community due to redlining, obtaining practical means of transportation access to UCLA would make it less accessible to students of color, who had to commute from South Los Angeles to the new UCLA campus. By contrast, UCLA’s new location in West Los Angeles became more easily accessible to surrounding affluent and predominantly white neighborhoods.

\textbf{The Early Years: Historical Groundbreakers}

\begin{center}
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{ucla_vermont_1920.png}
\end{center}

University of California, Southern Branch, Vermont Ave, circa 1920\textsuperscript{33}

\begin{flushleft}
\end{flushleft}
Bessie Burke & The Founding of UCLA

While we know of 1919 as UCLA’s inaugural year, the campus’s history dates back decades prior. UCLA began in 1882 as the California State School’s southern branch, primarily as a teaching college. Even when it became the Southern Branch of the University of California in 1919, it was only a two-year undergraduate program that revolved around its Teachers College. Five years later, owing to pressure from student athletes, UCLA became a four-year college.

The class of 1925, which awarded Bachelor of Arts degrees to 100 women and 24 men, is recognized as the first graduating class of UCLA. More than a decade before in 1911, Bessie Burke graduated from the California State School and became the first Black educator in the Los Angeles Public School District.34 In 1918, she was promoted to the first Black principal in the city at Holmes Avenue Public School. When she was transferred to Nevin Avenue School in 1938, Bessie Burke became one of the first Black principals to lead a racially integrated student body in the entire state of California.

Left: Bessie Bruington Burke35

Right: Miriam Matthews with plaque honoring the founders of Los Angeles, May 16, 198236

Miriam Matthews

Miriam Matthews attended the University of California, Southern Branch in the early 1920s when it was located on Vermont Ave. At the time, there were very few Black students on campus.\(^{37}\) Southern Branch was not a four-year college until 1925, and at the time of Matthews' tenure, the University of California, Southern Branch was still a two-year liberal arts school attached to LA High School. After two years at the Southern Branch, Matthews transferred to the University of California, Berkeley where she earned her bachelor's degree in 1926.\(^{38}\) While at UC Berkeley, Matthews earned a certificate of librarianship and passed the Los Angeles Civil Service examination.\(^{39}\) She then moved back to Los Angeles, where she settled and started her successful career promoting African American history and culture, establishing some of the first archives in Los Angeles and advocating for intellectual freedom.\(^{40}\)

At the Los Angeles Public Library (LAPL), Matthews was the first credentialed African American librarian.\(^{41}\) In her role, Matthews advocated for the City of Los Angeles to implement a week to celebrate the history of Black Americans. The city eventually established “Negro History Week” in 1931. Thirteen years later, Matthew published an article titled “The Negro in California from 1781-1910: An Annotated Bibliography.”\(^{42}\) Between 1940-1951, Matthew furthered her education by receiving a master's degree and sat on the Intellectual Freedom Committee of the California Library Association (CLA) and the American Library Association (ALA) and became the Chairperson of the Intellectual Freedom Committee for CLA. Between the years of 1949 and 1960, Matthews served as a regional librarian for LAPL and supervised twelve branch libraries in LAPL’s South Central region. Lastly, in the late 1970s and early

\(^{37}\) Ibid.
\(^{39}\) Ibid.
\(^{42}\) Ibid.
1980s Matthews helped to establish an archive program for the city of Los Angeles and advocated for the City of Los Angeles to erect a monument in honor of multiethnic founders of the city.43

Matthews’ contributions to African American history, Los Angeles libraries, and intellectual freedom groups are remarkable accomplishments, all the more so given the context of the period. She put together what became the *Miriam Matthews Collection of Los Angeles Newspapers on African Americans* (1948-1985) in the UCLA Young Research Library Special Collections, consisting of a multitude of significant newspaper articles published by and for the Black Los Angeles community.44 In addition to such significant work to preserve the history of Black Los Angeles, Matthews also curated the *Miriam Mathews Photograph Collection*, part of the UCLA Digital Library Collections, that contains 4,600 photographs depicting the history of Los Angeles, from its Spanish founding to the age of Black migration in the late 19th and early 20th century, and up to the Civil Rights Movement of the 1960s.45 As a Black woman working at a time of both racial segregation and gender discrimination, she had to fight twice as hard to uphold her commitment to Black history, education, and thought. Matthews is one of the earliest Black alumnae who deserve to be celebrated at UCLA. Currently there is no notable public recognition of her contributions in Los Angeles or at UCLA.

The careers of Bessie Burke and Miriam Matthews reflect the powerful intersection of education and political advocacy, as their work combatted the erasure of Black histories. The elevation of knowledge for historically marginalized communities precedes and surpasses the existence of UCLA as a predominantly white four-year public university.

“The Fabulous Five” Black Scholar-Athletes

One of the most critical narratives around race on UCLA’s campus is the history of campus athletics. Athletics contributed to the recruitment of Black students to

43 Ibid.
compete with other university programs and put UCLA on the map as a school more racially progressive than its peers. The “Fabulous Five” Black men were recruited to compete with rivals such as USC which were not integrating sports teams in the 1930s. That is not to say that UCLA threw open its gates to students of color. In 1939, when the iconic Jackie Robinson, future mayor Tom Bradley, Ray Bartlett, Woody Strode, and Kenny Washington were recruited, African Americans made up only 50 of UCLA’s 9,600 students.

Tom Bradley stated that the “UCLA administration made the decision that no school that would discriminate against its athletes could any longer compete in athletics with us.” UCLA’s roster of Black players on the football team made it the most racially integrated squad in college football history at that time. “We have yet to find another single coach in the history of football that has had the guts to play three of our races at one time and have [four] on the squad,” a reporter for the Chicago Defender, a newspaper for Black readers, wrote later in the year.46

Members of the “Fabulous Five” left their mark on campus and laid the foundation for future scholar-athletes. Track star James Lu Valle was the first president of UCLA’s Graduate Students Association and studied to become a chemist. Tom Bradley was a member of Kappa Alpha Psi, a safe haven for Black male Bruins at the time, and became president of the UCLA University Negro Club. Bradley then went on to pursue a long career in politics as the only Black mayor of the city of Los Angeles, serving for an unprecedented five terms.

The 1940s were a time of great tumult and tension in the United States. Red-baiting zealots sought to sniff out secret Communists at every turn. Meanwhile, racist fear of the alien reached new levels when Japanese American citizens were sent to internment camps in violation of their legal rights. With all of this upheaval, it is indeed surprising that in 1949, Sherrill Luke became the first Black student body president at UCLA. In this role, Luke formulated an anti-discrimination provision in the bylaws of UCLA Had 3 Barrier-Breaking Athletes Who Formed the ‘Gold Dust Trio’ in 1939.” Sportscasting. February 19, 2021. Accessed at: https://www.sportscasting.com/ucla-had-3-barrier-breaking-athletes-who-formed-a-legendary-football-trio-in-1939/


the control board for student government and with the backing of the Academic Senate, opposed the Loyalty Oath imposed by the state of California in 1949 against communism. Luke led a lobbying effort that repealed the regulation that prevented speakers who were believed to have communist leanings from speaking on campus.

At the time of Luke’s student presidency, Cold War hysteria on college campuses grew as members of the UC system were suspected of so-called un-American activity. UCLA and other UC college campuses were cast as hubs of Communism; the Los Angeles Times (1937) reported claims made by student Maxwell Rafferty, later State Superintendent of Public Instruction, that the Daily Bruin was a “red editorial.” Anti-communist policies such as the University of California Regents Loyalty Oath required faculty to take a pledge denouncing Communism, prompting some faculty to decry the denial of the right to academic freedom. By 1950, nearly one hundred faculty and staff had been dismissed for refusing to sign.

Luke’s contributions to UCLA were not limited to the work he did as a student. He later became a UC regent and president of the UCLA Alumni Association. Under his leadership, the UCLA alumni association became the first alumni association involved in the United State’s National Literacy Program. In 1988, at a time of racial, ethnic, and religious controversy on campus, the association also organized the first-ever Conference on Diversity. Outside of his contributions to UCLA, Luke worked as an assistant city manager of Richmond, California, served in Governor Edmund G. Brown’s Cabinet, and became a Superior Court judge. Luke and his work formed a legacy for students of color in governmental leadership roles that extended well beyond UCLA’s campus.

50 Ibid.
54 Ibid.
As of yet, Luke’s work has been minimally acknowledged. Though he earned a 1994 University Service award from the UCLA Alumni Association, his accomplishments have not otherwise been celebrated by the institution.\textsuperscript{56} Even in 2019, at the university’s centennial, no opportunity was taken to recognize Black historical figures like Luke who contributed to the university’s prestige. UCLA has an important opportunity to widen the scope of stories and achievements that they share – for example, a naming opportunity acknowledging Luke’s tremendous contributions would mark an important step toward repairment.

Left Image: Sherrill Luke in 1950, UCLA’s first Black Student Body President\textsuperscript{57}
Right Image: Sherrill Luke, second from left, alongside other recipients of the California Eagle Award in 1949\textsuperscript{58}

In 1956, Willard Johnson became the second Black student body president at UCLA.\textsuperscript{59} Johnson’s campaign was intentionally student-centered.\textsuperscript{60} At the time, UCLA was a commuter school, so Johnson campaigned on every bus to campus and in the parking lot to advocate for one of his most notable objectives of having students live on

\textsuperscript{59} https://www.proquest.com/docview/509480019/fulltextPDF/A33135E78F104C1DPQ/1
\textsuperscript{60} “Willard Johnson.” The History Makers. Accessed at: https://www.thehistorymakers.org/biography/willard-johnson-41
Johnson’s victory – after a recount, an additional election, and a landslide win – made the news, and was a triumph for underserved constituents. Johnson emphasized the importance of student involvement in government at UCLA. He also used his presidency to push forward a newly written constitution for UCLA that focused on the university as a site of academic success and political activism. His work as president at UCLA was echoed at UC Berkeley, where students continued to push Johnson’s agenda of reorganizing student government. Outside of student government, Johnson also helped develop a successful NAACP (National Association for the Advancement of Colored People) chapter on campus.

After his time at UCLA, Willard Johnson became a professor at Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) and focused on research and policy development in the field of international relations. Johnson continued to be a political advocate whose activism was intertwined with his academic work. Johnson also was a leader and creator of the national lobbying group, TransAfrica, that focused on African liberation.

Johnson’s work is a notable example of a UCLA alumnus of color who was a trailblazer in shaping UCLA’s history of student activism, student empowerment, and political involvement. He, along with other early Black students, such as Burke, Matthews, Luke, and Johnson, remains largely under-recognized by UCLA. Indeed, in the absence of any substantial physical recognition on campus, the stories of these Black pioneers, and many other memorable alumni of color, have been forgotten and diminished. Appreciation of the work of these trailblazers in the form of naming opportunities on campus would signal an earnest commitment by UCLA to creating an institution that truly believes in the value of the foundational contributions of Black students past and present.

---
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The Demand for Ethnic Diversity

1968 and 1993 Ethnic Studies Movements

During the political and social protests of 1968, there were strikes around the country calling for the creation of ethnic studies programs or centers at various colleges and universities. At UCLA, student activism helped establish the American Indian Studies Center, the Asian American Studies Center, the Chicano Studies Research Center, and the Ralph J. Bunche Center for African American Studies at UCLA. This effort was spurred by a similar movement in the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) schools.

The East Los Angeles Walkouts, a series of Chicano student protests against unequal conditions in LAUSD high schools, called for better teachers, better facilities, and college prep courses. The first walkout of 200-300 students took place on March 1, 1968, and was unplanned, the result of the principal’s cancellation of a student-produced play that was deemed too risqué. On March 5, about 2,000 students at Garfield High School initiated the first planned walkout, prompting school authorities to call the police. Eventually, an estimated 15,000 to 20,000 students walked out of seven high school campuses in East Los Angeles (Wilson, Garfield, Roosevelt, Lincoln — 75% of students attending those schools were Chicano) and other parts of Los Angeles (Belmont, Jefferson, Venice). These demonstrations served as an inspiration to students involved in the effort to establish the Chicano Studies Research Center (CSRC) at UCLA the following year. In this way, the CSRC emerged in response to the social protest against profound disparities in educational access for the populations of Chicano and Mexican descent in the United States.

Concurrently, other ethnic studies research centers were created at UCLA in response to the sociopolitical movement that agitated against racism in the United

---

States and American imperial expansion in the Vietnam War. The Third World Liberation Front (TWLF), a collective of the Black, Latinx, Filipino, Asian American, and Mexican students, arose already in 1968 as a coalition of ethnic student groups on college campuses in California in response to the Eurocentric orientation of educational curricula at San Francisco State College (now San Francisco State University) and the University of California, Berkeley. The TWLF strikes of 1968 were instrumental in creating and establishing Ethnic Studies and other identity studies as majors in their respective schools and universities across the United States. In response to the TWLF strikes and the wider climate of social and political protest, the four ethnic studies centers at UCLA were established in 1969.⁷⁰

The fight for ethnic studies continued for decades at UCLA. In 1993, a series of protests on UCLA’s campus helped to create a new César E. Chávez Center for Chicano and Chicana Studies. Retrenchment in budgets and changes in economic policy at the national level during the 1980s and early 1990s led to reduced state and local funding in California, and the inter-departmental program was at risk of being shut down. Because of national budget cuts to education throughout the 1980s and 1990s, Chancellor Charles E. Young refrained from bestowing departmental status on Chicano Studies.⁷¹ On April 28, 1993, students engaged in a sit-in demonstration led by the Conscious Students of Color group.⁷² Around 200 students walked across the UCLA campus to the Faculty Center to protest the decision. After Los Angeles Police Department and UC Police Department officers appeared in riot gear, a clash ensued, and 99 students were arrested. In addition, UCLA demanded that students pay $27,000 in damages to the UCLA Faculty Center.

Later in the spring of 1993, students and faculty organized demonstrations and a hunger strike as acts of civil disobedience to demand support for the program and the establishment of a department. The students faced strong resistance from the UC

Regents and then Chancellor Charles E. Young. Charges were filed against 83 students following a protest on May 11. In response, eight students and one professor held a water-only 14-day hunger strike in front of Murphy Hall that began on May 24. Tents were propped in front of Murphy Hall where the UCLA administration is located. The hunger strike received national attention as teamsters drove by in their trucks, state legislators lent their support, and celebrities stopped by in support of the activists. Ultimately, the protesters were able to secure a compromise entailing the development of a new academic center and six full-time faculty positions. The center was named in honor of César E. Chávez.

Although departmental status was not yet achieved, more than 400 students, faculty, and community supporters gathered on June 7, 1993 to mark the strike and celebrate the creation of the César E. Chavez Center for Interdisciplinary Instruction in Chicana Studies. The center became a new academic unit with six full-time faculty positions.

75 The state legislators were Tom Hayden, Art Torres, and Xavier Becerra.
76 Notably, Edward James Olmos (American actor, director, producer, and activist).
77 It was in 2005 that Chancellor Albert Carnesale approved the departmentalization of the program. Two years later, in 2007, both the center for interdisciplinary studies and department were joined into one and recognized as the César E. Chávez Department of Chicana and Chicano Studies at UCLA; “A Hunger Strike Ends, a Center is Born.” UCLA Alumni. Accessed at: https://alumni.ucla.edu/ucla-history-26/
Cindy Montañez, who eventually served in the California Assembly, sitting in the tent camp. "UCLA: The First Century."\textsuperscript{79}

\textit{UCLA Mother Organizations}

The Mother Organizations or "Mother Orgs," as they are known at UCLA, are a group of distinct student bodies on campus that played a role in the history of race relations at UCLA and continue to serve as a community for many Black students and students of color on campus. The “Mother Orgs” were initially comprised of the Afrikan Student Union (ASU) (previously named the Black Student Alliance or BSA), the American Indian Student Association (AISA), the Asian Pacific Coalition (APC), and MEChA (Movimiento Estudiantil Chicana/o de Aztlán). Today they consist of the ASU, AISA, APC, MEChA de UCLA, the Muslim Student Association, Pacific Islands' Student Association, Queer Alliance, Samahang Pilipino, and the Vietnamese Student Union. These student organizations represent marginalized communities and their interests. The Mother Organizations provided the means by which students of color could find student empowerment, culturally relevant support, and a community of students that share similar experiences.

Access and retention have always been central goals of the Mother Organizations. The first iteration of the Mother Organizations’ collective activism followed the transformation of the High Potential Program from the Academic Advancement Program (AAP) in 1971. In the process of creating the High Potential Program and as a result of anti-apartheid organizing in the 1970s, the “Mother Orgs” united to create the Third World Coalition. At the time, this coalition consisted of BSA, APC, MEChA, and AISA. The Coalition requested that AAP engage in cultural-based counseling, to be undertaken through outreach and retention. It also called on the Mother Organizations to spearhead the development of the program. In response to the increase in administrative oversight of AAP and the diminished voice of students in the program, BSA, and the rest of the Mother Orgs in the Third World Coalition created student-initiated and student-run retention and outreach projects.80

Following the creation of the retention projects, the Afrikan Student Union and Samahang Filipino led the effort to develop the Campus Retention Committee in the 1990s. The creation of the Campus Retention Committee (CRC) proved to be successful in retaining students of color. Unlike the High Potential Program, the Mother Organizations took steps to guarantee that the CRC's funding board remained under the control of MEChA, AISA, ASU, and Samahang Filipino. The very model and foundation of the CRC prompted an important shift in UCLA’s model for student success, empowerment, and retention.

Despite efforts to prevent the Campus Retention Committee (CRC) from falling under the control of the UCLA administration, the Mothers’ Org funding is overseen by the Community Programs Office (CPO) at UCLA.81 In recent years, the Mother Orgs have collected approximately $1 million in student fees that fund and maintain the free services that they offer.82 These funds are managed by the Community Programs Office, the budgets of which are inaccessible to the students.83 In response to this lack of

---

80 History of the Coalition (2007), Mother Org Summer Transition Retreat.
82 Ibid.
83 Ibid.
transparency in budget distribution over the last several years, students from the Mother Organizations held a protest at CPO in May 2021. During the protest, students demanded that CPO release their budgets and return to original hiring practices that allow for students to voice their opinions in hiring decisions. With insufficient access to funds and hiring practices that go against the bylaws of the initial Campus Retention Committee, the Mother Organizations are working toward developing a better way to support their projects without CPO.

To many students, participation in the “Mother Orgs” is a highlight of their UCLA experience. Student voices and student-initiatives have proven to be extremely powerful in supporting underrepresented populations on campus. It is imperative for UCLA administrators to take these student bodies and student-run projects seriously. These organizations should be given the opportunity to work alongside the administration in creating policies and procedures that effectively serve the needs of UCLA’s ethnically diverse populations.

High Potential Program and Black Panther Party Connection

Developed in 1968 by the Black Student Alliance (BSA) and the United Mexican American Students (UMAS) as a response to low enrollment of students of color at UCLA, the High Potential Program (HPP) was a site of collaboration among students, faculty, and administration to bring “non-traditional” students in LA to UCLA to take summer courses. Before the program, fewer than 1% of students at UCLA were people of color. Within two years, the program admitted over 500 students from low-income and educationally disadvantaged backgrounds. The program’s central idea was that students without “high academic” metrics may possess “high potential” for academic success and community empowerment through non-traditional avenues. Program participants were recruited by current students, with the criteria for selection rooted in a demonstrated commitment to serving the community. Notable alumni and students involved in the program’s launch saw the High Potential Program as a vehicle to empower, organize,
and embolden student activists at UCLA with the means to make a radical difference in their communities.

Alprentice “Bunchy” Carter and John Huggins, both of whom were members of the Black Panthers Party, were admitted to and highly invested in the High Potential Program.\textsuperscript{86} Along with other members of the Black Panther Party on UCLA’s campus who were admitted via the High Potential Program, they organized UCLA students and coordinated with UCLA food services to provide leftover food for the incipient LA Free Breakfast Program for Children. This activity aligned with the aim of the Black Panther Party to protect the welfare of Black communities.

The Black Panther Party was founded in Oakland, California in 1966. The organization’s philosophy and values were heavily influenced by Black internationalism, socialism, and self-defense.\textsuperscript{87} The Black Panther Party’s activism centered around the liberation of the Black community, self-defense, and the demand for greater public attention to housing, employment, police brutality, and education.\textsuperscript{88} The Black Panther Party Ten-Point Program was written in 1967 by founders Bobby Seale and Huey P. Newton. This document, released in the second issue of the Black Panther Party newspaper, served as the foundational platform for the organization’s objective and agenda. Notably, the Ten-Point Program states, “We want education for our people that exposes the true nature of this decadent American society. We want education that teaches us our true history and our role in the present-day society.”\textsuperscript{89}

These objectives inspired young Black activists associated with the Black Panthers to make their way to UCLA via the High Potential Program. However, the success of the Black Panther Party High Potential Program connection was cut short when John Huggins and “Bunchy” Carter were murdered, at a Black Student Union meeting in 1969, in all likelihood by Claude “Chuchessa” Hubert, a member of the


\textsuperscript{88} Ibid.

Organization US.\textsuperscript{90} That same year, the Federal Bureau of Investigations (FBI) declared the Black Panther Party a Communist organization and therefore an enemy of the U.S. government.\textsuperscript{91} The call for a meeting and consequently, the murders, were related to the appointment of a director to the newly established African American Studies Center. The Black Panther Party and the United States Organization supported different candidates for the position. The former had garnered student support, whereas the latter had the support of the UCLA administration.\textsuperscript{92}

Local grassroots activism did not cease with the assassinations of Bunchy Carter and John Huggins in Campbell Hall. Nor was the importance of the High Potential Program diminished by the event. In the same year of the Carter-Huggins assassinations, UMAS presented Chancellor Young with a set of demands on behalf of Mexican American students at UCLA, one of which was the call to establish admissions and retention programs with similar aims as the High Potential Program.\textsuperscript{93} In this way, UCLA students sought to ensure that underrepresented youth had the ability to take advantage of educational opportunities offered. In 1971, HPP and the Educational Opportunity Program (EOP) were integrated to create the Academic Advancement Program (AAP) as a student diversity and retention program.\textsuperscript{94} Student-led organizing for and by BIPOC communities, as distinct from UCLA’s administrative-led initiatives, has continued to shape the future of education in the university.

\textit{Faculty Development Program}

Following the movement for ethnic studies, national efforts from Black student activists in the late 1960s and early 1970s prompted universities to openly support curricula that challenged existing predominantly white scholarship with courses such as

\textsuperscript{93}https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED031324.pdf
Black literature and history. At UCLA, Black students called for culturally relevant content and an increase in Black and minority faculty who were familiar with the material. Virgil Roberts, a student at UCLA involved in the UCLA Black Student Alliance’s (BSA) educational committee, taught a class with an emphasis on Black identity, culture, and empowerment to demonstrate the need to have culturally relevant classes. About 500 students attended lectures for the BSA course, “Black Man in a Changing American Context,” signifying high interest in this subject area. The course’s success garnered a response from UC President Charlie Hitch, who established three committees of students, faculty members, and administrators to work alongside the UC Urban Affairs Committee in order to develop a Black Studies program. At the forefront of this initiative were UCLA BSA students who proposed a framework for a Black Studies Center as well as syllabi and course reading for 45 Black studies courses.

With the development of the Black Studies Program, students turned their attention to advocating for more Black and minority faculty representation. Although the UCLA administration was responsive to the request for a Black Studies program, there was hesitancy in offering multiple courses right away—because of what was described as a lack of available Black faculty to teach the courses. As a result, Vice Chancellor Charles Wilson, who was mentored by Chancellor Charles E. Young, developed the framework for the Faculty Development Program.95

As imagined by its advocates, the program would support the hiring, development, and retention of professors from marginalized racial groups. BSA and Wilson also imagined the program as a means of attracting candidates for faculty positions who might also assume roles as activists and community leaders. The UCLA administration was hesitant to move forward with the program, suspecting that there were few candidates who might meet the university’s hiring requirements. The administration failed to consider the work of activists and community leaders as sufficiently academically rigorous to qualify them for employment at UCLA, instead privileging formal education at predominantly white institutions, and in turn curbing

the program’s development.

In the process of fighting to keep BSA’s vision of the Faculty Development Program alive, UCLA Economics Department Director William Allen was explicit about not hiring faculty on the basis of race. BSA and Community for Awareness and Social Education (CASE) paired up to denounce the hiring practices of Allen and the Economics Department. In the midst of the complications with Allen, Wilson pushed ahead with plans for a Faculty Development Program that was announced in 1968 by Chancellor Young. The program would prepare minority Ph.D. candidates, UCLA professionals, and faculty at smaller schools in the hope of creating 100 new minority faculty positions in the next four years. It was one of the few programs in the nation that targeted non-white candidates, but it elicited pushback from the public as well as from faculty and administrators in the University of California system. Despite the criticism, Chancellor Young affirmed the Faculty Development Program and continued to implement procedures similar to affirmative action. Faculty hiring focused on minority recruitment, although the university and its faculty remained overwhelmingly white.

*The Firing of Angela Davis*

In the spring of 1969, Dr. Angela Davis was hired to teach as an assistant professor by Donald Kalish, the liberal chair of the Philosophy department. At this point in time in the early 1970s, the struggle to recruit minority scholars into university teaching positions was intense. Davis was recruited as an assistant professor through the newly implemented Faculty Development Program initiative.

Davis’s open affiliations with the Communist and Black Panther parties led the UC Board of Regents to keep a close watch on the Faculty Development Program. The Regents attempted to prevent Davis from teaching and withheld her pay, invoking the 1949 Loyalty Oath as just means. The UCLA Academic Senate, Black students on campus, and Chancellor Young supported her right to be employed and teach at UCLA.
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However, due to continued opposition from the Regents and direct pressure from then-California Governor Reagan, Davis was terminated in September 1969.

The Davis case provided the UC Board of Regents with enough cover to decry the funds channeled toward the Faculty Development Program, and to dismiss the prospect of extending offers to minority scholars to teach at UCLA. Indeed, the Faculty Development Program came to be seen by conservatives as a Communist breeding ground.

The murder of Fred Hampton, the assassinations of Bunchy Carter and John Huggins, and the campaign to unseat Angela Davis made 1969 an especially devastating year for Black students and faculty at UCLA. Black faculty at the time of Davis’ termination remarked that the university’s treatment of Davis would make it increasingly challenging to attract and retain Black faculty. In an interview, Masai Minters, a UCLA alum and AAP administrator, stated that the perception in the Los Angeles Black community that Bunchy Carter and Angela Davis had not been welcome at UCLA had an adverse effect on attracting Black students.

Davis’ hiring and firing were preceded by another controversy involving the UC Board of Regents. Black Panther leader Eldridge Cleaver had been hired to deliver guest lectures at UC Berkeley during the 1968-69 academic year. This appointment drew severe criticism from Governor Reagan, who demanded that the Regents rescind this offer. In response, the Regents passed a regulation preventing courses offered by guest lecturers to count for course credits, a move widely condemned by UCLA and UC Berkeley faculty.

The Cleaver and Davis controversies only underscore the significance of Regent policy in matters of Black and ethnic studies education. During this time, the UC Regents came to be dominated increasingly by a conservative majority that blocked the...
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advancement of liberal and radical causes.¹⁰¹

Angela Davis lectures in Royce Hall (1969)¹⁰²

Student of Color Presence on Campus

Enrollment Among Students of Color

UCLA has historically admitted and enrolled a small proportion of students of color. White students made up 72.3% of the graduating class in 1973, 39.2% in 1997, and 27% in the 2018-19 academic year. Despite this shift, the population of Black students on campus continued to be disproportionately low. They made up 3% of the student population in 2018-19. This reflected only half of the statewide percentage of the Black residents in California (6%),¹⁰³ and an even smaller proportion of Black 18-24 year-olds in California (6.6%), and in Los Angeles.¹⁰⁴ In 2006, Black residents made up 9.8% of Los Angeles County and 11% of high school graduates.¹⁰⁵

In the 1980s, the demographics of the UCLA student population shifted as more students of color were able to enroll. In 1985, the peak year for Black enrollment at UCLA, 9.6% of the freshman class was Black (along with 22.2% Asian/Filipino students, and 14.8% Latinx students).¹⁰⁶ Kimberly Cohn, who entered UCLA in 1982, explained

¹⁰² “ANGELA DAVIS LECTURES IN ROYCE HALL.” UCLA 100. Accessed at: https://100.ucla.edu/timeline/angela-davis-lectures-in-royce-hall
¹⁰⁶ Ibid
that she was among “the largest group of Black students that had entered UCLA” in its history thus far. However, she stated, “There were quite a few Black students in the freshman class and we probably all knew each other - which is kind of telling when I say that was the largest group.”

Though the 1980s saw this increase in enrollment of students of color, the trend did not continue. In 2006, the smallest class of Black first-year students since the 1960s entered UCLA.\textsuperscript{107} In that year, ninety-six Black first-year students entered UCLA, constituting just 2\% of the freshman class.\textsuperscript{108} In response to this low enrollment, UCLA students, led by the Afrikan Student Union, led protests on campus that resulted in a meeting with Chancellor Albert Carnesale.\textsuperscript{109}

\textit{UCLA Admissions and Prop 209}

In 1995, the University of California instated Standing Policy 1 and 2 that prohibited the consideration of race, sex, or other demographic information in admissions considerations.\textsuperscript{110} This was done even before the passage of Proposition 209 in 1996.\textsuperscript{111} Following implementation of this new policy, the Afrikan Student Union at UCLA developed an access project in an effort to support Chicanx and Black students interested in gaining access to higher education.\textsuperscript{112} In the coming years, the other Mother Organizations developed access projects that are now housed under the Student Initiated Outreach Center (SIOC) at UCLA.\textsuperscript{113}

\textsuperscript{109} Ibid
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The UC Regents’ prohibition of race-based affirmative action in the admissions process in July 1995 was followed shortly by California voters’ approval of Proposition 209 in November of 1996. The passage of Prop 209 led to a decline across all UC campuses in the admission of underrepresented groups by at least twelve percent, or by 1,000 individuals.\textsuperscript{114} The end of race-based affirmative action also discouraged highly qualified members of underrepresented groups from even applying to the UC.\textsuperscript{115} Prop 209 also led to a shift toward high-income enrollment, specifically at UC Berkeley and UCLA.\textsuperscript{116} Prop 209 especially impacted underrepresented STEM students: nationally, the number of underrepresented group (URG) students earning STEM degrees fell nineteen percent at highly selective colleges.\textsuperscript{117} Prior to the ban, affirmative action increased the representation of underrepresented groups by twelve percent at UCs.

Another effect of the passage of Prop 209 was the flow of underrepresented applicants away from UCLA and Berkeley towards less-selective universities.\textsuperscript{118} In turn, the decrease of underrepresented groups at selective UCs such as UCLA may have had an impact on the California job market as a whole.\textsuperscript{119} After Prop 209 passed, the percentage of African-American and Chicano individuals in their early 30s who earned over 100,000 dollars per year in California decreased by at least three percent.\textsuperscript{120}

One proposed alternative to affirmative action was a more sweeping process of “holistic review,” implemented at UCLA in 2007.\textsuperscript{121} Holistic review has led to an increase in Black enrollment of six percent.\textsuperscript{122} While holistic review is not specifically aimed at supporting URG applicants, it still benefits URGs as it adds additional context to their applications.\textsuperscript{123} While it has had a significant effect, it has been less effective than affirmative action in increasing the representation of minority groups on campus.\textsuperscript{124}
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As of 2014, the UCLA administration has come out publicly against Prop. 209. Chancellor Gene Block stated in 2014 that “we have suffered for it,” and acknowledged that UCLA has fallen short of the enrollment of underrepresented students before Prop 209.125

Campus Climate for Black Students

In 2013, a group of Black student activists, led by Sy Stokes, created a spoken word video titled The Black Bruins, calling on the UCLA administration to increase Black students’ enrollment and retention on campus.126 Stokes and other students involved with the Black Male Institute released the video in response to a report127 written by Richard Sander, UCLA Law professor and critic of affirmative action, who claimed that UCLA admitted Black students based on race and in violation of Proposition 209.128 The findings in this report were later disputed by UCLA Associate Vice Chancellor for Enrollment Management, Yolonda Copeland-Morgan on the grounds that the Office of Undergraduate Admissions is in full compliance with state and university policy and that holistic review, widely adopted by UC campuses, does not undermine Proposition 209 in considering race.129

The Black Bruins received widespread recognition across the country. However, not all of this attention was positive – the students in the video also received death threats and consequently suffered effects on their mental health. Despite an increase in UCLA’s policing budget over the years, these Black student activists did not receive security support from UC Police Department or the administration. The students instead developed their own forms of community safety, walking each other to class and

126 Sy Stokes. “The Black Bruins [Spoken Word] - Sy Stokes” Accessed at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BE00H5B0jFk
remaining in large groups when on campus. In a meeting with two administrators to address Black students’ concerns on campus, Sy Stokes described the majority of individuals to be of the “Sander’s camp,” standing by his claims.

The climate for Black students at UCLA has long been a concern: Black alumni from the 1980s and the early 2010s spoke about negative interactions with professors and students in their residence halls. Many Black alumni also describe the lack of response to student activism from UCLA administrators, explaining that even when administrators appear to listen, nothing changes. According to figures from 2019, the graduation rate for Black students at UCLA was 82.3%; compared to the overall graduation rate for all students (90.9%). Throughout the years, Black student activism has been an important (or perhaps a main) driver of change at UCLA. To take but one example from 2015, Chancellor Block associated several changes that UCLA
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adopted to support Black students and members of the local community with meetings that he held with students from the Afrikan Student Union.\textsuperscript{134}

In addition to issues of retention and support issues that Black students at UCLA face, Black student-athletes are confronted with additional challenges and marginalization. As USC professor Shaun Harper notes in a far-reaching report: “Perhaps nowhere in higher education is the disenfranchisement of Black male students more insidious than in college athletics.”\textsuperscript{135} This holds true at UCLA along with other NCAA Division I schools, as Black male students constitute 1.2\% of all undergraduate students at UCLA, but make up 54.6\% of the basketball and football teams. Further, the graduation rate disparity between Black male student-athletes and non-athletes is 19\% (57\% graduation rate for Black male student-athletes and 76\% for all Black male students). Additionally, the total student-athletes’ graduation rate (72\%) is higher than that of Black athletes specifically.

**Modern Years of Policing and Surveillance**

*Founding of UCPD*

University campuses nationwide continue to be plagued by a police presence that reinforces its authority and power through an illusion of campus safety and security. However, there has been a growth of activism and protests against the presence and tendency of campus police to engage in surveillance, violence, excessive force, assault and racial profiling. Police presence on college campuses can be traced to 1951, when Chancellor Lawrence A. Kimpton at the University of Chicago was hired with the explicit goal of making urban campuses like his safe for white students.\textsuperscript{136} Toward this end, the South East Chicago Commission was created as a way to maintain the campus and its surrounding area as white and to reinforce a clear separation between white and Black


students.137 As the goal of segregation on campus intensified, universities began utilizing local police departments and allocating funds in support of their mission. While the first police officer appeared on UC Berkeley’s campus in 1915, the State of California authorized the UC system to appoint officers to the UC Police Department in 1947.138 Police on campus became, for many, a source of unwanted and unwelcome force. In 1969 during the Vietnam War, UCLA saw the arrival of the Coalition, a group that aimed to abolish ROTC, remove police from campus, support open enrollment of people of color, and eliminate war research on campus.139 At the order of Chancellor Young, 100 policemen attempted to disperse 1,500 student demonstrators.140

A strong police presence—and rising budgets for police departments—continue to be part of the university landscape and have induced, especially after the murder of George Floyd, a complete distrust toward the policing system, including UCPD, which has extended its power and authority across campus. The UCLA Police Department currently has 65 authorized officers. In 2018-19, the UCLA Police Department budget was approximately $21 million, up $2 million from the previous year.141 This budget continued to grow, even during a global financial crisis. In the 2020-21 academic year, the budget was $22,182,739. This has sparked criticism as programs in support of students of color have seen their budgets cut in recent years.142

The UCLA Police Department has faced numerous complaints and charges of police violence throughout its history. In 1970, the National Guard opened fired on a peaceful rally of UCLA students, led by the United Mexican American Students (UMAS), against the Kent State Shooting and the expansion of the Vietnam War into neutral
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Cambodia. UCLA student protestors attempted to hide from police in Campbell Hall, but they raided the hall and beat Chicanx faculty, students, and staff. This police sweep of Campbell Hall constituted a violation of space and a lack of protection of UCLA students and faculty on campus.

Over the years, there have been frequent instances of harassment of Black males on campus. In January of 1976, this led to a demonstration of hundreds protesting racist police violence and harassment. In 1994, UCPD once again targeted African-Americans: Robert Sims, a photography student at Santa Monica College, reported that he was assaulted by a UCLA police officer. Sims was shooting nighttime photos in the courtyard of the UCLA housing complex where he lived with his wife, who was a UCLA student, when he encountered the officer. In the same year, Donald Dilworth, a UCLA dental student, filed a lawsuit against the UCPD. He stated that an officer stopped him and asked him if he was in a gang. After checking his driver’s license, which had a warrant for unpaid traffic tickets, the officer arrested him and sent him to LA County Jail. He was released four days later. Two months after the first arrest, the same officer stopped him again while he was studying for a final exam. He was arrested again, because the first warrant had not been cleared due to clerical errors and was held for two more days in jail.

Stefhan Bryan, a UCLA student of economics encountered the same officer on August 25 later that year. When he was asked by the officer to step outside and show ID, Bryan refused to comply because the officer would not give a reason for his
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request. Bryan was then arrested and charged with battering a police officer. Bryan spent two days in jail as he had a warrant for overdue traffic tickets.

Both Dillworth and Bryan separately filed claims against UCPD. They were referred by the Afrikan Student Union to attorney John Caldwell Jr. They stated that they were harassed by the officer because they were Black. Their attorney stated that “Dillworth was the only black student in the lounge when he was arrested, and as far as I know there had been no calls or complaints,” and that the police are “conditioned to think of African-Americans as suspicious...It's clear to me that the officer was on a fishing expedition. It's against the law, an officer has to have at least a reason to arrest someone.”

In one notable instance, UCLA Police Department officer Charles A. Harold was forced to take an administrative leave because he had filed grievances against the university. In 1993, Charles A. Harold filed a lawsuit against the UCPD, the Regents of the University of California, UCLA Chancellor Charles Young, UCLA Police Department and officers John C. Barber, Alan R. Cueba, Karl Ross, James L. Vandenberg, and Michael Shain, which alleged violation of civil rights, conspiracy, negligence, defamation, intentional infliction of emotional distress, and constructive termination in violation of public policy. It also said that Lt. Shain used unreasonable force and committed assault and battery against African American individuals multiple times, despite a memo put out two months previously from UCPD saying that “brutality will not be tolerated” and promising accountability.

Charles A. Harold wrote a letter to UC President Jack Peltason stating that excessive force by the police is “routine” and the “potential for violence is
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tremendous.” He said that the supervisors and the university itself were fully aware of the potential for violence by the UCPD. The coordinator of the UCLA Risk Management Office said that Harold’s charges were “specious” and he was “trying to manufacture problems that don’t exist.”

A newspaper article from 1994 reports that multiple students filed charges against UCLA police officers for the use of excessive force and harassment. Further, at least six former and current officers filed lawsuits against the university alleging that the “UCLA Police Department has a propensity to violence.” In 2006, UCLA police officers stunned student Mostafa Tabatabainejad at Powell Library. Students on campus protested the use of force and police brutality and called for an independent investigation. Investigators found wrongdoing on the part of UCLA police, and Tabatabainejad won a civil lawsuit against the university in 2009.

In addition to UCLA students and faculty experiencing violence by UCPD officers, Black community members are disproportionately harassed and arrested by the UCLA police department. In 2013, Los Angeles Superior Court Judge David S. Cunningham III was pulled over and arrested on Gayley Avenue by UCPD. Cunningham requested a supervisor who ordered him to be released after his arrival. Cunningham filed a complaint against UCPD, alleging that excessive force was used. He commented that he believed the treatment he received was influenced by the fact that he was a Black man. Cunningham won a $500,000 settlement against the university for the use of excessive force. The data on the demographics of arrests and police stops in Westwood, where
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UCLA is situated, demonstrate that police mistreatment of minorities extends well beyond campus.173 From July 2015 to June 2016, while Black and Latino people made up only 2% and 7% of Westwood residents respectively, yet Black residents made up almost 29% of “suspicious activity stops” and 31% of arrests, and Latino residents made up 10.5% of stops and 23% of arrests174

The racist nature of policing directly affects the culture on campus. While in theory the university should feel safe for all students, policing on campus poses a threat to the safety of students of color. The nature of policing on campus and in Westwood urgently needs to be reconsidered for UCLA to create an environment of safety, accountability, and anti-racism.

Some progress has been made on this front by other campuses. UC Berkeley Chancellor Carol Christ recently proposed reforms of the campus UCPD force.175 UC Berkeley will be undertaking an audit to assess UCPD’s militarization level and will relocate UCPD from the main administrative building to make the space “more welcoming.” Additionally, UC Board of Regents Chair John Pérez and former UC President Napolitano issued a statement in May 2020 in response to the murder of George Floyd by the Minneapolis Police Department,176 committing to re-examine university policing practices and stating that “the system must change.”

1992 Los Angeles Uprising

On Sunday, March 3, 1991, Rodney King was beaten by LAPD officers following a high-speed chase initiated during his arrest for drunk driving on the I-210 freeway. The unforgettable footage shows an unarmed King on the ground being beaten. The incident was covered by news media around the world and caused a public furor.177 During the
same month, fifteen-year-old Latasha Harlins was shot and killed by a store owner in South Los Angeles.\(^{178}\)

Friday, March 8, 1991, five days after the Rodney King beating, and one day after the footage was released to the public, 600 to 800 young people gathered outside the Mann Westwood Fourplex Theater on Gayley Avenue to buy tickets to the 10:00 and 10:15 showings of *New Jack City*, featuring Ice-T rapping and Wesley Snipes as a Harlem drug lord.\(^{179}\) They were turned away. The police said that the theater oversold tickets to the showings, but the theater denies that this happened.\(^{180}\) The police said that the crowd then “took control of the streets.” The police asked the crowd to disperse, but the crowd “spilled out into the streets.” The police formed a line and began to move the crowd towards Kinross Avenue.\(^{181}\) According to the police, Black and white youth became violent, “some looting stores, throwing beer cans, vandalizing cars and tearing branches off of trees to smash store windows.”\(^{182}\) About 100 police officers in riot gear poured into Westwood Village. At the height of the disturbance as many as 1,500 people were in the streets of Westwood Village. Police only booked six people for burglary, failure to disperse, and throwing objects at moving vehicles with the intent to injure. Seventeen stores were robbed. Eyewitnesses believed that the violence was fueled by tensions caused by the beating of Rodney King by the LAPD. It was reported that a few youths shouted “Black Power!” and “Fight the Power!” and made reference to the video recording of the beating while walking through the streets that night.

Eyewitnesses alleged that they thought that the police were instructed to hold back because of the video of the beating of Rodney King. Merchants were angry at the alleged “passivity” of the officers.\(^{183}\) One salesman asserted that the police stood and watched as looters stole $100,000 worth of equipment.\(^{184}\)
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Certain Westwood business owners blamed the showing of “Black films” in theaters for causing the violence. Gene Stratton, a Westwood business owner and a board member of the Westwood Village Merchants Association said that “The only problem we have in Westwood is when they show a Black film ... What happens is the Black film brings in Black gangs. These films incite violence.” He also said that the previous December merchants sent a letter to the mayor expressing concerns about “certain types of Black films.”

Many Black movie-goers were angry at the suggestion of a connection between such films and violence. Ava DuVernay, an African American UCLA student who was present on March 8th (and now is the award-winning filmmaker) said at the time, “They closed the movie because they don’t want Black people in Westwood...They’re using [the movie] as an excuse. [They’re afraid] this place is attracting too many Black people, basically.”

Over a year later, on Wednesday, April 29, 1992, a trial jury acquitted four officers of the Los Angeles Police Department of using excessive force in the arrest and beating of Rodney King. Cherie Francis, the assistant director of the Center for Afro-American studies, described listening to the verdict being read over the radio in class. As the verdict was read, the mood turned from disbelief to shock, and “some people broke out crying.”

That evening dozens of young people and students gathered outside the Contempo building to protest the acquittal. The crowd turned unruly when LAPD and UCPD officers amassed on Westwood Boulevard. A riot erupted at around 10:20 pm when a plate glass window was smashed, inciting a second instance of riots and looting in Westwood. During this “30-minute rampage,” rioters damaged several properties
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and littered the streets with debris and broken glass.\textsuperscript{192} As the events unfolded there were shouts from the protestors, such as “Let’s not be stupid,” and responses of “Fuck the police,” and “Fuck Westwood.”\textsuperscript{193} Officers were deployed, but reportedly did not actively engage the crowds. Filmmaker Matty Rich, who was at UCLA the night the events occurred, stated that “I’m angry as hell … but I don’t think hurting people is the key” and also emphasized that “you can’t blame the community for being angry because this has been happening for 300 years.”\textsuperscript{194}

Two to three days after the disturbance, students recall that “there were cops and the National Guard everywhere, and the entries into Westwood were cut off, so no one could really get in or out.”\textsuperscript{195} Looking back at these events, Daniel Mitchell, professor emeritus of UCLA Luskin School of Public Affairs and the UCLA Anderson School of Management, stated that “While there were a few isolated incidents of store vandalism in Westwood at the time, UCLA was mostly affected by the tense atmosphere the events created after the fact than by the actual riots.”\textsuperscript{196}

\textit{Jackie Robinson Stadium}

The murder of George Floyd at the hands of a white police officer drew nationwide attention and sparked series of protests against police brutality. Following one such protest at UCLA on June 1, 2020, the Jackie Robinson Stadium was used to detain the more than 1,242 protesters arrested for demonstrating on campus. Those held, including many students, were subject to physical restraints, and held for long hours with little food or water and without social distancing practices (despite the COVID-19 pandemic).\textsuperscript{197} UCLA’s long-standing lease of the Jackie Robinson stadium on the US Department of Veterans Affairs property and their agreement with LAPD

\textsuperscript{192} Ibid, 1.
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\textsuperscript{195} “UCLA revisits the LA riots two decades later.” The Daily Bruin. April 30, 2012. Accessed at: https://dailybruin.com/2012/04/30/ucla_revisits_the_la_riots_two_decades_later
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\textsuperscript{197} “LAPD’s use of Jackie Robinson Stadium as field jail was inappropriate, report finds.” The Daily Bruin. March 12, 2021. Accessed at: https://dailybruin.com/2021/03/12/lapds-use-of-jackie-robinson-stadium-as-field-jail-was-inappropriate-report-finds
allowed for this utilization of its parking lot to process arrests. Many in the campus community saw the use of the stadium as an outdoor jail as ironic, given that Jackie Robinson was a key figure of the civil rights movement.

This event propelled forward efforts to eliminate a police presence on campus, such as those undertaken by the faculty-led Divest/Invest Collective, which proposes divesting from university police and re-allocating funds to school programs. Another group engaged in this work is the No UCPD Coalition, a student-initiated organization that advocates for divestment from UCPD. These and other organizations urge the removal of police from campus, an end to police brutality and criminalization of protestors, and the reallocation of police budgeting in order to prioritize the safety of students.

Following pushback from faculty and students about the use of the Jackie Robinson Stadium, in late June 2020 UCLA announced that they would be providing funding for a new Black Resource Center on campus. After over 5 years of student-initiated efforts to receive funding for a Black Resource Center at UCLA, including a recently proposed referendum that did not pass, UCLA swiftly and promptly provided funding and space for Black students.

**Conclusion**

The history of race-related incidents at UCLA began long before its establishment as a four-year public university. Since its founding, there have been periods of greater
and lesser racial equity on campus. This history reveals a series of teachable moments that should not only be reviewed carefully by the current UCLA administration, but could also serve as an example for college campuses across the country. Progress in the realms of admission practices, student retention rates, fairness in employment, and funding for ethnic studies at UCLA has been slow and contentious. Movement forward in these areas has been closely linked to student protest and acts of resistance against administration decisions and police violence on campus alike. And yet, on UCLA’s campus, the targeting of Black students continues. Diversity, equity, and inclusion efforts have not been enough to remedy racial injustice at UCLA; they often fail to address deep structures of inequality (and acknowledge the work of student-led struggles). Universities must acknowledge the Black, Indigenous, and people of color (BIPOC) students and faculty who have shaped the university, and the continuous acts of suppression that violate the university’s ideals of racial diversity, equity, and inclusion. Such an acknowledgment is necessary in order to move forward in developing an institution that prioritizes the safety of Black students and students of color, historical analysis is an essential precondition to developing just policies to effectively fulfill the calls to action from Black students and students of color at UCLA. Empowering student voices in policy deliberations and decisions is an essential first step toward equity at UCLA. If successful, UCLA can set an example from which other institutions can learn. UCLA – and all universities – must create and sustain a racially just environment that is conducive to learning.

**Recommendations**

Our research team focused our work on ways to iterate and illuminate the important history of the struggle for racial justice on campus so that the university may improve the experience of all students, faculty, and staff of our campus and the university at large. Central to achieving an equitable institution is taking a diverse set of approaches to confront racism and injustice. We have broken down our recommendations into a three-pronged approach of renaming public space as well as the histories of racial injustice and resistance, redistributing material resources away...
from policing and toward adequately supporting student initiatives and academic programming, and reaffirming the crucial role of Black students and students of color to the history of UCLA and its achievements.

**Renaming**

Centering the histories of Black students and students of color is crucial to understanding the long trajectory of UCLA from its early years as a two-year and teaching college to the top ranked public university in the country. It is essential, as demonstrated throughout our research findings, to acknowledge and honor student, faculty, and staff initiatives for racial justice that have pushed the administration to adopt policies that advance equity, often against resistance. The struggle to improve Black student admission and retention, for example, has been spearheaded by Black student activists from early on in the university’s history. In this regard, we strongly suggest naming the recently announced Black Bruin Resource Center after these historical groundbreakers, specifically Bessie Burke. We also strongly recommend that the legacy of James Lu Valle be made more visible, especially as the Commons named for him does not appear to visually represent that he was a Black man in any meaningful way. We also recommend renaming Campbell Hall, where the fatal shootings of Bunchy Carter and John Huggins occurred, after those two brave and courageous men.

**Redistributing**

Aligned with national calls to defund City and university police departments, one of the recommendations from this study calls for the redistributing of funds away from the growing UCLA Police Department budget to initiatives that support the recruitment and retention of Black students and other students of color. UCPD at UCLA has benefitted from a steadily increasing budget, even in a time of economic crisis while other departments have experienced cutbacks. Canceling contracts with LAPD and other
local police departments, as universities across the country have done, in addition to divesting from UCLA’s own police force, would simultaneously demonstrate the commitment of UCLA to disrupting anti-Blackness and provide immediate funds to areas where they are sorely needed. Currently, students – through the work of the Mother Organizations and other UCLA entities – engage in much of the work of recruiting and retaining students of color on campus. However, these organizations are limited in resources and funding. Redistributing funds from UCLA’s police department to existing and new programs such as these is one opportunity to remedy the history of mistreatment of and racism against minorities on campus. This redistribution would also allow for more funding to go toward mental health services, case managing services for victims of assault, social workers, psychologists, and a host of support services that might eliminate the need for UCPD to intervene. There is currently a coalition of UCLA faculty who have issued a demand to “UCLA leadership to divest from policing and reinvest the university’s resources toward research and teaching, especially in the areas of racial justice, and to support Black students, faculty, staff, and workers at UCLA.”

We encourage UCLA administration to work with these faculty, along with students, staff, and community members to redistribute funds from the UC Police Department to initiatives that support Black members of the UCLA community.

Reaffirming

UCLA must reaffirm its commitment to serving communities of color. Its history of exclusionary practices, such as early Black students not being allowed to live in Westwood, along with the adverse treatment of activists and prominent students and
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faculty of color like Bunchy Carter, Angela Davis, and Sy Stokes, has led many communities of color in Los Angeles to harbor feelings of alienation from UCLA. To remedy this history, UCLA can take measures to highlight the achievements of students and faculty of color such as those mentioned above. In addition to maintaining and perhaps expanding institutional professionalized efforts, such as AAP, UCLA can begin to address these issues by allocating funds to support initiatives created and led by students and faculty of color, such as Mother Orgs and their retention and access efforts, that are the backbone of recruitment and retention Black students and of students of color at UCLA.

Additionally, UCLA can set an example for a policy framework that honors and respects Mother Organizations and other student organizations. Considering the many ways that students of color have taken the reigns of their own education and have successfully paved the way for community-based learning, they ought to be recognized as experts in ongoing conversations about furthering the aims of Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion to make student-centered decisions aligned with analysis of power in higher education.

A student advisory board for the UCLA EDI (Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion) department does exist, but lacks representation from student leaders in the Mother Organizations who do the groundwork of retention, access, outreach, social justice, and activism on a daily basis. Additionally, having a student board that is limited to advising, rather than decision making, continues to allow for UCLA administrators to make decisions that ignore the needs of students. Hiring student representatives within the UCLA EDI department with autonomous decision-making power would better address community needs and issues, and would resist a certain EDI tendency to reduce equity to inclusion. The aim here is to foster a rich educational space in which the labor, history, and excellence produced from both current students and alumni, is tangibly reaffirmed.
Specific Recommendations

1. Rename Janns Steps to “Tongva Steps” with approval and consultation from the American Indian Student Association.
2. Rename the Black Bruin Resource Center to “Bessie Burke Black Bruin Resource Center” with approval from the Afrikan Student Union.
3. Rename Cambell Hall to “Bunchy Carter and John Huggins Hall” in honor and remembrance of two Black students that contributed heavily to the Black community and were brutally murdered on UCLA’s campus.
4. Defund UCLA’s UCPD and redistribute these resources. Put these funds toward Black student scholarships, Black case workers, Black psychologists, and Black administration in the Black Bruin Resource Center.
5. Create an annual scholarship, funded by the university, that offers at least 10 Black students $5,000 per academic year for their contributions to the university through service, academia, and activism.
6. Affirm student advocacy and student-initiated efforts of retention by removing the Community Programs Office from having administrative oversight of the projects within the Campus Retention Committee and Student Initiated Outreach Center. Hire administrative and student staff members, with consultation of the Campus Retention Committee, that support the upkeep of the projects in a safe and equitable manner.
7. Publicly make a commitment to becoming an anti-racist institution through the development of curriculum, policies, and practices.
8. Publicly acknowledge the inaction taken to hold the university accountable to representative diversity, equity for all marginalized student populations, and anti-racist practices.
9. Create a student committee within the Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion department that has voting and policy making power that works alongside the current administration to hold UCLA accountable for retaining and actively supporting Black students and students of color.
10. Create a walking tour of the UCLA campus which highlights the rich history of Black students and students of color at UCLA.

**Toolkit**

Here we have consolidated digital resources from peer institutions—mostly on the East Coast—doing comparable work to confront their past, especially as it relates to slavery and genocide, remembering the racial legacies of their foundation as they work towards uplifting current and more diverse campus communities. We find these resources to be helpful not only for improving UCLA’s own memory of its racial origins but for our colleagues at other schools seeking to do similar work with intention and strategy. We will go further together, and that work begins with reckoning and recognizing our dark pasts and the ways they inform our present struggles.

- Georgetown University: [https://www.georgetown.edu/slavery/](https://www.georgetown.edu/slavery/)
- Princeton University: [https://www.princetonhistory.org/tour/](https://www.princetonhistory.org/tour/)
- Middlebury College: [https://www.middlebury.edu/office/anderson-freeman](https://www.middlebury.edu/office/anderson-freeman)
- Brown University: [https://slaveryandjustice.brown.edu/](https://slaveryandjustice.brown.edu/)
- Duke University: [https://humanrights.fhi.duke.edu/slavery-and-segregation/](https://humanrights.fhi.duke.edu/slavery-and-segregation/)
- Amherst College: [https://www.amherst.edu/news/antiracism/a-racial-history-of-amherst-college](https://www.amherst.edu/news/antiracism/a-racial-history-of-amherst-college)
- University of Virginia: [https://slavery.virginia.edu/](https://slavery.virginia.edu/)
- University of North Carolina: [https://exhibits.lib.unc.edu/exhibits/show/slavery/introduction](https://exhibits.lib.unc.edu/exhibits/show/slavery/introduction)
- Yale University: [https://president.yale.edu/president/statements/progress-building-stronger-and-more-inclusive-yale](https://president.yale.edu/president/statements/progress-building-stronger-and-more-inclusive-yale)
  - [https://yaleandslavery.yale.edu/](https://yaleandslavery.yale.edu/)
- Harvard University: [https://library.harvard.edu/confronting-anti-black-racism](https://library.harvard.edu/confronting-anti-black-racism)
  ○ https://aaas.stanford.edu/our-history-timeline
• University of Michigan: http://www.provost.umich.edu/nav/anti-racism.html
  ○ https://apps.lib.umich.edu/online-exhibits/exhibits/show/history-of-race-at-um
• University of Minnesota: https://umnrjr.umn.edu/

Further articles and books:
• Washington Post:
  https://www.washingtonpost.com/outlook/2021/04/01/higher-educations-racial-reckoning-reaches-far-beyond-slavery/
• PBS: https://www.pbs.org/newshour/show/universities-look-to-the-past-to-understand-their-relationships-with-race
• *We Are Worth Fighting For: A History of the Howard University Student Protest of 1989* by Joshua M. Myers https://nyupress.org/9781479811755/we-are-worth-fighting-for/

Research Process:
During this research process, we explored the university archives, conducted oral interviews with individuals involved in the events of the report, used student newspapers to understand perspectives of individuals present during a certain time, and sought to understand the lived experiences of students and faculty of color at UCLA.