



**ROSA
LUXEMBURG
STIFTUNG**
NEW YORK OFFICE

THE CHICANO MOVEMENT

Mexican American History and the Struggle for Equality

By Carlos Muñoz, Jr.

Table of Contents

Fighting for Equality. By the Editors..... 1

The Chicano Movement

Mexican American History and the Struggle for Equality..... 2

By Carlos Muñoz, Jr.

Early Anti-Mexican Racism..... 2
Americanization, Segregation, and the Fight for Equal Education..... 4
McCarthyism and the Suppression of Mexican American Radicalism..... 5
The Emergence of a Chicano Movement..... 7
The Birth of “Brown Power” 9
El Plan de Aztlán..... 11
Brown Berets and the Chicano Left..... 13
Chicano Arts Movement and Chicano Studies..... 15
The Struggle for Immigrant Rights in Recent Years..... 16
Prospects for a Chicano Movement Resurgence..... 19

Works Consulted and Recommended Reading..... 19

Published by the Rosa Luxemburg Stiftung, New York Office, April 2013

Editors: Stefanie Ehmsen and Albert Scharenberg
Address: 275 Madison Avenue, Suite 2114, New York, NY 10016
Email: info@rosalux-nyc.org; **Phone:** +1 (917) 409-1040

The Rosa Luxemburg Foundation is an internationally operating, progressive non-profit institution for civic education. In cooperation with many organizations around the globe, it works on democratic and social participation, empowerment of disadvantaged groups, alternatives for economic, and social development, and peaceful conflict resolution.

The New York Office serves two major tasks: to work around issues concerning the United Nations and to engage in dialogue with North American progressives in universities, unions, social movements and politics.

www.rosalux-nyc.org

Fighting for Equality

The United States currently has more than fifty million Latinos living within its borders, including an estimated eleven million who lack proper documentation. In recent years, this freshly minted “largest minority” has increasingly entered the national spotlight. Unfortunately, this has largely been due to a notable rise in state oppression. Arizona, Alabama, and other states have passed draconian immigration laws that target Latinos and trample on civil liberties and human rights. On the federal level, President Obama set deportation records in four consecutive years, expelling a total of 1.5 million women and men during his first term.

Despite this sorry record, Obama received an unprecedented 75% of the Latino vote in the 2012 presidential election. This was largely viewed as a vote against the Republicans, whose presidential candidate advocated “self-deportation,” while less cautious party members were far more overt in their racist declamations. Chastened by their defeat, Republican strategists now believe the party must appeal to Latinos to remain competitive, and demands for immigration reform have suddenly entered mainstream, national political discussion.

The distortions of the 24-hour news cycle and selective teachings of U.S. history have deprived most people of the framework to understand these events as part of a much longer struggle. To this day, centuries of injustice against Latinos have never been treated as a core constitutional or ethical issue in the United States. Similarly, courageous struggles by Latinos against this oppression have been largely left out of the history books and the news media.

The author of this study, Dr. Carlos Muñoz, Jr., knows these struggles as well as anybody. He is co-founder of the nation’s first Chicano Studies Department and of the National Association of Chicana & Chicano Studies. He is Professor Emeritus in the Department of Ethnic Studies at the University of California, Berkeley as well as a longtime activist who acted as a key figure in the Chicano Movement of the 1960s. His account of this period, *Youth, Identity, Power: The Chicano Movement*, is one of the seminal works of Mexican American history.

In this study, Muñoz recounts the history of the Mexican American struggle, from the 19th century conquest of the American Southwest to the 1960s, when the Chicano Movement came into its own, and ultimately to the movement’s decline and the present state of Latino battles for equality. Reading this study today, at a moment when the need for visionary political action is so clear, Muñoz’ account of the last major wave of Latino activism is of great importance. What can Latino and immigrant rights supporters learn from past successes and failures? How can we organize to win the battles at hand while cultivating visions for a more truly egalitarian society tomorrow?

Stefanie Ehmsen and Albert Scharenberg
Co-Directors of New York Office, April 2013

The Chicano Movement

Mexican American History and the Struggle for Equality

By Carlos Muñoz, Jr.

The Mexican American Civil Rights Movement, which later came to be known as the Chicano Movement, was a product of the politics of the 1960s, but to be fully understood it must be placed in a broader historical context. Mexicans became an oppressed racial group in the United States as a consequence of the expansion of the American Empire in the 19th century, and that fact has had a profound impact on their place in the class structure and their political and intellectual development ever since. As a conquered people, beginning with the Texas-Mexico War of 1836 and the U.S.-Mexico War of 1846-48, they have never been considered a moral or constitutional issue by U.S. society. This legacy remains visible in the present day, most recently manifesting itself through a series of anti-immigration laws accompanied by racist rhetoric by major politicians and news outlets. To understand the contours of contemporary Latino struggles—and to better assess opportunities and challenges for civil

rights movement building in the 21st century—it is vital to revisit the history of the Mexican American and Chicano Movements with a critical eye.

The Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, signed after the defeat of Mexico by the United States in 1848, granted Mexicans remaining in the newly acquired U.S. territories certain rights pertaining to property, religion, culture, and education—rights that were never honored or enforced by the U.S. government. Like the treaties that the U.S. government signed with the indigenous nations after the American Indian Wars, it became another broken treaty. As had been the case with Native Americans, Mexicans underwent a process of internal colonization that led to the undermining of their cultural identity and loss of their land. Racial, class, and gender oppression became the reality and the vast majority were relegated to the ranks of cheap labor.

Early Anti-Mexican Racism

Around the turn of the 20th century, the Mexican American population increased dramatically. The government did not then accurately report data on Mexican immigration, but reliable estimates by historians and social scientists have put the number at 24,000 between 1900 and 1909 and at more than 82,000 during the 1910-14 period of the Mexican Revolution. The

revolution was not the only stimulus to emigration, however, since many thousands continued to leave the country after its conclusion.

Rather, the crucial factor in Mexican emigration was capital's demand for cheap labor in the American Midwest and Southwest. World War I caused significant shortages of white labor, and

Mexicans and Mexican Americans were needed in the expansion and development of the steel industry in Chicago and Pittsburgh, and in agriculture and the southwestern economy in general. In addition to shortages of white labor, the passage of legislation excluding Asian immigration had eliminated Asian workers from this cheap labor pool.

According to the U.S. Census, by 1930 the Mexican population had reached 1,225,207, or around one percent of the population. When the country spiraled into economic crisis during the Great Depression of the 1930s, Mexican workers were perceived as taking jobs from American workers. Immigration policy became a central political issue in the U.S. Congress. Debates took place pitting those concerned with keeping America “racially pure” (while protecting white American workers from foreign competition) against those who argued that cheap Mexican labor was essential to the expansion of capital in the Southwest. The former were in favor of restricting immigration from Mexico through extension of the same legislation that had excluded Asians prior to the 1920s. Like Asians, Mexicans were perceived as a peril and threat to the social and cultural fabric of American society. Right-wing racists generated fears that the U.S. was being invaded by hordes of non-white peons from around the Western Hemisphere. Vulgar racist hostility against Mexicans was a staple of newspapers, magazines, and scholarly journals, especially between 1926 and 1930, when House and Senate committees on Mexican immigration conducted public hearings. Those in favor of restricting immigration represented various patriotic societies, eugenicist organizations, and a significant sector of organized labor. Patriots and eugenicists argued that “Mexicans would create the most insidious and general mixture of white, Indian, and Negro blood strains ever produced in America” and that most of them were “hordes of hungry dogs, and filthy children with faces plastered with flies [...] human filth” who were “promiscu-

ous [...] apathetic peons and lazy squaws [who] prowl by night [...] stealing anything they can get their hands on.”

Mexican immigrants were also characterized as Indian peons “without the trace of Caucasian blood;” “ignorant, tractable, moderately industrious, and content to endure wretched conditions of life which most white laborers would not tolerate.” They were also described as an “inherently criminal” race of “low mentality” that would “afflict American society with an embarrassing race problem.” Others compared Mexicans to Blacks in the South, often using equally negative terms. One eugenicist, for example, argued that because Mexicans were “eugenically as low-powered as the Negro,” as well as being “superstitious” savages who did not understand “health rules,” they suffered from widespread venereal diseases and constituted a public health menace. The politicians who supported the restriction of Mexican immigration also based their arguments on vicious racist stereotypes. Senators Hiram Johnson of California and Thomas Heflin of Alabama, for example, argued that Mexicans were a danger to American society because they were a “mixed breed,” “low type,” and “docile” people.

Rather than defend fellow workers, labor unions supported restriction of immigration because they believed that Mexicans took jobs away from white workers. Anticommunist politicians and organizations categorized Mexican immigrants as part of the so-called Red Menace. The U.S. Bureau of Immigration conducted intensive deportation hunts for “aliens” and “subversives” who, it asserted, were holding jobs that should rightfully belong to Americans. Although ostensibly aimed at “Reds,” the main victims of this campaign were actually Mexicans, since deportation efforts were focused on Southern California—the area with the densest Mexican population in the United States. Local politicians advocated large-scale deportations of Mexicans on the grounds that they were

“criminally undesirable” and part of the “Red problem.”

The politics of anti-Mexican racism resulted in the mass deportation of Mexican workers and their families. Both the U.S. and Mexican

governments disguised the deportations as a “repatriation” program. Data varies regarding the number of Mexican immigrants deported between 1929 and 1939, ranging from 500,000 to two million people and including many U.S. citizens.

Americanization, Segregation, and the Fight for Equal Education

The children of Mexican immigrant workers attended segregated public schools along with their Mexican American cousins, and both groups underwent a profound process of “Americanization” and indoctrination into the “American way of life.” They learned the values, beliefs, and ideas of the colonizer. The contradictions between what they were taught in school about American democracy and the realities of their people’s racial and class oppression were not apparent to most of them. Schools served as agents of cultural imperialism and the colonization process by contributing to the erosion of Mexican culture through the assimilation of immigrants and Mexican American youth. They were taught that Mexican culture was inferior, and those who did not assimilate into the colonizer’s culture were often placed in classes for students with developmental and learning disabilities. Most were encouraged to drop out at an early age and subsequently became part of the cheap labor force. Mexican youth were thus assured of walking the same path as their parents in the ranks of the unemployed and underemployed proletariat. Access to white colleges and universities was generally restricted to children of a very small Mexican American middle class, largely in Texas and New Mexico.

As issues surrounding the “Mexican problem” became more pronounced in U.S. politics, those entrusted with the Americanization of Mexican immigrants began to take their jobs

more seriously, especially those who had the responsibility of educating children in segregated Mexican schools. White administrators and teachers gave Mexican and Mexican American youth a much heavier dose of Americanism. In addition to teaching the “virtues of American democracy,” they also taught that Mexican culture was a major factor in the “backwardness” of Mexican Americans. Both racists and liberals adhered to the view that the problems of Mexican and Mexican American children were rooted in the cultural traditions of a society that was semi- if not altogether feudal, and suffered from the absence of the “progressive” values inherent in the U.S. capitalist system.

The response by Mexican Americans was to challenge segregation in the courts. It was arguably the first time in U.S. history that any racial or ethnic group had taken a legal approach in struggles for educational equality. In Texas and California, Mexican Americans were involved in numerous desegregation court battles. The first was “Jesus Salvatierra v. Independent School District” in Del Rio, Texas, in 1930. The town’s school board was sued on the grounds that Mexican American students were being deprived of the resources given to white students. Attorneys from the League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC), a civil rights organization founded the year before, played a prominent role in the case. The district judge issued a ruling in favor of Salvatierra, but the state’s

higher courts later overturned it on appeal from white opposition.

A year later, in San Diego, California, “Roberto Alvarez v. the Board of Trustees of the Lemon Grove School District” took place. Mexican Americans sued the school district when the principal of the local elementary school prevented 75 Mexican American children from enrolling in an all-white school. The court ruled in favor of Mr. Alvarez and, in contrast to the Texas case, the ruling was not challenged in the state’s higher courts, and the children were admitted into the white school. But the Lemon Grove case did not result in the termination of segregation elsewhere in California.

Other school boards throughout the state continued to implement existing segregation policies until 1946, when the “Mendez v. Westminster” case took place. Prior to this case, the city of Westminster in Orange County, California, had separate public schools, movie theaters, public pools, and restaurants for whites and Mexicans. The parents of eight-year-old Sylvia Mendez sued the school district when she and her brothers were denied enrollment at the 17th Street School in Westminster because of their dark skin and Spanish surname. They won their lawsuit. In contrast to the Alvarez case, the Mendez case did contribute directly to ending segregation throughout the state. It led to the passage of legislation, signed by Governor Earl Warren, prohibiting segregation in California.

Although Mexican Americans were victims of racial oppression, the desegregation cases fought by Mexican Americans were typically based on national origins and language, as opposed to race. This legal tactic contributed to the misperception of Mexican Americans as a white ethnic group. Nevertheless, the “Mendez v. Westminster” case set an important legal precedent for ending racial segregation throughout the United States. Eight years later, in 1954, Thurgood Marshall, who had filed an amicus brief on behalf of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, used the legal arguments from the Mendez case to win the historic “Brown v. Board of Education” desegregation case in the U.S. Supreme Court.

The desegregation of the Mexican schools, however, did not result in the decolonization of the educational system in the Southwestern United States. Integrated public schools continued to perpetuate the values of colonizers, stereotyping Mexican Americans as a racially and culturally inferior people. The school curricula did not include Mexican history. They also excluded courses about the contributions of Mexican Americans to U.S. history, particularly their participation in the labor movement, as well as their heroic efforts as soldiers in World War I and World War II. Nor did curricula include any information about the long history of struggles for social justice and civil rights that Mexican Americans had waged since becoming U.S. citizens after the 1848 war.

McCarthyism and the Suppression of Mexican American Radicalism

By 1950 the Mexican and Mexican American population in the United States had increased significantly, most notably in California, where

it had doubled since 1930. World War II had led to an influx of Mexican and Mexican American labor from rural areas to the urban centers of

the South and Midwest. The economic prosperity generated by the war had made possible some upward social mobility for a small sector of the Mexican American working class. But most Mexican Americans remained rooted in the semi-skilled and unskilled proletariat. Although many of the wartime employment gains they had made in industry had been lost by the end of the 1940s, Mexican American workers continued to make some progress through their participation in leftist trade union activity and labor strikes throughout the Southwest.

Mexican American women played important roles in labor struggles during this period. The best-known example is Emma Tenayuca, a member of the Communist Party, who in 1938 organized a dramatic strike of pecan shellers in San Antonio, Texas. Another example was the 1950 miners' strike in Silver City, New Mexico, which lasted almost two years. When the miners were prohibited from picketing, their wives took over the picket lines and succeeded in keeping the strike alive. The police attempted to break the picket by arresting its leaders, beating up several strikers in the process, but the protestors stood their ground. The men reluctantly tended to the housework while the women continued to maintain the lines. The movie "Salt of the Earth" captured the drama of the strike and also underscored the issues of gender roles in the family. The filmmakers who made it became part of the "Hollywood Ten," a group of directors and scriptwriters who were later blacklisted as communists.

The politics of the 1950s were not conducive to radicalism anywhere, especially to participation in social struggles that could be easily characterized as inspired by communism. Like other young people of their generation, Mexican Americans were influenced by the politics of super-patriotism emerging from the war against Hitler and fascism and reinforced by the Cold War against Stalin and communism. The decade

witnessed the rise of right-wing ideologues like Senator Joseph McCarthy of Wisconsin, who spearheaded an anticommunist crusade across the nation, and the passage of right-wing federal legislation like the McCarran-Walter Act, which resulted in the deportation of Mexican labor activists considered subversive to U.S. national interests.

New Mexican American middle-class community and political organizations emerged during this period. WWII and Korean War veterans who had gotten college educations through the G.I. Bill played key leadership roles. Those who became teachers, for example, founded the Association of Mexican American Educators (AMAE). Those who became social workers contributed to the founding of the Community Service Organization (CSO), a group inspired by the teachings of radical Jewish grassroots organizer Saul Alinsky. Other groups became active in community and electoral politics. Examples include the American G.I. Forum, which fought for the rights of veterans denied benefits, and the Mexican American Political Association (MAPA). Collectively, these groups came to represent a new professional sector of an emerging Mexican American middle class committed to a reformist politics of accommodation and assimilation within the two-party political system. Indeed, with rare exceptions, leaders of these types of organizations were ultimately committed to supporting the Democratic Party.

The majority of these groups promoted the image of Mexican Americans as a white ethnic group with little in common with African Americans. Some ignored their nonwhite indigenous roots for fear of being categorized as "people of color" and suffering the same discrimination as African Americans. Most believed that by minimizing the existence of racism toward their people, they could deflect anti-Mexican sentiment in society. Others rejected their nonwhite origins altogether and promoted

a “Spanish” or “Latin American” identity. As products of a racist society, others simply held anti-Black attitudes. Mass protest, confrontation, radicalism, and coalition politics with other people of color were therefore reject-

ed as alternatives in the pursuit of civil rights and equal opportunity in jobs and education. Few dared to speak out against the social injustices confronting Mexican Americans during the 1950s.

The Emergence of a Chicano Movement

By 1960, the Mexican American population had reached six percent of the total U.S. population of 180 million. But Mexican Americans still remained largely invisible to society at large. The middle-class political leadership from the generation of the 1950s became part of the presidential campaign of John F. Kennedy, helping deliver valuable Mexican American votes that contributed to Kennedy’s election. They became disillusioned, however, when they were ignored afterwards. No Mexican American received an appointment to serve in the Kennedy Administration, and problems facing Mexican Americans were not acknowledged. The Democratic Party was criticized for once again taking the Mexican American vote for granted.

The 1960s produced a young generation of working-class activists that departed from the politics of accommodation and assimilation. They were part of the growing numbers of Mexican American students on college campuses. Many were inspired by Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. to participate in mass protest activities and organizations of the civil rights movement of the South. Some became active as members of the movement’s Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC). For example, Maria Varela became a key SNCC organizer in Alabama, where she established an adult literacy project. She was from New Mexico and before joining SNCC had been a cofounder of Students for a Democratic Society at the University of Michigan. Elizabeth “Betita” Sutherland Martinez be-

came the director of the New York City SNCC office in 1964 and later spent time in Mississippi. Others participated in the 1963 March on Washington organized by Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. and the Southern Christian Leadership Conference.

Mexican American student activists were also exposed to more radical politics during the early 1960s as left political organizations resurfaced from the underground, where they had been driven during the McCarthy era. Communist and socialist youth groups became visible on college campuses, as did New Left groups like the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS). Some Mexican Americans joined the Communist Party or the Socialist Workers Party. Campus protests against the Vietnam War were also becoming visible, as manifested in the teach-ins organized by white liberal and leftist faculty and students. These antiwar protests caught the attention of Mexican American Vietnam War veterans attending college on the G.I. Bill, and many became active in the antiwar movement.

Other sources of inspiration were the anti-imperialist and decolonizing socialist revolutions in the so-called Third World against the U.S. and European capitalist nations that had controlled their economy and governments. In particular, these were inspired by the 1959 Cuban Revolution. For example, Luis Valdez and Roberto Rubalcava, student activists at San Jose State Col-

lege in California, joined the Marxist Progressive Labor Party (PL). They traveled to Cuba in 1964 as part of a PL delegation, and their firsthand observation of the Cuban Revolution inspired them to produce the first Mexican American radical manifesto. The manifesto read, in part:

The Mexican in the United States has been [...] no less a victim of American imperialism than his impoverished brothers in Latin America. In the words of the Second Declaration of Havana, tell him of "misery, feudal exploitation, illiteracy, starvation wages," and he will tell you that you speak of Texas; tell him of "unemployment, the policy of repression against the workers, discrimination [...] oppression by the oligarchies," and he will tell you that you speak of California; tell him of U.S. domination in Latin America, and he will tell you that he knows that Shark and what he devours, because he has lived in its very entrails. The history of the American Southwest provides a brutal panorama of nascent imperialism.

The manifesto represented a radical departure from the political thought of the Mexican American middle class and a harsh critique of its political leadership:

Spanish-speaking leaders are not leaders at all; Americanized beyond recall, they neither understand nor care about the basic Mexican-American population, which has an identity of its own. As sons of Mexican manual laborers in California, we have traveled to Revolutionary Cuba [...] to emphasize the historical and cultural unanimity of all Latin American peoples, north and south of the border. Having no leaders of our own, we accept Fidel Castro.

The dramatic emergence of the farm worker movement in California in 1965, led by Mexican Americans César Chávez and Dolores Huerta, provided inspiration to Mexican American youth. Valdez was one of those who became inspired and joined the United Farmworkers of America (UFW). He wrote the "Plan of Delano," which defined the farm worker movement as a nonviolent revolution for social justice led by the "sons of the Mexican Revolu-

tion." The document ended with the following statement:

The strength of the poor is also in union. We know that the poverty of the Mexican or Filipino worker in California is the same as that of all farm workers across the country, the Negroes and poor whites, the Puerto Ricans, Japanese, and Arabians; in short, all the races that comprise the oppressed minorities of the United States. We want to be equal with all the working men in the nation [...] to those who oppose us be they ranchers, police, politicians, or speculators, we say that we are going to continue fighting until we die, or we win. WE SHALL OVERCOME.

The "Plan of Delano" was not only a call for non-violent revolution; it was also the first concrete call for political coalitions among poor people of color in the United States. It underscored the reality that the farm worker movement was not just about Mexican American rank and file, although they were the majority, but also included Puerto Ricans, Asians, Arabs, African Americans and poor whites. Two vice presidents of the UFW, Larry Itliong and Andy Imutan, were Filipinos.

In addition to the farm worker movement, another source of inspiration was the land grant struggle in New Mexico, which was led by Reies López Tijerina and aimed to recapture lands stolen by white colonizers after the Mexico-U.S. War. Tijerina founded the *Alianza Federal de Mercedes* as the organizational vehicle of that struggle. On June 5, 1967, a group of armed men from the Alianza took over a county courthouse, taking twenty hostages who they held for about an hour before releasing. A jailer and a state police officer were wounded. Later, Tijerina's men fled into the mountains. The National Guard was mobilized and carried out a massive manhunt, complete with tanks. Subsequently, forty Alianza members were wrongly arrested for what had been the first militant armed action taken by Mexican Americans anywhere in the Southwest for over a hundred years.

The Birth of “Brown Power”

By 1968, numerous student organizations had been formed throughout the Southwest. The United Mexican American Students (UMAS) was the largest, and it played a significant role in organizing high school student protests against racism in the largely segregated schools of East Los Angeles. These protests, which came to be known as “Walkouts” or “Blowouts,” took place in the first week of March. Picket signs protested racist school policies and teachers and called for freedom of speech, the hiring of Mexican American teachers and administrators, and classes on Mexican American history and culture. Signs catching the attention of mass media, police, and the FBI included “Chicano Power,” “Viva La Raza,” and “Viva La Revolución!” These student walkouts brought the Los Angeles city school system, the largest in the nation, to a standstill and made news across the country; a *Los Angeles Times* reporter interpreted the strike as “The Birth of Brown Power.” Ultimately, over ten thousand students participated during the week and a half of walkouts.

Although not one of its original objectives, the student walkouts constituted the first mass protest explicitly against racism undertaken by Mexican Americans in the history of the United States, and it largely ignited the emergence of the Chicano Movement. The protests had a profound impact on the Mexican American community in Los Angeles and in other parts of the country, generating increased political awareness along with visible efforts to mobilize communities. This was manifested in the revitalization of existing community political organizations and the emergence of new ones, with youth playing significant leadership roles. Overnight, student activism reached levels of intensity never before witnessed. The slogans repeated throughout the strike reflected an increasing militancy and radicalism in the ranks of UMAS and other student organizations. Mem-

bership grew, as these organizations and their leaders became protagonists in struggles for change in Mexican American communities. The strike moved student activism beyond the politics of accommodation and integration that had been shaped by the 1950s Mexican American generation and the community’s middle-class leadership.

On June 2, 1968, three months after the high school student strike, thirteen young Mexican American civil rights activists, who had been identified by the city power structure as leaders of the emerging “Brown Power” movement, were indicted by the Los Angeles County Grand Jury on conspiracy charges for their roles in organizing the strike. The indictments charged that the activists had conspired to “willfully disturb the peace and quiet” of the city of Los Angeles and disrupt the educational process in its schools. They were alternately characterized as members of communist “subversive organizations,” or outside agitators intent on radicalizing Mexican American students. Each of the thirteen activists faced a total of sixty-six years in prison if found guilty. Although the conspiracy charges emerged from the grand jury, the activists’ arrests were part and parcel of the FBI Counter Intelligence Program known as COINTELPRO, which was designed to undermine the Civil Rights, Black Power, and white progressive movements of the 1960s.

None of the thirteen were in fact communists or members of subversive organizations. Six of them were student activists. I was one of them, at that time serving as president of UMAS at the California State College at Los Angeles. The indictments of the “East L.A. Thirteen,” as they came to be known, fueled the fire of an emerging radicalism among Mexican American students.

Although the “East L.A. Thirteen” were all men, women played key roles as organizers in the walkouts. They organized important community and campus meetings essential to the planning of the walkouts. They also did much of the behind-the-scenes work in educating members of their community and their own families, and developed networks of organizations essential to building support for the walkouts.

In November 1968, Mexican American students joined a student strike at San Francisco State College organized by the Third World Liberation Front (TWLF). The strike was marked by violent confrontations between students and the police, and many students were injured. Demands mostly focused on the needs of Black students, but one demand called for the creation of a Department of Raza Studies under the umbrella of a proposed School of Ethnic Studies. The TWLF also demanded open admission for all students of color. The San Francisco State strike was significant because it marked the first time that Mexican American and other third world student activists united to create a politically explosive rainbow coalition.

In October 1968, the Mexican American Student Confederation (MASC) took over the office of Charles Hitch, president of the University of California system, to protest his refusal to discontinue the purchase of grapes while Chávez’s farm workers were on strike—part of a national campaign to boycott grapes in support of the UFW. The takeover of Hitch’s office resulted in the arrest of eleven MASC members for trespassing and unlawful assembly. This was the first in a series of student confrontations with university authorities on the Berkeley campus, and eventually culminated in the formation of another Third World Liberation Front and student strike.

Patterning itself after the Third World Liberation Front at San Francisco State, the TWLF at Berkeley organized its own student strike, which last-

ed from January through April of 1969. It was the first major third world student confrontation within the University of California system, and one of the most violent to occur at any of the university’s campuses: many students were arrested or became victims of police violence. In contrast to the strike at San Francisco State, Mexican American students played a leading role in the organization of the Third World Liberation Front and the strike on the UC Berkeley campus. The strike was aimed at exposing the university’s lack of commitment to meeting the educational needs of third world people. Although there were many differences within the TWLF, the strike demands incorporated previous issues raised by both African American and Mexican American student activists. The TWLF demanded the creation of a Third World College with departments of Mexican American, Black, and Asian American studies. It also demanded sufficient resources for the proposed college to involve itself in minority communities and contribute effectively to their development. TWLF demanded that the new college be under the full control of its students, faculty, and representatives of the community; self-determination was to be its principle of governance. Other demands called for open admission for all third world people and poor and working-class whites, as well as the recruitment of third world faculty and staff.

There were other high school student strikes throughout the Southwest during 1969, mostly patterned after the 1968 strike in Los Angeles. In Denver, Colorado, and Crystal City, Texas, high school strikes resulted in significant political developments moving beyond immediate issues of educational change. In Denver, the strike contributed to the further development of the Crusade for Justice and made Corky González a national leader of the emerging Chicano Movement. In contrast to the relatively violence-free student strike in Los Angeles, the Denver demonstrations resulted in violent confrontations between police, students, and mem-

bers of the Crusade for Justice. Corky González was arrested. After his release he praised the striking students for risking “revolutionary” actions to make history: “You kids don’t realize you have made history. We just talk about revolution. But you act it by facing the shotguns,

billies, gas, and mace. You are the real revolutionaries.” In Crystal City, a high school strike contributed directly to the founding of La Raza Unida Party and made one of its founders, José Angel Gutiérrez, into another national leader of the Chicano Movement.

El Plan de Aztlán

The Chicano Movement was given further impetus by other events taking place in 1968, a year that marked a high point in radicalism and the turning point of the decade. The antiwar movement became a potent political force in national politics, as mass protest against the war in Vietnam dramatically increased. Simultaneously, the Tet Offensive caught U.S. military forces badly off-guard and signaled a turning point in the Vietnam War. As a result, the Johnson Administration was forced to agree to peace talks held in Paris later that year. 1968 was also the year that Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., organized the Poor People’s March on Washington, which included a contingent of Mexican Americans. Later in the year, Dr. King and Senator Robert F. Kennedy were assassinated.

1968 was also the year of international student uprisings from Paris to Berlin, Tokyo, and Mexico City. In Mexico City, the site of the Olympics that year, over four hundred students were massacred by the Mexican army. In Paris, students battled police and brought the entire city to a standstill, touching off a month-long nationwide general strike of ten million workers. Between 1968 and 1969, Mexican American student militancy intensified, as more and more became convinced that they were part of an international revolution in the making.

The student strikes in communities and on the college campuses, in conjunction with the polit-

ical upheavals of the late 1960s, thus generated the framework for the eventual transformation of disparate student activist organizations into a full-blown student movement. Crucially, these circumstances permitted the development of a larger Chicano civil rights movement with clear social and political goals, located within a framework of an ethnic, radical, nationalist, and anti-colonial ideology that came to be known as cultural nationalism.

There were two conferences that contributed to the development of the Chicano Movement in terms of ideology and concrete goals. The first was a national conference held in March 1969 in Denver, Colorado, hosted by the Crusade for Justice. The conference produced a document called “El Plan de Aztlán.” Aztlán was perceived to be the legendary point of origin of the indigenous Mechica, also known as the Aztec, ancestors of the Mexican people. The second was a statewide California conference held at the University of Santa Barbara in April that did the same for the Chicano student movement, producing a book-length document called “El Plan de Santa Barbara.”

The Denver Conference advocated a radical ideology of cultural nationalism for the Chicano Movement that would liberate the colonized minds of Mexican Americans. Resolutions underscored the Chicano identity as the basis of unity because it would promote pride of Mex-

ican culture. Other resolutions called for the creation of independent Chicano political and economic institutions that would replace the existing capitalist institutions. The two-party political system was defined as the “same animal with two heads that feed from the same trough.” A goal of the movement would be the creation of an independent political party and people’s cooperatives in the internal Mexican American colonies, known as barrios. There was also a resolution for community control of the schools so that Chicano Studies programs could be created at K-12 levels to teach youth about their people’s history and culture. And finally, resolutions were also passed that advocated self-defense and militant protest.

There was no resolution proposed to deal with the issue of gender inequality. A handful of Chicana feminists organized a workshop for the purpose of drafting a resolution on the subject. But the majority of female participants refused to approve such a resolution out of concern that it would become a divisive issue. The men at the conference reflected the patriarchal attitudes permeating the movement at the time. Many perceived feminism as a white women’s issue and believed strongly that Chicanas should follow the Chicano leadership of the movement. When the conference delegates reconvened to vote on all the resolutions that emerged out of the workshops, the representative of the Chicana Caucus reported that “it was the consensus of the group that the Chicana does not want to be liberated.”

The Santa Barbara Conference adopted a name for the Chicano student movement that would underscore the Chicano identity and conform to the cultural nationalism of the Plan de Aztlán. It was agreed that existing organizations throughout the state would change their names from United Mexican American Students (UMAS), Mexican American Student Confederation (MASC), and Mexican American Youth Association (MAYO), and together become the

Movimiento Estudiantil Chicano de Aztlán. The adoption of the new name and its acronym, MEChA (which means “fuse” in Spanish), signaled a new level of radical political consciousness among student activists. It represented the final stage in the transformation of loosely organized local student groups into a single structured and unified student movement.

In terms of identity and ideology, MEChA symbolized the emergence of a new generation of decolonized youth: “La Raza Nueva,” also referred to as new people or reborn youth. The adoption of this name encouraged students to see themselves as part of a new Chicano generation committed to militant struggle against oppressive U.S. institutions. The Chicano identity meant the rejection of the hyphenated “Mexican-American” identity that had been the product of assimilation and accommodation to the melting pot ideology guiding earlier generations of activists.

The Santa Barbara Conference proposed three basic goals for the student movement. First, MEChA was to be organically connected to the Mexican American community by participating in local struggles for civil rights. MEChA’s second broad goal was to establish itself as a power base on campuses to increase the presence of Mexican American youth in institutions of higher education. This was to be done by participation in efforts to establish student recruitment through on-campus opportunity programs. A complementary strategy would be the promotion of Mexican culture among students by organizing and sponsoring campus cultural events and activities. Third and most important, MEChA was to play a substantive role in the creation and implementation of Chicano Studies departments and programs with curricula focusing on the Mexican American experience.

Although the Plan de Santa Barbara was produced by a California conference, it had a broader impact because it furthered the goals

of the Plan de Aztlan National Conference. It captured the imagination of student activists

throughout the Southwest and contributed to the unification of the student movement.

Brown Berets and the Chicano Left

Other radical non-student youth organizations also became part of the Chicano Movement. The Brown Berets were the best known. They were a paramilitary organization that emerged to confront police brutality and drug pushers in the Mexican American community. They were perceived as Chicano counterparts to the Black Panther Party. As cultural nationalists, however, they had more in common with the militant Black cultural nationalist organization named United Slaves (US). The Brown Berets did not share the Marxist/Maoist ideology of the Black Panthers, nor their internationalist framework. They were nevertheless heavily infiltrated by police intelligence agencies and the FBI COINTELPRO.

The Brown Berets and student activists became a significant part of the first national Mexican American mass protest against the war in Vietnam, which took place in Los Angeles on August 29, 1970. The protest came to be known as the Chicano Moratorium. It drew over 20,000 people to Laguna Park in East L.A. Although organized as a nonviolent protest against the war, it ended in terror when Los Angeles police and county sheriff deputies attacked the crowd without provocation. Hundreds were injured and over two hundred were arrested, including Corky González and his contingent from the Crusade for Justice. Tragically, two Mexican Americans were killed. One of them was Ruben Salazar, a noted journalist for the Los Angeles Times who was covering the event. The other was a young Brown Beret. This police riot provoked the first violent Mexican American outburst in a major U.S. city, when a few protestors burned busi-

nesses and police cars on Whittier Boulevard, one of the main thoroughfares in East L.A.

That same year, in Crystal City, Texas, the Mexican American Youth Organization (MAYO) created the Chicano independent political party that had been called for in the Plan de Aztlan. They named it *La Raza Unida Party* (LRUP). Mexican Americans were the majority population (80%) in Crystal City at that time, but the white minority controlled the city's dominant political and economic institutions. LRUP succeeded in taking power over city government and the school system. The party held its first national convention in 1972 in El Paso, Texas. State elections took place after the convention and the LRUP candidate for governor, Ramsey Muñiz, received over a million votes but fell short of winning the election. The LRUP ran candidates in other states but was not able to repeat the electoral success it had in Crystal City.

The 1972 convention had started in the spirit of unity established at the 1969 Plan de Aztlan and Plan de Santa Barbara Conferences but ended with internal ideological differences. These differences were personified by the power struggle over control of the party that took place between two leaders who had campaigned for the party chairmanship. Both José Ángel Gutiérrez of Crystal City, Texas, and Rodolfo "Corky" González of Denver, Colorado, had contributed to the development of LRUP as the independent Chicano political party called for in the Plan de Aztlan. But each had advocated a different path for the party. Gutiérrez's focus was on electoral politics, while González advocated a radical fo-

cus that departed from working within the existing political system.

LRUP, and the Chicano Movement as a whole, dramatically declined after the convention. Ideological differences emerged throughout the movement, much as they previously had within the LRUP. Sexism became a critical issue. Women were largely absent in the leadership of Chicano Movement organizations and were generally relegated to secondary roles. Chicanas who identified themselves as feminists were harshly criticized for promoting what Chicanos claimed to be white feminist ideas. Many Chicanas created their own movement organizations that focused on gender oppression both within the Mexican American community and in the larger society.

Chicanos who were influenced by Marxist ideas criticized the movement's cultural nationalist ideology as reactionary because it denied the reality of class consciousness. Some joined the Communist Party USA or the Socialist Workers Party. Others created their own movement organizations. The most well-known was *Centro de Acción Social Autónoma* (CASA). CASA activists applied race and class to the analysis of Mexican American oppression. They introduced the concept "sin fronteras" (without borders), which called for a transnational politics that joined Mexican struggles in the U.S. with revolutionary movements in Mexico. CASA focused on the organization of undocumented Mexican workers and pushed for the development of a national immigrant rights movement.

Another Chicano Marxist community organization, the *August 29th Movement* (ATM), emerged from the antiwar Chicano Moratorium. It adopted a Marxist-Leninist ideology that emphasized "Mao Zedong's ideas" and focused on Mexican American worker and campesino struggles. Using Stalin's much-discussed definition of the nation from "Marxism and the National Question," ATM developed a plan for the establishment of

a Chicano nation within those territories of the Southwestern United States with a majority, or sufficiently large, Chicano population. It also called for the establishment of a multinational communist party in the United States. Both ATM and CASA failed to take root in the larger Mexican American community, in part due to the anticommunist tendencies imposed on mass culture during the 1950s McCarthyist Red Scare.

These internal ideological divisions were not the only contributing factor for the decline of the Chicano Movement. Repression and cooptation were also important. The FBI Counter Intelligence Program was particularly significant in undermining the movement. As was the case with all social movements of the 1960s and 1970s, Chicano Movement organizations were infiltrated by COINTELPRO informants and provocateurs. Chicano leaders were kept under surveillance. The Brown Berets, Crusade for Justice, and key student organizations like UMAS, MEChA, and MAYO, were key targets of COINTELPRO. As was the case with the Black Panther Party, there were violent confrontations between police and the Brown Berets and the Crusade for Justice, resulting in the death of several Chicano activists. Four members of UMAS in Denver, Colorado, were killed in a car bombing. Movement leaders were arrested on false charges and imprisoned. The best known case was the indictment of the "East L.A. Thirteen" for conspiracy to disrupt the educational system of the city of Los Angeles. It took two years in the courts for lawyers to get their charges dropped on the basis of the First Amendment of the U.S. Constitution.

The political cooptation of movement activists was also an effective strategy utilized by those working for local, state, and federal institutions. For example, after the decline of the LRUP, the leadership of the Democratic and Republican Parties engaged in outreach efforts to recruit activists. Most went to the Democratic Party because of its image as being the more progressive

of the two. The process of cooptation has since culminated in the rise of Mexican American politicians in the Democratic Party. One former LRUP activist created the Southwest Voter Project, which led to the increase of Mexican American voters for the Democrats and Republicans. Two sons of a former Texas-based LRUP activist were spotlighted at the 2012 Convention of the Democratic Party. One of them, San Antonio Mayor Julian Castro, gave the convention's key-

note speech. His twin brother, Joaquin Castro, is a member of the House of Representatives, representing Texas's 20th congressional district. Prior to the emergence of the LRUP, there were only two Mexican Americans in the U.S. Congress. After the 2012 elections there were twenty Mexican Americans, and as of 2013 there are 33 Latino members of the U.S. Congress, three in the Senate and thirty in the House. Of these, nine are Republicans and 24 are Democrats.

Chicano Arts Movement and Chicano Studies

The Chicano Movement produced artists, poets, and writers who collectively generated a decolonizing cultural renaissance and whose work played a key role in the development of radical ideology in the movement. In Oakland, California, the first group of radical artists organized themselves as the *Mexican American Liberation Art Front* (MALAF). José and Malaquias Montoya, Esteban Villa, Renee Yanez, Ralph Maradiaga, and Rupert García produced posters whose striking art reflected the movement's quest for identity and power. In San Francisco, Yolanda Lopez and Graciela Carrillo organized the *Mujeres Muralistas* (Muralist Women) in the tradition of revolutionary Mexican artists David Alfaro Siqueiros, José Clemente Orozco, and Diego Rivera. By 1970 a distinct Chicano art movement was in full bloom throughout the Southwest.

The *Teatro Campesino* (Farmworker Theatre) contributed heavily to the development of Chicano and Chicana actors. Luis Valdez had created the Teatro during the time that he spent in the farm worker movement. He left that movement to devote himself full-time to the Teatro's development and to refine his critique of the Mexican American middle class and its assimilationist and accommodationist perspectives. His

ideas and plays contributed to the conceptualization of the radical Chicano identity and the development of the Chicano Movement. Key members of the Teatro were student activists he recruited from college campuses in Northern California. *The Ultimate Pendejada* ("pendejada" roughly translates to "bullshit") was one of the first plays performed by the Teatro. The play was written by Ysidro Macias, a student leader at UC Berkeley, and it dramatized the rejection of a Mexican American identity that represented assimilation into the dominant white culture of U.S. society. It argued for the emergence of a decolonized Chicano identity that connected Mexican Americans to their indigenous ancestors. The Teatro Campesino generated a transnational grassroots theater movement called *Teatros Nacionales de Aztlán* (TENAZ), which emerged on college campuses and in cultural centers in Mexican American communities throughout the Southwest. TENAZ also included radical theater groups in Mexico.

The most lasting accomplishment of the Chicano Movement, and specifically the Chicano student movement, was the establishment of Chicano Studies programs, research centers, and departments throughout the nation. These

programs produced a new generation of Chicana and Chicano intellectuals and scholars who have produced a significant body of knowledge on the Mexican American experience in the United States. In 1972, a group of these scholars founded the National Association of Chicana and Chicano Studies (NACCS), which has since grown into a vibrant organization. Collectively, this work has contributed greatly to the decolonization of the Mexican American mind. In addition, Chicano Studies produced a new generation of writers, poets, artists, filmmakers, and actors, whose work has added to the interpretation of the Mexican American experience. And finally, it has contributed to the rise of a new professional middle class now visible in the areas of public education, law, social welfare, public health, the business sector, and in non-profit community organizations dealing with issues confronting poor Mexican Americans and other Latinos and Latinas. All of these

accomplishments were made possible because the Chicano Movement contributed to the expansion of civil rights for Mexican Americans. It opened the doors for equal opportunity in employment and in higher education via affirmative action programs.

The decline of the Chicano Movement, however, gave way to the re-emergence of organizations committed to the politics of assimilation and accommodation in the late 1970s. The League of United Latin American Citizens (LU-LAC), the National Council of La Raza (NCLA) and the Mexican American Legal Defense Fund (MALDEF) became the key mainstream Mexican American political organizations and are totally committed to the Democratic Party. Their leadership played major roles in the 2008 and 2012 Obama presidential campaigns. Obama has since appointed one of the leaders of the NCLA to his administration.

The Struggle for Immigrant Rights in Recent Years

When the Chicano Movement emerged in the 1960s, there were only three visible Latino populations. The largest was the Mexican American, followed by the Puerto Rican, and the Cuban American populations, which collectively represented 6% of the U.S. population. By the start of the 21st century, the Latino population represented 16% of the total U.S. population, or just over fifty million people. It is more complex and diverse due to changing immigration patterns from all of the Latin American nations.

The Mexican American population remains the largest, with over 65% of the total Latino population. In numbers, that represents 33 million people. The Puerto Ricans remain the next largest Latino population at four and a half million people. The Cuban American remains the third

largest at a million and a half. There are now several million more Latinos who have emigrated from other Latin American nations. The undocumented immigrant population has likewise undergone enormous growth. There were an estimated 540,000 undocumented immigrants in the 1960s; by 2011, there were 11,500,000, the vast majority of whom are Mexicans.

The response to the growth of the Latino population, and especially the Mexican American population, has been characterized by vulgar, racist anti-immigrant politics. As has been the case historically, Mexicans are once again perceived as a threat to dominant U.S. culture. Right-wing politicians and armed vigilantes along the U.S.-Mexico border promote a racist hysteria against Mexicans. Academics are also

adding fuel to the fire, as they did back in the 1920s and 1930s during immigration hearings in the U.S. Congress.

For example, the late Samuel Huntington, a distinguished political scientist at Harvard University, argued in his 2004 book "Who Are We: The Challenges to America's National Identity," that Mexicans were the most serious threat to Eurocentric identity and culture. He expressed fears that the United States would lose its single national language and its core WASP culture. In his words:

In this new era, the single most immediate and most serious challenge to America's traditional identity and border security comes from the immense and continuing immigration from Latin America, especially from Mexico.

In California, the state with the largest Mexican population in the nation, right-wing Republicans contributed to the passage of anti-immigrant electoral propositions. The first was Proposition 187, in the 1994 elections, which called for the termination of government health and social services for undocumented immigrants and made undocumented children ineligible for public schooling. The proposition was later struck down by a federal court judge on the grounds that it was unconstitutional. In the 1998 elections, the state's majority of white registered voters supported the anti-immigrant Proposition 227, which terminated bilingual classes for students with limited English proficiency, namely Latino and Latino immigrant students. It remains in effect.

In 2005, the battleground shifted to the U.S. Congress, where right-wing House Republicans introduced anti-immigrant legislation, numbered HR 4437, with the title "Border Protection, Anti-terrorism and Illegal Immigration Control Act." HR 4437 came to be known as the Sensenbrenner Bill after Wisconsin Republican Congressman Jim Sensenbrenner. It passed but was defeated in the U.S. Senate after over five

million Latinos protested in the streets of Los Angeles, Chicago, New York, and other cities across the nation with visible populations of Latino immigrants. The first and largest protest, numbering over a million Latinos, took place in the streets of Los Angeles on March 4, 2006.

In 2010, the battleground shifted to Arizona's state legislature, where right-wing Republicans succeeded in passing two bills, SB 1070 and HB 2281. The first bill made it a misdemeanor crime for an "alien" to be in the state without documents and allowed police to stop and question suspicious individuals who look like undocumented immigrants. In effect, it made it legal for police to racially profile Latinos. Two years later, in 2012, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled on SB 1070 in the case "Arizona v. United States." It concluded that three provisions of the law were unconstitutional, but it upheld that the police had the right to stop and question the immigration status of individuals they determine to look like undocumented immigrants. It was a victory for those advocating the racial profiling of Latinos and Latinas.

The second Arizona bill HB 2281 outlawed Ethnic Studies in public schools, arguing that its curriculum promoted "the overthrow of the U.S. Government," anti-white resentment, and "ethnic solidarity" instead of individualism. The real target of this bill was Mexican American Studies, because its curriculum included courses offering a critical reinterpretation of American history and underscoring the positive values of Mexican culture and traditions. Following the passage of this bill, books on the Mexican American experience were banned by the city of Tucson's Unified School District.

Anti-immigrant racial politics have also resulted in an ongoing war against immigrants in the streets, their workplaces, and their homes. Mexicans are once again the main targets, because they represent the vast majority of the undocumented. On a daily basis, immigrants

are terrorized, arrested, imprisoned, and deported without trial by the Department of Homeland Security's Immigration & Customs Enforcement (ICE) agency. The U.S.-Mexico border has been a militarized zone since a wall was built during the presidency of liberal Democrat Bill Clinton. President Obama increased the militarization of the border by approving the allocation of the largest budget to the U.S. Border Patrol in history. There are now more border patrol police than there are FBI agents. He has also deported more immigrants than any other president in the history of the United States. Over 400,000 Latino immigrants were deported in 2012 alone. In addition, his administration supports the use of profit-making private prisons in the deportation process. Every day, upwards of 30,000 undocumented men, women, and children are imprisoned in them.

Right-wing racist politics, U.S. government policies and anti-immigrant laws at the state level have given birth to an Immigrant Rights Movement with Mexicans and Mexican Americans as its core constituency. While its leadership and constituency is largely Latino, it is a multiracial and multiethnic movement that includes other people of color. It has put pressure on President Obama to make comprehensive immigration reform policy a priority on the agenda for the 2013 U.S. Congress.

The movement, however, is not a cohesive one. It is basically a coalition comprised of a multitude of organizations, including unions, at the community, state, and national levels. Although all activists in the movement identify as "progressives," there are divisions between those advocating for human rights-based comprehensive immigration reform versus those willing to settle for whatever compromise is agreed upon by Republicans and Democrats.

Activists advocating human rights-based reform call for the demilitarization of the U.S.-Mexico

border, the immediate termination of deportations and ICE terrorism, no more guest worker programs, and legal protections for undocumented workers. Their organizations generally have transnational, anti-imperialist, anti-racist, or democratic socialist perspectives. They include: the Hotel, Restaurant, & Janitor Workers Union, the Illinois Coalition for Immigrant and Refugee Rights, the Coalition for Humane Immigrant Rights of Los Angeles (CHIRLA), Educators for Fair Consideration, the Immigration Legal Resource Center (ILRC), the National Network for Immigrant and Refugee Rights (NNIRR), Blacks for a Just Immigration (BAJI), Filipinos for Justice, the National Alliance of Latin American and Caribbean Communities (NALACC), MORENA (a bi-national democratic socialist Mexican grassroots organization), the National Day Laborer Organizing Network, the DREAM Activist Network, and the social network *presente.org*.

In his second inaugural speech in January 2013, President Obama made clear that he does not support comprehensive human rights-based immigration reform. He instead advocated reform based on maintaining the militarized border and ICE enforcement focused on deportations, as well as the continuation of guest worker programs needed by corporate interests, in return for a policy that maps out a long-term path to U.S. citizenship for the undocumented. Latino organizations supporting the president and whatever compromises emerge from the Republicans and Democrats include the National Council of La Raza, the Center for Community Change, the National Immigration Forum, the Service Employees International Union (SEIU), the League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC), and the Mexican American Legal Defense & Education Fund (MALDEF). The members of the Hispanic Congressional Caucus, with one or two exceptions, will also support whatever compromise reform is agreed upon by the president and congress.

Prospects for a Chicano Movement Resurgence

The prospects for another Chicano Movement resembling what happened in the 1960s are not good for two basic reasons. The first is that the historic moment does not lend itself to the fostering of radical ethnic nationalist or otherwise leftist Mexican American politics. The politics of limited reforms within the current two-party system is part and parcel of the ideological hegemony of the capitalist state. Mexican American and other Latino politicians are committed to playing what is essentially the only political game in town. The second reason is that the Latino population is much more complex and diverse than it was in the 1960s. Although Mexican Americans remain the largest Latino group, a mass movement based on the Chicano identity will not take root. A new movement will have to be able to speak to the issues confronting all Latinos and Latinas throughout the country.

There is hope, however, in the possibility of a new multiracial mass movement emerging from the ranks of the left-wing Immigrant Rights Movement, which does call for comprehensive human rights-based immigration reform. The leadership of the organizations composing this movement offers anti-capitalist and anti-impe-

rialist perspectives rooted in paradigms inclusive of the class, gender, and race realities of people of color. A counter-hegemonic, multiracial, mass left movement capable of carrying on the fight to decolonize America would need to emerge from something like this.

Crucially, this movement would need to consider the broader struggle for Mexican American equality, both for its many successes and also for where it came up short. Participants would need to study the history of red-baiting, government infiltration and repression, political cooptation, and also the internal divisions on issues of race, gender, and sexuality that hobbled the 1960s Chicano Movement in the end. Only then will the Immigrant Rights Movement's tentative coalition have the chance to fashion itself into a more coherent movement capable of defending itself from the assaults of capitalist hegemony while expanding its influence in American society. Only in this way will Latinos living in the United States be able to take up the uncompleted legacies of the Mexican American and Chicano Movements and effectively push for a meaningful expansion of their civil rights and liberties.

Works Consulted and Recommended Reading

Blackwell, Maylei (2011). *Chicana Power!: Contested Histories of Feminism in the Chicano Movement*. University of Texas Press: Austin.

Broyles-González, Yolanda (1994). *El Teatro Campesino: Theatre in the Chicano Movement*. University of Texas Press: Austin.

Chávez, Ernesto (2002). *Mi Raza Primero: Nationalism, Identity, and Insurgency in the Chicano Movement in Los Angeles*. University of California Press: Berkeley.

Esquibel, Antonio (2001, ed.). *Message to Aztlan: Select-*

ed Writings by Rodolfo "Corky" Gonzales. Arte Público Press: Houston.

Haney Lopez, Ian F. (2003). *Racism on Trial: The Chicano Fight for Justice*. Harvard University Press: Cambridge.

Jackson, Carlos Francisco (2009). *Chicana and Chicano Art: ProtestArte*. University of Arizona Press: Tucson.

Lopez Tijerina, Reies (2000). *They Called Me "King Tiger": My Struggle for the Land and Our Rights*. Arte Público Press: Houston.

- Mariscal, George (2005). *Brown-Eyed Children of the Sun: Lessons from the Chicano Movement, 1965-1975*. University of New Mexico Press: Albuquerque.
- Montejano, David (2010). *Quixote's Soldiers: A Local History of the Chicano Movement, 1966-1981*. University of Texas Press: Austin.
- Muñoz, Jr., Carlos (2007). *Youth, Identity, Power: The Chicano Movement* (2nd Edition). Verso: Brooklyn.
- Muñoz, Jr., Carlos (1987). "Chicano Politics: The Current Conjuncture." *The Year Left 2: An American Socialist Yearbook*: edited by Mike Davis, Manning Marable, Fred Pfeil, and Michael Sprinker. Verso: New York.
- Muñoz, Jr., Carlos, Mario Barrera, and Charles Ornelas (1972). "The Barrio as an Internal Colony." *People and Politics in Urban Society*: edited by Harlan Hahn. Sage Publications: New York.
- Munoz Jr, C. (1974). The politics of protest and Chicano liberation: A case study of repression and cooperation. *Aztlán: A Journal of Chicano Studies*, 5(1), 119-141.
- Muñoz, Jr., Carlos and Mario Barrera. "La Raza Unida Party and the Chicano Student Movement in California." *Latinos and the Political System*: edited by F. Chris Garcia. University of Notre Dame Press: South Bend, 1988.
- Navarro, Armando (1995). *Mexican American Youth Organization: Avant-Garde of the Chicano Movement in Texas*. University of Texas Press: Austin.
- Pulido, Laura (2006). *Black, Brown, Yellow & Left: Radical Activism in Los Angeles*. University of California Press: Berkeley.
- Rosales, Francisco A. (1997). *Chicano! The History of the Mexican American Civil Rights Movement*. Arte Público Press: Houston.
- San Miguel Jr., Guadalupe (2005). *Brown, not White: School Integration and the Chicano Movement in Houston*. Texas A&M University Press: College Station.
- Treviño, Jesús Salvador (2001). *Eyewitness: A Filmmaker's Memoir of the Chicano Movement*. Arte Público Press: Houston.

Related Studies

The Value of Diversity

Canada's Immigration and Integration Regime

By Oliver Schmidtke - December 2012

Alabama's Shame

HB 56 and the War on Immigrants

By Mary Bauer - February 2012

Displaced, Unequal, and Criminalized

Fighting for the Rights of Migrants in the United States

By David Bacon - November 2011

Recent Publications

Demand Everything

Lessons of the Transformative Organizing Model
By Steve Williams - February 2013

Death of a Yuppie Dream

The Rise and Fall of the Professional-Managerial Class
By Barbara Ehrenreich and John Ehrenreich

From Special Interest to Social Transformation?

The LGBT Movement in the United States
By Dawne Moon - January 2013

Alternatives to War

Civil Conflict Resolution in the Context of International Politics
By Andreas Buro - January 2013

Teachers on Strike

Lessons from Chicago on How to Fight Back
By Ethan Young - December 2012

Canada's "Maple Spring"

From the Quebec Student Strike to the Movement against Neoliberalism
By Ingar Solty - December 2012

A Brief History of Occupy Wall Street

By Ethan Earle - November 2012

Recycle or Reimagine

Tracking the Direction of the U.S. Environmental Movement
By Lara Skinner - November 2012

Mapping the Left

Progressive Politics in the United States
By Ethan Young - November 2012

To Begin the World Over Again

A Politics of Wisconsin, Occupy, and the Next Left
By John Nichols - October 2012

GLOBAL NETWORK OF ROSA LUXEMBURG STIFTUNG OFFICES



NORTH AMERICA AND UNITED NATIONS

New York City/USA
Directors: Dr. Stefanie Ehmsen and
Dr. Albert Scharenberg
Website: www.rosalux-nyc.org

MEXICO, CENTRAL AMERICA AND CUBA

Mexico City/Mexico
Director: Torge Löding
Website: www.rosalux.org.mx

ANDEAN REGION

Quito/Ecuador
Director: Dr. Miriam Lang
Website: www.rosalux.org.ec

SOUTH AMERICA

São Paulo/Brasil
Director: Gerhard Dilger
Website: www.rls.org.br

PALESTINE

Ramallah
Director: Dr. Katja Hermann
Website: www.rosaluxemburg.ps

ISRAEL

Tel Aviv
Director: Dr. Angelika Timm
Website: www.rosalux.co.il

GLOBAL HEADQUARTERS

Berlin/Germany
President: Dr. Dagmar Enkelmann
Executive Director: Dr. Florian Weis
Website: www.rosalux.de

EUROPEAN UNION

Brussels/Belgium
Director: Dr. Klaus Sühl
Website: www.rosalux-europa.info

EAST-CENTRAL EUROPE

Warsaw/Poland
Director: Dr. Joanna Gwiazdecka
Website: www.rls.pl

SOUTHEAST EUROPE

Belgrade/Serbia
Director: Dr. Boris Kanzleiter
Website: www.rosalux.rs

TURKEY

Istanbul
Director: Kadriye Karci
Email: karci@rosalux.de

RUSSIA, CENTRAL ASIA AND CAUCASUS

Moscow/Russia
Director: Tiina Fahrni
Website: www.rosalux.ru

EAST ASIA

Beijing/China
Director: Dr. Lutz Pohle
Email: pohle@rosalux.cn

SOUTHEAST ASIA

Hanoi/Vietnam
Director: Nadja Charaby
Website: www.rosalux.vn

SOUTH ASIA

New Delhi/India
Director: Dr. Carsten Krinn
Email: krinn@rosalux.de

WEST AFRICA

Dakar/Senegal
Director: Dr. Claus-Dieter König
Website: www.rosalux.sn

EAST AFRICA

Dar Es Salaam/Tanzania
Director: Siegfried Schröder
Email: schroeder@rosalux.de

SOUTHERN AFRICA

Johannesburg/South Africa
Director: Dr. Armin Osmanovic
Website: www.rosalux.co.za



Website: www.rosalux-nyc.org

Facebook: [rosaluxnyc](https://www.facebook.com/rosaluxnyc)

Twitter: [@rosaluxnyc](https://twitter.com/rosaluxnyc)