

**Steve McGuire:**

Kenny, welcome to the podcast.

**Kenny Xu:**

Hey, thanks so much for having me.

**Steve McGuire:**

Yeah, really glad you could join us. So I'd like to talk to you today especially about your book, "An Inconvenient Minority," as well as the cases involving Students for Fair Admissions and Harvard and UNC, which were packaged together at the Supreme Court level. But first, let's begin by asking you to tell us a little bit about yourself and the work that you do with your organization, Color Us United.

**Kenny Xu:**

So I'm the president of Color Us United, and our work is to advocate for race blind America. That means that we believe that race should be out of the equation and all factors, promotion, hiring, admissions, anything like that. And also we're fighting against the narrative that America's a racist country, which is of course the premise of why people are trying to make these race-based decisions in the first place. So we've recently conducted campaigns targeting the Salvation Army and American Express, and our campaigns have been successful. They've led to lawsuits against American Express for having these policies that mistreat their white workers in the name of diversity. And with Salvation Army, we've been getting the commissioners and the National Commanders of the Army to release statements saying that, no, we don't believe America is a racist country, and we love and support the Americans who support us so generously to help in our mission to help the world. So, that's what we do. We're an advocacy group and we're really pushing against this narrative and this tide of DEI that's taking over the economy right now.

**Steve McGuire:**

Interesting. So with those two cases that you just mentioned, could you maybe say a little bit more about the specific policies or stances that you are going after them for?

**Kenny Xu:**

Yeah. So with Salvation Army, last year they released a document titled, Let's Talk about Racism, where they asked their members to repent and lament and apologize for racism. These are the least racist people you probably have ever met. They literally will go into the inner cities to help Black and Brown kids get food and shelter. They do not need to be told that they are racist. And so we successfully lobbied the Salvation Army last year to drop this statement, which they did after we organized about 18,000 donors to fight back against them. And this year we're pushing them harder because we believe that the Salvation Army is the counterexample to the tenants of critical race theory, which asserts that America's systemically racist. Why would a systemically racist country support an organization like the Salvation Army, which is dedicated to helping people of all colors? So, that's our objective this year. You can support us at [colorusunited.org](http://colorusunited.org). We've already had success last year.

With American Express, their policies discriminated against white males. They had a 15% bonus for hiring more Blacks and people of color and firing white people. And this was all over their diversity statement. They were touting it for a little while. We forced them, of course, this year to hold themselves accountable for that statement. We exposed that in the media and we've gotten three

lawsuits filed against American Express for their discriminatory policy. And American Express has been walking back their DEI statements as a result. So we believe in the power of public pressure, especially since we know that the facts and the issues are on our side.

**Steve McGuire:**

Interesting. So yeah, your work expands beyond the world of higher education, which is of course the focus of ACTA. So let's talk, well before we get to the affirmative action cases or the race-based admissions cases, let's talk a little bit about your recent book, *An Inconvenient Minority*. Maybe just start by explaining why in your view are Asian Americans an inconvenient minority?

**Kenny Xu:**

Because they completely inconvenience the narrative on the left that America is a racist country. We're a terrible racist country because we're letting these Asian Americans get ahead of white people. And look at these Asian Americans. They've been historically discriminated in our country. They still face issues today, but by and large, they're the most successful minority group in terms of household income and educational attainment. And the result, the reason why is not because of race at all, it's because of culture. It's because Asian American study twice as many hours as the average American. They also are more likely to be in two parent families, lower rates of crime, drug use, all of those kinds of things. And that tends to filter up in American society. It proves that we still are a country in which merit is rewarded and hard work is rewarded.

And so when people say that the problems in our country are because of race, I point to Asian Americans as the inconvenient minority who are a minority race, who have succeeded. And oftentimes I don't get any good answers from the left. And that's what provoked me to write this book, *An Inconvenient Minority*, because as you know, because of this race based agenda, they are now discriminating against Asian Americans in the admissions process who do not deserve to be discriminated against. There's nothing that they did. By the way, I don't believe there's anything that current white people did to deserve discrimination in the admissions process either. But Asian Americans are a very good example to use here because nobody can justify the discrimination against Asians that's happening against universities. And so that's the premise of my book, *An Inconvenient Minority*, to tell those two truths.

**Steve McGuire:**

Okay, interesting. And then also, as you mentioned, you focus on the issue of meritocracy quite a bit in your book as well. Could you maybe say a few words about why you think meritocracy is important and the role that it's played historically in America? Because I think you do at various points also acknowledge that meritocracy is obviously not always put into place or observed in things like college admissions, even before dealing with things like race-based admissions.

**Kenny Xu:**

Which makes my argument for meritocracy even stronger, because colleges are deviating from meritocracy and admissions that a whole host of negative consequences that are happening. Number one, Black Americans and Black students are not being matched properly into the universities that will support them. This is why Black people tend to graduate at the bottom 25% of their law schools and are more likely to switch out of STEM majors because they're just put into fields, they're smart guys, but they're not at that elite level. A lot of them aren't. And when they're put into elite schools who want

them for their diversity, they tend to struggle. And this does not help them in their career. This does not help encourage them.

So I see negative effects of deviations from meritocracy there. And then obviously the more that you embrace identity politics and rewarding people for victimhood rather than rewarding people for merit, the more you get into this invidious discrimination that's happening against Asian Americans where these people have nothing, they're getting the grades, they're getting the test scores, they're working hard, they are getting the good teacher recommendations, and yet they are discriminated against for no other reason than their race. And this should not be happening in a country like this. We should be rewarding hard work. We should be sending those messages to our kids. Doesn't matter what your skin color is, if you put in the work you can get in, or you have a higher chance of getting in. And that's what meritocracy should be all about. It should be about rewarding hard work and talent.

**Steve McGuire:**

And it sounds like you subscribe to a mismatch theory as well, that the affirmative action policies don't even necessarily help the people that they're purportedly designed to help. Is that right?

**Kenny Xu:**

Yeah, definitely. The evidence on this is just so clear based on new evidence released from law schools showing that Black kids would tend to graduate the bottom 25%. Also, when Proposition 16 passed in California, which banned, sorry, Proposition 209 in 1994 passed in California, which banned affirmative action in college admissions. Yeah, the percentage of Black kids went down in UC, Berkeley, but they just filtered off into all of the other universities that were better able to serve them, the California state universities and the lower tier UCs. But they were able to compete. And eventually Black people in California are actually doing quite well. They're one of the stronger minority groups, and they've actually been trickling up into these elite universities at a steady pace. So it does show that when you don't lower the standard, people will rise up to meet it.

**Steve McGuire:**

Okay, interesting. Well, let's turn specifically then to the case at Harvard as well as the one at UNC. Could you maybe just start by explaining to our listeners what is Students for Fair Admissions v. Harvard all about?

**Kenny Xu:**

So the Students for Fair Admissions v. Harvard case was a suit filed by a group of Asian American applicants to Harvard who were rejected because of their race, because basically they were alleging that Harvard has discriminated against them in favor of Blacks, Hispanics, and even white people. And the data, that was basically what happened was a judge forced Harvard to release their admissions data as a result of this. And it's just fascinating. Harvard asks Asian Americans to score 270 points higher on the SAT to have the same chance of admission as a Black person, and 80 points higher than a white person. So there are key preferences that Harvard's using, and it shows this unequivocally. The data now shows this, and we have this evidence in our hands. Now Harvard is saying, well, race is just one factor and we look at so many other things.

Oh, really? Then why are you so insistent on protecting race based affirmative action if race means so little to you? No, we know actually race means a ton to Harvard. In fact, an Asian American who has a 25% chance of admission based on his academic talent will have a 35% chance of admission if he were white, a 75% chance of admission if he were Hispanic, and a 95% chance of admission if he were Black.

And that's just according to plain controlled for academic characteristics. So this is what this case will expose and this is why I'm interested in covering it.

**Steve McGuire:**

Yeah, I was surprised looking at some of that data to notice that the way that it broke down was that even white students seemed to be advantaged over Asian students by Harvard's decile ranking system. They also used this personality score, I think as part of their admissions process. Could you talk a little bit about that and how that seems to work against Asian American applicants?

**Kenny Xu:**

Yeah. Well, this is how Harvard was able to justify their discrimination to the district courts, which first ruled for Harvard. It is now at the Supreme Court. So we expect and hope for a Supreme Court ruling against Harvard. But the district courts initially ruled for Harvard. And the reason why is because they bought Harvard's claim that the personality score isn't inherently discriminatory. Now, Asians score highest on academics, highest in extracurriculars at Harvard. And to compensate, Harvard has rated Asian applicants lowest on this thing called personality, which measures things like likability, humor, fitness, good leadership characteristics, et cetera.

And if you look at the objective evidence doesn't support this premise at all. Asians have the highest teacher recommendation and alumni recommendation scores, second highest Guidance Council recommendation scores. I imagine their personal essays are pretty good too. I don't know, maybe we're terrible writers, but nothing else suggests to me that we are. So there's no reason that Harvard would give Asians these low personality scores except for the fact that they need some metric to besmirch Asians, otherwise stellar credentials in terms of getting into Harvard.

**Steve McGuire:**

So, what do these personalities scores mean? What are they trying to say about the Asian applicants that they're receiving? What do they include?

**Kenny Xu:**

They're trying to say that Asians are test taking robots with no personality. That's what they're trying to say. So they're reliant upon the stereotype, which by the way, if you talk to progressive Harvard professors or students, which I haven't talked to many, and they're all in my book, *An Inconvenient Minority*. You see some even Asians sort of buying into this stereotype about themselves too, because the elite institutions in America have dubbed Asians as low personality. Some of us start to believe that as well. You can take a look at some of these essays, which Duke economist, Peter Arcidiacono took a look at. And you can have the exact same application with stellar personal story. And the Asian applicant will be rated standard strong, which means good, but not good enough. And the Black applicant will be rated, we have to get this person in. He's stellar, he's disadvantaged. We need to get this person in. So people, the more race is embedded into the framework of how you're making decisions, the more people will come up with stereotypes to justify themselves to get to that ultimate ratio that they want.

**Steve McGuire:**

YEAH. And that's what in your book, you suggest that some of these policies might be, in some cases tied not only to say current DEI measures and desires to say improve the chances of admission for say, Black applicants, but they might also be tied to historical anti-Asian discrimination and that sort of thing.

Could you say a little bit more about that and how you think it might be potentially a combination even of those two things?

**Kenny Xu:**

Yeah, I see this broader cultural justification of DEI as incredibly toxic for Asian Americans' future in America. You're basically, what DEI and diversity, equity, inclusion for people who don't know what I'm talking about. It's the new corporate speak for, we need to admit more Blacks and discriminate against white people and Asians is that, the new discourse is now saying that Asians are white adjacent. That's the new term. White adjacent is how they would describe Asians now, because we're too successful, that's why. So we have to be put in with the privileged category instead of the oppressed category.

So the more companies are going to practice DEI, they're not doing it for Asians guys. Google isn't hiring a chief diversity officer to protect the Asian software engineers and give them higher salaries and promotions. No, in fact, Asians are the least likely to be promoted in up the Google hierarchy right now. And if you're Black, you're extremely likely to be promoted. I wonder why. It's not because DEI is helping Asians, DEI is hurting Asians and it's helping other minorities. That's the point. That's what my book is addressing. I see this as reinforcing and reifying anti-Asian stereotypes in the name of diversity, equity, and inclusion. And I don't see this going anywhere good for Asian Americans in the future.

**Steve McGuire:**

Interesting. And you mentioned as well, in your book, you talk about how Asian Americans are even getting in a way, sandwich between existing elite clicks. Say look at a school like Harvard, and there's legacy admissions and various sorts of things like that where there's a self-perpetuating elite. And Asians don't necessarily historically fit into that group, so that hurts their admissions chances. But then also the race-based admissions policies hurt their admission chances as well. So they end up being at the short end of the stick for both those reasons. Is that right?

**Kenny Xu:**

Yeah, if you're a white or Black elite, because there are many of those who go to Harvard. In fact, 71% of the Black applicant of the Black [inaudible] Harvard come from wealthy backgrounds. I just want to confirm that. If you're an elite who has long standing name in America, then you probably won't be as affected by these race based affirmative action policies because we now know that you have a five times higher chance of getting into Harvard if you come from a legacy background. And your chances rise to 50% chance to get into Harvard if you're the child of a donor who's donated \$10 million or more to Harvard. And of course, Asians are very unlikely to fall into this legacy and child of donor category. And so they're doubly sandwiched. They don't get preferences for race, they don't get preferences for legacy. They're just screwed in this IV admissions process.

And what I see, what the further case that I make in my book is I'm using Harvard as an example of what happens as a culture when we decline for meritocracy. As a culture, when we stop rewarding the excellent, as a culture, when we stop prioritizing merit above all else, this is what will happen. On one hand, you'll have the lower class people, whoever we've dubbed as the oppressed, getting these unmerited benefits. And on the other hand, the rich people with connections will continue to thrive. So who are the people who lose? It's the hardworking Americans who have no social connections, who are trying to rely on their talent to move up in the American hierarchy. Those are the people who lose that when meritocracy dies. And that's the case that I make in using Asian Americans as that example.

**Steve McGuire:**

Yeah, I thought it was interesting. In your book, at one point you turned to discuss the political philosopher John Rawls. I'm a political theorist by training, so my ears perked up when you mentioned him, but you made a really good point, which is that in Rawls, he wants as equal a society as possible, that still benefits the whole, maximizes benefit, but he sees even innate talents and abilities as unmerited, which I suppose in some sense they are, but he wants to somehow have-

**Kenny Xu:**

... got into the Rawls Kool-Aid. I'm just kidding.

**Steve McGuire:**

But he somehow wants some social organization that levels the playing field regardless of, or at least maximizes the use of those talents for society equally so that there is a philosophical shift here against encouraging people to take their natural talents, cultivate them, and use them for their own personal benefit, but then also, of course, the benefit of society. You seem to be suggesting that if you don't follow that philosophy, it's going to hurt both the individual and American society.

**Kenny Xu:**

Yeah. I see Rawls's philosophy as an abuse, basically Christianity. Rawls wasn't a Christian, he was an atheist, but he came from a preaching background. He almost wanted to be a preacher. And basically in Christianity we say, you don't merit God's grace. Nobody merits God grace, everybody has unmerited favor from God, which is fine. I believe that too. But you don't take that and then say, in society, that means that nobody deserves the gifts that they got, because the truth is some people are faster, stronger, more intelligent. Some people are inherently bigger, can do hard labor. Some people can bear children better. And if you say to these people, all of those talents are not yours, and you don't deserve the fruits of those talents, then what are you saying to these people? You're basically saying to these people, stop using your gifts.

And we as a society have progressed from becoming cavemen and caves to becoming a modern civilized society because people use their gifts, because Thomas Edison or Tesla used his mind to create a light bulb, or because Isaac Newton developed the physics. And if we don't reward people who use their gifts in the correct way in the name of equality or helping the lowest class, and were hamstringing society as a whole from producing that innovation necessary to progress.

**Steve McGuire:**

Yeah. No, I think that's good. Yeah. Rawls did have a crisis of faith coming out of the war. Yeah, I think you're right that there is a kind of reaction against this idea that, well, these are your natural talents to put it in non-Christian language, or they are gifts from God to put it in Christian language. And Rawls seems to be saying, well, we can do better than that. We can make things even fairer than nature or God made them, but in a way that limits the ability of people to pursue excellence and to contribute to society.

**Kenny Xu:**

Yeah. Yeah. He wants to make... His concept of fairness quickly turns into unfairness once he starts to deny that people deserve even their inherent talents, because then he starts saying, well, then we can take away the fruits of those talents from people to give them to what he perceived as the lowest class. And that's unfair.

**Steve McGuire:**

So getting back to the case, they had oral arguments before the Supreme Court not too long ago, and I was wondering if you had any reactions to the oral arguments? Were there any key moments that you thought were particularly important? Did you get any sense of where... I don't know if you're in the business of predicting what the Supreme Court might do, but do you have any sense of what you think they might do based on the questions or the exchanges during oral arguments?

**Kenny Xu:**

Yeah. There are two key moments I want to hone in on. One is how the liberal justices started to really embrace this progressive originalism that Harvard is trying to propagate in legal culture now, this whole idea that, oh, the Constitution was never meant to be colorblind. Oh, the 14th Amendment wasn't supposed to make a colorblind society, it was just supposed to specifically be about black people, basically. And it's like we're regressing now as a culture, we're making it about whites and Blacks, again, even though our country is 25% Hispanic and eight or 9% Asian, we're getting to the point where Asians are going to be double digits in 30 years, guys. This is not an insignificant minority anymore. We have to figure out a way to treat everybody fairly, not just through the lens of a one-sided, or sorry, a two-sided dichotomy, racial dichotomy, but in a genuinely multicultural multiracial society.

And the answer to that is color blindness treat people only according to their merits. It doesn't matter what background you come from, doesn't matter if your name is Jenny Xu or VJ Gupta. Treat people not according to their name or their background, but according to what they can contribute. That's always been the basis for a colorblind society. That's what we have to progress. And I think that the liberal justices were descending into a very dualistic rhetoric, which I did not appreciate. But then Clarence Thomas, I think provided one of the more stellar points of the evening, sorry, of the morning where he said, Harvard was waxing on and on.

So I think it was UNC or Harvard, because this is a case against UNC too. But UNC was waxing on and on about why diversity, about we need to protect diversity and diversity this. And then Clarence Thomas said, well, why do you care about protecting diversity? Why are you willing to racially discriminate just to protect diversity, whatever that means. And then he said, he commented, I've seen all kinds of justifications to protect racial segregation, and your rhetoric falls in that line of the kinds of comments that have been used before that I've seen to protect racial discrimination. And there's no answer for that. And so I do think that that is persuasive. And I do think the justices are going to rule six three in favor of us.

**Steve McGuire:**

Interesting. Now, there's been some suggestion in the media that if they do rule that way, which I think other people think that as well, that there will be other ways that Harvard and UNC and other schools can try to achieve the diverse student body that they want to achieve. Do you have any sense of if this case goes the way you've just suggested, will Harvard or UNC just find other ways to accomplish the same goal anyways?

**Kenny Xu:**

They will try and we will have to hold them accountable. As you know Harvard just dropped out of the law school rankings claiming a flawed system. Look, it is a flawed system. I'm not going to say it's not a flawed system. But now Harvard is doing things like, we're going to make LSATs optional. We're going to make SAT scores optional. That's unacceptable because these SAT scores are actually accountability metrics if you think about it. Schools can change grades. Harvard's grade inflation has been going up for

the past five decades. I think the average GPA at Harvard is now 3.2, whereas the average GPA of a Harvard student 50 years ago was nowhere near that.

Grades are subjective, tests are not. You have to use a test based metric because it allows people to compete on the same playing field. Nobody that I know at least is going to say, oh, this kid won a fifth grade chess tournament so he can beat Magnus Carlson, because Magnus Carlson didn't win the World Grand Prix for chess. No one's going to say that. You have to have a test where people are on the same playing field, so that we can genuinely determine who is deserving.

**Steve McGuire:**

Yeah, I'm glad you brought that up, because I was thinking of the recent news that not just Harvard and Yale, but now a variety of law schools have pulled out of the US news rankings, which as you say, I don't think too many people are going to shed a tear for the US news ranking, but it does raise the question of what the motivations are that they're doing this. And then, of course, yeah, the ABA has recently decided that the LSAT can be optional and schools, of course, can still require it if they want, but they don't have to, which also raises questions about why they would do that.

**Kenny Xu:**

This is what I'm saying. Look, if you don't like the LSAT as it's currently structured, make an argument for making a different test. Make a better test. But don't just scrap the test because we need a test, we need an objective test. Okay. But reform it if you don't like it. Go ahead.

**Steve McGuire:**

So you said at the beginning, America's not a racist country. That's a key proposition for your organization. Certainly if not America's a racist country, many Americans would say that there's racism present in America today, that America has a history of racism. Do you think that there are any policies related to admissions that colleges and universities should pursue other than race-based admissions to acknowledge or address the presence of racism or the history of racism in American society?

**Kenny Xu:**

Well, I think the best policy that colleges and universities can do with regards to admissions to address racism is to treat people based on merit. I know it's very controversial, but look, when you start saying, well, because of the history of racism, we need to treat your races differently. You're just abetting your own racism at that point. Look at the culture of the Harvard Admissions Department now. They're literally at the point where they are justifying anti-Asian stereotypes to themselves just so they could discriminate against Asians in the personality score. That's the point. That is the state we are living in right now. You want to talk about racism? Let's talk about progressive racism. Okay. You want to stop talking about racism, you want to move on? Stop having race in the equation.

**Steve McGuire:**

Okay, great. What about the idea of say, financial aid, not based on race, but of course there's merit based financial aid, but then there's also need based financial aid. Do you support need based financial aid and see that as a way that could help even within a framework of meritocracy by using need based financial aid to identify students who merit admission to a school but don't have the resources to go to that school?

**Kenny Xu:**

Yeah, if you can afford it. My college, Davidson College, had a need blind financial, not a need blind. They had a financial aid system where they, instead of providing loans to students, they would give grants so the students wouldn't have to pay it back. And I think that that was a really, really cool thing that they did. And that was partly why I went there, because they have that trust. Now, of course, they have the financial means to execute that trust and nobody really knows the formula about who really is going to get most of that financial aid. But it certainly wasn't somebody like me whose parents weren't rich. We certainly didn't get any financial aid from Davidson.

So I don't know how deep that goes, but as long as you're admitting based on merit and not admitting based on, well, I think this class is oppressed and I think that we need to give a leg up to this sexual orientation or something like that, as long as you're admitting based on merit, yeah, you can provide need and you can provide the means to those who are most needy, I think that America's always believed that.

**Steve McGuire:**

Okay. And-.

**Kenny Xu:**

Genuinely need. Not needy based on your racial construct of yourself. Go ahead.

**Steve McGuire:**

Okay. So in the beginning of your book, one of the things you open with is a discussion of Thomas Jefferson High School. And this is a K to 12 example, but I think generally applies to education. And one of the things that you note is that they tried a new admissions policy for the sake of diversity and you argue that this resulted in bringing in students who weren't prepared to be at the school. And you suggest that that lack of preparedness has roots that go back much farther than the question of admissions into Thomas Jefferson High School. So I wonder if you have any thoughts about anything that could be done or whether anything should be done to help say African American students get to a point where they would be more likely to be admitted to a school like Thomas Jefferson or at the college level a school like Harvard, when they reach the age where they're applying to enter a school like that.

**Kenny Xu:**

Yeah. And this question about why Black students are so inequitably represented at the top high schools and colleges in the nation has bothered me for a while. I admit that. And just to... I'm not here to announce anything, but follow me on Twitter at Kenny M. Xu, and very soon you might see something that I post that where there might be something, a work of mine that will directly address this and why we've come to this place in the achievement gap and why our achievement gap hasn't closed in the past 40 years. And why, despite the fact that we spend three times as much money on students, especially Black and Brown students, that they haven't achieved at the level that we've wanted, we've expected given our financing of that situation.

And just preliminarily, there are serious cultural issues that go on at a lot of these Black majority schools. Look at Maspeth High School, which is a Latino majority school in New York City where it is a 98% pass rate, 98% of the kids graduate, 5% of them can do math. 5% of them pass the state sanctioned math proficiency exam, that signals that you are ready to progress past your grade. This kind of thing is allowed to happen in these inner cities over and over again, where excuses for failure are made over

and over again. Expectations are lowered, standards are lowered. Cultures of lack of discipline and accountability are embedded. And so this is going to be the key issue. This is going to be the key issue in education for the next 30 years, I predict it, because we need to get ourselves out of the rot that our public school system has become.

**Steve McGuire:**

Interesting. Well, by way of concluding, I want to get back to the question of Asian Americans and what your hopes are, I guess, for the future of Asian Americans as a group in America. I note in your book relatively early on, you say, and I'm quoting you here, until Asian Americans get a grip on themselves and organize into a coherent political identity, they will increasingly face the wrath of a country increasingly turning against their values. And I thought that was an interesting statement and maybe you could talk a little bit about what you had in mind there. And then, like I said, yeah, couple that with maybe some discussion of how you see Asian Americans faring in American society in the future and what hopes you have.

**Kenny Xu:**

Yeah. When I say Asian values, I don't mean these are values exclusively born by Asians, but generally reliance in education, generally studying hard, generally working hard, immigrant mentality, trying to figure out a place in the world, providing a better future for your children, disciplining your children appropriately. Things that good parents do. If our culture starts to reward, well, let's be loud and be an activist. And that's how you get into Harvard. And Stanford I think accepted a student actually from my New Jersey community, because I grew up in New Jersey and there's a student who wrote hashtag Black Lives Matter a hundred times on his personal essay to Stanford, and he got into Stanford.

And it's like, why are we rewarding this? We're rewarding activism now? We're rewarding you saying your personal victimhood story? What about excellence? What about good reputation from your teachers? What about the fact that people are willing to speak highly of you? What about the fact that the tests show that you studied? What about the fact that your grades and your test scores show that you're able to defer gratification and not go out to those parties every Thursday and Friday night because you're studying, and risking your social life as so many Asian Americans do not dating in high school, but studying because they have a goal. They have a goal in mind, they want to get into a good college. And that's good. That's a good thing, man. Isn't that a positive personality trait?

When Harvard rates Asians lowest in personality, I just find it deeply, deeply ironic because it's the personality traits that Harvard thinks are good personality traits, that they don't understand the sacrifices that it takes to sit down on a Friday night and work through an algebra textbook instead of go out and party with your friends when the culture is telling you, let's do that. So this book, *An Inconvenient Minority*, for me emotionally it means a lot because I want to justify the plight of some of the kids who study, of the kids who defer gratification, the kids who have that immigrant mentality that their parents put upon them, because I want that to be rewarded and heard in this culture too.

**Steve McGuire:**

Yeah. And in the book, you talk about how this even affects Asian Americans when they go into the workforce as well in terms of, say, getting leadership positions in companies and that sort of thing, that they're still dogged by discrimination that suggests that they don't have the skills or the personality or, I'm not sure exactly what it is that people say, well, you're probably not the right kind of person for this type of position.

**Kenny Xu:**

Yeah. And is it a chicken or egg sort of thing? Is there discrimination and stereotyping of Asians? Yes. But is it also Asian low self-confidence that is propagated from an inverted system of justice in which they've been taught to believe, in which they internalize their personality demerits that Harvard and elite colleges and guidance counselors have given them from their [inaudible]? Absolutely. There were guidance counselors saying to Asian applicants to Harvard, be less Asian. Don't put Asian in your bio. Try not to emphasize that you play the piano and violin or tennis for God's sake. Basically, don't be an Asian and don't be proud of your cultural heritage unless it's some social justice thing like Asian Lives Matter or something like that, then you could be proud of it. But otherwise, don't be proud of it.

These are the recommendations that these guidance counselors are giving these Asian students. And all of it is just to beat down and grind the Asian identity out of them. And if Asians start to internalize that and say, maybe we aren't good socially, maybe we can't get a girl, maybe we can't have leadership in these positions, then they're not going to.

**Steve McGuire:**

Okay, great. Well thanks for that. So just to wrap up, you mentioned it sounds like maybe you might be dropping a new publication soon. We'll certainly look forward to that. Are there other things that you or Color Us United have in the cooker that you're planning to work on here in the near future that you'd like to talk about?

**Kenny Xu:**

Yeah, I would just recommend follow me on Twitter where I post regularly on culture, race, identity, talk about my thoughts on the DEI industry. And yes, something's coming out from the cooker very soon. But in Color Us United, follow [Colorusunited.org](https://colorusunited.org), subscribe to our newsletter because we are trying to fight for you. We're trying to fight for the hard working person who just wants to be treated on his hard work, not on the basis of his unmerited racial identity.

**Steve McGuire:**

Great. Well thanks for joining us today, Kenny.

**Kenny Xu:**

Thank you.

**Steve McGuire:**

All right. Good.