

Copyright (c) 1999 University of Miami Law Review

University of Miami

July, 1999

LENGTH: 10278 words

MAPPING INTELLECTUAL/POLITICAL FOUNDATIONS AND FUTURE SELF CRITICAL DIRECTIONS: Introduction: LatCrit Theory: Mapping Its Intellectual and Political Foundations and Future Self-Critical Directions

Margaret E. Montoya *

BIO:

* Professor of Law, University of New Mexico School of Law. As always, kudos to Frank Valdes, Lisa Iglesias and the other organizers of the Miami LatCrit meeting which I, unfortunately, could not attend.

SUMMARY: ... The third annual gathering of LatCrit scholars has resulted in this cluster of essays and articles that continue the work of defining the foundations and the future directions of this legal scholarship movement. ... LatCrit already functions as a community for scholars of color and a "safe" space in which race, ethnicity, color, language, sexual identity can be explored and expressed in ways that are often not acceptable within the dominant culture or within many of the institutions in which we work. ... The reflections of Victoria Ortiz and Jennifer Elrod about their welcome reception into the Miami meeting of LatCrit provide some evidence that LatCrit has benefited from prior struggles that link race/ethnicity and sexual orientation. ... Part II: Mapping LatCrit Antecedents, Approaches, Spaces and Trajectories ... In my opinion, LatCrit should give serious consideration to reaching some accommodation that will insure the collaboration of the widest group of progressive scholars of color in both LatCrit and CRT. ... The article weaves stories of their "actual family" and their previous experiences of discomfort at academic gatherings with reflections on the "intellectual family" they find at LatCrit and their exhilaration at finding kinship, solidarity and hospitality at the Miami meeting. ... Despite the fact that LatCrit is about theorizing the Latino/Latina condition from a legal perspective, it has always been in the company of and in collaboration with other people of color and other progressives. ...

[*1119]

The third annual gathering of LatCrit scholars has resulted in this cluster of essays and articles that continue the work of defining the foundations and the future directions of this legal scholarship movement. As described in some of the articles within this cluster, LatCrit has had the benefit of learning valuable lessons from other slightly older schools of critical legal theory, most particularly from the Critical Race Theory ("CRT") Workshop. The LatCrit movement has been strengthened because scholars identified primarily with CRT working with and alongside scholars identified primarily with LatCrit have struggled to recognize, name and address the hetero-normativity and racial binarism which plague the U.S. society and its structures, even progressive groups. n1

LatCrit has much to gain from continuing its interactions with other progressive scholars working in other disciplines. In this cluster, Professors Kevin Johnson and George Martinez encourage LatCrit scholars to **[*1120]** recognize the roots of LatCrit within the established field of Chicana/o studies. n2 LatCrit has already integrated a few prominent Chicana/o scholars from other disciplines into its annual meetings. Antonia Castañeda n3 spoke at LatCrit II on the mis/use of children as translators for non-English

speaking family members; Tomas Almaguer⁴ and Rudolfo Acuña⁵ will be keynote speakers at LatCrit IV. All are established scholars within the Chicana/o Studies movement.

As LatCrit examines its connections to other scholarly movements, Stephanie Phillips reminds us that different forms of exclusion are parts of the histories of those movements and organizations. CRT, Chicana/o Studies and other scholarly groups have had to deal openly with issues of such exclusionary practices as homophobia, sexism and/or subtle forms of racism.⁶ Some progressive organizations have dealt with such practices quietly by recruiting Outsider scholars (such as scholars of color and Queers⁷) to join as prominent participants in conferences as [*1121] well as in the directorship bodies of the organizations. Occasionally groups have been formed partially in reaction to the deafness of the majority to the concerns of minority viewpoints. While some might describe LatCrit's relation to CRT in those terms, it also describes the history of other groups. For example, in 1984 many of the Chicanas fighting against the sexism in Chicano Studies formed MALCS, Mujeres Activas en Letras y Cambio Social [Women Active in Letters and Social Change]; fifteen years later the group continues to sponsor a summer workshop and a journal of Chicana studies.⁸

In the Afterword that follows, I caution LatCrits against accepting the body of scholarship produced by Chicanas/os without a careful and critical look at the anti-sexist and anti-homophobic struggles that were crucial forces in the development of the National Association of Chicana/Chicano Studies ("NACCS").⁹ In the Afterword I use two transcribed interviews to bring in the voices of Cordelia Candelaria, a writer, and Deena Gonzalez, a historian, who have been active in the formation of Chicana Studies.

Part I: Anti-Subordination and Self-Critique As Defining Features of LatCrit

Considered as a whole, the articles in this cluster regard LatCrit as a significant community for the production of critical scholarship examining, inter alia, issues of race, color and ethnicity as well as sexual identity from a perspective of anti-subordination. LatCrit already functions as a community for scholars of color and a "safe" space in which race, ethnicity, color, language, sexual identity can be explored and expressed in ways that are often not acceptable within the dominant culture or within many of the institutions in which we work. LatCrit also functions as an emotionally nurturing site where relationships and friendships are initiated and developed. Thus, these articles acknowledge that in a fairly short period of time, LatCrit has created a new space for critical legal scholarship and, in doing so, has created greater access to the experiences, histories and narratives of Latino/a communities for a diverse group of progressive scholars.

Whether LatCrit will endure and have an impact beyond the group that gathers for its annual conferences depends not only on its ability to [*1122] generate significant scholarship but also to continue to utilize mechanisms for meaningful self-criticism and to create inter- and intra-disciplinary alliances with other progressive organizations including CRT. Following the lead of ethnic studies programs, LatCrit has recognized the potential for increasing the utility of theoretical work by linking oppositional scholarship with teaching and by working with activists and community organizers.

The articles in this cluster advance several of the objectives identified with LatCrit and typify the best scholarship this movement is producing. The articles by Kevin Johnson and George Martinez, Stephanie Phillips and Athena Mutua suggest trans-disciplinary directions for LatCrit by strengthening its ties to Chicano/Chicana studies, cooperating with a renewed Critical Race Theory project, and providing new meanings for the shared term "Crit." Kevin Johnson and George Martinez explore the important but not always obvious connections between the scholarly agenda of Chicana/o Studies and that of LatCrit. Stephanie Phillips' article which examines the CRT Workshop's uneven history with issues of homophobia and Afrocentrism is an outstanding example of conscientious self-criticism. Athena Mutua urges that LatCrit continue to deploy analytical techniques that instantiate intersectionality by interrogating which groups occupy the "bottom" or the "center" at different times and with respect to different identity

characteristics. The reflections of Victoria Ortiz and Jennifer Elrod about their welcome reception into the Miami meeting of LatCrit provide some evidence that LatCrit has benefited from prior struggles that link race/ethnicity and sexual orientation.

The Mahmud article sustains LatCrit's emerging and deserved reputation for generating boundary-expanding, race-based scholarship. Tayyab Mahmud focuses outside of the U.S. with a rigorous analysis of the historical racializing and racist practices of Europe in its colonies, especially those of Great Britain in the Indian subcontinent.

Part II: Mapping LatCrit Antecedents, Approaches, Spaces and Trajectories

This introduction creates a "map" of this cluster that analyzes and inter-relates the articles. (See Appendix A.) But maps, even when they serve the function of guiding us through physical and/or theoretical spaces, inevitably distort reality by filtering out information while focusing and symbolizing other information. n10 The map compares the articles [*1123] using the following topics: the theoretical antecedents of the LatCrit scholarship, the principal theoretical approaches used in each article, the space/place applicable to the article, and the future directions or trajectories suggested for LatCrit. The map category called "Theoretical Antecedents" attempts to link the article with a larger body of scholarly work besides LatCrit to explore the varied critical discourses that are being expanded upon by this cluster of articles. The category "Theoretical Approaches" oversimplifies each of the articles by identifying the main approach chosen by the author(s) of each entry in order to demonstrate the breadth of styles being used in this cluster. "Space/Place" also demonstrates breadth, this time in the geographic reach of the authors in this cluster, covering Chicanas/os in the Southwest to Indians in their global diaspora. The final category of "Future Trajectories" tries to encapsulate the challenge and the potential that faces LatCrit as we examine ourselves critically even as we continue to develop a LatCrit community and to theorize about the society in which we work, live and love.

Crossover Dreams: The Roots of LatCrit Theory in Chicana/o Studies Activism and Scholarship by Kevin Johnson and George Martinez examines the "intellectual debt [owed by LatCrit] to the generations of scholarship focusing on Chicana/os in the United States." n11 The article should prove to be of immense interest to LatCrits as it recounts the history of scholarship focusing on Mexican-Americans and Mexicans (los Chicanos/ Mexicanos) residing in the U.S. Johnson-Martinez emphasize how the 1960-70's Chicana/o student movement intensified community activism that resulted in constructing new narratives and new individual and collective identities around the term "Chicano."

The article illustrates the ubiquity of Law in its multiple manifestations in the lives of this subgroup as evidenced in the writings of Chicana/o scholars. Immigration, civil rights, farmworker rights, economic integration and language rights were all issues being written about by the early Chicano academics.

As I try to show in the Afterword to this cluster, the Johnson-Martinez article mutes the intense controversies generated by the exclusion of Chicana experiences, voices and contributions from the narratives and reality-naming practices of Chicanos, especially within Chicano Studies [*1124] and NACS, as its national organization was originally named. Unfortunately, the Johnson-Martinez article reproduces the marginalization of Chicanas by confining their contributions to Chicana/o Studies to one paragraph. n12 And ironically, the anthology of Chicana/o history appended to the article contains more entries by women with non-Spanish surnames than those by women with Spanish surnames. n13

Despite this gendered criticism of the article, I strongly agree with its basic theme that LatCrits should look to the body of scholarship by Chicana/o scholars for inspiration and direction. Also I agree that it is important for LatCrit scholarship to disaggregate Latinas/os into subgroups - Chicanas/os, Puertoricanas/os, Cubanans/os, etc. - with their concrete histories, stories, commitments, and potentialities. I would, however, question whether all LatCrit scholarship has its roots in Chicana/o

scholarship. Indeed, I would posit that the strength of the LatCrit tree derives from the fact that it is rooted in many varied and separate histories with their corresponding bodies of scholarship.

With *The Convergence of the Critical Race Theory Workshop with LatCrit Theory: A History*,¹⁴ Stephanie Phillips makes a very useful contribution to the future development of LatCrit providing a context for understanding the overlapping histories of CRT and LatCrit. Written from her perspective as one of the early CRT Workshop convenors, the article concludes that CRT can continue to provide a home for the production of a progressive Black Nationalist body of scholarship.

At times writing in the first person as a participant and an observer, Phillips succeeds in relating a history that is marred by the exclusion and mistreatment of gays and lesbians as well as the dismissal or rejection of peoples of color, other than African Americans, as worthy subjects of race-based theorizing. This is not written as revisionist history. Phillips acknowledges the collective errors made within the CRT Workshops from year to year, and there is, at least to my ear, an undertone of regret but no justifications or rationalizations for the errors.

Phillips proposes that LatCrit sponsor alternate annual conferences with CRT because of the considerable overlap among the persons active in both groups. She wants to preserve CRT for the development of black critical theory with the collaboration of other scholars of color. In my opinion, LatCrit should give serious consideration to reaching some [*1125] accommodation that will insure the collaboration of the widest group of progressive scholars of color in both LatCrit and CRT.

In *Reflections of LatCrit III: Finding "Family,"*¹⁵ Victoria Ortiz and Jennifer Elrod relate a wrenching personal narrative about their lesbian inter-racial family and the lead-pipe mugging of their son Camilo just before Christmas 1997. Another family narrative appearing in an upcoming CRT anthology¹⁶ and their interactions with Frank Valdes had been their "doorway ...into LatCrit."¹⁷

The article weaves stories of their "actual family" and their previous experiences of discomfort at academic gatherings with reflections on the "intellectual family" they find at LatCrit and their exhilaration at finding kinship, solidarity and hospitality at the Miami meeting. I think many of us Latcrits will remember Elvia Arriola's *cris de coeur* at the first annual meeting describing her pain and alienation from her by rejection by peers and colleagues at the University of Texas and elsewhere.¹⁸

Given LatCrit's commitment to eliminating homophobia, it is gratifying to hear from Ortiz and Elrod that LatCrit offers a welcoming environment, but I wish they had allowed themselves to be critical. I would like to think that as LatCrits we are inclusive but I wonder if a significant number among us have done the moment-to-moment work that is necessary to change our homophobic tendencies and to eliminate careless utterances and hidden bigotry. Homophobia, however, runs deep in many cultures and the various Latina/o cultures persist in their rejection of Queer life, experience and values. Even as we work to increase the comfort level for all LatCrits - Queers and straights, we must be vigilant and candid about the biases that are pandemic in our communities.

With *Shifting Bottoms and Rotating Centers: Reflections on Lat Crit III and the Black/White Paradigm*, Athena D. Mutua has produced an ambitious analysis debunking the concept called the "Black/White" paradigm and exposing the misunderstandings it has provoked.¹⁹ Her article also provides a comparison of racial and linguistic hierarchies [*1126] that trap Blacks and Latinas/os in different ways/places/times. I found Mutua's paper to be especially intriguing because of her ability in capturing the sense of the conversations taking place at LatCrit III and attending to those conversations with this written riposte. She talks seriously about the rivalries and disagreements among Blacks and Latinas/os and then borrows the devices of "bottoms" and "centers" to theorize those conflicts and tensions. She writes, "the bottom speaks not to which group is more oppressed but rather speaks to power's obsessions and how those obsessions form the basis of different racial categories of oppression."²⁰ About rotating centers she notes that the idea of

focusing on issues of concern to other peoples of color besides Latinas/os at Lat Crit "institutionalizes a process of both advancing theory and building coalitions." n21

With Colonialism and Modern Constructions of Race: A Preliminary Inquiry, n22 Tayyab Mahmud initiates an analysis of the seemingly irreconcilable idealization of freedom and equality that characterizes European modernity with its appetite for conquest and colonization. Mahmud begins with an excellent introduction to the discourse of alterity that I associate with European post-colonial studies n23 focusing on the "West" and its confrontations with, and repression of, the "non-Western."

Mahmud's analysis of the construction of race in India during its colonial period when Europe established and maintained its forceful domination over the subcontinent resonates with other analyses about the construction of race. n24 The processes for the construction of inferiority is familiar: the plasticity of stereotypes, the instability and contingency of the racial hierarchies, and the reinforcement of subtle gradations of difference among the conquered to control and discipline from within. But the variety of racisms can only be understood when studied in terms of their particularities and peculiarities. So if Mahmud is guiding us through familiar territory, he is also leading us through the largely unknown terrain of the Indian varieties of racism.

[*1127] In India the colonizer creates new racial mythologies regarding the Aryan race and its evolutionary branches: the pure European Aryans with advanced cultures and contaminated hybrid Aryan India with its stagnant society. Mahmud identifies the principal racial stereotypes manipulated within the colonial framework of India: the martial races, the criminal tribes and the meek Hindu. This is a fascinating juxtaposition of military campaigns, history, geography, occupations, religions, languages and criminality, all being deployed with racialized meanings to maintain the subservience of the conquered/colonized population and the superiority of the conqueror/colonizer.

For me personally because of my own affinity for India, Mahmud's article is a particularly welcome addition to the explorations of race that are continuing under the RaceCrit/LatCrit/"OutCrit" n25 umbrella. After law school I traveled on a Harvard fellowship to Asia and spent six months in India. I harbor fond memories from that journey because it gave me, among many other things, new understandings of "racial" and color hierarchies. Mahmud has called this article a preliminary inquiry, and I eagerly await his deepening and broadening of this project that he has so effectively initiated. I hope future articles interrogate the intractability of the caste system and its connections to Hinduism as well as to colonial and contemporary racial hierarchies.

Part III: Afterword: NACS to NACCS Stories

A significant body of CRT and LatCrit scholarship, including several of the articles in the following cluster, analyzes and theorizes the de/formation of Latina/o individual and collective identities caused by sexism and homophobia. Consequently, it is prudent and productive to consider the long and painful history of the National Association for Chicana/Chicano Studies (NACCS) with respect to these two issues. What follows is not intended to pass as a complete retelling of that history. Much of that work has been done already by many prominent Chicana scholars, most notably Teresa Cordova, n26 and Deena Gonzalez, n27 and a few Chicanos, such as Gilberto Garcia. n28 I intend to write a longer article connecting that body of scholarship with work done by LatCrits for next year's annual meeting.

My purpose in this Afterword is to use the rhetorical device of listening to two Chicana scholars talk about their experiences within NACS and NACCS (more about that name switch in a moment) in order to consider group dynamics in LatCrit. I am focusing on both the complex intra-group gender dynamics (in this case among Latinas and Latinos in LatCrit by thinking about Chicanas and Chicanos out of LatCrit) as well as inter-group ethnic/racial dynamics (among Chicanas/os and non-Chicanas/os in and out of LatCrit). There is also the probability that the salience of a Chicana-ized anti-patriarchal and lesbian-centered anal

ysis will be contested, even among the Chicanas and the Latinas who are active in LatCrit. Nonetheless, as with racisms, hetero-normativity and homophobia, classism, white superiority, skin privilege and other forms of oppressive thinking, our expositions of sexism must be constantly re-centered and re-integrated into our discourses, otherwise it will reappear in new manifestations.

A few years ago NACS changed its name to NACCS - adding the "C" that symbolized the inclusion of women, thereby becoming the National Association for Chicana/Chicano Studies. By calling ourselves LatCrit, we elide the question of gender, and thus may never have to decide whether to make the kind of symbolic change made by NACCS. LatCrit's nominal elision does not, however, inoculate us against the ways that exclusionary practices against women, whether straight or Queer, replicate themselves. Anti-subordination requires the difficult work of recognizing, naming, challenging and changing marginalizing practices. Let me be blunt - I think that Chicanas/Latinas have been and continue to be marginalized and the Chicana/Latina voice has been and continues to be muted in legal scholarship, including LatCrit. For example, there is often an over-representation of invited Chicano scholars from other disciplines as compared to Chicanas at our annual meetings. In making this claim about the position of Chicanas/Latinas within LatCrit, I have not canvassed other Chicanas/Latinas active in LatCrit and do not presume to speak for the group.

[*1129]

A. An Interview with Cordelia Candelaria n29

MM: Can you tell me how NACCS came to have two C's in its name?

CC: Is that your operating question for the interview?

MM: No, I am basically interested in exploring what the lessons are that LatCrit should be learning from NACCS. While I am focusing on sexism and homophobia, I am not limiting it to that. I am particularly interested in the sexism, because more than homophobia, that issue seems to be submerged in LatCrit. As good Chicanas and Latinas I think we haven't raised that issue in order to maintain the collegiality of the group.

CC: Let me begin with a couple of comments just to situate my own awareness and also my ignorance in terms of NACCS and the two C's in its current name. I have not been actively involved in the organization since approximately 1990-91. Secondly, I was a member of NACS in the early days when the organization was evolving. This was a natural outgrowth for many of us from MECHA n30 and from our college experiences. We were not formally trained in anything like making pluralism work. My own formal studies were medieval studies, language, literature and that's what I have been doing ever since in one form or another. But I was always wanting to learn more about Chicano and Chicana literature - at first we called it "Chicano." We had raised feminist issues in MECHA in the 60's and 70's, however.

MM: I remember. I was active in MECHA when I was at San Diego State.

CC: So you know what I am talking about. The universe in terms of the 90's is quite different from the pre-80's... I became actively involved in NACS after I had been a dues-paying member for a long time. I had been asked to serve on the Mesa Directiva when I first came to the University of Colorado in 1978. I spent a couple of years at the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) where I worked to increase the resources of the Endowment for Humanities by simply calling everybody I knew to expand the names that the NEH was using for its reviewers, analysts, readers, and referees. Many of these scholars [*1130] were involved in NACS, and they provided other contacts, too. I was approached to be more active in NACS. I used to go to the conferences and encourage the colegas to apply to the NEH for grants and so on. After that, I became more directly involved. Gender issues generally tended to be things that we women talked about among ourselves. The few women I knew tended to be more compartmentalized about the discourse

of women and gender than we are now in terms of recognizing that it's a more complex cultural and cognitive process. Now we are more aware of the various dynamics and ways in which people engage and, of course, that everything's gendered. The Chicana Caucus is some thing that came out of that. As far as I know it evolved from these informal amorphous discussions. So that is my first comment regarding my NACS background.

MM: Is this when you became more involved in the organization?

CC: Yes, I was asked by Mary Romero, who was the chair of the NACS editorial committee, to join the committee as a reader. From that involvement I took on a much higher profile role. Out of that came my major role in NACS as the conference coordinator for the UC-Boulder conference in 1988. But before that the editorial committee would meet at the same time as the coordinating committee, so I would join some of those meetings. I saw NACS as basically a mutual aid society, folks who had common purpose in promoting Chicano studies and needed a professional society to do that. This second comment explains how I became more centrally involved in the Association.

When I made the proposal to host the conference at Boulder, I had to interact more formally with NACS - the coordinating committee, the chair and the treasurer. Preparing for the conference required the sort of accountability expected from established institutions as well as professional organizations. I saw myself as a with good will and wanting to contribute to build a stronger organization. But I would get frustrated by a lot of problems that seemed endemic to the organization and that needed redress. I interpreted them as gendered even though I didn't think it was perceived as such by some of our male colleagues. I thought some of the organizational inefficiencies proceeded from machismo, or whatever you want to call the patriarchal privilege emerging from old boy dominance of the Association. That is, they were so used to being in charge and working together that they tended to ignore internal organizational procedures and structures. Anyway, it was in this institutional phase (when the name was still one "C") when I had some problems.

MM: The name [NACCS] doesn't include two C's until fairly recently, right?

CC: Correct. Someone said to me, and I have never checked this [*1131] out, that the NACCS "C" was added after we, here at ASU, put two C's in the name of our Chicana/Chicano Studies Project, which is now a department. The reason that second C is there is because, when my ASU colegas, all males, asked me to take on the next phase of institutionalizing the Project in 1991, I wanted to have a serious discussion about the matter because I was a newcomer, and we needed to understand each other's assumptions. The first issue for me was that we needed to have some symbolic way of including women explicitly. I had several responses prepared for all the flack I expected to get. Immediately one of my colleagues said, it is about time to do that so how do you want to do it? I was so surprised because I had expected resistance and hadn't thought it through completely, but I suggested we put Chicana in there as well as Chicano and that's how it came about here.

Later on I was told by a MALCS [Mujeres Activas en Letras y Cambios Sociales] member that some of the NACS Chicana Caucus members had pointed to the Arizona model. But I wasn't part of NACCS discussions when it added the second "C", so I'm not sure.

MM: Let me go back to the point that you made about the time that you were the conference coordinator at UC-Boulder. How did the issues that you identified as gendered manifest themselves?

CC: The first [issue] had to do with my expecting a certain level of professionalism and accountability. When I came up in the ranks like Diana [Rebolledo, a Chicana literary critic and mutual friend] and other folks, we didn't have role models. We didn't have institutional support systems for the institutional reforms we were seeking. That support often came from other non-academic sources or we scraped around and did it ourselves. One of the things that we learned was how institutions function. From working in the research section of the National Endowment of the Humanities, I knew how to do paperwork to provide institu-

tional accountability. When I prepared the proposal for the conference, I went to the university and got different people to contribute and to be involved. We wanted to have a broad base of support, and many people were involved on my campus as well as NACS. I got a \$ 25,000 commitment from the university, and, of course, it had to be justified and accounted for, right?

MM: Sure.

CC: Up to then, I had a very even-toned relation with most of the men running NACS at the time, including the coordinator and the board. When I began to interact with them formally on conference business I expected reciprocity and basic efficiency, but I didn't always get it. So this is one way gender manifested itself in my view. I was quite straight- [*1132] forward and business-like in getting my concerns across and making requests for documentation.

That's when I had encounters which eventually led me to believe they saw me as sort of a professional bitch who "did not understand the organization," as it was often put me. I am not going to name names, but this was reported to me at different times by several NACS insiders. What ended up happening was key people dropping the ball. I enlisted the help of other members of the board since I needed to get answers and documentation, and that's when I would hear excuses made for the ones who dropped the ball from their cronies.

Basically, the conference planning committee wanted to leave a legacy for the future by having a good conference and by producing a conference manual so that every other NACS conference group wouldn't have to rediscover the wheel. The legacy was the conference, but the second thing was to get support and broadly based interest in the conference at Boulder from different sources because I was also trying to build up our Chicano Studies program. The manual would include a computerized registration system and up-to-date mailing list. The registration idea was a wonderful contribution from one of my colleagues, Leonard Baca, at the CU bilingual ed center, who donated a couple of staff and state-of-the-art software for conference registration. It would be on disk and then NACS would have it for future use. At that time, NACS did not have any regularized procedures, nor even an up-to-date mailing list of the membership. It took major effort to get an old mailing list for the conference.

My hope was that Boulder would contribute an efficient conference system, and we could all benefit from it. But some of the old boys didn't want to cooperate, and so they pulled out the "ideology card" - i.e., they said, we want to allow every conference the right to have autonomy. I asked how will it be less autonomous to have a regularized registration process in place; wouldn't that give more autonomy and time for issues of substance? Future organizers wouldn't have to waste time on Mickey Mouse things like setting up a database on basic conference preparations. I was also told that they felt that I was being a bitch, and somehow wanting to take over the organization. The ones who were most resistant were those who had had the highest profile in the organization. It was astonishing to me that they wouldn't see the benefits of this. Some of the other members told me that the "vatos" just don't want a woman to do this; they want to be the ones who take NACS forward in that way. I saw it as wanting to control everything and not have other people make any improvements that would be perceived as a reflection on them. But the reality was that nobody would have ever known about [*1133] it except that the next year's organization hosting conference would have a mailing list on disk and the software would be in place for registration.

What it came down to finally was that I took it to a board meeting. I asked the chair to put on the agenda the matter of procedural regularity and conference format systematization. Well, it actually took a vote and some of the senior people in the organization voted against it. Amazing, isn't it?, that we had to vote to be able to make the registration process more efficient.

MM: The important thing is the subtext of the vote not really the text of it...

CC: Right. Those are the things that you don't get from just looking at a vote. Somebody shrewd would ask, why did you even need to vote on something like that?

This gets to my second point and that is the way in which some organizational meetings were run and business was handled. The "real" business often would take place socially - for example, at the bar over beer with those who wanted to do that. Some of us who had family responsibilities or were not drinkers or whatever would not be part of that. I had gotten complaints from other members about this, and when possible I would confront it directly.

I objected to re-opening settled matters that had been agreed to or voted on, especially when accountability issues were at stake. I didn't think it was appropriate to handle organization business as if the emperor was perfectly dressed in a new suit cuando estaba casi empeloto [when he was almost naked]. But by and large people were respectful of me, but I just had a feeling that I wasn't making a dent. For one thing [some of the women in NACS] would talk to me privately but wouldn't speak up in the group. This sometimes happens because of inexperience and lack of confidence, as you know. But when these people who are behind-the-scenes allies don't stand up when it counts, then it ends up pitting the same one or two reformers against the status quo.

I never felt maligned in particular, although other women told me they did feel unfairly treated. It just happens that I was older than most of them, or as old as the oldest ones, and I have a very thick head and a very thick skin. Still, I also don't want to make it sound like there was an overly embittered atmosphere. One has to work with a lot of different people. Those of us, mostly women, who have come into the academy with a feminist viewpoint still have a long way to go before we move beyond the present transitional phase and become absorbed into the pulse of academe and other institutions. I don't mean only structurally in terms of affirmative action numbers, but, rather, conceptually as well. [*1134] We're a long way from ideological parity for women and other excludeds with viewpoints and styles which diverge from patriarchal modus operandi. That is what will produce systemic change, I think.

I also learned something else that is not unique to NACS and should not have been a surprise, but it was pretty disappointing. I'm not going to say too much except that there was irresponsible socializing, sexual liaisons, and partying that affected the organization. The partying and "playing" was perceived as residual perks for some, I was told and so it appeared. But it was undermining the organizational leadership. I think the dominant order plays itself out in ways that are historically documented: i.e., patriarchal privilege and sexual double standards will thrive where there are unregulated and unmonitored conflicts of interest and other abuses. I saw some of that in NACS. Personal relations affected the way some key players (mostly men, but some of "their" women, too) used NACS as a political or ideological rationale for their own individual interests.

Although I never did hesitate to talk about gender equity, I wish I had done more. I still have to say that NACCS has been a valuable organization, (even in the one "C" days), because it brought a lot of us together and it allowed us to have substantive exchanges outside of our institutions. That enhanced our daily professional lives by giving us a larger perspective.

MM: Can you explain that? Any examples?

CC: I have found repeatedly that many Chicana and Chicano Studies scholars are very sophisticated institutional players. Many possess a political savvy that some, or even many, of our university peers don't have, perhaps because of our biculturalism or transnationalities or transculturalities. We have learned to move in ways that transform institutional resistance and exclusion into political and instrumental capital. Maybe the rasquachi reality of having to scrap your way through the establishment because the institution didn't/doesn't recognize the legitimacy of our pluralist agenda has given us some tools and skills that many of my colleagues in canonical specialties have not had to develop. Some are politically naive because there's an institutional infrastructure for their academic needs, whereas that wasn't/isn't usually the case already for non-traditional newcomers to the institution. I'm sure you find this at the law school and many other places.

MM: Many places. In life.

CC: Yes, this is proven, I think, as well as theorized throughout an essay collection called *Feminisms: An Anthology of Literary Theory* [*1135] and *Criticism*.ⁿ³¹ In my "Wild Zone" essay in *Feminisms* I borrowed an idea from a couple of anthropologists studying African villages to address some of the gender/culture issues for Chicanas. They had discovered that over and over again as they researched the literature on Africans, they didn't find direct female reporting about women's rituals and practices. The information was usually obtained from the chief or the husband or a medicine man, some male who was empowered to speak and who described the women's rituals. Looking at the body of anthropology on African tribes, there had been nothing that went directly to the female subject voicing herself.

I used that concept in "The Wild Zone," first to talk about the fact that that record by and large was very partial, wrong, and/or distorted. As a result, women developed extensive private worlds of experience and female culture that was muted from the empowered male leadership. Over time women have learned to negotiate between their female-identified private worlds and the male-authorized perceptions of that world, and are therefore transcultural in their experience and identity.

In my essay I address Chicana feminism and the need to privilege gender when politically and conceptually necessary. And to do so without guilt. I think that many men who are reflected in the dominant structures and who cannot relate to women as peers or as leaders haven't developed these multiple transcultural codes because they're comfortable with the dominant order and status quo.

Anyway, Margaret, I think it is important to do what you are doing: to record [our history] as a means of learning from it. Many of the early pioneers in Chicana/o studies have been so used to rolling up our sleeves and just doing what needed to be done without chronicling the process. We just move on to other projects. History is lost is one unfortunate consequence. Another is that later on the history is sometimes rewritten in terms of making certain actors look good in ways that are totally unsupported by the facts. *Hasta la proxima - gracias, colega.*ⁿ³²

B. Interview with Deena Gonzalezⁿ³³

What follows is an interview I conducted with Deena Gonzalez, an [*1136] out lesbian who has been at the center of the struggles involving NACCS.

MM: Why don't you tell me about your history with NACCS.

DG: Some of the very same issues that arose in NACS in about the same period of time spilled over into MALCS.ⁿ³⁴ [There was] a shock in NACS in Albuquerque when gay and lesbian issues surfaced, especially around Emma Perez's plenary address on sexuality and discourse. Finally the lesbianized perspective was put before the membership with about a thousand people in the ballroom.

The other thing that occurred was that NACS didn't have a strong faculty presence after a certain point in the 1980's. When the conference began moving out of California, the faculty presence began to decline and the student membership rose. So many of the old guard that kept NACS going in a particular way were no longer there to answer why something happened the way that it did. New people stepped in with different agendas. At the very moment gay and lesbian presence was finally being defined. Then at the same conference and on the same day, we had organized the lesbian workshop. [There was some confusion about whether it would be an open panel or a closed workshop.] After Emma's plenary, there was enormous applause and kind of a stunned atmosphere about what she said. Then she said I want to continue with this discussion and we are going to have a workshop for woman only. Some homophobia surfaced, but it was relatively quiet. People had been upset about this [woman-only workshop] apparently and someone did get up in the plenary to ask about this. Then we got word that some of the men were going to crash the doors.

The workshop became this incredible space. There might have been sixty or seventy people. It was videotaped up to a point and then as women got up and came out, they asked that the video, the camera, the shooting be stopped. It was a very interesting development. There were also all these white women from Albuquerque who had come to hear about lesbians.

So, the audience very quickly got quiet and hushed when they realized there was something else going on in the room that they hadn't quite reckoned with. I think they thought they were going to hear papers. Emma Perez, Lourdes Arguelles, and I gave papers. I was probably the most angry. I gave this rendition of what it was like to be in an [*1137] association and have closeted people come out to Emma and to me but not to the association. Obviously [there are] issues of safety and visibility and so on. It was a very important turning moment with people getting up and saying all these things and a lot of people crying. Somebody got up and said I don't treat people badly and I don't like to think I am homophobic; basically saying I don't understand why you're insisting that people come out and then of course she is one in the closet...

There were cross currents and then she got up and left the room. Then other people stayed and just poured out how terrible it was to be in the closet. How wrenching an experience it was to come out in any context but especially this one - among your own community. One of the things that struck me was there were so many dialogues, so many discussions going on all at once. This first workshop organized by lesbian Chicanas on lesbian identity and Latina identity where two Chicanas and Latina (Cubana) were supposed to address everything.

We had someone who positioned herself at the door as guard and she said, "I will keep all men out because women need to have a safe space, a respected space." If the men of NACS don't understand this, it is too bad. And it was also her first time at NACS, she's Latina and lesbian and butch...

Some of the men said if you are going to have a lesbian and a gay caucus, what's next a marijuanista, a marijuana caucus? We said let's do something with that and so we decided we would approach individual speakers who had spoken against the notion of a lesbian caucus or of a women-only workshop. In the lobby Emma Perez looked up and said there is Tacho Mendiola, let's go ask him. And so she said, Tacho, who do you think you are? You know, what do you think this is about? And, why are you putting us down this way? What is the matter with you? He was just stunned. The conversation really grew very tense and then the word from those kinds of interactions went out that a group of lesbians were terrorizing others. Everybody took sides, people got mad, people were calling people back at their home institutions.

People didn't quite get it, but from that moment on gay and lesbian presence could not be ignored at NACS and it hasn't been. Since then there's just been incident after incident every year. Last year in Mexico City, the students attempted to hold a reception. They put up fliers that were offensive to the hotel management who came back and said we're a family institution. The hotel closed the doors and didn't let the students hold this reception and threatened to kick them out. So there had to be negotiations all night long about whether the students would end up on the street or not. It got to be quite tense and finally the mayor's office got pulled in. Mayor Cuathemoc Cardenas finally had to step in [*1138] and make a statement. The city did have an ordinance via the Mexican Chamber of Commerce that specified homophobic acts were not tolerable and that people and businesses could not discriminate. n35

MM: I am amazed that there is such an ordinance. Aren't you?

DG: It was pretty amazing, pretty stunning, It is a huge modern cosmopolitan city, but I don't think anyone would dare test it. Rusty Barcelo pushed herself to the front of the cameras and explained the situation to [the Major]. Then he had to respond in that way because the International Chamber of Commerce has to sign off on certain international law agreements. n36 I don't know which one it is, but it's on the books and the hotel belonged to the Mexican Chamber of Commerce.

A lot of people, the officers of NACCS, those on the Mexican side and on the U.S. side had to be up all night basically dealing with the hotel management. They got the students to stay, but they had to agree not to post any flyers. The flyers said "Joto Caucus" "Noche de Joteria." The students wanted to take to the streets. That's when I stepped in and said safety is a big issue. You do not want to end up in a Mexican jail.

It was in San Antonio in 1992, the year after Albuquerque, by the time the Lesbian Caucus was formed. At our first Lesbian Caucus meeting, there were straight women. We went around to say who we were, and where we were [working], and whether we were out or not. One of the women said I'm not a lesbian, but I'm here to support and help. The students who convened the Caucus said this is a Lesbian Caucus and we need to decide. I said that I would be more comfortable if the first Lesbian Caucus were only lesbians in the principle of women-only workshops and space and now lesbian-only workshops and space. And she didn't really take offense, it was her friend who had invited her to this space who did get very upset. She got up and said, "if our allies and friends can't be here, I'm not going to be a part of [this] organization." And she left very pissed off. And immediately everything erupted.

The first meeting of the Lesbian Caucus just laid out the tensions that had built up all along, but that still exist. Even in the spaces we consider to be zones of support and safety. It caused me in the early '90's to think very carefully about this business of what is a safe zone or space, or what is a women-only declared space. For whom is it safe, and how could these things be constructed and have meaning, application, and existence. That's what I tried to write about in "Speaking Secrets" without getting too upset all over again because it was very upsetting. [*1139] It was a very difficult moment and people divided themselves up. Radical lesbian separatists had a sense of how the politics of it operated, but there were a lot of people in the room who had no familiarity with this lesbian perspective.

The politics meant coming out on a lot of different levels and the repercussions were pretty great. There were a number of women at that first Lesbian Caucus who would later begin to assume roles in NACCS as Chicana lesbians, but who didn't go to the caucus meetings the first couple of years because to enter the room would mean that you were a lesbian. That was precisely one of the reasons that I said I wanted it to be lesbian-only because I really felt that was the key issue. As long as we stayed in the closet, we would never offer anyone an alternative example, only the traditional one. Rusty Barcelo and Norma Cantu who are out now did not go to those first meetings and reported they found it very frightening. I'm not saying it caused rifts, individual rifts or even problems between and among us, but it certainly did differentiate issues in an interesting way.

On the other side of things, there was an effort to raise the issue of men coming to the Chicana Caucus. I said I don't understand why we keep debating this issue. When Elena Urnutia came to MALCS one summer from Mexico City and heard us heard discuss [this issue] seriously, she finally said, "I'm dismayed that you're debating this issue. In Mexico we just don't do this anymore; we just say this is for women. The men who support us they say good. Let it be for women." Why do we have to keep conversing in this way?

A lot of it resolves itself or ends up having to do with women wanting not to offend and Chicanas especially want very much not to offend. We're raised not to offend the colonizer, not to offend the straight man, not to offend the father. It's very deep. And it keeps coming back.

MM: At the first formal LatCrit meeting in San Diego I and others were troubled by the fact that there were five keynote speakers and all of them were men, all of them Latinos. In the large sessions few of the Latinas were speaking and so during the second day, I called for a Latina Caucus. When we met, it was an incredible moment. We gathered outside in the evening light. There were about sixteen of us. We didn't even know one another's names. We sat in a circle and told our stories while we laughed and cried. It felt so different from the earlier sessions with their heavily male overtones and subtexts.

The next conference in San Antonio was developed around this idea that the meeting itself should feel more female and Latina. There was a wonderful session at which women brought things so that they could

engage in narratives; there were a lot of mother-daughter narra [*1140] tives. I brought pictures of my mother and her recipes. Those interac tions were very much motivated by women trying to make the space feel different, even though we were not asking for woman-only space.

DG: What year was that?

MM: 1996.

DG: The question keeps coming up again and again. It suggests to me that radical lesbian principles that were grass roots haven't become part of organizational and institutional life. By that I mean the idea of separate space, separate spheres of women-only space, but also the notion that only away from men can women really sort out their thinking and, in a way, de-polute themselves. Men will only move away from not relying on women in traditional ways if they [the women] sepa rate themselves out. So, sort of men's movement stuff.

I wonder to myself when have men worked out their sexism. Where has that happened in a kind of institutional way? There're so few examples even in places that have had very active women's studies programs or departments or caucuses. There seems to be so little progress. I don't think the progress is going to happen just because we say we want it or we say that's our vision. Or because now men get up and nominate a woman for x office whereas five years or ten years ago, they wouldn't even have thought of that.

The support that men give Chicanas or don't give Chicanas is still lagging in the kind of spoken ideal about equality. It becomes perfectly okay to talk about why Chicanas are not present. I heard Richard Gris wold del Castillo talk about this. I don't want to isolate Richard because he's certainly trying to understand this stuff, but he spoke about it at the Julian Samora Institute at Michigan and called for a [study of] the state of Chicana studies. He said I don't know why Chicanas are not produc ing books in the '90's. I just wanted to whomp him with a book or something. It takes money; it takes research assistants; and it takes a research institution to produce books. How many of us are lodged in those places? Very few of us. If we do produce books, we produce anthologies or contributory essays. And it takes a lot of time; it takes decades. That's why it took David Montejano fifteen years to write *Anglos and Mexicans in the Making of Texas, 1836-1986*, Tomas Almaguer fifteen years to produce *Racial Fault Lines*, and Ramon Gutierrez eleven years to finish *When Jesus Came, the Corn Mothers Went Away*.

It takes promotions and money; large grants produce books. There's an uninvestigated lack of empathy, or sympathy, or understand ing, or political outlook towards Chicanas. We need a tough line on the issue of Chicanas supporting one another and especially within institu [*1141] tionalized work. The organization of life in the U.S. just doesn't lend itself to much of what we are about.

We're just kind of looking out for others, thinking about others before ourselves and preserving what we've got and building on it. It's my feeling that if men just listened, really listened and then translated [what they'd heard] into jobs, tenure decisions, promotions, letters of evaluations, fellowship committees and fellowships, then I'd say ok, it has helped. But I don't see them doing that; in fact, things are probably even getting worse in some ways. We [Chicanas] are going to have to do it for ourselves. We may have allies who run interference and help behind the scenes and provide a lot of unacknowledged support. But the more visible interactions are still shaped by a kind of sexism that runs deep in Chicano men. They're not willing to give it up because it gives them power and authority when they have so little of it in so many other places.

MM: It's an issue we continue to grapple with. Let me ask about your work with other people of color and with white lesbians. What opportunities do you have to move out of Chicana/Latina circles? *Lat Crit* is by design a site and an approach to theoretical work that is not exclusively Latino/Latina. From the beginning we joined with other progressive scholars of color. And a few whites I might add. Despite the fact that *LatCrit* is about theorizing the Latino/Latina condition from a legal perspective, it has always been in the

company of and in collaboration with other people of color and other progressives. So I was wondering the extent to which NACCS has been, or whether you individually have been, trying to collaborate with other people of color and other progressives.

DG: It is still very limited within NACCS. People go there for the particular purpose of being refreshed and re-energized and provoked into thinking different things within Chicano Studies. Academic and cultural work that is more broadly based or more multi-voiced goes on in other places.

[*1142]

Appendix A: A Mapping Model

[SEE TABLE IN ORIGINAL]

FOOTNOTE-1:

n1. In a forthcoming article, Frank Valdes analyzes the ways in which antiracist communities, strategies and discourses are influenced by social and legal homophobia, and their analyses largely limited to white/black relations, thereby "reproducing white domination, black subordination and nonwhite/nonblack erasure in intra- and inter-group levels." He offers the terms "hetero- normativity" and "racial binarism" to express these complex outgrowths of the dominant culture's white supremacy and their internalization by the multiple subordinated subgroups. See Francisco Valdes, *Theorizing "OutCrit" Theories: Coalitional Method and Comparative Jurisprudential Experience - RaceCrits, QueerCrits, and LatCrits*, [53 U. Miami L. Rev. 1265 \(1999\)](#); *Foreword: Latina/o Ethnicities, Critical Race Theory, and Post-Identity Politics in Postmodern Legal Culture: From Practices to Possibilities*, 9 *La Raza L. J.* 1, 5 n.16 (1996).

n2. Kevin R. Johnson & George A. Martinez, *Crossover Dreams: The Roots of LatCrit Theory in Chicana/o Studies Activism and Scholarship*, [53 U. Miami L. Rev. 1143 \(1999\)](#).

n3. See, e.g., Antonia I. Castañeda, *Gender, Race and Culture: Spanish-Mexican Women in the Historiography of Frontier California*, 11 *Frontiers* 8 (1990); *The Political Economy of Nineteenth-Century Stereotypes of Californians*, in *Between Borders: Essays on Mexicana/Chicana History* (Adelaida R. Del Castillo, ed., 1990).

n4. See Tomas Almaguer, *Racial Fault Lines: The Historical Origins of White Supremacy in California* (1994).

n5. See Rudolfo Acuña, *Occupied America: A History of Chicanos* (3rd ed. 1988); *Anything But Mexican: Chicanos in Contemporary Los Angeles* (1996). Acuña has been a controversial figure for some Chicanas. The 1984 National Association for Chicano Studies annual conference focused on women for the first time. At the plenary panel on the position of *la mujer Chicana* within Chicano Studies, historian Cynthia Orozco observed that Acuña's book, *Occupied America*, perhaps the most widely read book about Chicanos (a work which should be considered the 'Chicano Bible') epitomizes the lack of a conceptualization of gender. Acuña cogently describes racial and class oppression, but he does not mention gender oppression. We must not underestimate the power of Acuña's book: teachers have organized courses around it, and it has taught thousands how to think about the oppression Mexicans experienced. See Cynthia Orozco, *Sexism in Chicano Studies and the Community*, in

Chicana Voices: Intersections of Class, Race, and Gender 12-3 (Teresa Cordova, et al., eds., 1990).

n6. I can speak from personal experience about the Society of American Law Teachers (SALT) and its struggles with racial analyses that are confined to the experiences of African Americans. These struggles were most evident at its teaching conference held in Minnesota in 1994. A series of reflection pieces about this conference appear in the SALT newsletter *The Equalizer*, Vol. 1994:4, at 5-20. Scholars of color including Sumi Cho, Frank Valdes, Lisa Iglesias, Leslie Espinoza, Anthony Farley, Sharon Hom, myself and others active in LatCrit have been a part of re-vitalizing SALT's agenda, advocating for affirmative action by organizing a march in San Francisco in January 1998 involving hundreds of law professors, lawyers, and law students, and mobilizing against the "Solomon Amendment," inhibiting law schools from preventing the military from recruiting on law school campuses, despite its discriminatory activities against sexual minorities and women.

n7. I use the word "Queer" strategically, in alliance with others who deploy this term to denote those who see sexual identity as a fluid and relational position that can be named, so as to destabilize the stereotypic and homophobic perspectives of the general society.

n8. See, Teresa Cordova, Forward to Third Printing, in *Chicana Voices: Intersections of Class, Race and Gender* xii-xiii (Teresa Cordova, et al. eds., 1993).

n9. I consulted with Frank Valdes as an editor of this symposium and obtained permission from Kevin Johnson and George Martinez as authors of the piece before deciding to write the Afterword. I see the Afterword as a colloquy with Kevin and George that is intended to indirectly examine LatCrit practices by listening to the voices of two Chicana scholars active over the years in NACCS.

n10. See Boaventura de Sousa Santos, *Towards A New Common Sense: Law, Science and Politics in the Paradigmatic Transition* 459 (1995). He writes:

Jorge Luis Borges told us the story of the emperor who ordered the production of an exact map of his empire. He insisted that the map should be exactly to the most minute detail. The best cartographers of the time were engaged in this important project. Eventually, they produced the map, and, indeed, it could not possibly be more exact, as it coincided point by point with the empire. However, to their frustration, it was not a very practical map, since it was of the same size as the empire.

(Citing Borges, *Obras Completas* 90 (1970)).

n11. See Johnson & Martinez, *supra* note 2.

n12. *Id.*

n13. Counting last names is admittedly a tricky business. Nonetheless, I report it here because I think it offers a rough measure of the extent to which Chicanas' agency in the construction of our reality can be overlooked. Moreover, I believe in "head counting" as one mechanism for exposing the presence or absence of particular subgroups.

n14. See Stephanie Phillips, *The Convergence of the Critical Race Theory Workshop with LatCrit Theory: A History*, [53 U. Miami L. Rev. 1247 \(1999\)](#).

n15. See Victoria Ortiz & Jennifer Elrod, *Reflections of LatCrit III: Finding "Family"*, [53 U. Miami L. Rev. 1257 \(1999\)](#).

n16. See Victoria Ortiz & Jennifer Elrod, Construction Project: Color Me Queer + Color Me Family = Camilo's Story, in *Critical Race Theory: Histories, Crossroads, Directions*, (Angela P. Harris, Jerome Culp & Francisco Valdes eds., forthcoming 1999). Coincidentally, I wrote the introduction to the cluster of articles on narrative, including this entry, which will appear in this book. See Margaret E. Montoya, *Celebrating Racialized Narratives*, id.

n17. See Ortiz & Elrod, *supra* note 14, at 4.

n18. See Elvia Arriola, Welcoming the Outsider to an Outsider Conference: Law and the Multiplication of Self, [2 Harv. Latino L. Rev. 397 \(1997\)](#).

n19. See Athena D. Mutua, Shifting Bottoms and Rotating Centers: Reflections on LatCritIII and the Black/White Paradigm, [53 U. Miami L. Rev. 1177 \(1999\)](#).

n20. Id. at 9-10. (footnotes omitted) (emphasis added).

n21. Id. at 17.

n22. Tayyab Mahmud, Colonialism and Modern Constructions of Race: A Preliminary Inquiry, [53 U. Miami L. Rev. 1219 \(1999\)](#).

n23. See, e.g., *Racism, Modernity & Identity* (Ali Rattansi & Sallie Westwood eds., 1994); Floya Anthias & Nira Yuval-Davis, *Racialized Boundaries: Race, Nation, Gender, Colour and Class and the Anti-racist Struggle* (1992). Mahmud's references reveal a library that, I believe, will prove quite intriguing to LatCrits, ranging from such well-known authors as Frantz Fanon and Edward Said to the military handbooks of the Indian army.

n24. See Michael Omi & Howard Winant, *Racial Formation in the United States*, (1986); George Frederickson, *White Supremacy: A Comparative Study In American And South Africa History* (1981).

n25. Valdes, *supra* note 1, at 2. Frank Valdes offers the term "OutCrit" to indicate an aspirational coalition among critical scholars working in the areas of CRT, LatCrit, Queer, Feminist, Race-Fem and other legal discourses focused on anti-subordination.

n26. See Teresa Cordova, Introduction to Third Printing, in *Chicana Voices: Intersections of Class, Race and Gender* (1993); Teresa Cordova, *Roots and Resistance: The Emergent Writings of Twenty Years of Chicana Feminist Struggle*, in *Handbook of Hispanic Cultures in the United States: Sociology* (Felix Padilla, ed. 1994); and, Teresa Cordova, *Anti-Colonial Chicana Feminism*, 20 *New Pol. Sci.* 379 (1998).

n27. See Deena J. Gonzalez, *Speaking Secrets: Living Chicana Theory*, in *Living Chicana Theory* (Carla Trujillo, ed. 1998).

n28. See Gilberto Garcia, *Beyond the Adelita Image: Women Scholars in the National Association for Chicano Studies, 1972-1992*, 5 *Persp. Mex. Am. Stud.* 35 (1995).

n29. Professor, Chicana and Chicano Studies Department, Arizona State University. Cordelia Candelaria is an accomplished poet, essayist and writer. She is the author of numerous books, including *Chicano Poetry, A Critical Introduction* (1986); *Seeking the Perfect Game: Baseball in American Literature* (1989); and, *Feminisms: An Anthology of Literary Theory and Criticism* (1997). She was the editor of *Frontiers: A Journal of Women Studies and Multiethnic Literature of the United States: Critical Introductions and Classroom Resources* (1989).

n30. MECHA is the acronym for Movimiento Estudiantil Chicano de Atzlan, a Chicano student activist organization.

n31. Cordelia Candelaria, *Feminisms: An Anthology of Literary Theory and Criticism* (1997).

n32. Revised 4/10/99 by Cordelia Candelaria.

n33. Associate Professor of History, Pomona College; Chair of Chicano Studies, Claremont. Deena Gonzalez has authored numerous articles on nineteenth century history, some with a focus on the will-writing practices of widows in Santa Fe, New Mexico. One of her books, *Refusing the Favor: The Spanish-Mexican Women of Santa Fe, 1820-1880*, is forthcoming from Oxford University Press, and the other, *The Dictionary of Latinas in the U.S.*, is forthcoming from Garland Press.

n34. MALCS is the acronym for *Mujeres Activas en Letras y Cambio Social* (Women Active in Letters and Social Change), a progressive group of Chicana academics that formed in 1982 in Northern California, who sponsor an annual summer workshop. In the summer of 1999, Guadalupe Luna (University of Northern Illinois) and I will participate on a panel on *LatCrit Theories and Practices* at the MALCS summer meeting being held in Minnesota.

n35. See Deena Gonzalez, *Speaking Secrets: Living Chicana Theory*, in *Living Chicana Theory* (Carla Trujillo, ed. 1998).

n36. Id. at 1.