Cultivating Aztlán: Chicano (Counter)Cultural Politics and the Postwar American University

Dennis Lopez

> *Chicano Studies mean, in the final analysis, the re-discovery and the re-conquest of the self and of the community by Chicanos.*
>
> Chicano Coordinating Council on Higher Education, *El Plan de Santa Bárbara* (1969)

> *The Chicano academic must do what he or she knows best. The first priority is to establish himself or herself as an authentic member of the academy. It is much easier and better to deal within the academy and in the community from a position of strength and authenticity. Professional development should be the number one priority.*
>
> Tomás Rivera, "The Role of the Chicano Academic and the Chicano Non-Academic Community" (1988)

Speaking at the Modern Language Association's annual convention in December 1975, Rolando Hinojosa observed that a "serious consequence of poor researching may be that Chicano studies will wither. Since we are labeled as a minority group we may be also marked off *en masse* as deficient when it comes to digging for facts and in the performance of the highly detailed and laborious task of investigative research."[1] With the newfound attention devoted to

0026-3079/2019//5801-073$2.50/0 American Studies, 58:1 (2019): 73–111

Chicana/o literature and culture within academic circles, Hinojosa saw an urgent need by the mid-1970s for "serious scholars," rather than "faulty researchers," in Chicano Studies. "If we don't police ourselves," he opined, "others will whether we like it or not for there is already good material on Chicanos being turned out."[2] As Hinojosa explained to Juan Bruce-Novoa during an interview in the spring of 1975, the reality remained that Chicana/o literature increasingly was "being read in the universities for the most part. It is read outside, of course, but at this stage, Chicano literature is being discussed in universities through symposia, colloquia, seminars, etc."[3] In Hinojosa's estimation, then, the very viability and prospect of a genuinely Chicana/o literary arts and cultural criticism, if not simply a Chicana/o presence, within the academy and beyond appeared to rest on the success of professionalized scholarship by Chicano Studies academics and intellectuals. Hinojosa's comments point to the ways in which the university and its institutional protocols and proprieties continued to exert tremendous pressure on Chicana/o scholars and cultural workers, despite their unequivocal alignment with the radicalism and disruptive politics of the age.

Marginalized, ignored, and disparaged for decades, Chicana/o writers and intellectuals now encountered in the postwar U.S. university a new willingness—although an admittedly tenuous one—to support, disseminate, and study their work. According to Adolph Reed, Jr., the 1960s and 1970s revealed once more "the university's significance in ethnic pluralist politics," and as one would expect, when confronted with mounting anti-racist militancy and challenges to institutional forms of discrimination, "the university reflected the world of which it was a part—a step behind."[4] However, the social and racial turmoil racking the United States during the Vietnam War era called on the university to do more than simply catch up with the times. As Jodi Melamed details, campus-based "insurgencies" by students and faculty saw the complete transformation of universities "as key to liberation struggles."[5] To this end, the objective was never simply representation, professionalization, and disciplinization via academic training and inclusion, but rather "open admissions for nonwhite students, the validation of the new knowledges produced by social movements, autonomy for black and ethnic studies faculty and students, and an education relevant to the concerns of marginalized communities."[6] Although forced to address the question of racial difference and inequality, U.S. universities invariably adopted a different agenda and vision than the one fostered by student movements. "[T]he essential function of the university in this period," Melamed concludes, "was to make minoritized difference work for post-Keynesian times—to produce, validate, certify, and affirm racial difference in ways that augmented, enhanced, and developed state-capital hegemony rather than disrupted it."[7] In a similar vein, Roderick A. Ferguson argues that the insurgent politics espoused by Sixties radicals of color elicited "an academic moment that helped to rearticulate the nature of state and capital, a moment in which truth as the ideal of the university and the mediator of state and civil society was joined by difference in general, and minoritized difference in particular." The postwar university,

he adds, "became the 'training ground' for state and capital's engagement with minority difference as a site of representation and meaning."[8] Such a move carried serious ideological and material consequences, ones not wholly unfamiliar to the history of the American university.[9]

Turning to liberal cultural pluralism for the basis on which to remap its place and bearing within the changing national landscape, the postwar U.S. university again emerged as social gatekeeper and as an active force in defusing and counterbalancing antiracist political threats to the status quo. Vijay Prashad makes the point in a discussion devoted to the "American ideology" of multiculturalism: "In my estimation, multiculturalism emerged as the liberal doctrine to undercut the radicalism of antiracism. Instead of antiracism, we are now fed with a diet of cultural pluralism and ethnic diversity."[10] For Melamed,

> English departments and discourses of literary multiculturalism did the lion's share of the work, socializing students as multicultural subjects, commodifying racialized culture, setting terms of social solidarity, and generating knowledges about racial difference within a liberal-multicultural framework, framing race as a matter of identity, recognition, and representation.[11]

Such was the new ideological and institutional backdrop against which students and academics of color expressed their demands for radical change. Rosaura Sánchez maintains that "ethnic studies programs were instituted at a moment when the university had to speak a particular language to quell student protests and to ensure that university research and business could be conducted as usual."[12] As a result, colleges and universities became "receptive to bilingualism and cultural pluralism," and suddenly it seemed "hip to be 'ethnic.'" However, according to Sánchez, the upshot was less than encouraging: "In the process the discourse of 'ethnic power' was totally neutralized. Thus despite the discourse of 'black power' and 'Chicano power' [on university campuses], back in Watts and East L.A. nothing changed."[13]

The celebration, recognition, and cultivation of diverse cultural traditions and identities, particularly on the part of the university, afforded an attractive alternative to the dismantling of racist material relations and institutional structures of oppression and exploitation. Ferguson contends that "state, capital, and academy saw minority insurgence as a site of calculation and strategy" and, in doing so, "began to see minority difference and culture as positivities that could be part of their own 'series of aims and objectives.'"[14] But the central goal was always the same: "to redirect originally insurgent formations and deliver them to the normative ideals and protocols of state, capital, and academy."[15] In order to achieve this task, a new "adaptive hegemony" was necessary, one that relied on "the disembodied and abstract promotion of minority representation without fully satisfying the material and social redistribution of minoritized subjects,

particularly where people of color are concerned."[16] The postwar university became, as Ferguson insists, a key site for the elaboration of an "adaptive hegemony" that would secure new modes of U.S. power, domination, and exploitation:

> Things academic would provide a new opportunity for power, one that would allow power to foster an entirely new relation between academy, capital, and state. This new relation would revolve around the very question promoted by the U.S. student movements, the question of minority difference—how to understand it, how to negotiate it, how to promote it, and how to regulate it.[17]

Rather than open hostility and sustained opposition to student protests and demands, the university ultimately welcomed engagement with notions of racial difference advocated by radicals of color throughout the 1960s and 1970s, if only as a means to "understand," "negotiate," "promote," and thus "regulate" its incorporation into the academy and post-Fordist capitalist society.

The standard historical narrative depicts university administrations as retreating in the face of antiracist militancy and ethno-nationalist protest on college campuses, with ethnic studies capturing a tenuous but still autonomous stronghold of opposition within the university. But this version offers only part of the story, since once the chanting and picket lines stopped the university actually had much to say with regard to the ultimate form and content of early ethnic studies programs and departments like Chicano Studies. Nineteen-sixties social movements adopted forms of ethnic cultural nationalism that, while projecting an oppositional political stance, ultimately supplied the common ground and language shared with institutions of American higher education. Specifically, "culture" emerged as the *lingua franca* between Sixties activists and university officials. As a consequence, the university would play a pivotal role in helping to recast more organic forms of ethnic political radicalism and antiracism.

This essay examines the close, if albeit complicated, relationship between prominent sections of the Chicano Movement and the postwar American university, exploring the latter's impact on the formation of a widely influential "counterculture" among of Chicana/o students, intellectuals, and artists.[18] By the first half of the 1970s, a significant number of well-known Chicana/o writers and poets held academic positions, and universities became the locus for the production, distribution, and consumption of Chicana/o identity and culture via aesthetic texts. Rather than an obstacle, el Movimiento's emphasis on cultural identity and cultural traditions, on the recovery of an Indigenous humanist value-system and spirituality, and on the production and promotion of suppressed histories, knowledges, and cosmologies—what I term its "countercultural"[19] ethos—supplied a means by which to operate within the institutional matrix of the university, but at the same time to maintain an oppositional stance toward its dominant forms. The postwar university represented one constellation of

forces—a particularly important one—that helped to shape the issues, subject matter, and approaches ultimately formulated and adopted in the writing and teaching of Chicana/o cultural texts.

"Aztlán Belongs to Those Who Plant the Seeds": Movimiento Counterculture and the Cultivation of Chicana/o Hearts and Minds

In the introduction to *Aztlán: An Anthology of Mexican American Literature* (1972), a seminal addition to the early canon of Chicano Studies, Luis Valdez opens by reminding Chicana/o readers that "the root of [our] uniqueness as Man lies buried in the dust of conquest. In order to regain our corazon [heart], our soul, we must reach deep into our people, into the tenderest memory of their beginning."[20] Close to 500 years of colonization and imperialism had robbed the Chicano of "all his ancient human fullness," leaving nothing "in our hearts but an empty desire, a longing for something we could no longer define."[21] The conquistador was not "content to merely exploit," but rather "stuck his bloody fingers into the Indian brain, and at the point of the sword, gun, and cross ripped away a vision of human existence," forcing Indigenous America and its descendants "to accept his world, his reality, his scheme of things."[22] Valdez saw the need "to recapture the soul-giving myth of La Raza," a project that forced the Chicano poet "to re-examine the facts of history, and suffuse them with his own blood—to make them tell his story."[23] For Valdez, "logic alone" could never reveal the "most basic truth" of Chicana/o history and culture: "that man is a flower . . . [that] there is poetry in reality itself."[24]

Echoing Valdez, the popular Movimiento poet Alurista remarks, in an interview with Bruce-Novoa, that Chicanas/os needed to "*expel the Yankees from our heart*" and take up "the responsibility of constructing a vision of the world that is truly ours, not a colonized vision of the world."[25] Alurista aimed to produce a poetry that would "nurture [and] cultivate my heart as well as the heart of my people, so that we can reconstruct our selves."[26] Decolonizing the hearts and minds of Chicanas/os thus consigned certain specific tasks to Movement intellectuals and cultural workers: artists and writers should strive to offer an alternative to the alienation, materialism, and spiritual sterility of postwar U.S. capitalism by reclaiming the humanist and communitarian worldview of Indigenous Mesoamerica, principally figured through the Movement's various artistic retellings of the myth of Aztlán. El Movimiento's reclaiming of Aztlán centered on a militant call for self-identity, self-determination, and the retrieval of stolen lands as a vehicle for obtaining political sovereignty. As Alurista proclaims in the central manifesto of the Movement, "El Plan Espiritual de Aztlán" (1969): "*we,* the Chicano inhabitants and civilizers of the northern land of Aztlán from whence came our forefathers, reclaiming the land of their birth and consecrating the determination of our people of the sun, *declare* that the call of our blood is our power, our responsibility, and our inevitable destiny. . . . Aztlán

belongs to those who plant the seeds, water the fields, and gather the crops and not to the foreign Europeans. We do not recognize capricious frontiers on the bronze continent."[27] Calls for economic self-determination and political control of land served as the fulcrum around which the Movement's countercultural politics revolved. Nevertheless, the reclamation of land served less as a political objective than as a rhetorical trope enlisted in the service of a (counter)culturalist program.

The Chicano Movement operated with two related ideological constructions of Aztlán. The first denoted a geographic region stretching from California to Texas, as well as a historical point of reference for evoking the territorial expropriation and political transfer of power sanctioned in 1848 by the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo.[28] References to Aztlán by Movimiento advocates were intended rhetorically to position the call for Chicano social protest within the context of a broader history of colonial dispossession and anticolonial resistance. However, Aztlán also served as a floating signifier that supplied, through the recovery of pre-Cortésian mythos and symbology, the semiotic ground for cultural-nationalist Chicano identity formation. According to Luis Leal, "second, and more important, Aztlán symbolized *the spiritual union* of the Chicanos, *something that is carried within the heart*, no matter where they may live or where they may find themselves."[29] Deep within every Chicana/o slumbered a powerful cultural inheritance of oppositional Indigenous knowledge and spirituality, a potential talisman against the encroachments of a deadening "Anglo" culture. In his study of Chicano Movement appeals to Mesoamerican cosmology, J. Jorge Klor de Alva observes that "Chicanos have used the symbols and ideas of past civilizations of Mexico not only as a foil by which to attack the dominant Anglo society, but also as a fetish by which to protect themselves from its malice."[30] These competing, if mutually dependent, conceptions of Aztlán—as anticolonial symbol and as cultural "fetish"—reveal the fault lines along which the Chicano Movement's political, economic, and cultural commitments ultimately fractured. Rafael Pérez-Torres contends that rival representations of Aztlán within el Movimiento demarcate the space of "a split between a strategic critique of sociopolitical reality and an iconographic instrument of cultural unity."[31] The latter figurative formulation of Aztlán became crucial in facilitating what Chicano Studies scholar Gustavo V. Segade describes as the transition from "the culture of politics" promoted by early Movement activism to "the politics of culture" dominant by the 1970s among a large number of Chicana/o radicals, scholars, and cultural workers.[32]

The symbolic search for Aztlán involved the clearing and cultivating of the Chicano "corazon," replanting for the future the forgotten seeds of "a new yet very ancient way of life and social order," as Valdez puts it.[33] No wonder Alurista stresses the more-than-political basis to his poetry, insisting: "I'm a cultivator. I consider myself *a farmer of the heart. I cultivate hearts, thoughts, feelings*. And I'm not the only one."[34] In this sense, Movement counterculture had less to do with questions of territory and political and economic sover-

eignty across the Southwest than with a spiritual and artistic renaissance of cultural identity, practices, and beliefs that could supply Chicana/o communities with the basis for an alternative value system and way of life in the absence of the direct control of land. As with the New Left and with Black Nationalism in particular, Chicano countercultural politics set out to conceive an alternative worldview that challenged the sterile materialism and commoditized forms of American consumer culture. As such, it supplied a powerful critique of what the Frankfurt School Marxist and New Left philosopher Herbert Marcuse at the time characterized as the instrumentalist and one-dimensional aspects of late capitalism.[35] Sheila Marie Contreras observes that references by Movement artists to "Nahuatl mythic deities . . . serve[d] to propel a critique of U.S. society that is marked boldly by attempts to demystify consumerism and the quest for instant gratification in the quick-fixes of television, fast food, and the beauty industry."[36] Nevertheless, she says earlier that the "central objective of Aztec revitalization was to transform self-image."[37] The emphasis on "self-image" invokes once more the primacy of culture and a cultural politics that aimed, in Alurista's words, to "*expel the Yankees from our heart*," if not exactly from the conquered lands of Aztlán. Furthermore, it calls attention to the especially fertile soil of the university, allotted as the prime site for the cultivation of national culture and wherein eventually much of Chicano Movement counterculture took root.

Summarizing the aims of the university as characterized by Benjamin Ide Wheeler, president of the University of California at the turn of the twentieth century, Christopher Newfield concludes that the "goal of university teaching was the student's self-development, whose goal was self-determination."[38] U.S. higher education pursued the pedagogical ideals of "self-development" and "self-determination" through the teaching of vital cultural and civic values, which the university helped to sustain by both generating and reinforcing a unified and coherent archive of national identity, culture, and tradition. Bill Readings insists that the history of the modern research university must be read in terms of its function as "one of the primary apparatuses through which [the] production of national subjects was to take place in modernity."[39] In Readings's words, "[t]he state protects the action of the University; the University safeguards the thought of the state. And each strives to realize the idea of national culture."[40] Their critics during the 1960s saw the university and the state as overly committed to a white-supremacist uniformity of cultural and ethnic identity, reproducing in the service of capital accumulation a narrowly Eurocentric, racist, and ideologically distorted image of the national subject.

More out of necessity than anything else, the university emerged in the late 1960s and 1970s as one of the prime benefactors of Chicano ethnic identity and culture, granting an admittedly circumscribed number of Chicana/o faculty and resident artists the resources, training, and authority with which to embark on the quest for Aztlán. Crucially, the cultural politics advocated by the Movement met important needs for the new postwar university. As Read-

ings argues, the shift from Fordist to flexible, neoliberalized global regimes of capitalist accumulation divested the research university of its original social mission, namely, to consolidate a unitary national culture and citizenry.[41] For Readings, the economic, social, and political crises of the Sixties brought to the fore what henceforth has become "an endemic condition" of higher education in the post-Fordist age: "the absence of a cultural center."[42] Along with Black Nationalism and African American Studies, most especially, the Chicano Movement supplied the university with a means of reconciling this condition, and equally important, the university became the designated social space for such a politico-cultural reconciliation. "If state and particularly capital needed the academy to reorient their sensibilities toward the affirmation of difference," Ferguson explains, "then it also meant that the academy became the laboratory for the revalorization of modes of difference."[43] The outcome of student protests and confrontations on university campuses "was not the downfall of a cultural center per se but its reconfiguration." Ferguson elaborates:

> Indeed, the cultural center was recalibrated in terms of diversification rather than standardization, no longer a center organized around a homogenous national identity but now a center structured according to the capacities for and the principles of heterogeneous absorption. This is the historic period that tried to perfect the motto 'e pluribus unum' as a technique of power, as a strategic situation for the U.S. nation-state, for American capital, and for the American academy. This perfection, in a moment of movements and agitations, would inaugurate a new dramatic turn for modern institutions in the United States, a shift that entailed a manifest rather than latent engagement with marginalized differences and cultures, an engagement that helped to constitute new modes of regulation and exclusion.[44]

Now more open to the conciliatory kinds of cultural pluralism championed by postwar new liberalism, the university was in these cases eager to substitute American Eurocentrism with calls for cultural diversity and liberal forms of American multiculturalism. The Chicano Movement countercultural ethos offered one set of parameters by which to *reconfigure* and *recalibrate* the "cultural center" of the university. To do so, the postwar university sponsored a tenuous but impactful relationship with Chicana/o radicals and intellectuals, one that helped to hold in abeyance the political, social, and class tensions perennially threatening to unsettle the Movement's precarious residence and aspirations in higher education. In the end, the university worked to make assimilable the radical discourses and demands of Chicana/o student and faculty activists in such a way as to resist the imperative for fundamental change set in motion

by the wide-ranging struggles of working-class communities of color and the global New Left.

Chicana/o cultural workers played a singular role in this process. On the one hand, Chicana/o artistic texts functioned as a form of cultural recovery and political contestation, with Movimiento counterculture posited as an emancipatory force. On the other hand, insofar as Chicana/o poetry and literature enacted a symbolic recapturing of the mythic homeland Aztlán and its lost "organic" relationships and values, the advocating of a counterculture of self-examination and self-development could assume equal priority with political efforts to reclaim lost and stolen lands. Movement cultural workers evoked a moment of loss and dispossession in their writings in order to challenge and expose the history of colonial exploitation, racist oppression, and cultural deracination endured by Mexican and Chicana/o communities in the Southwest. Yet these invocations offered the aesthetic experience of Aztlán in place of a much more difficult to achieve political self-determination and reacquisition of territorial sovereignty. Hence, writing in 1978, Segade remarked on the cultural politics of Aztlán: "Not everyone could have land; 80 percent of the Chicano population live in an urban setting. But everyone could share a mythic past, and the knowledge that their forebears were buried in lands now lost to strangers."[45] As a literary trope, then, Aztlán both marked and sought to redress a tension between past and present, between utopian possibility and "the Real" of U.S. postwar capital. Countless Chicanas and Chicanos possessed no land and confronted the distortions of a ravaged Indigenous inheritance. Movement invocations of Aztlán suggested how the lost control and cultivation of the earth might become instead an incipiently literary self-cultivation.

It is only fitting, as Leal indicates in his influential essay "In Search of Aztlán" (1981), that Alurista initiated the Movement's recovery of the myth of Aztlán in a university classroom: "Apparently, it [Aztlán] owes its creation to the poet Alurista who already, during the Autumn of 1968, had spoken about Aztlán in a class for Chicanos held at San Diego State University."[46] In "Poem in Lieu of Preface" (1970), which originally served as prologue to the inaugural spring 1970 issue of *Aztlán: Chicano Journal of the Social Sciences and the Arts*, the flagship academic journal for nascent Chicano Studies, Alurista delivers a seminal example of the ways in which Chicana/o cultural workers employed the trope of Aztlán in their writing. According to the speaker in Alurista's poem, modern Chicanas and Chicanos "dream of roses and / swallow thorns / . . . swallow / thorns / in powdered milk."[47] Government-issued "powdered milk" figures as a metaphor for the centuries-long systematic dispossession, impoverishment, and marginalization of Mexican-American communities within the United States, a reference not unfamiliar to Movement advocates. Reies López Tijerina, for instance, the prominent leader of the land-grant movement Alianza Federal de las Mercedes in New Mexico, exclaimed to his local supporters that "[t]hey took your land and gave you powdered milk."[48] The chief goal for López Tijerina and the Alianza was reclamation of stolen lands and com-

munal self-determination, but the struggle concomitantly carried a cultural and spiritual importance. Jose Madril, an Alianza member and co-editor of the New Mexican Movement newspaper *El Grito del Norte*, clarified in 1970 during an interview with the New Left *Ramparts* magazine: "Anglo eyes, an Anglo heart, they don't see things the way we do, they don't see what the land means to the people. It's like the *viejo* [old man] said in El Grito: 'The land is our mother. If we lose the land we are orphans. Where will we go?'"[49] The land as "mother" to the people nurtures the collective social, cultural, and spiritual bonds threatened by the imposed political order and corporate logic of "Anglo" domination. But, as "Poem in Lieu of Preface" indicates, the vital and life-giving nurture once supplied by the Earth-Mother has been replaced by the artificial and enervating "powdered milk" of the U.S. welfare state, less maternal than paternalistic in its persistent colonial and economic subjugation of contemporary Chicanas and Chicanos.

In Alurista's poem, Aztlán stands as a response to colonial expropriation, systemic racism, and discriminatory institutional practices; it emerges as cultural origin and as a future promise of spiritual endurance for the Mexican-American community. The past "mYthical land / wherefrom the AZTECS CAME" embodies the unfulfilled desires of contemporary Chicanas and Chicanos who, the speaker reiterates, "swallow / thorns / in powdered milk / feeling guilty about smelling flowers / about looking for AztlaN."[50] Alurista's figurative "expedition"[51] to Aztlán charts not geography but rather a possible path toward achieving ontological and cultural wholeness. Aztlán, as literary trope, allows Alurista to map an autonomous space for the cultivation of a genuine Chicano selfhood, culture, and humanity. The poem itself thus becomes the figurative soil of Aztlán in which Alurista can plant the seeds "to cultivate my heart as well as the heart of my people, so that we can reconstruct our selves."

Terry Eagleton reminds us of the etymological links between "cultivate" and "culture," as well as of the implications of political power and social hierarchy embedded in this semantic history:

> "Culture" at first denoted a thoroughly material process, which was then metaphorically transposed to affairs of the spirit. The word thus charts within its enigmatic unfolding humanity's own historic shift from rural to urban existence, pig-farming to Picasso, tilling the soil to splitting the atom. . . . But the semantic shift is also paradoxical: it is the urban dwellers who are "cultivated," and those who actually live by tilling the soil who are not. Those who cultivate the land are less able to cultivate themselves. Agriculture leaves no leisure for culture.[52]

The word "cultivation" thus simultaneously speaks both to the material labors expended on the land and to the spiritual affairs of the heart and mind, as

well as to the political and economic forces that create a social chasm between sites of agricultural cultivation and spaces of self-cultivation. In Alurista's writing, the language of cultivation likewise signals the close relationship that existed for the Chicano Movement between a political discourse of "stolen lands" (à la López Tijerina) and a politics of cultural reclamation and ethnic identity formation.

"Flowers Growing Where We Planted Bayonets": Movement Radicalism and the University's "Politics of Culture"

Mark McGurl points out that the late 1960s and 1970s witnessed, along with the rise of student activism and militancy, "a gradual shift in emphasis from disruptive political protest to less demanding (literally) interventions in the symbolic domain of cultural representation."[53] Threats unleashed by the temporary collapse of customary boundaries purported to separate the "autonomous" university from the state and civil society produced "for the better part of a decade . . . what might be described as a series of sometimes tragically violent, but increasingly *intramural*, and eventually purely symbolic and highly professionalized, conflicts." For McGurl, the university largely succeeded in resisting the imperative for fundamental change set in motion by activists of color and the New Left, making partially assimilable the transformative discourses and demands of student and faculty radicals. Chicano Movement counterculture illustrates, in important ways, this broader turn during the late Sixties toward a symbolic cultural politics (Segade's "politics of culture") that partly facilitated the translation of radical political and social demands into the language of culture dominant in the university.

The tendency on the part of the university to tolerate and tenuously endorse Chicano countercultural politics, while downplaying radical activism and militancy, did not go unnoticed by key cultural workers and intellectuals within el Movimiento. José Montoya, for example, would scathingly attack this trend in two important, if not often cited, Movement poems. An artist by training, Montoya helped to found the Rebel Chicano Art Front and in 1971 became professor of Art Education at California State University (CSU), Sacramento. In "From '67 to '71" (1972), a poem written shortly after beginning his tenure at CSU Sacramento, Montoya pessimistically points to a political shift within el Movimiento:

> Flowers are growing where
> we planted bayonets
> Hopelessness provides a respite
> and reckless impulses subside
> I no longer wait for the rains
> only cold winter evenings

I wince at revolutionary talk-talk
and a tear and a smile confuse
my prodigies[55]

Flowers serve as a traditional, perhaps even archetypal, symbol for the aesthetic. In Montoya's poem, the flowers blossoming in place of the Movement's "planted bayonets" may also allude to *florícanto* (or "*flor y canto*"), a term derived from the Nahuatl expression, or *difrasismo*, for "poetry" (*in xochitl* [the flower], *in cuicatl* [the song]) and popularized by Alurista to denote Chicana/o artistic production. On one level, *flor y canto* again draws attention to the countercultural juxtaposition of the material and the mystical, the tangible and the ineffable, concrete fact and private affect. Cordelia Candelaria points out that "[b]y yoking the flowers of the earth in their aromatic, colorful, natural beauty to the human created song of the air, the Nahuas demonstrated their recognition of the transcendent quality of poetry. The very term, its disparities brought together in wonderful communion, embodies the holistic, synthetic power of poetry to transform the mundane experience into mystical insight."[56] Within el Movimiento and Chicano Studies, *flor y canto* became accepted parlance for referring to Chicana/o art, literature, and especially poetry. The year following the publication of "From '67 to '71," Alurista inaugurated the cultural and literary arts celebration *Festival Floricanto*, or *El festival de flor y canto*, at the campus of the University of Southern California.

Montoya's opening line initiates a turn toward the past, contrasting what for the poem's speaker appears to be two very different legacies of el Movimiento. This temporal distance establishes a mode of analysis and critique by which to judge and possibly fault the final outcomes of Movement activism. For the retrospective speaker, a harvest of "flowers" now replace the "bayonets" once "planted" and cultivated by the Movement. The metaphoric reference to the land and agriculture is noteworthy, calling to mind the confrontational labor actions of César Chávez's United Farm Workers in California and the armed land-grant campaign spearheaded by López Tijerina in New Mexico. But now, the speaker laments, el Movimiento and Chicana/o communities are left with apparently empty "revolutionary talk-talk" and with an attendant sense of "Hopelessness" as substitutes for the once "reckless impulses" that at the very least led to forms of direct political action and radical optimism.[57] In the end, Montoya collapses the critical distance between the speaker and the Movement, as the poetic persona confesses in the closing stanza equal culpability for the apparent shortcomings of el Movimiento: "I don't want to recall / when I became ineffective / but I do."[58] The deep sense of "feeling guilty about smelling flowers" expressed in Alurista's "Poem in Lieu of Preface" returns in Montoya's verse, but in a quite different register. Where Alurista's "flowers" connote cultural revival and endurance, no doubt seen as a possible weapon against the dehumanization and oppression experienced at the hands of U.S. economic and racist domination, the "flowers" in Montoya's poem signal a retreat from

the political and social commitments espoused at one time by el Movimiento. The causes behind the Movement's gradual political shift are internalized in "From '67 to '71," framed by the poem's voice as a personal failure that leaves "my prodigies" in a state of confusion and the speaker with only "a tear and a smile" that betray the irony of history's ruse.

In Montoya's later satiric poem "The Movement Has Gone for Its Ph.D. Over at the University, Or the Gang Wars Are Back" (1992b), the responsibility for el Movimiento's failings and shortcomings is primarily attributed to the impact of the university on Chicana/o radicalism. The poem opens with a series of questions that contrast the initial revolutionary intentions of La Causa and the seemingly disbanded and defunct present-day Chicano Movement of the mid-1970s:

> What has happened to the Movement, camarada?
> What has happened to la causa and the guns?
> All those vatos de proposals y programas
> Federales, ¿Dónde están?
> Qué paso con EOP and education
> weren't we going to build a nation
> called Aztlan?[59]

Missing from the current political landscape is not only the radical militancy of the late 1960s ("la causa and the guns"), but also the federally sponsored War on Poverty programs that promised to ameliorate past racial injustices and economic inequalities ("proposals y programas / Federales"). For the poem's speaker, the struggle for an oppositional "nation / called Aztlan," along with the institutional remedies offered to students of color by the Educational Opportunity Program (EOP) and higher education, have failed to solve the serious problems plaguing Mexican-American communities. In fact, as the poem consistently intimates, "EOP and education" perhaps came to pacify and appease rather than radicalize and liberate the Chicana/o community. "¿De qué sirvio? [What was the use?]," asks the speaker, "las marchas [the marches] and all that yelling."[60]

The direct linking of the university ("EOP and education") and Chicano countercultural politics ("build a nation / called Aztlan") represents an early indication of where Montoya, at least in "The Movement Has Gone for Its Ph.D.," places the blame for the alleged failings of el Movimiento. While firing barbs at the conservative political establishment and the federal repression carried out by "all those plants and agents—all the / ones that / infiltrated,"[61] Montoya reserves his most severe and scathing criticism for Chicanas and Chicanos who much too quickly and comfortably acclimated to the institutional and bureaucratic culture of the university. The poetic voice queries, "Where do you suppose they've gone, / All those bad-ass bigotones / que llegaron shouting RAZA / y viva EL BARRIO / and they couldn't even roll their R's?"[62] Montoya

marshals a familiar cultural nationalist trope in these lines, satirizing Chicana/o PhDs via a rhetorical claim of cultural inauthenticity. Yet, at the same time, Montoya's satire in the poem foregrounds the fact that the very rhetoric and political assumptions of Chicano cultural nationalism proved politically misleading, allowing many self-professed radicals to project a position of seeming opposition through a cultural politics that fit rather nicely within the institutional matrix of the university.

In response to the political urgency and demands of Chicana/o communities outside the academy—"¡Ay! Qué Raza / no se aguanta—just what do these people want?"—the speaker ironically announces, "If they'd only go to college so that they / could learn Marxism / and learn of the benefits of cultural / pluralism!"[63] The struggle for political power, economic justice, and against racism embraced by the Movement and its New Left counterparts has been replaced by "the benefits" of a college education in liberal cultural pluralism. For Montoya, the university has effectively neutralized the political valence of Sixties militancy and radicalism, making academically palatable even Marxist revolutionary doctrines. Acquiescence and institutional coexistence rather than political antagonism now mark the Movement's residency in the university:

> Now consider los colegios and the
> progress de los estudiantes Chicanos
> donde MEChA mano a mano
> has just won the intramural cup!
> Y los profes y estudiantes siguen
> siempre deligentemente pa' delante
> all keep searching for those stipends
> in the sky.[64]
> [Now consider the colleges and the / progress of the Chicano students / where MEChA hand in hand / has just won the intramural cup! / And the professors and students keep / always diligently moving forward / all keep searching for those stipends / in the sky]

MEChA and Chicano Studies professors and students enjoy the intramural activities and rewards of the pluralist postwar university, moving diligently forward, no longer in search of a "a nation / called Aztlán," but instead on a quest for "those stipends / in the sky." Arguably, Montoya's sardonic criticisms speak to more than an individual sense of disillusionment, frustration, and cynicism over the purportedly altered politics of el Movimiento. More crucially, his poems draw attention to the changing institutional, political, and cultural landscape of the postwar American university.

Writing in 1974, Raymond V. Padilla similarly records in his dissertation on the development of Chicano Studies at Berkeley what he depicts as "a shift in Chicano Studies goals."[65] For Padilla, debates over Chicano Studies curricu-

lum and research, at least in Berkeley, culminated in "a compromise between the initial activistic [*sic*] goal of the program and the need to legitimize Chicano Studies on campus."[66] The compromise meant to mediate a sharpening contradiction within the evolving objectives of Chicano Studies. While initially centered on "people-community development," Chicano Studies soon became preoccupied with "sheltering students from an alien and inhospitable university environment."[67] Shielding Chicana/o students proved crucial, since originally these students supplied the main body of support for the new discipline, as well as the basis for its justification. In "an attempt to shelter the program itself," Padilla explains, Chicano Studies advocates gradually implemented a strategy that "took the form of identification with other liberal arts programs in the university."[68] However, in Padilla's judgment, such a strategy betrayed an "incongruency," since "attempts to make Chicano Studies function like 'any other liberal arts' program on campus . . . stands in contradiction to the first goal of activism."[69] According to Lisa Lowe, the need to grapple with such an "incongruency," or political contradiction, was not unique to Chicano Studies:

> Interdisciplinary studies express contradiction . . . to the degree that they provide the sites from which to reevaluate disciplinary methods that assume Western cultural autonomy and the universality of the Western subject. . . . In this sense, Ethnic Studies scholars do not reproduce the methods of literary, historical, or sociological studies merely to celebrate "ethnic culture" as an object separated from the material conditions of production and reception. . . . At the same time, institutionalizing such fields as Ethnic Studies will contain an inevitable paradox: institutionalization provides a material base within the university for a transformative critique of traditional disciplines and their traditional separations, and yet institutionalization of any field or curriculum that establishes orthodox objects and methods submits in part to the demands of the university and its educative function of socializing subjects into the state.[70]

Rather than dismantling and remaking the institutional demands and material relations of the university, interdisciplinary programs and departments like Chicano Studies and Ethnic Studies obtained institutionalized space on college campuses on the basis of a new "adaptative hegemony" that recognized difference, but only on the strict condition that the structural logic of the academy remained intact. For this reason, argues Michael Soldatenko, "Chicano Studies failed not because it had not properly implemented *El Plan* or any other vision, but because it was successful in grafting itself onto the academy."[71] As Soldatenko tersely concludes, "the community was replaced by the institution."[72] "All in all," Soldatenko sums up, "Chicano studies replicated all the traditional

practices and institutions of academic disciplines."[73] While not as ubiquitous as Soldatenko suggests, it is true that university campuses throughout the 1970s witnessed a palpable shift away from more organic forms of community-based political activism and militancy.

For Chicano educators like Montoya and Padilla, the increased concern over university institutionalization and disciplinary professionalization seemed to run counter to the initial anti-establishment and antibureaucratic radicalism of Sixties social movements. A proposal for a Third World College published during the turbulent 1969 Third World Liberation Front strike at the University of California, Berkeley, identified as one stated goal "an academic enterprise deliberately designed to focus on solving the problems that victimized Third World people, Third World communities, in a way unencumbered by obstacles of tradition too characteristic of our educational institutions."[74] Likewise, in his contribution to the 1970 Chicano Studies Institute, Manuel I. López stresses the need to espouse and implement a transformative approach toward U.S. higher education: "We must recognize that that which we seek in Chicano Studies calls for radical change in the university."[75] In López's estimation, a "radical" reconception of the university should lie at the core of the political and educational objectives behind Chicano Studies: "In order to change archaic admissions standards, irrelevant classes, a cutthroat grading system, institutionalized racism and faculty control of courses, the function and values of the university must be changed."[76] And, yet, the realities of institutional marginalization and underfunding constantly left Chicano Studies susceptible to the gilded promises of the university and its allied philanthropic organizations. The political scientist Mario Barrera warned in 1974 that "[t]here is great temptation to accept the assumptions of the profession and the funding agencies, since this makes it much easier to work in that environment."[77]

According to Johnnella E. Butler, a central founding and enduring principle of Ethnic Studies in its multiple forms (e.g., African American Studies, Chicano Studies, Latino Studies, Asian American Studies, and Native American Studies) is the scholarly and pedagogical drive "to illuminate the possibility of a vibrant, multiracial, and multiethnic national culture and a just society."[78] Consequently, Ethnic Studies must grapple with what Butler characterizes as "the repetitive forces of assimilationist imperatives" in large part sustained and promulgated by the university.[79] Indeed, the formation of Ethnic Studies programs throughout the late 1960s and 1970s represented a direct challenge to "the ingrained concept of universities as the carriers of Anglo-American values and as the domain of the elite."[80] As Butler rightly sums up, Ethnic Studies emerge as a corrective and a countervailing force to the "exclusionary universalistic theories and scholarly expressions of a national self-understanding birthed in slavery, racism, and colonialism."[81] The university thus signified for Sixties radicals a vital front in the battle to revolutionize the cultural, economic, and political foundations of the United States.

Chicano Movement activists and advocates waged fiercely turbulent campaigns against the university's institutional racism and elitist bureaucracy. However, such struggles more often than not (and especially during the 1970s) worked to reformulate and partially appropriate, rather than call into question and overturn, the sociohistorical mission of the university. Writing toward the end of the Movement years, the Chicano historian and scholar-activist Juan Gómez-Quiñones portrays the student movement among Chicanas and Chicanos as primarily directed at obtaining "reforms which in sum sought to democratize the relations between the community and the dominant system, but also to democratize the university and society as a whole."[82] As *El Plan de Santa Bárbara* stipulates, the goal of Chicana/o student and faculty activists was to compel universities and colleges "truly [to] live up to their credo, to their commitment to diversification, democratization, and enrichment of our cultural heritage and human community."[83] In defiance of the longstanding Eurocentric practices and interests of the American university, the Movement and Chicano Studies fostered a pedagogical strategy based on a countercultural ethos that called for the revaluation of cultural difference and national self-identity.[84] However, under the new adaptive hegemonic regime of the postwar university, Chicano counterculture proved complementary to the academy's shifting ideas on national culture, now anchored to notions of cultural pluralism and diversity. In fact, in his later assessment of el Movimiento, Gómez-Quiñones classifies Chicano counterculture and nationalism as a strain of "ethnic liberalism," concluding that in its artistic expressions as well as in its political and educational objectives the Movement "emphasized pride, condemned discrimination, and demanded equities. This message was easily assimilable by the dominant society and the varied sectors in the community. The emphasis was on ethnic contributions and participation, not insurgency."[85]

Insofar as it persisted at the level of culture, the push to "democratize the university" continued in large part—despite its frequent politically-charged rhetoric—to speak *in* rather than *against* the standard language of the institution.[86] For university administrators and boards of trustees, such an approach proved especially attractive as a means by which to dissuade and undercut radical proponents of autonomous Third World colleges, of participatory and democratic institutional governance, and of community-based and practice-oriented liberationist education. Rosaura Sánchez foregrounds just these political and bureaucratic exigencies facing the university during the late Sixties:

> New academic programs like ethnic studies and women's studies arose not out of a state interest in a body of knowledge but out of interest in ensuring campus order and security. . . . The university was able to create and integrate these programs administratively under its umbrella, allowing . . . for a potential firecracker to defuse itself.[87]

On the one hand, extremely difficult and fervent antiracist struggles raged on high school and college campuses over changes to the admission policies, cultural outlook, and curricular program of the U.S. education system. These hard-fought and salutary victories were in no way spontaneous, automatic, or generously granted by those in positions of power. On the other hand, as some Chicana/o intellectuals and activists frustratingly put forward, Movement countercultural politics at the end of the day evidently fell short of undermining the avowed mission and overall normalized operations and practices of the university. Sánchez concludes: "The discourse of ethnic power, opportunity, and pluralism led to an unrealistic assessment of the extent of struggle possible at the institutional level and masked our incapacity to avoid serving privilege and class domination within academia. In the end our counter discourses have been co-opted, silenced, or ignored by mainstream discourse."[88]

Similar concerns were voiced early on by Movimiento academics and activists. For instance, Carlos Vásquez anticipates Sánchez's later evaluation in his concluding piece for the critical collection of essays *Parameters of Institutional Change: Chicano Experiences in Education*:

> Culturally 'relevant' or 'pluralistic' programs have been conceded merely to confuse and obfuscate the real heart of the problem in the American educational system: a class-based and structured educational system which allows no signs of opening up for those of low socio-economic standing (Chicanos in our case), but instead continues to recreate and reproduce the same conditions and relations of production which capitalism has always needed to insure the realization of its motive force—surplus value or profit. . . . They [Chicano Studies programs] were allowed. They harmed no one. They threatened no one, least of all the capitalist mode of production. They quieted the campuses and busied the insurgents in the bureaucracies which their 'struggle' produced. With the increased intervention of the State, campuses languished in extra funds while Chicano college recruits enjoyed the fruits of 'struggle': a financial aids package and all the rhetoric they could master.[89]

Although not all so overtly Marxist and scathing in their analysis as Vásquez, most of the contributors to *Parameters of Institutional Change* offer similar critical assessments of Movement activism and its relationship to the institutional matrix of the university, likewise stressing the negative consequences of this ostensible *rapprochement* between el Movimiento and the university.

Not everyone regretted the outcome, however. In a celebratory rather than condemnatory tone, a 1978 Ford Foundation-sponsored report on the state of Ethnic Studies likewise highlights an apparent shift in the focus and com-

mitment of newly established disciplines like Chicano Studies. Interestingly enough, the Ford Foundation was a leading financial supporter of Ethnic Studies programs throughout the 1970s, seeing them as an instrument with which to improve "race relations" and to diffuse racial tensions in the United States through the fostering of cultural integration, diversity, and awareness—that is, by actively promoting liberal cultural pluralism. The report, aptly titled *Widening the Mainstream of American Culture*, claims to describe "the evolution of . . . ethnic studies programs,"[90] underscoring the move away from a much-feared earlier political radicalism:

> Although some misunderstanding remains on college and university campuses about the role and content of undergraduate ethnic studies programs, their place now appears secure. The exaggerated political rhetoric that once enveloped ethnic studies has largely disappeared; many weak programs have been winnowed out, and the more established ones have entered a new phase of improved staffing, curricula, and financial support.[91]

The language in the passage suggests a natural *evolution* for Ethnic Studies, with the gradual extinction of "weak programs" and the persevering through adaptation of "more established ones." In so doing, the report entirely downplays the very important role of university administrators and the Ford Foundation itself in determining which Ethnic Studies programs survived and which disappeared. The contestatory impetus behind the original calls for Ethnic Studies by student- and scholar-activists is dismissed as simply "exaggerated political rhetoric," most of which has now thankfully given way to "improved" administrative, curricular, and pedagogical practices. Butler notes that the "report's narrative belies the very tension that Ethnic Studies has attempted to address that plagues it from within and without: the battle against scholarship and teaching that reinforces through its theory and epistemology the racist assimilationist imperatives" of traditional higher education in the United States.[92] Although critical of the report, Butler welcomes the auspicious opening up of the university's curricula and scholarship that the Ford Foundation facilitated through its financial contributions to Ethnic Studies. Nevertheless, the trajectory of this advancement within the academy charts the contested ground of competing visions for Ethnic Studies and the institutional and financial weight the university and philanthropic foundations brought to bear on the process of resolving the significant political, scholarly, and pedagogical disagreements that punctuate the history of interdisciplinary programs and departments.

The sociologist Joan Roelofs draws attention to the longstanding influential, if not determinative, relationship enjoyed between charitable foundations and U.S. public education. Roelofs argues that philanthropic organizations within the United States historically have turned time and again to "the mask of

pluralism"[93] in order to preserve a hegemonic cultural dominant, to obfuscate and thus pacify class and racial antagonisms, and to shape public policy and opinion in the service of domination and capital accumulation. According to Roelofs, the Ford Foundation in particular was instrumental during the 1970s and 1980s in promoting and funding "initiatives [that] helped transform radical movements into professional-led scholarly or bureaucratic organizations."[94] In the face of growing political solidarity among radicals of color, "[f]ragmentation was regarded as urgent" by the ruling elite, a crisis that in Roelofs's opinion prompted foundation-backed "publications, institutes, and university programs . . . [that] helped create 'identity politics'" in its most innocuous academic forms.[95] Commenting on the Ford Foundation specifically, Roelofs stresses that when "an organization such as Ford, with assets of approximately $15 billion, decides to throw its weight behind one cause rather than another, it is no small distortion of democracy. This steering prevents threatening alternatives from appearing on the serious political agenda. Those who see our travails arising from corporate power and wealth gradually are excluded from political discourse; they are labeled 'irresponsible,' 'unrealistic,' and 'unfundable.'"[96] The Ford Foundation's role with respect to Sixties radicalism highlights exactly this hegemonic function of institutional selection, delimitation, and elimination characteristic of social philanthropy.

On September 29, 1968, the *New York Times* reported "a major policy shift" in the financial focus and operations of the Ford Foundation.[97] The announcement came from new Ford Foundation president McGeorge Bundy (1966–1979), who coincidently had served under President John F. Kennedy and President Lyndon B. Johnson as National Security Advisor, engineering many of the early military pacification policies employed in Vietnam. According to Bundy, the philanthropic organization now planned to "place part of its investment portfolio in ventures aiding the poor and minority groups and land conservation rather than enterprises offering greater financial return."[98] The new investment course, explained Bundy, stemmed from a determination on the part of the Foundation's trustees to "enlarge our kit of tools for trying to help in the social crisis of our time."[99] While expecting a "'probable low return'" on such investments, Bundy assured the *New York Times* that the potential financial losses would be offset by "'a high social yield.'"[100] Earlier in the same month, the *New York Times* reported that under Bundy's stewardship the Ford Foundation "has come to see itself . . . increasingly as an agent for the resolution of civil conflict."[101] In addition to its grant contributions and programs, the Ford Foundation's financial investments now also assumed as a chief objective the creation of business ventures, commercial and service organizations, educational opportunities, and handpicked leadership that could provide an alternative to the local self-directed actions and militant radicalism of the New Left, Black Power groups, and the Chicano Movement.

Regarding el Movimiento specifically, the Ford Foundation played a direct role in establishing and funding a number of service-oriented organizations

for Mexican Americans, including the Southwest Council of La Raza and the Mexican-American Legal Defense and Education Fund. Announcing in 1970 the Ford Foundation's decision to continue to fund the Southwest Council of La Raza, donating $1.3 million over a two-year period, President Bundy hailed the Southwest Council's success in creating "a visible organization with a sense of permanence and stability."[102] The significance of this achievement, in Bundy's opinion, should not be underestimated, since the Southwest Council had "taken the first steps toward converting the long pent-up anger and frustration of its people, ever in danger of explosion and violence, into beneficial programming and planning. We are glad to assist in this pioneering effort *to provide constructive direction* to the growing energy and momentum of the Mexican-American movement."[103] For Bundy, the Southwest Council of La Raza succeeded in meeting the target goal behind the Ford Foundation's "major policy shift," namely, the "converting" of popular anger and fight-back into less confrontational and volatile forms of bureaucratic "programming and planning." As another Ford Foundation executive, Boudinot P. Atterbury, affirmed much more bluntly, "We're going to show these people like Reies Tijerina, we're going to show these advocates of violence, that Ford has a better way."[104]

Writing for the New Left magazine *Ramparts*, Rees Lloyd and Peter Montague described the Ford Foundation's intent as mirroring that of prior colonizers of the Southwest: "to 'benefit' the natives—this time with a pacification program aimed at heading off the new militancy, creating a poverty-foundation complex, and building up a 'safe' leadership for La Raza akin to the NAACP or the Urban League."[105] Gilberto Ballejos, editor of the Albuquerque-based Movement newspaper *El Papel*, voiced a similar critique of the Ford Foundation's philanthropic work with respect to Mexican-American communities: "They're trying to create *Vendido* Power (Sellout Power), *Lame* Power (Asskisser Power), and they want the poor Raza to pay the price. . . . It's Bundy's bullshit, he's trying to bring Vietnam to New Mexico and trying to create 'leaders' the system can use as tools."[106] The Ford Foundation's assistance for the "benefit" of Mexican Americans was not limited to the barrio and the countryside, but extended into the university as well, where it also sparked criticism on the part of some Chicana/o radicals.

Between 1970 and 1978, the Ford Foundation contributed almost $11 million in grants to Ethnic Studies and more than $47 million in graduate fellowship packages, ranging from one to five years, for African American, Chicana/o, Puerto Rican, and Asian American graduate students.[107] According to its report *Widening the Mainstream of American Culture*, this financial support on the part of the Ford Foundation represented the means by which to assist Ethnic Studies in "developing their own scholars and scholarship, in order to enlarge self-understanding and to expand general awareness and appreciation of the rich ethnic diversity of American culture."[108] In this fashion, Ethnic Studies research and teaching would carry forward the "heightened consciousness of minority students [that] led to the recognition that non-European cultures had

been neglected by a white, European-oriented academic tradition."[109] In the eyes of the university and the Ford Foundation, Ethnic Studies programs like African American and Chicano Studies were charged with fostering the cultural "self-understanding" of Black and Chicana/o students, respectively, and with creating a "general awareness" of cultural difference among all students on campus, with the principal goal of encouraging "ethnic diversity." *Widening the Mainstream* wholly reworks and re-envisions the general intent and radical ends of Sixties campus militancy, deliberately endorsing a liberal cultural-pluralist politics at the expense of the "exaggerated political rhetoric" of protesting students and faculty of color within the university.

In tracing the history of Chicano Studies, Soldatenko highlights the early backing the Ford Foundation gave to programs, councils, and scholars, while also noting that such financial support remained "an issue of concern" for the Movement.[110] For instance, José Angel Gutiérrez, one of the founders of the Mexican American Youth Organization and later of La Raza Unida Party, worried that Chicana/o groups funded by the Ford Foundation would be "less accountable and accessible to the Chicano militants."[111] In reference to the Southwest Council of La Raza, longtime Mexican-American labor organizer and civil rights crusader Bert Corona admitted that financial dependence on the Ford Foundation "limited the effectiveness and autonomy of the group and steered it toward more of an establishment perspective."[112] In the eyes of more than a few Movimiento activists, concludes Soldatenko, the Ford Foundation and other similar philanthropic institutions "served to moderate Chicano academic politics."[113] Citing an article by Abel Amaya, a program officer in the Ford Foundation's higher education division, Soldatenko stresses the push to endorse and finance academic proposals that "had moved away from slogans, utopias, and cult of leadership" and instead embraced a "more legitimate effort" at guaranteeing a high level of Chicana/o scholarship and educational advancement.[114] Writing in 1974, Amaya opines that "[t]here are hopeful indications that Chicano 'education activists' have transcended the narrow rhetorical focus of the movement."[115] In Amaya's estimation, the Chicano Movement was finally "beginning to grapple with the real hard issues of educative progress," a sign that "our dreams and hopes are less utopic than yesterday."[116] However, for a significant number of Chicana/o faculty and students, Amaya's repudiation of earlier Movement militancy and anti-establishment attitudes confirmed their suspicion that the Ford Foundation and comparable charitable organizations strove "to moderate forces within ethnic studies"[117] while inducing proponents of el Movimiento to abandon the left radical ideals and emancipatory goals initially motivating demands for fundamental changes on college and university campuses.

Cultural pluralism and discourses of opportunity and social betterment within the university worked hand in glove with the broader program of pacification carried out by the U.S. government and affiliate public institutions during the volatile 1960s and 1970s. Sánchez reiterates the point in stark language:

"Thus to ensure domestic tranquility, the federal government initiated a liberal discourse of affirmative action, war on poverty, aid to education, bilingual education, and economic opportunity. This discourse was part of federal policy throughout this period as the government sought to maintain law and order in the streets at a time when the U.S. was concentrating on an expansion of the war in Vietnam."[118] The expansion of social and educational opportunities helped to underwrite the literary and scholarly recovery of formerly denigrated ethnic traditions and cultural practices. Nevertheless, for Sánchez and other scholars and activists, it also played a key role in safeguarding the fundamental relations of inequality, oppression, and exploitation responsible for the marginalization and domination of U.S. working-class communities of color in the first place.

"We Have Gun-Point Education": Institutions of De-Education and Chicano Countercultural Politics

Movement participants gradually came to see the university as a primary agent for change on behalf of La Causa. Surveying the state of Chicano Studies programs and departments in 1973, Refugio I. Rochin observes that "Chicanos perceive the university as a vital institutional instrument of change," despite the fact that "higher institutions of education had contributed directly to the deprived conditions of the Chicano, rural and urban."[119] Chicano Studies intellectuals and student activists, now armed with el Movimiento's countercultural ethos, believed they could wield the institutional resources, expertise, and commitments of the university to undo much of its past harm. On the one hand, "American universities had neglected the Chicano's socioeconomic and educational needs and had tried to impose the Anglo-American monoculture syndrome on all Chicanos in general."[120] On the other hand, the university seemed to offer, particularly through its expanding Chicano and Ethnic Studies units, the possibility of "strengthening . . . Chicano cultural heritage"[121] and therefore held out the possibility of bolstering and reinvigorating the countercultural politics at the heart of the alternative Chicano "value system." *El Plan de Santa Bárbara*, the Movement's manifesto on higher education, candidly states: "the university has contributed mightily to the oppression of our people."[122] However, the university traffics in "knowledge, which is power," *El Plan* maintains, and if harnessed correctly and effectively, can no doubt "contribute to the liberation of the Chicano community."[123] Through the developing of research and pedagogy that addressed the particulars of the Chicana/o cultural experience, programs and departments in Chicano Studies could potentially effect a countercultural radical transvaluation of the university's institutional mission.

Above all, Chicano Studies should strive for "re-definition" and "re-interpretation," observe Reynaldo Macias, Juan Gómez-Quiñones, and Raymond Castro in an important early essay on the nascent field: "It in effect affirms a counter culture that is authentically Chicano and universal."[124] The Curriculum

Committee for the Chicano Studies Division at Berkeley makes just such a countercultural point in its "A Proposed Curriculum for an A.B. Major in Chicano Studies" (1971), which Rochin quotes: "Every developmental force—economic, political, linguistic, demographic—has confirmed the Anglo-American monoculture and denied the Mexican-Americans their own, and the substantial contribution it would have made to the total society. Chicano Studies exists to rectify this cultural imbalance."[125] The university's "cultural" impact on the greater society could be marshaled to reverse the racist "imbalance" that persisted across the U.S. Southwest, if not the United States as whole, to the detriment of Mexican-American communities. Simultaneously, then, the university embodied for Chicana/o intellectuals and cultural workers both an enemy and a friend: a weapon of the ruling classes and the Eurocentric status quo, as well as a powerful and indispensable tool for dismantling existing societal relations of inequality and overturning the ideological apparatuses and repressive structures that maintained them.

Soldatenko identifies this "equivocation about the university" as fundamental to the basic outlook and eventual institutional trajectory of the discipline.[126] However, the Chicano Movement retained no exclusive claim to this paradoxical relationship with and perspective on the university. In fact, el Movimiento's ambivalent attitude reflects a more general contradiction endemic to the thinking of Sixties radicals and intellectuals vis-à-vis the academy. The historian Russell Jacoby notes that, "[w]hile activists often disdained academics, New Left intellectuals largely envisioned themselves as future professors. . . . Unlike the old left, the New Left frontally attacked the university. Yet young intellectuals entered it with less regrets."[127] Despite the initial negative assessment of the university and its "cumbersome academic bureaucracy" voiced in "The Port Huron Statement" (1962), the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) recognized college campuses in particular as "an overlooked seat of influence" and "a potential base and agency in a movement of social change."[128] Given its relation to knowledge and knowledge-production, its strategic geographical distribution, its range of political and ideological commitments, and its mounting concentration of youth populations, the university emerged for the New Left as "an obvious beginning point" for its organizing and quite possibly the last remaining social institution "[f]rom where . . . power and vision [could] be summoned."[129] Throughout the Vietnam War era, the New Left consistently viewed the university as a "significant source of social criticism and an initiator of new modes and molders of attitudes," and therefore as holding out the possibility for "revealing new potentialities, new levers for change."[130] As with the Chicano Movement, the New Left acknowledged the structural limitations and repressive nature of the postwar university, while at the same time emphasizing its latent uses for radical ends insofar as it comprised "a crucial institution in the formation of social attitudes."[131] For el Movimiento as much as for the New Left, successful social revolution depended on the instilling of new cultural values and practices, whether recovered from a communitarian past or pro-

leptically imagined from an egalitarian future. Given its standing as "a crucial institution in the formation of social attitudes," the university thus proved vital to this broader project for radical transformation.[132]

In Padilla's estimation, Chicano Studies "saw the university as a repository of resources which could be effectively harnessed for the development of the oppressed and exploited Chicano communities outside of the campus."[133] Yet, although Chicana/o academics "sought to address community problems by using campus resources," Padilla adds that many likewise regarded the "maintaining [of] an adversary relationship with the very same campus" to be not only desirable, but also necessary.[134] American higher education, despite its prospective benefits and advantages, still epitomized for Chicanas and Chicanos a neocolonial and authoritarian institution geared toward the socializing of subjects under the rule of an oppressive state apparatus. Mark McGurl describes this shared paradoxical outlook on the university during the late 1960s as a "confusing proximity of empowerment *by* institutions [of education] to imprisonment *in* institutions [of education]."[135] For Sixties radicalism, the possible positive and liberatory functions of the university ironically entailed mobilizing its institutional commitments and concrete practices against those very same commitments and practices: scholarly research and academic instruction geared toward the overturning and reformulating of the academy itself. As McGurl indicates elsewhere, the New Left and the various ethno-nationalist movements of the Vietnam War era called not for "*less* education, then, but *more* education, *as long as this education can be re-imagined as an education in resistance to assimilation by education*."[136] For McGurl, the impetus behind the "many ethnic studies programs and centers" formed during the late 1960s and early 1970s signifies not a desire for "inclusion simply, but a paradoxically *included exclusion*, the construction and maintenance of the outside within."[137] From its inception, Chicano Studies involved just such a counter-assimilative project. Chicana/o scholars and student activists sought to undermine existing power relations and institutional racism by framing and popularizing from *within* the university an alternative value system, rooted in Chicano countercultural politics, that ultimately would transform higher education in the process of extending *beyond* the university's walls to impact conditions in the local barrios and eventually to radicalize American society as a whole. Early Chicana/o "organic" intellectuals, insofar as they understood their role in such terms,[138] steadily looked to the university as a base of operations with a specific strategic mission: first, to tear the traditional veil of intellectual autonomy and objectivity shielding what Christopher Newfield calls the "triple helix" of the university-military-industrial complex,[139] and, second, and most importantly, to build el Movimiento and its countercultural politics by encouraging and molding—by *cultivating*—Chicana/o undergraduate and graduate students into future "organic" intellectuals tasked with returning to and assisting Mexican-American communities across the United States.

Carlos Muñoz, Jr., explains that *El Plan de Santa Bárbara* "loosely defined [Chicano Studies] as simply curricula on the Chicano experience, past and present, with a focus on the cultural aspects of that experience."[140] Muñoz maintains that the "rationale for Chicano Studies as outlined in the *Plan* was predicated on an *inward look* at the Chicano experience," in the hope that it would lead the Chicana/o student "to the discovery of his people's cultural traditions, thus providing an understanding of himself and his people."[141] Hence, *El Plan de Santa Bárbara* asserts that the "critical dialectics of Chicano Studies are the individual and culture which produces identity and new culture; the individual and community produces social action and change."[142] In this way, then, as with the postwar American university more generally, early formulations of Chicano Studies articulate an explicit commitment to the power of culture. "I teach their children in my university classes," the children of Mexican-American middle-class families, explains the famed Chicano novelist Rodolfo A. Anaya, "and find most don't speak Spanish, most do not know the ways or the history of the traditional culture. Now we will see if the elements of that culture that took hundreds of years to evolve can survive in the middle class."[143] The Chicano Movement, Anaya insists, reflected the "struggle of our community to exist and retain not only its cultural ways but its soul."[144] In the 1960s, young Mexican Americans "would look back in anger and realize they were losing many of their traditional ways."[145] A middle- and high-school teacher turned university professor, Anaya personally witnessed this struggle for the "soul" of the Chicana/o student unfolding daily in the academic and administrative spaces of the U.S. education system.[146]

In a similar vein, Alurista argued that the vitality and usefulness of Chicano Studies to el Movimiento rested on the extent to which Chicana/o faculty, administrators, and students succeeded in fostering el Movimiento's countercultural ethos on university and college campuses. In "Chicano Studies: A Future" (n.d.), a tract written for the first California State College Chicana/o faculty conference, Alurista explained that the promise of Chicano Studies depends on the rejection of a materialistic and militaristic U.S. status quo readily embraced by traditional academic disciplines.[147] Alurista underscored that "the future of Chicano Studies" as a positive contributor to the goals of the Movement presupposed a "rejection of endless dependence of the American way of life and its institutions," and conversely, the promotion of "the way of life indigenous to this continent."[148] Unfortunately, "insofar as we are inside the gringo institutions," wrote Alurista, "our task to transform our gringo patterns of existence is made more difficult since many of our members learn to enjoy the plastic way of life of the gringo student, the gringo teacher, or the gringo administrator."[149] For Alurista, combating the appeal of this "plastic way of life" necessitated an emphasis on countercultural "practice" rather than the "empty" and "pure" theorizing common within the university: "And it is our practice that will diferentiate [*sic*] us from other academic studies detached from the corrupt American reality which they practice every day."[150] In assessing Alurista's views on

Chicano Studies, Soldatenko highlights this point, reiterating Alurista's stress on the fact that "Chicano studies must reflect different practices than other academic endeavors. Chicano studies is about practice, about advocacy for change, a different way of life."[151] Significantly, as with much of his writing, in "Chicano Studies: A Future" Alurista conceives of such "practice" in almost strictly cultural terms.

The nurturing of Chicano counterculture within and beyond the university constituted an urgent task for el Movimiento, and as Alurista specified, "[t]o speak of cultivating a way of life is to speak of culture."[152] The university's attraction for Alurista rested on its power to impact culture, to alter attitudes and perspectives that motivated the daily practices, actions, and commitments of Mexican-American communities and of American society more generally. Chicano Studies, which had access to "flowing resources"[153] absent for the Movement outside the university, could thus undertake the vital practice of cultural self-renewal and self-determination, of reestablishing a different and oppositional "way of life" centered on an Indigenous Mesoamerican worldview:

> To recognize, reconocer, is to know again, to identify as known, as part of one. Chicano Studies may aid La Raza to recognize ourselves through our history. To recognize ourselves through our literature. To recognize ourselves through our arts. To take cognizance of our indigenous roots. . . . To take cognizance of the Way of Life, the culture which must be cultivated if our Nation is going to rise.[154]

The university and its resources afforded the much-needed opportunity to carry out a reclamation of Chicano identity and culture, but only if Chicano Studies oriented its pedagogy and research toward a "cognizance of our indigenous roots," Alurista insisted. Meeting this educational challenge would lay the foundation to "begin to offer, by example, an alternative to the American way of life and from our practice, from habitual lives that we develop, construct a different system of production."[155] Cultural revolution precedes social and economic revolution. Moreover, as Alurista's essay indicates, the responsibility now fell on Chicano Studies and the postwar American university to effect this cultural transformation of individual and community through the cultivation of a countercultural pedagogy and consequent new social "practice" and "way of life."

Rodolfo "Corky" Gonzales, the outspoken leader of the Denver-based grassroots Movement organization Crusade for Justice and the co-founder of an independently run Chicano school and college, La Escuela y Colegio Tlatelolco, likewise asserted the need "to create a cultural renaissance, a cultural revival of whom [*sic*] we were," during his first formal address to Chicana/o students at Arizona State University (ASU).[156] Delivered on October 14, 1970, Gonzales's speech stressed that, in order for Movimiento activists to tackle the

economic and political problems confronting Chicana/o communities, "[f]irst, we have to create cultural awareness."[157] "When you have that cultural awareness," maintained Gonzales, "then you can create your own economic base. Then you can get yourselves together." For Gonzales, this necessary and urgent cultural knowledge remained sorely absent among Mexican Americans and, more crucially, continued to be deliberately withheld by American educational institutions.

As Gonzales was wont to point out, dominant U.S. social and cultural institutions systematically deprived Chicanas and Chicanos of even a basic understanding of their history, culture, and communal identity. Through the daily practices and policies of an oppressive, colonial-like political structure, a racist and commercialized network of media outlets, and especially an education system with a penchant for mystifying and distorting sociohistorical truth, several generations of Chicanas and Chicanos had lost touch with their cultural heritage and collective sense of self. Instead, a number of Mexican Americans within the barrio and many more outside of it blindly valued what Gonzales and like-minded Movement advocates deemed the cutthroat individualism, crass materialism, and hollow societal mores of a technocratic U.S. capitalism. "Most of this society is brainwashed by their own TV, by their own literature, their own news media," Gonzales remarked during his ASU speech.[159] The university, in particular, worked to inculcate a sterile, deadening, and conformist cultural logic: "the educational system teaches you that you can make it as long as you conform to society. This means that you must become a robot. You have to become another one of those human beings out there in that no man's land of a neurotic society. This is what you have to become to be what they want out of their schools."[160] Not surprisingly, given its widespread popularity and appeal in the United States by 1970, Gonzales's language echoes New Left critiques of a technologically rationalized, instrumentalist, and bureaucratic postwar capitalism.

Regardless of its ostensibly humanistic mission, the principal function of the university for the New Left proved to be anchored in the "one-dimensional" structure of late capitalist modernity, to use yet again Marcuse's then-fashionable term. The "actual intellectual effect of the college experience," reads "The Port Huron Statement," "is hardly distinguishable from that of any other communications channel—say, a television set—passing on the stock truths of the day."[161] The university "transforms the honest searching of many students to a ratification of convention and, worse, to a numbness to present and future catastrophes."[162] For the SDS authors of this New Left manifesto, the college student invariably learns the standard lesson dispensed in class after class at institutions of higher education: "to accept elite rule within the university, which prepares him to accept later forms of minority control."[163] The university, as Mark Rudd puts it in 1969, "serves the interest of the ruling class" above all by "getting people socialized to take a role, filling a slot in the society."[164] Similarly, Gary R. Weaver, an instructor and former Assistant Dean at The American Univer-

sity, declares in the introduction to his edited collection *The University and Revolution* (1969) that "we have used universities as Xerox machines to reproduce the *status quo*—they have been cultural cookie-cutters taking as their pattern white, male, Anglo-Saxon, middle-class America."[165] Gonzales more than agreed. Schools are "cookie-making-machines," he emphatically told listeners at ASU: "Really! It is a cookie-making machine that goes boom, boom, boom, boom, and all the cookies come out looking alike. The only thing wrong is that some of them have names like Trujillo, Quintana, and some of them are black cookies. They don't fit the slots."[166] Along with his New Left counterparts, Gonzales saw higher education—in fact, the U.S. educational system as a whole—as actively complicit in the perpetuation of an extremely stultifying, alienating, and dehumanizing social condition, one felt much more deeply by students of color. For Chicanas and Chicanos, the "stock truths" of the "cookie-making-machines" translated not only into an enervating conformity and critical stupor, but also into a form of "self-hatred" engendered by cultural deracination and internalized racism.[167]

One Chicana student at St. Mary's University in San Antonio summed up the prevailing situation at the close of the 1960s: "Schools try to brainwash the Chicanos. . . . They try to make us forget our history, to be ashamed of being Mexicans, of speaking Spanish. They succeed in making us feel empty, and angry, inside."[168] Arguments in favor of Chicano Studies programs, departments, research centers, and support resources repeatedly referenced throughout the 1970s (and even up to today) the need to remedy the estrangement and feelings of inferiority experienced by the growing but still relatively small number of students of color on American college and university campuses. Evaluating in 1974 the formation of Chicano Studies at Berkeley, Padilla writes that these nascent academic units advocated "the goal of people-community development" along with "the creation of a 'hospitable environment' on campus for the Chicano student. This goal assumed that the university environment was generally inhospitable and alienating for the Chicano."[169] Likewise, in his paper for the 1970 Chicano Studies Institute, López underscores the alienation and enmity awaiting the newly arrived Chicana/o undergraduate. "The Chicano student found the university a strangely hostile and alien environment," López confessed:

> He found it staffed by administrators and faculty that knew nothing of his history or his culture. He found that he was expected to change into that which they said he should be. He was tested by tests that were not based on his values and by testers that did not relate to him. He was confronted by admission standards that were designed to keep him out, and he experienced anomie of the soul and heart.[170]

The university, in other words, mirrored and helped to preserve the broader social inequities and racial injustices of midcentury America. Institutional racism, inherent to the American culture industry, stigmatized and caricatured the traditions, history, and cultural values of La Raza. Such widespread discriminatory practices, at the heart of which lay the U.S. education system, resulted in frustrated, confused, and disaffected Chicana/o students.

Sal Castro, the Lincoln High School activist-teacher who played a leading role in the 1968 "Blowouts," argued that "[w]e are teaching these kids [Chicana/os] with psychological guns pointed at their heads. . . . We have gun-point education. The school is a prison. Education in the barrio doesn't free the mind of the Chicano. It imprisons his mind."[171] In the eyes of Chicana/o university students and professors, the same dismal situation prevailed in higher education. For López, "the university perpetuates the status quo"[172]—a social practice that involved, according to Alfredo Sanchez, onetime chairman of MEChA at San Jose State College, "the raping of our culture."[173] Higher education, Sanchez complained, "is one of the institutions that has been most responsible for the racism and decadent education Chicanos have been receiving."[174] The underground student newspaper *Chicano Student News* shared this judgment. Much like López, Sanchez, and Gonzales, the newspaper stressed the racist Eurocentrism and conformist ideology reflected in the priorities and curricula of higher education: "You see a Chicano student is alienated from his language; he is de-culturized and finally dehumanized so as to be able to function in a white, middle class, protestant bag."[175] Divorced from any conscious association to a Mexican or indigenous cultural and historical legacy—in fact, encouraged to forget and, when possible, to break any such affiliations—the Chicana/o student was turned against her/himself, left psychologically, culturally, and politically divided and conquered. The general estrangement manufactured by the educational apparatus and mass media of a one-dimensional and conformist American culture ("a white, middle-class, protestant bag") manifested, when one factored in the omnipresence of racism, a double affliction for students of color. As a result, "anomie of the soul and heart" marked their educational experience at all levels, a direct consequence of schooling that lacked and regularly disallowed any familiarity with "his history or his culture," not to mention "his values."

"We are the schizophrenics of this society," Gonzales informed the audience at ASU. "We have guys walking around like John Wayne and singing like James Brown. They don't know who in the hell they are."[176] This "schizophrenic" identity among Mexican Americans stemmed from the simple "fact . . . that they are not identifying with their historical roots!"[177] For Chicano Movement radicals such as Gonzales, the blame rested squarely on the shoulders of a racist and ideologically motivated U.S. educational system. Education for the Mexican American consisted of what Stan Steiner described in 1969 as a "process of de-education."[178] De-education entailed not solely the deliberate failure of U.S. schools to impart an adequate level of formal literacy (i.e., technical skill and

competency) to the Chicana/o student, but also and more significantly, an aggressive policy of cultural imperialism. "The schools have been one of the most effective instruments of the 'Conquest,'" Steiner contends.[179] The "suppression of the Spanish language and the culture of La Raza"[180] was pivotal to the de-education of Mexican and Mexican-American communities across the southwestern United States: "Nowhere in the curriculum is there a word on the Indian, Spanish, and Mexican cultures of the Southwest. . . . The language and culture of the Southwest are seen by his [the Chicano's] teachers as a prime hindrance to his progress, not only in learning English, but in 'becoming an American.'"[181] Cultural assimilation and social conformity remained the central objectives of the U.S. education system vis-à-vis Chicana/o students. Hence, schools adopted a program of de-education with the willful intent to guarantee the political submission and cultural incorporation of Mexican-American students.[182]

"It's important to know that you have to not just evaporate or disappear after you get out of the college scene," Gonzales advised students at ASU. "College is not the launching pad out of the community. We want to see our youth come back to the community."[183] Chicano Studies departments, programs, and centers presented a potential guarantee against the longstanding assimilation of Mexican-American college graduates into professionalized roles and away from the pressing needs and problems of their communities. Too many pre-Movement university students of the so-called "Mexican American Generation" had been lost to the cultural deracination and mainstream American assimilation of the college experience. Chicano Studies afforded a frontline of defense against cooptation. By generating through research and instilling through teaching a countercultural ethos of communitarian values, ethnic pride, and collective service, Chicano Studies promised to counteract the racist, materialist, and individualist logic of late-capitalist "success" that deemed education an avenue of escape from working-class Mexican-American barrios. Gonzales warned his ASU audience not to fall into the trap of professionalism: "You're not here only to obtain a professional level of educational attainment. You are not here only to learn something to take it out for your own economic freedom."[184] For Gonzales, more than enough Chicana/o college graduates had already gone "out into gringo land and . . . never come back."[185] It remained crucial to La Causa, Gonzales affirmed, that "our young people bring back their expertise, their professionalism, their degrees, their humanity, and their compassion, back home where it belongs, to the community."[186] Movement participants like Gonzales thus viewed Chicano Studies as a pedagogical safeguard, ensuring dedication and service to the community on the part of Chicana/o students. *El Plan de Santa Bárbara*, for instance, announces at one point that "[t]he goal of Chicano Studies is to provide a coherent and socially relevant education, humanistic and pragmatic which prepares Chicanos for service to the Chicano community and enriches the total society."[187] Such academic preparation revolved around a "general framework" that granted "the curriculum vehicle for affirming identity and developing an in-depth appreciation for the cultural heritage" of Chicana/o

communities.[188] Movimiento countercultural politics, codified to serve as the core of Chicano Studies instruction, would deliver the antidote to American assimilation and cooptation, fortifying Chicana/o students against the materialist allure of U.S. capitalist culture.

Hence, Gonzales identified for his ASU listeners the key political task at hand: "We have to do what we are talking about: make men and women whole again."[189] A renewed sense of "wholeness" entailed for Gonzales traveling that "long road back to yourself when the society has made you into someone else."[190] Chicana/os will "come back home, to La Raza, to [their] heart," insisted Gonzales, only "if we build centers of nationalism" that could challenge and offset the processes of de-education so integral to the U.S. schooling system.[191] Aztlán pulsated deep in the heart of every modern-day Chicana/o, and yet too many routinely failed to hear and recognize its rhythms. The independent community-run school, La Escuela y Colegio Tlatelolco, founded in October 1970 by Gonzales and the Crusade for Justice, represented a prime example of the Chicano Movement's attempt to build educational "centers of nationalism" that would cultivate Chicano counterculture. Characterized in a 1973 brochure as "a Chicano creation to preserve and augment La Raza de Bronce and our home, Aztlán," La Escuela y Colegio Tlatelolco centered its curriculum, from primary and secondary schooling through college, on "Chicano ideas, culture, values, experience, feelings, and knowledge . . . to develop and offer alternative models for Chicano education and educators."[192] In Gonzales's opinion, alternative Chicano-controlled schools signaled perhaps the best avenue through which to guarantee an autonomous and committed leadership for the Movement "untainted" by the ideological and institutional machinations of the K-12 and university "cookie-making-machines."[193]

Yet, by the mid-1970s (if not earlier), many Movimiento radicals realized that while alternative education presented a desirable course of action, independent institutions faced many of the very same obstacles and difficulties that were undermining the goals of Chicano Studies academic units within mainstream universities and colleges. Writing in 1974 on the status of Chicano Studies, Juan Gómez-Quiñones acknowledged that alternative schools "are not a panacea. They are hampered by societal and institutional constraints concerning accreditation, funding, and sufficient human resources. They may be free of university politics, but they face the more intense politics of the local area."[194] For Gómez-Quiñones, the problems endangering the goals of Chicano Studies ultimately were not "strikingly different" from those confronting alternative forms of education, but rather "generally the same."[195]

Furthermore, the rising numbers of Chicana/o college students and the range of educational shortcomings and problems that demanded redress remained more than alternative academic institutions could realistically tackle, especially given the practical limitations under which they operated. Just such a conclusion was drawn by Eliezer Risco, onetime editor of the popular Los Angeles Movement newspaper *La Raza*, director of Ethnic Studies at Fresno

State College, and cofounder and director of La Universidad de Aztlán, an autonomous Chicano university in Fresno, California. In his contribution to *Parameters of Institutional Change*, Risco admits:

> Although we might develop ten to twenty Chicano colleges, we're never going to be able to take in all the Chicanos going to college. For years to come, most of the Chicanos going to college will go to college to an established institution. Within those institutions we need to have some kind of basis for support—self identification—and basis for students to work from in dealing with the institutions. That's what Chicano Studies provides.[196]

While skeptical of Chicano Studies' original ambition to radicalize and transform the university, Risco nevertheless stresses the importance of Chicano academic units to the fostering of a much needed "basis of support" that would allow Mexican-American undergraduates to attain "self identification" and to navigate the treacherous institutional minefield of U.S. higher education.

"Who controls the finance and who controls the politics?" asked Gonzales of his audience at ASU. He added, "You know who controls the politics. You know who runs the administration at any school. That is why, when you come to the college, you have to organize a community here."[197] For Gonzales, Chicano Studies programs and departments, along with the Movement student organizations that arguably furnished their principal advocates, embodied Chicana/o "community" within the ivy walls of the American university. Moreover, as an act of "community" building on the campuses, Chicano Studies were charged with articulating and inculcating a political self-knowledge that recovered and made explicit Chicano counterculture. The fact that a large number of the new Chicana/o undergraduates carried the allegedly conformist middle-class ideas and attitudes of the "Mexican American Generation" only made the undertaking more urgent.

In order to survive, Mexican Americans during the 1940s and 1950s "withdrew and protected their families, and in some cases they put some of the young people in a cocoon," Gonzales lamented during his talk at ASU. "Their children later had to come to Chicano Studies in colleges to find out they were Chicanos."[198] At one and the same time, Gonzales acknowledges intracultural class differences and divisions when pointing to the university while smoothing over such gaps and breaks through an appeal to Chicano identity and culture. A similar elision of social class and structural imperatives under the sign of "culture" occurs in the discourse and priorities of el Movimiento's counterculture, especially as it settled within the institutional spaces of the university. Nonetheless, Gonzales's observation perhaps helps to explain the "curious" phenomenon noted by Chicano historian F. Arturo Rosales: although the term Chicano "has at times almost disappeared" as an identity moniker within Mexican-Ameri-

can communities across the United States, "it is as strong as ever at universities."[199] Indeed, in the decades following el Movimiento, the "long road back" for many Chicanas and Chicanos would necessarily travel through the offices, classrooms, libraries, and research institutes of Chicano Studies at mainstream U.S. colleges and universities. As tenuous and fraught as the relationship has proven over the years, the postwar university ultimately came to house versions of Gonzales's "centers of nationalism," where Mexican-American students arrived "to find out they were Chicanos." Today, when openly reactionary, xenophobic, and racist attacks prove ever more common, the survival of Chicano Studies and its core political and cultural mission would seem to call once again for a transformative and militant radical politics that can reimagine not only the hallowed halls of the American university, but also the deeply and extremely inequitable society beyond its ivory walls.

Notes

1. Rolando Hinojosa, "Literatura Chicana: Background and Present Status of a Bicultural Expression," in *The Identification and Analysis of Chicano Literature*, ed. Francisco Jiménez, (New York: Bilingual Press/Editorial Bilingüe, 1979), 45.
2. Ibid.
3. Juan Bruce-Novoa, *Chicano Authors: Inquiry by Interview* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1980), 55.
4. Adolph Reed, Jr., "Ethnic Studies and Pluralist Politics," in *Class Notes: Posing as Politics and Other Thoughts on the American Scene* (New York: New Press, 2000), 173, 174.
5. Jodi Melamed, *Represent and Destroy: Rationalizing Violence in the New Racial Capitalism*, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 2011), 94.
6. Melamed, *Represent and Destroy*, 95.
7. Ibid.
8. Roderick A. Ferguson, *The Reorder of Things: The University and Its Pedagogies of Minority Difference* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2012), 11.
9. For more discussion on the university and its historically active role in upholding the dominant cultural, economic, and political social order of the United States, see Christopher Newfield's *Ivy and Industry: Business and the Making of the American University, 1880–1980* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2003) and Henry A. Giroux's *The University in Chains: Confronting the Military-Industrial-Academic Complex* (London: Routledge, 2007).
10. Vijay Prashad. *Everybody was Kung Fu Fighting: Afro-Asian Connections and the Myth of Cultural Purity* (Boston: Beacon Press, 2001), 63.
11. Melamed, *Represent and Destroy*, 96.
12. Rosaura Sánchez, "Ethnicity, Ideology, and Academia," *Cultural Studies* 4.3 (1990): 300.
13. Ibid.
14. Ferguson, *The Reorder of Things*, 6.
15. Ferguson, *The Reorder of Things*, 8.
16. Ferguson, *The Reorder of Things*, 6, 8.
17. Ferguson, *The Reorder of Things*, 27–28.
18. As one finds generally among radical movements of the 1960s and 1970s, the political organizing and cultural imaginary of the Chicano Movement concurrently included an emancipatory program for collective liberation *and* an uneven but nonetheless widespread commitment to heteropatriarchal and sexist ideas and practices. The historical examples of Movement activism and ideology discussed in this essay evince these gendered contradictions. To reflect this problematic legacy, I employ the masculine ending, both in Spanish and in English, when referencing el Movimiento and its related contemporary formations. For more on Chicana feminist activism and struggle in and foundational contributions to el Movimiento, both inside and outside the university, see especially Maylei Blackwell's *¡Chicana Power!: Contested Histories of Feminism in the Chicano Movement* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2011), and the collection of essays edited by Dionne Espinoza, María Eugenia Cotera, and Maylei Blackwell, *Chicana Movidas: New Narratives of Activism and Feminism in the Movement Era* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2018).
19. I use the term "counterculture" to capture two important facets of the Chicano Movement. First, it denotes el Movimiento's clearly antihegemonic stance and contributions vis-à-vis

the dominant cultural, political, social, and economic apparatuses of the midcentury United States. Second, the term counterculture draws attention to the strong emphasis placed by large segments of the Chicano Movement on communal cultural identities, traditions, and practices, and on the recovery of alternative Indigenous value-systems, cosmologies, and worldviews. The term itself was occasionally used by Movement participants, as in Reynaldo Macias, Juan Gómez-Quiñones, and Raymond Castro's early essay on the founding of Chicano Studies: "It in effect affirms a counter culture that is authentically Chicano and universal." See Macias, Gómez-Quiñones, and Castro, "Objectives of Chicano Studies," in *Epoca: The National Concilio for Chicano Studies Journal* 1.2 (1971): 32.

20. Luis Valdez, "Introduction: 'La Plebe,'" in *Aztlán: An Anthology of Mexican American Literature*, eds. Luis Valdez and Stan Steiner (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1972), xiii–xiv.
21. Valdez, "Introduction: 'La Plebe,'" xxxiii, xxi.
22. Valdez, "Introduction: 'La Plebe,'" xx.
23. Valdez, "Introduction: 'La Plebe,'" xxxi.
24. Ibid.
25. Bruce-Novoa, *Chicano Authors*, 276 (emphasis in the original).
26. Ibid.
27. "El Plan Espiritual de Aztlán" (1969), in *Aztlán: An Anthology of Mexican American Literature*, eds. Luis Valdez and Stan Steiner, (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1972), 402–403.
28. Luis Leal, "In Search of Aztlán" (1981), in *Aztlán: Essays on the Chicano Homeland*, eds. Rudolfo A. Anaya and Francisco A. Lomelí (Albuquerque: Academia/El Norte Publications, 1989), 8.
29. Ibid (emphasis mine).
30. J. Jorge Klor de Alva, "California Chicano Literature and Pre-Columbian Motifs: Foil and Fetish," *Confluencia* 1 (Spring 1986): 25.
31. Rafael Pérez-Torres, *Movements in Chicano Poetry: Against Myths, against Margins* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 58.
32. Gustavo V. Segade, "Identity and Power: An Essay on the Politics of Culture and the Culture of Politics in Chicano Thought," *Aztlán: International Journal of Chicano Studies Research* 9 (Fall 1978): 88.
33. Valdez, "Introduction: 'La Plebe,'" xxxiv.
34. Bruce-Novoa, *Chicano Authors*, 276.
35. See Marcuse, *One-Dimensional Man: Studies in the Ideology of Advanced Industrial Society* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1964).
36. Sheila Marie Contreras, *Blood Lines: Myth, Indigenism, and Chicano Literature* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2008), 97.
37. Contreras, *Blood Lines*, 77.
38. Newfield, *Ivy and Industry*, 95.
39. Bill Readings, *The University in Ruins* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1996), 46.
40. Readings, *The University in Ruins*, 69.
41. Readings, *The University in Ruins*, 15.
42. Readings, *The University in Ruins*, 114.
43. Ferguson, *The Reorder of Things*, 13.
44. Ferguson, *The Reorder of Things*, 29.
45. Segade, "Identity and Power," 88.
46. Leal, "In Search of Aztlán," 11.
47. Alurista. "Poem in Lieu of Preface" (1970), in *Aztlán: An Anthology of Mexican American Literature*, eds. Luis Valdez and Stan Steiner (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1972), 333.
48. Quoted in Rees Lloyd and Peter Montague, "Ford and La Raza: 'They stole our land and gave us powdered milk," *Ramparts* 9.3 (1970a): 13.
49. Quoted in Lloyd and Montague, "Ford and La Raza," 11.
50. Alurista. "Poem in Lieu of Preface," 333.
51. Alurista. "Poem in Lieu of Preface," 332.
52. Terry Eagleton, *The Idea of Culture* (London: Blackwell, 2000), 1.
53. Mark McGurl, "Learning from *Little Tree*: The Political Education of the Counterculture," *Yale Journal of Criticism* 18.2 (2005): 245.
54. McGurl, "Learning from *Little Tree*," 256.
55. José Montoya, "From '67 to '71," in *In Formation: 20 Years of Joda* (Sacramento: Chusma House Publications, 1992a), 24.
56. Cordelia Candelaria, *Chicano Poetry: A Critical Introduction* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1986), 34–35.
57. Montoya, "From '67 to '71," 24.
58. Ibid.

59. José Montoya, "The Movement Has Gone for Its Ph.D. Over at the University, Or the Gang Wars Are Back," in *In Formation: 20 Years of Joda* (Sacramento: Chusma House Publications, 1992b), 95.
60. Ibid.
61. Ibid.
62. Ibid.
63. Montoya, "The Movement," 96.
64. Ibid.
65. Raymond V. Padilla, "Chicano Studies at the University of California, Berkeley: En busca del campus y la communidad," PhD diss. (University of California, Berkeley, 1974), 1.
66. Ibid.
67. Padilla, "Chicano Studies," 48.
68. Ibid.
69. Padilla, "Chicano Studies," 47–48.
70. Lisa Lowe, *Immigrant Acts: On Asian American Cultural Politics* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1996), 40–41.
71. Michael Soldatenko, "Radicalism in Higher Education: How Chicano Studies Joined the Curriculum," in *The Hidden Curriculum in Higher Education*, ed. Eric Margolis (New York: Routledge, 2001), 211.
72. Michael Soldatenko, *Chicano Studies: The Genesis of a Discipline* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2009), 8.
73. Soldatenko, "Radicalism in Higher Education," 209.
74. Quoted in Padilla, "Chicano Studies," 40. In discussing a similar effort to establish a Third World College at the University of California, San Diego, George Mariscal describes the Third World Liberation Front strike in the similar following terms: "On the UC Berkeley campus, the Third World Liberation Front strike was called on January 22, 1969, after negotiations with the administration for a Third World College and other reforms (including a Center for Mexican American Studies) broke down. Composed of the Mexican American Student Confederation, the African American Student Union, and the Asian American Political Alliance, as well as a White Student Strike Support Committee, the Berkeley coalition and its demands shared a number of characteristics with the UC San Diego effort. More specifically, both groups demanded fundamental changes in the governance practices of the university, changes that would challenge the elite composition of the academic hierarchy in terms of decision making, curriculum, faculty hiring, and student admissions." See Mariscal, *Brown-Eyed Children of the Sun: Lessons from the Chicano Movement, 1965–1975* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2005), 213.
75. Manuel I. López, "The Role of the Chicano Student in the Chicano Studies Program," *Epoca: The National Concilio for Chicano Studies Journal* 1.2 (1971): 14.
76. Ibid.
77. Mario. Barrera, "The Study of Politics and the Chicano," *Aztlán: Chicano Journal of the Social Sciences and Arts* 5.1–2 (1974): 23.
78. Johnnella E. Butler, "Introduction: Color-Line to Borderlands," in *Color-Line to Borderlands: The Matrix of American Ethnic Studies*, ed. Johnnella E. Butler (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2001a), xxi.
79. Johnnella E. Butler, "Ethnic Studies as a Matrix for the Humanities, the Social Sciences, and the Common Good," in *Color-Line to Borderlands: The Matrix of American Ethnic Studies*, ed. Johnnella E. Butler (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2001b), 23.
80. Butler, "Ethnic Studies as a Matrix," 26.
81. Butler, "Ethnic Studies as a Matrix," 32.
82. Juan Gómez-Quiñones, *Mexican Students Por La Raza: The Chicano Student Movement in Southern California 1967–1977* (Santa Barbara, CA: Editorial La Causa, 1978), 45.
83. Chicano Coordinating Council on Higher Education, *El Plan de Santa Bárbara: A Chicano Plan for Higher Education* (Oakland: La Causa Publications, 1969), 10.
84. For a discussion of Chicano cultural nationalism as pedagogy in the Chicano Movement, see Dionne Elaine Espinoza, "Pedagogies of Nationalism and Gender: Cultural Resistance in Selected Representational Practices of Chicana/o Movement Activists, 1967–1972," PhD diss. (Cornell University, 1996), 25–64.
85. Juan Gómez-Quiñones, *Chicano Politics: Reality and Promise, 1940–1990* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1990), 141–42.
86. As Lowe explains: "The liberal discourse on education has challenged this reformulation of a unified Western culture by advocating diversification of the humanities curriculum and urging an integration of the university through student and faculty affirmative action. Yet to the degree that liberal challenges have remained wedded to a culturalist program, however 'multiculturalist,' that still tends to isolate culture from material relations, they have yet to disrupt adequately the neoconservative management of the function of university education" (*Immigrant Acts*, 39).
87. Sánchez, "Ethnicity, Ideology, and Academia," 300.
88. Sánchez, "Ethnicity, Ideology, and Academia," 301.

89. Carlos Vásquez, "Education Under Capitalism—A Bibliography," in *Parameters of Institutional Change: Chicano Experiences in Education* (Hayward, CA: Southwest Network of the Study Commission on Undergraduate Education and the Education of Teachers, 1974), 179–80.
90. Jack Bass, *Widening the Mainstream of American Culture: A Ford Foundation Report on Ethnic Studies* (New York: Ford Foundation, 1978), 2.
91. Bass, *Widening the Mainstream*, 15.
92. Butler, "Ethnic Studies as a Matrix," 25.
93. Joan Roelofs, *Foundations and Public Policy: The Mask of Pluralism* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2003), 202.
94. Roelofs, *Foundations and Public Policy*, 44.
95. Ibid.
96. Roelofs, *Foundations and Public Policy*, 123.
97. M. A. Farber, "Ford Fund Capital to Back Ventures Aiding the Poor," *New York Times* 29 (September 1968): 1.
98. Ibid.
99. Farber, "Ford Fund Capital," 43.
100. Farber, "Ford Fund Capital," 43, 1.
101. Quoted in Lloyd and Montague, "Ford and La Raza," 15.
102. Ibid.
103. Quoted in Lloyd and Montague, "Ford and La Raza," 15 (emphasis mine).
104. Quoted in Lloyd and Montague, "Ford and La Raza," 16.
105. Quoted in Lloyd and Montague, "Ford and La Raza," 10–11.
106. Quoted in Lloyd and Montague, "Ford and La Raza," 15. Lloyd and Montague's article was published simultaneously in *El Grito Del Norte* on August 29, 1970, under the title "Ford's Pacification Program for La Raza: The Story of The Feedlot Scandal." In April 1970, *El Grito del Norte* also published a special joint issue with *El Papel* entirely devoted to detailing what it described in one article as the Ford Foundation's "process of creating 'leaders'—leaders manufactured by Ford and other foundations, or issued by the government, either through its OEO or CIA." The piece concludes with the powerful declaration: "The people will choose their own leaders. They will not have their leaders manufactured for them—not even by Ford." See "'Professionals,' 'Leaders,' 'Experts'—Chicano Titeres," *El Grito Del Norte y El Papel* (April 1970): 2, 7.
107. Bass, *Widening the Mainstream*, 2.
108. Bass, *Widening the Mainstream*, 33.
109. Ibid.
110. Soldatenko, *Chicano Studies*, 100. In *The Making of Chicana/o Studies: In the Trenches of Academe* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 2011), Rodolfo F. Acuña offers a similar and highly detailed accounting of this relationship. See especially chapter 7.
111. Quoted in Soldatenko, *Chicano Studies*, 64.
112. Quoted in Soldatenko, *Chicano Studies*, 63.
113. Soldatenko, *Chicano Studies*, 64.
114. Soldatenko, *Chicano Studies*, 100.
115. Abel Amaya, "On Chicanos in Higher Education," *La Luz* 3.3 (1974): 4.
116. Ibid.
117. Soldatenko, *Chicano Studies*, 100.
118. Sánchez, "Ethnicity, Ideology, and Academia," 298.
119. Refugio I. Rochin, "The Short and Turbulent Life of Chicano Studies: A Preliminary Study of Emerging Programs and Problems," *Social Science Quarterly* 53.4 (1973): 888, 887.
120. Rochin, "The Short and Turbulent Life," 886.
121. Ibid.
122. Chicano Coordinating Council on Higher Education, *El Plan de Santa Bárbara*, 77.
123. Chicano Coordinating Council on Higher Education, *El Plan de Santa Bárbara*, 78.
124. Macias, Gómez-Quiñones, and Castro, "Objectives of Chicano Studies," 32.
125. Quoted in Rochin, "The Short and Turbulent Life," 886.
126. Soldatenko, *Chicano Studies*, 31. Soldatenko views this ambivalence regarding the university as one of various political and ideological tendencies among Chicana/o academics and students during the late 1960s and 1970s. He specifically attributes the position to advocates and supporters of *El Plan de Santa Bárbara*, whom he associates with institutionalized forms of Chicano Studies.
127. Russell Jacoby, *The Last Intellectuals: American Culture in the Age of Academe* (New York: Basic Books, [1987] 2000), 132.
128. "The Port Huron Statement" (1962), in *"Takin' It To The Streets": A Sixties Reader*, eds. Alexander Bloom and Wini Breines (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995), 70, 72, 73.
129. "The Port Huron Statement," 73, 72.
130. "The Port Huron Statement," 70, 73.
131. "The Port Huron Statement," 72.

132. "Making values explicit—an initial task in establishing alternatives—is an activity that has been devalued and corrupted," insist the authors of "The Port Huron Statement" (64). The stress on a new set of values, on the need for a new and alternative value system, is felt throughout the manifesto; moreover, the important role the university *might* play in articulating and fostering such values is also frequently underscored.
133. Padilla, "Chicano Studies," 153.
134. Padilla, "Chicano Studies," 154.
135. Mark McGurl, *The Program Era: Postwar Fiction and the Rise of Creative Writing* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2009), 348.
136. McGurl, "Learning from *Little Tree*," 258 (italics in original).
137. McGurl, *The Program Era*, 246.
138. In his 1984 assessment of the origins and development of Chicano Studies, Carlos Muñoz, Jr., deliberately employs Gramscian language to characterize the early objectives of Chicana/o academics: "What was being called for, although not articulated as such, was the development of organic intellectuals of Mexican descent within the university, i.e. the kind of academic who would be an integral part of his community and actively participate in the Chicano Movement, do research critical of society, and simultaneously contribute to the shaping of a Chicano consciousness." See Muñoz, "The Development of Chicano Studies, 1968–1981," in *Chicano Studies: A Multidisciplinary Approach*, eds. Eugene E. García, Francisco A. Lomelí, and Isidro D. Ortiz (New York: Teachers College Press, 1984), 24.
139. Newfield, *Ivy and Industry*, 5.
140. Muñoz, "The Development of Chicano Studies," 13.
141. Ibid (emphasis mine).
142. Chicano Coordinating Council on Higher Education, *El Plan de Santa Bárbara*, 19.
143. Rudolfo A. Anaya, "At a Crossroads," in *The Anaya Reader*, introduction by César T. González (New York: Warner Books, 1995), 340.
144. Anaya, "At a Crossroads," 336.
145. Anaya, "At a Crossroads," 335.
146. Anaya's early judgment of the Movement appears anchored to a viewpoint almost exclusively informed by the actions and campaigns of Chicana/o students on university and college campuses. As Anaya tells Ishmael Reed during an interview on July 1, 1976: "I've been involved in the Chicano Movement since the '60s, primarily in education. . . . the Movement is a social and political and aesthetic movement, you know, called the Chicano Movimiento. And at its core it has a kind of consciousness-raising effect. When the Mexican-American or the Chicano looks around him and raises all the questions you're raising, you know. Who controls the land, who controls the wealth, who controls the schools? . . . And what do I do about it? What is my image in this world? Then you begin to have the Chicano's aggressive movement towards the society that he found himself in, that was not reflecting, say, his image, so I've worked with that in the realm of education since that's where I've been all, most of, my life, I guess." See Anaya, "An Interview with Rudolfo Anaya," interview by Ishmael Reed, in *Conversations with Rudolfo Anaya*, eds. Bruce Dick and Silvio Sirias (Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 1998), 4.
147. Alurista, "Chicano Studies: A Future," in TS. Alurista Papers, Donald C. Davidson Library, University of California, Santa Barbara (n.d.), 1.
148. Alurista, "Chicano Studies: A Future," 5.
149. Alurista, "Chicano Studies: A Future," 2.
150. Alurista, "Chicano Studies: A Future," 3.
151. Soldatenko, *Chicano Studies*, 73.
152. Alurista, "Chicano Studies: A Future," 2.
153. Alurista, "Chicano Studies: A Future," 4.
154. Alurista, "Chicano Studies: A Future," 1.
155. Alurista, "Chicano Studies: A Future," 2–3.
156. Rodolfo Gonzales, "Arizona State University Speech," in *Message to Aztlán: Selected Writings of Rodolfo 'Corky' Gonzalez*, ed. Antonio Esquibel (Houston: Arte Público Press, 2001a), 38.
157. Ibid.
158. Gonzales, "Arizona State University Speech," 52.
159. Gonzales, "Arizona State University Speech," 38.
160. Gonzales, "Arizona State University Speech," 36.
161. "The Port Huron Statement," 70.
162. Ibid.
163. Ibid.
164. Mark Rudd, "Events and Issues of the Columbia Revolt," in *The University and Revolution*, eds. Gary R. Weaver and James H. Weaver (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1969), 138.
165. Gary R. Weaver, "Introduction," in *The University and Revolution*, eds. Gary R. Weaver and James H. Weaver (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1969), 2.
166. Gonzales, "Arizona State University Speech," 42–43.

167. Gonzales, "Arizona State University Speech," 40.
168. Quoted in Stan Steiner, *La Raza: The Mexican Americans* (New York: Harper & Row, 1969), 212–13.
169. Padilla, "Chicano Studies," 46–47.
170. López, "The Role of the Chicano Student," 13.
171. Quoted in Steiner, *La Raza*, 210.
172. López, "The Role of the Chicano Student," 13.
173. Alfredo Sanchez, "Chicano Student Movement at San Jose," in *Parameters of Institutional Change: Chicano Experiences in Education* (Hayward, CA: Southwest Network of the Study Commission on Undergraduate Education and the Education of Teachers, 1974), 32.
174. Sanchez, "Chicano Student Movement at San Jose," 22.
175. Quoted in Steiner, *La Raza*, 236.
176. Gonzales, "Arizona State University Speech," 38.
177. Ibid.
178. Steiner, *La Raza*, 212.
179. Steiner, *La Raza*, 213.
180. Steiner, *La Raza*, 211.
181. Steiner, *La Raza*, 212.
182. For more on the U.S. education system with respect to Chicanas and Chicanos, see Gilbert G. Gonzalez, *Chicano Education in the Era of Segregation* (Philadelphia: Balch Institute Press, 1990.); Rubén Donato, *The Other Struggle for Equal Schools: Mexican Americans during the Civil Rights Era* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1997); and José F. Moreno, editor, *The Elusive Quest for Equality: 150 Years of Chicano/Chicana Education* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard Educational Review, 1999).
183. Gonzales, "Arizona State University Speech," 35.
184. Ibid.
185. Ibid.
186. Gonzales, "Arizona State University Speech," 36.
187. Chicano Coordinating Council on Higher Education, *El Plan de Santa Bárbara*, 44.
188. Chicano Coordinating Council on Higher Education, *El Plan de Santa Bárbara*, 43.
189. Gonzales, "Arizona State University Speech," 46.
190. Quoted in Steiner, *La Raza*, 379.
191. Quoted in Steiner, *La Raza*, 385.
192. Rodolfo Gonzales, "La Escuela y Colegio Tlatelolco," in *Message to Aztlán: Selected Writings of Rodolfo 'Corky' Gonzalez*, ed. Antonio Esquibel (Houston: Arte Público Press, 2001b), 172.
193. Gonzales, "Arizona State University Speech," 42. Additional examples of alternative Chicano colleges are Colegio Jacinto Treviño in Mercedes, Texas; Colegio César Chávez in Mount Angel, Oregon; La Universidad de Aztlán in Fresno, California; Deganawidah-Quetzalcoatl University in Davis, California; and La Academia de la Nueva Raza in Dixon, New Mexico. See Juan Gómez-Quiñones, "To Leave to Hope or Chance: Propositions on Chicano Studies, 1974," in *Parameters of Institutional Change: Chicano Experiences in Education* (Hayward, CA: Southwest Network of the Study Commission on Undergraduate Education and the Education of Teachers, 1974), 162.
194. Gómez-Quiñones, "To Leave to Hope or Chance," 162–63.
195. Gómez-Quiñones, "To Leave to Hope or Chance," 163.
196. Eliezer Risco, "Before Universidad de Aztlán: Ethnic Studies at Fresno State College," in *Parameters of Institutional Change: Chicano Experiences in Education* (Hayward, CA: Southwest Network of the Study Commission on Undergraduate Education and the Education of Teachers, 1974), 47.
197. Gonzales, "Arizona State University Speech," 43.
198. Gonzales, "Arizona State University Speech," 45.
199. F. Arturo Rosales, *Chicano!: The History of the Mexican American Civil Rights Movement* (Houston: Arte Público Press, 1997), 183.