

Mar 15th, 2:00 AM - 2:00 AM

## Entre El Dicho y El Hecho: From Chicano Studies to Xican@ Studies

Reynaldo Flores Macias

University of California - Los Angeles, reynaldo@chavez.ucla.edu

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



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

---

Reynaldo Flores Macias, "Entre El Dicho y El Hecho: From Chicano Studies to Xican@ Studies" (March 15, 2012). *National Association for Chicana and Chicano Studies Annual Conference*. Paper 5.  
<http://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/naccs/2012/Proceedings/5>

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).

**ENTRE EL DICHO Y EL HECHO:  
FROM CHICANO STUDIES TO XICAN@ STUDIES<sup>1</sup>**

by

**Reynaldo F. Macías**

Chicana/o Studies, Education, & Applied Linguistics, UCLA

Buenos días, good morning.

We are celebrating 40 years of the existence of this organization. This is an anniversary worthy to mark for its longevity. It is worthy to celebrate more so as a legacy of the Chicano movement, than of the organization itself, or even of the field of Chicana/o studies, for the origins of Chicano Studies are found in the Chicano movement more so than the academy. This is a story, I believe, that bears repeating, if only to maintain some mooring for the field and the organization as we move forward to our golden anniversary and our centennial in the not too distant future. It is also important as a self-identifier, self-definer, identity if you will, of ourselves as a field. This grows in importance as the number of doctoral programs in Chicana/o studies increase.

Other than introductory survey anthologies there is still no “textbook” on Chicana/o studies. Still more rare are book-length histories of the field. Two books on Chicana/o Studies have recently been published—both focused on the origins and development of the field over the last 45 years. Michael Soldatenko’s 2009 book is entitled *Chicano Studies: The Genesis of a Discipline*, and is touted on the cover as “the first history of the discipline.” Soldatenko’s well-documented history develops two intellectual traditions he says competed for dominance in the field over its initial years. The dominant tradition he labels “empirical,” and describes it as accommodationist to the academy and its epistemology. The second school of thought he labels “perspectivist” and describes it as oppositional to the academy and its dominant theoretical and methodological paradigms. He argues the essentialism of identity in Chicana/o Studies, and centers his analysis and exploration around personalities and politics of the field. This is an intellectual history of the field, albeit a slightly reductionist one, that attempts to go beyond identifying the cycle of theories, like internal colonialism, that have driven the essayist history of Chicana/o studies. Yet, it attributes and imposes motivations and intentions on the part of scholars without interviewing many of these scholars. Many of them are still available to question their motivations and “perspectives” in producing their scholarship, and especially the periodical or journal vehicles for publications that helped found and develop the field of Chicano studies. This absence in his research allows him to cement the two intellectual traditions as an organizing principle for the book, as if they were present in mature and determinative form from the beginning of the field, well developed and intentioned by the scholarship and scholars of the time, and to frame them as a race for top dog in the field. These are faults that problematize this history of the field.

The second book is Rudy Acuña’s *The Making of Chicana/o Studies: In the Trenches of*

---

<sup>1</sup> Based on the Plenary Remarks I made at the NACCS Annual Meeting, Palmer House, Chicago, Illinois, on March 15, 2012.

*Academe*, published in 2011, in which he brings our attention to the socio-political, institutional context of the histories of the discipline, qua the individual campus programs across the nation, without necessarily resolving many of its apparent contradictions or conflicts. It centers on the currently largest Chicana/o studies program in the country at California State University, Northridge—Acuña’s home campus—as an exemplar of the institutional growth of the field. His longevity in the field, his status as a senior scholar and one of the most productive in the field, his training as a historian, and his continuity, and thus involvement, at CSU Northridge’s program, all provide for a testimonio to this disciplinary history beyond the other research that was done for the book. We benefit from this in the detail and motivations of the events, and actors—a first-hand look at the stories.

As you all probably can predict, there is a need to further explore these issues, perspectives, and research on the history of the discipline to continue to shape a more comprehensive and complex intellectual and infra-structural history of where we have been, how we got here, and who we are.

Let me briefly remind us of the Chicano Movement as a unique social movement in our history. Roughly peaking for a decade between 1965 (give or take a few years), and 1975 (give or take a few years), it was multi-faceted and community-based; it incorporated organizations and individuals, especially youth, into a loose network of general mutual-support; it involved farmworkers and other labor organizations and unions; civil rights organizations; and anti-Viet Nam war and pacifist activists. It was co-incident with counter-cultural movements that promoted peace in the world, social justice, and personal freedoms. The sexual revolution was changing relationships between men and women, the structure and role of the family, and other gendered social units within society. There were also major socio-governmental changes taking place during the 1960s, that included expansion and protection of fundamental rights: the passage of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, the 1965 Voting Rights Act, and there was a national war on poverty, that attempted to change the plight of people in this country and to “open up society.”

It was also very much of a segregated society. While legal and constitutional segregation was falling by the wayside, the practices of segregation, exclusion, and racial discrimination were still the norm. The Mexican-origin population was much stereotyped, segregated, discriminated against, and very much unequal in U.S. society. These communities were less than 5% of the national population of 200 million and historically concentrated in the ceded lands of the U.S.-Mexican war of 1846-48, that was ended with the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo, just a century earlier. More than two-thirds of the Mexican origin population was then native-born, and more than half was native born of native born parents. The average age of 23 years was 10 years younger than the national average. Mexicans lived in cities more so than the rest of the nation. It was from these platforms that the electoral, labor, and civic activism of the time blossomed into a movement.

The Chicano Movement shared some of the goals of other contemporary movements: elimination of racism; end to discrimination; promotion of equity, fairness, and social justice; social change—even revolution—from the status quo. The movement was inspired by the anti-colonial and national liberation struggles around the world, and so advocated self-determination, the agency of Chicanos, as a primary mode of acting in the world. Collectively this meant defining ourselves as a rejection of being defined by others, as an affirmation of our own power and agency, and of who we were as Mexicanos, Chicanos—Raza. Collectively, this meant the ability to make decisions about our future and development of the power to realize those goals,

plans, and dreams.<sup>2</sup>

This loose network of organizations and individuals shared common logos, or signs, or ideas, that gave communion and unity of purpose.<sup>3</sup> Amongst these were “Chicano,” “La Raza,” and “Aztlán.” Let me elaborate just briefly so as to share them as a common frame of reference. Chicano—an in-group self-identifier that became used as a public identifier to name ourselves. Its etymology ties it with Mexicano, affirming a cultural identity. It is also tied to an indigenous past and present of the Meshicas, one of the 7 tribes who came from somewhere north of Tula—from Aztlán—to found and expand the Aztec empire. It was also connotatively pejorative in its colonial period association with Indios, who occupied the lowest rung on the Spanish imperial social ladder. Its use as a public identifier announced its re-valuation to a positive name and a proud use of the name. It was both a cultural, historical, and political label.

La Raza—The promotion of a collectivity, as a people—a family—that shared a common history, language, place on this continent, and even a common biology, tied as it often is to the creation story of the “mestizo;” a promotion of solidarity based on these commonalities that can transform to unity and organization and power.

Aztlán—As the name of the northern homeland of the 7 Chichimeca tribes that migrated south to the Valley of México, it had three meanings or uses in the Chicano movement: (1) it represented a place of origin that could be what is now the southwestern United States, providing us with a legitimate, historical claim of presence there; (2) as a unifying notion of nation or a people—we are a spiritual nation—reflected in *El Plan Espiritual de Aztlán*; and (3) it reinforced our identification with our indigenous past—mythologized or disrupted as you might see it.

These three ideographs, amongst others, provided for a broad net of ideas loosely bringing together people into the Chicano movement. They also implicated three big ideas in the ideologies that competed for attention in the movement to describe and explain our situation, our condition—race, class, and culture.

As you can see, these elements of the movement drew on Mexicano culture, identities, and histories for use in a socio-political movement in the United States. At the same time it rejected a claim to the modern nation-state of México. These core commonalities were reflected in the rhetoric and ideologies of the Movement.

The diversity of the participants, and the openness to join the movement, also promoted “el respeto al derecho ajeno” con un reconocimiento de que “cada cabeza es un mundo.” Hicimos hincapié a la diversidad—mestizo, indio, hispano, mulatto! The diversity of the movement can also be described, in part, by its organizational bases—labor, cities, rural areas, farms and ranches, barrios, schools and universities.

The exclusion of Chicanos in the power centers of society and in many institutional areas

---

<sup>2</sup> See several Plans issued by organizations outlining goals and strategies that reflected Movement ideologies: (1) *El Plan de Delano*. (1966). In Rendón, A. 1996 (1971). *Chicano Manifesto: The History and Aspirations of the Second Largest Minority in America*. Berkeley, CA: Ollin Company. Pp. 298-301; (2) *Plan de la Raza Unida*. (1967). In Rendón, A. 1996 (1971). *Chicano Manifesto: The History and Aspirations of the Second Largest Minority in America*. Berkeley, CA: Ollin Company. Pp. 301-302; and (3) *El Plan Espiritual de Aztlán*. (1969).

<sup>3</sup> See Powers, Lloyd. 1973. Chicano Rhetoric: Some Basic Concepts. *Southern Speech Communication Journal*. 38. 340-346; Delgado, Fernando. 1995. Chicano Movement Rhetoric: An Ideographic Interpretation. *Communication Quarterly*. 43:4 (fall). 446-454; and Gutiérrez, José Angel. 1985. Ondas y Rollos: The Ideology of contemporary Chicano Rhetoric. In Hammerback, Jensen, and Gutiérrez. *A War of Words: Chicano Protest in the 1960s and 1970s*. Westport, Conn. Greenwood Press. 121-162.

was evident and visible, and Movement equity goals pursued increases in the participation of Chicanos in these areas proportionate to our presence in the population. There were few Chicano students in higher education, for example. I enrolled at UCLA as an undergraduate in February of 1965, from East Los Angeles' Garfield High School. I was one of 4 Chicano students that entered that year through the Educational Opportunities Program (EOP), and joined an undergraduate student body of 16,000 students. I went to UCLA because I was recruited by the Educational Opportunities Program, a newly-established office which purpose was to diversify the student body by recruiting Black and Chicano students. There were maybe 60 Spanish surnamed students on campus—but most of them were foreign students from Latin America. It was a white university and we were socially isolated from the daily campus life. The experiences of hundreds others like me at other colleges and universities, drove us to pursue Chicano recruitment and admissions (and completions) to higher education as part of the Chicano Student movement.

As part of the burgeoning Chicano Movement, the few Raza students on campuses organized. 1967 was a significant year for student organizing—groups with different names (like the United Mexican American Students, the Mexican American Student Association), in different cities and states, at different colleges, sprouted with enthusiasm and excitement. In 1969, after the Denver Youth conferences and the Plan de Santa Barbara conference in California, most of the Raza student organizations changed their name to MEChA—Movimiento Estudiantil Chicano de Aztlán, to signify unity, reflect Movement solidarity, use the Spanish language, promote the new public identifier of Chicano, and still be a four letter word. At last, a familiar and supportive community was created for Raza students on these campuses. Raza student organizations were being created at most of the colleges and even high schools, demanding better, relevant education, an end to discrimination and segregation, and promoting equity and social justice. They promoted the broad common goals of the movement at their place of action—schools. These student organizations also adopted the symbols, the rhetoric and the ideologies of the Movimiento: Chicano; La Raza; and Aztlán. We adopted symbols, slogans, and dichos from the Mexican Revolution, and the Mexican political and student movements: “Por mi raza habla el espíritu;” “I didn’t come to work for the university but to have the university work for the community.”

At this time the scholarship on the Chicano community was fairly limited—we were an invisible group to many of the researchers writing their books and articles. What little research existed on the Chicano community, was often plagued by distortions, stereotypes, fragmentation, one-sidedness, and linguistic bias.<sup>4</sup>

The Chicano Student movement responded to this situation by creating a new area of studies to correct these intellectual gaps and errors—Chicano Studies.

The five goals of this new area of study were:

- (1) Create new knowledge about the diverse Chicano community and share it. That is investigate, recover and teach the history, culture and social practices of our communities in this part of the world.
- (2) Reformulate and correct old knowledge. That is, analyze, and evaluate the existing stories about our community and correct them if necessary and challenge them if necessary.
- (3) Apply research knowledge to the improvement of the Chicano community. That is, bring

---

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Hernández, Deluvina. 1970. *Mexican American Challenge to a Sacred Cow*. Monograph No. 1. Los Angeles: UCLA Mexican American Cultural Center; Vaca, N. 1970. The Mexican-American in the social sciences, Part I: 1912-1935. *El Grito*. 3:3, 3-24; Vaca, N. 1970. The Mexican-American in the social sciences, Part II: 1936-1970. *El Grito*. 4:1, 17-51.

the university and higher education to bear on the improvement of the material conditions of our communities—poverty, injustice, inequality, social discrimination, political manipulation, and economic exploitation.

- (4) Support the cultural renaissance within the community. That is, be part of the artistic, creative cultural processes generated by our communities in ways that incorporated them to the universities to make them ours as well. The first Chicano mural was created at UCLA in 1969.
- (5) Support social changes through a critical awareness and commitment to equity, and social justice.

This was accomplished with five strategies, according to Ornelas, Ramírez, and Padilla in their 1975 work entitled *Decolonizing the Interpretation of the Chicano Political Experience*:<sup>5</sup> (1) Have Raza do the research and publish it; (2) Take to task the methods and models and explanations of earlier studies; (3) New courses and academic programs at colleges; (4) Establish alternative, independent institutions (including alternative schools and colleges, but also network and membership organizations, like NACS); and (5) Pressure commercial publishers to stop their exclusion of Chicano authors and works. New courses and incipient academic programs were developed as early as the mid-1960s at various colleges. A 1969 California conference sponsored by the Chicano Coordinating Council on Higher Education, led by Arturo Madrid, focused on consolidating these activities and promoting them to other institutions by sharing syllabi of many of these courses. The publication of the proceedings, entitled *El Plan de Santa Barbara: A Chicano Plan for Higher Education: Analyses and Positions* (Santa Barbara, CA: La Causa Publications, 1970), tremendously stimulated the creation and expansion of these courses and programs within the state and especially in other parts of Aztlán.

Research centers and academic degree programs were established throughout the country around Chicano Studies. At UCLA this took the form of an inter-departmental major, drawing on the few faculty available, and developing new courses that were offered by different departments, and paralleling the structure and power arrangements existing on these campuses.

Professors, graduate students, undergraduate students, and community activists all played an important role in bringing to life the Movimiento's goals in higher education. Carlos Muñoz stated, "The movement for Chicano Studies and the Chicano Student Movement were originally one and the same."<sup>6</sup>

Earlier scholars had challenged pre-existing views of Mexican Americans. The 1960s was a time that Chicano scholars not only challenged the conclusions of Euro-American scholars but provided alternative paradigms and theoretical perspectives. Octavio Romano was one of the first Movement scholars to do this, and do so through an alternative publication vehicle. In *El Grito: a Journal of Contemporary Mexican American Thought* (established in 1967), Romano argued that the common claim of "truth" and "objectivity" was used as an excuse to justify Anglo-American scholars in their racist and biased views.<sup>7</sup> According to him, a claim to "truth" and "objectivity" was a misleading notion that allowed scholars to publish their negative academic portrayals of Chicanos.

*El Grito* and, later, *Aztlán: Chicano Journal of the Social Sciences and the Arts* (the first

---

<sup>5</sup> Ornelas, Ramírez, and Padilla. 1975. *Decolonizing the Interpretation of the Chicano Political Experience*. Pamphlet No. 1. (Los Angeles, CA: Aztlán Publications).

<sup>6</sup> Muñoz, Carlos. 1989. P.

<sup>7</sup> See in particular the seminal works of Romano, O. 1968. The anthropology and sociology of the Mexican-Americans: The distortion of Mexican-American history. *El Grito*. 2:1 13-26; Rios, F. 1969. The Mexican in fact, fiction, and folklore. *El Grito*. 2:4 14-28; Romano, O. 1970. Social science, objectivity and the Chicanos. *El Grito*. 4:1 4-16; and Romano, O. 1969. The historical and intellectual presence of Mexican-Americans. *El Grito*. 2:2 32-46.

issue was published in 1971, although the date on the cover indicates fall 1970), came to reflect the dialogue among some of the young intellectuals and scholars of the Chicano movement regarding the quest for a Chicano Studies and the related quest for identity and power by the student movement as a whole.<sup>8</sup> These journals included varying perspectives, theories, methods, and paradigms.

Coming out after the initiation of the Chicano student movement and the *Plan de Santa Barbara*, the inaugural issue of *Aztlán* in 1971 (although the publication date was printed and intended as 1970), was significantly introduced by three opening paragraphs of *El Plan espiritual de Aztlán*, and a poem by Alurista in lieu of a preface. This *Plan espiritual de Aztlán* advocated revolutionary cultural nationalism by calling for the liberation of Chicanos through popular mobilization, control of resources, and economic and political autonomy. The co-founders of *Aztlán* espoused the *Plan* by creating a Chicano-controlled, independent publishing house that solely focused on Chicano issues—*Aztlán* Publications, hosted at UCLA. The *Aztlán* journal served as an outlet for Chicana/o scholars, but unlike most academic journals of its time, it assured every author copyright to their article. Each author had total control over the use and reproduction of their work. This reaffirmed the claim to autonomy, self empowerment and self-determination to the entire cadre of scholars who were published by *Aztlán*.<sup>9</sup> The short poem by Alurista titled, *Poem in Lieu of Preface*, chronicled the struggle of a people who are in search of their homeland, Aztlán.

The original co-editors of *Aztlán*, Juan Gómez-Quiñones, Roberto Sifuentes, Jaime Sena, and Alfredo Cuellar, all graduate students at UCLA, intended to publish articles that (1) would critique extant scholarship on the Mexican origin population; but also would (2) present original, empirical work on Chicanos (much of the early articles were derived from master's theses and doctoral dissertations); (3) theorize within Chicano studies; and (4) cover topics and themes which forced both disciplinary and multi-disciplinary attention to new frameworks, and to little attended areas of Chicana/o life (much of this was done through special issues; for example, the recognition and promotion of the idea that Chicanos consisted of heterogeneous communities was reflected with special issues on Chicanos in the midwest, and the northwest, articles on Chicanos in New York, and Chicanas and labor). These presumptions allowed the co-editors and authors to advocate social and academic change through the journal.

The first issue of *Aztlán* started with exploratory answers to several questions: What is a Chicano? Do we have a history? Are we a distinct culture? Some of the prominent themes of the period, such as identity, racism, class, culture, and stereotypes, were tackled by specifically printing articles that would reinterpret frameworks to better explore these themes. For this reason the first issue included essays that provided a discussion of the definitions of the “Mexican American” people, the affirmation of a Chicano culture, the proposition of a Chicano history and resistance, that excavated social and labor movements in the Chicano community. Not only did these journals serve as a symbolic contestation to U.S. Euro-American culture and history, but also served as an outlet for Chicano scholarly and intellectual alternatives.

The assertion of a culture and an identity was also exhibited in the format and composition of the journal. In addition to using meso-American indigenous art the journal included contemporary original art. The art was initially produced by Judith Hernández from the

---

<sup>8</sup> Other Chicano academic journals initiated throughout the 1970s and 1980s often focussed on specific areas of Chicana/o studies, e.g., the *Chicano Law Review* (first issue published in 1974).

<sup>9</sup> This changed in 1985, when the editorial leadership of the journal was changed and transferred from co-editors Juan Gómez-Quiñones, Reynaldo F. Macias, and Teresa McKenna, to Raymund Paredes (English, UCLA), Manuel Miranda (Social Welfare, UCLA), and Carlos Otero (Spanish & Portuguese, UCLA), as Paredes became the new director of the host unit, the UCA Chicano Studies Research Center.

Otis Art Institute of Los Angeles, California, and the publications designed by UCLA Theater Arts undergraduate student Vicente Madrid. All of the cover art was crafted for the journal. It's ties to the student movement was evident after the MEChA logo appeared on the back cover of the third printing of the first issue.<sup>10</sup> For the next four years it remained on the back cover only being replaced by the Partido Liberal Mexicano logo. Though the MEChA logo was not formally adopted by MEChA, it still is widely used. The place of publication recognized a historical relationship to the area, and one that associated it with ideographs of the Movement, beginning in Volume 2, number 2, as "El Pueblo de Nuestra Señora La Reina de Los Angeles de Porciúncula, Califas, Aztlán," using the Spanish name for the pueblo of Los Angeles, and adding, not only the local indigenous name for the area (Porciúncula), but also the spiritual nation of Aztlán. The goal was to become an autonomous, professional, yet untraditional, Movement academic journal. It met a recognized need to provide another space for the intellectual dialogue amongst scholars interested in research on Chicana/o communities and their material and existential conditions.

The second issue not only included critiques but also articles that began to outline alternative perspectives that could be used in the social sciences and the humanities. Co-editor Teresa McKenna professed this clarion call, when she wrote in her 1971 article, entitled "Three Novels: An Analysis": "The Chicano must not only address himself to the creation of a distinct literature emergent from his own reality, he must also contribute to the further richness of his art through the development of a body of criticism and approaches to Chicano literature from a Chicano perspective."<sup>11</sup>

The few PhDs and the slightly larger number of ABDs of the Chicano movement were active in their disciplinary professional associations. They formed disciplinary caucuses within these professional associations, forced these associations to establish committees on the status of Chicanos in the profession, lobbied for more participation in conferences, panels and disciplinary publications. Some of these Chicano caucuses organized a meeting, coordinated by graduate student Jaime Sena Rivera (chair of the Chicano caucus of the American Sociological Association) at Highlands University (NM), at which representatives of these disciplinary Chicano caucuses organized a cross-disciplinary, independent, network organization, known as the National Association of Chicano Social Scientists (NACSS). This organization later became The National Association of Chicano Social Science, and then the National Association of Chicano Studies (NACS), and then the National Association of Chicana and Chicano Studies (NACCS). This new group organized "focos"—cross-disciplinary, local research teams—as their basic membership unit, rather than the disciplinary caucuses. The group established national conferences focused on Chicano research and scholarship—something not heretofore done, and which have continued to this day.<sup>12</sup>

It was also through these annual meetings and this organization that major changes were effected within the field—including a paradigm shift based on gender, feminism, and sexuality—in the 1980s and 1990s. In the big ideas department of Chicano studies, we went from "race," "class" and "culture" that dominated before the 1990s to "race," "class" and "gender/sexuality"

---

<sup>10</sup> This logo was designed for the United Mexican American Students organization at UCLA, I believe by Mexican-born doctoral student Roberto Sifuentes, who provided much of the connection to Mexican cultural and student political activity for the UCLA movement organizing. The "UMAS" lettering around el caballero aguila was replaced with "MEChA" when the UCLA student organization changed its name, after the Santa Barbara conference that yielded *El Plan de Santa Barbara*.

<sup>11</sup> McKenna, Teresa. 1971. Three Novels: An Analysis. *Aztlan*, 1:2. (Fall) p. 47

<sup>12</sup> Cf. Macías, R. F. ed. 1977. Appendices I & II. In *Perspectivas en Chicano studies*. Los Angeles, CA: Aztlan Publications & NACCS. Pp. 210-220.



that dominated after 1990. These academic organizations, activities, and networks, were also movement organizations, activities and networks.

The 1980s saw a renaissance of writing and publications on Chicana/os, some of it influenced by, and influencing, feminist theories and critical cultural studies (cf. Schmitz et al, 1995, p. 713; Moraga, Cherrie & Anzaldua, Gloria. Eds. 1981. *This Bridge Called My Back*. Anzaldua, Gloria. 1987. *Borderlands*.). Academic publishers and journals, which heretofore had resisted publication of Chicana/o subjects and authors, began series on Chicana/os and reflected the influences of the growing fields of Chicana and Chicano Studies. Mainstream professional association academic journals, and an increasingly larger number of independent and commercial specialized and inter-disciplinary academic journals accepted many more articles on Chicanos and by Chicanos.

The traditional single disciplines also were affected by this multicultural intellectual renaissance. Many of these disciplines re-conceptualized their notions of race and ethnicity and the centrality of these constructs to their work; many embraced the study of immigration and immigrants; and identity and social processes of change became more prominent within their areas of study.<sup>13</sup>

The influence of postmodern studies could be felt within and outside Chicana/o Studies in approaches to scholarship, terminology and the topics of studies. The focus of study within Chicana/o Studies research began to shift noticeably from the center of the subject to the periphery, from the object to the interstitial spaces of borderlands and the in-betweens of previous constructs around which the field was organized.

In the 1980s, partly with the impetus of Raza students, the rise of Chicana Studies added several other goals to these intellectual efforts at self-knowledge taking place primarily at universities and colleges that focused on gender and sexuality:

- Place the Chicana as a central construct in the study of our communities. That is, integrate gender and sex as a necessary and universal dimension of our research.
- Challenge patriarchy within and outside the Chicano community. That is, engage and challenge the gendered power relations between the sexes in a way that provides for equity and equality between Chicanos and Chicanas. And
- Recognize the diversity of sexuality in the community. Make visible, attend to, and respect the sexual diversity within our communities. Address the bias and prejudice against lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgendered Raza.

Many of these discussions, debates, even choques, took place and resolved themselves at NACS, which eventually changed its name to reflect this resolution of integrating “Chicana Studies” to the field as the National Association of Chicana and Chicano Studies. In the 1980's, MEChA also changed its name to Movimiento Estudiantil Chicana y Chicano de Aztlán. The Chican@ movement, the Chican@ student movement and Chican@ studies were still symbiotically related.

In the 1990s, research and publications in Chicana/o Studies reflected influences from critical cultural and legal studies<sup>14</sup> and research on sexuality.<sup>15</sup> There was also a renewed interest

---

<sup>13</sup> Moore, Joan. 1997. Latina/o Studies: The Continuing Need for New Paradigms. *JSRI Occasional Paper #29*. East Lansing, MI: Julian Samora Research Institute, Michigan State University.

<sup>14</sup> Delgado, Richard and Stefancic, Jean. 2000. Latino/a Critical (“LatCrit”) Legal Studies: Review Essay. *Aztlán*. 25:2 (Fall), pp. 161-189; and Solórzano, Danny. 1998. Critical Race Theory, Race, and Gender MicroAgressions, and the Experience of Chicana and Chicano Scholars. *Qualitative Studies in Education*. 11:2, pp. 121-136

<sup>15</sup> For example, see DeLaTorre, A. & Pesquera, B., eds. 1993. *Building with our own hands: New directions in Chicana Studies*. Berkeley, CA: U. of California Press; Hurtado, A. 1998. ‘Sitios y lenguas’: Chicanas theorize feminisms. *Hypatia*. 13:2, 134-162; Gaspar de Alba, Alicia. 1993. Tortillerismo: Work by Chicana Lesbians. *Signs: Journal of*

in transnational, and to some extent diasporic, studies. Notions of “cultural citizenship” and questions about the long-term viability of the nation-state helped redefine physical and social geographies and promoted new regional approaches to the study of Chicana/os.<sup>16</sup> These studies often placed the individual and identity processes under the research lenses, rather than the group. Studies of cultural performance and production, criticisms of public exhibition of self and others, the roles of individuals and identities in this production and the debates around a “Chicana/o aesthetic” also became more prominent within the field and broadened its scope, even while scholars continued to deepen their understanding of the Chicana/o collective and material conditions.

Indigenous studies regained attention towards the end of the decade and are growing in number and influence within the field. This renewed development of the indigenous wing of Chicana and Chicano Studies has centered on language, culture, identity and social relations with other indigenous peoples in the western hemisphere not only historically, which tends to be mythologized, but today as well. How much are we de-tribalized? What is the possibility of recapturing, revitalizing, decolonizing ourselves? Some have suggested that these emphases should be reflected in spelling the field with an X as in Xican@ studies.

The last two decades also saw a consolidation of much of the research and literature into compendia, encyclopedias on Chican@s, Latin@s, and research handbooks, providing a different, bibliographic and infra-structural foundation to the field, training, and literature. For example, at the UCLA Young Research Library Reference desk, in fall 2003, there were 33 reference works on Chican@s and Latin@s specifically, dating from 1974. These ranged across 3 encyclopedias, 10 research handbooks, 9 dictionaries, 8 indexes/bibliographies/finding guides, and 3 directories. Of these, five were published in the 1970s, 10 in the 1980s, 12 in the 1990s and 6 between 2000 and 2003, with at least two more encyclopedias and a research handbook since 2003 and 2011. The encyclopedias and research handbooks were published predominantly in the 1990s. In addition to these print resources there are three searchable digital databases on Chican@s and Latin@s. Much of this recent reference literature provides syntheses and summaries of 4 decades of research, analyses, and intellectual work. If people are looking for canons, they won't find them here, unless they create them.

The development of doctoral programs in Chican@ Studies over the last decade is another infra-structural threshold in the development of the field. PhD programs will change things again. It will be the doctoral students in Xican@ Studies who will accomplish that change.

Los estudiantes, el movimiento de estudiantes, are the reason why we have great research centers in Xican@ Studies. The students, are the reason we have more than 40 departments of Chicana/o Studies at four year colleges, and many more at community colleges.<sup>17</sup> MEChA, and other Raza student organizations are why we have a majors, minors, and now masters degrees and doctor of philosophy degrees in Chicana and Chicano Studies. MEChA is why we now have nearly 4,000 Raza students at UCLA and many more at other institutions of higher education. The Chicano Movement, and the Chicano student movement, are why we now have you here at NACCS, in 2012, in Chicago, Illinois, at the Palmer House Hotel.

For the 45 years since we organized on campuses as undergraduate and graduate students, there have been continuous student actions that realized dreams and fulfilled aspirations through

---

*Women in Culture and Society*. 18:4, pp. 956-963; González, Deena. Speaking secrets: Living Chicana Theory. In Carla Trujillo, ed. *Living Chicana Theory*. Berkeley, CA: Third Women Press. Pp. 44-77.

<sup>16</sup> Flores, W. & Benmayor, R. Eds. 1997. *Latino cultural citizenship: Claiming identity, space and rights*. Boston: Beacon Press.

<sup>17</sup> Macías, R. F. 2007. *El Grito en Aztlán*. Also see the appendix in Acuña, 2011.

work, through collaboration and through community. We have provided and promoted research, teaching, scholarship and service that enhances the appreciation and understanding of human behaviors, social organization, and life on earth, over time and space. But, it also promotes active engagement in shaping our world.

The university has become more important than ever in helping us make sense of the rapid and profound changes taking place in the human family and all around us. We seek to understand and explain the diverse forces that affect us as individuals and that shape our local, national and world communities. It is critical to maintain and develop those disciplines that reflect changing paradigms, and particularly express the voice of those not easily heard within our society; of those still struggling to achieve social justice—disciplines like Xican@ studies. Our goals continue to be to give you the skills, the knowledge, and the ideas you need to navigate the increasingly complex world in which we live; to appreciate the many expressions of the human experience, and the many faces of the human family; and to help shape a better and just world for the future.

NACCS continues to be a critical part of the network of intellectual work in Xican@ Studies. My hope is that we continue to teach and learn in Xican@ Studies—inside and outside the classroom—to dream for ourselves, to enrich the societies in which we live, to connect the local with the global, and to make the changes in the world to build a better one—a socially just one—for all of us and for the generations to come.

We are still part of a movement to help change the world for the better. Like the students that came before us, let's leave a legacy of affirmation, construction, and greater growth of the Raza community on campus. Come occupy the academy. Aquí tenemos nuestra casa, y aquí tenemos nuestra familia.

Gracias por su atención.

¡Adelante! ¡Si Se puede! ¡Que Viva La Raza!!

Muchas gracias. Thank you.