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ABSTRACT

THE ORGANIZATION AND DEVELOPMENT
OF A DRUG ABUSE TEACH-IN

by

Duane Hisashi Oshinomi

Master of Public Health in Community Health Education

January, 1975

This paper is a description of the process employed by the author to organize and develop a community drug abuse teach-in. All community members above elementary school age in a selected Japanese-American community within the Los Angeles area were solicited to attend the half day program.

The objectives of the teach-in were:

1. To identify and assemble concerned citizens within the community to help promote the teach-in.

2. To educate and bring awareness to the community concerning the nature and scope of drug abuse within the local community.

3. To promote better lines of communication between second and third generations of Japanese-Americans
concerning problems that may lead to drug abuse.

4. To increase child and parental understanding of the tangible and intangible factors that contribute to drug abuse among all ages.

5. To provide an alternative to drug use among young persons.

Organizing the teach-in was divided into four stages. The first stage dealt with contacting interested and concerned community members who could aid in making this program a success. The second stage was to establish a steering committee to plan and outline a teach-in program. The third stage dealt with acquiring speakers from different vocational backgrounds to address the audience. The last stage, an import area, dealt with publicizing the event. Although the organization of the teach-in was divided into four stages, it by no means is implied that the stages took place in chronological order; in fact, all four stages simultaneously occurred.

The teach-in took place on May 20, 1973. The program consisted of speakers from the community and from other neighboring communities. A film involving an Asian drug self-help group was shown, followed by ten small group discussions. Approximately 130 people attended the program which lasted a little over five hours.
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Each month, new literature about an old problem manifests itself in libraries and on book shelves. The problem, one which society has been facing with an overwhelming tenacity, concerns itself with drug abuse.

This overabundance of literature dealing with this overburdened topic tends to suggest that the problem is one that is growing at an undiminishing rate.

Much of the drug-related literature concerns itself with certain major populations: the whites, ghetto people, middle America, the youth, and the middle aged. The problems each of these populations face in relation to the drug problem are generally discussed.

Little focus has been given to one particular group which until now has been considered a minority group with little incidence of crime. This segment of the population is the Japanese-Americans.

The Japanese-American minority in the past has been viewed quite favorably by the majority population.

Facing barriers such as racial prejudice and physical internment, the Japanese have gained a reputation of respect and trust. In the process of establishing themselves in American society, the ensuing generations of
Japanese-Americans seemingly have drifted from traditional Japanese values to take on many American values. In doing so, the latter generations of Japanese, in the eyes of the author, have become entwined in a societal pandemic of drug abuse.

In an effort to combat this problem, it was felt by an Asian Drug Coalition to which the author belonged, that an educational program directed to a community might prove beneficial. With the aid of some community members, an educational program was formulated.

Before continuing further, the concept of drug abuse must be commented upon. The definition of "drug abuse," is still unclear to many because each of the two terms comprising this concept are in themselves very general. According to Mikeal(22) and Smith,

"A drug is any substance, except food, consumed by a living organism that exerts a differentially measurable physiological, or sociological change in the structure or function of the organism from its preconsumptive state."

For the second part of the concept, "abuse," Bruyn(3) says,

"The term "abuse" is more generally understood and certainly evokes the intended image of wrongful use or use for a wrong purpose."

Some authors like Johnson(13) and Westman define drug abuse in terms of examples,
"Commonly accepted examples of drug abuse refer to altering one's mental state, with self-destructive physical, emotional or social consequences, often in violation of an established law or social value."

Of these definitions, the author feels that Boe(2) gives the most functional definition by stating that it is, "the use of any drug or chemical substance for other than its intended purpose and which seriously damages either the person's health or ability to function."

In developing the program, it was decided that a teach-in would be an innovative method that might best reach a large audience while, at the same time, hold the audience's attention and interest.

In contrast to teacher-student relations, as in school or "straight from the book learning," this somewhat new and different approach might best stimulate open dialogue between the audience and facilitators.

"The value of the teach-in approach to learning stems from the individual's internal "motivation" to learn rather than an externally stimulated pressure to "receive" learning. In effect, "teaching is not lecturing or telling ideas to others."(25)

With this teach-in method decided upon, a program for the day's event was developed.

The program was to consist of a number of speakers presenting different points of view concerning the drug abuse problem. Speakers were to include ex-users, a lawyer, a probation officer, a nurse, concerned community
leaders, and employees of drug abuse agencies. These speakers, all Japanese-Americans were to come from surrounding communities and have a common goal of trying to suppress drug abuse.

To compliment a program of speakers, a movie was to be shown dealing with drugs. This was to be followed by a separation of the audience into smaller discussion groups. The discussion groups were to be led by members of self-help groups from neighboring Asian communities who were currently involved in related drug programs.

Following the small group discussions, which were to be the main area of concentration, the separate groups would rejoin and then more speakers would address the audience with the last speakers offering an alternative to drug abuse for the youth.

The event was to take place in the local Community Center on a Sunday so it would be possible for parents to attend.

**Background**

Among the Asian populace, the Japanese-Americans have survived a long history of struggles. From their emergence in the United States as late as the latter part of the nineteenth century, the Japanese have faced intense prejudice and discrimination.
With the onset of the gold rush in California, masses of Orientals, mostly Chinese at first, came to America to meet labor shortages. Facing harsh attitudes and warped judgment, the Orientals had many restrictions placed upon them. Land leasing limitations, permanent citizen ineligibility, employment restrictions were but a few of the many obstacles the Japanese emigrants faced.

"Gulick mentions a sample of proposed anti-Japanese legislation emanating from the California legislature in the 1910's, and containing such items as: Forbidding Japanese the use or ownership of power engines; forbidding Japanese to employ white girls; making Japanese inheritance of land illegal, and raising the standard fishing license fee of $10.00 per year to $100.00 for orientals."(16)

As a consequence, to insure survival, Japanese emigrants from both Japan and Hawaii formed institutions paralleling those of the majority population. From this existence, under strict parental guidance, these first pioneers, raised the first generation of Japanese-born Americans, the Nisei.

This second generation, faced constant pressure from their parents to be good, quiet citizens, for any outbreak of deviant behavior was considered a reflection upon the child's parents and would marr the family's name. In complying with these parental wishes, the Nisei were credited with virtuous conduct, scholastic achievements, and above all, the ability to stay out of trouble. These
attributes were an outcome of a strong family system whereby the father assumed complete dominance over the children. In contrast to their white American counterparts, the Japanese children had much more of their lives regulated by their parents and as a consequence grew up with an observable regard for authority.

Aware of their cultural and racial differences from the majority population, the Nisei dispersed from each other and sought invisibility in surrounding communities and suburbs.

In a society already laden with barriers, the Nisei faced another insurmountable obstacle. In 1942, through governmental action, over 100,000 Japanese-Americans, of which some 70 per cent were American citizens, were forced into concentration camps. These permanent camps, totaling ten, located mostly in the interior of the United States, interned Japanese-Americans for approximately three years. From this second World War action and other massive prejudicial feelings, racism against orientals was strengthened.

"We cannot close our eyes to the fact, demonstrated by experience, that in time of war, residents having ethnic affiliations with an invading enemy may be a greater source of danger than those of a different ancestry."(8)

This statement, evidence of the attitude of that time, was not voiced from racist groups or from political agitators, but were words from men of high esteem, the Supreme Court.
Lieutenant General John L. DeWitt, commander of the Western Defense Command, in justifying his actions of uprooting every last Japanese from the West Coast into concentration camps stated to a congressional committee,

"A Jap's a Jap. They are a dangerous element, whether loyal or not is no way to determine their loyalty... It makes no difference whether he is an American; theoretically he is still Japanese, and you can't change him..."(20)

These attitudes, plus the years shamefully spent confined to the camps had an important effect upon the second generation. During this time, many Japanese were in search of an identity. Many youths faced a duality of citizenship. These American-born citizens with an American outlook, were recognized only as Japanese because of their appearance and ancestral ties. This predicament placed many Americans of Japanese ancestry in a tormenting position, especially while international tensions were increasing due to the aggression displayed by Japan on the Asian mainland.

As one Japanese girl stated,

"We belong to two groups, the Japanese and the American. In ancestry and in physical appearance we are Japanese, while in birth, in education, in ideals, and in ways of thinking we are American. Nevertheless the older Japanese will not accept us into their group because as they see us, we are too independent, too pert, and too self-confident, and the Americans bar us from their group because we retain the yellow skin and flat nose of the Oriental. Thus, we stand on the border line that separates
Orient from Occident. Though on either side of us flow the streams of two great civilizations — the old Japanese culture with its formal tradition and customs and the newer American Civilization with its freedom and individualism — the chance to perceive and to imbide the best things from each has been withheld from us."(29)

Many more contradictions were felt by the Niseis in the educational institutions. In schools they were taught the American freedom doctrine and all the accompanying opportunities. Yet, away from the schools, they faced a society of racism where skin color and facial characteristics were a much greater factor than one's own ability.

Within the Japanese home many conflicts were brought to the minds of the youthful Nisei. Raised under the strong cultural heritage of respect for elders, obedience to authority, and a great sensitivity to opinions of peers, the Nisei experienced more contradiction.

"In school the Nisei were taught to question and challenge, encouraged to make their own decisions, to be aggressive, to assert their individuality. To make matters even more confusing, the parents whom one was taught at home to honor, respect and obey, in turn urged the Nisei to honor, respect and obey the teachers who, unconsciously and unintentionally, were indoctrinating the youngsters in a conflicting philosophy." (11)

To compliment their confusion, an identity crisis manifested itself in many Nisei. At home, the second generation was expected by their parents to be and act as proud Americans while ironically at school their Caucasian counterparts considered them as "only Orientals."
To overcome these attitudes, many Japanese felt that the only way they could survive was to conform to the major society and quietly gain acceptance. This was in fact the major course the Japanese-Americans followed.

In talking about strategies of adaptation, Kitano says about the Japanese,

"The Japanese themselves like to compare it (their strategy to move toward acculturation) to a small stream; like a stream they have followed the contours of the land, followed the lines of least resistance, avoided direct confrontation and developed at their own pace, always shaped by the external realities of the larger society. It is basically a strategy of accommodation." (16)

But to lead a life of accommodation, the Nisei had to gain respect. One way this respect could be accomplished was through education.

"As is often the case in primary and secondary school, conformity was rewarded by good grades. And with good grades came approval from teachers, parents and peers - and from an entire ethnic community. Every element of his society sanctioned conforming behavior and school success." (16)

Earning good grades became a typical phenomenon among the Nisei, in fact it became quite a competitive effort. Many Japanese children were constantly being compared to other Japanese children of the same neighborhood. Grades as well as respect and obedience were always features that parents would compare among their own children and those of their neighbors. In this respect, many Nisei
grew up in an atmosphere of pressure, always working hard in their effort to maintain positive stereotypes.

The third generation Sanseis, trying to follow in the paths of their Nisei parents, found it a difficult task. The Sanseis, unlike their parents seemed to be much different. They knew very little about their own heritage, few could understand the Japanese language, let alone speak it, and school with its competitive atmosphere of grade earning became a greater pressure to contend with.

"While the academic record of Sansei students is generally respectable, as a group they are less driven than their parent's generation, more often willing to accept a place in society somewhat less prestigious than the utmost they might have been able to realize."(27)

Straying from strict parental guidance, the Nisei apparently raised the third generation under more lenient conditions. This may have been in rememberance of their own childhood of harsh loneliness and restrictiveness as shown by the first generation parents.

Whether or not the Nisei parents have become mitigated in their child rearing, other comparisons between the Nisei and Sansei can be made.

"...it is no wonder that Caucasian teachers and administrators discussing Nisei children in the 1930's found much praise in the "ideal Japanese child and his wonderful, cooperative parents." Sansei children today tend to follow this prescribed Japanese model, but older teachers can be heard increasingly often
to remark that "the Japanese youngsters are acting more like everybody else all the time." This means, essentially, that they are talking back more and conforming less." (16)

Whether or not this phenomenon is related to parental leniency or a reflection of a minority culture exhibiting values of a majority population is vague. What is important is the fact that within the third generation, there appears to have been noticeable changes in conduct.

The author understands that there are a multitude of factors responsible for a person's drug taking behavior, and that it would be an injustice to attribute drug use solely to historical occurrences among the Japanese in the United States. It would be equally biased to disregard any of these occurrences as not having any influence on a person taking drugs, even if only in a minor sense.

In preparing this paper, the author interviewed many Sansei ex-users who experienced problems in reference to education. Many ex-users expressed the opinion that they were unable to contend with the competitive atmosphere of grade earning to maintain stereotypes of upward mobility. It must therefore be stressed that there are many factors involved which influence a person into taking drugs. Since no two individuals are similar in their personalities conditions that may lead one to take drugs may not have the same effect on the other. As such, it has been soberly brought to the attention of the author that no
factor too small can be overlooked when discussing causes leading to drug abuse.

In a society already indoctrinated into drug taking by the mass media, it is no wonder that from pre-adolescence on, we are brain washed into taking medication for the most minor of pains.

"If, for example, you watched two recent Super Bowl games, you must realize that if Len Dawson, Joe Namath and their teammates had consumed even a fraction of the beer and tobacco it was implied they regularly used, they would not have been able to stagger onto the fields, let alone win those championships. Yet that is the way we push drugs in American society. The imagery that is stressed by these companies, these "drug pushers," are the sexual pleasure, eternal youth and happiness that you will somehow magically get from these and other chemicals." (1)

Compounded with this societal attitude, are many factors which when considered alone or taken collectively, are extremely important in influencing an individual into drug misuse.

Among the prerequisites to drug abuse are overproduction and availability of drugs, perception of self image, one's life style and values, peer group pressure, personality, knowledge of the involved drugs, attitude towards drugs, family relationships, social economic status, ability or lack of ability to cope with problems, escape from boredom, and the physical need to continue drug usage after an illness requiring chemotherapy. These
factors and assuredly many more, are probable
influencing-agents in leading a person to drug abuse.

Accepting the fact that there are a multitude of
influential factors contributing to the drug abuse rise,
we need to look at recent trends of narcotic related
statistics. For a nation of immigrants and subcultures,
where crime unfortunately runs commonplace, the Japanese
have remained, to a certain extent, crime free. Recently,
however, with the Japanese minority becoming more
acculturated, Sanseis seemingly have developed both
accepted as well as deviate forms of behavior patterns
that are in accordance with the majority cultures.

"There appear to be recent changes in
the type of delinquent acts committed
by the Sansei juvenile in Los Angeles.
Assault and battery, narcotics violations,
and disorderly conduct by gangs has
increased over previous periods." (15)

Assuming this crime trend to be clear and present, associ­ates involved in formulating the teach-in expressed
desires to openly discuss and clarify factors which could
act as precursors to the drug problem. By discussing
these concepts, it was hoped that given pertinent infor­mation and understanding of the many underlying conditions
of drug abuse, some people might be prevented from
experimenting with drugs.

The next step was to try and gather evidence to
support the need for a drug teach-in.
Although there appears to be much cited statistical literature showing increases of drug abuse among other ethnic and minority populations, documentation concerning the Japanese-American drug problem is questionably scarce. Procedures within the present methods for gathering statistical evidence alone create an indiscernible account of the Japanese-American problem concerning drug offenses.

Most statistical data, define drug and criminal populations into groups of Black, White, Mexican-American, Puerto Rican, and usually that of "other;" other being comprised of a conglomerate of many sub-populations, not represented within the previous major categories. Due to this non-differentiated grouping of minorities, true statistical representation of the Japanese-American drug problem becomes hidden.

Another factor which makes the true assessment of the Japanese-American drug problem obscure is the relationship to certain Japanese mores.

Their appearance as a "model minority," emphasizes the fact that Japanese imagery within a family unit would suffer if confronted by or associated with any abnormal or deviate behavior. The nature of the topic itself, drugs, precludes many community citizens from divulging information about a problem concerning themselves which a society condemns. As an outcome, many Japanese-American parents are unwilling to discuss the problems their
children or relatives face in relation to the drug crisis. Hence, the problem of younger generations of Japanese-Americans arrested or convicted of criminal behavior tends to be underplayed by both parents and officials. Japanese family doctors best illustrate this point. For the sake of a Japanese patient's family, these doctors may sympathetically attribute drug overdose deaths to more socially acceptable causes such as heart attacks, or natural occurrences which otherwise would not warrant further investigation. Consequently, statistical values dealing with overdose deaths due to drugs are at best, extreme minimal estimations.

This phenomenon extends itself to law enforcement as well. A law officer apprehending a Black or Mexican-American who possesses drugs may have no empathy for the suspect and accompany the law breaker straight to the precinct, whereas, in confronting a Japanese-American, the officer may confiscate the drug, berate the suspect and then send him home thinking the suspect's law-abiding parents will rectify the situation. If by chance a conviction occurs, a sympathetic judge may suspend sentence in favor of probation for the Oriental offender. In doing so, the judge may reflect his leniency towards a population which previously exhibited one of the lowest crime rates. Although this may seem quite farfetched, a number of such cases have been witnessed.
These factors illustrate the difficulties involved in gathering valid statistics of the drug problem among Japanese-Americans.
CHAPTER II

THE COMMUNITIES

The communities chosen for the teach-in were Venice and Culver City. Together these two cities housed a large Oriental population consisting mainly of Japanese. The Community Center in which the teach-in was to take place was located at the outskirts of Venice. Since most of the members using the facility were from the two different cities, the teach-in was planned to accommodate both communities.

According to the City of Los Angeles 1970 Census\(^5\), the total population of Venice was recorded at 36,146 persons. The median family income was listed at $8,000, while the range was $10,000 to $15,000.

The Southern California Regional Information Service (SCRIS), listed the various Asian groups under one category. This category, listed as "other specified races," includes Japanese, Chinese, Filipino, Hawaiian, and Korean. Of this category, by dividing the Venice community into its ten census tracts, approximately 222 are Japanese.

The average age of the inhabitants occupying the ten census tracts in Venice was 28.67 years.
Venice is mainly a residential area with many of its homes being built over 25 years ago.

In respect to education, Novak states,

"In educational background the population of Venice is below the norms for the City of Los Angeles. In 1968, it was estimated that less than fifty per cent of the children in Venice go to high school."(23)

The business area of Venice is composed of small shop businesses and an array of skilled laborers.

In respect to the Japanese target population, the Japanese seem to be distributed throughout the whole community. The highest concentration of Japanese population was centered in the census tract 2741.

The other city involved in the teach-in was Culver City. Officially established in 1917, Culver City has grown from an initial population of some 550 inhabitants to a present population of 34,526(28) as recorded from combined data resulting from the 1968 and 1970 census.

Of the non-Caucasian population, 4.7 per cent consisted of various races. Of these races, the Orientals predominated, and of the Oriental population, the Japanese were of the majority. Of the reported 34,526 population, 4.0 per cent comprised the Oriental group. Of the fourteen districts comprising Culver City, seven districts had Oriental and Spanish surname Caucasian persons totaling most of the five to twenty per cent minority populations in the respective districts.
According to the 1970 census, the median family income of Culver City amounted to approximately $12,000 yearly. The per cent of owner-occupied dwellings for the same period was 48.2 per cent. The range of average income varied from $7,000 to $20,000.

The median age of Culver City residents was 33 years for the 1970's, an increase of two years from the 1960 census.

Culver City, unlike Venice, is somewhat industry oriented. With an aerospace industrial complex and major motion picture studios, Culver City has steadily grown economically.

Passing through this city is a new freeway system, bringing many more business opportunities to the different communities.

Both Venice and Culver City have one common street where many businesses are occupied by Japanese proprietors. Among these businesses are, a Japanese Bank, two eating places, a market and a host of other small Japanese business enterprises.

Thus, within these two cities there exists a perfect site for a drug abuse teach-in aimed directly at a Japanese-American population.
CHAPTER III

THE ASIAN DRUG COALITION

Teach-ins similar to the one organized by the author have been conducted by members of an Asian Drug Coalition.

The Asian Drug Coalition is comprised of approximately fifteen members, from various backgrounds, of self-help groups, ex-drug users, employees of government drug abuse programs, members of a national Japanese-American citizens organization, a clergy fellowship, an employee of a community mental health center, and concerned community volunteers. All are concerned with fighting drug abuse.

Starting with self-help groups, the Asian Drug Coalition took on many tasks to increase awareness of drug abuse in the community.

Hoping to combat drug abuse among Asians, the Coalition started three programs. These programs included a petition drive, drug workshops and community programs to educate and raise concern about the growing drug problem.

The petition drive was initiated by the clergy fellowship within the Coalition, and was aimed at securing tighter controls over barbiturate production. The second aim of the petition drive was to unite community support
by involving community members in a concrete manner of fighting drug availability.

While the petition drive was in progress, the Asian Drug Coalition was conducting drug workshops in churches and community groups as a means of alerting participants to the potential threat brought about by drug abuse.

On a larger scale, the Coalition also organized community teach-ins. These teach-ins were conducted in communities with large Asian populations. Although the goal was to offer teach-ins to Asians (meaning, Japanese, Chinese, Filipino, Samoan, Thai, Hawaiian, Korean and others of Asian descent) actual teach-ins occurred only in Japanese communities because of their acknowledged presence and receptiveness towards the program.

The petition drive resulted in 4,173 signatures being collected, far short of the 10,000 signature goal.

Although the petition drive seemed unsuccessful, it helped bring together many Asian-American drug abuse groups within Southern California.

In the process of organizing the teach-in described in this project, the author, a member of the Asian Drug Coalition, acted as a liaison between the community hosting the teach-in and the Drug Coalition. In effect, the author reported the progress of the teach-in to the Coalition while the Community Core Group conducted their own meetings. In this respect, the author coordinated the efforts of the two groups.
CHAPTER IV

METHODOLOGY AND ORGANIZATIONAL STAGES

The possibility of having a drug education program came about through members of the Asian Drug Coalition contacting leading members of a known Japanese-American community and explaining the perceived need for such a program.

After a few preliminary meetings and phone calls, members of the community that were interested set a date for a meeting at which the author could present a tentative program, discuss the goals of the program and some alternatives to drug abuse. The people attending the meeting seemed quite interested in the proposal. After discussing the benefits of having such a program, a unanimous recommendation was made to proceed.

Within one week, the first meeting was held to start planning some type of drug education program.
MEETING I

The author's responsibility dealt with organizing the teach-in and as a liaison between the Community Core Group and the Asian Drug Coalition. In carrying out this responsibility, it was necessary to attend all meetings the Community Core Group held and to report the progress and content of these meetings to the Asian Drug Coalition.

Working with a Core Group of interested community members, the first stage in organizing the teach-in was undertaken. Influential people interested in the program were contacted for the first preliminary meeting to take place on March 7th at 7:30 p.m. The meeting was held at the home of a member of the Japanese-American Citizens League, an organization which was to co-sponsor the teach-in.

Attending this meeting were two officials from the Japanese-American Citizens League, a District President for the Venice-Culver area and the District Governor for the Pacific Southwest area. Also attending the meeting were important community leaders and organizers of previous community events, including high school students and college students from the Venice-Culver area. The author along with two other members represented the Asian Drug Coalition, the other organization which was to co-sponsor the teach-in.
The purpose of this meeting was to discuss the roles of the members of the Venice Core Group, their functions and their tasks to be completed to make the teach-in successful. The role of the Asian Drug Coalition also was described at this meeting. It was decided that the Asian Drug Coalition was to be responsible for small group discussions, which would be a major part of the teach-in. Their members were to act as facilitators for the event.

Members of the Coalition had gained experience in previous drug programs and teach-ins of a similar nature. The Venice Core Group would be responsible for developing a steering committee which would oversee the smaller groups. The task groups were to be responsible for the major part of organizing the teach-in. Specific task groups were designated to handle the areas of publicity, making contacts for support and help in setting up the teach-in, preparing the Community Center for the event, soliciting aid and support from the Asian Businesses within the community, and other tasks which might be needed to make the organizing a smooth process. Within the course of this meeting it was decided that the teach-in would encompass all age groups, starting with the junior high school level, but that emphasis would be placed reaching parents, especially fathers. From past experience, fathers seemingly are unwilling to attend
functions such as this and usually rely on their wives to attend in their place. In doing this, the fathers divorce themselves from drug problems which may in part be partially their fault. In viewing the drug problem in totality, reaching just the children and mothers is only confronting half of the problem. Therefore it was decided that the fathers would be a major target population for the teach-in.

It was also established at this preliminary meeting that churches would be a major vehicle for making the teach-in a success. The support of the churches in the community would assure a large turnout.

It was decided to hold the teach-in in the new Community Center, a meeting place for various organizations.

Many of the people attending the planning meeting, especially the young, felt the Community Center was not being used to its full potential and hoped that the teach-in would be the first of a series of educational programs scheduled there to benefit the Asian Community. These programs hopefully would bring greater awareness to the community of the problems facing Asians.

Before the close of the meeting, the drug abuse problem within this community was discussed. Many were unsure of the total extent of the problem but agreed that there were reports of drug abuse in high schools and colleges attended by residents of the community.
It was proposed that prior to the next meeting, members of the planning committee would try to contact people in the community who might have a better understanding of the scope of the problem.
MEETING II

The second meeting involving the community took place March 12, 1973. Attending this meeting were the original nine members of the Core Group. They included interested community people, students from both high school and college, leaders of important community organizations, a lawyer, and a probation officer from the community. Again, all those attending were Japanese-Americans living in the community.

During the evening, three major points were to be discussed: one, the choosing of people to head the various work committees such as publicity, refreshments, setting up of the community center, and last minute arrangements; two, a tentative date for the teach-in; and three, a tentative program. The tentative date proposed was some Sunday late in April or early May. This could not be decided upon since it was not known which Sunday in either month the Community Center would be available. Therefore, it was decided to set the date after consulting the person in charge of coordinating dates at the Community Center.

A major concern of the group was that citizens were unfamiliar with the existing drug problem in the community. The probation officer attending the meeting shared his feelings that the drug problem of the Japanese-Americans in this community was atypical and not to be
compared to the drug problem in other Japanese-American communities. He stated that the geographical location of the community made it a high potential danger in reference to the availability of drugs.

Because this community is adjacent to a vast marina complex open to the sea and in close proximity to a major international airport, the community faced a problem of constant drug trafficking. Also, part of the Venice district, especially the beach area, was felt to be an area high in availability for drugs. Although this phenomenon could apply for any area within Los Angeles County, the probation officer still felt that this contributed to making the Venice-Culver area vulnerable. Keeping this factor in mind, and also recognizing the fact that most people in the community might not identify or relate to an alleged drug problem first hand, it was decided that the theme of the teach-in should center around the potential danger within the community. With the focus on prevention of a potential danger, the teach-in might attract more parents concerned with their children's welfare.

The committees that were formed were headed by people attending the meeting. They in turn were to recruit other community people and solicit aid in performing their respective tasks. The publicity committee was to be responsible for contacting all community
newspapers, developing posters, flyers, and church mailers and making personal contacts through a telephone chain in order to reach all community organizations operating within the community.

The other two committees were to deal with providing refreshments and making arrangements for preparing the Community Center for the event.

During the course of the meeting, a tentative program was decided upon. Both the author and the Community Core Group believed the program should begin with an introduction from someone living within the community who was well known and well respected. His introduction would explain the purpose of the event, the relevance for having such a program and a general welcoming for all community members. This would then lead into a film or slide presentation of some sort which would stimulate further discussion. Following the visual presentation, a general discussion concerning itself with drugs would be given by a qualified speaker. In previous teach-ins, the problematic drugs most closely associated with abuse in Japanese-American communities were the barbiturates. But since the theme centered around prevention, it was decided that the subject matter the speaker would cover would encompass all categories of drugs, including alcohol.
Following the pharmacology subject matter, another speaker was to speak on the relationship of mental health to drug abuse. This speaker would try to give an overview of society's indoctrination to a drug oriented attitude. The speaker would try to convey the message that drug abuse may be just a symptom of deeper societal problems. At the conclusion of the two speakers and the visual presentation, the audience would then be broken up into small discussion groups which would be led by members of the Asian Drug Coalition. Depending on the number of people attending the event, it was felt that groups should number no more than ten people per group with three of the ten acting as facilitators. Since this was to be the most important part of the teach-in, the small group discussion was to have the highest priority for time allotment. As such, it was decided that the workshops would meet in separate classrooms within the Community Center and last for approximately two hours. At the completion of the small group discussions or workshops, there would be a break for approximately ten to fifteen minutes at which time refreshments would be served.

After the break, organizers would call the audience back into the main auditorium for the last segment of the program. This latter part would concern itself with speakers who themselves were at one time drug users.
Their purpose was to speak to the audience and convey the problems they faced which in turn led them into drug abuse.

At the completion of the last speaker's topic, the community member who introduced the program and welcomed the community would deliver the final segment. He would close the event with his own perception of the drug problem and offer some concrete alternatives to the community in an effort to combat the high potential danger of drug abuse.

Both the Community Core Group and the few members of the Asian Drug Coalition attending the meeting felt this to be a good start for a tentative program and if need be, it could be altered at a later date without affecting the content of the teach-in. The following tentative schedule was adopted:
**Figure I**
**TENTATIVE SCHEDULE**

Place: Community Center  Date: Late April or Early May

Time: 1:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Approximate Time</th>
<th>Starting Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. General Introduction</td>
<td>10 min</td>
<td>1:00 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Visual Presentation</td>
<td>20 min</td>
<td>1:10 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Speakers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Pharmalogical Discussion of Drugs</td>
<td>15 min</td>
<td>1:30 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Overview of Drugs and Mental Health</td>
<td>15 min</td>
<td>1:45 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Small Group Discussions</td>
<td>2 hrs</td>
<td>2:00 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Break</td>
<td>15 min</td>
<td>4:00 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI. Speakers-Problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-Users Face</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Ms. Ex-user</td>
<td>15 min</td>
<td>4:15 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Mr. Ex-user</td>
<td>15 min</td>
<td>4:30 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII. Conclusion</td>
<td>15 min</td>
<td>4:45 pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With the tentative program set, the meeting concluded.
MEETING III

At the Asian Drug Coalition meeting which was held March 20th, the author outlined the tentative program, the goals and the problems encountered. The Asian Drug Coalition unanimously gave its support.

The author was asked to continue his work and keep the Coalition informed of the status of the organization and planning for the event. The author asked the Coalition to contact all members and prepare them for training and reintroduction to the roles they were to play as facilitators and speakers. Total support was acknowledged and a future Coalition meeting was established for training members of the Drug Coalition and the Community Core Group to act as facilitators for the teach-in.
MEETING IV

The next Venice community meeting took place on March 21st. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss publicity and to confirm a date for the teach-in.

Attending the meeting were twelve people, of whom, four attended high school, two were college students, one was a community member active in other community functions and three were members of the Asian Drug Coalition.

In the previous meeting the date suggested for the teach-in was to be either in late April or early May. Sunday was considered the best day to attract fathers since Saturdays were reserved for outings and golf. This left choices of the 15th, 22nd, and 29th for April, or the 6th, 13th, or 20th of May. The Community Center was already occupied for the 6th of May so that date was out of contention. The 15th and 22nd of April were Sundays within the Easter vacation week so these dates were also ruled out. The 13th of May was Mother's Day and that would surely defeat the teach-in since most families take their mothers out to dinner. Thus, the only dates available were April 29th and May 20th. Most agreed that May 20th would give extra time to smooth out any problems and would afford more time to organize the event, so this became the chosen date.

The next important task was to decide on areas of publicity and how to disseminate the information. The
The author, having prior experience in publicizing teach-ins, suggested that the publicity could be divided into three areas: personal contacts, written articles, and posters and flyers.

The personal contacts were to be made with the various organizations involved in the community. Many of these organizations already were using the Community Center as a meeting place so it was not a major task to address the various groups and explain the purpose of the teach-in. By gaining this type of support, the Community Core Group believed that this might result in a large portion of the audience that would attend. Among the groups that were to be contacted were: Boyscouts, Venice Youth Council, the Judo and Karate Clubs, Gardening Club, Japanese-American Citizens League, and the various community churches. The publicity committee was given the responsibility of attending the meetings of these groups. Through their respective leaders, the publicity committee would try to get the various clubs to commit themselves to attending the teach-in. Also planned was a phone chain to solicit attendance from other members of the community not involved in these groups. The next aspect of publicity, the written portion, was to include articles and press releases directed towards community newspapers, church bulletins and other forms of mass media. This committee was to
find out all deadlines for publication and prepare releases to be placed in the newspapers.

Another form of publicity was the making and distributing of flyers and posters. The posters were to be placed around the community in businesses, schools, churches, and other places of public occupancy. The flyers were to be inserted in papers and church letters and other forms of mass mailings. The hope of the committee was to have as much cross coverage and re-emphasis through repetition as possible so that the total community would be informed.

The author's role at this point was to contact people outside of the community who could help make the teach-in more efficient than ones previously staged.
MEETING V

The following Monday, another meeting took place. This date, the 26th of March, was designated primarily as a publicity meeting.

Items considered at the meeting were: the youngest age that should be invited to the teach-in; whether the program should offer and administer a different type of program for younger members of the audience; and various means of publicizing the teach-in.

A decision was reached on the first point after considering the following factors. First, how young could a person be so that interest was not lost? Second, at what age do children start to experiment and try drugs? And finally, how young could a person be to listen to and understand the problems and hazards of using drugs? After discussing these points carefully, a decision was made. Based upon the latter two considerations, it was agreed that the youngest age of participants to be invited would be junior high school students from the age of 12 years.

With the youngest age group decided upon, the community members turned to the question of whether or not some alternative program for the junior high group should be provided.

Between the March 21st community meeting and this meeting, the author consulted a member of the Asian Drug
Coalition who at the time was also a member and integral part of the Asian Family Awareness program working in conjunction with a different Japanese community church.

The Asian Family Awareness program originated with the purpose of trying to help children of junior high and high school ages who had problems with drugs and situations which might influence young adolescents into taking drugs. The person that the author consulted felt that during the teach-in, when the audience divided into smaller groups for more in-depth discussion, all younger age children should be put into similar discussion groups with the provision that there should be no adults or high school aged people mixed in with them. This would hopefully encourage the younger children to speak freely without the presence of adults who might, to the children, represent authority. Upon explaining this to those present at the meeting, agreement was reached on this procedural point.

The tentative program therefore would not change except for the addition of a small discussion group which would involve junior high aged children. This specially designated group would be led by the member of the Asian Family Awareness organization who in the past was a junior high school teacher.

It also was suggested that it might be beneficial to show a movie in the junior high discussion group, since
the discussion period was to last for two hours and that might prove to be too long for any young person to endure. With a twenty minute movie on drug abuse, followed by an hour or so of discussion, the children involved in the special discussion group might stay interested and attentive for a longer period.

With these factors decided upon, the meeting progressed to a discussion of the publicity. The Publicity Committee asked the author what he thought would be the most effective means of publicity.

With the agreement of the other members of the committee, it was decided that five areas could cover the entire span of publicizing the teach-in.

The five areas of publicity were:

1. Flyers, to be inserted into community newsletters, distributed to community organizations and passed out at anyplace where people might congregate.

2. Press releases, to be put into community newspapers. These articles could be comprehensive in terms of purpose, why and how the teach-in originated and the time and place of the event.

3. Posters, to be made and placed in the Japanese business district of the community, schools, churches, and any place where the public might view them.

4. Personal contact, to be conducted by community members. This would encompass speaking to any community organization, club or church, and to speak of the importance of the program, the potential dangers of the drug abuse problem and the need for support from all community groups.
5. Telephone contact, whereby each member would contact five other members or friends which eventually forms a telephone chain.

These five areas of publicity if conscientiously carried out would give total coverage for the teach-in. The next step was to establish deadlines and progress reports of the individuals who were to head each of the main areas of publicity. It was agreed that within the next week there would be a publicity meeting to confirm all deadlines and establish all contacts for making the publicity a success.

Within the following few days, the author visited self-help groups and people affiliated with organizations concerned with drug abuse programs. With the dual purpose of soliciting support and gathering past posters and press releases to provide the publicity committee with, the author made contacts with people who could lend their expertise to the benefit of the teach-in.
MEETING VI

On the 3rd of April, the author and members of the Community Core Group attended an Asian Drug Coalition meeting. During the meeting, the author introduced the community members and spoke of the progress of the teach-in planning. The author asked that the Asian Drug Coalition set aside a meeting time to train and refamiliarize members for roles as facilitators and speakers. The members attending the meeting from the community suggested that help was needed in securing publicity and other areas of planning. The Community Group also felt that there seemed to be a lack of interest within the community over the teach-in. This lack of interest probably stemmed from the fact that the community felt no need for a drug program since they perceived no imminent drug threat.

The Asian Drug Coalition pledged help and agreed to send some members to the next community meeting to help with the planning. It was also suggested that to create more interest in the community, more speakers from within the community should speak to provide a more personal approach to which community people could better relate and identify with. Along with this, it was stated officially that the next Asian Drug Coalition meeting would be designated for the sole purpose of training and reintroducing people into the role of a facilitator.
As a final request, the Asian Drug Coalition was asked to invite all members to attend the next Coalition meeting, in conjunction with all members of the Community Core Group, to devote the meeting to facilitator training and to go over any problems that might arise in the upcoming weeks preceding the teach-in. With all members attending the May 1st meeting, from both the Community Group and the Asian Drug Coalition, it was felt that an audience of well over one hundred could be handled effectively.
MEETING VII

The following evening, April 4th, the Community Core Group met to discuss progress in organizing the teach-in. Again, the group felt there was much apathy among community members. To combat this, it was felt some adjustment needed to be made to create more interest. To give the community a greater felt need for a drug program, the program would have to have more speakers from within the community. The program, still only a tentative one could be altered, so with the consent of the members it was changed.

To introduce the program and welcome members of the community, the Core Group decided to have from the community a father, a student, and someone familiar in some first hand way with the drug problem.

The father to be contacted would be someone known and respected in the community, and who had children growing up in the community. The student would be one who knew of the drug problem and could address the audience as to his own perceptions of the total problem. The Community Core Group felt that the last speaker should be the parole officer who had been attending the community meetings. Although he did not work in this community, he was a resident of it and had first hand experience of Japanese-Americans involved in drug abuse. This would
establish much credibility among the community and would give a first hand account of the problems instead of vicarious learnings from second hand accounts given by people of different communities.

With this point established, the members decided to change the program to the following:

Figure 2
VENICE-CULVER TEACH-IN

Place: Community Center Date: May 20, 1973

Time: 1:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m.

Program:

I. General Introduction (Community Member)
II. Speakers (Community Members)
   A. A student who grew up in the community
   B. A concerned parent
   C. A probation officer
III. Pharmacology Speaker
IV. Overview of the Problems of Mental Health and Drug Abuse
V. Movie about a Self-help Drug Abuse Group
VI. Break
VII. Small Group Discussions
VIII. Problems the Ex-users Face
   A. Ms. Ex-user
   B. Ms. Ex-user
   C. Mr. Ex-user
IX. Conclusion

The author and the two other members of the Asian Drug Coalition were asked to be responsible for contacting the other speakers and confirming the teach-in date with
them. The author contacted the speaker who was to give the talk on the pharmacology topic to be sure that alcohol was included with the rest of the drugs to be covered. Alcohol as a topic was included in order to cover all drugs that could be abused. In other communities of large Japanese populations such as Crenshaw, East Los Angeles, and Gardena, members of the Asian Drug Coalition reported a predominant use of barbiturate-type drugs. Although information of this type is hard to document, it was agreed upon by self-help drug groups and ex-users working in drug abuse programs that the most problematic drug in these communities were the barbiturates. The Venice-Culver communities, unlike the previously mentioned Japanese communities, did not feel a drug program aimed directly at barbiturates would be proper. Since the community perceived no direct problem in reference to any one drug, there was no felt need solely to combat a barbiturate problem. Therefore, the community wanted the pharmacology speaker to consider all drugs as potential dangers and not to place emphasis on any specific ones.

The other members of the Asian Drug Coalition attending the meeting were asked to locate and secure the film to be shown at the event. Their task also included finding someone to run the projector and to make certain that the film and equipment were in satisfactory condition prior to the teach-in.
The Publicity Committee contacted the three local Japanese newspapers and wrote press releases to be placed in the newspapers prior to the teach-in.

The Publicity Committee planned to have the main Japanese newspaper carry two articles, one a few weeks prior to the teach-in and the second article approximately two days before the teach-in to re-emphasize the event.

Posters were made by a neighboring self-help group that undertook the task of silk screening some thirty posters. The flyers also were in the process of being made. The committee involved in the personal contacts with churches and community groups reported some success. Some groups had upcoming events which conflicted with the May 20th date. The Judo organization which had a large enrollment of junior high school children, was having a tournament with a neighboring Judo school, while the Japanese-American Citizens League was planning to hold a large district meeting which would draw many Japanese adults. Many people felt that these activities might affect the attendance of the teach-in.

The people in charge of the personal phone calls expressed a need for more help, so, members not involved in other committees agreed to help.

Although the teach-in was more than a month away, the organization and development seemed to be making favorable progress. It was now a matter of coordinating the two
separate groups to work together as a team and compliment each other in areas of weakness. The Community Core Group, somewhat naive in matters concerning drug abuse, were knowledgable of the potential dangers within their own community, whereas the Asian Drug Coalition, with its expertise in drug related problems, knew little of the community and the inherent problems. Without the aid of the Community Group, the Drug Coalition could at best consider this community on the same basis as other Japanese communities with greater problems.

In the days following the meeting, speakers were contacted and time, date, and general topics were confirmed. The speakers, with the exception of the ones from the community, had previous experience speaking at drug teach-ins. The speakers living in the community were asked to present their own point of view and were for the most part free to speak on what they felt to be important within the realm of drug abuse.
MEETING VIII

On the 17th of April, the Asian Drug Coalition had a meeting. The author gave a progress report on the community teach-in. Members of the Drug Coalition were notified that all phases were running smoothly. It was a matter, now, of coordinating everything.

All matters concerning publicity were completed with people distributing flyers, posters, and first hand information by personal contact. What was left to be done was the overseeing of all committees to see that the committees were completing their respective tasks.

In the meantime, the Japanese-American Citizens League, which was to co-sponsor the event, donated funds to purchase refreshments for the break period during the teach-in.

The Asian Drug Coalition members were asked to spread the information about the teach-in. All members and people associated with drug abuse programs were asked to attend the next Asian Drug Coalition meeting which was to be devoted to facilitator training and explanations of the procedures involved in making the small group discussions work successfully.

At the conclusion of the meeting, the people attending from the target community felt apprehensive about providing facilitators from their own community. They were concerned about being able to provide a sufficient number
of facilitators or even facilitator assistants from the community since they had little or no prior experience in drug related discussions. It was reaffirmed that they would not have to carry the main burden of leading the discussions, for in most cases the small group discussions would continue on their own. To reassure the Venice community members, it was stated that there would be enough members from the Asian Drug Coalition, self-help groups, and drug related agencies to handle the number of people expected.

With the confidence restored, the meeting adjourned with designated people to perform final tasks in their respective committees.

In the following days, the author met with people from both community self-help groups and official agencies to confirm all speakers for the event and their respective speaking topics.
MEETING IX

On May 1st, the Asian Drug Coalition held the meeting which was devoted to a facilitator training session. Since the people from the Venice community expressed concern about their lack of experience in conducting a small group discussion, the meeting focused on clarifying methods and procedures to be used in small discussion groups.

Fifteen members from the target community attended along with others, this raised the total number attending the meeting to approximately thirty-two.

The author gave a brief progress report on the state of affairs concerning the teach-in and then introduced the members from the target community. The program was outlined and each segment explained. The plan for the small group discussion was then explained in detail. The purpose of the small group discussion was to let people have a chance to discuss what was felt to be relevant, to ask questions about drug topics, to get advice concerning matters of children or adults, or just express their opinions about their own feelings concerning drugs. Most of the program dealt with the audience listening to speakers. The small group discussion period had the purpose of letting the people pursue, in greater depth, some of their own questions or points which may not have been clearly dealt with by the speakers.
A major problem, learned from earlier teach-ins, was that Japanese were reluctant to speak out or question statements in conflict with their own opinions. It was therefore suggested that some mechanism be employed that could initiate dialogue. Then, during the course of the small group meetings, more people would enter the discussion and the dialogue would sustain itself. It was this drawing out of dialogue that the Venice community group felt ill at ease with. Once again they were reassured that the role of a facilitator was not to dominate the discussion but to help the discussion along. The Venice group was asked only to act as facilitator assistants.

To explain the technique for initiating dialogue, an Asian Coalition member outlined the procedures involved in setting the discussion in motion. The technique employed to initiate dialogue is similar to brainstorming.

"When practicing brainstorming, a group lists all the ideas that come to mind regarding the solution of a problem, without evaluating or judging them in any way. One is to forget entirely about the quality of the idea. Quantity only is stressed."(4)

The procedure used in the small group discussion was to start with everyone in the group being handed a slip of paper on which they were to write two words expressing their personal feelings about drug abuse. These words were to describe each individual's attitude
concerning drug abuse. This would give the group some idea of the attitudes and feelings expressed by the members. Recurrent words such as, "confused," "frustrated," "worried," "concerned," and "upset" usually express the common attitudes held about the drug abuse problem. These words after being written on slips of paper were to be collected by the facilitator and written on a blackboard by a recorder.

The purpose for having all members of the small group write words was to draw out feelings from even the quietest members of the group. In this manner, the dialogue once started, hopefully, would not be dominated by any one person, and all feelings from the group could be displayed. Once this was completed, the facilitator could go over the list and if any words seemed out of context or different from the majority, questions could be raised as to what the person meant. In the past this procedure usually was fairly effective in starting off a dialogue.

After completing this approach, which would take no longer than ten minutes, the second part of the brainstorming type technique was to take place.

On another piece of paper, each person was asked to write two questions concerning drugs or drug abuse. The questions could be about any drug-related problem. Again, by having everyone write questions, all members of the
small group would be contributing to the discussion in some manner. The facilitator would collect the questions and the recorder would write the questions on the blackboard. The facilitator would then read the questions and if any questions were unclear he would ask the person who wrote the question to either rephrase the question or elaborate more on what he was asking. Once all the questions were read, the questions could be placed in some order for answering. Usually the most straightforward or technical questions can be answered first while the more general or controversial questions can be saved until later when most members of the group feel more at ease about speaking in the discussion group. Typical questions such as, "What do "reds" look like?", or, "How can you tell if someone is "high" on marijuana?", should be answered first. Questions such as, "Why do people turn to drugs?", or "How would you raise a child to stay away from drugs?", should be answered later. Some questions have no answers but in the process of the group trying to answer the question, the group as a whole may partially draw some conclusions or alternatives.

It must be emphasized that the facilitator in no way was to assume the role of leader or one who holds all the answers. His role was to merely start the dialogue or help draw it out. Hopefully in this manner, all members of the group would voice their opinions. The
only time the facilitator was to intercede was if someone was dominating the floor. The first half hour usually is the most difficult since in many cases the people are reluctant to voice their opinions to other members of the community with whom they are unfamiliar. Once the group members became familiar with each other, the conversation can flow easily.

What the Asian Drug Coalition did want to stress in the small group discussion was that most drug problems generally are symptoms of some deeper emotional problems. Participants were to be advised to perceive a drug problem as representative of some deeper trouble, not a final outcome.

It was also pointed out that in the group session, the dialogue might stray from one topic to another. However, it was pointed out that topics although seemingly unrelated might in fact be quite relevant to the drug discussion. For instance, one might relate to experiences of identity or prejudicial encounters which could have affected the persons identity consciousness. These might have been accountable for leading a person to take drugs as an escape from prejudice or to gain acceptance from one's peers. In any case, it was stressed that the format used for the discussions would be similar but that the direction of the different groups could be quite varied.
With the format of the small group discussion outlined, the trainees separated into three groups for a trial run. The meeting was then reconvened and a discussion was held to help anyone still unclear of the technique.

With this portion of the meeting completed, the author asked all members of the Asian Drug Coalition to gather brochures from their respective self-help groups, agencies, and programs they represented, to display at the teach-in.

After all announcements were made, the next Asian Drug Coalition meeting was set for May 15th. Any problems that might occur with the final preparatory stages could be rectified at that meeting.
MEETING X

On the 10th of May, the Community Core Group had a final meeting. Among the topics discussed were: the food to be served during the break; the setting up of the Community Center; and the final stages of publicity.

The committee in charge of the refreshments had secured sandwiches for the break.

Since the Community Center could not be set up until the actual teach-in date, a tentative set-up procedure was established. It was agreed that about two hours before the onset of the program, volunteers would meet to set up chairs in the main auditorium. Others would be responsible for the parking arrangement, setting up of the public address system, arranging the refreshment table, and manning the registration desk. The latter responsibility was to be carried out by members of the community. This was to facilitate the dividing of the audience into groups so that all members of one family would not be in the same small group discussion. The author felt that better dialogue might take place if close friends and relatives were in different groups.

The author devised a system whereby all entering people would sign a list asking for their name, address, zip code, and telephone number. After this was completed, one of the attending receptionists would make a name tag which had a number placed in the corner of the tag. This
represented the room number for the small group discussion. If several family members entered the auditorium simultaneously, they would be placed into different groups. Each group was to consist of seven members, not counting the two facilitators and one assistant recorder. Accordingly, stacks of seven name tags were placed in piles and when each person entered he was given a tag out of one of the piles. In this manner the receptionists could, at a glance, fill all of the groups equally without one group becoming too large.

The author also wanted groups to have equal numbers of adults and teenagers, with the junior high school aged children being placed in a special group. The purpose of dividing the adults and younger generation was to have equal representation from both age groups. Without this consideration, the purpose of the small group discussion might be defeated. One adult surrounded by six teenagers might feel hostility if he voiced harsh parental attitudes. Similarly, a teenager might not be able to equalize any opposing polarity brought about by an all adult group.

After concluding this portion of the meeting, the various self-help groups displayed their brochures and exhibits. All facilitators and helpers were asked to be at the Community Center by 12:00 noon, to set up the
Community Center and take care of any problems which might occur. Announcements were also made for people to help: compile a pamphlet describing drugs and their effect for the community members acting as facilitator assistants to supplement their knowledge; to compile succinct background information on speakers not from the community so that the master of ceremonies could formally introduce them; to find out who would run the junior high school discussion group; and to speak with the nurse giving the talk on pharmacology and confirm the addition of alcohol to her talk.

As a final note, the members were again encouraged to solicit as many members in the community to attend the teach-in.
INTERIM BETWEEN MEETING X AND XI

In the remaining time between Meeting X and the next meeting, the author tried to complete as many tasks as possible. Of primary concern was that all speakers would be ready for speaking on their topics. With this in mind, the author met with the speaker who was to present a talk on various types of drugs.

By contacting members of the Asian Family Awareness group, the author was able to gain their assistance in leading the junior high level discussion group.

It was felt by members of the Drug Coalition that the attention span for the junior high people might be much shorter than the two hour time allotment for the discussion period. Keeping this factor in mind, what alternatives were there to break up the two hour period? Many had agreed that another film possibly geared for that specific age group might hold their attention for the first part of the small group period and then they could have a discussion for the second part of the period. Agreeing upon this matter, the author visited a neighboring junior college known to have a narcotics information bureau. This agency had available speakers, brochures on drugs, and a list of films with short descriptions and recommended age levels. Taking a good number of the brochures on drugs for the display table,
the author also took a few lists of the movies to present them at the next Asian Drug Coalition meeting to jointly decide on which movie might be best suited for the junior high level.

In the continuing days preceding Meeting XI, final planning was completed. Publicity was carried out by way of newspapers, word of mouth and by personal phone calls.

To aid publicity, it was noted that on May 20th there was to be a pancake breakfast sponsored by the Optimist Club, primarily a Japanese organization. It was to take place right in the target community. The turnout for the breakfast was expected to be quite large, and permission was given to announce the teach-in during the breakfast. This possibly might attract people not informed of the teach-in by any of the other means of publicity.
MEETING XI

On May 15th, the final Asian Drug Coalition meeting before the teach-in took place. Since this was the final meeting, practically all members of the Community Core Group and Asian Drug Coalition attended. Also joining the meeting were most of the speakers who were to address the teach-in.

All facilitators were asked to meet at the Community Center at 12:00 noon on Sunday to help set up the facility. All respective groups representing the Asian Drug Coalition were told to place their literature and brochures on the front display tables. One person was asked to compile some background information on the speakers.

With most everything taken care of, it was now a matter of providing certain materials for the teach-in and some last minute arrangements.

The author was to provide films for previewing by some members of the Coalition so that a film appropriate for showing to the junior high group could be selected. This was to be completed by Friday.
FINAL ARRANGEMENTS

By Friday, two days before the teach-in, two films were checked out by the author and taken to the Asian self-help group which was to help with the film previewing.

The people who viewed the films felt that they were not appropriate. Although a brochure description stated that the appropriate level of the films was for junior high students, one film had resorted to mild scare tactics while the other film was too old with a poor sound tract. Unfortunately, other popular films at the Narcotics Information Center had either been checked out or were reserved for the same weekend. Thus, it was decided that the small group discussion for the junior high students would be staged in a manner similar to the other groups except that the topics would not have to be completely centered on drugs. Although this would be the main target point, issues of identity, problems in school, racial encounters, or any other relevant topics could be discussed.
CHAPTER V

THE DRUG ABUSE TEACH-IN

PREPARING THE COMMUNITY CENTER

On the morning of the 20th, people from the target community were busy preparing the Community Center. The large canvas covering the new gymnasium floor had been rolled back and chairs had been set up. The movie projector was placed in the middle of the auditorium, and the large screen on the stage had been drawn. At the front entrance of the auditorium tables were placed for literature and information about self-help groups from neighboring communities.

By 11:30 a.m., most of the Community Core Group and Asian Drug Coalition members were present. Exhibits were set up on the display tables along with other informative materials.

In the foyer in front of the main entrance, another table was set up to have people sign the attendance roster as they entered the auditorium. This table was to be manned by two people who would be responsible for assigning all entering people into the various small groups for the discussion period. Along with this, the two people were to make out name tags and to see that the roster was filled out correctly.
While preparations were going on the main auditorium, people also were setting up the adjacent classrooms. It was expected that approximately fifty to one hundred people would attend. For this number of participants, eight to ten classrooms were needed. Fortunately, there were nine classrooms and if need be, some of the groups could meet in the auditorium.

With everything set up properly, it was now a matter of awaiting the community. While waiting, some of the members attended the pancake breakfast to invite additional people to come to the teach-in.

At approximately 12:30, people started to come. By 12:45, most of the hundred seats were filled so it was decided to start exactly at 1:00 p.m. as planned.
FIRST PORTION OF THE PROGRAM

At 1:00 p.m., the teach-in officially began. Welcoming the audience was one of the leading members of the original Community Core Group. In his official capacity as a lawyer, he explained the need for a program such as this and expressed his views concerning drugs. After his general introduction, acting as the master of ceremonies, he introduced the first speaker.

The first speaker was a recent high school graduate who grew up in the community and was now attending college in a different area. Giving his impressions as a student, he told of instances of attending parties where the majority of people were intoxicated on drugs. His attitude was that although many students denied the use of drugs, that at parties and social functions, these same people used drugs as an escape and means to enjoy themselves. The student continued to say that whether a person was taking stimulants or depressants was trivial but what was important was that it clearly showed there was definitely some type of problem which caused the person to use drugs. The speaker further stated that the problem no longer was confined to ghettos and slums but was now commonplace in middle and upper class communities. The speaker brought out the point that there was a definite problem of drugs in the community. Whether
there was only one person involved or many, this should warrant concern. Right in his own high school, students could be seen walking around the campus high on drugs.

For approximately ten minutes, the student spoke about his experiences and the problems his friends faced in relation to drugs.

After the student concluded his talk, the master of ceremonies introduced a man who was active in the community and belonged to many community organizations. The second speaker, an adult having children of his own, expressed views from an adult's standpoint. He felt that the time he was a teenager, to the present time, much had changed. He felt that the youth of today had more to contend with and a greater adjustment to make. His personal views regarding his own family was that at times there were instances of an inability to communicate with his children. He also was concerned that unless parents realized these problems and tried to rectify the situations, the outcomes could easily manifest themselves as drug problems. By trying a little harder to understand the youth from a parent's perspective and by trying to better understand the position of a parent from a teenager's perspective, many problems might not develop. The speaker hoped that parents could recognize these situations and attempt to straighten them out before the problem became too great. After relating many instances
of his own experiences, the father re-emphasized the need for better communication and understanding between child and parent.

The third speaker was introduced as a member of the community who worked as a probation officer in this area for almost two years. Although he could not pin point the drug problem as affecting only Asians, he did attest to the problem involving the greater city. His perceptions of the cause were quite interesting in that the community was in a prime location for drug trafficking. On one side, there was a great international airport which at anytime could supply narcotics from different countries. On another side was a marina complex which also could be a factor in drug transport. To the north was a beach community with a noted reputation for drug abuse. All these factors contributed to an extremely high potential for availability of drugs in this community. He reflected his feeling that unless the community became concerned and aware, a large problem could arise. Although the speaker stated that the drug problem within this community was not as acute as in other Japanese-American communities, the people should still open their eyes to the fact that at any time a large problem could easily arise. Following his concluding remarks, the master of ceremonies stated that he and the probation officer were working on a proposal for
the Japanese-American Citizens League to create some type of program for the youth of this community.

The master of ceremonies then interjected a point about his own perceptions concerning a problem that specifically faces Asian communities.

As a lawyer, he felt that many Asians were at times privileged because of their racial stereotypes. He continued to relate stories where Asian juveniles had been stopped by police officers suspecting them of being intoxicated on drugs. Knowing that Asians were law abiding citizens and respected in the community, there would be a much greater likelihood that the Asian would be counseled and released than a Chicano or Black person. Although this may seem favorable for the Asian, it often prevents the community from recognizing a potential problem.

Following these comments, the next speaker was introduced. The speaker, a nurse by profession, was to give a technical talk on the pharmacological aspect of drugs. Within her talk, was included the effects of drugs on specific parts of the body, the classes of drugs, the dangers of the different types of drugs, why certain drugs were employed, and their medicinal uses. The nurse's talk was the most comprehensive, covering all aspects of the different classes of drugs and their affects. Covered in her talk were stimulants, depressants
(including alcohol), hallucinogens, and over-the-counter drugs. The speaker also went into marijuana since it was so controversial. At the conclusion of her talk, the master of ceremonies introduced the final speaker. This speaker was a well known person instrumental in forming many self-help groups. His topic was to relate mental health and drug abuse. As a Japanese-American himself, he raised the point that many personal problems involving a family were never openly discussed for fear that other community neighbors might find out about their problems. This fear was the result of families not wanting others in the community to know about their troubles, thus giving them a bad family name. The attitude stemmed from a deeply held cultural mores that a family should never have its name disgraced. The speaker stated that not talking about a problem never clarifies the situation but instead perpetuates the problem. What is needed, is the ability to perceive the reality and rectify the situation by getting to the heart of the problem.

Many times, a child grows up accustomed to parents who constantly berate him saying that the problems are always his fault. The child starts to believe these responses and his self-worth and self-image deteriorate causing more problems to arise. These situations must be solved by people together because many of the problems
cannot be solved alone by one family or by just the individual himself. By working together and solving some of the problems, one's own self-worth increases. Solving one problem, may be a start to solving other problems. For example, if in a neighborhood one child is bad and relates to others in an antisocial way, it is much better to have someone talk to the child and try to straighten out the problem rather than to just tell everyone to avoid him. The typically Japanese approach of avoiding the child must be overcome. Finally, the speaker stated that by strengthening oneself through working with others and solving some of the occurring problems, prevention becomes much easier and communities become better places in which to live.

After concluding his talk, the speaker introduced the film. This film illustrated the work of a group of Asians who started one of the first self-help groups. The film showed the many people who became involved in the group as a self-commitment to help themselves from their own drug problems. The film expressed the total involvement that the people had with the group as an alternative to drug abuse.

At the completion of the film, it was time for the break. Originally the break was planned to last for only fifteen minutes, but because of the amount of food and time it would take people to re-enter the auditorium, the
break was extended to a half hour. During the break, the author assigned the facilitators to the various discussion groups. Where possible, an experienced facilitator was paired with a less experienced discussion assistant. In some instances, more than two facilitators were assigned to a group.
SMALL GROUP DISCUSSION

With the completion of the break, the audience returned to the main hall for further instructions. After explaining the format to the master of ceremonies, the master of ceremonies made an announcement for everyone to go to the classroom which was numbered on each of their name tags. All facilitators were to come to the front of the auditorium and receive their room assignments. After the room assignments were completed, the facilitators and assistants were told to begin at 3:00 p.m. and conclude promptly at 5:00 p.m.; this would give the desired two hours for the workshops. Because some of the speakers' talks were longer than expected, the program was running behind time. Rather than cut the small group discussions, it was decided that the program instead of ending at 5:00 p.m. would last until the final speakers concluded.

The small group discussions were run on the same basis as the earlier practice session at the May 1st Asian Drug Coalition meeting.

The group attended by the author started by writing their feelings about the drug problem on a slip of paper. These were collected and were written on the blackboard for the other members to view. After this was accomplished, the second slips of paper were distributed.
Participants were asked to write specific questions they had in reference to drugs or drug abuse. The slips were then collected and again written on the blackboards. These slips which had specific questions written on them would start the real portion of the discussion period.

The small group discussion was the most significant part of the teach-in for this was the time when all members of the community could actively participate. Even those who were somewhat reserved could write questions out on a slip of paper. Even the quietest could participate. After the silence was broken and group members felt more comfortable with each other, the discussion became quite interesting.

A whole range of questions were asked such as: Why would a person want to become involved in a drug problem? Why is getting intoxicated on alcohol more acceptable than using drugs which are less harmful to the body? How can you tell if someone is using drugs? Many of these questions could be answered in a straight forward fashion whereas others had no simple answers. Although some questions could not be entirely answered, all questions brought on good dialogue and different points of view. Many times, questions would come up involving the Japanese heritage and past experiences of some of the people. One youth explained how in high school his Caucasian friends would refer to him as a "nip." Although he knew his
friends used this term jokingly, it embarrassed him in front of other people. The discussion seemed to focus on this topic, and many others began to see how one could try out drugs as a means of acceptance by one's peers.

The sessions also seemed to build lines of communication between second and third generations, a point considered as one of the objectives of the teach-in. Some of the adults could not understand how the third generation could become involved in such great problems when they as youngsters had a harder time, contending with greater prejudices, the war, and the responsibility of supporting a family. The younger group replied by expressing the opinion that conditions may have changed and that perhaps it was currently harder to grow up in such a competitive society. In any event, the dialogue continued with everyone participating and voicing their views. Feeling that this group was proceeding well with able facilitators, the author went to another group. This next group was in the middle of a discussion about one parent's friend who had a child that was giving them problems concerning school. One of the facilitators then related his own experiences as a youth and admitted his involvement with drugs as an outcome of school problems. The facilitator told of his experience by explaining that school to him was extremely competitive. Being an average student, his grades were fairly low for the amount of work he did.
Resenting his mother's commands to do better, he would make up stories of going to the library while actually visiting his friends to take drugs. Although admitting that his taking drugs never solved the problems, he did reply that it took his mind off of the constant pressure of school. From this story, the facilitator brought out the point that maybe if his mother with good intentions had understood the situation better and if he himself had realized the importance of his mother's advice, a problem might not have started. Again the discussion in this group dealt partially with broken lines of communication between parent and child.

The last group the author visited was discussing the actual drug problem within this community. Although prior to the teach-in, people were expressing their lack of knowledge concerning drug use in the community, many did say they had heard about someone in that area or someone going to this and that school who was involved in drugs. This again pointed out that although people knew of the drug use, most ignored the problem.

The author visited three different discussion groups. Although the questions and topics varied, the three groups focused on similar content. As was hoped, the dialogue in the three groups attended was quite good.

After two full hours, people started to return to the main auditorium. Some of the groups were still in
deep discussion and appeared to want to continue.

By 5:10 p.m., all classrooms were empty and people were congregated outside, where coffee was provided. Much of the dialogue at this time was about some of the interesting discussions that had taken place. An announcement was made that the program was running behind schedule and for everyone to take a seat in the auditorium for the final segment of speakers, the ex-users.
The master of ceremonies welcomed everyone back, hoped they had a discussion group that was as interesting as the one he attended and then introduced the first speaker.

Because these next speakers could relate their experiences on a personal level, it was thought this could provide the participants with a first hand view of the problems encountered after a conviction on a narcotics offense.

The first speaker, a female ex-user now working in a federally subsidized drug program, explained that to some people drug addiction becomes a way of life. This abused way of life depends on every possible way of obtaining money to support a habit. From theft to prostitution, any hard core user will employ every possible method to obtain money for drugs. She criticized the current rehabilitation system, stating that the conditions in most rehabilitation centers make the process dehumanizing. In most cases the rehabilitation systems were nothing more than jails. Once the user has completed the rehabilitation process of incarceration and treatment, he is again placed in society. Speaking from experience, the speaker reflected that this person, is left to the mercy of the community. What usually happens is that the community people don't understand that the ex-user is
human and that he could have been a victim of circum-
stances. Most people see an ex-user as a criminal and
not as a person who has had problems too large to contend
with. Because of this attitude, securing employment and
making new friends and meaningful relationships become
almost impossible. This adds to the problem of the ex-
user in readjusting to a society so that it is even
harder to cope with than before. The speaker told of her
own experiences and how she became a drug addict. After
expressing her own downfalls and rationales for using
drugs, she concluded by saying that the only way these
problems can be solved is through community education and
bringing a greater awareness of the problem to the people.

The next speaker, also a woman, told of her involvement
with drugs. At the age of eighteen, the speaker began
using drugs. She became addicted to morphine after a
medical operation. When she was discharged and taken off
the drug, she started using something comparable to
morphine, heroin. While under the influence of the drug,
the speaker stated that not only did she feel good but
she was able to relate and converse with people which she
could not do when not using drugs. After a long period
of using heroin, she realized her life was meaningless.
When she finally decided to stop using and actually kick
her habit, she had a difficult time. While recovering,
she realized that her problem wasn't only one of using
drugs, but was a deeper inability to identify herself with the community and to communicate her feelings and aspirations with others. When her drug problem was discovered, her parents turned their backs and she was left to contend with her own problems. There were many supportive things people could have done for her that might have helped the situation, but these things were not done. This was not because people didn't want to but because people didn't understand. The speaker commented that people have to be open about similar situations but no one seems to take the time to be understanding and open about these types of problems. The speaker next discussed alternatives to drug abuse. She felt that an alternative was a way of substituting one addiction for another. It does no good to offer sports or programs as an alternative to drug abuse. Addicting a child on sports does not solve the problems at home or school, and these are the deep rooted causes of problems that may lead to drug abuse. Before finishing, the speaker spoke about the pros and cons of Methadone maintenance. From her own experience, she felt that it did not solve any problem except to keep the addicts off the street. It was again a switch of one addiction for another. Finally, she stated that in order to combat the drug abuse problem, people must first understand more about themselves and their inability to deal and cope with problems. Once this is accomplished, progress can be made.
The last speaker, a male ex-user, told how he was able to stop taking drugs by involving himself with the anti-drug abuse movement. His motivation came from helping others with similar problems. By going to other communities and speaking of the drug abuse problem, and by becoming completely absorbed in working against drug abuse, the speaker helped himself with his own problem. By helping others, his self-worth was raised which in turn gave more meaning to his life. Realizing that the youth of communities such as these would someday become leaders, he stressed that everything must be done to secure their growth as citizens, free from problems like drug abuse. He related his gratitude that many people showed up for the teach-in. This showed interest, which was the first step in fighting drug abuse, an interest to try and do something about it. He also expressed his feelings that the third generation Sanseis were much more knowledgeable about drugs and problems concerning them, so hopefully being more aware, they would make better leaders of the future.

Following the speakers, the master of ceremonies gave a closing address. He explained that the purpose of the teach-in was to present different viewpoints concerning drug abuse. The purpose was not to present a dogmatic approach for the community. What was attempted was to provide speakers with expertise in certain areas, provide
the small group workshops so that more people could voice their opinions. With this information, people could then make their own decisions concerning the problem. Along with this information and understanding, community members, including the youth, would be able to make rational decisions about whether or not to take drugs. Hopefully, with the right understanding and rational, people could realize their problems and rectify them so they wouldn't have to use drugs.

The master of ceremonies closed by saying that the Community Center could be a great force in helping to deter a potential drug problem. By providing similar programs such as this, the Community Center might be organized to have many more programs for both the youth and adults which would be meaningful and educational.

After presenting this thought, the speaker thanked everyone for attending and hoped that they would continue their interest in the community's welfare by keeping posted of future events sponsored by the Community Center. With this, the teach-in officially closed.
CHAPTER VI

DISCUSSIONS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

As Johnson has commented on the goals set for a seminar on drugs involving junior high school students:

"We hoped to show him how good decisions are made by becoming informed and by weighing alternatives. We hoped to help him lose his curiosity by a program in which he and his peers could speak and think openly about dangerous drugs." (12)

If this were to be a major criterium for judging the success of the teach-in, then it would seem natural that the teach-in was indeed a success. Unfortunately, even though an open forum was provided, giving all sides of the problem, other considerations must be made to objectively evaluate the program.

In comparison to past teach-ins within the communities, this teach-in was quite successful in terms of number of persons attending. Previous programs with similar content usually attracted eighty to one hundred participants, with very few adults in attendance. The roster which was compiled for the Venice teach-in listed one hundred and fourteen names. But because many did not enter through the main entrance, a more realistic count probably would approach upwards of one hundred and thirty. Approximately half of those attending were adults, many of them being
fathers, a feat which was never accomplished in any of the previous teach-ins.

The speakers, with their speeches somewhat lengthy at times, provided differing points of view which hopefully brought awareness of the problem to the community. Because many of the speakers were themselves from the community hosting the teach-in, there was a greater relevance and personal identity with the speakers. It was felt that most of the objectives of the teach-in were met.

The identification and assembly of concerned citizens within the community to help promote the teach-in was the first objective faced. This was realized by working with the Japanese-American Citizens League through which many of the community leaders were contacted and consulted. Also by contacting the various community organizations, leaders and officials were encouraged to pledge their support for the teach-in after learning the objectives of the teach-in.

The second objective was to educate and bring awareness to the community concerning the local nature and scope of drug abuse. Although the scope of the problem in the Venice-Culver community seemed relatively low, the information about drugs, and related factors contributing to drug abuse were brought out in the open and discussed.

Much of the discussion in the small group workshops involved themselves with the third objective, the
promotion of better lines of communication between the second and third generations of Japanese-Americans concerning problems that may lead to drug abuse. Throughout the speeches and discussion groups, there was an emphasis on how a lack of communication could lead to misunderstandings which ultimately could lead to family problems.

The fourth objective, increasing child and parental understanding of the tangible and intangible factors that contribute to drug abuse among all ages, was primarily accomplished through the discussion groups. Although families attending the teach-in were split up into different discussion groups, much of the dialogue dealt specifically with communication and understanding of problems which may lead to drug abuse and could apply to all families.

The final objective, the provision of an alternative to drug use among young persons, was the objective least realized. Only a tentative follow-up program could be planned as an alternative.

Although the teach-in was designed to educate and bring awareness to the community, it was not expected that any direct behavior change in relation to drug abuse would take place. The small group discussions did provide lines of communication between second and third generations. But because the discussion groups were designed to have parents and their children placed into different groups,
there was no guarantee that the family would return home and keep open the lines of communication which were developed in the teach-in.

"Shotgun" or "Crash" programs which Merki describes as, "programs where a wealth of material is crammed into a short period of time," (21) are extremely difficult to evaluate. Because of the nature of a one-time program, the means which were employed for evaluation give, at best, mere indications of the teach-in's value.

The evaluative process consisted of follow-up telephone calls to participants for whom this teach-in was a first experience. A second evaluative process involved a discussion with people who took an active part in the teach-in as facilitators, and others who could compare and relate this teach-in to previous ones.

The author tried to contact forty people. Of the forty, thirty-two were successfully reached. They were asked questions about the teach-in. The answers were to be utilized as future recommendations to be applied to other teach-ins to make them more successful. Although this was a form of evaluation, it was not structured to test knowledge acquired through the teach-in or the inherent knowledge the community people had in relation to drug abuse.

Six questions were asked (see Table I).
**TABLE I.**

**TEACH-IN EVALUATION**

**Part 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.</strong> Which portion of the teach-in was the most informative?</td>
<td>Small Group Discussion: 24, Speakers: 8, Movie: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.</strong> Which portion was the most interesting?</td>
<td>Small Group Discussion: 28, Speakers: 4, Movie: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.</strong> Which portion was least interesting?</td>
<td>Small Group Discussion: 0, Speakers: 9, Movie: 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.</strong> Was the teach-in a worthwhile event?</td>
<td>Small Group Discussion: 29 YES, Speakers: 3 YES, but not entirely, did not answer their questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.</strong> Were the number of speakers appropriate for the teach-in?</td>
<td>Small Group Discussion: 9 YES, Speakers: 23 NO, too many.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6.</strong> Do you feel this teach-in method is an effective means for educating a community about a problem involving drug abuse?</td>
<td>Small Group Discussion: 32 YES, Speakers: 0 NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In conducting the evaluation, the respondents were told that the teach-in was divided into three portions, the speakers, the movie, and the small group discussions. The respondents were then asked to evaluate the separate portions. The tabulated results are presented in Table I.

Most of the people contacted agreed that the teach-in was a worthwhile project. Some of the more outspoken people had voiced the opinion that the speakers, especially those dealing with more technical oriented topics were too lengthy and somewhat boring. Although most had agreed that the small group discussions were by far the most interesting and informative part of the program, some had expected more concrete answers to the problems of drug abuse. This point in itself shows the lack of understanding most people have about drug abuse. One young student in particular felt that many questions were asked for which she herself wanted answers, but the questions were never really answered. Unfortunately, as was stated earlier, many of the problems which contribute to drug abuse have no answers.

Many of those interviewed expressed the feeling that more programs targeted at the community are needed. One respondent in particular felt that although children learn about drug abuse in school they can never really learn what the ex-users had expressed in their talks. Even the few who felt that the teach-in did not answer
their questions agreed that the small group discussions provided both sides of the story. Most of the respondents stated that the film was the least informative part of the program. This was probably due to the condition of the film as well as the content. The film described a group of people who joined together to form a self-help group. Throughout the film, people were shown who were instrumental in founding the self-help group, their efforts and failures in helping themselves and others to combat drug problems.

Most of the audience attending the teach-in probably were not familiar with the struggle of this first self-help group, and therefore had difficulty in relating to what was shown. For this reason, many felt that the movie was the least interesting and informative part of the teach-in.

The second part of the evaluative process dealt with a discussion with some of the facilitators who helped at the teach-in. Many of the facilitators felt that in comparison to past drug abuse teach-ins, the Venice-Culver teach-in was quite successful. Many had stated that there was a notable increase in numbers of people attending the teach-in, especially fathers. Many of the facilitators also agreed that there was much dialogue during the group discussions, even to the point that some groups did not want to break up when told to go back to
the main auditorium. Most facilitators felt that the teach-in ran smoothly except that it was somewhat longer than usual. This was due to the extra speakers on the program. Past teach-ins usually had three to five speakers. This also was a major complaint of some of the respondents to the telephone calls. As with the telephone respondents, the facilitators agreed that the number of speakers should not exceed five.
RECOMMENDATIONS

In retrospect, starting with the organizing and planning stages, more emphasis should be placed on specific types of publicity. Although the teach-in had much more publicity than previous teach-ins, more emphasis should be placed on personal contacts. Flyers, posters and press releases have their place within the publicity context, but personal contacts are by far the most effective. When addressing a group for support or soliciting a club for aid, it is of utmost importance that a leading member of the group or club be convinced of the importance. This helps in gaining acceptance of the program by the other members of the organization.

In respect to the actual teach-in, many recommendations can be made.

Although the content presented by the Venice teach-in speakers was excellent, the number of speakers was too large. Seven speakers were too numerous for the occasion. If all topics could have been covered by five speakers, the program would have been less exhausting. Also, many speakers talked longer than their allotted ten to fifteen minutes. Although the master of ceremonies tried to control this, it is still important to limit the maximum amount of time for each speaker.

The film which was shown also was discussed. Many who were asked during the evaluative phone calls which
part of the program was least informative stated it was the film. In this respect, it is suggested that films to be shown should be previewed by a group of people from all previous backgrounds of drug knowledge. Thus, a film of interest and educational value would be an asset to the teach-in both to add knowledge and to stimulate dialogue in the small group discussions.

As far as the small group discussions are concerned, the brainstorming technique must be re-evaluated. Many times, depending on the strength or weaknesses of the facilitator, the first half hour might be wasted just going through drills of the brainstorming technique. The technique is only a process with which to draw out dialogue from the group members. If the group seems already eager to discuss topics, the brainstorming technique could be abandoned. Another point that should be considered is for all facilitators to have certain agreed upon points to emphasize. Although most discussion groups covered the same general topics, the three different groups the author visited were somewhat different. All facilitators should have an outline of all points to be emphasized during the discussion. One way to aid this matter is to keep the questions which were asked during the brainstorming technique and collate all questions for answers. Facilitators could then have a
list of most probable questions and the proper means to answer or direct the discussion groups.

Since facilitators differ, some means of standardization is needed to ensure that the right attitude or value is given which best expresses or represents the policy of the people conducting the program. Along with this, facilitators need more training to help them draw out dialogue. The facilitators and facilitator's assistants also need to discuss strategies with one another so there is a minimum of conversation lag.

One final recommendation involves evaluation. It was realized by both the author and active participants that evaluation is far more difficult than one perceives. Although personal interviews and phone calls gave opinions of the overall program, this alone does not provide information on how effective the program was. The author believes that for future programs such as this, the person who conducts the evaluation be someone other than the main organizer. This is recommended because the author was never really sure if the community people were truthful in their comments or if they were just patronizing the author because they knew he had a major part in planning and organizing the program. Unfortunately, the author's lack of foresight and desire to keep the evaluative questions consistent resulted in a less than satisfactory means of evaluation. Some of the people
contacted seemed to give the initial impression that the program meant very little to them, yet when interviewed, they revealed great enthusiasm and concern. The author therefore feels that the evaluation should be conducted by people not involved in the organizing or planning of the program.

Many of the people interviewed felt that some type of pre-post test be administered for the program. This might be effective in testing one's knowledge of the drugs and physiological effects of the drugs, but the author feels that knowledge of these particulars is somewhat irrelevant. Knowing facts about drugs does not necessarily impede drug abuse, therefore these types of tests are not warranted unless the aim of the program is to impart this type of knowledge.
CHAPTER VII

SUMMARY

The purpose of this paper was to provide a guideline for those interested in forming a one day drug abuse program within the context of health education.

Provided in the paper is an account of all the procedures, from the initial stages of planning and organization to the final culmination, for the drug abuse teach-in.

The objectives of the teach-in were:

1. To identify and assemble concerned citizens within the community to help promote the teach-in.

2. To educate and bring awareness to the community concerning the nature and scope of drug abuse within the local community.

3. To promote better lines of communication between the second and third generations of Japanese-Americans concerning problems that may lead to drug abuse.

4. To increase child and parental understanding of the tangible and intangible factors that contribute to drug abuse among all ages.

5. To provide an alternative to drug use among young persons.
Organizing the teach-in was divided into four stages, all occurring simultaneously. Stage one was to contact influential community members that might aid the teach-in in respect to support. The second stage was to establish a steering committee to oversee the organizing and planning of the teach-in. The third stage was to acquire speakers from all different fields both from within and out of the hosting community. And last, the publicity phase was to develop awareness about the teach-in.

Eleven meetings were reported in order to show the procedures involved in setting up a one day drug abuse program.

Following a discussion of the meetings, a description of the actual teach-in program was provided.

Approximately one hundred and thirty people attended the teach-in.

On the basis of post-evaluation efforts, the author feels that the teach-in was a success.
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