

In This Issue #404

- 2026/08/03 APA Justice Monthly Meeting
- *Science*: University Science in the US Needs a Coherent Plan
- A Coalition Pushes Back Against OMB Rule
- AASF 2026 Frontiers and Pioneers Symposium
- News and Activities for the Communities

2026/08/03 APA Justice Monthly Meeting

The next APA Justice monthly meeting will be held on Monday, May 4, 2026, starting at 1:55 pm ET. In addition to updates from:

- **Judith Teruya**, Executive Director, Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus (CAPAC)
- **Joanna YangQing Derman**, Program Director, Advancing Justice | AAJC
- **Gisela Perez Kusakawa**, Executive Director, Asian American Scholar Forum (AASF)

We are honored to welcome the following distinguished speakers:

- [Tam Dao](#), Associate Vice President of Public Safety and Research Security, Rice University
- [Kenny Evans](#), Fellow in Science, Technology, and Innovation Policy, Rice University
- [Sarah Stalker-Lehoux](#), Acting Chief of Research Security Strategy and Policy, National Science Foundation
- [Roger Innes](#), Distinguished Professor, Biology, Indiana University

The virtual monthly meeting is by invitation only. It is closed to the press. If you wish to join, either one time or for future meetings, please contact one of the co-organizers of APA Justice - **Vincent Wang** 王文奎 and **Jeremy Wu** 胡善庆 - or send a message to contact@apajustice.org.

Science: University Science in the US Needs a Coherent Plan



The *Science* [editorial](#), published July 23, 2026, argues that the Trump administration's ongoing actions are systematically undermining U.S. academic science, and that universities' collective silence in response is making the crisis worse.

The Evidence of Harm:

- Graduate student enrollment at major research universities (which award half of all U.S. doctorates) has dropped 15% year-over-year, driven by immigration policies deterring international students and funding uncertainty that makes universities hesitant to commit to new doctoral students.
- National Science Foundation (NSF) recently cut basic science grants by up to 30% or more, shifting support away from academic research toward entrepreneurial tech initiatives.
- Office of Management and Budget (OMB) ignored bipartisan pushback and refused to extend the comment period on its proposal to shift grant-approval power from peer review boards to political appointees — the same rule covered in APA Justice's [prior newsletter coverage](#).
- High-profile scientists are leaving: Nobel laureate chemist **Omar Yaghi** departed UC Berkeley for Tsinghua University in China to lead a new AI-driven materials science institute, and chemist **David Nicewicz** left UNC Chapel Hill for Nanyang Technological University in Singapore, citing a desire to be in a "country that truly cares about the development and welfare of its citizens."

The Core Critique:

The editorial's central argument is not just about administration policy — it is about institutional

failure. Only a handful of organizations (AAAS and the Association of American Medical Colleges) issued immediate, firm condemnations of the OMB rule. Most universities that objected did so quietly, at the last minute, with minimal follow-through beyond their formal comments — Yale and Duke are cited as rare exceptions. The author attributes this caution to fear of retaliation from the administration.

The most concrete, actionable resistance is coming not from universities but from activist organizations like Stand Up for Science. Meanwhile, university leadership is described as more focused on competing with each other for visibility than coordinating a unified response.

The Ask:

The editorial calls for a "coherent plan" — a clear, practical strategy from academic leadership on how U.S. science can survive and adapt to the current political climate. If university leaders disagree with the more confrontational approach of groups like Stand Up for Science, the piece argues they owe the scientific community a clearly articulated alternative — rather than leaving faculty, students, and prospective students to navigate a "messy patchwork of guidance" without direction.

A Coalition Pushes Back Against OMB Rule



As the White House's sweeping OMB grantmaking rule moves toward finalization, a coalition of activist organizations, faculty unions, and scientific societies has emerged as the clearest, most organized source of opposition — filling a vacuum left by largely quiet university leadership, as covered in a separate article in this issue.

Stand Up for Science: Leading the Fight

Founded in 2025 amid the administration's disruption of federal science funding, Stand Up for Science (SUFS) has become one of the most active organizations tracking and opposing the OMB rule specifically. Founder and CEO **Colette Delawalla** described the group's work as "a frankly enormous campaign educating the public and scientists" on what the rule actually contains.

SUFS published a detailed "[Impact Report](#)" on the proposal and a plain-language explainer flagging specific legal vulnerabilities — including its finding that the rule's "domestic first framework" restricting foreign collaboration appears to conflict with CHIPS and Science Act carve-outs that expressly permit certain international research exchanges, and that OMB devoted unusually extensive legal justification to its DEI restrictions and expanded grant-termination authority, a sign the agency may be bracing for litigation. This CHIPS Act tension echoes the concerns Stanford physicist Peter Michelson raised regarding NSF's SECURE program, covered in our OMB rule article elsewhere in this issue.

SUFS also built public tools making it easier to file substantive, individualized comments rather than form letters, and partnered with the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) and the American Federation of Teachers (AFT) on public action events, including a June 18 educational webinar and a July 13 "OMB Deadline Day Rally" billed as "the fight is just beginning."

For more information, visit the [Stand Up for Science](#) website.

The Scientific Societies Mobilize

According to an analysis by [Tech Policy Press](#), roughly 70 scientific and professional societies filed formal comments opposing the rule, an outsized share by influence, since organizational comments tend to carry more technical and legal weight than individual submissions. Among the most prominent:

- **AAAS**, publisher of *Science*, submitted a comment identifying three core harms: OMB overreach, political control over grantmaking and terminations, and expanded restrictions on international cooperation — arguing the rule would "overemphasize political objectives in scientific priority setting" while "deemphasiz[ing] scientific opportunity, merit-based expert peer review, and the needs of American patients, industries, and workers."
- The **American Physical Society** called the rule an "unequivocal threat" to the peer-review system underlying U.S. scientific leadership.
- The **American Astronomical Society**, representing roughly 9,000 members, warned the rule would "cause significant harm to the scientific community, research institutions, and professional societies," specifically flagging new restrictions on covering conference attendance and publishing costs.
- The **American Association for Cancer Research** mobilized its 66,000 members, warning the rule would "undermine scientific independence, restrict collaborations, disrupt the dissemination of research, and seriously threaten progress against cancer."
- The **American Society for Microbiology** flagged that the rule's prohibition on using federal funds for publication costs would force researchers to divert limited funding away from training and mentoring early-career scientists.

- The **American Geophysical Union**, whose board member **Tanya Furman** warned that restricting scientists' ability to share results "damages our nation and leaves us unable to compete," joined the **American Mathematical Society** in filing detailed technical objections.
- The **Council of Professional Associations on Federal Statistics (COPAFS)**, representing the federal statistics and data research community, filed a comment calling for the rule to be "withdrawn in their entirety," warning that "by introducing political oversight, sudden funding instability, and broad self-censorship requirements into the grant-making process, this rule directly threatens the integrity, continuity, and accessibility of vital research" — arguing that accurate, objective, and timely federal data is "the bedrock of public policy, economic forecasting, and scientific progress."
- The **American Council on Education (ACE)** led a coalition of over 60 higher education associations in a joint formal response calling on OMB to withdraw the proposal entirely.
- Even the **New England Journal of Medicine** weighed in: Editor-in-Chief **Eric Rubin**, a Harvard professor, said the rule "would certainly be bad for Boston," reflecting concern from a region where research institutions employ thousands of federally funded workers.
- **FASEB**, a federation of scientific societies, has announced a "Phase 2" of advocacy focused on direct congressional engagement now that the comment period has closed.

An analysis by STAT of the submitted comments found that science advocacy groups and scientific journals led the initial wave of opposition, with higher education coalitions, professional societies, and individual researchers following — and even some industry groups, typically cautious about criticizing the administration, submitting comments as well.

Bipartisan Congressional Pushback

This advocacy coalition found some traction on Capitol Hill. Sen. **Susan Collins** (R-ME), chair of the Senate Appropriations Committee, criticized the rule's mid-award termination provisions and new payment-justification requirements, warning they would disproportionately burden small and rural communities alongside scientific and biomedical research. Rep. **Jamie Raskin** (D-MD) submitted a letter of opposition with 125 co-signers. House Democrats **Frank Pallone**, **Diana DeGette**, and **Yvette Clarke** separately called the rule an "obvious power grab" that "threatens to inflict severe harm on the nation's biomedical research enterprise by usurping the critical role of scientific experts in the approval and funding of grants."

What's Next

AASF 2026 Frontiers and Pioneers Symposium

REGISTRATION: <https://www.aafuturefoundation.org/>

Upcoming Events:

2026/08/03 APA Justice Monthly Meeting

2026/08/05 C100: The Impact of AI on Asian American Careers in Technology

2026/08/07-09 AASF: Asian American Pioneer Medal Symposium and Ceremony

2026/08/26 C100: An Advice and Networking Event (Technology)

Visit <https://bit.ly/3XD61qV> for event details.

#

APA Justice Task Force is a non-partisan platform to build a sustainable ecosystem that addresses racial profiling concerns and to facilitate, inform, and advocate on selected issues related to justice and fairness for the Asian Pacific American community. For more information, please refer to the APA Justice website at www.apajusticetaskforce.org. We value your feedback. Please send your comments to contact@apajustice.org.

Copyright © 2026 APA Justice, All rights reserved.

You are receiving this email because you opted in or have expressed interest.

Our mailing address is:

APA Justice P.O. Box 1242 McLean, VA 22101 USA

We do not share, sell, rent or trade any of your information with third parties unless you provide explicit consent. [Read our Privacy Policy here.](#)