San Jose State University
SJSU ScholarWorks

National Association for Chicana and Chicano Studies Annual Conference

2002-2004: 29th, 30th, & 31st Annual Conferences Proceedings

Mar 1st, 9:00 AM

Chicanismo, Patriotism, September 11th, 2001: A NACCS Political Stance on the War on Terrorism

Raoul Contreras
Indiana University - Northwest

Follow this and additional works at: http://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/naccs

Raoul Contreras, "Chicanismo, Patriotism, September 11th, 2001: A NACCS Political Stance on the War on Terrorism" (March 1, 2002). *National Association for Chicana and Chicano Studies Annual Conference.* Paper 12.
http://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/naccs/2002-2004/Proceedings/12

This Event is brought to you for free and open access by the Conferences at SJSU ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in National Association for Chicana and Chicano Studies Annual Conference by an authorized administrator of SJSU ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@sjsu.edu.

CHAPTER TEN

Chicanismo, Patriotism, September 11th, 2001: A NACCS Political Stance on the War on Terrorism

Raoul Contreras, Indiana University Northwest

Chicanismo, Patriotism, September 11th, 2001 – A NACCS Political Stance on The War on Terrorism was a panel session held at the 2002 annual spring meeting of the National Association for Chicana and Chicano Studies (NACCS) held in Chicago. That panel session initiated a process that generated NACCS organizational resolutions of opposition to the War on Terror. This NACCS action was the first formal declaration of opposition to the War on Terror by a national Latino organization in the U.S. Most likely, it was the first such formal anti-war stance taken by any national academic association in the nation.[1] This essay reflects upon the organization's opposition to the War on Terrorism and the ensuing efforts to practically implement this anti-war political stance. These year-long efforts concluded with the 2003 annual spring meeting in Los Angeles, California.

BACKGROUND

September 11th, 2001 (9/11) now demarcates contemporary U.S. history. Four years later, in the Fall of 2005, the social, political, and cultural implications of that day's events are still unfolding. However, even the

immediate consequences of "9/11" on the development of U.S. culture and society have been considerable.

Foremost, at the international level the attack on the trade towers and the Pentagon in 2001 initiated a new and escalating phase in a continuing dance between "terrorism" and U.S. military aggression that many would argue is driven by imperialist motives. This can be seen first through the war and occupation of Afghanistan, and later through the war and no-end-in-sight military occupation of Iraq. At home, 9/11 has meant a concomitant and increasingly tightening curtailment of civil liberties and rights, a growing militarization of U.S. culture, and an intensification of social divisions and social inequalities based on race, class, and gender.[2]

In this essay, I argue that an assertive Chicana/o role in post-September 11th history-making, particularly in opposing U.S. imperialism abroad and fascism at home, is inherent in the ideals and historical foundations of Chicano Studies and NACCS. This is to say that among the many consequences and implications brought about by September 11th, 2001, it also unveiled anew the ideological dimension of Chicano history and culture (Romano 1968; Gomez-Quinones 1971) inscribed in Chicano identity as a "colonized minority" of the U.S. (Blauner 1969; 1972).[3]

Personally, a realization about the significance of September 11th, 2001 came rather immediately. On September 13th, the university administration at Indiana University Northwest in Gary, Indiana organized a "detraumatizing" community gathering, similar to those held on many campuses and communities across the nation immediately after the terrorist attacks. This one was structured with a panel of faculty members who were selected on the basis of their campus familiarity/popularity and/or presumed historical, political, sociological, or psychological academic expertise relevant to the events of 9/11. In addition to that, I was specifically asked to join the panel because of my status as one of the campus' very few "minority" faculty members.

A CHICANO PERSPECTIVE ON 9/11

The university's "community meeting" was held in a filled-to-capacity auditorium. My presentation began by explicitly identifying myself as a "Chicano" presenting a "Chicano perspective." While assertively condemning the indiscriminate violence and death, and specifically the unambiguous targeting of civilians on September 11th, the presentation placed the terrorist attack squarely in a historical context of U.S. imperialism, and especially U.S. foreign policy in the Middle East that negatively impacts Palestine specifically and the Islamic world generally.

A "passionate" discussion followed with audience debate, focusing largely on the misinterpretation of my historical analysis for a "justification" of the terrorist attack. What's more, the discussion began with a white female student asking, with a proud sarcasm and an unconcealed hostility and disgust, "why do you call yourself a 'Chicano'… why don't you call yourself an 'American?' I gave an assertive answer.

As the discussion continued, the emotional, racial, patriotic nature of the give-and-take made clear to me how 9/11 had reshaped my political agenda as a Chicano educator, and I felt, the political agenda of Chicano/a Studies and its national organization, The National Association for Chicana and Chicano Studies (NACCS). Hence, my response to the student's question, "why do you call yourself a Chicano…," in the context of analyzing the events of 9/11, became the substantive thesis for a panel proposal submitted a few weeks later to the 2002 NACCS national conference coordinating committee. This panel abstract posed that "Chicano identity" mandated opposition to the Bush administration's recently declared "War on Terror." It also indicated that a specific goal for the panel would be spurring NACCS into adopting an activist "anti-war political stance."

2002 NACCS NATIONAL CONFERENCE

The following spring the panel was held during an early morning session on Thursday March 28th, the first "working day" of the association's annual meeting held in Chicago, Illinois. The panel was well attended (35-40) for an early morning session on the first day of the conference.

Seated on the panel were Rene Nunez, a Professor of Chicano Studies at San Diego State University, and Elizabeth "Betita" Martinez, an activist scholar from the Institute for Multiracial Justice in San Francisco, California. Nunez and Martinez were specifically recruited for the panel because they were, and are, two of the more significant individual participants in the political history of Chicano Studies/NACCS.[4] They were also on the panel because they were identifiable within the association by the anti-imperialist orientation of their politics.[5] Also on the panel was Raoul Contreras, a Professor of Latino Studies at Indiana University Northwest in Gary Indiana. Miguel Rodriguez, an undergraduate student at the University of Illinois, Chicago, was a fourth panelist.

Betita Martinez led the panel with a historical analysis that linked the "War on Terror" to "Manifest Destiny" and 19th century Chicano history. Her role was to assert an ideological linkage between "Chicano history" and opposition to the so-called "War on Terror." Nunez followed with an analysis of the "War on Afghanistan." His focus was to assert the anti-imperialist orientation of the panel's opposition to the "War on Terror." He was followed by Rodriguez' summary of student anti-war activism. Contreras' paper concluded the panel presentations. Its role was to explain the purpose of the panel—organizing a NACCS political stance against the War on Terrorism.

THE POLITICAL IDENTITY OF NACCS

Thematically, this presentation academically grounded the rationale for the panel's goal in the history and ideology of NACCS; that is, its political identity.[6] The panel's thesis maintained that the very manner in which NACCS articulated its history, its traditions, its beliefs and values, and through the very manner in which its constituting documents explained the association's origin, this mandated and obligated an oppositional political stance toward the so-called "War on Terror." Martinez' presentation had implied that argument in terms of relating 19th century Chicano history to the "War on Terror." Further, Nunez' analysis that the War on Terror was more properly understandable as a war "for oil," included an argument that NACCS as an organization, and Chicano/a Studies as an academic discipline, had to take a political stand against the war on the

basis of their anti-imperialist history and principles. Added justification for this argument emerges from a discussion on the organization's identity.

CHICANO MOVEMENT CHICANO STUDIES

Literally, the acronym NACCS refers to the National Association for Chicana and Chicano Studies. Thus, the substantive question to really address was, "What is it about the identity of Chicana/Chicano Studies that mandates a political stance on the War on Terror?" In the 1997 edition of *Mexican American Perspectives*, the article, "Chicano Movement Chicano Studies: Social Science and 'Self-Conscious' Ideology," addressed this question in the specific way that it was being put forward in the 2002 panel (Contreras 1997). That article posited that Chicano Studies' political identity was inherent in the relationship between the dual dimensions of its historical origin as both a new "social science" and as a "self-conscious ideology" of the Chicano Movement.[7]

Chicana/o Studies was a "social science" in that it was an academically based multidisciplinary approach to studying and understanding the social world. It was a "new" social scientific view of the world because, in contrast to "traditional" social sciences originating with the cultural revolution of the 18th century European Enlightenment, Chicano Studies emerged out of the cultural revolution and social activism of a 20th century Chicano Movement.

It was this origin as an element of Chicano Movement social activism, not just as an accomplishment or consequence of that activism, that had inscribed Chicano Studies with its ideological dimension and political identity. Chicano Studies was not just a new social scientific view of the world; it was also a social science expression of the worldview, or ideology of the Chicano Movement.[8] A militant political opposition to U.S. imperialism was an integral aspect of that Chicano Movement worldview (Mariscal 2002, 2005; Oropeza 2005). Thus, the underlying goal of the March 28th panel became to spur NACCS, as the professional organization of Chicana/o Studies, into an organizing role that reasserted this Chicana/o Studies legacy in the context of political opposition to the "War on Terror."

The discussion period following the panel presentations was enthusiastic and productive. It generated a commitment by those in attendance to "talk up" the need for an anti-war resolution(s) over the course of the conference in the various regional FOCOs to which they were affiliated.[9] What's more, a small group formed among the panel audience and panel participants to draft a resolution that could be proposed at regional FOCO meetings for endorsement, and subsequently for a discussion and vote at the conference's concluding business meeting. The text utilized in the planned resolution emphasized the basic themes of the panel presentations, and stressed the need for a specific "implementation" plan.

COMPAS CAUCUS

Later that day, as the idea spread to the various regional FOCO and caucus meetings being held, the association's COMPAS caucus considered a proposal to adopt an anti-war resolution.[10] The official role of NACCS' COMPAS caucus is "the empowerment and welfare of the Chicana and Chicano community…, (and to) direct social action to address issues in our community and the organization."[11] However, in actuality, the caucus had been defunct and inoperative in terms of its by-laws mandate for a number of years, serving solely to distribute information and announcements to the NACCS membership. Thus, members of COMPAS saw the proposed anti-war resolution as a way to re-establish a more overt political orientation to the caucus, and to NACCS as a national organization. The COMPAS caucus voted affirmatively to compose an anti-war resolution. Moreover, COMPAS' proposed resolution included a clause that identified itself, the COMPAS caucus, as the "organizational mechanism" for coordinating activities and actions that might develop from the resolution.

There was a political organizing rationale for inserting this "organizational mechanism" clause into COMPAS' proposed resolution. The geographically regional FOCO was the basic unit of the association's national organizational structure and its basis for individual membership and participation in the association's activities and decision-making. However, the annual four day national conference was the only practical opportunity for the geographically regional FOCOS to convene as a group and to engage in an association-wide common political action. However, the

caucuses were national, association-wide organizational components of NACCS. Thus, COMPAS, with its official mandate to "direct social action," was the natural choice for assuming a leadership role in coordinating and directing anti-war activities across the association's regional FOCO organizational structure in the interim between national conferences.

NACCS ANTI-WAR RESOLUTIONS

The organizing effort over the remainder of the conference generated four proposed anti-war resolutions at the concluding 2002 business meeting. Three emerged out of Northern California, Southern California, and Rocky Mountain FOCOs, and one from the COMPAS caucus. All were approved by the membership.

While similar, the resolutions were substantively distinguishable. For example, the Northern California FOCO most clearly articulated the principles of NACCS' opposition to the War on Terrorism. The Southern California FOCO and the COMPAS caucus' resolutions, which were merged since they were almost identical, differed from the other FOCO anti-war resolutions in two ways. First, it made explicit the need for a plan of "implementation" based upon a specific proposed action. More specifically, they declared that the 2003 national conference be thematically organized in terms of NACCS' opposition to the War on Terrorism, and that other interim activities between the 2002 and 2003 national conferences should be held. Second, it named the COMPAS caucus specifically as the mechanism for overseeing the "operationalization" of the resolution.

PRINCIPLES OF OPPOSITION

There were three principles of opposition to the War on Terrorism inscribed in the four approved resolutions.[12] First, NACCS had declared its opposition to the "War on Terror," because contrary to the Bush administration's claim that it was a worldwide fight against the forces of "evil," the resolutions portrayed it as a war to defend and expand U.S. imperialism. Behind the administration's cynical claim to seek justice for innocent Americans killed on September 11th, the resolutions argued

that the War on Terror was an arrogant assertion of a right to military, cultural, and economic domination of the world.[13]

Second, the resolutions declared a NACCS opposition to the war because the death and destruction it portended for people of color in the "Third World" was inseparably related to an attack, then already underway, on the social justice and civil rights and liberty concerns of Chicanos and other progressive people and communities in the U.S. In a general and direct sense the resolutions argued that national resources directed towards foreign wars are resources taken from domestic social justice concerns. In a barely more subtle manner, the resolutions emphasized that the costs of war—who fights, kills, dies, and pays— is always race, class, and gender discriminatory.[14]

Third, the resolutions declared that NACCS' opposition to the Wars on Terror was based on the Chicano Movement ideology from which the very identities of "Chicanos/as" and "NACCS" were derived. NACCS was opposed to the War on Terror not only because the war was imperialist; but also because we, as Chicano/a Studies scholars/activists and NACCS members, were upholding the principles of the Chicano Movement.[15]

CELEBRATING THE CHICANO MORATORIUM AND FEBRUARY ACTION

In the Fall of 2002 the COMPAS caucus took its mandate from the resolutions to "serve as a coordinating body" for implementing NACCS' anti-war political stance by organizing its first activity. This was a set of coordinated "NACCS Public Forums" held at urban university and community locations in California, Illinois, and Indiana by the Southern California, Northern California, and Midwest NACCS FOCOs. They were organized under a common theme of "Celebrating the Chicano Moratorium." The intent of these NACCS public forums commemorating the moratorium was to publicize both in the university and in the larger community the resolutions that had been adopted by NACCS the previous Spring. They were also intended to be a venue for publicly articulating the principles behind NACCS' opposition to the "War on Terror."

The Chicano Moratorium itself was a historic anti-war march and demonstration against the U.S. war on Vietnam that occurred on August 29th, 1970. The moratorium, the climax of an anti-war social movement in the Chicano community in the late 1960's and early 1970s, is acknowledged by many in Chicano Studies to have been the "apex" of the Chicano Movement.[16] The Moratorium manifested a historically remarkable public emergence of a mass Chicano anti-Vietnam war activism in a Mexican American community that was characterized as reflexively "flag-waving patriotic" and/or assimilationist in nature.[17]

In an important sense this historic anti-Vietnam War movement in a "socially conservative" Mexican American community is explained by the impulse and the trend of anti-imperialism in the Chicano Movement. Historically and ideologically, the foundation of Chicano/a Studies, as well as NACCS, was in this Chicano Movement. It was for this reason that an action celebrating NACCS' and Chicana/o Studies' relationship to the historical experience of the Chicano Moratorium, and specifically to its anti-imperialism, was selected to initiate the process of publicly articulating the stance on the War on Terror adopted at the 2002 national conference.

In the Winter of 2003 COMPAS coordinated another expanded set of public forums deemed as "February Action" at urban university and community locations in California, Washington, Arizona, Illinois, and Indiana that involved the association's Southern California, Northern California, Pacific Northwest, Rocky Mountain, and Midwest FOCOs. These forums occurred as the Bush administration's campaign for the War on Iraq was reaching its peak. These forums became part of the historic worldwide social movement of opposition to the March 2003 U.S. invasion of Iraq.

2003 COMPAS SPECIAL SESSION AND WORKSHOP

The celebration of the Chicano Moratorium and the February Action were organized by the COMPAS caucus in the interim period between the 2002 Chicago and the 2003 Los Angeles NACCS annual meetings as called for in the previously mentioned resolutions. However, the explicit

form of implementation called for by the combined resolutions was for COMPAS to elaborate an anti-war theme for the 2003 national conference and "… to make programmatic and organizational suggestions for how to structure that theme into the 2003 national conference…"

This "programmatic and organizational" integration of an anti-war theme into the 2003 conference took the form of a "COMPAS Special Session and Workshop." This COMPAS Special Session and Workshop was conceived as a half-day "mini-conference" on NACCS' opposition to the "War on Terror" that would be structured into the conference's general program. It was programmed for Friday afternoon, the middle working day of the association's annual meeting.

There was an underlying conception to the special session and workshop. This concept encompassed a view that the commitment to an anti-war political stance that NACCS had made the previous year would be an ongoing and activist one. The political stance would have to respond and correspond to the duration, the developments, the evolutions, and the transformations of the War on Terror itself. Further, the COMPAS Special Session and Workshop was conceived with a view that implementing NACCS' anti-war stance had to be in its first instance, an internal "intellectual" and "political" organizing of that opposition within the association itself. That is, the special session and workshop was conceived as a mode by which NACCS learns and develops its political role as a "colonized intellectual" of the Chicano community in the context of its opposition to the War on Terror.[18]

The special session component was entitled, "Chicano Anti-Imperialism and The U.S. War Against Iraq—A NACCS Perspective." The special session formalized the "intellectual" dimension of the internal organizing of NACCS' anti-war perspective. In the COMPAS plan the special session in conjunction with the workshop, was the main link in a process for socially constructing a NACCS' anti-war political stance. Specifically, the special session presenters addressed the war in terms of its international, domestic, and NACCS organizational political dimensions and implications. Substantively, however, the presentations were a discursive elaboration of the principles of NACCS' opposition to the War on Terror. A dis-

cursive elaboration that was informed by the presenters' participation in anti-war activism in the COMPAS organized interim activities between the 2002 and 2003 NACCS conferences—the "Celebration of The Chicano Moratorium" and the "February Action."

While thematically the special session projected a primacy to elaborating the identification of the "War on Terror" as an imperialist war of aggression, the emphasis of the presentations was more towards drawing the connections between the US war against Iraq and the social justice, civil liberties and civil rights abuses of Chicanos "at home." In this regard a version of Jorge Mariscal's special session presentation, "The War at Home: What Raza Will Lose in Bush's World," was also given the day before at the conference's plenary session.

The COMPAS Special Session was designed with an extensive floor discussion period to follow the presentations. This discussion period was spirited and productive. Attendees gave their own take on a "NACCS Perspective" on the "War on Terror." They not only assessed and evaluated the special session presentations; they also presented views, opinions, and potential tactics and strategies of implementation informed by their own experiences, either as individuals or as part of other groups involved in anti-war activities.

The special session discussion period was followed by the "Workshop." The workshop was conceived as the "political" dimension of the internal organizing of NACCS anti-war stance. More specifically, through the workshop participants were to develop "plans, strategies, and specific action proposals" to operationalize NACCS' anti-war political stance through both "coordinated national activities" and "specific regional actions" that could be implemented after participants left the conference. The basic idea was that the workshop's "political" organizing of NACCS' anti-war stance was to be informed by the "intellectual" organizing of the special session. Some of the specific action proposals and plans that came out of the workshop were to once again and annually institutionalize and "Celebrate the Chicano Moratorium." The workshop's unanimity around the idea of celebrating the Moratorium conveyed the centrality that participants saw in identifying NACCS' anti-war stance with its Chicano Movement history and ideology.

There was an equal importance that workshop participants saw to linking NACCS's anti-war stance to the association's social justice, civil liberties and rights concerns of the Chicano community. In this regard workshop participants contributed summaries and analyses of their own efforts to bring anti-war views into community activities they were involved in or supported. Thus, an important component of "implementation" of NACCS' anti-war stance was to link, coordinate, and to network the activities that NACCS members and groups were engaged in on their own.

The workshop also generated a consensus on the need to establish links and relationships to the national and international social movement of opposition to the U.S. war on and occupation of Iraq. It was consensus tempered, however, by an insistence that NACCS maintain and distinguish its Chicano/a and Chicano/a Studies identity and political agenda from any such integration with the national and international anti-war social movement. Specifically, the workshop foresaw a NACCS emphasis on the "War on Terror's" implications for U.S. imperialist aggression in Mexico, the Caribbean, and other parts of Latin America.

This reflection upon NACCS' response to the "War on Terror" initiated at the 2002 National Conference in Chicago is poised as a striving for praxis for the integration of scholarship and activism idealized in the organization's founding documents. Thus, it is reflected upon as an effort to realize a Chicano Movement-based Chicano Studies. This work that began in the year spanning the 2002 and 2003 NACCS annual meetings has been the framework through which the association continues to organize its activist opposition to the "War on Terror."

Endnotes

1 In the Fall of 2002, The National Women's Studies Association formally adopted an anti-war stance. Dr. Collette Morrow, who directs the Women's Studies program at Purdue University – Calumet in Hammond Indiana, conveyed this to me at a meeting in spring 2003. She was the President of the Women's Association that year.

2 On the "dance" between "terrorism" and U.S. imperialism see *Blowback: The Costs and Consequences of American Empire* by Chalmers A. Johnson. He documents how seemingly unprovoked attacks on the U.S. or its "national interests" are actually

"costs and consequences" of a long and continuing history of U.S. interventions, military and/or political, covert and overt. He develops this theme in *The Sorrows of Empire: Secrecy and The End of The Republic* and emphasizes empire's impact on U.S. culture, or "the republic," including militarism and the heightening of domestic social contradictions.

3 In Chicano Studies the "ideological dimension" of Chicano history and culture is first proposed by Octavio Romano (1968). Also, Juan Gomez-Quinones in the first Chicano Studies "Chicano historiography", emphasizes the role of Chicano history for generating analyses that can be used for "positive action" on the community's behalf (1971). The thesis of my dissertation, *The Ideology of The Political Movement for Chicano Studies* rests on this notion of an ideological orientation to Chicano history and culture (Contreras 1993). "Colonized minority" is a term coined by Robert Blauner (1969), a sociologist at the University of California, Berkeley in the 1960s during the formative period of Chicano Studies. Blauner was widely referenced by Chicano Studies activists and scholars of the era. In particular, he was recognized by early Chicano Studies scholars for his significant contribution to the evolving perspective of "internal colonialism." Blauner used the term "colonized minority" to posit an ideological relationship between racial/ethnic minorities in the U.S. and people of color in the "third world," whose struggles mirrored efforts against U.S social, economic, and political imperialism.

4 Rene Nunez and Elizabeth "Betita" Martinez have been contributors to Chicano/a Studies from its inception. Nunez was the principal organizer of the 1969 Santa Barbara Conference that generated *El Plan de Santa Barbara*. Martinez's early support and defense of the Cuban Revolution is a prime individual example of the "anti-imperialist" trend of thought and action that has always characterized Chicano/a Studies.

5 A basic premise of this essay is the presence and significance of an "anti-imperialist" trend of thought and action in the Chicano social movement of the 1960s/1970s, and therefore in Chicano/a Studies and NACCS. This implies an understanding of the Movement as being composed of various, multiple trends of thought and action with "anti-imperialism" being one of them. Jorge Mariscal identifies this anti-imperialist trend more generally as internationalist in his deconstruction of the "stereotype of the Chicano Movement of the Vietnam era as a narrowly nationalist and separatist social movement…" (Marsical 2002; 2005). Projecting this Chicano Movement anti-imperialist ideological dimension onto Chicano/a Studies is based on the argument that Chicano Studies was a social constituent of that Movement and not just an accomplishment or consequence of it (Contreras 1993, 1997). In his history of the movement, Carlos Munoz supports this idea of Chicano/a Studies and its relationship to the Movement (Munoz 1989). This is not an imposition of a political "anti-imperialist identity" on Chicano/a Studies or NACCS, or on the individuals who compose it. This essay argues more narrowly that there is an anti-imperialist social trend of thought and action in Chicano/a Studies and in its national organization NACCS.

6 This presentation was published in the Summer 2002 *Noticias de NACCS* newsletter. (Volume 29 No. 2) It can be accessed at http://www.naccs.org/images/naccs/archives/7071NACCS.pdf.

7 See Immanuel Wallerstein's historical analysis on the origin of "traditional" Social Science (1980; 1991). Most important is his argument about the political and "ideological dimension" of traditional Social Science's origin. See Munoz on the relationship between Chicano Studies and the Chicano Movement (1989). Contreras' analysis of *El Plan de Santa Barbara* argues that in that document Chicano Studies is "self-conscious" about its ideological relationship to the Chicano Movement (1993). "*El Plan*" is cited as Chicano Coordinating Council for Higher Education (1969).

8 This was the basic thesis of my dissertation (Contreras 1993). This conception of Chicano Studies is also the basis for my analysis of the campaign for a Chicano Studies department at UCLA in 1993 (Contreras 1997). This view of Chicano Studies is implied by Munoz's history of the Chicano Movement (Munoz 1989). Chicano Studies is "self-conscious" about its ideology in *El Plan de Santa Barbara* (Chicano Coordinating Council for Higher Education 1969).

9 In the NACCS organizational structure, individual members are enrolled into the association and participate, principally, in association with activities and decision-making though a specific geographically regional unit called a "FOCO." While members vote on organizational matters such as resolutions on an individual basis, resolutions can be proposed to the association only through a regional FOCO or an association caucus that has its endorsement.

10 The NACCS organizational structure includes various caucuses that address specific issues/concerns/demographics of the organizations such as "women" (Chicana Caucus), or the relationship and representation of the "community" (Community Caucus) to the organization. Each caucus has at least one selected or elected voting representative from each FOCO. But membership/participation in any caucus is open to anyone in the general NACCS membership. A caucus can contribute to national organizational matters, like propose resolutions, similar to the FOCO.

11 This language on the COMPAS caucus is cited in the NACCS By-Laws. It can be accessed at http://www.naccs.org/naccs/By-Laws.asp?SnID=1006306991#a8.

12 The full text of the four anti-war resolutions were published in the Summer 2002 edition of the NACCS newsletter, *Noticias de NACCS* (Vol 29;2 http://www.naccs.org/images/naccs/archives/7071NACCS.pdf). The resolutions were numbered "#9" (Rocky Mountain FOCO), "#10" (Southern California FOCO and COMPAS caucus), and "#11" (Northern California FOCO).

13 This interpretation of the War on Terror is based on an analysis of the Bush administration's formal statement of strategic response to the terrorist attack on 9/11. See *The National Security Strategy of The United States of America – 2002.* It was publicly released in January 2002. It is in this document that the 'right' to permanently maintain current U.S. economic, political, and military supremacy, through "pre-emptive war" if necessary, is asserted. The assessment that on the whole this document asserts a right to "military, economic, and cultural domination of the world" is not an extreme one; or even contested by leading foreign policy officials of the Bush administration. See "Imperial America" by Richard A. Haass, who was a leading defense department official, for an acknowledgement of an "imperial" foreign policy even before 9/11. See "Imperial America and War" by John Bellamy Foster for critical analysis of this public acknowledgement of a "benevolent" U.S. imperialism by foreign policy experts and officials who support U.S. policies.

14 Documenting the "domestic costs" of U.S. imperialism, and specifically the race, class, and gender discriminatory nature of these costs, will be a primary focus of the "implementation" of these anti-war resolutions at the 2003 NACCS national meeting. Chalmers Johnson (2005) addresses this relationship between imperialism and "domestic costs" ("the sorrows of empire") generally. Lorena Oropeza writes about its relationship to the emergence of a Chicano anti-Vietnam war movement (2005).

15 This elaboration of the third principle of opposition does not intend to contradict the point made in note #5. Chicano/a Studies/NACCS is composed of various, multiple trends of thought and action. This third principle implies a method by which unity, a common political position (or "stance"), is constructed out of such ideological heterogeneity.

16 This assessment of the Chicano Moratorium as the "apex" of the Movement is made in *Chicano!:History of The Mexican American Civil Rights Movement*, the television documentary made for National Public Broadcasting (PBS). This assessment of the Moratorium is implied in Munoz's history of the Chicano Movement (1989). In his history of Chicanos, Rudolofo Acuna makes a similar assessment (Acuna 2003). Lorena Oropeza presents the most complete study of the Chicano anti-Vietnam War movement and the importance of its place in the Chicano Movement (Oropeza 2005).

17 See Juan Gomez-Quinones' analysis and explanation for the "patriotic" tenor that characterized Mexican American community leadership in the period that immediately preceded the rise of the Chicano Movement (Gomez-Quinones 1990: 45).

18 In Antonio's Gramsci's theory of Cultural Revolution, "organic intellectuals" are the agents of moral and intellectual reform (transformation) of the dominant hegemonic ideology (Gramsci 1970: 60-61). Utilizing an ideological conception of "history," Frantz Fanon developed a similar notion, "colonized intellectual/artist," who must "use the past" as a way of "opening the future" and as an "invitation to action" (Fanon 1968: 209). In my dissertation I fuse Gramsci's and Fanon's ideas and pose the role of the "colonized intellectual" as an analogy for the political role of Chicano Studies (Contreras 1993: 282-285).

Bibliography

Acuña, Rodolfo. (2003) *Occupied America: A History of Chicanos*. Fifth Edition. New York: Pearson/Longman.

Barrera, Mario. (1974) "The Struggle for Third College at UC San Diego," *Parameters of Institutional Change: Chicano Experiences in Education*. Compiled by the Southwest Network. Hayward, Ca. Southwest Network.

_____. (1979) *Race and Class in the Southwest: A Theory of Racial Inequality*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.

Barrera, Mario; Munoz, Carlos, Jr.; Ornelas, Charles. (1972) "The Barrio as an Internal Colony." *Urban Affairs Annual Review*, (ed.) Harlan H. Hahn, 6:465-98. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Blauner, Robert. (1969) "Internal Colonialism and Ghetto Revolt." *Social Problems 16*(Spring): 393-408.

_____. (1972) *Racial Oppression in America.* New York : Harper & Row.

Chicano Coordinating Council for Higher Education. (1969) *El Plan de Santa Barbara.* Oakland: La Causa Publications.

Contreras, Raoul. (1993) *The Ideology of The Political Movement For Chicano Studies.* Ph.D. Dissertation -- University of California at Los Angeles.

_____. (1997) "Chicano Movement Chicano Studies: Social Science and `Self-Conscious' Ideology." *Perspectives in Mexican American Studies,* Volume 6:20-51.

_____. (1999) "Chicano Studies: A Political Strategy of The Chicano Movement." *Mapping Strategies: NACCS and The Challenge of Multiple (Re)Oppressions – Selected Proceedings of The XXIII Annual Conference of The National Association For Chicano Studies.* Maria Antonio Beltran-Vocal, Manuel de Jesus Hernandez-Gutierrez, and Silvia Fuentes, eds. Editorial Orbis Press.

_____. (2000) "What is Latino Studies? The Ideological Dimension of Program 'Construction' and Program 'Location.'" *Latino Studies Journal.* Winter 2000, Volume 11, No. 1.

Eagleton, Terry. (1991) *Ideology: An Introduction.* London; New York: Verso.

Foster, John Bellamy. (2003) "Imperial America and War," *Monthly Review.* May 2003.

Fanon, Frantz. (1963) *The Wretched of The Earth.* New York: Grove Press.

Flores, Guillermo. (1973) "Race and Culture in the Internal Colony: Keeping the Chicano in His Place," *Structures of Dependency.* Frank Bonilla and Robert Girling (eds.) Stanford Institute of Politics.

Haass, Richard A. (2000) "Imperial America," *Foreign Affairs.* November 11, 2000.

Goldberg, David Theo. (1993) *Racist Culture.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Gómez-Quiñones, Juan. (1971) "Toward a Perspective on Chicano History." *Aztlan*, Vol. 2, no.2 (Fall), p. 1-49.

_____. (1990) *Chicano Politics*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.

Gonzles, Rodolfo. (1972) *I am Joaquin: An Epic Poem.* New York: Bantam Books.

Gramsci, Antonio. (1971) *Selections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci.* (eds.) Q. Hoare and G. Nowell Smith. London: Lawrence & Wishart.

Horsman, Reginald. (1981) *Race and Manifest Destiny*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Johnson Chalmers A. (2000) *Blowback: The Costs and Consequences of American Empire*. New York. Metropolitan Books.

_____. (2005) *The Sorrows of Empire: Secrecy and The End of The Republic.* New York: Henry Holt and Co.

Katsiaficas, George N. (1987) *The Imagination of the New Left: A Global Analysis of 1968.* Boston: South End Press.

Lukacs, Georg. (1971) *History and Class Consciousness.* Cambridge: The MIT Press.

Macias, Reynaldo Flores (Ed.). (1977) *Perspectivas en Chicano Studies.* Los Angeles: Chicano Studies Center Publications (UCLA).

Mariscal, Jorge. (2002) "Left Turns in the Chicano Movement, 1965-1975" *Monthly Review*. July-August 2002.

_____. (2005) *Brown-Eyed Children of the Sun – Lessons From The Chicano Movement, 1965-1975*. University of New Mexico Press.

Moore, Joan W. (1970) "Colonialism: The Case of the Mexican American," *Social Problems.* 17: 463-472.

Muñoz, Carlos, Jr. (1970a) "Toward a Chicano Perspective of Political Analysis." *Aztlán*, Vol. 1, no.2.

_____. (1970b) "On the Nature and Cause of Tension in The Chicano Community: A Critical Analysis." *Aztlán*. Vol.1 no.2.

_____. (1983) "The Quest for Paradigm: The Development of Chicano Studies and Intellectuals." *History, Culture, and Society: Chicano Studies in the 1980s*. National Association for Chicano Studies. Ypsilanti, MI: Bilingual Press/Editorial Bilingue.

_____. (1984) "The Development of Chicano Studies," *Chicano Studies: A Multidisciplinary Approach*. Eugene E. Garcia, Francisco Lomeli, and Isidro D. Ortiz. (eds.) New York: Teachers College Press.

_____. (1989) *Youth, Identity, Power: The Chicano Movement.* London: New York: Verso.

Nuñez, Rene., Contreras, Raoul. (1992) "Principles and Foundations of Chicano Studies: Chicano Organization on University Campuses in California" in Tacho Mindiola Jr. and Emilio Zamora (eds.), *Chicano Discourse*. Houston: University of Houston.

Oropeza, Lorena. (2005) *RAZA SI! GUERRA NO! Chicano Protest and Patriotism During The Vietnam War Era.* Berkeley. University of California Press.

Rocco, Raymond A. (1970) "The Chicano in the Social Sciences: Traditional Concepts, Myths, and Images." *Aztlán*, Vol. 1, no.2 (Fall).

Romano-V., Octavio Ignacio. (1967) "Minorities, History, and The Cultural Mystique." *El Grito*, Vol. 1, no.1 (Fall).

_____. (1968) "Anthropology and Sociology of the Mexican-Americans: The Distortion of Mexican-American History, A Review Essay." *El Grito*, Vol. 2, no.1 (Fall).

_____. (1969) "The Historical and Intellectual Presence of Mexican Americans." *El Grito*, Vol. 2, no.2 (Winter).

_____. (1970) "Social Science, Objectivity, and The Chicanos." *El Grito*, Vol. 4, no.1 (Fall).

Takaki, Ronald. (1979) *Iron Cages*. Oxford University Press.

Therborn, Goran. (1980) *The Ideology of Power and the Power of Ideology*. London.

Wallerstein, Immanuel Maurice.(1979) *The Capitalist World-Economy: Essays*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press.

_____. (1983) "Crises: The World Economy, The Movements, and The Ideologies," Crises. *The World System*. Albert Bergensen (ed.) Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

_____. (1983) *Historical Capitalism*. London: Verso.

_____. (1986) "Societal Development, or Development of The World System," *International Sociology*. Vol.I no.1

_____. (1989) "The French Revolution as a World Historical Event," *Social Research*. Vol.LVI no. 1.

_____. (1989b) "The Myrdal Legacy: Racism and Underdevelopment as Dilemmas," *Cooperation and Conflict*. Vol.XXIV no. 1.

_____. (1991) *Unthinking Social Science: The Limits of Nineteenth Century Paradigms.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

White House. (2002) *The National Security Strategy of The United States of America.* (Electronic reserve) Washington. White House. (Access) www.whitehouse.gov/nsc/nss/2006