

Jan 1st, 7:00 AM - 7:00 AM

# Chicanos as a Post-Colonial Minority: Some Questions Concerning the Adequacy of the Paradigm of Internal Colonialism

Fred A. Cervantes  
naccc@nacccs.org

Follow this and additional works at: <http://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/naccc>



Part of the [Political Science Commons](#), and the [Race and Ethnicity Commons](#)

---

Fred A. Cervantes, "Chicanos as a Post-Colonial Minority: Some Questions Concerning the Adequacy of the Paradigm of Internal Colonialism" (January 1, 1975). *National Association for Chicana and Chicano Studies Annual Conference*. Paper 9.  
<http://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/naccc/1975/Proceedings/9>

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](mailto:scholarworks@sjsu.edu).

CHICANOS AS A POST COLONIAL MINORITY:  
SOME QUESTIONS CONCERNING THE ADEQUACY  
OF THE PARADIGM OF INTERNAL COLONIALISM

FRED A. CERVANTES

Chicano Studies,  
Political Science  
University of Southern California

I. TRIBUTE

Behind the ethereal wall of objective scientific inquiry, traditional social scientists have devoted themselves to the highly normative practice of developing paradigms of assimilation and integration in studying ethnic minorities. With the recognition that not all assimilate well, nor can be accommodated easily within the United States political and social economy, have come a few realizations and some puzzlement. Quite a few notions of social and cultural deviation have been advanced to explain why Chicanos and other "deviants" persist with attitudes and behaviors that have been associated with patterns of futility or failure by the institutions of schooling, politics, penalty, and mental and physical health.

Robert Dahl, to cite a relatively innocuous example of traditional political wisdom for the "minority" scholar, suggests that the persistence of ethnic voting patterns is a somewhat puzzling deviation that, surely, will eventually lose its significance.<sup>1</sup> If Dahl just seems to beg important questions, Nick Vaca has identified for us a whole legacy of analysis in the literature of the social sciences that is far more troubling.<sup>2</sup> Vaca notes that over the years the Chicano and his culture have been systematically condemned for creating a set of values that presumably have resulted in social and economic failures because these values were so often diametrically

opposed to the acceptable and functionally superior Anglo values. In becoming deviants in their own land, Chicanos have had every thing from their high fertility rate and high school drop-out rates to their family and convict behavior attributed to such "dysfunctional" norm-myths as Machismo and Indian fatalism.

Within the baleful framework of blaming the victim (without really getting normatively involved) there has been little room for the Chicano social scientist. Understandably and commendably we have looked for alternative conceptualizations elsewhere and have been receptive of those that provided a critical framework for looking at historical and institutional forces in terms of their impact on people. There has long persisted a Chicano folkloric tradition that has chronicled the conflicts between Mexicanos and external forces of political and cultural assault. These lessons were hard to come by in the schools of the Southwest. Moreover, Chicanos have shared with Native Americans the distinction of being the special objects of scrutiny by state and federal as well as local law enforcement agencies in the Southwest. Not only have Chicanos been the primary concern of the Texas Rangers since their inception in 1835 to "protect the frontier," but we have known the Immigration and Naturalization Service and U.S. Forest Service as an oppressive controlling force, which is *inter alia*, not to forget the LAPD or the Kern County Sheriffs. So the search for alternative conceptualizations stems from more than an interest in rejecting academic trends in sociology, political science and history.

Out of an identified and professed need for a new perspective, Barrera, Muñoz and Ornelas developed their conception of the barrio as an internal colony.<sup>3</sup> The influence of this model is widely appreciated and is notably represented in its further association with the works of Tomás Almaguer,<sup>4</sup> Guillermo Flores and Ronald Bailey.<sup>5</sup> In their essay, Barrera, Muñoz and Ornelas indicate the limitations of the older "assilationist/accommodationist" view and present the inadequacy of the more recent tendency of explaining Chicano powerlessness as a function of inadequate Chicano leadership. They declare that their model offers a more realistic and effective means of singling out significant aspects of the Chicano "situation."<sup>6</sup>

In applying the model of internal colonialism, previously used by Blauner as an instructive analogy to traditional colonialism, Barrera, Muñoz and Ornelas have gone a step further to urge that the concept of internal colonialism should be regarded as something more than a heuristic device.<sup>7</sup> In this sense, a few Chicano social scientists have braved the U.S. academic waters and shown a consistent willingness to extend an essentially Marxist concept of analysis to U.S. political behavior. To provide an interesting twist to William Appleman Williams charge against U.S. historians, there has not been a great evasion of Marxist analysis on the part of Chicano

political scientists.<sup>8</sup> (Even though I can remember being at a symposium on Chicano politics here in Austin three years ago when it was personally easy and intellectually pragmatic for a Chicano political scientist to wonder out loud about the contemporary and scientific relevance of all this 19th century Marxist stuff he was hearing from Carlos Muñoz.)

As a few voices in the professional disciplines (Williams, Paul Baran, Paul Sweezy and Irving Horowitz) have long suggested, there is much to learn about U.S. society from a Marxist perspective. Moreover, it is a perspective that has become more important to understand for Chicanos and others who find themselves at the bottom of the socio-economic and political ladder in a political economy that has become increasingly multi-national and is straining under new constraints of scarcity and political challenge to its established patterns of capital expansion. Put another way, the Marxist paradigm remains the most significant systematic critique of capitalism as well as being its most important ideological threat.

## II. CRITIQUE

Having noted the importance of the Marxist perspective, it is from this perspective that I would challenge the adequacy of explaining the contemporary Chicano "situation" in terms of the model of internal colonialism.

At different points in their essay, Barrera, Muñoz and Ornelas define internal colonialism as a condition of powerlessness and a condition involving the domination and exploitation of a total population.<sup>9</sup> As they put it: "The essence, then, of being an internal colony means existing in a condition of powerlessness."<sup>10</sup> This essence, however, does not really distinguish internal from external colonialism. Nor, for that matter, does such a definition really distinguish colonialism from the exploitative relationship which exists between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat.

In another broadly inclusive observation, the three authors state that:

No one disputes that colonialism in its modern usage refers to a relationship in which one group of people dominates and exploits another.<sup>11</sup>

While this can be granted, it really does not take us very far in clearly defining colonialism as a type or system of exploitation distinct, for example, from the mechanisms of class exploitation. In their exposition of colonialism, however, the three authors cite the importance of González-Casanova's idea that a relationship of domination and exploitation of a total population that has distinct classes. Or as Guillermo Flores has noted in citing Memmi's work, colonialism establishes power and privilege for even the poorest colonizer over the colonized.<sup>12</sup>

Restated in a way that further pursues the Aristotelian ideal of understanding a phenomenon's "essence," it can be said that while exploitation and domination are necessary for colonialism to exist, these conditions are not sufficient. Flores suggests the critical importance of understanding colonialism in terms of an institutional control mechanism, which, for me, connotes state and administrative controls capable of clearly and materially elevating even the poorest colonizer to a position of power and privilege over the colonized.

Consequently, a bothersome question arises for me when the three authors assert that:

The crucial distinguishing characteristic between internal and external colonialism does not appear to be so much the existence of separate territories corresponding to metropolis and colony, but the legal status of the colonized (i.e., whether or not there is a distinct legal status for the colonized).<sup>13</sup>

I would wonder if colonialism can exist at all without a separate legal status for the colonized. According to Barrera, Muñoz and Ornelas, internal colonialism exists if domination or exploitation of a distinct group is maintained even though the colonized have the same formal legal status as the colonizer, whereas external colonialism is said to exist where there are clearly separated legal statuses for the colonized and colonizer. If this distinction is unambiguous it seems arbitrary and, within its own unexplained context, it is dubious if for no other reason than that the distinction violates a coherent understanding of internal and external colonialism based on territoriality. More importantly, what is the conceptual difference between internal colonial and class exploitation according to their schema?

To return to an earlier proposition: for colonialism to exist it is not enough that a pattern of exploitation be identified. Colonialism has been understood as a distinct mechanism of exploitation, noteworthy in its use of economic and legal institutional forms to differentiate the exploited from the exploiters. From a Marxist-Leninist perspective colonialism has been viewed as the material extension of legal administration to politically institutionalize economic inequalities. Even in terms of the concept of neo-colonialism, dependent status is institutionally and jurisdictionally arranged by those who are the alien political administrators or economic exploiters.

The political antidote for both colonialism and neo-colonialism in the Third World has been anti-colonial movements of national liberation, that have articulated struggles of national self-determination. Dialectically speaking, this means that the rise of nationalism as a force of political

liberation is the negation of colonialism. Consistent with this implication, those who subscribe to the internal colonial model have examined the Chicano movement with a view toward demonstrating the bases of contemporary Chicano nationalism. Indeed, if contemporary Chicano nationalism can be clearly demonstrated it would be a satisfying and satisfactory way to substantiate the existence of colonialism regardless of how well the model of internal colonialism stands up to the analytic scrutiny of traditional Marxist or Stalinist concerns. However, demonstrating that Chicano nationalism is an antithesis of colonialism in contemporary times seems unlikely.

The question of the nature of Chicano nationalism aside for the moment, let us turn to some interesting variations on the internal colonial model advanced by Tomás Almaguer and Guillermo Flores. They challenge us to go beyond Marx, Lenin, Hobson and Stalin while nevertheless submitting their variations on a theme to the dialectical and historical requirements of a non-doctrinaire but coherent Marxist perspective. Moreover, it is instructive to see how their analyses relate to the unresolved questions raised above concerning Chicano nationalism and the definition of internal colonialism.

In the latter part of their essay, Barrera, Muñoz and Ornelas depict racism and stereotyping as both justifications and mechanisms of colonialism, concluding that:

Of all the mechanisms of domination, the racist mobilization of bias may be the most pervasive and most subtle in its effects.<sup>14</sup>

In his essay entitled "Race and Culture in the Internal Colony; Keeping the Chicano in His Place," Flores picks up where his colleagues left off. He accepts their model and develops his own concept of racial-cultural surplus value, which he views as a major legacy of the colonial past and an operational characteristic of internal colonialism today.<sup>15</sup>

According to Flores the racial-cultural superordinate position enjoyed by the colonizer is part of the surplus value that accrues to all colonizers, presumably without regard to class position--unlike the dynamic end result of economic surplus value which accrues to the bourgeoisie. In the case of racial-cultural surplus value advantage is maintained through a vast ideological apparatus that guarantees racism despite official (political) myths to the contrary. Although dialectical interaction is assumed, there is no clear delineation of substructure and superstructure in this conception of change in which an economic concept, i.e., surplus value, is borrowed to depict attitudes and values without indicating the limits or logic of such an analogy.

Viewing internal colonialism as a "highly fluid system of domination," Flores makes no attempt to determine if racism is more a function of colonialism or an operational part of

it.<sup>16</sup> Compatible with the Barrera, Muñoz and Ornelas distinction between internal and external colonialism there is not apparent need to make such an assessment in the Flores model. All forms and manifestations of dependence blend together into colonialism that is bisected only into its internal and external parts by the knife of legal status. If colonialism is nothing more specific than domination and exploitation, however complex, then understandably "internal colonialism is nothing more than the domestic face of world imperialism," as Flores remarks elsewhere (along with Ronald Bailey).<sup>17</sup>

While Flores and Ronald Bailey have stressed the importance of being historical in understanding Chicano colonial status, it is Tomás Almaguer who, in a recent issue of *Aztlán*, has taken us furthest in developing a dialectic of Chicano colonialism.<sup>18</sup> Drawing on European history as a history of competing colonial forces, he brings into dialectical as well as historical perspective the conditions of contemporary Chicano oppression. In his dialectics of racial and class domination, Almaguer sees the expansion of mercantile and industrial capital as driving forces for colonial advantage that were pre-conditions for the absorption of half of the Mexican territory by the United States in a process of one group of colonizers overwhelming others. He reminds us that the United States was not the only colonizer in the area and that U.S. military and political predominance did not mean a complete cultural and social rout of the Mexicanos, but established a context of struggle and conflict that has in turn, determined the status and struggle of Chicanos today.

In reading Almaguer's account of the complex pattern of colonization that affected the people and area that became the Southwestern United States, I became mindful of the salient importance of Marx's discussions on capital accumulation and Lenin's thesis on imperialism, and recalled William A. Williams instructive survey of *The Making of the American Empire*. But why the legacy of this important colonial experience, which today manifests itself in the racism that we all have known as Chicanos, in the proletarianization of Chicano workers and in other forms of domination and exploitation, should be called internal colonialism is unclear to me--except as a function of an established definition that Almaguer has also assumed.<sup>19</sup>

With a little added help from Marx's writings, Almaguer can be cited to support the suggestion of making the transition from the model of internal colonialism to a model of post-colonialism. He contends that: "The foundation of Chicano oppression is based on the organization of social relations of production,"<sup>20</sup> to which one can add Marx's insight that "Social relations of productions, change, are transformed, with the change and development of the material means of production, the productive forces."<sup>21</sup> This is to say that the means of oppression changes and is transformed by the dialectics of market expansion. It is suggested that colonialism as a form

of oppression that defines social relations of production in a particular way changes and may be usefully transformed to a post-colonial means of exploitation once the proletarianization of a dependent people is realized. This pattern of development seems to have been particularly evident in the U.S. with the taking of territories followed by the selective granting of statehood.

The point to be made at this juncture is that the contemporary Chicano "situation" can more usefully be conceptualized as being in a state of post-colonial development which, as the term implies, must be understood within the dialectical context of its colonial experience. It is the *legacy* of colonialism that manifests itself in various post-colonial structures of economic and racial-cultural dependencies. As a dialectical process, colonialist oppression of the Mexicano and the Chicano has undergone a series of institutional quantitative changes that has produced a qualitative change that, I suggest, is not usefully or clearly understandable as a different face of colonialism. In addition to the arguments stated above, I would offer a number of other practical and analytic reasons for this shift in conceptual emphasis.

In the first place there is the problem of finding an ideological base in the Chicano movement for the negation of presumed colonialism, i.e., a distinct and salient Chicano nationalism (assuming as I do that nationalism means something more than cultural or ethnic identity). Central to the political nationalism is the idea of the struggle for self-determination not just the right to practice interest group politics equally. In its anti-colonial form, the teleology of nationalism is devoted to the liberation and self-government of a particular oppressed people. The Marxist-Leninist prototype of a model, is specific and rigorous in determining whether or not a distinct community constitutes a nation or potential nation. Stalin prescribes that there must be an "historically constituted" community of people with a common language, a common territory, a common economic life and a common "psychological make-up" that manifests itself in a common culture.<sup>22</sup> According to him a nation does not exist or "ceases to be a nation" if *all* of the features are not apparent. All of the characteristics are regarded as being necessary and sufficient for each other. For the Chicano nation-builder Stalin's is a most demanding model. Stalin can be rejected, of course, for his dogma or his rigor, but final questions concerning the existence of distinct territoriality, separatist politics and economic life must be answered in determining any reasonable concrete measure of Chicano nationalism.

Trapped by having accepted internal colonialism as a definition of Chicano political reality, some of my colleagues, it seems to me, have futilely attempted to interpret reformist politics as Chicano nationalism or, worse, as the power of the Chicano movement to de-colonize the United States.



The lack of political representation is cited as an important example of the political dimensions of internal colonialism by both those who have developed and those who have accepted the model.

The trouble with regarding the lack of representation as a significant aspect of colonialism is that electoral politics can then be logically viewed as an anti-colonialist activity. To stretch this notion to an absurd theoretical conclusion, each new Chicano representative can be cited as an example of the anti-colonial negation of having less or no representation! Regardless of the symbolic significance of the election of two Mexican American governors last year, my common sense tells me that as the number of Chicano elected officials in the Southwest increases, there will be less rather than more evidence of Chicano nationalism working as a force of anti-colonial national liberation. I think it ironic if understandable to admonish Chicanos to intensify their electoral participation as a part of the struggle against internal colonialism.<sup>23</sup>

Even El Partido de La Raza Unida, which has become a factor in Texas electoral politics in the name of justice and equity for Chicanos, finally is not a voice for Chicano nationhood. La Raza Unida, nevertheless, has emerged as a voice against the oppression and domination of Chicanos. Its candidates have sought power through the ballot box and the articulation of Chicano interest, by Chicanos for Chicanos, running for city council, school board seats and state and county offices. While the Partido seeks to redress the political oppression and economic exploitation of Chicanos in Texas and elsewhere, its aim is to reform and make the existing political system serve the interest of Chicanos. The activities of La Raza Unida remind us that one does not have to prove that there is colonialism, internal or external, or practice anti-colonialist politics to demonstrate and tactically respond to the inequities of exploitation.

Flores' conception of internal colonialism as the disparity between our psychological and social ideology on the one hand and our official, i.e., political ideology on the other hand, creates a distinct but related problem. In this schema, reducing the disparities between professed and actual beliefs becomes an anti-colonialist act. The "ideological transformation" that he calls for is, it seems to me, aimed more at making the 18th century promise of "American pluralism" work rather than developing Chicano liberation.<sup>24</sup> His idea of developing critical awareness and consciousness to combat well-developed patterns of psychological exploitation seems to be an approach to the legacy of colonialism rather than a direct anti-colonialist assault. He finds that in its growing sophistication, the Chicano movement increasingly has attacked institutional inequity and decreasingly attacked racist individuals.<sup>25</sup> The awareness that he suggests is developing is an interest group orientation toward gaining access to U.S. institutions.

In viewing the structures of the welfare system as an institutionalization of colonialism as Almaguer, for example, does, virtually all poor people are reduced to the status of the colonized. This is problematic for a number of reasons. First of all, this factor tends to equate class status with colonial status, erasing the essential distinction advanced by González-Casanova that colonialism must be understood to level class status for the colonized. Secondly, this factor is not particularly useful for demonstrating the colonization affecting Chicanos in that the largest number of poor people in this country are Anglos. Thirdly, even though Chicanos and Blacks may be disproportionately affected by *some* welfare bureaucracies, we find that the welfare bureaucracy does not govern the lives of most Chicanos and that large numbers of Chicanos have been excluded from the benefits of the welfare state. It is the exclusion of Chicanos, it seems to me, that is a part of the basic oppression and exploitation of the Chicano in relation to the Anglos who have taken relatively much from the public trough. To be sure, a welfare bureaucracy creates dependence. But it is odd to consider welfarism colonialist activity when so much energy in the Chicano movement has been spent on trying to make governmental agencies more responsive to the welfare of Chicanos. Is it colonialism and, if so, who are the anti-colonialists?

Finally, there is something to be learned and questioned in the recent comments of Carlos Muñoz on the politics of protest and Chicano liberation.<sup>26</sup> The most important thing he suggests to me is that we simply do not find ourselves in a colonialist situation. He laments that in the absence of a mass based working class organization, Chicano protest has been effectively channeled into the ongoing political process.<sup>27</sup> Yet he persists in conceptualizing about this phenomena within the framework of the model of internal colonialism asserting that the politics of *Chicano cultural nationalism* has been more of a politics of reform than of radical social change.

To view reformist politics as cultural nationalism I submit, begs an important question and assumes by definition the teleology of Chicano liberation. How novel to regard reformist politics as the stuff of national liberation. I would argue that Muñoz has engaged in reductionism in making trends he has assessed critically conform to an assumed definition of internal colonialism that is as questionable now as it was when it was formulated. Furthermore, I would suggest that the reformist thrust of progressive Chicano politics suggests that Chicano nationalism is not a very important political factor in and of itself.

### III. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

Considering the extent of Chicano advocacy of reform and the interest in making pluralism work in this polity, it seems

to me we should be ready to close off the dead-ends of the model of internal colonialism but nevertheless extend the main Marxist track on which this theoretical perspective has taken Chicano social scientists. Barrera, Muñoz and Ornelas have demonstrated the need for critical models in our professions and have shown us the essential utility of understanding Chicano politics in relation to the forces of colonialism. Almaguer and Flores have highlighted the importance of casting our analysis of colonialism in a dialectical and historical mold. Following Almaguer and Flores, I underline the importance of setting such questions as the analysis of Chicano nationalism within a context of historical conflict. From this perspective, I am persuaded that we have passed into a post-colonial period in which Chicano progressives have become the leaders of a national minority seeking multicultural pluralism rather than an anti-colonial force seeking national liberation.

To reiterate, colonialism implies a particular pattern of exploitation. Conquest, suppression and separate political administration of an oppressed nation of people offer the clearest example of colonialism. In the case of Chicanos, this kind of colonialism did not abruptly end with the conclusion of the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo, but the Treaty signalled the beginning of a shift from colonialism to other forms of exploitation. Anglo land barons created the Texas Rangers to keep the Mexican colonized and resist the threats of separatism emanating from Mexican rebels in South Texas until the early part of the 20th century. The notorious "Santa Fe Ring" systematically went about undermining political and economic assurances of the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo. These are obvious examples of the trauma of U.S. imperialism effecting the Chicano. Moreover, the Rangers are still with us and most of the land of Nuevo México is owned by Anglos and the federal and state governments; and Chicano poverty in Northern Nuevo México and South Texas still suggests the reality of colonialism. But for most of us, this is the legacy of colonialism. Even among the Chicanos of Nuevo México and Texas, where the conditions of exploitation are the worst for large numbers of Chicanos, anti-colonial feelings that would nurture a sense of separate nationalism, it seems have been negated by the reality of reformist politics that seeks redress at the polls or from the courts. However, much of South Texas and Northern Nuevo México have remained in the colonial past. The areas of the Southwest where Anglos first came to clearly outnumber Mexicans were the first to pass into a political post-colonial status.

Territorial status under the U.S. system of government has been roughly equivalent to colonialism. The grant of statehood conversely, was a rough indicator of the beginning of the transition out of colonialism. It was in Texas that the Anglos first came to significantly outnumber Mexicans and first clearly demonstrated their political power in the Southwest--even before the war on México. It was Texas that first became a state in

1845 even before that war. However, the concentration of the Anglo domination of population in the eastern, central, and northern parts of the region created a special problem. It is this distortion of population distribution despite the Anglo numerical superiority that, I would argue, necessitated the maintenance of a quasi-colonialist regime in the southern region of the state while the rest of the state made an early transition to post-colonial status. The difference was that the Anglos could guarantee overall political and economic dominance through their demographic power while they needed to maintain regional colonialism to guarantee exploitation of the Mexicano in South Texas.

In California the number of Mexican and Anglo inhabitants was relatively balanced until after the Gold Rush of 1849--the Indians having been colonized by both. California became a state the next year. Nevada, according to Morison and Commager was "admitted prematurely in 1865 because the Republicans thought they needed its electoral vote."<sup>28</sup> For me the interesting thing about Nevada's admission only four years after it had been reorganized as a territory is that, having been the most extreme example of a mining region it attracted a safe Anglo population majority regardless of its overall size. Colorado had its rush of Anglos after the discovery of gold in the foothills of the Rockies in 1859 and after the development of the railroads in the seventies brought an influx of Anglo farmers. It became a state in 1876.

While having a culturally "safe" (note Utah's late admission date of 1896), and dominant Anglo population may not have been sufficient for statehood, it seems to have been necessary for the political rites of passage to post-colonial status. For Chicanos in the Southwest it was the adverse shift in demographic balance that initiated the beginnings of the post-colonial period. As is generally the case with dialectical conflict, the process of change was uneven. Resistance followed the new material and political reality, particularly in South Texas; but it was eventually quelled and new, more sophisticated forms of exploitation than colonialism were instituted where the scars of colonialism remain.

For us, there remain ample reasons to sustain our probes of U.S. society from the critical perspective that has been introduced by Barrerra, Muñoz, Ornelas, Almaguer, Flores and others. But it is important to relate these concepts more closely to the realities of contemporary Chicano history and politics. For this reason I would advocate conceptualizing the patterns of Chicano resistance, struggle and exploitation as a legacy of colonialism rather than as an example of internal colonialism.

I suggest the importance of looking at topics such as the following as post-colonial phenomena in order to delineate more complex patterns of exploitation, dependence and subordination and superordination: (a) economic dependence, economic entry and racism; (b) restriction of status mobility; (c) the impact

of sexism and feminism on Chicanos; (d) cultural suppression of Chicanos; (e) labor market segmentation of Chicanos; (f) the proletarianization and metropolitanization of Chicanos; (g) the imposition of bureaucratic dependence upon Chicanos; (h) symbolic representation of Chicanos and the meaning of Chicano voter participation.

## NOTES

1. See Robert Dahl, *Who Governs?* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1961).
2. Nick Vaca, "The Mexican American in the Social Sciences 1912-1970, Part II: 1936-1970," *El Grito* (Spring 1970).
3. Mario Barrera, Carlos Muñoz and Charles Ornelas, "The Barrio as an Internal Colony" in Harlan Hahn, ed., *People and Politics in Urban Society*, Vol. 6 (Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1972), pp. 465-498.
4. Tomás Almaguer, "Historical Notes on Chicano Oppression: The Dialectics of Racial and Class Domination in North America," *Aztlán-IJCSR*, Vol. 5 (Spring/Fall 1974), pp. 27-56.
5. Guillermo Flores and Ronald Bailey, "Internal Colonialism and Racial Minorities in the United States: An Overview" in Frank Bonilla and Robert Gerling, eds., *Structures of Dependency* (1973), pp. 149-160.
6. Barrera, Muñoz and Ornelas, op. cit., pp. 480-482.
7. See Robert Blauner, "Colonized and Immigrant Minorities" in his *Racial Oppression in America* (New York: Harper and Row, 1972) and his "Internal Colonialism and Ghetto Revolt," *Social Problems* (Spring 1969), pp. 393-408.
8. William Appleman Williams, *The Great Evasion* (Chicago: Quadrangle Books, Inc., 1964).
9. Barrera, Muñoz and Ornelas, op. cit., pp. 481-483.
10. Ibid., p. 481.
11. Ibid., p. 482.
12. Guillermo Flores, "Race and Culture in the Internal Colony: Keeping the Chicano in His Place" in Bonilla and Gerling, op. cit., pp. 189-223.
13. Barrera, Muñoz and Ornelas, op. cit., p. 483.
14. Ibid., p. 490.
15. Flores, op. cit.
16. Ibid., p. 201.
17. Flores and Bailey, op. cit., p. 154.
18. Almaguer, op. cit.
19. Ibid., pp. 41-42.
20. Ibid., p. 43.
21. Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Selected Works* (New York: International Publisher, 1968), p. 81.
22. J. V. Stalin, *Works* (Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1955), Vol. II, pp. 303-307.

23. For a good example of this see: Rodolfo Acuña, *Occupied America, The Chicano's Struggle Toward Liberation* (San Francisco: Canfield Press, 1972)--particularly the last chapter.

24. Flores, op. cit., p. 195.

25. Ibid., p. 215.

26. Carlos Muñoz, "The Politics of Protest and Chicano Liberation: A Case Study of Repression and Cooptation," *Aztlán*, Vol. 5 (Spring/Fall 1974), pp. 119-142.

27. Ibid., pp. 120-121.

28. Samuel Eliot Morison and Henry Steele Commager, *The Growth of the American Republic*, Vol. I (New York: Oxford Press, 1942), p. 703.