



universität
wien

DIPLOMARBEIT

Titel der Diplomarbeit

„Hybridity as a New Model of Society in a World that
is Challenged by Multiculturalism. Analyzing the
Example of Chicanos in California.“

Verfasserin

Madlene Knoll

angestrebter akademischer Grad

Magistra der Philosophie (Mag. phil.)

Wien, 2012

Studienkennzahl lt. Studienblatt: A 300 300

Studienrichtung lt. Studienblatt: Politikwissenschaft

Betreuerin / Betreuer: Ao. Univ.-Prof. Dr. Otmar Höll

Table of contents

1	Introduction	13
1.1	Central Questions and Hypotheses.....	15
1.2	Workflow	16
1.3	Methodology.....	17
2	Theories of Integration in the United States	19
2.1	Migration	19
2.2	Integration	22
2.3	Early Models and Theories of Integration.....	24
2.3.1	Americanization Theory	25
2.3.2	The Melting Pot.....	27
2.3.3	Cultural Pluralism.....	31
2.4	Contemporary Situation in the United States	33
2.4.1	Integration in the 1990s	36
2.4.2	The Impact of 9/11 on Integration	36
2.4.3	The Influence of Globalization on Integration	39
3	Recapitulation	43
3.1	Hybridity vs. Multiculturalism	44
3.2	Hybridity vs. Assimilation.....	47
4	Hybridity	51
4.1	Terminology	51
4.1.1	Bhabha's Understanding of Hybridity.....	52
4.2	Culture:.....	54

4.3	The Difficulty of Defining Culture	55
4.4	Defining Culture According to Bhabha's Interpretation of a Hybrid Culture	56
4.4.1	Demarcation of Culture	56
4.4.2	The Myth of Pure Culture	58
4.4.3	Applying Bhabha's Cultural Hybridity Today	60
4.5	Identity:	62
4.5.1	Identity Construction	63
4.5.2	National Identity	66
4.5.3	Hybrid Identity	68
4.6	Nation (State)	71
4.6.1	Has the Nation State Expired?	73
5	Chicano Power! History, Culture and Identity from a Hybrid Perspective in Order to Make Integration Work	75
5.1	Chicano History – Telling History from the Perspective of Los Híbridos	75
5.2	Who is Who? – ¿Eres Latino/a, Hispanic, Mexican-American o Chicano/a?	78
5.3	The Chicano Movement	81
5.3.1	Emergence of the Chicano Movement	81
5.3.2	I am Joaquín	83
5.3.3	Los Chicanos (Nacionalistas)	84
5.4	Hybrid Chicano Identity	86
5.5	Hybrid Chicano Culture	89
5.5.1	Hybrid Material Culture	89
5.5.2	Hybrid Cultural Norms and Ideas	92
5.6	Chicanos and the Nation State	93

5.6.1	Today's Challenges	95
6	Conclusion	97
7	References.....	100
7.1	Interviews:	109
8	Appendix	110
8.1	Interview with Colin Gunckel	110
8.2	First Interview with Carlos Manuel Haro, Ph.D.....	136
8.3	Interview with Alvaro Huerta, Ph.D. Candidate.	154
8.4	Second Interview with Carlos Manuel Haro, Ph.D.....	170
9	Abstract.....	184
10	Curriculum Vitae	187

Acknowledgments

First of all, I would like to thank my parents, who always believed in me and supported me in any possible way during my entire course of studies. Their guidance made me become an optimist who believes that everything is possible.

I also want to thank my little brother, whose unique sense of humor was like sunshine on a rainy day during my writing process.

Furthermore, I wish to express special thanks to my friend Simone. Our endless discussions helped me to reflect on the topic of my thesis as well as everything under the sun.

I especially want to thank Eva, Eric, Tanya, David, Izzy and Kinga. I honestly could not have finalized my thesis in time, without your linguistic and moral support. You are the ones to call on short notice, when there is a revolution going on.

My greatest respect goes to my supervisor, Dr. Otmar Höll, whose enthusiastic feedback and initiative made it possible to realize this project that once started out as an idea.

***„Nothing happens in the ,real‘ world unless it first
happens in the images in our heads.“***

(Anzaldúa 2007: 109)

List of abbreviations

CSRC	Chicano Studies Research Center
IOM	International Organization of Migration
UCLA	University of California, Los Angeles
UNHCR	United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees

1 Introduction

Migration is one of the most extensive topics discussed in various scientific disciplines. Because of its affect on every sphere in our global and national society (culture, politics, legislation, economy, education, demography, labor market, etc.), it is necessary to analyze the causes and effects of migration not separately but within its structural ties.

In the course of this thesis I am going to analyze the effects of transnational migration on today's multicultural society from a sociological and political point of view in the United States with a focus on California. Therefore, it is necessary to reflect on the contemporary environment within which migration is happening. Migration is not a new phenomenon, but the nature of the globalizing world we are living in today, changed the quantity and the characteristics of migration drastically. "[...] globalization is the general backdrop for any understanding of the new immigration." (Suárez-Orozco et al. 2005: x) With the support of new forms of communication and modern transportation technologies, contact between the country of origin and the country of destination is eased and therefore binds different states closer together than previously possible. It is easier for migrants to keep in touch with their country of origin and therefore easier to maintain the culture and language of their country of origin than it used to be.

Migrationen sind Teil eines Prozesses der Globalisierung, der die ganze Welt umfasst. Migrationen sind mit globalen Vernetzungen wirtschaftlichen und politisch-strategischer Natur verbunden; sie gehen mit einer zunehmenden internationalen arbeitsteiliger Produktion von Gütern und Dienstleistungen Hand in Hand, im Gefolge des technologischen Wandels, verringerter Transportkosten, neuer Möglichkeiten der Kommunikation (Internet) und des Bildungsaufholens der Menschen in allen Regionen der Welt [...]¹.
(Biffi 2010: 5)

This "new" characteristic causes the borders between nation states to become more permeable and therefore not only changes and influences, but also transforms the model of society, the economics, the culture and the identity within a multicultural state. "Assimilation findet immer seltener statt; an ihre

¹ Migration is part of the process of globalization all around the world. Migration is part of the global economic and strategic political interconnectedness; it accompanies the international division of labor and production of goods and services, following the technological change, the decreasing costs of transport, the new possibilities of communication (internet) and educational advancement in all regions of the world [...]. (translated by the author)

Stelle tritt eine flexible Akkulturation [...] oder segmentierte Assimilation [...] mit fließenden Übergängen zwischen der Kultur und Sprache des Aufnahmelandes und jener des Herkunftslandes.“² (Biffl 2007: 5)

This transformation comes into conflict with the idea of a homogenous national culture and a national identity on which the models of integration were based in the past. These prior models of integration assumed that migrants would eventually blend into the new culture, forming a homogenous culture and identity in line with the paradigm of the country they moved to. For example the “Melting Pot Theory” and theories dealing with acculturation or assimilation, characterize integration as a process where the ultimate intention is ending in total incorporation of the migrants into the society of the receiving country. According to those theories, identity and culture is static, and defined by society within a state. However, culture and identity are in fact under constant transformation, only intensified by the process of globalization. Culture therefore is not a hermetically sealed monument which can be adopted by people who were not born within these imagined static frames.

Due to the long-held notion of static culture and identity it has been and remains impossible for migrants (even after several generations) to fully blend into this idea of a static identity and culture of their country of destination while at the same time completely giving up the cultural and linguistic heritage of their home country. Also the doctrine of assimilation does not necessarily constitute a desirable goal for migrants. “MigrantInnen streben allerdings weder ausschließlich nach Assimilation noch nach sozialer und kultureller Grenzziehung, sondern leben soziale Beziehungen über nationale Grenzen hinweg, wodurch sie mindestens zwei Gesellschaften in ein einziges soziales Feld zusammenführen [...]“³ (Strasser 2011: 43)

Because of transformation of the nation state and globalization, new models of integration not based on a national narrative or a singular view of ethnicity need to be introduced. An updated model should focus on heterogeneity and

² Assimilation occurs more infrequently; it is replaced by acculturation [...] or segmented assimilation [...] with a smooth transition between the culture and language of the country of destination and the country of origin. (translated by the author)

³ Migrants neither solely strive for assimilation nor for social or cultural demarcation, but live social ties beyond national borders. Therefore they unite at least two societies within a single social domain. (translated by the author)

acknowledge the possibility of a dynamic concept of culture, identity and society.

One such concept, which enables transformative thinking of culture and identity is the “Theory of Hybridity” by Homi K. Bhabha. In his magnum opus “The Location of Culture” (Bhabha 2007), he analyzes the concept of hybridity in the postcolonial and postmodern world. This theory will be used as the theoretical base for this thesis,

1.1 Central Questions and Hypotheses

Our contemporary society, both globally and nationally, is challenged by multicultural issues. The main questions of this thesis will be how the model of hybridity can contribute to a functioning cohabitation in today’s society and whether or not the societal model of hybridity is more adequate to describe our contemporary society than former theories of integration. Furthermore I will try to determine whether or not deliberate steps can be set, by the government or civil movements, to advance hybridity by promoting recognition and approval of hybridity in a multicultural society. I will also examine how external influences, such as the history of immigration, the political leadership, or the economic situation of a country, affect the formation of a hybrid society and the paradigm of integration of a country.

Assumptions include the following:

1. Former models of integration are outdated and counterproductive in our contemporary society, because they are based upon the premise of a homogenous, national culture and identity, which in reality never existed.
2. In an adequate theory of contemporary integration, the paradigm of a homogenous national culture and identity needs to be deconstructed in order to enable a dynamic understanding of culture and identity which is necessary to ease the cohabitation of multicultural people in a globalizing multicultural state.
3. The theory of hybridity and its understanding of a transformative culture and identity enable immigrants and non-immigrants to negotiate their identity and

culture on an evenhanded and equal level and therefore reduce possible economic, political, ethnic and sociological discrimination in a multicultural society.

4. The government and social movements can set actions which influence social, economic and regional integration or segregation.
5. Education (curriculum, resources and segregated/integrated schools) plays a major role in the formation of a hybrid society and the integration of immigrants.
6. External influences like including the history of the immigrant society within the country of destination, the political party in power, and the representation of (illegal) immigrants in the media, affect positively and negatively both hybridization and integration.

1.2 Workflow

This thesis will first describe the theoretical approach to the topic, beginning with a chronological analysis of models of integration in the United States. I will outline the meaning and significance of a national culture and identity for each model, and later describe why that understanding of a (national) culture and identity is no longer useful in today's multicultural world in regard to integration. After understanding how integration was seen in the past and discussing the role of national culture and identity in the United States, I will move on to specify what is understood by the national culture and identity in the U.S. will deconstruct the idea of a national culture and identity in order to introduce the theory of a hybrid culture and identity. I will then explain how this understanding can create a hybrid model of integration.

After exploring the theoretical sphere and background of integration, I will apply this theoretical knowledge to a practical example of a hybrid society – the Chicano community in California. Furthermore, I have added broader empirical data to this thesis through several interviews with experts in the field of Chicano studies, literature research at the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) and participant observation in Los Angeles.

1.3 Methodology

My approach to the topic stems from three different scientific methods, qualitative discourse analysis, expert interviews and participant observation. The goal was to achieve a comprehensive and significant outcome via these three approaches of investigation.

In order to conduct successful discourse analysis about integration, migration, possible models for integration, and the Chicano issue, an extensive literature research was necessary.

Discourse Analysis

I chose to examine the integration of the Chicano community, because research about the hybrid culture and identity of Chicanos/as has previously been conducted and therefore empirical literature about this example is readily available. However, access to Chicano literature in Austrian libraries appeared to be rather meager. Yet, the act of conducting field research in Los Angeles, California, for two months and the chance to use the library at the Chicano Studies Research Center (CSRC) at UCLA, added a broad spectrum of literature to my research. Experts on the topic of Chicano studies at the University of California, Los Angeles, supported my research by recommending suitable and helpful literature for my discourse analysis about the topic.

Beyond that, three of these experts agreed to take part in an interview.

Expert Interviews

By definition, an expert is a person who is able to provide objective information for empirical studies. This person is not the object of our research, but rather a medium or a witness regarding the topic of interest. Yet, experts who are adequate for an interview are in a special position as a witness or a medium. They play a special role or have special knowledge about the topic we are trying to analyze. (Gläser/Laudel 2010: 12f.)

Colin Gunckel, Ph.D., who is currently working as an assistant professor at the University of Michigan, was my first interviewee. He is an expert on American

and Latino Film History and Chicano Art and has written several publications about these topics. Most questions during the interview related to the (change of) representation of Chicanos/as in the media during the 20th and 21st century. (University of Michigan 2012)

Carlos Manuel Haro, Ph.D., was willing to give me two interviews about the topics of education and the Chicano Movement. In the past he served as the Program Director as well as Assistant Director at the CSRC, in Los Angeles. Furthermore, he was a member of the generation that took an active part in the rise of the Chicano Movement in California. (Latinos & Economic Security 2012)

Alvaro Huerta is currently a Ph.D. candidate at the University of Berkley, Department of City and Regional Planning. Among other fields he is doing research in urban planning for minority communities, urban poverty and the role of immigrants in the U.S labor market. (Alvaro Huerta Site: 2012) The focus of the interview was domestic segregation in Los Angeles and stereotypes of immigrants in the U.S.-American labor market.

After developing a guideline for the interview, I conducted a semi-structured interview. As soon as I finished the transliteration of the interviews, I evaluated my results according to the grounded theory in order to structure my results and to be able to connect the praxis of the interview topics and the theory of my thesis.

Participant Observation

Through interactions with people who consider themselves Chicanos and live in Los Angeles, I was able to experience first-hand what living in a 'hybrid culture' meant in reality. Visiting neighborhoods where the majority of its habitants were Chicanos enabled me to develop a different perspective, and establish the connection between the theory of a hybrid culture and identity and its living reality. This is precisely what participant observation is intended to do. To develop hypotheses based on observation and participation within limits. (Atteslander 2003: 107)

2 Theories of Integration in the United States

Before analyzing theories of integration in the United States it is important to define the meaning of both migration and integration used in this chapter. The term migration is subsuming several features which need to be evaluated before talking about migration in general. These peculiar features of migration are also influencing how integration is dealt with and its normative impacts.

2.1 Migration

As has already been mentioned above, migration is not a new phenomenon. The movement of people from one place to another is as old as mankind itself, but the characteristics and dynamics of migration flows changed drastically because of globalization. A general definition of the phenomenon today is set by the International Organization for Migration and reads as follows:

The movement of a person or a group of persons, either across an international border, or within a State. It is a population movement, encompassing any kind of movement of people, whatever its length, composition and causes; it includes migration of refugees, displaced persons, economic migrants, and persons moving for other purposes, including family reunification.
(IOM 2011)

This very general definition of migration already unveils the existence of different types of migration. A lack of differentiation among those varieties can be problematic when talking about the implications of migration.

Especially when analyzing the effect of migration in conjunction with integration, it is important to distinguish between different kinds of migration. Depending on what grounds the migrant moved, it affects the impact on integration on every level (the legal, the economical, political, the cultural and the sociological). The definition also influences the expectations of the immigrated population about their attitude and behavior within this “new” environment.

Migration is categorized by its regional, temporal, lawful and elective characteristics.

There is

- migration within a country and transnational/international migration;
- temporary and permanent migration;
- legal and illegal migration;
- voluntary and forced migration. (Kalayci 2007: 14ff.)

It is often difficult to precisely demarcate the characteristics of voluntary and forced migration. If for instance the economic situation in a country is stable enough in order for people to find employment, but the remunerations of work are not sufficient to enable a family to send their children to school, or even for upkeep of their basic needs. Therefore the head of the family may decide to search for employment in another country with adequate wages. The question arises whether she/he was forced by the circumstances or she/he simply chose to migrate in order to improve the situation of living for the family.

The “International Organization for Migration” describes forced migration as “a migratory movement in which an element of coercion exists; including threats to life and livelihood, whether arising from natural or man-made causes (e.g. movements of refugees and internally displaced persons as well as people displaced by natural or environmental disasters, chemical or nuclear disasters, famine, or development projects).” (IOM 2011) An economic migrant on the contrary is choosing to move someplace else in order to improve her/his quality of life; her/his decision is not influenced by life threatening occurrences according to the IOM. This definition of an economic migrant is expedient if one wants to distinguish between people who are considered to be categorized as refugees. Yet the term “economic migrant” does not differ between legal and illegal border crossing.

Migrants, especially economic migrants, choose to move in order to improve the future prospects of themselves and their families. Refugees have to move if they are to save their lives or preserve their freedom. They have no protection from their own state - indeed it is often their own government that is threatening to persecute them.
(UNHCR 2011)

A legal definition of the term “refugee” can be found in the “UN-Convention and Protocol Relating to the Status of Refugees” in Article 1.

In this paper the main focus lies on the effects of transnational and permanent migration. It should be noted that there are also illegal and temporal border

crossings between the United States and Mexico, which can also influence the hybridization of society.

Whereas migration within a country (e.g. migration from the country to the city – urbanization) is more common than transnational migration, this thesis is focused on the effects of transnational migration, which is defined by a crossing of an administrative border and a change of residence for more than a year. (Becka/Rethmann 2010: 9f.)

A permanent migrant is considered to stay in the country of destination for an infinite time, whereas the stay of a long-term migrant exceeds a one year period, but she/he is expected to return to his/her country of origin. The term ‘transnational migration’ implies a crossing of a national border in order to create a life in another country. (Kulinskaya/Morgenthaler/Staudte 2008: 82f.)

After clarifying the general differences of various types of migration and migrants, it seems necessary to accentuate some aspects of migration that are important when analyzing the effects of migration from a sociological point of view. Transnational migration does not occur in isolation, but it is embedded into a cultural and social environment.

In den Sozialwissenschaften wird Migration als dauerhafte Ortsveränderung definiert, die mit einer Grenzüberschreitung verbunden sein kann und mit einem Wechsel des sozialen und kulturellen Bezugssystems einhergeht. Die soziologische Perspektive verknüpft systematisch die Dimension Raum und Zeit (Ortsveränderung und Zeithorizont), Grenze (Überschreitung politisch-administrativer Trennlinien), Sozialstruktur (Statusordnungen, Schichtgefüge) und kulturelles System (Werte- und Normensystem).⁴
(Reinprecht/Weiss 2011: 15)

The change of the cultural framework which is attended by the phenomenon of migration will be a major focus within this paper. The influence of migration on social structure and cultural systems within a multicultural society will also be examined. The question how integration can be approached in a way that might be “functioning” for the people affected by the phenomenon of migration will therefore be evaluated in detail.

⁴ In social sciences migration is defined as a permanent translocation, which can be associated with a frontier crossing that involves a changing social and cultural framework. The sociological perspective systematically connects the dimension of time and space (translocation and time frame), border (crossing of political administrative division line), social structure (estates of realm, social stratification) and cultural system (system of values and norms). (translated by the author)

2.2 Integration

After leaving their home country, migrants arrive and settle at the country of destination. The question arises how people (immigrants and the local population) with different cultural, historical and linguistic background are creating (consciously or unconsciously) their lives within a confined territory without causing problems and conflicts due to their multicultural society.

Migration studies were conducted in the beginning of the 20th century at the “University of Chicago” (USA) to analyze this issue scientifically. Social scientists started to reflect on the social, economic, cultural and political tensions that challenged the United States as a country of immigration and tried to find models of society that would diminish the tensions within its society that composed of people with different backgrounds. (Han 2006: 1ff.)

In the beginning, these theories and models addressed the incorporation of the immigrants into the local society. Research was only conducted from the perspective of the receiving country and integration of immigrants was seen as a process that ended into total assimilation of the immigrant population. (Han 2006: 8)

In due course, concepts about how people in a multicultural society are living together and should live together were shaped and conceptualized. The term integration was used to describe any concepts of incorporation ranging from assimilated to pluralist theories. Yet in all these concepts, integration – mainly the ones with an assimilated view – suggested the incorporation of immigrants into an imagined static local society, whereas the fact that the local society must change as well was ignored. Therefore presuming an endpoint to the process of the “incorporation” of the immigrant society, which would be achieved by total assimilation is deceptive, because society is subject to constant change. (Aumüller 2009: 45)

This idea of integration as assimilation of the immigrant society into the local society presumes the existence of a homogenous and already integrated society on the national or regional level. This interpretation of integration implies that the imagined national society determines the normative paradigm for the process of integration. Due to this enormous impact of an existing national

society upon the field of integration studies until today, the meaning of 'nationalism' will be explained later on. (Ata 2011: 235) The role of the nation state in the context of today's globalization needs to be reconsidered.

Integration was and still is used almost as an equivalent to the term assimilation, but it is important to distinguish the terms. While the terms show a similarity in their reference to the nation state, they do differentiate in regard to the expectations about actions according to different conditions.

Mit Assimilation hat Integration gemeinsam, dass sich beide Begriffe im gängigen Gebrauch auf den Nationalstaat beziehen: Dieser gibt den Rahmen vor, worin sich Integration zu vollziehen hat. Im Unterschied zu 'Assimilation' hat der Integrationsbegriff jedoch eine sozialinterventionistische Komponente. Die 'nationale Gesellschaft' bildet den definitorischen Rahmen, auf den sich empirische Studien über Ungleichheit, städtische Probleme, Entfremdung, soziale Konflikt [sic!] etc. beziehen können. [...] Hierbei wird tendenziell die Rolle staatlicher Intervention im Integrationsprozess überschätzt gegenüber dem großen Einfluss, den informelle, marktförmige oder auch kulturell zentrierte Prozesse für die Integration spielen.⁵
(Aumüller 2009: 45)

Even though the interventionist role of the state is overestimated, it cannot be ignored that the state among other actors can influence if integration is directed towards a multicultural or a homogenous understanding of society.

Expectations and validations are implied or explicitly expressed with the use of the term of integration. These normative orientations of integration are often not considered in the economic, cultural, political and psychological effects within a society and its individuals and can therefore lead to an additional problem when the term integration is (mis)used. (Aumüller 2009: 23f.)

It would not make sense to write about integration without exceeding the descriptive level of its function. The term integration used in this paper will also indicate a normative aspect. It seems important to name only a minimum of normative core principles that should be achieved through integration in order to prevent a limitation of multiple actions that can be set to reach "ideal integration". In the context of this paper, integration should be understood as an open process, without an inherent understanding of a finite state of society.

⁵ The terms 'assimilation' and 'integration' both refer to the nation state in their popular utilization: This sets the frame where integration takes place. In contrast to 'assimilation', the term of integration implicates a social-interventionist aspect. The 'national society' provides the specified frame to empirical studies about inequality, urban problems, estrangements, social conflicts etc. in order to enable them to relate to it. [...] At this the role of state intervention is gradually overestimated compared to the great influence that informal, market-based or culturally centered processes have on integration. (translated by the author)

Integration should lead to a peaceful cohabitation of people of differential cultural descent without requesting a unilateral assimilation or an abandonment of the cultural and linguistic identity of the immigrants' country of origin. Later, when describing the "model of hybridity, the normative aspects of how integration is understood within this model will be characterized in more detail. In the paper's practical section on the integration of Chicanos in the United States, it will be described how the theoretical understanding of integration based on the model of hybridity can be realized.

In order to understand why a new model of integration is needed in our contemporary globalizing society, the following chapters give a historical overview of the models of integration and show their impact on the society of the United States. As a result, the transformation of the content and the normative implications of the term integration will become clearer.

2.3 Early Models and Theories of Integration

The number of international migrants increased throughout the ending of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th century in the United States. Specifically, the increasing contingent of Eastern and Southern Europeans lead to a proportional decrease in the percentage of Anglo-Americans in the total population. During World War I, these European immigrants reinforced their nationalist feelings towards their countries of origin. Consequently the question arose how this old-national solidarity and loyalty towards the countries of origin should be treated at a political level in the United States. (Hildebrandt 2005: 31)

The response of the government was to demand complete assimilation into Anglo-American society and culture and to give up the inherited culture and identity. Yet nationalism during this time was not a unique occurrence within the migrants' communities towards their countries of origin. A general rise of nationalism was seen during that time period. The melting pot theory was one of the most popular integration theories within the United States that was based on nationalism. "The course of the most popular of these theories, the melting pot idea, in fact paralleled the development of American nationalism and nationality." (Harper 1980: 1)

In the following chapters the situation within the US and the current impact of the most popular theories of integration (Americanization, melting pot, cultural pluralism) on the population of the United States (immigrants and non-immigrants) will be explained. “All three theories of American nationality – the melting pot, Anglo-Americanization, at times referred to as Anglo-Saxonism, and cultural pluralism – have enjoyed a measure of popular support.” (Harper 1980: 7) It should be noted at this point that the theories often phased into each other. Specifically, the Americanization theory and the melting pot theory co-existed for years and shared many parallels. A major influence of the Americanization theory can be seen during and after World War I while the melting pot model appeared to be popular especially in the aftermath of World War II in discussions of ethnicity. (Alba/Nee 2005: 39) This paper will start with Americanization theory which coexisted and phased into the melting pot theory that dominated until the mid 1960s.

2.3.1 Americanization Theory

Prior to the mid 19th century the target of anti-immigration sentiments were mostly Catholic Irish immigrants. The incentives of assimilation and immigrant restrictions during that time ensured the hegemony of whiteness and the Anglo culture in the United States. For a long time non-British migrants have faced pressure to quickly assimilate to the Anglo-Protestant culture. While Irish immigrants in the early 1800s showed some cultural similarities with the English, most of the immigrants assimilated relatively easy into Anglo-American culture. At the turn of the 20th century “new” immigrants from eastern and southern European countries came to the United States with very different cultural backgrounds and therefore differed in the previous process of assimilation. Some immigrant groups were reluctant to abandon their cultural and linguistic heritage from southern and eastern Europe. (Perea 1997: 18, 25) In the mid-1800s schizophrenic behavior towards the new immigrants from Eastern European countries could be seen. On the one hand the United States benefited from the economic impact of immigration and therefore capitalists were against restrictions of immigration and in favor of Americanizing the new

immigrants. At the same time many Americans saw the immigrants as a threat to the nation's Anglo culture and institutions. (Perea 1997: 17)

There were disagreements between the conservative wing of the Americanization movement and the progressive capitalists. The conservative Pan-Anglo-Saxon groups still believed in the 1920 that national unity could only be attained by race purity. These convictions showed similarities to studies about race superiority and inferiority during the colonial era. (Anrovici 1920: 703) "Not only are these immigrants viewed as racially and intellectually inferior but they are also accused of being incapable of assimilation to the Anglo culture." (Perea 1997: 23)

To justify the stigmatization of immigrants as a threat to the United States it was stated that the bond of the immigrants with their countries of origin, which was expressed by keeping cultural practices and speaking the native language, would deter the establishment of unity and solidarity among the people of the U.S. This assault even went as far as to blame immigrants as a threat to democracy. (Aronovici 1920: 698f.)

The aspect that immigrant flows in many cases reflected the labor needs of the US was often ignored by anti-immigration activists. Especially after the U.S. Civil War (after 1865) the U.S. government tried to attract European immigrants as laborers. "As of 1900, the major source of new labor for expanding industries was southern and eastern European immigrants." (Perea 1997: 20)

Entrepreneurs tried to boost the process of Americanization of their immigrant laborers. Most powerful U.S. capitalists shared the view that a fast Americanization of the eastern and southern European immigrants was necessary. Henry Ford, one of the most famous capitalists, organized a "melting pot school" where immigrant workers had to attend in order to learn English and certain Anglo-Protestant values. (Perea 1997: 25f.)

But even though certain actions were labeled as "melting pot", it did not necessarily mean that the "melting pot" as an idea, where all the involved parties equally melted their inheritances into a "new" nation, was realized. Careful analysis is needed in order to objectively evaluate if certain incentives were based on the idea of Americanization or on the idea of the melting pot.

“Although this process was labeled ‘melting pot’ assimilation, the actual model is one-way assimilation to the dominant culture.” (Perea 1997: 26)

The combination of restrictive immigration policy and the active support to Americanize immigrants predominantly before, but also after WWI, were conducive to an effective implementation of the theory of Americanization. “In der isolationistischen, patriotischen und nativistischen Nachkriegsstimmung konnte sich zunächst das Konzept der *Americanization* durchsetzen.”⁶ (Hildebrandt 2005: 41)

Yet it was impossible to deny that the influx of “new” immigrants left cultural marks on the Anglo-American culture. The realization of an uncompromising abandonment and detachment of the inherited culture of the immigrants’ countries of origin turned out to be impossible. (ibid.)

Therefore a model of integration needed to be developed – a model that would enable immigrants to contribute to the country of destination without denying part of their inherited identities and cultures. The melting pot should have a less assimilative character than the Americanization theory – at least in theory.

2.3.2 The Melting Pot

The Melting pot theory, contrary to the Americanization theory, attempted to focus on the integration of the immigrants as an open process, without a static imagination of the American society. In this process of melting together, the immigrants should take an active role in order to contribute to framing the American way of life. (Hildebrandt 2005: 32f.)

There were two moments where the melting pot as a theory was expected to guide the integration of immigrants within the society of the United States. The first moment started at the beginning of the 18th century when all immigrants with their different cultural backgrounds created a special environment in the United States and together fabricated what was perceived as “American”. The immigrants of European descent were more than just a variety of people thrown together in a new country. At this time there was a conviction on the existence

⁶ During the isolated, patriotic and nativist sentiments of the postwar period, the concept of ‘Americanization’ first became widely accepted. (translated by the author)

of a metamorphosed “new” nation that was considered to be “American”. (Gordon 1955: 115f.) This belief that the American melting pot was ideal in making the multicultural society of the United States, could still be noted throughout 19th century by a very open-door liberal immigration policy. “Some observers have interpreted the open-door immigration policy of the first three-quarters of the nineteenth century as reflecting an underlying native faith in the effectiveness of the American melting pot, [...]” (Gordon 1955: 116)

Contrary to the Americanization theory, in which the Anglo-conformity is a central aspect, the melting pot theory proposes a more generous and idealistic viewpoint. This theoretical ideal of the melting pot becomes visible when we take a closer look at the development of the American institution at this time. The American institutions that were built by the Anglo-Saxons were influenced by all the immigrants and not exclusively shaped by the British migrants and their descendents. Also intermarriages between differing ethnic groups (Scottish, Irish, German, Scandinavian...), were more common throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. (Gordon 1955: 115ff)

In the second moment in the beginning of the 20th century, President Wilson and President Roosevelt were trying to use the image of the United States as a melting pot in order to respond to the immigrant-receiving experience of the country. Neither of them believed in racial superiority of the Anglo-Saxons and thought the southern and eastern European immigrants would, like the previous immigrants, be absorbed into the American culture. (Gordon 1955: 121)

Yet the immigrant experience at that time differed. The melting pot was seen as a part of nation making, but the melting pot that formed later on at the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries had a more assimilative purpose for the new Southern and Eastern European immigrants. For example the percentage of intermarriages between different ethnicities decreased significantly between 1870 and 1940. (Gordon 1955: 122)

When immigrants from eastern and southern European countries settled in the United States, the idea of a “Melting Pot” turned into a version of “Americanization” in which the concept of melting the immigrants completely into the American culture and extinguishing any trace of the culture of the immigrants’ country of origin became dominant. (Gordon 1955: 125)

The idea of the melting pot theory that it should equally melt down the characteristics of the immigrants' backgrounds and the characteristics of the local residents into a "new" American ideal retreated into the background and the dysfunctional reality of the "Melting Pot" became visible. The theory of the melting pot in the United States about the amalgamation of the various characteristics that were brought by the immigrants due to their differentiating backgrounds and turned into one great new "Americanness" turned out to be a utopian fantasy that could not be realized. (Gordon 1955: 127f.)

Therefore, the attempt of realizing the melting pot theory in the beginning of the 20th century was quite radical and resembled the Americanization theory. The second wave of the theory, like the Americanization theory, focused on assimilation as a process towards an Anglo-conformity. The foreign elements of the immigrants should be discarded. Another problem that occurred in the beginning of the 20th century was that immigrants with different cultural and linguistic backgrounds were still excluded and discriminated within the American society. In 1922, for example, there was still a quota for Jewish students at Harvard University and other legal barriers on who was allowed to vote as well as denials of essential civil rights for black Americans. (Hirschman 1983: 397f.)

These exclusions and the resembling approach towards Americanization of immigrants paralleled the development of American nationalism. The basic patterns that could be described as American nationalism were set during the colonial days when the Anglo-Saxons who arrived from Britain set up institutions and also ethnically dominated the society. (Harper 1980: 1, 10)

Restrictive nationalists did not agree with the melting pot idea of an amalgamation of various ethnicities which would strengthen the United States as a country. They believed it was impossible to assimilate immigrants with different cultural backgrounds. (Harper 1980: 110)

Nationalists supporting the melting pot theory embraced its assimilative character that would help develop a sense of national unity. "Other nationalists gloried in the assimilative process by which mutual modification of natives and newcomers were united under the principles basic to the American nation." (Harper 1980: 114) For these nationalists the melting pot and the formation of national identity became the basic principles for national development. (ibid.)

However the melting pot ideal that was visibly realized in the beginning of its implementation did not apply anymore. The shift towards a paradigm of assimilation which was still miscalled 'melting pot' had already happened. "In the case of the **melting pot** the aim is that all cultures become reflected in one common culture, however this is generally the culture of the dominant group - *I thought this was mixed vegetable soup but I can only taste tomato.*" (Gloor 2006: para. 4)

Until the 1960s models that have been based upon the idea of a liberal and socially permeable society, where ethnic differences would be discarded throughout time, dominated the integration theories in the United States and other countries of immigration in Europe. In the 1960s the paradigm of "Cultural Pluralism" replaced the doctrine about preserving and creating a homogenous society. Movements against assimilation of immigrants arose and demanded to implicate multicultural aspects into the education system. (Aumüller 2009: 77f.)

During World War I the number of immigrants from Europe decreased, but at the same time the industrial boom in the northern hemisphere of the U.S. demanded a higher number of laborers. (Han 2006: 102) Even though the immigrants from eastern and southern European countries were perceived to be impossible to assimilate, the United States still kept their borders open because cheap labor was needed to meet the needs of the industrial progression. The picture of the United States as a melting pot, where everybody would have the same chances in the land of golden opportunities, was kept alive in order to attract the needed work force. (Norgren/Nanda 2006: xv)

Therefore most immigrants surrendered to the enforcement of assimilation in order to benefit from the fruits that the land of the golden opportunities had to offer for hard working people. However the immigrants' disposition towards accepting the demand of total assimilation and abandoning part of their identity will soon shift towards a more self-confident demand for a new model of integration that awarded the value which was brought into the United States by the immigrants of the 20th century. This value was more than just that of meeting the demands of cheap labor.

2.3.3 Cultural Pluralism

In the beginning cultural pluralism was exclusively discussed in the academia. Student activists utilized the theory of cultural pluralism in order to induce universities to establish certain departments for various cultural and ethnic studies. (Hildebrandt 2005: 55f.) Between 1967 and 1969 student movements throughout California put pressure on the administration of colleges to implement the establishments of new institutions. This successfully led to the creation of the Chicano Studies Research Center at the University of Los Angeles in California as well as other institutions in 1969. (Haro 2011a: 138ff.)

Also, the federal governments began promoting cultural pluralism during this time and focused on desegregation of the school system. For a significant period of time, schools were ethnically segregated due to their location into “poor” and “rich” neighborhoods. Studies showed that ethnically homogenous schools could eventually have negative effects on the children of immigrants. This was due to poor facilities in lower income areas where the majority of the immigrants settled. “Significant change came in the late 1960s when federal courts and the federal government began to require desegregation of school systems that had a history of de jure segregation. Major strides were made toward integration during this period, largely in Southern school districts.” (Hirschman 1983: 408)

The student movements and activism did not only pertain to education. Other topics, such as fighting for rights of minority groups, and cultural autonomy were on their agenda during the revolutionary period of the late 1960s and early 1970s. At the same time, the nation state as a prevailing frame of reference was contested. (Aumüller 2009: 78)

Previous theories that focused on Anglo-conformity, like the melting pot theory and the Americanization theory, pursued the idea of decreased visibility of immigrant groups and rather that they be absorbed into the American social structure. This did not always match the immigrants’ conception of how integration should be implemented. (Gordon 1955: 133) In reality the groups that constituted American society were very diverse and were not one homogenous culture, as the melting pot theory proposed. The presumption in

the melting pot theory was that individuals needed to be alike in order to be able to peacefully share their political and social space. According to this theory, a peaceful integrated society could not be built on the reality of diverse cultural groups. The melting pots' ideal homogenous society, in which competing cultural ideals would wither, was only a utopian fantasy. (Hildebrand 2005: 58f.) Even before the late 1960s when the theory of cultural pluralism was discussed in the scientific and the public arena, it was already the reality within the United States due to the immigrants' home cultures. To a great extent the culture and language of the immigrants' countries of origin was maintained after their arrival in the United States. (Gordon 1955: 33ff.) "Thus cultural pluralism was a fact in American society before it became a theory – at least a theory with explicit relevance for the nation as a whole and articulated and discussed in the general English-speaking circles of American intellectual life." (Gordon 1955: 135)

One special and often misunderstood characteristic of cultural pluralism is that it did not necessarily promote equal treatment of ethnically different groups, rather its aim was to acknowledge the right to be different. Because of this ambiguous definition of the term, cultural pluralism could be and was used to justify inequality and discrimination. Furthermore, it was likely that minorities were placed in inferior circumstances within a plural society because of their cultural *difference*. (Rex 1997: 207)

A theory related to cultural pluralism is the 'Cultural Deprivation Theory' which was influential in the 1960s and 70s within social science, is an example of misinterpreting and misusing the theory of cultural pluralism in order to differentiate and justify the evaluation of diverse ethnic groups. It suggested an understanding and tolerance for the "culture of the poor". Teachers were encouraged to particularly support immigrant working class children. This was due to the thinking that, children of minorities would not possess the cultural qualifications needed to be successful within the ethnic majority in America. (Hildebrandt 2005: 55ff.)

Consequently, cultural pluralism received significant criticism, because in practice it was based on the existence of a systematic inequality within society. Pluralists did not sufficiently scrutinize the existing social and economic disparities between minorities and the majority. Justification of separatism and

economic exclusion based on cultural differences were the consequences of these arguments. (Han 2006: 104)

Furthermore, the circumstances within the United States made it impossible for the immigrants to exercise cultural pluralism in the long term. Exercising a culture that does not conform with Anglo-American culture in public would have lead to an economic and social marginalization for the members of the divergent culture. Already at the time when the melting pot theory was exercised as a form of assimilation, the migrants chose to assimilate in order to avoid economic and social marginalization and discrimination. Therefore, to deny part of the immigrants' identity in order to economically survive or to be successful, lead to an identity crisis for many individuals within the immigrant community. (Han 2006: 96f.)

An alternative paradigm which did not ask the immigrants to choose between either giving up part of their identity or being marginalized needed to be established – a paradigm that guaranteed the right to be different without abusing distinction between cultural groups as justification for discriminative actions. (Rex 1997: 206f.) Especially today where the notion, and sovereignty, of nation states are challenged enormously by globalization, a new model of citizenship based on new relations and ties between the members of this particular multicultural society, needs to be established. (Brooks 2002: xiiiif.)

2.4 Contemporary Situation in the United States

These previous models of integration discussed thus far, can either be categorized as assimilated and homogenous society – like the Americanization theory or the melting pot theory – or to a multicultural and heterogeneous view of society – like the theory of cultural pluralism. Of course those three theories were not the only theories that were used as theoretical models of integration. Other theories that could be considered somewhat influential – such as the 'Race Relations Cycle' by Park, where the ultimate goal was total assimilation of immigrants, Berry's model of 'Acculturation' or Eisenstadt's concept of 'Absorption' – can be located in either of (or at least closer to one of) the two pillars (Multiculturalism or Assimilation). (Han 2006: 8ff., 62ff.)

It should be emphasized that until the mid 1960s various interpretations of assimilation theories bestrode the theoretical sphere of integration. Whereas, models that were based upon the idea of a pluralistic society, were either ignored or not recognized by the scientific community, or simply did not exist in the mainstream until the mid 1960s in the United States. Prior to that time integration was seen as a process that resulted in incorporation of immigrants into the dominant Anglo culture. The phases in between the arrival and the complete assimilation of immigrants were described and interpreted differently by various intellectuals who were mostly descendants of the Anglo majority. Yet the common thread between the various theories of assimilation was their assumption of a gradual process that ended in total incorporation of the immigrant communities and individuals into the dominant society, while at the same time demanding a denial and abandonment of the characteristics that were associated with the immigrants' sending countries. (ibid.)

As I have mentioned previously, in the late 1960s a new model of integration was introduced, which opposed the image of a homogenous society, and therefore challenged the context of integration. Yet this does not mean that the model of cultural pluralism replaced the theoretical approaches based on assimilation. Though, it was a significant turning point because it added a new approach to the theories of integration which dominated until then, it did not fully replace the previous assimilative and homogenous views of society.

From then on – the mid 1960s - new actors (scientists who were descendents from immigrants or immigrants themselves) who dealt with the issue of integration in a differentiated way, were officially part of the scientific space regarding integration. The earliest theories of assimilation were no longer the only option to approach integration. (Haro 2011a: 139f.) Yet, theories that are most similar to the assimilative approach still seem to be dominant today.

The United States' founding fathers believed that the incorporation and assimilation of all immigrants is essential in order to advance (economic) growth. This was officially established and recorded in 1802 by introducing the oath immigrants' take in order to become a fully recognized member of the American society. This oath should formally guarantee the immigrants loyalty to

his/her “new” home country and at the same time convince the immigrants to give up their devotion for their country of origin. “Wenn die Einwanderer die Bedingung einer Aufenthaltszeit von fünf Jahren erfüllt hatten, wurden diejenigen, die einen Loyalitätseid schworen und somit ihre frühere Untertanentreue aufgaben, als vollwertige Gesellschaftsmitglieder anerkannt.”⁷ (Martin 2003: 276)

For more than 200 years this principle of inclusion with an inherent characteristic of assimilation has been kept alive. The recognition of dual citizenship can be one of the many indicators whether a country’s integration policies lean towards the realization of a pluralistic society or more towards an assimilated and homogenous society. Even though dual citizenship is recognized by the U.S. government today it can involve various disadvantages for the holder of dual citizenship when living in the United States. (U.S. Department of State 2011)

It should hereby also be mentioned that unlike other countries of immigration (e.g. Australia or Canada) the government of the United States does not regulate integration. Integration is primarily on the agenda in the private sector. Members of the family and employers have the main responsibility to actively shape how integration is practiced. Apart from government support for institutions that assist with integrating refugees and asylum seekers, there are no government projects to address integration. (Martin 2003: 290)

Looking back, a constant shift between liberal and restrictive U.S. immigration policies can be detected. In times of economic and political instability, immigration politics in the U.S. tended to be more restrictive. In recent years, the conditions of immigration politics gradually became more limited. “In den letzten Jahren geht die US Politik zunehmend dazu über, legale Einwanderer vor allem über ihre soziale und rechtliche Stellung zu definieren und die zuvor überwundenen Modelle der Abweisung wieder aufzugreifen.”⁸ (Martin 2003: 277)

⁷ If the immigrants accomplished the conditions of the minimum duration of stay of five years, the ones who took the oath and therefore gave up their former allegiance were recognized as equal members of the American society. (translated by the author)

⁸ In recent years the politics throughout the United States tend to define the state of legal migrants especially in their social and legal area. Former models based on rejection of the immigrants are reinforced. (translated by the author)

2.4.1 Integration in the 1990s

This recent shift towards a more restrictive immigration policy and a more conservative view of integration becomes noticeable in the mid 1990s. The feeling of responsibility for immigrants by the U.S. citizens decreased and social services for immigrants were cut back. Even though opponents fought for equal rights and publicly objected this financial cut back, reformations were taken by the congress in 1996 that reduced social benefits for immigrants. Legal immigrants still had the liability to pay the same amount of taxes as US citizens, but society was not held accountable for any kind of obligations or responsibilities in reverse. (Martin 2003: 284ff.)

A discriminative attitude towards immigrants in the United States was in place not only in terms of the financial and economic situation, but also in the legal realm. Laws were released that treated immigrants differently. As long as migrants were “good American citizens” they were considered equal members of society, but as soon as immigrants came into conflict with the law, differentiations between citizens and non-citizens did exist. Especially after 9/11 this discriminative treatment in the legal area seemed to be supported by a greater part of society than before. (Martin 2003: 284f.)

2.4.2 The Impact of 9/11 on Integration

What happened on 11th September 2001 drastically changed how immigration and integration were treated. “The 9/11 events have an impact on the migration discourse. That in itself represents a negative development. [...] Yet, terrorism has forced a great many societies to discuss, on the one hand, the balance between freedom, security, and justice, and, on the other the concept of social coherence and the fabric of society itself.” (Krieken 2005: 71)

Before this major turning point in our recent history, the administration of George W. Bush was still working on a program about amnesty, where illegal immigrants residing in the United States, would be able to acquire a legal status under certain conditions. After the 9/11 incident, immigration policies became much more restricted and foreigners who resided within the borders of the

United States found themselves in a situation where the solidarity of American citizens towards immigrants was diminishing. (Gunckel 2011: 128)

Demand arose again for assimilative actions from immigrants, just as they did at the beginning of the 20th century. "In times of near-war, it is not easy to resist demands for unity, conformity and homogeneity." (Gerstle 2008: 240)

After 9/11 there was a strong demand for restrictive immigration policies and an assimilative approach to integration within the borders. Therefore, the question arose, whether a theory of assimilation that had already been contested in the 1960s and 70s would be of use in today's globalized world. Not only scientists, but also society at large is not fond of the term "assimilation" and its connotations. "[...] in recent decades assimilation has come to be viewed by social scientists as a worn-out theory that imposes ethnocentric and patronizing demands on minority peoples struggling to retain their cultural and ethnic integrity." (Alba/Nee 2005: 35) Yet it did not stop the American culture and social scientists from reconsidering the assimilative theories of integration.

In the past assimilation of immigrants seemed to "work" when the flow of new arriving immigrants was interrupted or stopped. If a continuous immigration stream does not exist or individual immigrants are not assimilating in large numbers, "[...] the supply-side of ethnicity is diminished as a whole as well as narrowed in specific respects." (Alba/Nee 2005: 41).

Two major external factors within society can be identified that seem to influence whether or not assimilation will be exercised and interpreted as a goal worth achieving by immigrants. When analyzing the history of assimilation, one of these factors was given during the 19th and early 20th century in the United States. At that time immigrants were able to socially move upwards within American society. Economic advancement allowed immigrants to ascend in class standing. On the one hand this possibility of improved lifestyle acted as an incentive for immigrants to assimilate into American society. On the other hand, social mobility also leads to intensified contact between ethnicities and therefore supports assimilation amongst each other. This intensified contact is often followed by desegregation. (Alba/Nee 2005: 42, 44)

Segregation and social distance seem to be preventative factors in order to achieve the goal of an assimilated society. Social distance is the distance or

nearness that is felt subjectively towards certain individuals and is not necessarily characterized by physical segregation, even if this is the most obvious form of segregation. If social distance is low there is a feeling of common identity, but if social distance is high, there are feelings of apprehension and reserve (which can still be the case even after a long period of time). (Alba/Nee 2005: 43)

Today the possibility of the upward social mobility within the American society seems to be missing. Especially immigrants from Mexico seem to be largely excluded from this process of working hard to achieve the American dream. “[...] with Mexicans as the preeminent example, may end up in the lower rungs of the stratification order, while human capital immigrants, common among Asian groups and Russian Jews in the current mass immigration, experience rapid social mobility.” (Alba/Nee: 2005: 42)

Therefore this factor of social mobility does not seem to be an attractive motivator for assimilation anymore. The other external impact that either works as a driver or as an obstacle to assimilation is determined by the contact which immigrants have with their inherited culture. In the late 1920s the stream of mass immigration from Europe was interrupted, and thus gave the immigrants who were already in the United States (who arrived prior to the great halt) time to assimilate. Restrictive immigration policies and the Great Depression lead to an interruption of forty years of mass immigration, and therefore weakened ethnic communities and cultures. A constant impetus of cultural and linguistic stimulants that would have strengthened the ties between the immigrants living in the United States and their country, culture and language of origin was interrupted and therefore indirectly supported immigrants to adapt to the American society, and the new cultural patterns of their environment rather than keeping up the cultural patterns of the immigrants’ past. (Alba/Nee 2005: 46)

Even if immigration policies are exercised rather restrictively and the influx of new immigrants is cut back, there seem to be other possibilities in today’s globalizing world to work around the brigades, which tend to keep the cultural supply side “locked out”. The drivers of assimilation seem to collide with the impact of today’s globalization. There seems to be a constant flow of information supporting the retention of cultural patterns and language.

2.4.3 The Influence of Globalization on Integration

The call for assimilation and homogeneity during the new millennium seems to collide with ongoing globalization. 1989 can be seen as the year in which globalization radically accelerated. Not only was it the end of the Cold War, and hence a decline of ideological differences, but also the expansion of new communication technologies made the world seem to close ranks and to accelerate the pace of change.

“The year 1989 is not just about the fall of the wall, the demise of communism and the end of ideological warfare [...]. In addition, liberal principles in economics have spread, and have succeeded in producing unprecedented levels of material prosperity, both in industrially developed countries and in countries that had been, at the close of World War II, part of the impoverished Third World. [...] However, at least as important, 1989 also stands for the introduction of electronic communications, the Internet and e-mail.”
(Krieken 2005: 48)

It seems difficult to measure the specific characteristics of this “new” intensified version of globalization. The common ground for the fields where globalization becomes visible is accelerated speed and dimension of mobility. “Globalisierung zu Beginn des 21. Jahrhunderts kennzeichnet eine nie da gewesene Mobilität von Waren, Kapital, Informationen und Menschen; ihre weltweit wirkenden Kräfte haben nicht nur ökonomische wie politische Auswirkungen, sondern nehmen auch Einfluss auf die alltagsweltliche Lebenspraxis von Individuen, lassen neue Lebensentwürfe sowie Sozialräume entstehen, die grenzüberschreitend sind.”⁹ (Zoll 2007: 11)

Suárez-Orozco structures the phenomenon of globalization into three interrelated formations:

1. The postnationalization of production,
2. The emergence of new information and communication technologies,
3. Unprecedented levels of worldwide migration.

(Suárez-Orozco 2005: 3)

⁹ Globalization in the beginning of the 21st century can be identified by an unprecedented mobility of goods, capital, information and people/humans; its worldwide effects have economical and political consequences. Furthermore an impact on the everyday life of individuals can be noticed as well as the creation of new transnational lifestyles and social spaces. (translated by the author)

These three peculiarities lead to implications that influence migration patterns and the implementation of integration.

Postnational production entails international trade, foreign direct investment, capital market flows and a general (imbalanced) distribution of goods and services. Knowledge based work seems to become more significant compared to the past and technology induced this shift. Tangled in between these two formations, migration generated a significant demographic and cultural changes throughout our world. (ibid.)

Especially inequalities between regions of the world that are produced via the first two factors seem to be responsible for the third factor, large scale migration. Globalization seems to widen the gap between rich and poor nations worldwide. Those against globalization argue that it is destabilizing, disorienting and threatening to large numbers of people. Yet on the contrary, globalization also promises benefit for those who embrace it. "These twin factors, globalization's uneven effects on the world economy and the emergence of a global imaginary of consumption, are behind the largest wave of immigration in human history." (Suárez-Orozco 2005: 4)

Postindustrial democracies are the ones who succeeded and benefited the most from the yields of globalization, and therefore seem to be an attractive destination for people who suffered in countries that were less fortunate. While large migration flows towards more industrialized countries accompany the phenomenon of globalization, the countries of destination experience anti-immigrant sentiments and xenophobia. (ibid.)

All these factors need to be considered in order to understand integration in the United States today. Especially when investigating the normative aspects of integration, based on a hybrid model of society, these contemporary influential determinants need to be kept in mind.

Once again, integration cannot be examined within the borders a single nation state anymore, because of the transformative implications of the contemporary phenomenon of globalization. Economic, social and cultural practices are de-territorialized in the globalizing, contemporary world. Today's economy and technology enhance globalization and its interconnectedness and vice versa. Migration and integration are affected by these factors and reciprocally affect

cultural patterns, identity formations and the nation state itself. (Suárez-Orozco 2005: 3ff.)

Culture

The foremost concern of destination countries is the question how immigrants culturally adapt to their “new” home country. Especially 9/11, as already mentioned above, intensified xenophobic prejudices particularly against the Islamic culture within the western hemisphere. The significance of homogeneity within a society’s culture gained strength again, in order to support xenophobic prejudices. (Suárez-Orozco 2005: 14ff.)

Yet because of the transformative effects of globalization on the “national” culture, the demands for a homogenous culture seem to be in question more than ever. “Globalization detaches social practices and cultural formations from their traditional moorings in bounded (often national) territories. Globalization decisively undermines the once-imagined neat fit of language, culture and nation.” (Suárez-Orozco 2005: 5)

The understanding of culture and the collision of an imagined homogenous (national) culture will be examined in more detail later. For now, it is important to understand the necessity of developing a new and altered understanding of culture, that is not based upon national homogeneity.

Nation State

The position of the nation state and its sovereignty within an international globalized system is currently challenged. The function of the nation state within and outside its borders shifted throughout time, in addition to its revamped position within the international arena. Today one of the most important assignments of the state is to protect and monitor its borders. (Suárez-Orozco 2005: 6)

However the problem that appears today seems to go beyond the definition of the contemporary functions of the state. Since the people, the nation of that state, transfer responsibilities and authority to the state and therefore legitimizing its power, the question arises how our contemporary multicultural society defines the legitimacy base for the nation state. (Holton 1998: 85f.)

Identity

The impact of globalization and large-scale migration is becoming visible on the state level, but also on the individual level of societal struggle, both of which are linked to the contemporary issues of integration. Societies that settled within a specific territory seem to have an implicit understanding of identity that appears amongst its members. “Sesshafte Gesellschaften verbinden, ohne dass es dazu einer besonderen Reflexion bedarf, lokale Identifikationen und Identitätskonstruktion.”¹⁰ (Hauser 2007: 29)

The extension of new media technologies, especially the internet, contributed to a diminished significance of the actual location for its influence on the construction of identity. The formation of identity was no longer exclusively bound to one place, since distant locals throughout the globe can now be easily reached. It is now possible to reach and obtain information and materials from regions that are located outside the primary location of reference and therefore add other influences to identity construction. (Hauser 2007: 31ff.)

To identify and locate oneself only within the borders of a nation state was challenged through the effects of globalization. The implications of our contemporary environment call for an adequate model of integration that considers the current influences on culture, nation and identity.

¹⁰ Settled societies are conjunct via territorial identification and identity construction without requiring particular reflection. (translated by the author)

3 Recapitulation

So far integration – in theory as well in practice – was treated as unilineal assimilation. But the outcome of this process was exaggerated, because imprints on American culture were left strongly by immigrants. Even though there is acculturation and assimilation by minority groups towards the dominant culture, the influence of the minority culture on the dominant culture cannot be denied. (Alba/Nee 2005: 40f.)

Therefore unilineal assimilation is no longer of use as a theory, because as we have seen previously, the impacts of globalization, its economic implication and 11th September 2001 challenge this method of integration, which is primarily based on a model of society that tends towards a homogenous and nationalistic paradigm. Today's pluralistic and multicultural characteristics within a nation state need to be enhanced in their statutes in order to benefit from its potentials. "In the global era, the tenets of unilineal assimilation are no longer relevant. Today there are clear and unequivocal advantages to being able to operate in multiple cultural codes as anyone working in a major corporation knows." (Suárez-Orozco 2005: 17)

Each model of integration described above seemed to have tried to respond according to the environment at the specific times where either of the models provided an adequate and suitable framework.

Yet, when looking at the contemporary situation in the United States, it appears that the American society, as well as all societies, experienced a huge transformation during the last few decades. This transformation left an impact on integration and seemed to especially collide with the status of nationhood, culture and identity, which had been in place for an extended period. Therefore, a societal model is needed that reacts accordingly to these transformations and adequately responds to these three areas. My attempt in this paper is to outline how the hybridity model can be used to describe appropriate assumptions for the areas of nationhood, culture and identity, and then mould a suitable model of integration around these respective assumptions.

It should be clear that the model of hybridity is not a sequel of previous theories of assimilation, multiculturalism or pluralism. As has already been mentioned, the main focus of the theory of hybridity relies on the Homi K. Bhabhas' approach. He opposes critiques that claim that his concept of hybridity would merely be a sophisticated form of multiculturalism. Bhabha argues that multiculturalism only accepts diverging cultural identities, if they are constructed according to the model of nationhood. (Marchart 2007: 83f.)

Since the reciprocal impact of migration on culture, identity and nation has been described above, the concrete evaluation of identity, culture and nation according to the model of hybridity will now be analyzed in the following second part of this thesis. By the conclusion it should be clear how various interpretations of the three fields vary, according to the different models on which they are based.

3.1 Hybridity vs. Multiculturalism

For now I would like to set the preconditions for a demarcation between hybridity and multiculturalism in order to get a better understanding how the previous and the following chapters are connected and to underline their importance. Therefore, I would like to outline how culture, identity and nationhood are perceived in a multicultural model of society in order to understand the different perception of these areas in the hybrid concept of society later.

Culture

It is important to analyze culture within its ties and not to isolate culture from the space in which it appears. It needs to be broken down first and then examined within its structural ties. Multiculturalism on the contrary is a concept that can be abstracted from its context and transferred into any space. "Multiculturalism is a general concept; as such, it is also transcontextual. [...] Yet matters of culture cannot be addressed transcontextually. Understanding anything which is essentially holistic requires a contextual approach; and culture is such thing." (Heller 1996: 25)

The problem with multiculturalism is that it seems to be highly politicized and ideologized. Even though when the concept of multiculturalism is broken down, core values remain that seem to cause problems. Mutual (equal) recognition of people with different cultural backgrounds, while at the same time acknowledging the differences among people, challenges the concept.

“[...] equal recognition of cultures can be granted or should be warranted in the sense that in a liberal democracy, one cannot live together in peace and friendship with groups of people whose lifestyle, language, customs, religious or sexual practices differ from ours, unless one recognizes that the other way of life also has some worth.”

(Heller 1996: 27)

Later, when describing the role of culture within the concept of hybridity, the understanding of culture will be deconstructed and contextually reconstructed in order to find a solution for the perception of ‘otherness’ in regard to culture.

Another problem that occurs in multicultural societies is the loyalty towards various groups within the multicultural society. “The complexity of multiculturalism resides in the fact that individuals simultaneously convey different sets of cultural symbols that express their various allegiances, both as members of their groups and as members of the wider society.” (Ben-Rafael 1996: 133)

The social embedment of identity in cultural constructions needs to be evaluated in order to understand its problems. *It is important to recognize that identity can be embedded in more than one cultural and social frame at the same time.*

Identity

“[...] the multiple identity of individuals must also be recognized and respected. A good example is the case of ‘identity politics’, most favoured among contemporary multiculturalists (especially in the United States and in Canada), where freedom by individuals to multiple identities is regularly curtailed because absolute solidarity with one of those identities is demanded.” (Heller 1996: 28)

Attention must be paid to the fact that one can identify with more than just one single culture or nation simultaneously. If people with a multicultural background – as it is the case for migrants – are impelled to “chose” their identity and narrow it to relate to one singular concept of culture and nationality – even if

they live within multiple and sometimes diverging concepts and practices – it can lead to an identity crisis. As we have seen before when analyzing the models of integration that could be located within an assimilated view of society, it has become clear that trying to enforce a singular and homogenous national identity is impossible to realize, because it only exists as a utopian fantasy. “Conceptions of national identity, however, often entail an ideational element as well as an imaginary filiation.” (Zolberg 1996: 53)

It seems multiculturalism did not try to investigate the notion that multiple identities within individuals could be possible. The focus of identity within a multicultural society relied on recognizing multiple identities *in between* the people who were divergent in their cultural background, and not the various influences of more than one culture and nation on the individuals affected by this implication.

Nation state

Multiculturalism challenged the imagination of a homogenous nation and at the same time undermined the way the nation state operated.

“Given the self-division of the human species into imagined communities believed by most of their members to partake of something akin to biological existence (Anderson, 1983), co-nationals – encompassing as many as several hundred million persons dispersed over continental spaces – take on the character of extended kin; concomitantly, non-nationals are viewed as ‘strangers’, whose ‘otherness’ is literally and forcefully evoked by the English legal term ‘aliens’.” (Zolberg 1996: 43)

Multiculturalism was and still is idealized by approving its ability to negotiate the difference within the imagination of a homogenous nation state. (Mitropoulos 2006: 38)

The principle of nationalism is the coherence of political and national unity. If the national unity is made up of more than one ethnicity it does not necessarily mean an immediate friction of the principle of nationalism. The number of immigrants that start questioning national unity cannot be determined. The shift from tolerating the presence of immigrants to perceiving other ethnicities as a threat of security cannot be determined by a specific number. (Gellner 1991: 8ff.)

One of many problems that evolve when a multicultural concept encounters nationalism is the anxieties about the consequences of cultural diversity within the dominant society. The ethnic majority might be afraid of losing cultural hegemony over parts of society. This is especially true with concern to language and its metamorphosis into an unmanageable mixture. Another fear that arises is that minorities might cultivate collective identities that conflict with the principles of liberal democracies. This is especially the case with regard to religion. (Bauböck 1996: 13f.)

In summary, multiculturalism has difficulties in responding to contemporary challenges in the areas of culture, identity and nationalism, when these fields are discussed with regard to integration. The necessity of a contextual understanding of culture is not given within the multicultural concept of society. Even if an awareness of a multicultural identification exists, the possibility of identifying oneself in between multiple cultures is still limited. The dominant society within the United States claims to be the main point of reference for identifying oneself with the core values of its culture for people living and residing within this nation state (even if it is not specified which characteristics actually constitute American). The dominant society still is the main point of reference for identity construction and cultural identification. (Hall 1994: 10f.) Exercising the “right” amount of diversity and also equality in addition to appreciating the difference among the members of a multicultural society, brings into question the current perception of the nation state. Multiculturalism is still challenged by the assimilative and homogenous implications within all three areas discussed above.

3.2 Hybridity vs. Assimilation

Considering the analysis thus far, it seems that the concept of multiculturalism and assimilation have more characteristics in common than initially assumed. Even though multiculturalism attempts to respond to the pluralistic composition of a diverse society it seems that both concepts have similar assumptions when it comes to the construction of culture, identity and nationhood.

Culture

Proponents of the assimilation concept stress that they do not oppose the difference between the possibly fluctuating features of different cultures within a nation state, but they criticize segregation and marginalization, that is more likely to occur within a pluralistic rather than a homogenous society. “Assimilation sei nicht gegen kulturelle Differenz gerichtet, sondern vielmehr gegen die Ghettoisierung, Segregation und Marginalisierung von gesellschaftlichen Teilgruppen.”¹¹ (Aumüller 2009: 42)

Yet the relevant question within the concept of assimilation concerns its assumption of a homogenous culture. It is debatable whether or not something like this ever existed and if this assumption is still tenable, while the impact of globalization described above shapes the world surrounding us. Travel and new technologies of communication facilitate maintaining contact with the migrants' countries of origin and therefore impede the development of an assimilated homogenous society. (Hans 2010: 50)

The definition of culture will be explained in more detail later, but for now it is important to understand that culture is a dynamic and not a static, monolithic and homogenous concept. (Hein 2006: 68) This is in contrast to the idea of an assimilated concept of society and culture.

Nation state

Part of the nation state is an “imagined” national culture which composes of five elements according to Stuart Hall. These elements are the narrative of the nation, the common historical experience, the invention of tradition, the foundational myth and the pure original people. (Zoll 2007: 28, Wodak et al. 2009: 24)

The last element especially seems to be relevant for an assimilated and homogenous perspective about the nation state. It “[...] stellt die Rückbesinnung auf das ‘reine ursprüngliche Volk’ dar, vor allem in Zeiten einer Krise, um teilweise das Volk zu mobilisieren oder um

¹¹ Assimilation would not oppose cultural difference, but is rather targeting ghettoizing, segregation and marginalization of specific groups within a society. (translated by the author)

Ausgrenzungsmechanismen für andere Identitäten zu schaffen.“¹² (Zoll 2007: 29) Therefore assimilation is used to legitimize a cultural and ethnical homogeneity of society that in reality never existed within any nation state. (Aumüller 2009: 39)

Yet this idea of a homogenous national culture is still manifested in the popular understanding of the nation state. This image functions as an ‘over-idealist’ reference for the adaption of immigrants. For almost 120 years, assimilation as an incentive was only discussed within the borders of a nation state. (ibid.)

The influence of globalization on the nation state today – as discussed above – is tremendous. The role of the nation state is changing due to the contemporary phenomenon of globalization. Other spaces that are interconnected via migrants and located outside the nation state need to be included into sociological research. (Zoll 2007: 17)

Culture and Identity cannot be reduced to the territorial claim of the nation state anymore. Migration, and hence integration, cross these borders and create “new spaces” that need to be considered when analyzing these two phenomena.

Identity

The nation state as a single frame of reference to construct an identity is no longer adequate in our modern era. (Zoll 2007: 24) Certain scientists argue that globalization is causing cultures to move closer together and therefore creating a homogenous mixture among them. Yet in reality this is more complicated. The nation state as an actor that demands a homogenous culture is not as predominant and therefore indirectly encourages pluralistic practices. “Der Staat tritt zunehmend von der Regulierung und der Herbeiführung von Homogenität in seinem beherrschten Raum zurück und schreibt jedem Individuum mehr Selbstverantwortung zu und setzt es gleichzeitig höheren Risiken in einer komplexeren Struktur aus.“¹³ (Zoll 2007: 69)

¹² It [...] is a recollection to the ‘pure and native population’, especially in times of crises in order to mobilize the people or create mechanisms of exclusions for differing identities. (translated by the author)

¹³ The nation state increasingly steps back concerning the regulation and instigation of homogeneity within its governed space. The state therefore ascribes individuals more personal

It has to be acknowledged that identifying oneself is not exclusively bound to the country of origin anymore. Identity can be obtained globally. An understanding that identity can be contradictory needs to be established. Identity does not have to be exactly congruent with the idea of national identity. (Zoll 2007: 68f.)

The difference between the national culture and the culture of the country of origin of migrants (first generation as well as the succeeding generations) comes into conflict with the imagination of a homogenous, assimilated and national culture. "Die Identität und die Bezugspunkte für ein Subjekt befinden sich innerhalb des ‚Systems Nationalstaat‘, d.h. Subjekte hatten eine starke Bindung zu ihrer Herkunft bzw. stellt heutzutage die Kultur neben der Familie eine an dem Individuum haftende Herkunftsbindung dar."¹⁴ (Zoll 2007: 29)

An assimilated view of society no longer seems to be adequate since it interprets culture too static, to cope with the challenges of immense cultural diversity within the nation state. The nation state interpreted as a hermetically sealed box, is challenged more than ever by the globalizing impact of today. It needs to be acknowledged that the role and the characteristics of the nation state are currently influenced by a dynamic process. An awareness, an understanding and acceptance of a reciprocally changing influence need to be initiated in order to reduce the problems caused by multicultural and assimilated models of society.

"Countries unable or unwilling to tolerate or, indeed, thrive in the context of immigration-related changes need to carefully reconsider their dependence on immigrant labor. The one fundamental law of immigration is that it will change everyone involved: the immigrants and those among whom they settle. [...] The changes brought about by the new immigration require mutual calibrations and negotiations."
(Suárez-Orozco 2005: 17)

responsibility and at the same time increases the risk of exposing the individuals to a more complex structure. (translated by the author)

¹⁴ Identity and the subjects' point of reference are located within the 'system nation state', i.e. the subjects had a strong connection to their lineage. Today culture and family are the individuals' main source of identification and location. (translated by the author)

4 Hybridity

After establishing that a new understanding of our contemporary society is necessary in order to solve the problematic issues in the field of integration, I will evaluate the hybridity model in the following chapter.

The hybridity model is a theoretical and philosophical model. Because of its abstract character it has been criticized as not pragmatically relevant. However, Homi K. Bhabha has a different view. He argues that even if theories are not explained by means of examples, they are still able to challenge universal principles which are exercised in the 'real' world. The emergence of the theory of Hybridity, as found in Bhabha's book "The Location of Culture", is shaped by scientists who are committed to postcolonial cultural studies. Conflicted cultural identity is a central topic within this discourse. (Marchart 2007: 76ff.)

The main question in this chapter will be whether or not an interpretation of our world as a hybrid formation is able to contribute to a solution of the current dilemma with thinking about integration.

Therefore, I will start with the conceptual history of the term of hybridity. Afterwards I am going to analyze the role of culture, identity and the nation state within the hybridity model, since we have seen above that these are the main areas that are influenced by the effect of migration. The meaning of culture, identity and the nation state will be explained according to the relevant chapters.

4.1 Terminology

Originally the term 'hybridity' was used to characterize cross-breeding of two different breeds in biology and botany. In the 19th century the term related to racist images which were used by colonial empires in order to classify and stigmatize certain kinds of people. During the colonial era peculiar assumptions existed about the infertility of people who descend from particular ethnic background. According these assumptions, the 'purity' of various human races would be ensured. The growing population of the creolized population at this

time questioned this very racist assumption. However, during this particular era, people, whose ancestors consisted of the 'white superior colonizers' as well as the 'non-white inferior colonized', were called 'hybrids'. This term had an intrinsic negative connotation since the people who were called 'hybrids' were degraded within the hierarchical structure of society at this time. (Hein 2006: 54)

The negative aspect of the term was only possible due to the introduction of a system to categorize various ethnicities and an ideology that was based on racism, practiced by colonizers. These two factors contributed to the establishment of an unequal relationship between the colonized and the colonizers, which is still apparent among nation states throughout the globe today. The fact that the establishment of an imbalanced structure at that time still affects the relationship among nations around the world today, demands self-reflection by the western world. (Ha 2010: 39f.) "Die Geburt der modernen Wissenschaften aus dem Geist des Kolonialismus stellt bis heute eine schwere Hypothek dar und verweist auf die Notwendigkeit zur selbst-reflexiven und herrschaftskritischen Wissenschaftspraxis."¹⁵ (Ha 2010: 40)

4.1.1 Bhabha's Understanding of Hybridity

Homi Bhabhas' term of hybridity is built on this postcolonial criticism mentioned above. Thus, two aspects of his understanding of hybridity need to be pointed out. Firstly, he describes hybridity as an expression of the ambivalent colonial structure. Secondly, his theory of hybridity describes an open model of culture beyond binary correlations. (Ha 2010: 38)

Because of these two factors, Bhabhas theory of hybridity seems to be adequate to explain the situation of the nation state today, and the associated cultural transformation. Furthermore, it is applicable in order to analyze the contemporary permeability of national and international borders due to globalization and also for evaluating the asymmetric position of migrants within the dominant society of a nation state. Furthermore it is important to mention

¹⁵ Today the birth of modern sciences during colonialism is still an enormous burden. Self-reflection and dealing critically with established structures of power and scientific practice is indispensable. (translated by the author)

that his interpretation of hybridity is not simply a modern theory displaying an amalgamation of cultures. (ibid.)

When it comes to explaining the effects of migration this model seems to function as a supportive and constructive model to defy the challenge of integration in our globalizing world.

In an interview Homi Bhabha describes his interpretation of hybridity as follows:

“For me, hybridization is really about how you negotiate between texts or cultures or practices in a situation of power imbalances in order to be able to see the way in which strategies of appropriation, revision, and iteration can produce possibilities for those who are less advantaged to be able to grasp in a moment of emergency, in the very process of the exchange or the negotiation, the advantage. Hybridization is much more a social and cultural and enunciative process in my work. It's not about the people who eat Chinese food, wear Italian clothes, and so on; but sometimes in a very complimentary way to me personally, it's been taken to mean some kind of diversity or multiple identities. For me, hybridization is a discursive, enunciatory, cultural, subjective process having to do with the struggle around authority, authorization, deauthorization, and the revision of authority. It's a social process. It's not about persons of diverse cultural tastes and fashions.”
(Olson/Worsham 1999: 39)

Bhabha talks about the negotiation of cultures in situations of power imbalances. This is particularly true of migrants, since they are considered to be part of a minority within a society that, as has already been described in chapter two and three, uses models of integration wherein migrants assimilate to the dominant culture. They find themselves living in between cultures. Migrants often seem to have a strong bond with their home country. Their fantasy about the culture of their homeland often reflects an image of the past, making it impossible to physically return to their recollected homeland. Therefore, migrants become accustomed to the culture they are currently living in. However, they are not able to fully assimilate to the contemporary culture surrounding them without losing part of their identity. Supporting the belief of cultural and ethnical purity and homogeneity in this context seems to be counterproductive. Sustaining this belief becomes a contradiction to the current reality faced in multicultural societies. (Marchart 2007: 86)

Retaining this concept about the need of identifying oneself with the dominant or the mainstream culture of society excludes the fast growing population of migrants throughout the world.

“The great connective narratives of capitalism and class drive the engines of social reproduction, but do not, in themselves, provide a foundational frame for those

modes of cultural identification and political affect that form around issues of sexuality, race, feminism, the lifeworld of refugees or migrants, or the deathly social destiny of AIDS.”
(Bhabha 2005: 8)

Because of this exclusionist aspect of today’s application of culture, Bhabha demands a radical review of the term. The actors who defined the cultural norms and ideas of our society need to be assessed. Their position of power within the society needs to be challenged by those who are excluded, in order to incorporate a different view of culture. (Bhabha 2007: 8f.)

The main features of the term Bhabha uses are the postcolonial construction of power, the hybridization of culture, and the hybrid construction of identity among people who are influence by more than one cultural context.

He identifies postcolonial societies with an understanding of cultural hybridity as those societies that seem to be contra-modernity. These societies are applying their cultural hybridity in order to translate social images of modernity and at the same time opposing assimilative incentives. (ibid., Bhabha 2005: 8f.) “Such cultures of a postcolonial *contra-modernity* may be contingent to modernity, discontinuous or in contention with it, resistant to its oppressive, assimilationist technologies; but they also deploy the cultural hybridity of their borderline conditions to ‘translate’, and therefore reinscribe, the social imaginary of both metropolis and modernity.” (Bhabha 2005: 9)

However, before describing in more detail Bhabha’s hybridization of culture, the essential question arises: What is the meaning of culture?

4.2 Culture:

For centuries people have asked themselves about the meaning of culture. Throughout time the term and the negotiation about its content underwent a constant change. Even though sociologists and anthropologists tried to solidify its final definition, there is no universal definition of culture.

4.3 The Difficulty of Defining Culture

This lack of a universal definition is presumably one of the reasons for today's ambiguous utilization of the term culture. The blurry demarcation about what can be declared part of a culture and what is not, makes it elusive to scientifically and empirically write about culture. However, this is not the only difficulty one encounters when analyzing culture. Another complication is its inflationary application which has produced a vast number of various meanings of culture. "Anthropologisch verstanden, deckt es alles ab, von der Haartracht über Trinkgewohnheiten bis zur Anrede des Vetters zweiten Grades, während es ästhetisch verstanden zwar Igor Strawinsky, aber keine Science-fiction einschließt."¹⁶ (Eagleton 2001: 48)

One possible way to tackle the difficulty of analyzing culture, is to start with deciding whether an extensive or a more confined definition of the term will be the fundamental basis for the analysis. Both definitions of culture indwell pros and cons. Eagleton assumes that the current problematic nature of defining culture is an either too extensive definition of the term which makes it too abstract and blurry to be useful anymore, or its definition is too confined which makes it inapplicable. It is futile defining culture as an opponent of nature, because the demarcation between them is not clear without ambiguity. Furthermore, it would not be wise to narrow the term down to the field of fine arts, because it would be a reduction of its meaning. Via this delimitation, extensive spheres of the social system and even actual members of society would be excluded from the cultural domain. A wise attempt to determine what culture is according to Eagleton, is to locate it in between the formations of esthetics and the instrumental values of society. Culture therefore indicates those elements within the social structure which cannot be exploited in a capitalist or economic understanding. (Eagleton 2001: 50ff.)

¹⁶ In an anthropological understanding it covers everything. From hairstyle to drinking habits to addressing the second uncle twice removed. In an esthetical understanding it addresses Igor Strawinsky, but excludes science fiction.

4.4 Defining Culture According to Bhabha's Interpretation of a Hybrid Culture

As we have seen, the meaning of culture is elusive, but in order to scientifically evaluate culture, it is necessary to assess which areas of society will and will not be assigned to the term culture when used in this paper. Furthermore it is important to identify the characteristics of culture.

4.4.1 Demarcation of Culture

Robert Bierstedt conceptualized a framework that seems to be adequate for demarcating an appropriate term of culture. His determined reference points for culture will be helpful to embed Homi K. Bhabha's analyses of the hybrid culture for a better understanding.

Dimensions of Culture

For Robert Bierstedt, culture covers three dimensions: "1. Ideas, or ways of thinking that organize human consciousness; 2. Norms, or accepted ways of doing or carrying out ideas; and 3. Material culture, or patterns of possessing and using the products of culture." (Kornblum 2008: 46) Ideas, in Bierstedt's understanding, cover the cultural values of a society which are shared by society. However, it is possible that individuals interpret these values in a different way, even though they are members of the same culture. This possibility can create problems within a society. The more severe the differences of individual values within a society are, the higher the potential for conflict. (ibid.)

This aspect is a common cause for problems within a culture, where migrants with different cultural background interact and sometimes collide. Therefore Homi K. Bhabha is trying to find a way to rewrite history from a different angle in order to create a hybrid understanding of culture, but this will be explained in more detail later.

The inherent norms of culture reflect the desired and ideal state which society should aspire to according to Bierstedt. These norms are more than just

normative ideas and values, because they supply more explicit goals. They surpass the values of society, because they are supposed to be justified by them. "Values are more abstract than norms; they are the ideas that support or justify norms." (Kornblum 2008: 47) The established laws of society can be examined for a more in depth perspective. The valid laws of society are written and legally binding norms. Another example is ideology, which according to Bierstedt is also located within norms as they are connecting ideals and norms. Social conflicts are more likely to appear in a situation where ideals and norms diverge. (Kornblum 2008: 47f.)

"Material culture [emphasis added] consists of all the things a society produces." (Kornblum 2008: 50) The ideas and values of society can be expressed by material culture. If efficiency is considered to be of great value within society, a vast quantity of cultural goods, expressing this efficiency, will be found. (ibid.)

The term of culture used in this paper should also respond to these three areas – ideas, norms and their material and perceptible cultural expressions. Homi K. Bhabha operates with these aspects of culture. However, the modality of how these areas of culture are negotiated within multicultural societies will be evaluated in more detail later. Though, before going into detail of Bhabhas understanding of hybrid culture, it is important to analyze the characteristics of culture.

Characteristics of Culture

After clarifying the areas which are covered by culture in society, it should now be analyzed how the function and peculiarities of culture can be described. Two essential characteristics which are interdependent need to be pointed out when trying to understand hybrid culture.

The first one is the aspect of constant change, which is an inherent part of culture. Culture needs to be evaluated before the background of the construction of our society, which cannot be considered as a static system either. Bhabha himself stated this matter in an interview in 1990. "The changing nature of what we understand as the 'national population' is ever more visibly constructed from a range of different sorts of interests, different kinds of cultural

histories, different postcolonial lineages, different sexual orientation. The whole nature of the public sphere is changing [...].” (Rutherford 1990: 208)

Due to his statement that culture would undergo constant change, Bhabha was confronted by critics with a legitimate question one assumes when analyzing his theory in the book “The Location of Culture”. If constant alteration of culture is a matter of fact, where and when can we locate the initiation of this alteration? Is there an original culture? And if not, how is the existence of a hybrid culture even possible without an initial and pure substance that could be turned into a hybrid formation of culture?

Bhabha stated that belief in a source of culture must be rejected, because it is simply nonexistent. A cultural concept of hybridity, which is based on the fact that (cultural) identities preexist, is obsolete. Cultural identities appeared through negotiation between their actors of negotiation. (Marchart 2007: 97) “The ‘originary’ is always open to translation so that it can never be said to have a totalized prior moment of being or meaning – an essence.” (Rutherford 1990: 210)

Homi K. Bhabha emphasized these two characteristics – the constant change and the repudiation of an original and pure culture – are the reasons why his understanding of culture is suitable for today’s multicultural society in order to deal with integration.

4.4.2 The Myth of Pure Culture

Assuming the existence of an authentic, pure or homogenous culture evolved due to the historic courses of events, and is connected to the evolution of the nation state. “Die Nationalstaatsidee, wie sie sich seit dem 18. Jahrhundert herausgebildet hat, manifestiert sich in einer Vorstellung von Kulturnation, die vom Prinzip sprachlicher und kultureller Homogenität ausgeht.”¹⁷ (Aumüller 2009: 36)

¹⁷ The idea of the nation state, which evolves since the 18th century, can be located in the fantasy about a cultural nation which is based upon the principal of linguistic and cultural homogeneity. (translated by the author)

The reason of this concurrence was that nation states would be able to confine their territories, if their definition national culture was established and therefore express their differences amongst them. The nation state had to establish the preconditions in order to be able to govern and control a territory that was defined by its borders. This incident set the foundation of nationalism that would emerge later in history. (Zoll 2007: 25)

Establishing a frame of reference is one of the functions nation states accomplish. National culture operates as foundation in order to keep the subsystems of this established framework together. Citizens of states are in this context considered to be the carriers of national culture. They are rooted by birth in this defined national and cultural space. The citizens contribute to the national and homogenous culture via communication and negotiation of culture. (Zoll 2007: 25ff.)

Even though Bhabha does not sympathize with the idea of national culture, he agrees that culture is located and exercised where this negotiation of its carriers takes place. He locates the negotiation of hybrid culture in the so called 'Third Space' which will be explained later.

Now, after giving reasons why an idea about national and homogenous culture evolved and explaining its function, the next step is to define the grounds on which this idea was able to persist.

Stuart Hall determined five elements that constitute and feed the fantasy about national and homogenous culture, even though in reality it never existed.

The first one is manifested in the historical events of a nation. Myths and symbols that are retold and applied within nation states are also part of this element. The second component is the national history of the state. This narrative is also utilized to support the first element mentioned above. The third one Hall described is tradition. However, tradition is not necessarily based on fact. Also, invented tradition contributed to maintaining the fantasy. The fourth benchmark is based on the myth of genesis of a nation, which does not have an exact date for its point of origin. Finally, Hall referred to pure culture. The last of these five elements demonstrated the reference of an imagined homogenous culture to its pure and original population. Especially during times of crises,

these five manifestations can be exploited in order to mobilize people. (Zoll 2007: 29)

However, due to globalization and migration this constructed and imagined national culture comes into conflict with its surrounding dynamic environment. It is challenged and required to adapt to reality in order to solve the emerging problems in the field of integration.

Because of Bhabha's rejection of building his interpretation of hybrid culture upon the idea of pure and homogeneous culture, his theory seems to be more suitable to meet today's demands of culture. The characteristics of his hybrid culture, going about an inherent change, and its location beyond the borders of a nation state, seems most appropriate to our reality today.

4.4.3 Applying Bhabha's Cultural Hybridity Today

In the past the main topic of world literature, according to Bhabha, was retelling and passing on national traditions. Today migrants and political refugees are writing history. (Bhabha 2007: 18ff.) The intention during the process of rewriting history on the bases of hybridity is not to create a 'new' and essential base for binary utilization of the term. Hybridity is neither sequel to multiculturalism nor trying to relativize cultures in order to solve tensions among differing values of cultures. The concept of hybridity by Homi K. Bhabha is not trying to disperse the tensions of and between cultures through relativism. It aims to reduce tensions by proclaiming acceptance of a pluralistic understanding of culture and identity, where contradictions, that oppose the idea of homogeneity, are welcome. (Marchart 2007: 83)

This understanding of a pluralistic and hybrid culture and identity is supposed to be negotiated and articulated in, what Bhabha is calling, the 'Third Space'. "A transnational framework that accepts hybrid cultural formations brings to the forefront questions of what is home and what is exile. It also creates what others have called a 'third space' beyond the confines of any one nation-state." (Angeles Torres 2003: 382)

Therefore the 'Third Space' is located beyond the nation state. It is a point of reference that allows identification outside the nation states structure, framework and history. It is a figurative 'place' where it is possible to rewrite history of cultural concurrence; where the history of people outside the mainstream culture and society are able to negotiate their perspective and turn it into our perspective. (Bhabha 2007: 10) "[...], it is the space of intervention emerging in the cultural interstices that introduces creative intervention into existence. [...], there is a return to the performance of identity as iteration, the re-creation of the self in the world of travel, the resettlement of the borderline community of migration." (Bhabha 2005: 12)

The 'Third Space' can be described as a bridge connecting home and 'unhomeliness' – the unknown. It provides space to negotiate the power (imbalances) of cultural differences throughout history in order to rewrite it and add perspectives of our history and interpretation of culture that have been left out. Therefore, it can be used to modify what is perceived as the reality of today. (Bhabha 2007: 13ff.)

According to these facts, the 'Third Space' contributes to establishing a modified and hybrid perception of culture, because it adds the perspective of those who have been excluded during the process of writing history and writing the *norms*, *ideas* and *material culture* of what is perceived to be 'our' (national) culture today.

As we have seen before, the nation state uses the idea of a homogenous national culture to secure its authority. Therefore, it seems to be unlikely that the nation state will be able to provide the 'Third Space' where hybrid identity and culture can be articulated and negotiated. It seems unlikely that the nation state will act as support to the establishment of a hybrid understanding of culture, hence I have introduced and applied an integration based on a model of hybridity. Yet, since I earlier mentioned that the government of the United States is not actively taking action in integration politics, it might be possible that other actors, like the Chicano Movement, can be supportive to establish a hybrid model of integration based on hybrid comprehension of culture. The achievements of the Chicano Movement concerning the development of a

hybrid understanding of culture and identity will be discussed in the last part of this paper.

Homi K. Bhabha's 'Third Space' also provides a framework that enables people who do not match the "mainstream identity" of the nation state to identify themselves. People whose identity seems to be ambiguous and contradicting to that of the dominant society is given room in the 'Third Space' to articulate themselves. (Rutherford 1990: 211)

If the cultural and social context is stable, the construction of identity of individuals will be relatively consistent. However, if this context is on the verge of collapsing or simply changing – as it is the case with migrants –, the construction of identity will be incompatible with the common understanding identity construction. "[...], Migration führt sowohl Unsicherheit als auch Hybridität in die Identitätskonstitution ein. Diese Identität konstituiert sich als Kontaktstelle zwischen unterschiedlichen Welten und wird durch diese verändert, weil sie in einem Grenzbereich angesiedelt ist, [...]"¹⁸ (Kluszczyński 2007: 112)

4.5 Identity:

As we have already observed previously, our cultural and social environment is constantly and rapidly changing in our contemporary globalizing world. We, as individuals as well as members of certain groups, are embedded and living in this changing environment and therefore cannot deny that it is shaping and influencing us – our identity.

In a relatively stable environment the construction of our identity is supposed to be rather unobstructed. However, if we seem to be depersonalized, alienated or estranged from our social and cultural environment, we will not be able to homogenously blend into it. Especially people who are moving across borders – national, cultural or social borders – are affected by this postcolonial reality

¹⁸ Migration leads to insecurity as well as hybridity concerning the construction of identity. This (migrant) identity operates as a place enabling contact between different worlds. It is located in a grey area – a threshold region – and therefore modified because of this special impact. (translated by the author)

which is questioning the ideas of enlightenment about human beings. The postcolonial reality and the effects of globalization do not seem to be consistent with the idea of identity that was defined and constructed during the Age of Enlightenment. (Bhabha 2007: 61)

In order to understand why the definition of identity of the past seems no longer to be adequate, will be discussed in the following chapter. Therefore construction of identity will be deconstructed and analyzed.

4.5.1 Identity Construction

Throughout time, different interpretations about identity construction have emerged. Stuart Hall introduces three conceptualizations of identity. Each of which reflects a different approach.

The first concept is an individualistic concept of identity and is based on the interpretation of the subject during the Age of Enlightenment. The subject – the human being – was seen as a very centered, completed and unified individual. These humans were considered to possess reason, consciousness and the capacity to act. Her/his inner core of being was given by birth and she/he was supposed to be identical with this static and consistent core throughout their entire life. (Hall 1994: 181)

The second concept, Hall introduces, is a sociological concept and reflects the complexity of the modern world. In contrast to the first concept, the subjects' inner core is not autonomous. Being and existing as 'oneself' is not enough. It is necessary to exist against the background of something or someone other, in order to sustain and shape identity. The relation to and the interaction with the world outside oneself is necessary to recognize oneself. This second concept is not an individualistic, but rather an interactive concept of identity. Identity is constructed via (active or passive) interaction between 'I' and the surrounding cultural world. (Hall 1994: 181f.) "Das Subjekt hat immer noch einen inneren Kern, ein Wesen, das ‚das wirkliche Ich‘ ist, aber dieses wird in einem

kontinuierlichen Dialog mit den kulturellen Welten ‚außerhalb‘ und den Identitäten, die sie anbieten, gebildet und modifiziert.“¹⁹ (Hall 1994: 182)

Within this conceptualization, identity is connecting the cleavage between the personal and the public world. Through this connection the subject is stabilized and rooted within its environment. Via reciprocal interaction the environment and the subject become more homogenous and predictable. (ibid.)

However, this concept of identity seems to cause problems in our contemporary world, because the subject and the environment interacting in this concept seem to drift apart. Identity becomes fragmented and is composed of sometimes divergent and contradictory elements. The process of identification becomes more complicated. (ibid.)

Therefore Hall is introducing another concept of identity that seems to respond in a more appropriate way to today's circumstances. This concept of identity is based on what he calls the 'postmodern subject'. The postmodern subject, compared to the sociological subject, does not own a persistent or intrinsic identity. (ibid.) This identity is continuously modified by its surrounding cultural system. According to Hall, it is an illusion to assume the existence of a completed, unified and coherent identity. Especially if the phenomenon of globalization today is speeding up the process and intensity of change, fragmented identities will be more likely to emerge. (Hall 1994: 183ff.) This third method of contemplating identity is where the model of hybrid identity is based on. However, before going into detail about hybrid identities, it is necessary to add two more categories of identities. These categories concern a more specific context of identities.

Social and Group Identity:

The three formations of identity analyzed above were mainly concerning the level of individual identity formation. Even though, the context and environment of identities was implicated, it focused on the identity of individuals and their assigned roles of expectations. (Wodak et al. 2009: 16)

¹⁹ The subject has still got an inner core, an essence that consists ‚the true I‘. However, this essence is created and modified via continuous dialogues between the cultural worlds/environments (outside) and its extended identities. (translated by the author)

However, there is also an identity formation taking place within and in between our social systems and among its groups. This concept of identity is not necessarily separated from the individual concept since they are reciprocally influencing one another. This second category of identity is called group or social identity. This perspective considers identities in relation to systems and is used for the characterization of collective identities like groups, organizations, classes or cultures. (ibid.)

It is important to understand that we establish categories when ere we are locating ourselves and others. Nationhood is one category and will be looked at in more detail later. However, the reason for creating categories is to structure our perception of reality. “The concept of ‘fit’ relates categories to the preexisting organization of the social world. It looks backward from perception to structure and insists that our understandings are functional insofar as they allow us to find our way through the world as it is structured.” (Reicher 2004: 935)

Nevertheless we have to be careful when simplifying reality by a homogenizing system that has opposing differences.

Two problems may occur when we are categorizing and grouping identities. First of all, dividing our complex social world into seemingly homogenous categories can be dangerous, because individuals appear to be too diverse for some of the categories we have developed so far. Categories trying to give the impression of consisting exclusively of a homogenous group of people can be misused in order to (violently) expel people who are not fitting the category. (Wodak et al. 2009: 11, 17, Reicher 2004: 935)

“Used as a completely static idea, the concept wrongly suggests that people belong to a solid, unchanging, intrinsic collective unit because of a specific history which they supposedly have in common, and that as a consequence they feel obliged to act and react as a group when they are threatened.”
(Wodak et al. 2009: 11)

The second problem seems to be that we are asking ourselves the wrong question when categorizing individual identities into groups. We are asking who we are going to put into which group or category while we should be trying to think about the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of specific categories in the first

place. Whether or not established categories are making sense and actually simplifying current realities or simply distorting our reality. (Reicher 2004: 935)

One such conflicting category is called 'national identity' and is currently recognized as being ineffective in simplifying our contemporary globalizing reality.

4.5.2 National Identity

National cultures seem to be one of the main sources for cultural identity. However, as we have already learned before, national cultures are an invention of nation states in order to legitimize their authority. We are not born possessing a national identity. National identities are in fact socialized conceptions which we have learned through representations of national identity. (Hall 1994: 199f.)

„Nationale Kulturen konstruieren Identitäten, indem sie Bedeutungen der ‚Nation‘ herstellen, mit denen wir uns identifizieren können; sie sind in den Geschichten enthalten, die über die Nation erzählt werden, in den Erinnerungen, die Ihre Gegenwart mit ihrer Vergangenheit verbinden und in den Vorstellungen, die über sie konstruiert werden.“²⁰ (Hall 1994: 201)

The reason for creating this national identity is to unify the members of national society under one homogenous cultural identity. This act of unification is not necessarily always a harmonious and peaceful process. Violent oppression of cultural differences is a possible consequence of believing in and exercising national identity. However, national identity not only applies to homogenous cultural national identity. Its meaning can also imply notions of a homogenous social class throughout the territory of the nation state. (Hall 1994: 205f.)

Looking at our world today and the idea about national identity, we have to ask ourselves, as Reicher has already suggested earlier, whether or not the maintenance of this category of identity is still effective in order to simplify reality.

²⁰ National cultures are constructing identities by creating a nation that we can identify with. They (national identities) are constructed by narrations about the nation, which connect the present and the past and the fantasies constructed by them. (translated by the author)

Since there is movement, constant border crossings, due to globalization, information technologies, tourism, economic translocation and financial transfers, the maintenance about the imagination of national homogenous identity is no longer supportable. "In the gap between such connections and differences we can begin to unwind the self-reflexive national idiom and its xenophobic refusal of external referents in its formation, in its making." (Chambers 1995: 28)

Migrants especially seem to be an 'obstacle' of the misconception about a homogenous national identity. The problem concerning migrants can be identified on both levels of identity – on the individual level as well as on the level of social identity.

There is a rupture occurring in the formation of individual identity as well as a change of the environment, which is concerning migrants as a group distinguishing them from other groups. "[...] remember [...] that social identity is simultaneously something intensely personal and important to me as an individual, but also something that, in substance cannot be reduced to me as an individual but is rather a cultural and historical construct." (Reicher 2004: 929)

They cannot deny and abandon their inherited culture of their past since it is an inherent part of their identity. "None of us can simply choose another language, as though we could completely abandon our previous history and feely opt for another one. Our previous sense of knowledge, language and identity, our peculiar inheritance, cannot be simply rubbed out of the story, cancelled. [...]

The zone we now inhabit is open, full of gaps: an excess that is irreducible to a single centre, origin or point of view." (Chambers 1995: 24)

As we have learned before, we – as individuals – are also imbedded in groups and in our surrounding environment. Our individual identity is therefore also interconnected with group identity. Since national identity can be located within the category of group identity, this means that we have to some extent been able to relate to this identity we are living (even if it is invented). If our individual identity does not match the preconceived idea of national identity that is constructed by the nation state we are residing in, problems will arise.

Our contemporary situation in the age of globalization seems to force us to find new ways and ideas about the construction of identity. Globalization is a phenomenon that is crossing and penetrating frontiers. Its cross-border effects are connecting societies and not dependant on time or space. Even though globalization is not a new phenomenon, its impacts on society and our globe have intensified tremendously since the 1970s. These impacts are significantly contributing to the constitution of hybrid identities which are, according to Hall, going to replace notions of national identity. (Hall 1994: 208f.)

People with multiple identities will grow in quantity due to the effects of globalization. "With increased contact between people and cultures, we may be witnessing the rise of transnational identities. [...] Diaspora communities where people are grounded in multiple cultures also produce hybrid identities." (Angeles Torres 2003: 381)

4.5.3 Hybrid Identity

After realizing that a process of identity which has been interpreted as being continuous and stable seems not to be responding well to the reality of identity formation today, we need to find a more adequate formation of identity. Identities can never be seen as being completed. They are undergoing a constant process of change. (Hall 1994: 72)

When trying to unify individuals under one pre-ordained homogenous group identity as well as characterizing individual identities as being homogenous problems occur within and among identities of today's (global) society. "[...] the idea of a homogenous 'pure' identity on the individual or collective level is a deceptive fiction and illusion." (Wodak et al. 2009: 16)

Hall is arguing that the effects of globalization are creating favorable circumstances for creating culturally hybrid identities. Multiple and hybrid identities have the potential to counteract practices of exclusion. The authors give an example of linguistic and religious differences in Switzerland where ethnic and religious differences are reciprocally toned down because of the overlapping differentiating. There are French-speaking and German-speaking Swiss who are Catholic at the same time as they are French- or German-

speaking. Therefore religious differences are contemplated in a different light. (Wodak et al. 2009: 17)

The first time hybrid or divergent identities, opposed to those which fit into a homogenous fantasy about identity, were discussed came at the end of the 1960s. Social movements were speaking up for groups/minorities that also include individuals and identities with multiple identifications occurring simultaneously – hybrid identities on the political agenda.

“Dennoch kann kulturelle Identität – spätestens seit der Zäsur von 1968 und dem Aufstieg neuer sozialer Bewegungen, in denen die Strategien der Identifikation selbst zum ersten Mal und über die traditionellen Grenzen des politischen Raums hinaus zum Gegenstand der Politik wurden – nicht mehr als Bewahrung eines Wesens oder einer ursprünglichen Essenz gedacht werden. Sie muß in den Kontext eines neuen Globalisierungsschubs des Weltkapitalismus gestellt werden, durch den Interdependenz und Zeit-Raum-Verdichtung ausgeweitet wurden und [...] die internationale Migration eine neue Qualität erlangte.“²¹
(Hall 1994: 10f.)

As Hall mentions, international migration was being able to discuss identity construction on a new level – a more integrative rather than exclusionist level. Today we have to analyze identities that are characterized by segmentation, fragmentation and contradiction. We have to oppose the notion of homogenous and continuous identities as the goal of identity construction. (Hall 1994: 69f.)

As has already been mentioned previously, the construction of identity needs to be interpreted as a process. This process is driven by a goal that constitutes our normative picture of identity. However, we have to understand that we will, according to Bhabha, never reach fulfilling this picture completely. We are undergoing constant transformation and change by adopting this normative picture or identity. The process of identification never “[...] die Bestätigung einer von vornherein gegebenen Identität, nie um eine ‚self-fulfilling prophecy‘ – sondern um die Prouktion eines Bildes der Identität und die Transformation, die

²¹ Cultural identity is challenged – since the caesura of 1968 and the rise of social movements at the latest. For the first time strategies of identification became an agenda in politics and transcended traditional borders of the political space. This challenged cultural identity is not a maintenance of the original essence of being. Identity has to be interpreted in connection with its surrounding globalizing environment, where interdependence and the unit of time and space have been intensified and [...] where international migration achieved new quality.

das Subjekt durchläuft, indem es dieses Bild zu eigen macht.“²² (Bhabha 2007: 66)

The refusal to support the belief of an identity that is given by birth is one approach of hybrid identity. However, this does not necessarily apply only to individual identity, group identity is also impacted by this. Theories about hybrid identity not only oppose the belief in a naturally given identity, but they also destabilize the interpretation of a naturally given identity often assigned by others. We can recognize the impact of demonstrating power when we identifying others (Bhabha 2007: 74ff.)

However, this impact of Bhabha's theory of hybrid identity will become clearer once we apply it to the example of Chicanos.

Another major influence that the theory of hybridity is trying to provoke, are our constructed categorizes of political thinking. Perspectives by those who have been excluded from the mainstream discourse need to be included on the political agenda.

„[...] das Hervorbringen von etwas Zusätzlichem, das nicht nur ein abgetrennter Teil oder eine Spalte des Subjekts ist, sondern auch der Querschnitt, den es über soziale Orte und Disziplinen hinweg erzeugt. Diese Hybridität setzt das Projekt des politischen Denkens in Gang, in dem sie ihm Ständig die Probleme der Strategien und Kontingenz, das entgegenstehende Denken seines eigenen ‚Ungedachten‘ vor Augen führt. Es muß seine Ziele durch eine Anerkennung differentieller Objekte und diskursiver Ebenen hindurch verhandeln, die nicht nur einfach als Inhalte, sondern in ihrer Äußerungsweise (address) als Formen textueller oder narrativer Abhängigkeiten – seien diese nun regierungsamtlicher, juristischer oder künstlerischer Natur – artikuliert werden. Trotz seines festen Engagements muß das Politische immer die Priorität des Ortes, von dem aus es seinen Anfang nimmt, als Problem oder Frage ansehen, wenn seine Autorität nicht autokratisch sein soll.“²³

(Bhabha 2007: 95f.)

²² [...] confirms a predetermined identity. It is never a self-fulfilling prophecy, but rather produces an image of identity and its transformation that the subject goes through by internalizing this image. (translated by the author)

²³ [...] the establishment of something additional that is not just a detached part or a cleavage of the subject, but also a cross-section that is created throughout social spaces and disciplines. This hybridity induces a project of political thinking in which it constantly illustrates the strategic problems and contingencies of conflictive thinking of its un-thought self. It has to negotiate and articulate its goals by recognizing differential objects through discursive levels that are not just substances, but rather addresses of textual and narrative dependencies – no matter if they are government issues, or juristic or artistic issues. Despite the politics strong commitment, it has to start evaluating problems from their beginning, if its authority opposes being autocratic. (translated by the author)

Categories need to be reconsidered on the political level and stories need to be told from a different angle which includes more than just one point of view. Cross-sectional discourses have to be established with the inclusion of those who have been excluded. It is necessary to turn those who have been the objects of discourses into subjects and enable those who are affected by discourses to rewrite them as subjects. (ibid.)

These demands are clearly located in the postcolonial critics of sciences. However, they need to be applied on the societal level in order to prove their effectiveness. Therefore the example of the Chicano discourse will be analyzed later.

After analyzing the fields of culture and identity we realized that its application has to be transformed in a way that is more effectively when we are trying to analyze today's constantly changing world. Previous claims of identity and culture do not fit anymore and therefore we have to try to find new theories about its interpretations and categorization, in order to effectively create a simplified theoretical picture of our complex reality.

Both fields are showing a tremendous influence of the *imagined* nation (states) – as Benedict Anderson would say. Therefore the role of the nation (state) concerning integration and its creation of new approaches towards integration should be high lightened.

4.6 Nation (State)

As we have encountered, the nation state is closely interconnected with our national identity and national culture. These two elements and the nation state itself are challenged by the phenomenon of migration. However, before going into detail about how the nation state is challenged by today's globalization and migration, the terms of 'nation' and 'state' need to be clarified.

State

According to Max Weber, the state is the agency within society which possesses the monopoly of legitimate power. "Zwangsgewalt darf rechtmäßig

nur durch die zentrale politische Autorität ausgeübt werden sowie durch jene, an die sie dieses Recht delegiert.“²⁴ (Gellner 1991: 11)

The state is constituted of institutions which are deal with executing law and order. These agencies that are differentiated from social life in order to maintain stability based on the rule of law. (Gellner 1991: 12)

However, determining nation does not seem to be as simple as the definition of state.

Nation

First of all it is important to understand that 'nation' is a normative fantasy. This normative fantasy about nation has been growing throughout history. We are not born with an essential necessity of possessing a nationality. The normative fantasy about nation comprises two factors. (Gellner 1991: 16)

Firstly, members of the same nation are linked by loyalty and allegiance to the same culture. This understanding of culture is based on the same definition as it has already been described earlier – as a system of thoughts that consists of symbols, associations and behavioral and communication patterns applied by its members. The second attribute of nation is its recognition by its members. “[...]; Nationen sind Artefakte menschlicher Überzeugung, Loyalitäten und Solidaritätsbeziehungen. Eine bloße Kategorie von Personen [...] wird zu einer Nation, wenn und sobald die Mitglieder dieser Kategorie bestimmte gegenseitige Rechte und Pflichten anerkennen, die sie ihrer gemeinsamen Mitgliedschaft verdanken.“²⁵ (Gellner 1991: 16f.)

After clarifying the meaning of nation and state another term needs to be assessed before moving on to evaluate the challenges of the nation state. It seems to be important to determine the meaning of nationalism, since this phenomenon appears to accompany the phenomenon of migration among today's nation states.

²⁴ The enforcement of order can only be legitimately executed by the central political authority or by those who have been delegated by this authority to do so. (translated by the author)

²⁵ “[...]; nations are artifacts of human beliefs, loyalties and relations of solidarity. A simple category of people [...] becomes a nation if and once the members of this category recognize certain rights and duties which they owe to their membership. (translated by the author)

Nationalism

“Nationalismus ist vor allem ein politisches Prinzip, das besagt, politische und nationale Einheit sollten deckungsgleich sein.”²⁶ (Gellner 1991: 8)

This principle or theory of nationalism that states that the political and ethnical border have to be congruent can cause problems, if they turn out to be disparate. In ethnically heterogeneous states nationalism can lead to expulsion, homicide or assimilation of those who are not ethnically conforming citizens. There is no concrete number that measures the moment when the national feeling is violated by too much ethnical diversity. (Gellner 1991: 9f.)

The national feeling is “[...] eine Empfindung von Zorn über die Verletzung des Prinzips, oder von Befriedigung angesichts seiner Erfüllung.”²⁷ (Gellner 1991: 8) However, exactly this principle is challenged by today’s globalization and migration. T

4.6.1 Has the Nation State Expired?

As we have already seen earlier, national culture and national identity were established to legitimize and maintain the nation states authority and monopoly of power. However, it seems that today’s impact of globalization and migration is challenging the principles the nation state is based upon.

For Joppke, globalization is indicating an increasing irrelevance of space in today’s social life, because markets and cultures are not tied to the territories of nation states. (Joppke 1998: 12) He is arguing that restrictive immigration policies are implemented by nation states in order to protect their principles of homogenous national identity and culture. These restrictions are presented as national interests in order to keep out those who are not wanted and those who would endanger the legitimizing principle of national sovereignty. (Joppke 1998: 9)

The achievement of citizenship through birth is an indicator of belief in an inherent core of national identity which needs to be sustained in order to

²⁶ First of all, nationalism is a political principle which indicates that the political and national unity should be identical. (translated by the author)

²⁷ [...] a sentiment of wrath if the principle [of nationalism] is violated, and a sentiment of gratification if it is achieved. (translated by the author)

authorize the position and monopoly of nation states. “[...] – the relationship between individual and state was so intense as not to be changed over a lifetime, and not to be divided between several states at the same time; [...] [therefore] [...] contemporary immigration with its dual implications of post-national membership and multicultural identity politics must be profound challenge to every component of the classical model of citizenship.” (Joppke 1998: 23)

Since migrants are challenging this belief about an inherent core of national identity and therefore also challenging the sovereignty of the nation states two possible scenarios arise.

The first, more conservative option is that the nation states are trying to defy the challenge of migration by incorporating it into their existing framework. With this outcome the membership would still be bound to the nation state. The rights of immigrants would be independent of citizenship as they have already become independent when we are looking at international human rights for example. Human rights are universally valid and not terminated by the nation states borders. However, the implementation and execution of human rights is still the nation states business. Even if some of the implications in this scenario would be located outside the framework of the nation state, the process of identification would still be territorialized. (Joppke 1998: 7f.)

The second possibility seems to be more radical. Its intention is to fundamentally transform the nation state. Identity and culture would no longer be territorially bonded to the nation state, but rather located elsewhere. (ibid.) This is exactly the intention of the model of hybridity; to create an integrative model of society that is not based on exclusionist principles, where borders are established in order to keep the fantasy about homogenous cultures and identities alive. Since the model of hybridity is located outside the competences of the nation state, the nation state does not seem to be an adequate actor to introduce this model. Other possible actors, that are able to promote and execute the model of hybridity, need to be empowered in order to find a way of meeting the needs of today’s globalized and multicultural society.

The Chicano movement fought for the recognition of the Chicanos hybrid culture and identity. Therefore the achievements of the Chicano community in the United States will be evaluated in the next chapters.

5 Chicano Power! History, Culture and Identity from a Hybrid Perspective in Order to Make Integration Work

Before introducing the Chicano's hybrid model of society and analyzing integration of Chicanos in the United States in this context, it should be clarified what is understood by the Chicano's hybrid culture and identity. Therefore, a brief introduction of Chicano history should be given in order to understand what it means to be Chicano/-a.

5.1 Chicano History – Telling History from the Perspective of Los Híbridos

As Homi K. Bhabha already stated, it is necessary to retell history from the perspective of those who have been left out until today, in order to facilitate a hybrid model of society. In this case, it means to take a closer look at the Chicanos' perspective about their history of immigration and integration in the United States.

Pérez-Torres identified three historical moments that are significant for conceptualization of hybrid Chicano culture and identity. The first one occurred in 1521 with the Spanish conquest of the Aztec Empire. This time was known for enslavement, genocide and oppression of the indigenous population of Mexico. The relationship between the invaders and the oppressed accompanied the appearance of 'mestizos'. Children of Spanish and Indian descent were called 'mestizos'. (Pérez-Torrez 1998: 154)

The 'mestizos' were virtually located between the oppressors and the oppressed. However, as we have learned in the chapter about the terminology of hybridity, (mestizo) hybrid people were ranked very low in the social

hierarchy of that time. Therefore, 'mestizos' were actually not located between, but rather below the colonizers as well as below the colonized population. People who were called 'mestizos' or 'hybrids' at that time, were people without a voice and treated as objects of history.

The second moment Pérez-Torres identified, is the signing of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo in 1848. Pérez-Torres called this the moment of betrayal which initiated new subjects who were officially called Chicanos/as. (ibid.)

In order to understand who these so called Chicanos were, we need to go back in history and explain the reason for the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo.

In 1821 Mexico became a nation – a nation that was bankrupt and in desperate need of building an infrastructure. Mexico at that time was already racially very heterogonous due to 'mestizaje' and immigration and therefore struggled to form a government. However, in 1821 the territory that is known today as Texas was still belonging to Mexico. Contrary to today's flows of migration, huge waves of Anglo-Americans were drawn into Mexico – the opposite direction of today – in order to acquire cheap land. At first, Mexico demanded the immigrants to be Catholic and to take an oath of allegiance to Mexico before allowing them to settle on Mexican territory. Later, in 1830, the Mexican government closed its borders in order to stop Anglo-American immigration. However, in 1845 Texas became part of the United States and this circumstance was one of the causes that triggered the Mexican-American War in 1846. (Acuña 1988: 6ff)

Anglo-Americans at that time portrayed themselves as superior and Mexicans as inferior people. An imbalance of power and stigmatization by Anglo-Americans was determining identity of the Mexican population. US-American literature published at the end of the 19th and beginning of the 20th century combined the conviction of superiority of the United States, its mission to spread democracy and its prejudice about Mexicans as inferior people who should be grateful about being liberated by the USA. (Acuña 1988: 14f.) At this point it is important to mention that the unequal relationship between colonizers and colonized is a major topic in Homi K. Bhabhas 'The Location of Culture'. He describes this relationship as one of the factors that inaugurated hybridity as a reference point among the colonized.

However, the Mexican-American War left mutual mindsets towards each other which would continue to pervade contacts between Mexican and US-American people. "Mexicans' attitude toward Anglo-Americans has been influenced by the war just as the easy victory of the United States conditioned Anglo-American behavior toward Mexicans." (Acuña 1988: 15)

On 2nd February 1848 the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo was signed. Today's California, New Mexico, Nevada, parts of Colorado, Arizona and Utah became officially part of the U.S. territory. Mexicans who stayed behind in the 'lost' territories were forced to assimilate. Therefore, the treaty included several articles dealing with the rights and duties of these 'new' citizens. Mexicans who remained living on U.S. territory were given one year to choose whether they would stay or move to the state of Mexico. Most Mexicans stayed in U.S. territory and about 2000 chose to relocate. Another article of the treaty formally guaranteed that those who stayed behind, would enjoy all rights of U.S. American citizens according to the U.S. constitution and that their property would remain in their possession. However, the enforcement of the treaty concerning the rights of the remaining Mexican settlers depended on the good faith of the United States. In reality, the well meaning statements in the treaty turned out to remain just well meaning statements and nothing more. (Acuña 1988: 19ff.) "In practice, however, the treaty was ignored and during the nineteenth century most Mexicans in the United States were considered as a class apart from the dominant race." (Acuña 1988: 20)

These Mexicans who became citizens of the United States were called Chicanos. Once again the term Chicano was used by others to label Mexicans residing in the United States who worked in the industries and fields for low-wages. (Pérez-Torres 1998: 154)

However, the terms' connotations that Chicanos were only called Chicanos by others – the transformation of Chicanos into objects of their history – altered with the rise of the Chicano Movement in the 1960s. Chicano empowerment turned themselves into the Subjects of their history in order to express their pride for being Chicano.

The third moment which turned out to be significant for shaping Chicano hybridity, is the ongoing event about immigration issues in the United States. This moment is about the controversies over immigration, employment and border control which shape Chicano identity and culture. (Pérez-Torres 1998: 154)

Immigration from Mexico to the US has a long historical tradition – starting from the late 19th century until the present and even though a political discourse occurs, trying to curtail immigration into the United States, speculations exist that it might even increase in the future. Due to the fact that the US economy is based on the need for an influx of immigrants, the number of immigrants might increase. Agriculture, construction and textiles are the main sectors acting as powerful pull factors of Mexican immigration. (Maciel/Herrera-Sobek 1998: 4)

The refusal to assimilate and blend into the American culture and enduring ethnic identity by Mexican immigrants contributed to the establishment of Chicano identity. (Maciel/Herrera-Sobek 1998: 6f.) The meaning of Chicano identity will be analyzed in more detail later.

However, before analyzing hybrid Chicano identity and culture, a demarcation of the terms ‘Hispanic’, ‘Latino/a’, ‘Mexican-American’ and Chicano/a should be given.

5.2 Who is Who? – ¿Eres Latino/a, Hispanic, Mexican-American o Chicano/a?

The Spanish-speaking community in the United States is one of the largest and most heterogeneous groups. Categorizing people who are members of this group turns out to be quite difficult. “[...] one must also recognize that there is no more heterogeneous ethnic group in the United States than the Spanish-speaking.” (McWilliams 1990: 7)

However, it is important to demarcate who is spoken to and about when certain terms are used. Yet, in the context of this thesis it is even more important to take a closer look at the question of who made up the terms of Chicano/a, Hispanic, Mexican-American or Latino/a. It needs to be clarified whether the

term is created by those who define themselves as Chicano, Latino/a, Hispanic or Mexican-American or whether the term was invented by others in order to describe a certain group of people.

It appears that the usage of the terms vary within the U.S. according to cities or states.

"In Chicago, the word is 'Latino', which refers mostly to Mexicans and Puerto Ricans but can include, for example, Portuguese. In the Midwest, 'Mexican American' is a more commonly used term; in the southwest, 'chicano'. But in California, which now has a large Central American population, 'Latino' and 'Hispanic' are used increasingly because, technically, 'chicano' refers specifically to a Mexican American. There are Mexican Americans who will give you a tongue-lashing if you call them chicanos and there are chicanos who insist on being called Mexicans."

(Langley 1988: 9)

However, it is very important in this paper to use the most authentic term possible in order to prevent identification by others. Also the term 'Chicano' has been used by others in order to categorize and stigmatize people of Mexican descent. After the critical postcolonial discourse, the term Chicano experienced a new meaning given by the Chicano Movement.

Chicano

In order to avoid using the term with its previously wrong and stigmatizing implications, I will adopt the definition of Chicano from Carlos Muñoz Jr.. He was one of the leaders of the Chicano Movement in the 1960s and therefore is a legit reference to define the term Chicano. (Muñoz 2006)

The term 'Chicano' was popularized in the late 1960s. Ever since Mexican American scholars and political activists have applied it uncritically. However, it implicates political and ideological significance that was attached by the founders of the Chicano Movement.

One famous example of using 'Chicano' in the wrong context is the reference of César Chávez as a national leader of the Chicano movement, when in reality he has been the leader of the farmworkers' union. However, it needs to be mentioned that there has been reciprocal influence of members of the farmworkers union and members of the Chicano Movement.

"[...] he [César Chávez] did not consider himself to be a Chicano leader but the organizer of a union representing a multiracial constituency of rank-and-file workers. [...] It is nevertheless true that many Mexican American student activists, including this author, were inspired by Chávez and many rank-and-file union members came to identify with the goals of the Chicano movement."
(Muñoz 2006: 7)

However, what needs to be emphasized is that the term Chicano implicates a meaning of identity and empowerment.

Three interpretative models of the term Chicano can be identified. The first one is a cultural pluralist model, in which Chicanos are a particular ethnic group subjected to racial and cultural discrimination. Therefore, Chicanos have responded by struggling to protect their cultural status. "The result of this experience has seen Chicanos emerging as an ethnic group that, while becoming American in political status, has simultaneously maintained much of its cultural heritage." (Foster 1982: 6)

The second model is called the internal colonial model. In this model the Chicano experience is embedded in a form of colonialism. Due to the Mexican war and racial oppression the term Chicano relates to these inherent elements of Chicano history. The third interpretation of Chicano relates to the connotation of the Chicano experience with the capitalist labor needs of the U.S.. "[...] American capitalism has basically exploited Chicanos as cheap and unskilled labor. In this process, racism has been used as a form of labor control in the economic labor market, which is segmented along racial lines." (Foster 1982: 7)

After analyzing Chicano identity and Chicano culture, it will be clear who exactly is meant when defining him or herself as Chicano. However, it is necessary to keep in mind that the definition of Chicano needs to be referred to and claimed from a Chicano himself or herself. It is a form of identifying oneself and committing to an identity outside national connotations. All three of the previously mentioned interpretative models are influencing the formation of the term Chicano terms.

Defining the term Chicano is due to the topic of this thesis the most important one. However, in order of a clear distinction to the other terms, I will rely on the definition of Carlos Muñoz Jr.. The term Mexican(-)American will be applied to

refer to people of Mexican descent, who are born and raised in the United State. Used with a hyphen, it will refer to the generation of the 1930s and 1940s and the political ideology shaped by that generation. (Muñoz 2006: 16)

The term Latino/a refers to people of Latin American descent in the U.S. including Mexican-Americans and Mexican Americans. However, the term Hispanic seems to be controversial to me, as it “[...] retains associations from its birth in the corridors of the federal bureaucracy and among political elites.” (ibid.) Therefore, the usage of this term will be avoided in the following chapters.

After mentioning the Chicano Movement and its contribution to the empowerment and identification of Chicanos, it needs to be evaluated in more detail how the Movement contributed to the establishment of hybrid Chicano identity and culture. The focus lies on the Chicano Movement in California, where more than 45 % of the total population of Mexican ethnic descend of the United States are living. In Los Angeles people of Mexican descent are the fastest growing ethnicity. (Gutiérrez 1998: 313)

5.3 The Chicano Movement

In order to understand the reasons of the rise of Chicanos in the United States the history of the Chicano Movements’ evolution needs to be told. It needs to be assessed how Mexican American immigrants turned from assimilation to cultural nationalism and pluralism. After this clarification, a better understanding of the appearance of hybrid Chicano culture and identity will be provided.

5.3.1 Emergence of the Chicano Movement

As we have seen earlier in the beginning of the 20th century the Melting Pot Theory was a thriving concept in the United States. The Mexican American communities and organizations responded to that concept by trying to blend into the Melting Pot and assimilate towards the Anglo culture. “Until World War II Mexican-American organizations had been either mutualist self-help or assimilationist-citizenship in their orientation.” (McWilliams 1990: 274)

During WW II the citizenship of Mexican Americans in the U.S. was strengthened because of their needed labor and participation in the Army. Mexican Americans moved to the cities or joined the army where they were surrounded by a more tolerant environment than before. Social upward mobility was given and the standard of living could be improved. Assimilative integration concepts seemed to be an adequate response in order to make a living as a Mexican American immigrant. (McWilliams 1990: 271ff.)

However, at the end of WWII the U.S. economy declined, because of its lacking investments in its own industries of production. A shift towards a demand of knowledge based work occurred. Better paying jobs required more intensive education and this was not given in the broad spectrum of the Mexican American community in the United States. Therefore, the social upward mobility, hence pull factor towards assimilation, as has already been clarified in previous chapters, was not given anymore. This contributed to the turn towards cultural nationalism in the beginning of the formation of the Chicano Movement. (Acuña 1988: 307f.)

“First, after World War II, a marked trend toward assimilation had occurred and many Mexican American parents refused to teach their children Spanish. This trend was reversed by the growth of cultural nationalism and the presence of larger numbers of Mexican nationals. Rather than a rejection of Mexican heritage, cultural nationalism created a renaissance in Mexican consciousness.”
(Acuña 1988: 320)

In the 1950s Mexican American farm-workers fought oppression and class struggle in the agribusiness and therefore formed a union. César E. Chávez was the leader of the United Farm Workers and inspired Mexican Americans throughout the States. This happened before the background of the postwar period, the Melting Pots’ peak and the McCarthy Era when assimilation towards the dominant society was the only acceptable way to integrate. (Muñoz 2006: 48, McWilliams 274ff.) “The politics of the 1950s were not conducive to radicalism anywhere, especially to participation in social struggle that could be easily characterized as ‘communist inspired’.” (Muñoz 2006: 48)

However, the Chicano movement of the 1960s had a different agenda. Even though mutual influence between the farm-workers union and the Chicano Movement cannot be denied, the Chicano Movement tried to create awareness

for broader issues that were concerning Mexican Americans in the United States. Issues that went beyond the class struggle in the agricultural area. They demarcated themselves, because they did not want to contribute in reinforcing stereotypes about all Mexican Americans being farm-workers. (Muñoz 2006: 60)

Before the rise of the Chicano Movement in 1968, the representation of Mexican Americans in the media was either completely excluded or based on stereotypes. Mexican Americans were being portrayed as violent, lazy or unintelligent. (Gunckel 2011: 112) Also the situation in schools was very precarious for Mexican Americans at that time. Most Mexican Americans of Los Angeles lived in the eastern part of the city and attended segregated schools there. Teachers were mostly white Anglo Saxons and there was no encouragement of diversity or integration. High Schools were overcrowded in the 1950s. The construction boom of high schools that responded to the fast growing population was mostly a response of election campaigns in order to gain votes. However, after the elections no one seemed to be interested in investing into the segregated schooling system anymore. The situation was even worse on university level. Only very few students of color attended university at that time. (Haro 2011a: 136ff., Haro 2011b: 177f.) “[...] UCLA was highly segregated – nothing but white faces and relatively few students of color. Very few blacks, most of them were athletes, very few Asians and relatively few Mexicans.” (Haro 2011a: 138)

It was time for the Chicano Movement, lead by Rodolfo ‘Corky’ Gonzales, to respond to this unbearable situation the Mexican Americans lived in.

5.3.2 I am Joaquín

Rodolfo ‘Corky’ Gonzales grew up in an urban barrio in Denver where he was a political activist. In 1967 he wrote an epic poem called ‘I am Joaquín’. This poem described the key events and personalities of Mexican and Mexican American History. It begins with the Spanish conquest and ends with the conviction that people of Mexico are going to continue and to endure. ‘I am

Joaquin' does not provide a well-defined radical ideology "[...], but it did provide a critical framework for the developing student movement through its portrayal of the quest for identity and its critique of racism." (Muñoz 2006: 61)

Until 'I am Joaquín', publications about Mexican American history were practically nonexistent. History told by Mexican Americans was excluded from the curriculum in colleges, elementary and secondary schools. 'North from Mexico' by Carey McWilliams, a white liberal supporting the Mexican American civil rights struggles in California, was the only piece of literature dealing with the duality of Mexican American history. (ibid.)

5.3.3 Los Chicanos (Nacionalistas)

Rodolfo 'Corky' Gonzales developed the image of the 'Crusade for Justice', which was the vanguard of the Chicano Power movement. The 'Crusade for Justice' hosted a National Chicano Youth Liberation Conference in March 1969 in Denver, Colorado. The key issues of the Chicano Movement were compiled. They dealt with Chicano self-determination, rejection of capitalist goals and values and replacing them with humanistic values, orientation towards nonviolence, fighting the colonialist impact of U.S American dominance and forging a new Chicano Identity. (Muñoz 2006: 75ff.) "This new identity would base itself on symbols of traditional Mexican culture and would reflect a total rejection of *gabacho* culture – the culture of the white Anglo-Saxon Protestant." (Muñoz 2006: 76)

During this time of the Chicano Movement, the establishment of a new identity was based on nationalist ideology.

The Chicano Movement in the 1960s focused on the nationalist impact to establish an identity contrary to the national identity of the USA, in order to avoid forced assimilation towards national identity of the Anglo-Protestant cultural majority. (Neate 1998: 104f.)

During the conference in March 1969, 'El Plan Espiritual de Aztlán' was adopted. The name of the document referred to the original place occupied by the Aztecs as well as to the southwestern part of the U.S. that was taken from Mexico during and after the Mexican American War. 'The Spiritual Plan of

Aztlán' captured the demands of the Chicano Movement. One month later during another conference 'El Plan de Santa Barbara' was developed. It was much more sophisticated than the previous one. (Muñoz 2006: 77ff., 83f.) 'The Plan of Santa Barbara' "[...] specifically focused on the role of the Chicano intellectual and identified institutions of higher education as strategic targets for political change." (Muñoz 2006: 84)

However, both of the plans were based on a nationalist framework.

"Marginality in cultural production and social participation are related ideological constructions of a self-proclaimed national subject. The United States comprises one specific example of how national status and hegemony have been appropriated through the deprivileging, by on group, of other socio-cultural units by means of a narrative or, [...], an 'invention of ethnicity'." (Neate 1998: 104)

During that period most members of the Chicano Movement legitimized their fight and existence based on their own cultural nationalism in order to stand up against the dominant society's national culture. (Neate 1998: 105) Chicano cultural nationalism is based on very complicated structures. It is based on a myth about the home country of Aztlán. The image of Aztlán was ideologically misused in order to create a homogenous self-image of Chicanos which did not exist – like in any other national culture – within the Chicano community in the United States. (ibid.)

However, we have to interpret the rise of Chicano nationalism before the background of the dominant integration theories during that time. As we have learned during the 1960s the idea of cultural pluralism and pluralist integration theories emerged. Therefore, the appearance of a movement of migrants whose ideology was based on nationalism seemed to be inevitable. The Chicano Movement focused on its own national unity in order to persist in the interpretation of a pluralist society at this time.

However, in the long run Chicano nationalism was neglected by many members of the Chicano Movement. "To a certain extent, then, the dominant ideological tendency which sought to construct an identity in terms of an emphasis on particular historical aspects of the Chicano/a experience paradoxically dehistoricized Chicano/a identity and denied its dialectical reality." (Neate 1998: 112)

And these Chicanos who neglected the nationalist impact of the Chicano movement were/are the ones, responsible for developing a hybrid Chicano identity. The beginning of the movement was responsible for initiating a critical perspective about the self-determination of Chicanos, but in the end the national tendencies were not able to sustain.

5.4 Hybrid Chicano Identity

As previously learned, hybrid identity is based on constant change and transformation. Multiple identifications, which can sometimes be contradicting, and lead to fragmentation or segmentation, are happening at the same time. Again, hybrid identities, which Bhabha describes as the postmodern subject, have the potential to counteract practices of exclusion. They form cross-sectional discourses therefore leading to inclusion rather than emphasizing distinctive negations.

Expressing, representing and accepting this hybrid identity is not easy in a world that is based on the belief of a homogenous and consistent identity. "In relationships of domination, the possibility of self-representation is always at stake. Intersubjective relationships between two selves are prone to follow a trajectory according to which one party achieves a full sense of identity through the repression of the autonomous subjectivity of the other." (Neate 1998: 169)

However, one hybrid identity seeking and expressing are Chicanas. It is the female Chicana community, which places itself outside the mainstream identification of Chicano nationalists and Anglo-American cultural nationalists. (ibid.)

They are fighting for and expressing their multiform or plural identities that are not matching traditional overall homogenous creation of identity. They are refusing to settle for an identity that is constructed upon homogenous and unambiguous form of identity. (Neate 1998: 170f.) "[...] Chicana identity is, in fact, a plural one which exceeds and undermines the limited terms of a unified subject position." (Neate 1998: 172)

One of the first cutting-edge and most significant Chicanas who fought for the recognition of hybrid Chicana identities was Gloria Anzaldúa. She asked for the tolerance of contradiction and ambiguity in identity constructions. Two elements that are mentioned in her groundbreaking book 'Borderlands. La Frontera. The New Mestiza' seems to be essential in the establishment of hybrid Chicano identity. First, a new consciousness that affirms contradicting influences of our (cultural) identity is needed. (Anzaldúa 2007: 100)

Especially due to globalization's multiple and sometimes contradicting impacts, this sort of consciousness is inevitable. Interactive technologies today relativize the connection of identity and location. The association that the process of identity construction can only occur within (one) confined space is no longer relevant. The 'place' of belonging can be constructed anywhere and simultaneously be more than just one 'place' of identification. (Vargas 2009: 193)

The second element Anzaldúa demands is a tolerance for ambiguity in hybrid identities. We need to accept contradicting identities within and among us. Anzaldúa is also stating, like Suárez-Orozco previously, that those who are able to tolerate and shift between this ambiguousness will be the ones who are able to persist in the future, because they are the ones who are able to perceive reality. (Anzaldúa 2007: 101f.)

These multiple and contradicting impacts of our identity construction today continue to affect us. However, migrants seem to be involved into this new modality of identity construction on a deeper level. Identity construction of those who are influenced by migration – first or subsequent generations – does not follow one general pattern. Chicanos living in the United States are tremendously influenced by a contradicting and ambiguous identity construction. Being in a situation like this is leading to the creation of hybrid identities. (Garcia 2002: 128)

"Mexican immigrants continue to hold on to their Mexican culture even as they forge an American identity. This process is not always a smooth one; it usually reveals tensions, conflicts, and negotiations between immigrants and American society and culture. Within Mexican immigrant communities in the United States, Mexicans construct new American identities as they attempt to keep the best of both worlds."
(ibid.)

Before the rise of the Chicano Movement in 1968 the Spanish language media (produced by Mexican Americans) in Los Angeles almost exclusively dealt with issues about Mexico – the homeland of Mexican immigrants. The Chicano Movement was not satisfied with this, because it did not reflect the reality that affected Chicanos living in the United States. English Anglo-American media was stigmatizing the Chicano Movement and criminalizing their actions. On the one hand traditional Mexican American media that did not accurately reflect on contemporary Chicano issues and on the other, the Anglo-American media identified Chicanos by using stereotypes. Due to these two dissatisfying circumstances, the Chicano Movement decided on two tendencies on Chicano representation in order to change misperception and strengthen the Chicano community. One was creating art and culture that was representing ‘Chicano-ness’ in order to provoke identity affirmation of Chicanos themselves. The other notion was to send out a message to Non-Chicanos. Therefore independent cinema productions were rising in order to increase a more authentic representation of Chicanos within the movie and media industry. (Gunckel 2011: 115–119)

This (public) negotiation of plural subjectivity – to identify with the American, the Mexican American, the Mexican and the Chicano community at the same time – can contribute to mutual recognition within dominant communities. (Neate 1998: 176)

The Chicano community is still developing plural subjectivity of their identity.

“Mexican immigrants have gradually negotiated through American society by developing a second level of identity. At the same time that they see themselves as culturally distinct from the larger American society, Mexican immigrants develop an ethnic identity and consciousness that integrates a sense of ‘American-ness’. [...] Mexican immigrants maintain multiple sources of identity that combine old ties and new allegiances. [...] current studies have found that immigrants and their American-born children develop multiple identities. They are both immigrants and New Americans.”
(Garcia 2002: 183)

As we have learned, identity construction is always embedded in its surrounding environment. However, this does not necessarily mean that the environment is in line with the process of identity construction. The fantasy of national homogenous culture does not seem to be an adequate framework anymore in

today's pluralistic world, as we found out previously. Hybrid Culture seems to be what is actually concordant with today's reality. Migrants who are often described as border identities – especially in the Chicano community – have become very interesting for artists and writers to evaluate their culture.

“Community organizations have played a central role in the creation of border identities, but it is artists and writers – unconstrained by the slow production of academia or the structures of the electoral arena – who have redefined the parameters of the debate and offered more radical notions about identity and consequently politics.”
(Angeles Torres 2003: 377)

5.5 Hybrid Chicano Culture

The theoretical analysis of culture has already proven that homogenous culture exists only in our fantasy. It is an inadequate assumption in order to describe our globalized world that consists of migration, transnational and cross-cultural movement of norms, ideas and material goods. Describing and living culture as being a hybrid expression and formation of *norms*, *ideas* and *material culture* seems to be fitting of today's challenges.

One of the most important objectives of the Chicano Movement, besides fighting for equality, was to establish and mediate (hybrid) Chicano Culture. (McWilliams 1990: 297) The movement demanded new curricula for high schools and universities, a quota for Mexican American teachers to enable students to relate and communicate with their teachers as well as bilingual education. Furthermore, bicultural education was demanded by the Chicano movement in order to enable young Chicanos to identify with their cultural roots and to empower and enhance the status of Chicano culture in the United States. (Haro 2011b: 172f.)

5.5.1 Hybrid Material Culture

Members of the Chicano Movement pioneered researching and representing hybrid culture. They were opposing the fantasy of homogenous culture and

fighting against power imbalances of culture that were constructed throughout history.

“Current immigration studies find that immigrants often construct their sense of ethnic self in ways that may well be different from their country of origin, but still the formation of their new American identities retains aspects of the culture and traditions left behind.” (Garcia 2002: 82)

Material Chicano culture expresses their inherent hybridity and provides easy access to observe and experience hybridity by people outside the Chicano community. Chicano murals, music and literature seem to be the most impressive expression of Chicano hybrid culture I experienced during my research in Los Angeles.

“One of the most interesting results of the movimiento has been the considerable expansion in Chicano art, especially mural art.” (McWilliams 1990: 300)

Murals documenting Chicano issues are painted in almost every city in the Southwest. “[...] they painted their beliefs and feelings on walls, overpasses, and buildings in a variety of styles from harsh social realism to abstract expressionism.” (McWilliams 1990: 301)

Numerous murals in Los Angeles are displaying symbols of Chicano history and Chicano identity. They are used to tell an inclusive story of migration, transformation and (social) border crossings. Murals are located in public spaces and at the same time they are creating public spaces where hybrid culture can be negotiated. (SPARC 2012)

Chicano artists are also using Music to express their ambiguous cultural identity. Latino music in the United States often expresses a process of identification as immigrants located between cultures. Music as cultural expression can create a sense of identification by reflecting feelings on ones reality. (Vargas 2009: 193)

Music of Chicanos is a form of hybridization, in which elements of Mexican and also American origin evolve into something new. It is harnessed to express and reflect the cultural world of Chicanos in the United States. Examples of famous Chicano musicians that reflect on the Chicano experience are the bands ‘Los Lobos’ or ‘Molotov’. They are also popular outside the Chicano community and

their main topics are critical reflections on issues concerning Chicanos and Mexican-Americans. (Garcia 2002: 98, McWilliams 1990: 300)

Chicano literature, besides music and mural paintings, is another material expression and form of identification with Chicano hybrid culture. One famous example which has already been mentioned is the poem 'I am Joaquín' by Rodolfo Gonzales. On the one hand it functions as reference for Chicano identity, but on the other hand also provides information and many references for Chicano culture. (McWilliams 1990: 297)

It is worth mentioning that bilingual literature is very common in Chicano literature and Gloria Anzaldúa's classic 'Borderlands' is an example of bilingual writing in English and Spanish. Bilingualism was an important issue the Chicano Movement was fighting for. Before the rise of the Chicano Movement there was never an agenda about teaching students in another language than English. (Haro 2011b: 171f.)

However, in 1968 the first bilingual education act was released and federal funding for bilingual education increased tremendously between the end of the 1960s and the 1980s. Conservative Anglo-Americans opposed bilingual education, because it was thought to be a threat to assimilation. Instead of portraying bilingualism as an inclusive incentive that would 'incorporate' 'new' American citizens into the U.S. American culture, based on a level of equality that simultaneously embraces differences, conservatives were responding to bilingualism as being a threat. However, Chicanos were acknowledging that it is necessary to be fluent in English, but at the same time it was unacceptable for them to degrade Spanish an inherent part of their culture. "An overwhelming majority of them [Chicanos] recognized the need to speak English in order to function in the United States society and to improve their economic and social position, but they rejected any implied inferiority of the Spanish language." (McWilliams 1990: 303)

5.5.2 Hybrid Cultural Norms and Ideas

The recognition of bilingual education was not just changing the field of material culture. Furthermore it showed an impact on the norms and ideas of Chicano culture.

Bilingual education at schools also incorporated Mexican American parents into the U.S. school system. They took an active role in supporting bilingual education for their Chicano children. (ibid.)

Normative patterns of culture were transformed by contributing to the acknowledgement of hybridity. Family patterns that were based on cultural norms changed. However, these changes in family patterns were not only visible in the migrants' countries of destination, but also in their countries of origin. (Gómez-Quíñones/Maciel 1998: 29f.)

While most of the members of the Chicano Movement supported bilingual education in schools, the agendas and strategies were very diverse among the complex groups and individuals of the Chicano Movement. Not all of the members were supporting the notions of the most left wing of the Movement. Members with a more radical view of changing cultural norms and ideas were separating from the core of the movement. Their idea about Chicano culture became known as 'Chicanismo'. 'Chicanismo'

"[...] cut across the usual boundaries of sex, class, region, and generation. Generally it rejected the idea of assimilation or acculturation. [...] It argued that, as an alternative to assimilation, Chicanos had a right to cultural self-determination and autonomy. In the furtherance of these ideas it agonized over identity and felt it was necessary to develop Chicanos' self-identity, their culture and their history, thereby constructing a new self-image."
(McWilliams 1990: 304)

Gloria Anzaldúa and various other cutting-edge Chicanos can be located in the 'Chicanismo' movement. However, after 1975 the Chicano Movement was not as vibrant as in its founding years. Since the fragmentation of the movement into different groups, it could not maintain its powerfulness. (McWilliams 1990: 305)

5.6 Chicanos and the Nation State

Especially during times of economic distress, nationalism that is turning against immigrants seems to arise. Those who do not fit the criteria of the imagined national culture and identity are accused of being scapegoats. In the public political sphere – especially in the southwest of the United States – the immigration topic is still (ab)used to justify measures towards exclusionist immigration and integration policies. (Vázquez/Torres 2003: 322, Gutiérrez 1998: 317f.)

Today's discussions primarily deal with the border between Mexico and the United States. Mostly Conservative politicians in the southwest support the myth of unity and homogeneity as being necessary in order to maintain a functional economy and society. Their argument is that the border between Mexico and the U.S. needs to be kept as impermeable as possible for migrants (not for capital flows) in order to succeed economically. (Gutiérrez 1998: 319)

The fixation on the issue about the border in the media is often represented without reflecting the issues going on beyond the border. Immigrants are not portrayed as humans anymore, but as (illegal) 'aliens' who are crossing (socially constructed) borders in order to exploit 'The Land of the Golden Opportunities'. We are lacking a deeper public understanding of border crossings that would lead to an inclusive understanding of integration. (Gunckel 2011: 128–130)

However, some scholars seem to oppose these political strategies of exclusion and demand a transformation of the current interpretation of the nation states function. Maintaining the fantasy about homogenous nation states is not effective anymore. "Indeed, a growing number of scholars and social critics have begun to ask whether the ongoing economic, demographic, and cultural shifts that are transforming the region are not signs of a fundamental – and permanent – shift in the meanings of citizenship, national affiliation, and individual and collective identity in transborder region." (Gutiérrez 1998: 319) It should be clear by now, that this is exactly what the hybrid model of society is aiming to develop; an adequate model that is responding to today's globalizing situation.

As a matter of fact, due to globalization leading to increased migration, the confined territories of the nation state are eroding. Whether we are supporting this transformation or not, we need to establish a system that is able to effectively deal with this contemporary situation. The nature of politics and political participation needs to change. (Angeles Torres 2003: 370) Identity and Culture can no longer be used as loyalty to legitimize the nation state. “[...] citizenship assumes loyalty to a state. In order to acquire U.S. citizenship, for example, emigres must swear an oath of exclusive allegiance to the United States. Yet the identities of many immigrants are too complex to allow this.” (Angeles Torres 2003: 371)

Therefore the previously mentioned ‘Third Space’ is needed more than ever as a framework for identification. “A transnational political identity, or citizenship, would better accommodate the rights of individuals who for a myriad of reasons cross the frontiers of multiple nation-states and whose lives are affected by decisions made by more than one state.” (Angeles Torres 2003: 382) The Chicano Movement of the 1960s was fighting for the establishment of the ‘Third Space’. Contrary to the Mexican American Movements of the 1950s, which were speaking up for equal treatment of Mexican Americans under the already existing modes of integration, the Chicano Movement of the 1960s was trying to change the rules and the system of integration. By retelling history from a Chicano perspective and therefore creating confidence for hybrid Chicano identity and culture, the Chicano Movement was able to generate awareness of the Chicano issue in the southwest of the U.S.. In the 1980s also the Mexican government became aware of the Chicano issue in the United States and was institutionalizing an office called ‘Mexicans de Afuera – Mexicans Abroad’ to support political activism of Chicanos in the United States. (Angeles Torres 2003: 375)

Again, in order to avoid misunderstandings, the Chicano Movement was not aiming to separate from the U.S. nation state in order to create their own nation unit. The Chicano Movement was fighting for a different framework of identification that is going beyond the nation state. “[...] we have passed into a postcolonial period in which Chicano progressives have become the leaders of

a national minority seeking multicultural pluralism rather than an anti-colonial force seeking national liberation.” (Cervantes 2003: 339)

The Chicano Movement was trying to reform the political system in favor of the Chicanos. The growing number of official Chicano institutes indicates an improvement. (Cervantes 2003: 336) However, since the model of hybridity is a model with an inherent understanding of constant change, we are still facing numerous of challenges.

5.6.1 Today's Challenges

Especially in the field of representation in the media, Chicanos are still fighting for more self-representation. Anglo-Americans are still dominating the movie industry and therefore accountable for the representation of Chicanos – if they are represented at all.

Representation

Stereotypes of Chicanos in the media are still occurring, but they seem to be more pervasive. Chicanos are portrayed to be violent or lazy. One reason seems to be the exclusivity of the movie industry. Chicano film makers are being represented by independent labels that are not able to compete with the mainstream. Access to the mainstream movie industry in Hollywood would allow some kind of self-representation of Chicanos. However, movies by Chicano producers are rarely appearing in the mainstream. (Glunckel 2011: 108, 110, 116)

Not only the topics of Chicano cinema, but also the issue of migration in general is only portrayed within certain limits. It is portrayed in a way that is still ‘sellable’ to the mainstream audience. (Gunckel 2011: 118)

However, a more positive change can be noticed in the Spanish-language media. Compared to the past, it is now reporting on local news coverage in Los Angeles. Before the rise of the Chicano Movement, the Spanish-language media mostly covered news from the homeland – from Mexico. Today it seems to be more interested in the current issues of Chicanos and therefore focusing on the ‘Third Space’ Chicanos are currently living in. (Gunckel 2011: 117)

However the most challenging field still seems to be education. One of the most important issues, the Chicano Movement was fighting for in the 1960s and 1970s is still challenged by today's circumstances.

Education

Everything started out as grass-root movement in high schools. Chicano students in Los Angeles started to walk out in 1968 to fight for better and more inclusive education. Bilingual and bicultural education as well as new curricula including Mexican American history were demanded. (Haro 2011b: 170f.)

In the 1960s the Movement was very dynamic. Within two years the Chicano Movement managed to develop a plan of action, as well as its implementation and the establishment of Chicano institutions on university level. (Haro 2011a: 139ff.)

However, the situation of schools in East L.A. is still terrible and the schools of the Los Angeles Unified School district are still overcrowded. (Huerta 2011: 156f.) Today the Los Angeles Unified School District is very segregated and densely populated with students of ethnic origin other than Anglo-American. However, the dropout rate of students of Mexican American descent is very high between the 9th and the 10th grade. Only few Chicanos are able to enter university. (Haro 2011a: 149f. – Interview)

However, Dr. Haro offers a positive outlook.

“What I have determined is that we, as human beings, change very slowly in terms of our attitude, but there has been progression. We are better people now than we have been in the 60s overall. Our society is better today than it was in the 60s. There isn't a continual progression, there is some upsetting moments and then we can make some progress, but slowly we seem to be evolving. [...] On the positive side, I see that we are going to continue to produce people that are educated and prepared that will move into various professions and sectors and then they will become change agents and they see themselves as change agents. They see that this should be done in a different way.”

(Haro 2011a: 148, 150)

Taking the Chicano Movements' dynamic quest for change as an example, we should realize that the time for change has come again. By starting to change the images in our heads towards respectful and inclusive thinking, we, the global citizens, can contribute to turn our world into a better place.

6 Conclusion

As we have learned, the principles our society is based on until today, are challenged more than ever by the tremendous impact of globalization. 1989 can be identified as the moment when the pace of globalization accelerated and started to change the structures of our society on an unprecedented level. Post-national production, the emergence of new information and communication technologies, as well as the facilitation of travel are making the borders of the nation state become more permeable. The construction of identity as well as its cultural identification becomes deterritorialized.

Previous theories of integration were based on a model of society that was designed by nation states in order to legitimize their sovereignty. Two elements – national culture and national identity – were inherent to this model.

The myths about a homogenous national culture and identity, as we have heard earlier, were necessary elements that needed to be provided in order to demarcate the nation states' territory. They are based on the idea that the members, who are living within the nation states' territory, share the same cultural ideas and norms and express them in a similar way. By maintaining these fantasies about common homogenous national culture and identity, the members of the nation state transfer their mutual loyalty to the level of the nation state. The nation state's position of power is therefore being secured.

Early theories of integration tried to conceptualize incentives in order to incorporate immigrants into this framework of the nation state. The Melting Pot Theory and the Americanization theory were two examples in which immigrants were assumed to assimilate to the dominant society. The idea of 'Americanization' was to erase the immigrants' cultural inheritance of the past and become a citizen with the same features that are based on the fantasy of the peculiar national identity and culture.

However, the theory that was aiming to contest a one- sided assimilation of immigrants emerged in the 1960s and added a new spectrum of integration theories. 'Cultural Pluralism' was the first model of integration promoting diversity among citizens. However, it failed to reform the system of integration that was still based on nationalism. Cultural Pluralism was abused to justify economic and social disparities based on cultural differences.

These previous models of integration failed to provide an effective theoretical approach towards integration. The reason why assimilative as well as pluralistic approaches both failed in the past is because they were basing their normative incentives on our nationalistic model of society. It is not the model of integration that needs to be reformed, but the preceding national model seems to be ineffective in contesting the challenges of integration today.

This model of society that is based on national principles has become ineffective. Therefore we have to choose, whether we keep trying to incorporate today's reality into the static and homogenous theoretical construction of the nation state or if we are ready to deconstruct and reform this theoretical framework of the nation state.

The hybrid model of society which has been analyzed in this paper, is suggesting the latter. The interpretation of culture and identity within the model of hybridity is much more adaptive to change. Contradicting and ambiguous elements of culture and identity are inherent in the model of hybridity. Both can be negotiated in, what Homi K. Bhabha is calling, 'The Third Space'. This third space is used for negotiation of the process of identification and culture and goes beyond the borders of our nation states. The third space is providing a vacuum where power imbalances are reevaluated by retelling history from perspectives that have been left out.

The Chicano Movement of the 1960 started as a civil rights movement fighting for equality. Their focus was education, where they spoke up for bilingual and bicultural education. Segregated schools should become more integrated and ethnic studies should be institutionalized.

In the beginning of the movement's rise, it could be related to cultural pluralism, but later it fragmented into several groups. Some of the members of the Chicano Movement pioneered in researching hybrid culture and identity. They spoke up for themselves as people who live the hybridity in between cultures possessing multiple identities.

Many problems the Chicano Movement tried to contest still exist or even worsened. Schools in Los Angeles are still segregated, overcrowded and poorly

equipped. Representation and stigmatization of immigrants in the media is still questionable. Actors like the government, or political parties do not seem to be able to change the exclusionist practices sometime soon. Especially in times of economic stress, nationalism that turns against those who do not fit the invented criteria of national identity and culture, rises. Conservative politicians and media add fuel to the fire of nationalism.

Since we have already experienced in the past what nationalism in combination with the idea of homogenous society is able to perpetrate, I suggest we reconsider an alternative model of society that is meeting our needs of today from an inclusive perspective. However, the government does not seem to be an adequate actor to promote a hybrid model of society, since challenges the structures and principles of the nation state.

Civil Movements, like the Chicano Movement appear to be more efficient to promote a social model of hybridity, since it aims to change social structures in an inductive way. As individuals we can contribute to change the world, by starting to change our perspectives.

"When two people meet, each one is changed by the other so you've got two new people."

— John Steinbeck

7 References

Acuña, Rodolfo (1988): *Occupied America. A History of Chicanos*. 3rd Ed. Harper & Row. New York.

Alba, Richard/Nee, Victor (2005): *Rethinking Assimilation Theory for a New Era of Immigration*. In: Suárez-Orozco, Marcelo M./Suárez-Orozco, Carola/Qin, Desirée Baolian (Eds.) (2005): *The New Immigration. An Interdisciplinary Reader*. Routledge. New York/London. pp. 35-65.

Alvaro Huerta Site 2012: <http://sites.google.com/site/alvarohuertasite/cv> [accessed on 1/4/2012]

Angeles Torres, María de los (2003): *Transnational Political and Cultural Identities. Crossing Theoretical Borders*. In: Vázquez, Francisco H./Torres, Rodolfo T (Eds): *Latino/a Thought. Culture, Politics, and Society*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc. Oxford, England. pp. 370-385.

Anzaldúa, Gloria (2007): *Borderlands. La Frontera. The New Mestiza*. 3rd Ed. Aunt Lute Books. San Francisco, CA.

Aronovici, Carol (1920): *Americanization. Its Meaning and Function*. In: *American Journal of Sociology*. Vol. 25, No. 6. pp. 695–730.

Ata□, Ilker (2011): *Migrationspolitik und Inkorporation von MigrantInnen. Politikwissenschaftliche Perspektiven*. In: Fassmann, Heinz/Dahlvik, Julia (Ed.): *Migrations- und Integrationsforschung – multidisziplinäre Perspektiven*. Vienna University Press. Vienna. pp. 235–247.

Atteslander, Peter (2003): *Methoden der empirischen Sozialforschung*. 10th Ed. Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co. KG. Berlin.

Aumüller, Jutta (2009): Assimilation. Kontroversen um ein migrationspolitisches Konzept. transcript Verlag. Bielefeld.

Bauböck, Rainer (1996): Introduction. In: Bauböck, Rainer/Heller, Agnes/Zolberg Astride R. (Eds.): The Challenge of Diversity. Integration and Pluralism in Societies of Immigration. Ashgate Publishing Company. Vermont, USA. pp. 7-22.

Becka, Michelle/Rethmann, Albert-Peter (Eds.) (2010): Ethik und Migration. Gesellschaftliche Herausforderungen und sozialetische Reflexion. Verlag Ferdinand Schöningh GmbH & Co.KG. Paderborn.

Ben-Rafael, Eliezer (1996): Multiculturalism in Sociological Perspective. In: Bauböck, Rainer/Heller, Agnes/Zolberg, Aristide R. (Eds.): The Challenge of Diversity. Integration and Pluralism in Societies of Immigration. Ashgate Publishing Company. Vermont, USA. pp. 133-154.

Bhabha, Homi K. (2005): The Location of Culture. Routledge. New York.

Bhabha, Homi K. (2007): Die Verortung der Kultur. 5th Ed. Staufenburg Verlag. Tübingen.

Biffl, Gudrun (Ed.) (2010): Migration & Integration. Dialog zwischen Politik, Wissenschaft und Praxis. Omnium KG. Bad Vöslau.

Brooks, Stephen (2002): The challenge of cultural pluralism. Praeger Publishers. Westport, CT.

Cervantes, Fred A. (2003): Chicanos as a Postcolonial Minority. Some Questions Concerning the Adequacy of the Paradigm of Internal Colonialism. In: Vázquez, Francisco H./Torres, Rodolfo T (Eds.): Latino/a Thought. Culture, Politics, and Society. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc. Oxford, England. pp. 331-342.

Chambers, Ian (1995): *Migrancy, Culture, Identity*. Routledge. London/New York.

Eagleton, Terry (2001): *Was ist Kultur? Eine Einführung*. Verlag C.H. Beck oHG. München.

Foster, David William (1982): Introduction. In: Foster, David William (Ed.): *Sourcebook of Hispanic Culture in the United States*. American Library Association. USA.

Garcia, Alma M. (2002): *The Mexican Americans*. Greenwood Press. Westport, Connecticut/London.

Gellner, Ernst (1991): *Nationalismus und Moderne*. Rotenbuch Verlag. Berlin.

Gerstle, Gary (2008): The Immigrant as Threat to American Security. A Historical Perspective. In: Barkan, Elliott R./Diner, Hasia/Kraut Alan M. (Eds.): *From Arrival to Incorporation*. New York University Press. USA. pp. 217-245.

Gläser, Jochen/Laudel, Grit (2010): *Experteninterviews und qualitative Inhaltsanalyse*. 4th Ed. VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften. Wiesbaden.

Gloor, Leana B. (2006) *From the Melting Pot to the Tossed Salad Metaphor. Why Coercive Assimilation Lacks the Flavors Americans Crave*. Retrieved from: <http://hilo.hawaii.edu/academics/hohonu/writing.php?id=91> [accessed on: 9/17/2011]

Gómez-Quíñones, Juan/Maciél, David R. (1998): What Goes Around, Comes Around. Political Practice and Cultural Response in the Internationalization of Mexican Labor. 1890–1997. In: Maciel, David R./Herrera-Sobek, Maria (Eds.): *Culture Across Borders. Mexican Immigration & Popular Culture*. University of Arizona Press. Tucson. pp. 27-65.

Gordon, Milton M. (1955): Assimilation in American Life. The Role of Race, Religion and National Origins. Oxford University Press. New York.

Gutiérrez, David G. (1998): Ethnic Mexicans and the Transformation of 'American' Social Space. Reflections on Recent History. In: Suárez-Orozco, Marcielo M. (Ed.): Crossings. Mexican Immigration in Interdisciplinary Perspectives. Harvard University Press. Cambridge, Massachusetts/London, England. pp. 309-335.

Ha, Kien Nghi (2010): Unrein und vermischt. Postkoloniale Grenzgänge durch die Kulturgeschichte der Hybridität und der kolonialen >>Rassenbastarde<<. transcript Verlag. Bielefeld.

Hall, Stuart (1994): Rassismus und kulturelle Identität. Ausgewählte Schriften 2. Argument Verlag. Hamburg.

Han, Petrus (2006): Theorien zur internationalen Migration. UTB. Stuttgart.

Hans, Silke (2010): Assimilation oder Segregation? Anpassungsprozesse von Einwanderern in Deutschland. Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften. Wiesbaden.

Harper, Richard Conant (1980): The Course of the Melting Pot idea to 1910. Arno Press. USA.

Hauser, Susanne (2007): Über Städte, Identität und Identifikation. In: Kröncke, Meike/Mey, Kerstin/Spielmann, Yvonne (Eds.): Kultureller Umbau. Räume, Identitäten, und Re/Präsentationen. transcript Verlag. Bielefeld. pp. 29-41.

Hein, Kerstin (2006): Hybride Identitäten. Bastelbiografien im Spannungsverhältnis zwischen Lateinamerika und Europa. transcript Verlag. Bielefeld.

Heller, Agnes (1996): The Many Faces of Multiculturalism. In: Bauböck, Rainer/Heller, Agnes/Zolberg, Aristide R. (Eds.): The Challenge of Diversity. Integration and Pluralism in Societies of Immigration. Ashgate Publishing Company. Vermont, USA. pp. 25-41.

Hildebrandt, Mathias (2005): Multikulturalismus und Political Correctness in den USA. VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften. Wiesbaden.

Hirschman, Charles (1983): America's Melting Pot Reconsidered. In: Annual Review of Sociology. Vol. 9. Cornell University, Ithaca. New York. pp. 397–423.

Holton, Robert J. (1998): Globalization and the Nation-State. Macmillan Press LTD. Great Britain.

IOM (2011): International Organization of Migration. Retrieved from: <http://www.iom.int/jahia/Jahia/about-migration/key-migration-terms/lang/en> [accessed on 7/20/2011]

Joppke, Christian (Ed.) (1998): Challenge to the Nation-State. Immigration in Western Europe and the United States. Oxford University Press. Oxford/New York.

Klayci, Erdal (2007): Kommunale Integrationsmodelle für MigrantInnen – Strategien zur Integration auf der Ebene von Städten und Gemeinden. Vienna.

Kluszczyński, Ryszard W. (2007): Hybridität als Bewusstseinszustand. Einige Gedanken zu Arbeiten von Lynn Herschman, Vera Frekel und Kinga Arya. In: Kröncke, Meike/Mey, Kerstin/Spielmann, Yvonne (Eds.): Kultureller Umbau. Räume, Identitäten, und Re/Präsentationen. transcript Verlag. Bielefeld. pp. 99-115.

Kornblum, William (2008): Sociology in a Changing World. 8th Ed. Wadsworth Publishing Co. Inc. Canada.

Krieken, Peter van (2005): Terrorism and the Changing Paradigm of Migratory Movements. In: Henke, Holger (Ed.): Crossing Over. Comparing Recent Migration in the United States and Europe. Lexington Books. Oxford. pp. 47-76.

Kulinskaya, Elena/Morgenthaler, Stephan/Staudte, Robert G. (2008): Meta Analysis. A Guide to Calibrating and Combining Statistical Evidence. John Wiley & Sons Ltd. England.

Langley, Lester D. (1988): MexAmerica. Two Countries. One Future. Crown Publishers. New York.

Latinos & Economic Security (2012):
<http://www.latinoeconomicsecurity.org/profile-haro.html> [accessed on 1/4/2012]

Maciel, David R./Herrera-Sobek, Maria (1998): Introduction. In: Maciel, David R./Herrera-Sobek, Maria (Eds.) Culture Across Borders. Mexican Immigration & Popular Culture. University of Arizona Press. Tucson. pp. 3-26.

Marchart, Oliver (2007): Der koloniale Signifikant. Kulturelle ‚Hybridität‘ und das Politische. Oder: Homi Bhabha Wiedergelesen. In: Kröncke, Meike/Mey, Kerstin/Spielmann, Yvonne (Eds.): Kultureller Umbau. Räume, Identitäten, und Re/Präsentationen. transcript Verlag. Bielefeld. pp. 77-98.

Martin, Susan (2003): Öffnung, Schließung, Ausbeutung: Drei Modelle amerikanischer Einwanderungspolitik. In: Thränhardt, Dietrich/Hunger, Uwe (Eds.): Migration im Spannungsfeld von Globalisierung und Nationalstaat. LEVIATHAN Zeitschrift für Sozialwissenschaft. Sonderheft 22/2003. Westdeutscher Verlag. Wiesbaden. pp. 274-292.

McWilliams, Carey (1990): *North From Mexico. The Spanish-Speaking People of the United States*. 2nd Ed. Praeger Publishers. New York.

Mitropoulos, Amanda (2006): *Under the Beach. The Barbed Wire*. In: Berry Slater, Josephine/Seymour, Benedict (Eds.): *Dis-Integrating Multiculturalism. Mute*. United Kingdom. pp. 34-43.

Muñoz Jr., Carlos (2006): *Youth, Identity, Power*: 11th Ed. The Chicano Movement. The Bath Press. London.

Neate, Wilson (1998): *Tolerating Ambiguity. Ethnicity and Community in Chicano/a Writing*. Lang Publishing, Inc. New York.

Norgren, Jill/Nanda, Serena (2006): *American Cultural Pluralism and Law*. 3rd Ed. Praeger Publishers. Westport, CT.

Olson, Gary A./Worsham, Lynn (1999): *Staging the Politics of Difference. Homi Bhabha's Critical Literacy*. In: Olson, Gary A./Worsham, Lynn (Eds.): *Race, Rhetoric, and the Postcolonial*. State University of New York Press. Albany. pp. 3-42.

Perea, Juan F. (Ed.) (1997): *Immigrants Out! The New Nativism and the Anti-Immigrant Impulse in the United States*. New York University Press. New York/London.

Pérez-Torrez, Rafael (1998): *Chicano Ethnicity, Cultural Hybridity, and the Mestizo Voice*. In: *American Literature*. Vol. 70, No. 1. Duke University Press. pp. 153-176.

Reicher, Stephen (2004): *The Context of Social Identity. Domination, Resistance and Change*. In: *Political Psychology*. Vol. 25, No. 6. International Society of Political Psychology. pp. 921-945.

Reinprecht, Christoph/Weiss, Hilde (2011): Migration und Integration. Soziologische Perspektive und Erklärungsansätze. In: Fassmann, Heinz/Dahlvik, Julia (Eds.): Migrations- und Integrationsforschung – multidisziplinäre Perspektiven. Vienna University Press. Vienna.

Rex, John (1997): The Concept of a Multicultural Society. In: Guibernau, Montserrat/Rex, John (Eds.): The Ethnicity Reader. Nationalism, Multiculturalism and Migration. Polity Press. Cambridge. pp. 205-220.

Rutherford, Jonathan. 1990. The 'Third Space'. Interview with Homi Bhabha. In: Rutherford, Jonathan (Hg): Identity: Community, Culture, Difference. Lawrence & Wishart London. pp. 207-221.

SPARC (2012): The Social and Public Art Resource Center. Murals. Retrieved from: <http://www.sparcmurals.org/usmx/manifesto.html> [accessed on 1/8/2012]

Strasser, Sabine (2011): Über Grenzen verbinden: Migrationsforschung in der Sozial- und Kulturanthropologie. In: Fassmann, Heinz/Dahlvik, Julia (Eds.): Migrations- und Integrationsforschung – multidisziplinäre Perspektiven. Ein Reader. Vienna University Press. Vienna. pp. 33–55.

Suárez-Orozco, Marcelo M. (2005): Right Moves? Immigration, Globalization, Utopia, and Dystopia. In: Suárez-Orozco, Marcelo M./Suárez-Orozco, Carola/Qin, Desirée Baolian (Eds.): The New Immigration. An Interdisciplinary Reader. Routledge. New York/London. pp. 3-19.

Suárez-Orozco, Marcelo M./Suárez-Orozco, Carola/Qin, Desirée Baolian (Eds.) (2005): The New Immigration. An Interdisciplinary Reader. Routledge. New York/London.

UNHCR (2011): Convention and Protocol relating to the Status of Refugees. Retrieved from: <http://www.unhcr.org/protect/PROTECTION/3b66c2aa10.pdf> [accessed on 8/20/2011]

UNHCR (2011): United Nations High Commissioner on Refugees. Retrieved from: <http://www.unhcr.org/pages/49c3646c125.html> [accessed on 8/20/2011]

University of Michigan (2012): Retrieved from: http://lsa.umich.edu/sac/faculty_staff/gunckel.html [accessed on 1/4/2012]

U.S. Department of State (2011): Retrieved from: http://travel.state.gov/travel/cis_pa_tw/cis/cis_1753.html [accessed on 10/20/2011]

Vargas, Lucila (2009): Latina Teens, Migration, and Popular Cultures. Peter Lang Publishing, Inc. New York.

Vázquez, Francisco H./Torres, Rodolfo T (Eds.) (2003): Latino/a Thought. Culture, Politics, and Society. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc. Oxford, England.

Wodak, Ruth/Cilia, Rudolfo de/Reisigl, Martin/Liebhart, Karin (2009): The Discursive Construction of National Identity. 2nd Ed. Edinburgh University Press. Great Britain.

Zolberg, Aristide R. (1996): Immigration and Multiculturalism in the Industrial Democracies. In: Bauböck, Rainer/Heller, Agnes/Zolberg, Aristide R. (Eds.): The Challenge of Diversity. Integration and Pluralism in Societies of Immigration. Ashgate Publishing Company. Vermont, USA. pp. 43-65.

Zoll, Katharina (2007): Stabile Gemeinschaften. Transnationale Familien in der Weltgesellschaft. transcript Verlag. Bielefeld.

7.1 Interviews:

Gunckel, Colin (2011): Face to face interview with Colin Gunckel on 3rd March 2011 at the Chicano Studies Research Center. UCLA. Los Angeles. pp. 110–135.

Haro, Carlos Manuel (2011a): Face to face interview with Carlos Manuel Haro on 23rd March 2011 at the Chicano Studies Research Center. UCLA. Los Angeles. pp. 136–153.

Haro, Carlos Manuel (2011b): Face to face interview with Carlos Manuel Haro on 30th April 2011 at the Chicano Studies Research Center. UCLA. Los Angeles. pp. 170–183.

Huerta, Alvaro (2011): Face to face interview with Alvaro Huerta on 20th March 2011 at the Chicano Studies Research Center. UCLA. Los Angeles. pp. 154–169.

8 Appendix

8.1 Interview with Colin Gunckel

On the 3rd March 2011, 11:00 am at the CSRC in Los Angeles, California.

Contact:

Colin Gunckel

gunckel@umich.edu

+1 213 804 7134

A: Madlene Knoll

B: Colin Gunckel

A: How did you get interested in the Chicano issue? What's your relation to it?

B: I grew up in Texas and at an early age, like about nine or ten, I became really interested in speaking Spanish, because there were people in class who didn't speak any English, so I started learning Spanish from them. From that point on just as a, you know in middle school and in high school I dedicated myself to learning Spanish. I have no idea why, but part of it is because in a place like Texas there is like a large Mexican population. And I think for me what was compelling or fascinating, learning the language is that learning that language gave me access to the other world that was around me in a way – that I wouldn't have access otherwise and that included music, literature and so forth. So I kind of followed that trajectory. In college I studied literature until I... at the end at the university of Austin, when I was about to graduate I discovered film and movies and I discovered Mexican movies. So then, I think, at that point I discovered that this would become my passion for a while and then I moved on to the University of New Mexico to study film. I came out of a Latin American studies perspective at first when I was in college, so I was looking for Mexican cinema. When I moved to New Mexico to study film I became more interested in Chicano culture and Chicano Art. I met a lot of artists in New Mexico and I ended up doing work in this area as well. So I was taking more Chicano Studies classes. The first Chicano class I

took at University was Chicano cinema. Now I am a professor of all things [laughs].

A: Yes, I have read your review – it's amazing.

B: [laughs] oh, that's good. I am pretty much interested in all Chicano art and culture, but it really did start at the age of nine. At that time I knew that this is what I want to do with my life. At that time I didn't know what it actually meant, but it turned out to mean something, which is kind of weird.

A: But this is great.

B: Yes, but it's kind of a strange story. And here I am. So I was meant to do this [laughs].

A: So. You also did movie studies.

B: Yes.

A: And how would you consider in general the influence of movies when it comes to forming the opinion of the public – when you compare this media to newspapers, or to the news on TV. How intense are they to form an opinion in the public on a specific topic.

B: That's always difficult to measure the thing into a set, right? All scholarship on representation deals with that indirectly. It kind of assumes that kind of way we are impacted by the things we watch and those kind of representations. But it's often difficult to tell in what ways. I think, ... I don't know if they are more or less, ...if they have more or less impact or influence than the news or the newspapers or other sorts of media, but I think that they definitely work in conjunction with those other things. So if you're talking about an issue like immigration being in the news or drug trafficking or things like that in the news I think there is a way in which ideas about Chicanos exist in the media, or that are conveyed with a news media and then kind of reinforced in a fiction film. And there is this kind of ... there is a relationship right between those kind of things, and fiction film is one facet in a way. But it's also kind of compelling in a different way than the media, right? The media has this kind of way... on some level like the news... and the newspaper has this kind of objectivity ...and they are telling you it's the truth and the movie is obviously fiction. But they kind of reinforce these ideas. So I

don't know which one is more powerful, but I think Films are definitely a place in which these ideas and conceptions are reinforced. Does that make sense?

A: Yes. Ahm... So what do consider movies, which are dealing with the topic of Chicanos... Are they more entertaining movies, or do they also present the facts... and creating awareness of the Chicano topic? Like what Chicanos are dealing with here? About and by the Chicano Movement.

B: I think there are a lot of entertaining films about Chicanos. There are those other ones you are talking about. That are more serious, more like a documentary style. Their purpose is kind of informative, but there are a lot of good short films. I think my favorite director probably is Jimmy Mindiola. He made a film about a girl punk group in San Antonio, Texas. It's a lot of fun, right? It's very much about their identity as Chicanos being in Texas as Tejanos, but it's also a lot of fun. And it's about music and art.

A: You focused also on punk music, right?

B: Yes. I guess I have a short attention span, but it all fits together in some way. ...so, there is a whole range of things.

A: But you could say it is balanced – a lot of informative movies and also a lot of entertaining ones which also indirectly inform about what's going on.

B: Yes on some level. I would say there is probably more... I mean there are a lot of different kinds of films made by and about Chicanos, but at the same time there are not, I suppose. Even when we're talking about there is different kinds, it still doesn't change the fact that there is not very many in total.

A: Yes, that's right that in the whole movie industry there is not a lot about Chicanos. But I also would like to know, how the representation before 1968, before the Chicano Movement came up, ... how was the representation of Chicanos at that time? Compared to now, is it becoming more? But how was it before that?

B: Well before '68 it's a mixed bag. Let's talk first before '68, before the Chicano Movement. I mean essentially, for the most part, there are exceptions that are dealing with the Chicanos dealt with in stereotypes. And there are a series of films, like "The Ring" or "The Lawless", like a few films that were called kind of social problem films. They were very interesting and kind of

sensitive about the way that Chicanos were caught between two identities – caught between cultures. And dealing in a more honest way with some of the problems based on Chicano discrimination. But those movies are just a handful from those from Hollywood, but for the most we are talking about pretty much stereotypical representation. Chicanos as either violent, sometimes simultaneously violent and ridiculous – not very intelligent, so on and so forth. Post '68 I think it changed a little bit on some level, but what's more remarkable than the change sometimes is the fact of the continuity. So even after the Chicano Movement those stereotypes still persisted. So we are talking about the "Bandit" from the 1960s – "El Bandido". That stereotype doesn't surface that much anymore, but what does surface is this Chicano gangster, right? That takes the place. The same idea of this violent masculinity, but coded through a different representation. So unfortunately even when there have been changes, there is more kind access to filmmaking and more representation, or different, a greater range of representation of Chicanos on some level there is still this kind of ... I think the stereotypes are more pervasive. There is this other thing too – and only a few people have written about this that with this interest in the Latino market ... kind of marketing to Mexican Americans and Puerto Ricans, and so on and so forth... And creating television programs and movies that would appeal to them. A lot of that production happens in Latin America, or a lot of the creative talent comes from Latin America or is like white people here. So like Latinos who grew up here and were born in the US don't actually have access to the industry. And they are not the ones that are making the films and are not necessarily the ones that are hired by the industry, but it's kind of a Latin American thing. And also the Hollywood Studios, they would not... and things like that. So even though there seems to be more representation, Latinos and Chicanos themselves don't actually have access to Hollywood. They are not the ones that are producing the films for Hollywood.

A: And are those movies that are produced here, are they also published in Mexico?

B: There is a number of ... I am trying to think of a recent one. There are just so few. No, they are mostly produced here. I am trying to think of a good

example of one. Well, say for instance like what they do with the... I think it's probably more the case with television. Where they have... like 'telenovelas' in Spanish language to like this kind of other channels. Like MTV3 that tries to market to a younger demographic. That's probably the most production, that I am talking about, where you have like either the content that comes from Latin America or it's kind of for the most part, and there are a few exceptions, produced without ...not produced by Latinos in the US, right? They are either produced by white people or by the studios by the white directors and crew producing those concepts or produced or purchased from Latin America.

A: And what kind of stereotypes are used in those kind of movies?

B: Two things: It's not necessarily in this case, and people point as it as something positive, because it's more representation. There are like Latinos – technically there are Latinos on television, but for the most part they don't necessarily deal with the experience of Latinos living in the US, because they are not being produced by Latinos who are living in the US. So they are dealing with this kind of ... They are not dealing with that experience of Latinos living in the US, but also ... they tend to cast people who are light skinned. Like blond hair and things like that. So they don't look like most Latinos in the US, or at least they don't have that range of representation. So it's less that they deal in Stereotypes than they project this particularly like that kind of light washed idea what it means to be Latino and very much like privileging light hair and light skin.

A: Before I focused on Mexican culture, I focused on Asian culture ...and there, for example, the ideal beauty is also with light skin and is it the same like in Mexico when those kind of telenovelas are produced with very light skinned – I hope that doesn't sound racist.... but you know what I mean.

B: No, no. Race politics in Mexico is terribly complicated. Essentially what you have in Mexico is kind of a class based race system that goes all the way back to colonial times. Where Spanish were the higher class and they were typically with lighter hair and lighter skinned and had light hair and that was valued. Have you seen the cast paintings that they did in Mexico? Essentially during the colonial period you have the Spanish, you have African slaves and

you have the Indian population which are like... everyone is intermarried. They had like this system of I think 16 racial types that would categorize people in terms of their race – whether they were half Indian half Black or half Spanish half Black. They had like an entire system, like a racial cast system that was very detailed and with a hierarchy in that sense. And you could move up and down based on your class position, but the top of the higher hierarchy was Spanish born – pure blood, right? And that's that system just in a nutshell. This system is really complex. So I am not doing it justice obviously, but that system in some respect has kind of persisted. So you have kind of a higher hierarchy based on race and racing class. Those are the people that control the media, those are the people that always have been kind of in control of politics on some level. But it's this kind of strange ideal – like glamour and beauty. The persistence of it is really strange, because you don't see people look like that when you walk the streets of Mexico. I mean that's not racist to say, it's just the truth. So that system is reflected in the media and it has been reflected in the Spanish media then, in the kind of media that's shown on US television. So on one level there are more Latinos on television, and they do have entire channels dedicated to Latinos and Spanish speaking in particular. But there is still that kind of problem that they are not reflecting the population and they are trying to market it. That's maybe a better way of saying what I was trying to say earlier.

A: And how is the perception of that in the broader Mexican American community or Chicano community here? I mean when it's not reflecting reality. Are Chicanos into those movies, or are they annoyed by that, because it's an illusion somehow?

B: I think there is a certain level of annoyance and also kind of like the people who typically watch the Spanish language programming are people who speak Spanish languages or like first generation, right? So Chicanos whose families may have been here for like generations and speak English, probably don't watch it that much. Or they watch it with their parents or grandparents. Mostly people find it a little bit ridiculous, because it is silly. I mean, on the one hand you can't be offended by something that is so over

the top ridiculous. Even during the Chicano Movement as an example, there was a lot of animosity towards those channels and towards Spanish language newspapers in the city for very similar reasons, because they were all reprint news from Mexico or talk about things that were going on in Latin America, but they weren't during the time of the movement talking actually about what was happening in Los Angeles or talking about Mexican American issues. So I think that has changed, because they have local news coverage and things like that now. The other side of that too is that their news tends to be super sensationalist. So they emphasize like a lot of violence and things like that, but I think most people either ignore it or like laugh at it. But Hollywood and the studios and television networks are always trying to figure out how to market to younger Latinos, right? And it's easier to conceive of a market that only speaks Spanish, right? That's the only market they want. They have always had a hard time trying to figure out what younger Latinos who speak English, who have this kind of more of a bicultural kind of identity, like trying to market to what would interest them. They are always trying to figure out what that kind of demographic is into and what it means to be Latino. But for the most part from what I understand they focus on ...they did pour a lot into this Spanish language market as kind of a unique demographic. And every once in a while Hollywood would think that it stumbles upon something or something will hit and become a good success. Like a good example is like around 2000 was like that Mexican Cinema, like *Amores Perros*. So Hollywood hired all these directors that they would have like this new Hispanic Hollywood thing. And it didn't really work out that way. They made films, but they were not really that good.

A: So what was the reason that they didn't really work out?

B: Because I don't think that those directors were really interested in I mean they actually are still doing things. I think it's kind of a longer process. Like Guillermo del Toro or others, they all have their own production company. And that's the whole point of the production company is to produce films they'll play in Latin America, but that can also be marketed in to the Latino audience in the US. They are still trying to do things along those lines. Does that make sense? I mean you can stop me if I am rambling.

A: No, that's totally fine. But the thing you mentioned before that it [Chicano Movement] was kind of excluded from media during the time. What would you consider the reasons for that? I mean it was a big deal when you look back to that time, what happened there.

B: Well part of it ... I think they would do coverage. But say for instance in the Chicano Movement they were producing their own newspapers and magazines primarily for that reasons, right.

A: So it was more present in the printed media that presented what was going on?

B: Well, there was no mainstream media that represented what was going on. Well, they were either not covering what was going on or they were distorting what was going on. Say for instance if the Chicano moratorium, which was a big protest in 1970 against the Vietnam War, the police essentially attacked the protesters and the police killed a journalist in the process. I think they shot a tear gas can at Rubén Salzar – at his head. So this is like a good example of the “Los Angeles Times”, when they covered that protest, and when they covered what they called a riot, they made it sound like the Chicano protesters just went wild, that it was their fault and the police had to stop them and maintain order, but that was actually not the truth. So the mainstream media, both the printed and the television, they all kind of framed the story in that way.

A: So it was not only the exclusion of the media, but also the stigmatization of the Chicano Movement in a negative way?

B: And also just beyond the movement, Chicanos were dissatisfied with the fact that if Mexican Americans or Chicanos were in the news it was for a crime story, like a gang violence, and it was not about anything actually going on in the neighborhood, nothing positive...

A: So there was no awareness making of why were fighting for it?

B: Yes. So it was just kind of sensationalism what happened and then the process of framing Chicanos as kind of criminals which is the way they were treated by the police and the media. So even the Spanish language media news and the Spanish language newspapers in Los Angeles as an example were always criticized by people in the movement as just ignoring it.

A: So also the Spanish language media, they also ignored that fact.

B: Yes, because for the most part, I think it ... they began the change gradually, but up until the movement, they would say, like for instance “La Opinion”, which is like the biggest Spanish language newspaper in L.A., they didn’t have a correspondent to deal with East L.A. issues. So they’d report on East L.A. as an example, but they would report on Mexico... And also the paper has always been pretty much conservative as is a lot of Spanish media at that time. So they didn’t necessarily agree with the Chicano Movement and would probably... a lot of cases ended up with kind of ... their coverage often on some level coincided with the “L.A. Times”. So kind of strange...

A: So when you say that at that time “La Opinion” also tried to... when you say a lot of their reports were dealing with what was going on in Mexico. Would you say that they were trying to take their homeland here – or strengthen the connection and not deal with the “new” identity and the new “reality” of what was going on here?

B: I think that’s changed now, but up until that point “La Opinion” always kind of imagined in that way and would help people ... and when it was founded that was kind of the logic of the newspaper to maintain a kind of connection to the homeland. And its orientation was always kind of geared that way. It was kind of a newspaper of Latin America and it dealt with Los Angeles too, but not necessarily ... people didn’t feel that it was advocating for them or was doing anything for them.

A: Especially for the younger generation I guess.

B: Yes, especially the younger generation.

A: So did the Chicano Movement – the students – did they produce any movies or support any independent movies, that would really represent what they were fighting for?

B: Yes. For instance... I can’t remember how many, but there were a lot of newspapers ... they produced their own newspaper, because there was no other print media that would cover their story fairly or at all. And also there were a lot of films coming out ... mostly documentaries at that point – like Jesús Treviños documentary. A lot of that was keeping in with the social movement like film productions.

A: And how was the reception of those movies produced by the Chicano Movement? Was it only read or absorbed by the people who were within the movement or did it also spread out to non-Chicanos or to the more conservative Chicanos?

B: Ahm... That's a good question. But that would mean you'd have to look at every production history of each film, because I am sure each one had its own or unique like trajectory. A good example is like "I am Joaquin". That's something that would be shown at gatherings, like cultural arts centers. So they would show that as part of kind of a presentation. Like 'El Teatro Campesino' would show that as kind of their broader show. So for the most kind of people it would be seen within the movement, or whoever came to see this theater performance and it circulated around schools and universities. So it probably had a broader impact, but it was definitely addressed towards that Chicano community.

A: For their identity, I guess?

B: Yes, because that's exactly what it is. It is about claiming this identity and claim the southwest as a homeland. Also, kind of mapping up this trajectory of Chicano history, or Chicanos in US history. Does that make sense?

A: Yes. Was there part of the Chicano Movement that also focused on informing people outside the movement? Like to gain a bigger audience?

B: Yes. Well Chon Noriegas book is essentially about this on some level. That two kind of tendencies ... like he is talking about television and film productions. But it also extends to arts. There is two tendencies: one is about creating art creating culture for the movement or this kind of like identity affirmation. There is also this other tendency or kind of simultaneous tendency to projects outwards. So within the media for example, there were some people, like "I am Joaquin", things like that are just this idea that Chicano media had to exist outside the mainstream and never get it right. And that is pretty much true. I mean we will never produce anything like "I am Joaquin". There should be films made by for and about Chicanos, right? But at the same time there were other people saying, well, what we need to do is change the system from inside. So while there were people producing independent cinema that Hollywood would never touch and would never

produce. There were also people working with the industry and trying to kind of increase representation within the industry. Precisely with the idea of increasing Chicano visibility within Hollywood and that would change peoples' minds and potentially effect politics. So you would see those Chicanos in films and all of a sudden they are human beings and not just gangsters. You begin to think differently about them. So to a large degree there was a kind of projecting outwards and attempting to ... as part of a broader program of a political change to increase visibility.

A: This is my kind of idea that first you have to change peoples' mind and then it'll eventually change in real life. This is why I was wondering, if they were trying to work within the "other" system.

B: Yes. And again, to go back to the protest against "Frito Bandido". The "Frito Bandido" kind of perpetuated these ideas, that Chicanos were criminals and that they were also ridiculous. So there was this kind of a broad based efforts to change... There were a lot of boycotts to change representation of Chicanos in the mainstream media and advertising. Precisely because they realized that they hadn't effect on the way they were perceived, but also kind of interestingly, when we talk about representation of that time was also the impact that they would have on children. The idea in the case of "Frito Bandido" that Mexican kids would be called "Frito Bandido" by the other kids. Thinking of representation had an impact of self esteem and the development of Chicano children on some level. There was always kind of this emphasis, not always internal but external changing peoples' minds, because that does obviously have an impact on policy. I mean it seems to make a lot of sense. I think about this a lot in terms of immigration issue. The way that you can definitely see the way immigrants are represented and in general represented in the media has an impact on the way we talk about and debate about that subject. The terms of that debate and the limits of that debate. So immigrants are perceived and represented in a particular way. And that manifests itself in different formats in like the news talks about it in one way like the 24 hour news stations... When you see an immigrant in a film they are always playing a particular role. No one bothers to explain like the process of immigration or why it happens or like the broader... except for

documentaries maybe. But people who are not so interested don't watch those documentaries, but it's not on prime time, right. So for someone who lives in the middle of nowhere – and this is an issue – because I live in the Midwest now, so I know. Like in the last 10 years there have been more Mexican movies in the Midwest. When people are born and live in the Midwest, and have no experience with Latinos or Mexicans or immigration, suddenly find themselves around Latinos and see these populations growing. The only primary reference they have is television. That's all they know – probably “Fox News”, but hopefully not, or anything else. They don't know about immigration, they don't... in a very real sense, without making a ... for the most part this is where they are getting their information. So it does have a massive effect. And you hear the way white people talk about Latinos and immigration in the Midwest, there is a lot of anger and frustration and there is also just like a lot of misperception and the media does nothing, but kind of perpetuate that.

A: When you were talking about what kind of impact the movies are having on peoples' opinions. So how would you describe the change of stereotypes in the movies of Chicanos? Like from 1968 until now – how did that stereotype change? Did it change?

B: I think it changed to some degree. You have more films produced by Chicanos, someone like Robert Rodriguez. And you do see... I think there are more kind of interesting, complex representations than there used to be. At the same time the stereotypes haven't really gone away. Stereotype analyzes in media studies as a way of thinking of analyzing media is kind of outdated way of analyzing media. Like looking for the stereotypes and trying to understand them, but I am surprised to which extend it's still relevant. That you can still talk about them and how they exist. So the changes that there are a few more Latinos working in Hollywood... there are some interesting and complex characterizations and there are more Latino characters on television, but at the same time those stereotypes haven't really disappeared. Which on some level is more insidious, because Hollywood can then claim, “oh, we have all these characters... we are making all these changes”, but they are using those changes on some level to keep the stereotypes. They

say, that “oh, we also have these positive characters right here”, so it balances out with these negative characters, because for some reasons they can’t let these negative characters go.

A: Is that something you would say that the audience wants to see these stereotypes.

B: Yes, because it is short hand, right? For example, because it conveys a lot of information in a very kind of efficient way. You look at an American gangster and you automatically know. Every American television show has a Mexican gangster. There are entire casting companies that are dedicating to supply Hollywood with gangster types. That’s kind of how pervasive it is. Part of it also has to do with the fact that there are not many Latinos in high level positions in Hollywood. I mean this is always a problem, that they realize that they want to tap into this market, but they are not really hiring people who are trying to do that. They try every once in a while...

A: But it seems kind of strange to me, because I had the impression that the movie industry seemed to be liberal and not that conservative. What do you think about that?

B: Oh, no. Let me tell you something. A lot of the representation stems from the fact that filmmakers, people in the film industry, don’t have a direct, or have a specific kind of contact with Mexicans and Chicanos. And that contact is primarily Latinos who are their gardeners or their maids, or Latinos they see on the television. So on some level when we see these representations is a reflection of those people’s experiences. Their very limited understanding of the...

A: Yes, but it seems very strange to me, that they don’t go beyond that picture. That they don’t question it, if they have a Mexican gardener, what the whole reason behind having a Mexican gardener is.

B: Yes it’s kind of this very limited interaction and perception and a lot of it... You know L.A. is a very strange place. There are people who have never been to other parts of the city. They know nothing about... People live in Hollywood and they would never have been to East L.A. So they have no idea what that means to ...they feel like that this is a place where they can’t go, because it’s too dangerous. I would bet money that there are so many... I

mean I have talked to people so I know that there are people who have lived here their whole life and have never been to East L.A. So all they know about East L.A. is the same that someone from Nebraska knows about East L.A., which is what they saw on television and what they saw in movies. It's very bizarre. And it's laziness. I mean this is L.A., well they are not drawing from experience, they are not drawing from reality. They are drawing from some other movie they saw instead of convention in cinema and not necessarily like life experience. And their life experience is limited, but I all say that most of Hollywood is liberal, but sort of white liberal. A particular kind of liberal and that's an interesting thing about growing up in the US. They are still insulated and they believe that they are progressive, but don't realize it that they are not. And because they believe themselves to be kind of progressive, they are lying to their own racism. And the way that their lives are structured, because they have a very kind of a different understanding of what it means to be progressive or leftist or liberal than I do, I guess.

A: I also wanted to ask, aside from the Chicano topic, some questions about migration. Would you say that now, that also the reasons for migration are explained in movies, or a focus on why migration is happening? Do they also deal with the positive effects of migration in a society? I have seen a movie called "A day without a Mexican" – and I would be interested how the perception of those kinds of movies are in the society?

B: Yes, that's quite an interesting film, but I am not sure if the bigger part of society saw that movie. That might be the problem. I think that's maybe one of the few things that's been made and that was actually a coproduction with "Univision". It's kind of an interesting case that was produced with Mexico, because the filmmaker is from Mexico. I think it's definitely an exception when we are talking about migration and that our economy does essentially rely upon a pool of cheap labor. And I think, some people recognize, but not everybody. So I like the film for pointing that out if every Mexican in the city disappeared, like the city will collapse essentially.

A: But do you think, those kind of movies encourage people to question why migrants are abused here as cheap laborer? Or are they fine with it?

B: Well in those cases, when we are talking about those kinds of movies, that are attractive for... I think people who disagree with that film probably wouldn't ever see it in the first place. I think that's the problem with doing those kinds of film analyzes, because you can talk about those films politics and why it's so interesting and why it's important to do something like that, that no other film does, but you can't eventually assume that people actually watch it, outside of people who already agree with the movie. That's always kind of a problem. I don't know if it did affect... it's hard to say, but it didn't do very well at the box office... there is also another movie, called "Sleep Dealer" which is kind of a sci-fi movie about migration, but again another good example. The filmmaker Alex Rivera is actually my other favorite filmmaker. He is into documentaries, but also other things. This is a sci-fi film and it is really cool.

A: Ok. Thank you. I'll look it up.

B: Great. It should be easy to find.

A: When you said that "awareness-making movies" are only reaching that specific audience that is already agreeing with it, so what do you think what would have to change, to also reach out to people who are conservative? What would have to change in the movie industry?

B: You know I think it's going to change eventually and this is probably what's going to happen in every other sphere in American life when inevitably Latinos become the majority. I think that's what will change the most, when the population like 30 to 50 years in the future, when demographics change to an extent, when that population can't be ignored and more of that population is in control or has, at least in terms of Hollywood, some control over that level of culture. It's hard to say, because at the same time... because if you look at the Spanish language television now it is all Latino and it is all Spanish speaking. Like I said, there are Latinos present and represented, but this other kind of problem with class politics and race politics. So I don't know if this will ever be solved, because if you have a greater representation of Latinos, it would also depend on which kind of level you find that representation and that's a struggle. I think that's an issue that is overlooked in these debates is that representation isn't necessarily positive

or desirable... but what actually matters are these politics, this issues of class. And talking about the people who have the most at stake in the migration debate and talking about immigration in an honest way. In a way that has impact on peoples' lives, because that debate does very correctly impact peoples' lives. So I think to just instead of this ability, because I think those debates have some ideas have somewhat more discredited that visibility within the media means necessarily political change, but it doesn't. I mean, there are people all over television, but that doesn't say anything about the general condition of most African Americans in that state, which is deplorable. So just being on television doesn't really fix anything. I think that necessarily there always have to be media that exists outside that system that's actually about creating awareness and kind of pushing or putting pressure on Hollywood to do something.

A: You mean the independent film industry?

B: Yes, I think that necessarily has to exist, but at the same time it would be nice to see... I guess what I am trying to say is that there should be emphasis on those issues on like social change and political change and thinking about representation through that lens instead of like: "well let's get some Latinos on television and ..." because I mean, who cares? I mean I think part of that debate is first off like the visibility means political empowerment, which it doesn't. And this other idea that Latino have to prove that they are human or normal, that they are just like everybody else, that they have all those American values, that they are conservative that they believe in the family and so on. These things are like problematic to begin with that their acceptability has to do with embracing all these American values – like those conservative values. So I think between that kind of conservative, racial politics, the family values and class... those things. It's worth thinking about representation through that rather than just visibility. Does that make sense?

A: When you say that the society in Los Angeles for example, that they claim those kind of values... and that for example the "big bosses" in the movie industry claim, before they give access to Chicanos in the industry, that the

Chicanos would have to prove that they would have the same values like the American society.

B: On some level, unless we are talking about something that is geared towards a huge market. Hollywood still tries to have it both ways. Like to have Latinos, but not in a way that would offend a broader, like a general population. You know what I mean?

A: How would the broader population be offended?

B: Like what they typically try to do is to avoid controversy. I mean not necessarily all the time, but avoiding controversy or avoiding ...What's a good way to put this? ... I think what they are trying to do is to attract as many people as they possibly can and that means that they are trying to push the boundaries, they are trying to be a little bit controversial as a way of... you know, but not too much, not in a kind of way that would offend people – accessibly on a political level. Maybe they are attracting Latinos, but they are not doing it in a way that turns off the other audience. Part of that has to do with the way Latinos are represented that's kind of acceptable. Did that make sense?

A: Before you said that only the access itself won't make a change, so would you say that if Chicanos would have access to higher positions in the movie industry, that it could be an initial for a change?

B: Yes, eventually. Here is a good example. From someone like Robert Rodriguez. ...it's a good question. You would like to think of it that it would, but then you don't know exactly how that will translate, because at the end of it what matters is that they make money. Honestly a lot of Chicano films, or films that are geared towards that market don't make that much money. They are not that profitable. It's a good question. There is someone like Robert Rodriguez, but it depends on how you understand those films, because Machete was like controversial in Texas, but I think it's an interesting film. And it's exactly that kind of film which you wish would be made more often, but there is still so few – I mean it is about immigration. It is like this other perspective towards immigration. I like the fact that this movie is really political. That's a really good example of something that has like politics, but also has a lot of fun, has a humor and action. That's actually a good example

for what I was talking about before, because before the film even came out, there was a lot of backlash about it from the conservative wing. And you would like to disregard it, to it's just like a bunch of extremists or whatever, but the state of Texas is actually very conservative. Concerning the tax incentive he got in Texas, because it portrays Texas in a negative light. So they actually kind of listened to the extremists. So this film is about hating white people. This film is racist. So it kind of demonstrates exactly that kind of controversy that Hollywood tries to avoid. Even when he is trying to push it into that direction and trying to be political, he is doing it in a way like... I mean Machete is not like the acceptable Latino... it's kind of this typical American idea. No one in this film... none of the Latinos are. That's what I found very interesting. I sense that part of that controversy is that comfort. We see Mexicans that are active and demanding their rights and standing up for themselves and I think that scares the hell out of people. And I think that's what's different about this film. The fully flashed out characters that stand up for themselves and refuse to be in their place. Refuse to conform to this idea of immigration assimilation narrative, where everyone becomes American. I think the complaints about Machete and what they were really concerned about were bothered by was that assertive representation and white people were the villains. So when I talk with students about stereotypes and representation they say, well it's just a movie, why are you so concerned about it. As soon as you a situation where the dynamics are reversed, then people start calling you a racist. It's kind of reverse racism. And that Robert De Niro character is being criticized for being racist and for showing Texas in a bad label, but actually I grew up there, so I know. It's a lot worse than that. People are bothered by that when the tables are turned and when there are white people as immigrants. People have just become so accustomed to Mexicans being less than human in representations of the media and then when the table flips its disturbing to people. Because it should be disturbing to all of us, that you can talk about people without referring to them as human beings, with calling them illegals, right? They seem to be in this anonymous war. They are like a type, right. I mean that's the problem with stereotypes. They deny people humanity. They become this convention and they become

a type and they are not human anymore. I think that's what people respond to when they see themselves portrayed that way. And it's true, no one should have to... it is kind of a cruel thing, but that never translates to people thinking of, oh, I see...

A: So you don't think that after that movie, people don't reflect that or just argue that this is not correct.

B: Well conservatives would argue that. This is racist and he is making Texas look bad, but I do think that the heart of that is that being disturbed by that dynamic or being disturbed by seeing something aggressive.

A: But do you think that it could contribute to creating awareness, that when you put the majority in the shoes of a minority to see themselves through a mirror or something?

B: I don't know. You would like to think so. People, when they have their entrenched beliefs challenged, they become defensive. You would like to hope that they change, but it's always hard to tell. Again, for me that's always a difficulty talking about media or analyzing media, because sometimes it does come down to not having any idea what effected us, what impact does it have, but it does have an impact.

A: But totally away from the Chicano and Migration topic. When you look at the representation of homosexuals in movies and how it changes over the years. I mean in the last maybe two years movies came out that were really good and you could relate to the emotions of the characters and the story behind it. In the past homosexuals also were labeled in ridiculous way. So I think that changed and I think that changes the awareness of people, right?

B: I think so too and I thought about this and it's definitely the case. I think it has changed, but that's a debate though and people still debate this. First and formal, I think that gays and lesbians were valued as a market or as a target market, before they were kind of... Like they were valued as a market place by the studios and all these corporations, before they ... and that turned into a recognition on civil rights issues... and the idea that the circumstances are changing. And it's hard to tell whether people are just changing their mind, but I think the media has something to do with it. I think it is this kind of feedback thing, where it's a lot more complex to talk about. The other thing I

think about are two changes that I think have happened in terms of government policies or the things that are changing is the ability to serve in the military and second of marriage. So there is this idea of rights are changing and peoples kind of perception of gays and lesbians and tolerance of gays and lesbians have improved, but only in so far as their political goal line up with this conservative kind of ideology of the military and the family. I know on some level they are challenging marriage, but this idea to just want to construct this idea of family the same way like you are. The other kind of assimilation that is kind of acceptable. So you know more politicized or these other kind of issues ...like more radical kind of queerness is not part of that package. It's more this kind of acceptable in a very same way and things that do challenge people... I think that there are limits to that dialogue and to that representation. So that there is a particular idea of gayness that is accepted. I think the same holds true for migration.

A: Are there any questions which you think would have been important and I didn't ask?

B: No. I think we talked about a lot, because you were interested in representation, right? I think what's interesting in that debate for me is the idea or the illusion we have within the media is a range of opinions and there is a continuum of opinions, but there is also a limit to that debate and I think to that very much is a product to representation in films, but also the way print journalism and the news talk about migration and that definitely influences policies and the kind of debates that happen in terms of legislation. So there is one extreme, where you the like "close the borders" and deport everybody and at the other extreme you have like immigration reform and the pathway to citizenship, but more people are afraid to talk about anything more. Like for example amnesty or some kind of open border policy, but that's not even on the table. We can't even talk about that. So there is within this supposed diversity and debate there is kind of a limit to what you can talk about. And a limit to what the congress or other lawmaking bodies would consider.

A: So do you think, when you look back, that those limits shifted?

B: Yes, they have become narrower. If you think about post 9/11 – like Bush. Before 9/11 Bush was talking about some kind of amnesty program. It was on the table and it felt like it might happen, but then 9/11 happened and we all became terrified of what's coming over the border. And now amnesty program is completely forgotten. The other thing is that what I mention to you is that what is highlighted and gets fetishised within that representation is the border. And they fixate on the border. Both films and government policy have a major emphasis on the border, but the entire concept of illegality and being illegal is about the fact of the illegal border crossing. A lot of cinema focuses on that. And for a lot of obvious reasons the border is a really interesting place, but there is this kind of fixation on something that the border is the problem and that determines peoples' status, just by crossing that border people become not human beings, but illegals – that defines what they are. That is very typical of both policy like crime prevention and law enforcement and government policy very much focuses on that end point of the border. So the idea by fixing a problem by creating a wall, as if the crossing of the wall would be the problem, while actually these broader circumstances that actually affects all of us. These are just the people who suffer the most from those circumstances that we are all experiencing. Instead of looking at it in a broader extend, in a way that would actually kind of create a sense of solidarity between the working class here and Mexican immigrants, because it's the same process that they are screwing both of them over and instead of trying to understand it, it becomes about this crossing this fixation on the crossing that determines how people are labeled that determines the way policy is shaped and the way people ... This is the one thing that I hate about the migration debate. That everyone agrees, no matter where you stand in that debate, that we have to like first we have to secure our border. That's not the first thing that you should probably think about.

A: This is very interesting, because it seems to be exactly the same in Europe.

B: It seems that this kind of idiocy transcends to borders itself. It's the same here with law enforcement and crime. So you have all these television shows that are about crime. So a lot of money is put into enforcement and into jail into hiring more police, when actually the committing of a crime is like the end

point of a long and complex process instead of circumstances, but that's evidently unrepresentable. And in Immigration is the same in a lot of respects. There is just a large part of the equation left out. So sometimes not what's being represented is important, but what these representations refuse to talk about. I mean some movies do, but those are not movies that you typically see at the Megaplex, so these broader processes of neo-liberalism and globalization is never part of the debate or the discussion. No one like CNN is like, what about this 200 years of history of like US imperialism in Mexico. The US always had like a major stake in Mexico what they call like American imperialism. And essentially we control Mexico when we want it to function the way it functions. Essentially it's part of our economy and it's part of our success. Our wealth is built on other peoples backs, but we never talk about that. They want what we have. And the other thing when people talk about, because they want to hear this, and it also coincides with these conservative values, but it's also a mischaracterization. People say that immigrants are coming here, because they want a piece of the American dream. Oh, yes, we can all relate to that, because what they want essentially is America in a kind of a typical way. Instead of saying, well the reason for crossing the dessert on foot for days is not necessarily because they want access to the American dream, because they want freedom. It's a matter of survival and the conditions in Mexico and Central America are that people, they would not... People put themselves at risk, put their lives at risk to come here and that dimension is never talked about, like what circumstances are they coming from? And what kind of circumstances are they living in and what compels them to make that journey, which is a major risk. And that's never talked about. It's just about crossing the border and the American dream they are after. This aspiration of the American dream that they will take what we have. But if we are talking about the border too in movies and political films we'll see that it's just seen as a thing that people cross or are trying to get across, but I think if they talked actually of the part of the crossing more... I mean "Babel", that's probably the only film that I have seen that deals with it in an honest way that shows what it's actually like to cross the border. The circumstances are a little bit strange, maybe unbelievable.

Nonetheless it does give a kind of idea what it's like to cross the desert and more people understood that people are risking their lives or spending all their money to do this. I think there was this idea, and people just assumed that it's kind of this easy thing or they think that all they have to do is cross, but there is something about the risking involved in that – the kind of the abuse that happens on both sides of the border and the kind of condition that the people are willing to risk. I think that has to be taken seriously. There is just now way, if more people would knew this, that those people are serious and I am curious what make people do this and it's not the American dream it's life or death for a lot of people. There is a friend of mine at the University of Michigan and he is an archeologist. He was doing work in Mexico and the shifted to do this thing where he is doing archeological studies of border crossing and like on both sides. He is arguing that we know a about a lot of things, but we don't know about that process, because as an archeologist, you can't ethically cross the border with them, you can't stick with them. So what can you learn by what they leave behind, and it's just terrifying. It's worse than what people ever imagined. Then you would know why people would do this. Not because they want a house and two cars or to steal our healthcare. I am interested in the immigration debate and what the media has to do with that and the limits about what's left out and the limitation of the debate. The terms of the debate are pretty much limited by in which way the issue is represented in multiple media. And the way that the issue is represented in multiple media is kind of constrained by the debate as well. It's kind of interesting moving beyond kind of a particular set of ideas.

A: Why would you say that there no interest in the media and why are the limits are set so narrow.

B: I think the limits are set so narrow for a number of reasons. The first one, and this has always guided the discourse in the US, is that we need immigration and we need unfair immigration, we need exploitative immigration, because that's part of our economy. And talking about these issues in a genuine way and looking at broader process and the circumstances would mean and would require us to make a kind of change that is unlikely to happen. Like a major economic change. Given the direction we are going in kind of neo-

liberalism it is very unlikely to happen. Or if it does... I think that's the illusion of the debate that there are certain things like economic justice that are completely off the table. And the media, both the news media and Hollywood, they are just lazy, because they just reproduce what they hear. There is not much very good investigative work by the mainstream. I mean there is on the internet in blogs and so on, but mostly they are just content to reproduce the quotes from politicians and stuff, without digging deeper.

A: Do you think that it also has economic reasons that they don't research beyond that point, that they just take it and like "quickly to do and easy to sell"?

B: Oh, yes. Part of the economic production is that they want to produce something cheap and interesting and uncontroversial. They are also owned by corporations that benefit from the same economy that is kind of supported by the government. That's the one thing you can't forget about media corporations, that they are corporations and they also have the same sort of interest to a large degree to ..., but I don't think it's that direct, but sometimes it is, but there is really not much incentive to kind of explore immigration beyond that... I mean "Babel" is a good example of ... But "Babel" is set in such weird kind of circumstances like where she ends up going to take those kids to a party and has to cross that border like that... I mean that would never happen, but it's a good question. The other thing to talk about migration in an honest way is probably not seen as being entertaining. It's something that's better treated in a documentary. But I think in terms of politics it's very much about ...it would require people to make changes that they are unwilling to make or the government or corporations are unwilling to make. Or the implementation of fair labor practices. Some kind of accountability for labor practices around the world that is unlikely to ever... hopefully it comes about someday. They would require large scale changes. And they would also require ... to when calling people illegal and stressing their kind of humanity or kind of not allowing them be referred to as human beings also means it's easier to deny them. And these kinds of wild proposals that are also floating around here in California as well. If you were undocumented, they would have the right and the power to cut off your water

and power. It's inhumane – who would do that to another person. And they are paying for these services, so what do you care? It's just that kind of thing, if those issues were humanized, people would think about it in a completely different way. And again, someday we will, because the majority will be Latino in a lot of states and in a lot of places, so that will change. You know, you always hear these predictions that all of us will be migrants in one way or the other. Yes. Two things: broader economic change and also the kind of recognizing migrants as human beings, recognize that they do deserve services that extends to them that doesn't coincide with this kind of idea to cut services as humanly possible and kind of remove the safety net that exist for the poor, which is gaining a lot of attraction. Not there is much to begin with, but they are trying to cut that last bit away. The conservative have congress and they have the economic crisis that justifies even cutting further back. I think it would have to be a different environment to extend things to immigrants that the rest of us are losing altogether. So there is a number of factors and incentives for not understanding immigration as a more complex process and understanding immigrants as human beings with genuine motivation for moving.

A: I only have one more question: When you said that people belief that Mexicans are crossing over, only because of the American dream. How is the US represented in the movies in Mexico? Is it the American dream?

B: No, it's the American nightmare. This is pretty consistent. I have to say I haven't seen these narratives for a while, but maybe since the 30s in Mexico, immigration has been a topic, because it has been constant since then on one level or the other. America is typically represented as a place where immigrants face things like discrimination, violence, racism – it's a little bit closer to reality on some level – but the main point of a lot of these films is that you should probably just stay in Mexico. A lot of these stories are stories of failure. Like immigration as like failure on some level and that it ends like in an eventual return to Mexico, where everything is better than in the United States. The American dream and the American nightmare and all this hope you have is illusion. And these movies were funded – like in the 50s and 70s – films with that narrative, were funded by the government in Mexico. So it

coincided with that it had always been an official policy until recently that the level of immigration is somewhat an embarrassment and it is kind of an attempt to keep people in Mexico and discourage them from migrating to the US, but that kind of narrative has become some kind of convention on some kind of level. It's repeated in films and on television that the US is seen as ... there are some comedies about it, but people are always like return home, because they can't make it and they face discrimination and I am sure all the Arizona stuff is probably not helping much and it only sends that message that people work forcefully, but the border figures into that narrative, even within those films, in those stupid comedies, it's about why they leave and then what they experience when they cross the border and then again, if people knew more about the... because it's one of those things that are mysterious that doesn't really get examined very frequently in film. Just like labor conditions, like where they are working, how they get paid and what they have to do to get a job in the US. We do like a coverage of law enforcement, we could talk about rates on certain businesses. All these kind of enforcement based ideas, that all we need to do is fine or arrest the people that are hiring the illegals and the problem will be solved, but we all hire unemployed illegals on some level. In place like California the economy is built on a cheap and exploitable labor. And that's the other reason why the debate doesn't move further. There is an investment in keeping these people on their precarious positions where you can pay them very little, they have no bargaining rights, they have no status and when you need to get rid of them or not pay them you can just call ICE or whatever. I mean that still happens. That cheap labor is a big incentive. It does prevent any kind of major action and major policy to happen, because people like that industry we all depend upon.

8.2 First Interview with Carlos Manuel Haro, Ph.D.

On the 23rd March 2011, 11:00 am at the CSRC in Los Angeles, California

Contact:

Carlos Manuel Haro

charo@chicano.ucla.edu

+1 310 267 5290

+1 310 206 1784

A: Madlene Knoll

B: Carlos Manuel Haro

A: For the beginning I would like to know some general information. Like what was your experience as a Chicano at high school for you and how you did you become interested in the topic of education?

B: My under graduate degree was in political science and I also did quiet a bit of work in the history area, so I could have graduated in a degree in either history or political science from UCLA, but it was when I was a senior, when I decided to go into education. And the graduate school of education here at UCLA is where I applied for a Master's degree which I completed in 1971 and a doctor that I completed in 1976. The Masters' degree and the Ph.D. at the school of education at UCLA and a graduate degree in 1969 in political science.

And now going back; I started at UCLA in 1965 and I was one of two students that came from Roosevelt high school, which is a school on the other side of the river – East Los Angeles – east of the river. Some great books have been written on the history on East Los Angeles. Rodolfo Acuña wrote some great books about the history of East Los Angeles. That would be your primary resource for history on East L.A. and the Mexican population of the East Los Angeles area. Several good books... in fact one of his first books "Occupied America" became a primer for Chicano studies, because there was relatively little written about the Chicano population – the Mexican American population. But going back to high school, which was your first

question. Roosevelt high school was already in 1965 predominantly Mexican-American. It was over 70 % Mexican origin students and that meant again that could be 3rd or 4th generation born here of Mexican descent, or it could be a new immigrant population; students that have just arrived from Mexico. Primarily Mexican – there were some Central Americans, but relatively few. And Boyle Heights – that's the area east of the river – that district. That's where I was raised and Boyle Heights was back in the 1920s, 30s and 40s, Russian, Orthodox Jews and Japanese-American. The main street was called "Brooklyn", right after New York's Brooklyn Avenue. There was a concentration of Europeans that were primarily Jewish. They had a synagogue and it was a very strong Jewish community and Japanese-Americans that lived in Boyle Heights. What changed all that was World War II. The Japanese were removed from there – removed from every city on the west coast and elsewhere and they were taken to internment camps. So you know some of that history as well. I interacted with Japanese children that were children of the internees – people that were interned – that were put away during World War II. I interacted with their children and in fact I met recently with one of my old school mates. His name is Dan Nakanishi. Nakanishi went to Yale and then Harvard as well and then he came here and taught in the education school for about 22 years. And he and I retired at the same time. So here is a fellow from Roosevelt High School and Boyle High School district going to Yale, and myself, of Mexican descent, coming to UCLA and then. So those are two different histories of two different people – the Japanese population. You know when they were interned, they were told, you will be at this train at such and such a time in 24 hours. They lost everything and all they had were the suitcases they were able to put together and take with them to the train or the bus station. It was a very sad history of Boyle Heights. So that population disappeared for the war. Some of them were able to come back, because their properties were held by friends, neighbors. And who were the neighbors? [Chicanos] But in most cases they lost everything. They lost their property, they lost their furniture, they lost their clothing, because there was nothing they could take. And in high school no one ever

talked about it. No one talked about World War II or the experience of the Japanese in Boyle Heights, but there were a number of Japanese families that returned. I had that experience. I experienced a more integrated high school and middle school environment than many students in East L.A. today, where it's so highly segregated. It's over 90 % of Mexican schools, but in the 1960 there were still Japanese students and a few Jewish students and we were able to interact. So it was a very different environment and I was very fortunate to have that kind of experience. My outlook was very different from many of my fellow students of whom I met here, because they went to segregated Mexican schools. They never interacted with Jews or Japanese students.

A: And this special situation was only in that specific area in Boyle Heights?

B: Yes, that only happened in Boyle Heights. So there was a parcellation that was very different. It was not unusual to see an Asian and not unusual to interact with a Jewish student. That was common every day.

A: So there was no feeling of being different, because everybody was different?

B: Yes, right. There was no feeling of right or wrong, it was just normal. And it wasn't until I came here, to UCLA that I felt like an outsider. And it was when I went to the dormitories, which were brand new, and I walked into a situation, when I walked into the cafeteria and I looked around – nothing but white faces. UCLA was highly segregated – nothing but white faces and relatively few students of color. Very few blacks, most of them were athletes, very few Asians and relatively few Mexicans.

A: And how was the number of professors who taught here and also the teachers who taught at high school? Were there teachers from Mexican descent, were there immigrants teaching as well?

B: The teachers... I don't recall them being very diverse. We still had a very segregated teaching staff in those days. Interestingly enough, the teacher who encouraged me to go to UCLA was an old Irish man. [laughs] That was, because he came to UCLA – he was an alumni. He came to study here and I think that was during World War II. He was very old, but I don't think that the teaching staff at Roosevelt necessarily encouraged integration or diversity per se. They were still the old lined teaching staff that was very rooted in the

50s, but the 60s was a new a turbulent area that challenged everything that those teachers were about, I think. I graduated from Roosevelt High School in 1965, so I wasn't around the school when the high school students challenged the high schools as institutions. That occurred in 1968 when they did the walkouts. That was a very important demonstration of Mexican-American political cloud in power in the urban setting. We already had César Chávez and the United Farmworkers working in the rural sector. So when you went outside of the city the one force that existed in the rural, an especially in the agricultural area, was the United Farmworkers. Everyone had a white flag with an eagle on them. In high school and inside of the city of Los Angeles there wasn't a force that aggressively confronted the institutions until 1968 with the massive demonstrations of high schools students waling out. I was already here [at UCLA]. That was three years after my studies at UCLA, but in the high schools, in the colleges, in universities, we had been organizing since 1967- organizing student organizations at the college level. And here my friend Luis Ortiz writes about it – about the organizing here at UCLA.

A: And also the organization of ethnic studies which was realized very fast; within one year, right?

B: Yes. If you look at the 1960 everything is compacted into a very short time frame on extreme, not only action, but reaction on ministration colleges to the pressure from students at the college level, but that meant that students had to be organized and that they had to create a strategy – a plan of action – and then mobilize to implement their plan of action. We were able to do that on the student side from 1967 to very, very early in 1969. So within two years you had student organization, implementation and complementation of institutions. It was really dynamic and when I look back and we did that all in a couple of years. On the drawing board of students and this occurs with various students backgrounds coming together – there was the notion we needed to create change. It was within the context of what was happening in the larger society. We had the Vietnam War going on and then we had the civil rights efforts, which were primarily identified with a black initiative. The free speech of student movement that was occurring over all in the US. At

the college level of the 1960 every student fought for free speech and the power of students, but that was also occurring in other countries. In Mexico city 300 students were killed over their demonstrations. In Paris, students were killed. In London... I don't know if anyone was killed in London, but there were demonstrations of students in power. So this was happening throughout Latin America – Mexico and down. Students were protesting against the way the state and other institutions were treating the people. In the context of universities and colleges in this area, Chicano students organized and we identified ourselves as being different from Mexican-Americans. We had the GI-Generation of World War II. So they came back after fighting in Europe or in the Pacific and they find that they are discriminated against. They create pressures against the institutions at that time – in the late 40s, early 50s. The creation of several organizations – the GI-Forum, Mexican Opportunity Foundation in Los Angeles, the MALDEF... all sorts of organizations proactive for civil rights for Mexican-Americans. We had that generation and we are the offspring of that generation. We went a step further. We felt that it wasn't enough – that the change that occurred wasn't enough. We were still being discriminated against – there were still prejudices out there. And we were still in many cases second class citizens – being treated as second class citizens. At the college level our thinking was: "Things that we can do." And of course if you had gone to an UMAS first which became MeChA in 1969. UMAS stood for "United Mexican American Students" and then MeChA stands for "Movimiento Chicano de Aztlán". That organization, when there were meetings, there would be a lot of back and forth, arguing, ideology and Nationalism over here and Marxism over here... [laughs]. Attending one of those meetings you would think that nothing would get done, but things did get done. There was a plan, a layout, a plan of action. You might be able to get "El plan de Santa Barbara" online. That elaborates on what should be done on each campus. In our case, we emphasized the creation of a research center for Mexican-American studies. That center was created in 1969. We also pushed for creation of programs that would outreach in the community. To recruit students that would come to the University, because the university didn't have that. Part of our outreach

was creating a university presence in our communities like in East L.A. We actually established a center which I coordinated for a year and that would be back in 1969. An undergraduate student coordinating that! [laughing]. We found that those were the kinds of things that the institution could do and should do. Outreach, admissions to the university and then support students, not only in financial assistance through scholarships, but also in mentoring, tutoring and making sure that students succeeded in this university which was so different from their experience in East L.A. I mean, I was shocked. My first experience here was a shocking affair to deal with, because I wasn't ready for it. It wasn't like I had parents that had attended a college. My parents were 3rd graders. That was their level of education. Being the first person in my family to come to a university; that was shocking. It was a completely different experience from what I had.

A: When you talked about the outreach to the community and to inform the high school students about the possibilities of higher education. Was there also information for the parents and to create awareness how important it is to send their kids to get their children into higher education?

B: Also gender plays a role. Males and Females in Mexican culture... the tradition and the value for women is to stay at home. There were many cases where parents didn't want their daughter to come to UCLA, even though its only 30 miles away. The mind set, especially of the father, was "no, young lady, you stay home and maybe you don't go to school." That was their experience. They came from an agricultural background where you had many children and you put them all to work. Their thinking was different than the thinking of college students in 1967, '68 and '69 and we had to confront that a great deal. That was dealt with in many ways, but in the center we established the recruitment center, we often sat... our people, our students often sat with parents and talked to them about the value of education for their daughters or sons and that UCLA was a great place [laughs]... and the support was there, because they were mostly poor. We said that the university would support their daughters at UCLA. She would have a place to live, a dormitory, with other women, not men. In 1968/69 we had to deal with that and it wasn't a professional... it wasn't professionalized – staff members

at the university – didn't become into play until 1971. That's when the transition of a student run initiative became owned by the institution and became institutionalized. That was when full time staff people to work in the community, to try to go out there, to try to recruit student and to bring them in...

A: And the people who were recruited [by the University], were they Chicano?

B: Well. In many cases yes. There was a recognition of this campus that you needed a diversified stuff to do that sort of work in the community. And of course early on this institution, like many others, thought, well, let's hire some black staff and they'll do the work, because they always framed it in terms of the black and white thing. The blacks – the African-American population – and the white population. That's diversity [laughs]... but here on this campus and others we constantly tried to drive home that there are other groups – not just the African-American. That there are Asians-Pacific groups, there are Native Americans and there are people that are brown skinned that are from south of the border and they have been here longer than you have. The understanding that it was more than a black and white issue was something that was driven home in the 60s and in the early 70s. And it was understood here, that there is more than one group when you say people of color, but that wasn't the case at other campuses. In my article, the one that you have been reading, there was Hayakawa [= President of San Francisco State University] the one at San Francisco State, was the model for the head of a university in terms of reacting against the push of students. That was the model for the conservatives in our society at that time. Ronald Regan was governor of the State of California and he decided that Hayakawa would be a great president of a college, because of his stand against those outside educators – those communists [laughs]. What was occurring here at this university here [UCLA], was not duplicated at other universities throughout the state – it was varied. There was a very different kind of response of the institution to the pressure of students and the community coming onto the campus for the first time. The first time in the history of a public institution there was a Mexican presence – political presence of pushing the institution to change.

A: And I had the feeling when I read your article that the institution here – UCLA – was much more open and trying to find other solutions than just shutting the movement down.

B: Right. We had a different head of the institution than the Hayakawa-Model. Chuck Young was much younger. It was his first assignment as chancellor. He had been vice chancellor for a few years, but he was very young. He could have been thought of as a graduate student in some circles. He was more... there were several things that I think that drove him. One was that he wanted to keep peace and he was at that point in his career, where he was a forward thinking person. He understood that society was changing, because what was going on outside the university: civil rights movement, war in Vietnam, student movement... So he was willing to experiment, to pilot test. Let's see what we can do. It was a period where there was a balancing act on the part of students and the administration. We want this, but we are able to give you this... well, we can't do that, but we can do this. So it was a back and forth. In addition to his outlook – but he was also very stubborn – he would stand very firmly in a point. If he really strongly believed in it, even if it was wrong, in our point of view ... in addition to that he had around him several very good lieutenants – they were vice chancellors. They interacted with students and helped putting together the four ethnic studies in 1969. There was also David Saxon who was very good. He was an older person, but he also was aware of the larger dynamics in our society and how it was affecting the university. David Saxon is an interesting person. He was a young professor in the late 1940s and he got caught up in the loyalty oath requirement – it was the McCarthy-Era and he refused to sign it. What an interesting story. So David Saxon was from that era. He was a rebel too and he paid the consequences in his career, but he came back very strong. He went up administration and he is one of the people a Chuck Young brought in to help him. That indicates to me that kind of thinking that Chuck Young had too. And David Saxon recently died... I think only four years ago. He not only became the executive chancellor of this university, he became president of the entire system. Of all nine university campuses of California. President of all of them. The greatest public university system and he was the president and

he had been fired in 1952 [laughs]. So we had here coming all sorts of players and actors that... when you look back on them, it was a very interesting group.

A: What were the greatest achievements of the Chicano Movement during that time? Was it to enabling Chicanos to enter university or the outreach to all the other people about creating awareness with what Chicanos are struggling and where support is needed?

B: Well. It was across of all of this that there had to be some activity. When we look back at the achievements of this particular campus, I think what we moved from a student movement to something that was institutionalized, that is here, that is part of the institution and that is offered by the institution. We have the outreach efforts that are institutionalized, the support that is provided to students that need support – not only financial aids, but also academic support. On that side I think it's outstanding. That's a very great achievement. In terms of awareness outside... about what's going on... I think in the long term it was the establishment of the center and the publishing house. It has continued to publish the journal "Aztlán" since 1970. That's publications of over forty years now. It's a long history of encouraging scholars writing in the field of Chicano studies to get their research and writing published to the larger society. To share that research and that writing with other scholars. That has been really important that the publication effort has become even more diverse – a multitude of monographs and we have policy briefs dealing with policy issues. And then of course the library that has been an important source for scholars. It sort of completes the circle of what we wanted to do many years back. We wanted to make sure that there are scholars that are interested in Chicano studies. That are encouraged to do their research and encouraged to write and that others that are coming after them are able to read their materials and able to use that to further their research to do it again. This is something that we thought about in the late 1960s. "Wouldn't it be wonderful to have publications that deal with Chicano issues in the United States?" And the idea became real in 1970 with the first publication. Now that idea was in the mind of Juan Gómez Quiñones who

was the first editor of Aztlán. He was a graduate student. He was thinking beyond what an undergraduate, like me, in the 1960s would have thought of.

A: So if you compare the situation to now. In what areas of the education are still problems concerning access for Chicanos? Or is there a lot of segregation in schools now?

B: Well almost the same issues that we were confronting in the 1960s are here today. All of them are here today. When we demonstrated to improve the schools, we set out a number of issues. Those same issues exist and they have been aggravated by the fact that our population has dramatically increased. So there is more segregation today than there was in the 1960s. And it has to deal with our people being segregated into particular geographic areas. So they attend those schools that are in those areas. Although the Mexican-American population is moving throughout the United States, in urban centers they are concentrated in certain areas. East of the river primarily or in parts of the valley, but you find Mexicans all over the place in Los Angeles County. You find a Mexican restaurant anywhere you go. In terms of the schools the issues we had in the 1960 were that they were segregated. It would be children... my children that would be segregated. It's more than a generation away from what we were doing in the 60s and our schools are overcrowded. We argued that in the 1960 that there are too many students here. You are packing them in. A school that should have 2000 has 4000 kids. You can't do that. That has an impact on the size of the classrooms and how the teachers teach. We argued against about what was being provided. The curriculum of high school was not preparing kids for college – for academic careers and universities in the 60s. Very few of us were going to universities and very few were being prepared to go to universities. The same thing today. Very few kids from Roosevelt High School are being prepared to come here. The numbers have increased – true –, but percentagewise it's still small. When you look at the population here at UCLA it fluctuates, but it's around 15 % of the total population of Mexican origin. 15 %! You go to just about any school district in Los Angeles and it's over 70 % of Mexican origin. So if you have 70 % of the kids in L.A. unified school district and you only have 15 % of students at UCLA of Mexican

origin, what's happening? This should be way up there – like 40 or 50 percent.

A: And also the income varies a lot if you graduate from high school or if you graduate from college. So this will reproduce the pattern. With a lower income you won't be able to support your kid financially.

B: Yes the correlation is usually between college on the one hand and earning potential. And there is also the correlation between who is going to attend college and your parents' education and their earnings. That correlates with whether or not you are going on with university. If you are poor the chances that you are going to attend poor school, that is very poorly equipped that doesn't have the curriculum that's going to prepare you to going on to university. And in that curriculum there are not the Advanced Placement Courses. This is something that the university invested in: Advanced Placement Courses. Courses at the high school are usually four points: A, B, C and D, but if you take an Advanced Placement Course, that's a course that is recognized by the university of being applicable, acceptable. It's a higher level course, it's more demanding, that's five points. So you can graduate from high school with a four point two. Depending upon the number of courses that you take in AP. If Roosevelt High School has ten AP-courses and another school has 25 to 30 AP-courses. That alone creates the difference in a students' ability to get into a university like UCLA, because you don't have access to this. You don't have access to the AP-courses, you can't take them, you can't get the grades and be competitive with a student that does have access and that does earn those grades and elevates their 4,0 to a 4,25. That is a discrepancy and you find this discrepancy throughout the system. If you go to a poor school they have fewer AP-courses if you go to a school that's in a ... where the socioeconomics is higher they have got more AP-courses.

A: How would you consider the awareness of the larger society of the importance of higher education? Are people aware that education is important and linked to the progress of a society – also economically?

B: Well in most cases parents are not aware or Mexican origin parents are not aware, because they are not being told, they are not informed, they are not

educated themselves. The teachers don't speak to them. There isn't that awareness in the parents that's created by the school and school personal. There is also the difficulty to overcome,... because we have a constant infusion of young immigrant parents. Young immigrant parents that do not come from the experience to come from parents that have gone to college. It's a new experience for them. They think in many cases that having their kids just going to school is enough. If they truly understood that education is more than going to K12 – graduating with a high school diploma they would do things differently. And there have been studies when workshops are prepared for parents to inform them, when they are offered in Spanish and their trainers come from similar backgrounds and are more mentors than they are lecturers and they are able to telling the parents what had happened to their children and what opportunities open up to their children, because they are educated and go on to college and then go on to professions. Then the mind sets of parents change and they become activated and become activists. So you have in different grammar schools and elementary schools very activist groups of parents.

A: And how is it in the larger society? People who are not migrating now – are they aware of the importance of passing on the information to immigrants of the importance of society? Is the larger society aware that an increase in education of immigrants would decrease problems that are caused in a multicultural society?

B: I don't think that the school as an institution and the staff is able to do that or trained to do that. Even today you would think that they would be helpful and that they would be foresighted. If you train all students of color you are preparing the work force of the future and you are going to be able to have a better economy of the state of California and you are going to be able to support all those retirees. That's a foresighted thinking person, but that's not how they think. That's not the way the way that the school as an institution thinks. They are thinking about right now, about today. How many kids do I have? What's the kid-teacher ratio? It's an institution that is embattled, because it doesn't have the money it thinks it should have. It doesn't have the resources that it thinks it should have. There is a constant battle within

the institution of what to do. They are not foresighted. They are not thinking one generation down into the future.

A: In a society there is not the awareness of the importance of education?

B: The society isn't there. It wasn't there in the 60s and it's not there 2011. For example in the 60s and 70s one other reason why we had a highly segregated school system and school district was because of the phenomenon of white flight. White families leaving the school districts and leaving the public schools. And the reason for that was a desegregation case called the "Crawford Desegregation Case" of Los Angeles City school district. The Crawford Case lasted from about mid 60s to 1982 – all that time. And if you look back in the history of school education here, you find that there was a very bitter period when in order to integrate the school system there was "Bussing". There was the movement of students from one school – the local school to another school, in order to change the numbers and mixing of students. The anti-busing-movement, the population that was against bussing, was primarily white. When bussing became one approach for desegregation of schools, white families started to remove their children from the schools into private schools and you still have that phenomenon. That's one of the reasons why L.A. unified school district is primarily with students of color. The white population is very small there. So go back to the 70s and early 80s with the political power the white sector had: they decided in large numbers to remove themselves, to not integrate. That's still the problem with L.A. unified school districts, because if they had the resources, if they had the funds, the white people would put their children in private schools. For example catholic schools increased their numbers, but also other private schools. We had that to deal with too.

A: What are the facts? What are the reasons for white people to remove their kids from those public schools? Do they fear a decrease of the English language?

B: On the face of it the argument against bussing was that it was dangerous to send your children off. You wanted to be good guardians; you wanted to have them closer with you. Close by in your neighborhood school. Number two: how dare you to take my children away from my neighborhood. That's a

decision that I as a parent should make and not the school system. Not you the state, not you the government. It's an intrusion in the decision that I as a parent should make. Those were factors that were stated. When they did studies why families were taking their kids out of the schools was that they didn't want their children to go to the schools, because there were gangs there, because there were drugs there, because the children in those schools were violent, because they didn't speak English well, because the curriculum was bad, because the libraries were bad, because the facilities were bad... Those were the actual reasons for parents not wanting their children to go to their neighborhood schools bussed over to a primarily Mexican-American school or to the black schools. Those were the actual reasons and some of them were true, because we were arguing that the schools were not good, that the facilities were not good, the curriculum was not good and that it has to be improved. So in some cases they were on target, but all these other things about gangs and violence, bad language, those reflected the prejudice and discrimination of parents. There was one study that was very clear, I have forgotten the name, but the parent that were surveyed there were clear, they were prejudiced and discriminating. I don't want my children to be in that Mexican school. They didn't want their kids to come together. How are you going to content against that attitude, that prejudice that exists? Some Mexican parents, I have to say, felt the same way. They didn't want their kids to go to that white school, because they feared that their kids would be discriminated and mistreated. So how much has changed? I don't really know. [laughs]

These are very deeply rooted and unfortunately those prejudices that were surveyed in the 70s and 80s by those parents are rooted in their children. And if the children were 15 in 1980, how old are they today. And then their children...

A: This question might be a bit subjective, but how do you think, this pattern or this vicious circle can be interrupted?

B: Well. Change has occurred. There has been a progress. In the 60s people were killed over their differences. We have made some progress, we have moved along. What I have determined is that we as human beings change

very slowly in terms of our attitude, but there has been progression. We are better people now than we have been in the 60s overall. Our society is better today than it was in the 60s. There isn't a continual progression, there is some upsetting moments and then we can make some progress, but slowly we seem to be evolving. The evolution is going to be forced by the fact that the Mexican population is so huge. The demographic changes are going to require a continual evolution of the way people interact, because there is not going to be a day that you or I is going to be out here without interacting with a brown skinned person. We are going to have to interact with them. I may be an employer, I may be employing brown skinned people. They have to interact with them. It'll come in every different setting, but the interaction will be there. Most of it will be good, some of it will be bad interaction, but most of it will be good and it'll cause the change.

A: It is fact that the Mexican-American population will grow a lot, but is it also fact that the Mexican-American population in higher education and at universities will grow in proportion to the population growth?

B: It's relatively small in comparison to the huge population that is there, but it's just enough to create that core that is able to move into the professions and start to create change too. In 1968 it was a core of students that was around 200 and 250, but if you establish that core you are able to create change. We are not talking about a mass of students at UCLA, but a very small group. In a school of, at that time it would have been a number of 25.000 students, 250 students [were Mexican-Americans]. And that's what I am hopeful of. That's what it is that is going to create that bright future that I see and we there will be young people, like my daughters, who have been educated, who have been prepared, who also have a service orientation. They are not in their professions for the money; they are in there to help people. My older daughter is a lawyer. She has been working as an immigrant lawyer for years and now she is working with foster kids and adoption. She is serving. The younger one is a councilor, but she is working to earn her second master as a therapist, to work in family therapy. She wants to be a therapist to work among poor families who are in a grieving process, who are losing one other family member who is dying. That's the sort of thing she wants to get into,

where she wants to work at. It's again a service orientation. And she is going to change the ways people are provided comfort as a therapist in that grieving process and the older one is dealing with Spanish speaking communities that need legal assistance in order to adopt children. They become in their world, in their professions, they become important change agents. Just like I was at UCLA in the 60s and then later on in my career. Change agents; you do create change by what you are able to do, but the only reason that you are able to do it is, because you have that educational base. You got that certificate, you got that diploma, you got that recognition, you are a person that has been educated, trained and prepared and you can do it.

How do you get to be a faculty member at the University of California? Well you better have a Ph.D. You better come from a recognized university and you better have done research and written and published. Those are important things. We have people that are preparing to assume those positions, not huge numbers, but they are in the pipeline. Education can be seen as a pipeline. Beginning with kindergarten all the way through graduate school and in some instance graduate school and in some instance post-graduate research and writing. This is the pipeline. Our pipeline is broken in several areas, where we have too many dropouts before graduation from high-school. Usually dropping out in 9th or 10th grade, but that's a leak, but we still have a flow, we still have a flow... We have a huge population to begin with and then coming through, coming through... In the very end, we have point two percent with Ph.D. [laughs], but since you have such a large base, that's meaningful. On the positive side I see that we are going to continue to produce people that are educated and prepared that will move into various professions and sectors and then they will become change agents and they see themselves as change agents. They see that this should be done in a different way.

A: One more question. It is very well put with the pipeline and the change agents. Do you think regarding education and immigration... if a person was struggling to move up that pipeline because of immigration, that when this person finally manages to move up, that this kind of person with that specific

background would be more able to create change? Because of their experience?

B: It depends. For example my wife and I are highly educated people and we were able to give our daughters much, much more than our parents were able to give us in terms of preparations, insights and values with regard to education with regard to public service and community service. On the one hands that's good, but if you see other couples that are highly educated and they want the best for their children, but they are directing them in a different direction. If you want your kids to be self serving, you can do that. The "Me-generation", it exists. There is plenty of that. So there is a mix happening with my generation and the one just behind me. They also have children who are in their 20s now. Maybe not 20s, but they have got students, young people that are students that are being educated. On the other hand is that what I found is that an immigrant student that is here and they are attending schools... You see a lot of bright stars coming out of that group. They are driven... In one of the factors that is driving them is that their parents are pushing them and the reason why the parents are pushing them is, because they don't want their kids to suffer in the way that they suffered. That's a huge motivator for parents. I don't want you to scrub floors the way I had to scrub floors. When you think of it in that way there is a great wealth that's an asset. That motivation is there for their kids, for their sons, for their daughters, even though some other values get in the way. The young girls are kept at home, because their fathers don't trust the larger society or the mother is crying, because the son is going out to college. Immigrant parents often have what is called assets of wealth in terms of their values and what they value and education is often one of them. We often think of immigrant parents of being illiterate and unable to comprehend that education is an important asset for their kids to earn and to be trained, but it's not necessarily so. If you think of an immigrant parent, someone that comes from Mexico and they are here and they have to work as blue collar workers and maybe they have to work in the fields. I have met so many kids from the fields that I have had experiencing working when they were young. They learned the value of work and they also know that's not what they want to do. [laughs] They tell

me these stories I worked when I was 6, 7 or 8 years old and it was backbreaking work and I don't want to do that anymore. I don't want to go back to the fields. I want to be educated and become a lawyer. [laughs] That's an asset, that's a wealth. It's a value system, because they experienced it and they learned, boy, that's backbreaking and I don't want to do that and their parents teaching them, go and continue your education. You don't want to do what I have been doing all my life. It's a mixed picture, but immigrants bring a lot of those assets with them, but what we have to do here is allow those assets to bloom, to blossom and to become important factors in the education of their children. The moment we think of them as illiterate and that they are not going to be useful we shut them off. I have never met a parent, and I talk to parents in Spanish, because that's their language,... I have never met a parent that didn't say "Quiero lo mejor para mi hijo." "I want the best for my children". And if you tell them that when they are educated, they get a better life. Then... "entonces education es importante" [Then, education is important].

8.3 Interview with Alvaro Huerta, Ph.D. Candidate.

On the 29th March 2011, 11:00 am at the CSRC in Los Angeles, California

Contact:

Alvaro Huerta

ahuerta@berkeley.edu

A: Madlene Knoll

B: Alvaro Huerta

A: For the beginning I would like to know some general information about you. How did you get into UCLA? And where did you go to high school before that?

B: Well. I grew up in... My parents are immigrants from Mexico and I come from a big family of eight. They didn't go to school. It was like a third grade education in Mexico and they worked in the fields. They came to the US in the late 1960. So I was born and raised here. I grew up in East L.A. in housing projects. So I got into UCLA in 1985 through... There were Affirmative Action Programs, but it was more because of the programs that were out there for minorities in this country that promoted education. For people that didn't have the money to hire tutors, then these programs through the federal government allowed for people like myself to go to university. I went to UCLA as an undergraduate and then I got my Masters at UCLA and now I am finishing my Ph.D. at the University of Berkley.

A: You did your Masters in urban planning, right? How did you get interested in that?

B: Well, the urban planning was looking at different programs in... I saw that there was more room there to help people. To work with poor people and to help them. I've seen the other graduate programs and a lot of them are more about making money. Like if you want to be a lawyer or if you want to be a doctor. I thought with urban planning you are a little bit more flexible.

A: And how big is the social component when you study urban planning? How much is thought about the segregation of a city?

B: At UCLA they are pretty good. At other programs they might not be, but at UCLA they do emphasize a lot about it. Once you are there, there are different opportunities. Some people do transportation or more real estate. It really depends on the individual.

A: What did you look at?

B: I was looking at urban immigration and things of that nature.

A: L.A. is a huge city. Would you say that segregation exists in this city? Are there also parallel societies that are not interacting too much?

B: Yes, definitely. What happens is that for example half of my life I grew up in East L.A. and the other half in West L.A. So when you live in East L.A. and you are poor and you don't have a car. Your whole world is about your 2 mile radius. Going from East L.A. to Santa Monica to the beach is like going from France to Spain. It's like going from one country to another. I am not saying that people don't do it, but in terms of reality... If your parents don't have a car or they don't have money it is very difficult to get there. Public transportation is very difficult, and also the reality is that you don't feel comfortable. That's all you know, but once you start going out it becomes a little difficult. That's one thing in terms of class. In terms of race if you live in West L.A. for example, you can be there for a year without seeing a black person. There is a racial segregation even though there is no signs like "No Blacks allowed" in this area. If you go to certain places, restaurants or markets... You can go most of your life without seeing black people. In order to do that – to see Black people you have to go to South L.A. There is that segregation where people feel uncomfortable, because they are the only Black person or because they are the only poor person. So a lot of times that alone will make it difficult. And the other thing is that if you are black or if you are looking in a certain way, or if you are Mexican and you are not a gardener and you are in Brentwood you get pulled over and you will be asked for your ID by the police. Even though there is no sign like "No Blacks allowed", if you are looking in a certain way. Like if you are young and you are Black or Latino and if you are dressed in a certain way then the police is going to harass you. That's another way of the way the city is segregated. And the last why I see it is segregated is if they want to get rid of certain

populations in an area they just raise the price of apartments. For example before in Universal Studios a lot of Black people used to go there and the parking was relatively cheap. So what they did was raising the parking rates. So once the rate was like 15 or 20 dollars you didn't see all these kids going anymore. Before it was free entertainment, but once you start charging people you start getting rid of poor people.

A: So there are inputs on purpose to segregate the city.

B: Yes there are.

A: You mentioned that people from East L.A. wouldn't feel comfortable... But the other reason of the housing prices... Is the City Planning Department aware of that problem, that in the long term the larger society would suffer from those effects? What effects of segregation would you name in the long term in a segregated society? Like effects on the economy...

B: I think, one of the main things it does is that it promotes the status quo. For people who are rich, well off or even middle class, to them it's fine that they are just surrounded by middle class. They don't want poor people in their neighborhood. So in Santa Monica, before they used to have like rent control and there was a lot of poor people and a lot of working people, but there is people that wanted to turn the city around and wanted to make it more touristy and bring in more money. Before a house used to cost 100.000 dollars and now it costs 2.000.000 dollars. They don't want a homeless person there now asking for money or a poor person hanging their clothes outside to dry. They don't want that. They are going to give a permit to allow for example a 5 % of low income people, but then the 95 % is market rate. The fact that they allow that is that people are institutionally discriminated. It's not like that they can do it the other way around. That they are going to do a public housing building here versus a condominium, because they don't want all these poor people, because the city should be seen as this beautiful touristy city where everything is nice and expensive to bring all these tourists in.

A: How is the quality of the schools in the poorer areas?

B: It's terrible. I went to a school in the inner city – in the Los Angeles School District. Especially now, when you have 35, 40 kids in one classroom and

there is only one teacher. The quality is really bad. You can go through 12 years or more of schooling and you can go without reading one book. I only read one book during high school. That was the "The Pearl" by John Steinbeck and I only wrote one two page paper. From Kindergarten through high school.

A: But how did you manage after high school to get into college? Did you do a lot of self studies?

B: I was good in math, that helped me. I did a lot of self studies with the writing.

A: But it was your own motivation?

B: Yes.

A: How were your parents? Were they supportive? Did they want you to get into higher education?

B: The thing with Mexican immigrants, like from the Caribbean or from Latin America, they are poor. They come here very poor. They have very poor education. The problem is that they can't help you. So if you get stuck in a math problem, in algebra, they can't help you. Like my son has problems in math and I can help him. They are making the minimum wage and you are struggling and you need a tutor. They can't afford a tutor. So that's the problem. Even if they want to be supportive. For example my mother wanted to support me in terms of education, but they didn't have a way of helping me. So if it didn't come from me. It wasn't going to happen. A lot of it is a combination of luck, or having one or two good teachers who pushes you. They don't let you decide, they just tell you "I want you to do this...". They don't let decide. They put you into a class and then you realize it is not too hard for you. A lot of times with poor kids, they grow up in the barrio or the ghetto, a lot of it is insecurity or the fact that nobody believed that they can do it. There are too many contradictions in this country. Like for Blacks – as long as they are entertaining us, everybody is happy. You know when they are good at basketball or baseball. Everybody is happy and cheery. But when it comes to having them in graduate school or Ph.D. school, you are not going to see them. Like all colleges, any colleges, unless you go to Utah, all of the football players are black. And you go to the same school and you look at the graduate school and you look at any department, there are no Black people.

So to get out of this ghetto and this bad, poor environment, sports have always been a way to do that. And that's one way that they accept you. But that is not that same support from society through higher education for Blacks or Latinos.

A: But would you say that the immigrant parents are aware of the fact that higher education is important for their children?

B: They are very aware. Their mindset is very simple, but profound. This is what they are going to say and this is universal. They are going to tell their kids, I want you to go to school, because I don't want you to work the way like I did. Now a lot of parents, not all parents are good, but a lot of parents want their kids to do better than them. So let's say your parents went to college, so they are going to say that I want my daughter to get her masters or become a doctor. That's the logic. Every generation should be better than the one before. In the case of immigrant workers, they know how hard it is, they have suffered all their lives, coming from a poor country. Then doing the same work, they are paid more, but the cost of living is higher, so their idea is... like... all this sacrifice. All that I am doing, I am only doing it so my son or my daughter can have a better education and a better future that I have. If that is going to happen or not is a different story, because they are not in control of everything. They are not in control. They trust the institutions of education of Los Angeles School District. They trust them to raise their children and to prepare them, but they can't, because there are too many children, not enough funds and they are not teaching them how to be critical thinkers. It's not going to get any better. It's actually getting worse.

A: Is the larger society aware of the fact that if you have a segregated society with poor schools and bad education, that you will keep the poor working class? Is there an input of the larger society to get those people into school? Because in the long run it would increase economy – if you just look at the economic aspect of integration.

B: I think there is the deep racism in this country that hasn't gone away. It is more subtle now. They don't want... They are resentful of having a black president. They are resentful of having a Latina in the supreme court. You have like a backlash. You have people who see it as ...you know they got

there as an affirmative action, because somebody did them a favor versus they worked hard for it. So there is a big contradiction. You have people who work hard, like Obama. They actually worked hard, they went to good schools, like Harvard, Princeton or Yale. You go to these elite schools and you do well and then you are going to make it and then they will say you are there because you are like a token, like affirmative action. We don't want you. So you are not really accepted. You are not really one of us. There is still questioning whether Obama is a citizen or not. So that's the way the racism comes in. So on the one hand they are telling Blacks, the reason you are poor is, because you don't work hard enough, because you are lazy and all you do is listening to rap music. You need to have discipline. Like when you look at the movies, for example at "Dangerous Minds" with Michelle Pfeiffer. You have schools that are like a jungle environment and everything is in disorder and you need this one... you need order. You need the one great white savior to put order to the school. And teaches these kids discipline. Once you have discipline then they are going to make it. That's the contradiction when one person does it, that one person is not accepted, but at the same time they are being blamed for not being that. You have it where the victims of racism in this country, for the institutional racism and racial segregation, are being blamed for their own ...so the burden is on them. The people in the society are telling them the reason that you are poor is, because you are lazy and you don't work hard enough. And then when somebody works really hard on their standards, then they are saying you are not one of us. You got here because of affirmative action. You are damned if you are doing it and you are damned if you don't. So I think the way the situation is right now is, that there are people that are fine with it. They are ok with it, because they don't want poor Mexican kids competing with their kids to go to UCLA.

A: And where does that stem from that deep rooted racism?

B: I think one of the reasons is the idea of individualism. There is a lot of self interest in the individual and there is this idea of this white privilege. If you are white, you are destined to be the leaders and the people who are going to be in control of society. If we have other kids competing against them... We

don't belief in welfare. They do everything that's possible to not make it equal, because it doesn't benefit their self interest. Because they want their kids to go to UCLA. Now in L.A. you are talking about 50 % Latinos. So if those 50 % Latinos would have an excellent education opportunity then UCLA would have a 50 % Latinos and then there would be less White kids and less Asian kids. So those kids, the White and the Asians, those are not going to be out there advocating for this equality for all, because it doesn't benefit them. So to them the way it is, is fine. If the public schools are terrible and you are not going to them, it doesn't affect you, because you are going to a private school. In the long run they don't care. It is very short sighted. It's like Bush has invaded Iraq. It is very shortsighted. It's the same mentality. It's a lot of short sighted thinking. They don't really care about the long term effects. Whether it is global warming, lack of universal health care... This country is very short term, very individualized. When you have groups that are living in poverty and going to poor schools they are not blaming the system, they are blaming the victim. They blame the people themselves. Because it is easy and they can wash their hands. It is like if you have a brother or a sister or an uncle who is an alcoholic, and you can look at it as a disease and at somebody who needs help, and it's beyond them in the fact that it is probably because of a factory close... If you look at it in broader terms of view and broader issues then you can see that this person needs help. But if you look at it from a perspective, where you are blaming that person and that it is a question of choice. He chooses to be an alcoholic, then it is easy to wash your hands. So you can easily say that he doesn't want help. I tried to help him, I offered him to stay here and I gave him some money... and he drank it away. So you end up washing your hands with any responsibility and the person is still a drunk. So the drunk abuses his kids and when those kids grow up they are drunks too. So what happens is that this cycle is perpetuated and the people who are separated from it to a certain degree, ...it benefits them to treat it that way. Like to put the burden on them... like it's your fault, because one is that they don't have to do anything, and two, because once they get involved then it takes something away from them, like time or money,... and I am not saying that it is

malicious. I am saying that it takes time, money and investment and it is not something what you could blame the individual for, you can't. It is a problem with society and as long as it is segregated and as long as the problem is only affecting certain kids, poor kids, black and brown kids, in general society is fine. They don't care. The people in power don't care, because it doesn't affect their kids. But once that goes to the suburbs, then it's a problem. Like in Columbine when they had that shooting. All of a sudden it was a big problem, like the world is going to end, because the white kids are killing each other. But black kids and Mexican kids have been killing each other for years and nobody cared. You see what I am saying.

A: So just to sum it up: You would say that there is no awareness in the larger society that there is a connection between urban planning, like where to locate good schools, and community housing for integrating society and the quality of education and how important it is and then what kind of job you get and which is all connected... like how much money you are going to earn later and what you can give to your children.

B: There is no awareness and there is an indifference. There is a level of indifference and I don't really care. It's not like I am telling you and then you are going to change. They just don't care. In some they do care – they do like more charity work. They are not going to sacrifice their own livelihood. They'll give money, to feel better. Like false charity. You give charity and then you feel good about helping the poor. I don't know if you saw the movie "The Blind Side"? It's a really good movie. It's a white family who are taking in the Black kid. I think with movies it is really good to watch, because you get a good idea. That movie shows the racism, once you bring in the Black child and her friends, who have been doing charity work, see that... Some other good movies. Some of the movies also blame the victims. They blame the parents...

A: Before I also had an interview about the representation of Chicanos in the movies and how this could create awareness. And the result was that if it is a very critical movie, people who are left would watch it, but you can't really reach out to the conservative people.

B: Yes. What happens is that you have actors that play certain roles, but the roles are very submissive. And a lot of actors are... In Hollywood it's a little tricky. Like the Latino actors say that we don't want to play maids or gardeners... This is the problem that I have. My mom was a house keeper. So they treat the maid like she is a drug dealer. As if it would be something that you have to be ashamed of, but there is nothing to be ashamed of if you are a maid or if you are a house cleaner or a gardener. They treat them like that... I don't want to be a murder, I don't want to play a role of a drug dealer, a murder or a child molester. Because the actors themselves are not educated. They don't know any better. They are just actors and they shouldn't be talking about society issues that are very complex, because... I mean, where do they get their information from? Were they reading Tolstoy? It doesn't make any sense to me. But people listen to them. They want to hear what Lindsay Lohan says or O.J. or all these dummies... So my thing is that, why don't you present a three dimensional... like humanize these people? To tell their stories and show how they are humane and that their lives are important and that they are contributing to society. This used to be a problem. So when you accept the frame that these immigrant jobs are no good and they have a low social status. Once you accept that then you internalize the racism. So when I was a kid and my mother was a house keeper, we received welfare and my father was a farmer. When I came to UCLA in 1985 and they went around the class and asked what do your parents do? I was embarrassed to say that my mother was a house cleaner, because I internalized that racism that being that was something to be ashamed of. Because when people see that on TV, all they see is that dumb workers, they are ignorant and they don't know any better. They can't speak English and they don't contribute to society... then you are ashamed and embarrassed because of that versus as you are a rich Mexican kid or a rich White kid from Beverly Hills and your father is a lawyer or a Hollywood executive. There is pride in there when you can say, my father did this movie or he represented that case. The kid feels that he is superior number one, number two he doesn't have that issue of being ashamed of being ashamed of what his parents do. So this wealthy kid comes together with this poor kid

that ends up going to university. Those inequalities are there within the university. A lot has to do with the way the society portrays these people and the value it gives to them. So when you are talking to a professor you have to call him doctor or professor. When you are talking to a gardener you just say: "Hey you, come over here!". Let's say you are a kid and you are 10 years old and you have a nanny – I say, I am not against all this; I mean these people have to work, but when the kid calls the nanny like if it's one of her toys or start telling her what to do. The nanny doesn't even have a name and it's more like "Come over here... and take me over there." You know the sense of entitlement and privilege is something that is already embedded in their heads.

A: Before when you said that the larger society doesn't really want immigrant workers to move up the social ladder and integrate them... So would you say that another solution would be to value the jobs more, to pay up and to create a different awareness of those kinds of jobs in a society.

B: Yes, definitely. Yes, because right now, once you stigmatize... When a job is stigmatized, when it's like an immigrant job, or a dirty job, then you don't have to pay them that much. So in general the employer benefits in being able to divide the workers. So there is people that benefit from that. If it's a dirty or an immigrant job, like working at McDonalds... because it's stigmatized, you are going to pay them the minimum wage or below, but once you start adding value to that and it's a dignified job, when you treat people the same, then you have to pay them more, you have to pay them the same. You have to treat them with respect, you have to give them health insurance...

A: Wouldn't it go hand in hand when a job is paid better, that it would be valued more by the society?

B: Yes, money counts. And in this particular society there is a lot of emphasize... you are valued of what you have. Because in some places you can be rich, but you don't have to show it off. But here it's like who has the biggest car, who has the biggest lawn, who has the biggest house. You could be two people and you can have 14 rooms and 5 bathrooms. So that person has more status and the person that has an apartment or no car, there is no

status at all or low status. So in that type of system, certain people benefit, but I am trying to say in general, that it is not enough to educate people, because even if you are educated, they don't want to change it, because they like it the way it is.

A: How would it be possible to change that value pattern? How can awareness be created in a larger society that every job is important to keep up the system? Would it be possible through education in school?

B: I think schools are very important, the way people are portrayed. When kids are growing up, they get a lot of information from TV or the movies they see. If you are a black little girl and you only see white actors when you watch a movie, or a Latina... Even though you are not told, the fact of what they are seeing is really what they are going to get based on. From the school to what's portrayed on TV and how it is portrayed on the internet and the movies, and also in terms of how things are represented in terms of government... The fact that we have a Black president, even though he is more of a moderate, it's important for Black people, because they feel if he can do it, I can do it too. He is one of us. He gives Black people hope that they can be president too, but before that you can say that you can do everything you want, but in this country there has never been a Black president before. One thing is saying it and the other thing is doing. These type of values... the whole system has to change. The only way it is going to happen is from the bottom up. People organizing and people fighting.

A: Like it has been with the Chicano Movement in the 60s. They achieved a lot.

B: Yes. And it has to come from the bottom, it's not going to come from the top, because it doesn't benefit them. They want it the way it is. They don't want... if the immigrants are going to move up the social ladder, who are they going to exploit? Who is going to do the yard and who is going to take care of their kids? Too many people benefit from cheap labor and from the immigrants in particular. So those people are not going to push for the integration of the immigrants; the full integration of immigrants in the society. It has to do with being racist, being hypocritical and it has to do with the American way. Americans appreciate equality, but they don't practice it. For immigrants for example. Instead of giving them amnesty or allowing them to be here without

that fear. What they want is a guest worker program. All it is is cheap labor, exploitable labor. They are just one nudge above slavery. All we want is your labor and then we want to dispose you when you are not good anymore. But you can't go to our schools, you can't get health insurance, you can't get social security. It's like a disposable culture. And that's all they care about. They don't care that those people are human beings and they have kids. When people say the immigrants are coming and say that they are using the health benefits from the emergencies... I say, yes of course they are. They should. That's the least that this country can do for them, because what they give is not equal to what they receive in return. They don't qualify for social security and medicare. Those are the two biggest programs in the budget. Apart from the military those are the two biggest programs. And they can't collect in their taxes, because a lot of them are using a fake social security card or are just paying cash. They are giving, but they are not going to receive equally. So their children are going to school... yes of course! They are going to the emergency... yes, what do you want!? Anything else is just slavery. That's just slavery.

A: So you think, because the larger society doesn't want to change, that the only chance to change the system is via grass root organizations.

B: Right. The bottom line is that the conservatives and the republicans, they know that the immigrants are hard working people, they know that. Because there is the need there and they come from a society where they start working when they are ten. It's already engrained in their mind, the discipline versus American kids. They are lazy. They grew up and the parents did everything for them. They could be 20 years old and they have never made their bed in their whole life. So it's a different reality, but they know that. Everybody knows that. When you lose your job it's easy to blame a Mexican. I lost my job because of him. But you never see them picking oranges or grapes or strawberries. I don't see you doing that. I don't see any whites on the corner as a day laborer. I don't see any Americans doing that. So they are not really taking your job, are they? If people would be really true about this then people should boycott... If they really believe that, then they should boycott the products what are produced by immigrants. So let's say, if you

are an immigrant and you are coming here.... Don't buy anything that an immigrant produces, because that's hypocritical, right? If you are against something. If you are against it, you don't want anything to do with it. Let's say you are Jewish and you eat kosher. You are not going to eat pork... so that's the principle think to not do. But let's say you are against it and nobody is looking and then you are eating pork, so that's hypocritical. You say for example: "I'm against all these illegals coming here." And the next thing you go to the market and you buy some grapes. The people who picked them are undocumented. And the reason you bought it for less than \$ 4 a pound is because somebody was paid \$ 3 an hour. Or they are not even paid hourly, but how many buckets they pick. Or the tomatoes. If you go to Taco Bell and you get a taco for under a dollar. The only reason because you are getting it, is because of how it is produced. There is the Mexican employer who picks the tomato and they are paid 15 dollars a day. So Taco Bell buys these tomatoes very cheap and as a consumer you are able to buy it at a low, affordable cost. So you are against immigrants and you are against of what they do, but you are benefitting from their cheap labor through your pocket book. Because if all these people were American and earning a good wage, then grapes would cost 10 dollars a pound. Or if you are buying a fashionable outfit, instead of paying 100 dollars you are paying 200 dollars. In that sense, people don't practice what they preach.

A: So do you think that the Americans are aware of that fact, that the current economy is only working because of the contribution of immigrants? Is there information, education out there to create the awareness of what illegal immigrants are contributing through their work to the American economy?

B: Some people know and some people don't want to know. It's just being hypocrite and they are not being honest. I think sometimes people want to blame somebody else for their own problems. So in this country they are thought to be responsible. To be accountable for your own actions. So let's say somebody gets fired from their job that is a white worker. So he is at home and depressed and everything. So instead of blaming himself, I should work harder or maybe I should go to college. He blames the Mexican or the Black guy, because it's easier. It's an easy escape. The whole country is in a

recession and instead of blaming the banks or the regulation of the economy. Instead of giving the rich the tax breaks and engaging the war in Afghanistan or Iraq... and all these policies that are very conservative and very anti-worker. Instead of blaming those people, ...then again it's because they are undocumented and because they come from Mexico and they drain all our resources. Now the people on top. They know that. They are lying. But the worker in Arkansas doesn't know it. But the people on top doesn't even want that worker to know. It's a way of dividing people. Any conservative business person knows that cheap labor benefits the bottom line. And they want the workers to keep coming. And they want a certain pool of people to be uneducated. The kids that grew up here. Kids in the barrio and in the ghetto. They [people in power] want that, because if everybody is educated who is going to do the construction and who is going to work on the freeway. They want those people there. It doesn't benefit society if everybody is educated. In this society it doesn't exist and they don't want it to exist. Only so many people can go to Harvard. And the only way that Harvard is going to be Harvard is, because it only allows, let's exaggerate, only five people out of a million. Once Harvard gives everybody the equal opportunity to go there, then it will just be a community college. So it's only through discrimination that Harvard is Harvard. If an idiot like George Bush can go to Harvard and get his MBA, what does that say about Harvard? You have an affirmative action for the rich, because they have these legacy programs. If your dad went to Yale then you go to Yale. They accept a few tokens to say that they have got diversity. A few Africans from Africa, the elite who are exploiting their own people. And then they say look we have diversity, we have a Black guy. But that Black guy is like a white guy. He is not an African American from the Ghetto. He is an African from Africa who comes from that cultural elite. So that's how these hypocrites operate.

A: What kind of roles do intellectuals play in that set of pattern? For example in the Chicano Studies Research Center. Most of the people here really worked their way up, right?

B: Yes. A lot did. A lot of the people... Their parents went to college. They are like in a privileged position, relatively speaking. So if your parents went to

college, you should go to college. If your parents went to UCLA and you don't go to UCLA, something is wrong. The reality is... For me to go to college was like a miracle. Because my parents were illiterate. They didn't even know how to drive. For my son to go to college, even though he is Chicano, he is expected to go from day one. He is going to go. I know how to fill out the application, financially... to do all that stuff. So even though my parents wanted me to go, they didn't have the tools to do it. It was just more of an idea. A lot of these people, if you talk to them, their parents went to college. So it's their advantage. It's like the second or third generation... If you are looking at the 50 million Latinos in this country right now, it's only like a certain segment of that and those are the ones that are at UCLA. Like my kids. That's the exception, that's not the rule. It's more my son... My son is going to be at UCLA, at Stanford or at Harvard. It is not because he worked any harder. It has to do with because he was born in a position where there was human capital that he can access. A facility for him to go to a top university, not just anyone. So that's what you have around here. Most people here they didn't suffer at all.

A: What role do they people play when it comes to publishing... What roles do intellectuals play to point that out, for example what the banks messed up regarding the current economic crisis?

B: You do have a lot of great people, for example like Noam Chomsky... The problem with them is that they are marginalized and that they are seen as... They are put in a certain category. So the New York Times would never publish someone like Noam Chomsky who is one of the greatest intellectuals of mankind. They only come like once in a lifetime, but you won't see them published in the New York Times, because he doesn't fit what they want. He challenges them. So they are only going to publish people that are nonthreatening. Who don't questions certain things of this country, things that the US promotes. The issue is when these intellectuals, these individuals at the CSRC, who are doing a great job, ...to find the issues in the greater society in a way that goes beyond the base. Because once you are just preaching to the choir, you are not going to get anywhere.

- A: So to sum it up. You would say the problem in a segregated society is on the one hand the lack of access for intellectuals to reach out to larger society to create awareness of what's going on and on the other hand it's in the poor areas lack of education is perpetuating. And also that there exists that sort of hypocrite that doesn't want to make that change happen.
- B: Yes, because it doesn't benefit their self interest and it's more about the individual. It's more about the I versus the we. And it's more about maintaining the white privilege. Once that is threatened then there is a backlash. The few that make it are questioned and challenged at a different level that others are not. All the challenges on Obama are based on racism. Not all of them, but a lot of them. Asking for his birth certificate, asking whether he is a Christian or not. That was never asked of George Bush. Or even McCain and he was born in Panama. The other thing is that a lot of intellectuals are unfortunately far removed from the same community. So they come from middle class. Their parents went to college. So there is no connection. My particular situation is more rare. And because I have that I am more sympathetic. So when I talk about immigrants and immigrant workers I am not saying it from an academic perspective. I am saying it from a personal perspective. But for a lot of academics it is more abstract. They don't know what it is to grow up poor. They never grew up poor. I am not judging them. My son doesn't grow up poor, so he doesn't know what it is to be poor. To him to be sympathetic when he goes to university is more of an idea, but to go beyond that, to have a real commitment to social change and to dedicate your life is going to take more. But if you grew up middle class and to you it is comfortable you don't want to disrupt that. Even though you want to go out and help the workers, you can't, because you have to pay the mortgage and you have to send your kids to school. You can write about it and everything, but it is more theoretical and more abstract.

8.4 Second Interview with Carlos Manuel Haro, Ph.D.

On the 30th April 2011, 11:00 am at the CSRC in Los Angeles, California

Contact:

Carlos Manuel Haro

charo@chicano.ucla.edu

+1 310 267 5290

+1 310 206 1784

A: Madlene Knoll

B: Carlos Manuel Haro

A: In your paper was mentioned that one of the demands of the Chicano Movement in the 60s was that classes should be held to teach Chicano history and also that classes should be held bilingual, bicultural education and there was a demand for more Mexican teachers in the schools. How did those demands turn out? Did they reach the goals? Is it happening now in schools what was requested back then?

B: I don't think any of the goals were met. There was progress or change that evolved due to the demonstrations in the 60s. Not only with the walkouts in 1968, but also efforts in various colleges, in other sectors of education. The demands of high school students in the walkouts in 1968... Some of them on that list are not really very important overall. Food in the cafeteria doesn't seem to be as important as others. But the important issues revolved around... oh, and incidentally demanded the corporal punishment... That's when a teacher could swat a student for punishment. Teachers had the authority to swat. They used a wooden board, like in cricket. They would make the student, usually a male, bend over and then they swat the rear end of the student. That was corporal punishment that was allowed. The students were demanding an end to that. If you see the film "Walkout", it gives you the Hollywood version of 1968 walkouts. Some of it is fact. The students were demanding a greater voice. The very serious demands revolve around their education. It was revolutionary. They were demanding equality in education

as they saw it. And one of the demands revolved around the curriculum. The courses that they wanted. They wanted in effect ethnic studies. They wanted Mexican-American studies or Chicano studies. Courses that provided the history of the people – of Mexican origin people in the southwest. That kind of history in reflection was not provided in many books, not taught in the schools and purposefully excluded in the schools. A couple of references that were made based on the book by a fellow at that time named Carey McWilliam – his book was called “North from Mexico”. And it was done in 1948. He was a progressive, very liberal writer in the 1940s. He wrote about Californian history, Mexican-American history and Native-American history as well. It was very interesting, but that was the book that people were reflecting in 1968, because there was nothing else. There was nothing out there.

A: Was it taught at high school?

B: No, no one taught that. No one used that book. This book is the bench mark for 1968 – what was available. Otherwise it would have been articles in one kind or another, but usually the articles were very negative about Mexicans in general. Magazines, Times, Newsweek – they were all fairly negative. Portraying Mexicans as being very negative. The other thing they wanted, was not only a curriculum, but they wanted bilingual, bicultural education. What was new about that was of course, that the school would never conceptualize of teaching students in their home language. That was out of the question. It was English and that was it. You succeeded or you failed in English – only English.

A: There were some subjects taught in English as a second language.

B: That was for immigrant student who were coming in who were monolingual Spanish. That had to be done, because the population was dramatically increasing of monolingual Spanish speaking student. They needed to have preparation to move into English course work. Now that’s one thing: a monolingual Spanish speaking student. That was the situation in Los Angeles city schools at that time. The population of Non-English speaking students was increasing. How do you deal with them? You put them in English courses the teacher can’t communicate with them at all. They don’t understand the simplest instructions, because it’s not their language. Even

this school district recognized that they had to do something and their approach was ESL – English as a Second Language. That was their approach in the 60s. It wasn't happening in the 50s. It was the approach in the 60s. That was occurring and even then ESL was very short lived in terms of the student. You either got it in a very short time, or you didn't. You went through ESL and you were quickly moved in into regular English language courses – very quickly. It wasn't a long term program for students – it was short term. Rudimentary. What the students in 1968 wanted was bilingual education to acknowledge that they spoke Spanish and they also spoke English. To built upon the home language; to built upon the Spanish language and develop their English to a higher degree, so they became more competitive. Then the other side of that was not only bilingual, but also bicultural. Recognition of a different culture other than that which was the culture that was being taught in schools. There was the dominant United States culture and there are these other cultural groups that aren't primarily national in origin. But even African-Americans were recognized of having a different culture. At the time in 1968 the students were demanding Mexican-American studies, bilingual – bicultural education, and then teachers. They were demanding teachers. And the thinking of that time was that the schools did not have any were near a sufficient number of Mexican-American teachers. They were demanding a larger teaching core of Mexican-American teachers. The concept was get a role model of a teacher, that looks like the students, relates to the students and was able to communicate with the students, who comes from the same community as the students. You'll change things and you create success in education. That was the concept. Progress has been made. There was course work, curriculum that was added. There were teachers that were added, but now we come to a stage where there has been a counter reaction to those initiatives in 1968. There was always a counter reaction, but the most frightened counter reaction is now in Arizona where they voted last year to eliminate ethnic studies in the schools at Tucson. What happened was irrational. It wasn't performance based, it was something else. It wasn't that the program was not succeeding with the students, not enhancing their academic success. It was other

reasons. It was the politics, the ideology of the elected politicians who voted not to provide the resources for it. They named a number of things, that it was un-American, that it was radicalizing the students, that it was permitting untruth to be taught at the schools. If you go back to the late 40s and early 50s those same sorts of approaches were used during the McCarthy Era throughout the United States. What's happening is that McCarthy is being recycled in the guise of what? What's the guise? The Neoconservatives are using terms like un-American. You have to be patriotic. You have to be true to the United States of America. You have to be red, white and blue. The mother country. Where have heard that before? The mother country? Serve the mother country. It comes up in different states, in different countries and it's recycled and it's unfortunate that it is happening again, but that is where the actions of the students in 1968 were trying to accomplish. This is what it's confronting today. But all along the line we had to confront those sorts of reactions against bilingual education, but the thing that was really fought against has been the cultural side. In the United States they don't like to have distinctive cultures in education. The effort has always been to be homogeneous. As if homogeneity in this society is going to be accomplished any time. [laughs] It's unbelievable how they think.

A: What is that idea of this homogenous culture? The US is very diverse.

B: They don't see that. They have an ideal in mind of what the true American culture is. And when a Mexican comes up and says: "I want to teach, or I want to learn more about my historical background." The true American culture wouldn't allow that. You are not adhering to our perceived true American culture. That's what we face now. The full blown reaction of biculturalism in ethnic studies has surfaced in Arizona, but it's also in other parts of the southwest. It has always been there. And people that used to wear in the 19th and 20th century the hoods. The Ku Klux Klan – they are now the Neoconservatives. What are they thinking of?? We are looking at the world in very different ways in very different classes. And they are looking at the world in... It's really a very difficult situation for this society, because this element is controlling in many ways of what's happening. They control in many ways what's happening in Arizona. What is even more of a concerning

matter is that voters put them in the office. Residents of the State of California elected these people. Then you have to consider the fact, those people that vote in Arizona and in most of the states in the US are not really representative of all the people. They are not. They are not representative of all of the people of the US. The people that vote in Arizona are not necessarily representative of all of the people that are residents of the State of Arizona that live there. Same thing in other countries. You can get control by having a minority who vote you in. It's bizarre. You know the Tea Party has taken control of the Republican Party. And they are out there in the fringe [laughs]. You read some of the things they say and it is incomprehensible how anyone has gained status and importance in terms of the political system in the United States. That has to do with our economy, it has to do with what Bush did during his two terms in office and how democrat Obama has to pick up the pieces and try to make it work. It took eight years to destroy it and he is expected to fix it. This country is in a very difficult situation and in that kind of environment where the initiatives of 1968 would not do well. Not in the context of 2011. Things have changed. They have gotten worse and initiatives for progressive change don't have much of a chance to move forward.

A: Would you say that those external influences – the economy, 9/11, the Iraq War – promoted xenophobia in this country?

B: Yes. Not much could be done during the Bush Era. It's unreasonable to expect that Obama is going to be able to push an aggressive agenda along. Although you have to consider the fact that health care reform was tried over and over again by the democrats. Going back to Kennedy, the first Kennedy. And then Johnson. But it never happened. Clinton. Never happened. He got something done, but he is paying the consequences now. In the last midterm elections.

A: Would you say that xenophobia and the economy are the new external influences that the Chicano community has to face to finally reach equality?

B: Yes, because one of the challenges is that our population, Mexican origin population, Chicano communities, are even more affected by the flow of immigrants into the community than in 1968. The population of immigrants

and first born in the United States is a greater part of the community now than it was in 1968. So the challenge is in terms of language, structure and so on, are even greater than they were in 1968.

A: How would you describe the difference of segregation regarding back then in the 1960s and now?

B: To finish up on the immigrant. The immigrant becomes a target for the society that is, for our society as it currently is, the immigrant population is seen as a challenge and a target for neoconservatives, the right wing, all those folks that are talking about one American society, a singular American society. They see immigrants as a threat in many ways, because they are changing the true American society into something else. That's what puts the population that existed in 1968 and their children and the influx of immigrants into greater difficulty. There is more challenges for us today than there were in 1968, believe it or not. Because part of our population is being targeted nationally for exclusion and removal or simple discard them. So if you don't value them why should you value them in education. And if you don't value them why should you value any part of that population of which they are a part. So we are less valued overall, because we have the stigma of being an immigrant group. That stigma affects us in all sectors, not only in education, but in the economy as well. It's there and it's going to grow. In good times you can accommodate, but in bad times what happens? And then you had the other question about... ahm...?

A: Segregation. But also those challenges enforce segregation. How would you describe this segregation different from 1968?

B: In 68 it was fairly clear. The demographic data was fairly clear, that Mexican origin students were more and more segregated into different parts of the city. East of the river primarily and some parts in the valley. San Fernando Valley. The reason for that was not de jure segregation that is by law, but rather geographic residential patterns. They were living in communities and they were growing in communities of alike people. Why only there? One reason was that that was the only area you could afford to live in. So there was some economic circumstances of pushing that. And the other reason was a sort of comfort level. You felt comfortable living in that area. It's true in

other countries as well. People tend to cluster in communities. Everything that was driving that in 1968... Our problem today is that that has continued, but what has enhanced, increased the problem is the population growth. The population of Mexican-American People in 1968 would have been the 3rd largest. First the white population, then the African-American population and then the Mexican origin population and the Asian population would have been 4th. But today in California the state has Mexican-Americans, Mexican origins, sometimes called Hispanics, sometimes called Latinos as the 2nd largest population in the State of California. It's surpassed the African-American population in California. And that it's also doing in other parts of the United States. So it has become the 2nd largest identifiable population in the senses in the United States. Ethnic origin, national group, whatever... Now recognizes the 2nd largest group. Given that tremendous population growth over the last decades it also means those clusters of people have continued and expanded. The schools in those areas are highly segregated. That is the only one group. Mexican origin group. That used to be in south-central of African-American schools. You could go to primary school, middle school and high school and have very few white people in a black school. Now those sectors have changed. There is Latinos and Blacks in the schools in south-central. That causes another kind of conflict among ethnic racial groups. But in the predominantly Mexican-American sectors; the high schools... At my time when I was in high school in East Los Angeles, the Mexican-American population would have been about 70 to 75 %. The other 25 % was Asian and White. Now it's over 95 % in the high school where I went to is Mexican-American; Latino. More segregated today than it was in the 60s.

A: One thing about the bussing. One thing why this incentive didn't work was, because White people removed their kids, because they didn't want their children to attend schools with poor resources. But also the Chicano Movement was pointing out that those schools have very poor resources are too poor and it has to improve. Were there people who tried to increase the resources instead of removing their kid and to try to make it work?

B: Those initiatives that occurred in the School districts. They had special programs for students that were bussed in from White schools and bussed

into predominantly minority schools. African-American and Chicano schools. Special programs for those kids who were bussed in. Especial enhancement programs. They benefited from that. But the phenomenon of white flight. That's what we called it: "White flight". Like a bird and an alligator. The bird sees the alligator coming and what are they going to do? They are going to fly away. [laughs] So the picture I had in my head was of a white bird and an alligator coming. And the alligator were those minority students. [laughs] Now that white flight phenomenon occurred in the 60s and 70s to the point where Los Angeles School District is not only the second largest school district in the United States, but it is also primarily minority schools of minority students school district. The white students were taken elsewhere by their parents. Private schools. Religious schools – primarily catholic schools. That has continued with the phenomenon of charter schools. The White Flight was not only based upon... The decisions to remove the White students from the school district was not only based upon the quality from the schools where they were taken to, because they were being provided. They had excellent programs. Imagine this: You are bussed from a white school in West Los Angeles and you go to a predominantly Mexican school in East L.A., grammar school, but when you are bussed in, you go to these special classes and you are segregated from the rest of school. So it's White students going to a Brown school, but they are segregated within that brown school. And they only get to interact with the top tier of the Mexican students. The very top tier. Those are the Mexican kids they interact with. If they interact with any of them at all. So it's segregation within segregation. And that occurred a lot. That's what made some parents say: "Oh, well. I try it." I send my son or daughter on a bus to that school as long as you give me what you promised in terms of the best teacher, the best courses and the best preparation for my son or daughter.

A: So to try that incentive; to try bussing. There must have been an awareness before that segregation isn't going to do well in the long run, right? Where did that go? Why don't white people care about the segregation anymore? Or are there incentives now to fight segregation?

B: There is not much that can be done in a school district this large when the student population is all students of color. What are you going to mix in? How are you going to integrate that population?

A: Are there incentives of the city planning department to build schools or social facilities that are more distributed over the city?

B: One of the issues of 1968 was the facility and that it was overenrolled. A quality issue. When you have 4000 students in a facility that was supposed to accommodate 2500. That was an issue at most of the schools, because the population had grown dramatically in the 60s and there was overpopulation at the schools. The schools had been constructed in the 30s and 40s. And suddenly they were inadequate. They were not only old schools, but there were insufficient number of classrooms to accommodate this booming population. The school district had constructed high schools in East Los Angeles until two years ago. They built two new schools. The population that benefited from the construction boom of schools was primarily the white population in the 50s. You see propositions, bonds to build schools being passed while the voters of the 40s and 50s into the 60s... And suddenly no one was interested in supporting the building projects. The building of schools. No more interest in that. They didn't want to spend money. It wasn't only the voters, but also the planners. The people in the administration of the schools and city government. They were saying that there is not enough money. You can't do it. There is not enough voter interests to pass the bonds. And the bonds were... They say: "We are going borrow 50 million dollars to build schools and the people will pay them off slowly via taxes." A penny here, 2 cents there, 5 cents over here... The voters were not interested in doing that anymore. So we remain with the old buildings that benefited the earlier student population, but with not accommodating the population explosion that occurred in the 60s and onward.

A: But the schools are still very overcrowded. Yesterday when I talked to Mister Huerta, he saw the only chance for initiating a change are grassroot organizations, who activate... Like the Chicano Movement. They had that time and power to initiate that change. Do you see a movement like that coming up now?

B: It's amazing what might occur. You and I never dreamed of the Egyptians rising up. Or other populations in Middle Eastern countries would rise up against their dictators, but that is happening. It's human nature to want democracy, to want freedom. I think it's also part of us to want the best for our people. It's easy to understand that parents want the best for their children. It's possible that there can be a resurgence, but at the present time the strength and the mobilization seems to be on the far right. We had our sort of demonstration of power and strength with the 2008 elections of a man no one thought who would have ever been elected to be president of the United States. And then that happened and there was mobilization. There is an ebb and flow... There is an ebb and what happened was, the other side rose. It has been mobilizing and their target is the next election. Mobilization in the community, the challenges that it is facing right now may cause that mobilization, the challenges to Mexican immigration... that's one that might cause... The challenges for increase costs at schools. Especially at the college and university level. And then the treatment of students in the schools. From kindergarten all the way to 12th grade. There are issues there that might cause mobilization. What that means is that there is confrontation. The 68 movement was denoted by confrontation. Continuing confrontation. The 68 walkouts of high school students, what was that? An essence of confrontation. Getting to the point where you are fed up and you say no one is listening to me, I am going to confront the system, I am going to fight. Same thing happened here at this schools, same thing happened at other schools, where there was confrontation to make a change. Are our parents at that point where they are willing to make confrontation, mobilize and confront the school system? I don't know. Maybe I am too far from the grassroots, but I haven't seen that rise, that mobilization at the grassroots level. I haven't seen it. I have seen clusters, where people of a school come together and force change at a school, but not at the entire school district. A mass mobilization, I haven't seen that.

A: What are the reasons for that?

B: The people that are mobilizing are caught up in day to day living. Making it from one day to the next. You get fed up though with that and you are likely

to do anything. That's why we have occasionally a riot. People throwing rocks at the store, because they were charging them 50 % interest rates to get their refrigerator. [laughs] That's likely to happen. Another incident in the community, but that'll be in one community and not the entire Los Angeles area. But who knows? There are some strange things happening in the world. Things that you could not have predicted. It might happen in this society. Some people are completely fed up by what is being done by the far right. Their act against the labor movements, against unions. Against the health and welfare of those in need. Those who need support. It might create a counter. And within that act of reaction there might be a mobilization of the Mexican and the immigrant population, but they have to identify their self interest. And they have to act on it. What is it that we need? What is it that we want? And then mobilize to it. Here it's fairly concrete. Within the Chicano Movement – within the civil rights movement, it was fairly clear what we could do here. We demanded a research center, we demanded a library, we demanded curriculum. You know things that could be done within an institution, like this university.

A: One more question about the influences that created xenophobia. How would you value the influence of the illegal immigrants and the discussion about the border. How does that affect the immigrants who are living here and who are trying to integrate?

B: There are immigrants that are considered having legal status. They are trying to succeed like everyone else, but they are motivated in a different way. The motivation is different for them than a second or third generation Mexican-American. Their motivation is that they start from a nothing and they want to work up to something. They don't have the advantages. I think they are highly motivated to make change for themselves and their families. Mother and father are highly motivated and they are providing that in their children. But there is another group of immigrants that would not be considered as having legal status. And that's a significant group. It's a large number. It's unknown how large the number is. It could be 15 million, it could be 16 million. Los Angeles has a large population of immigrants that do not have legal status. Their situation is very difficult. It's tension filled, stressful. They

live from day to day hoping not to get caught. There are some songs about it. The “Tigres del Norte” sang a song about “La jaula de oro” the cage of gold. The man is singing about his experience. He doesn’t have documents. He has his family here. He is raising his children here. He can’t go out on weekends. He can’t live a social life. He is caught, he is trapped and he is limited with what he cannot do. And then he has a son and he tries to encourage him to learn about Mexico and even to go back to Mexico and experience that. And the son says no, that’s not for me. I am an American. [laughs] He is rejecting his fathers’ culture, rejecting the fathers’ identity of who he is. Imagine being put in that position as a father and as a man. That population is suffering in a way that we could not ever understand fully. You can identify certain data, they are the poorest of the poor and they work the hardest of anyone. They earn less than anyone. They do anything to work and then they have all these other challenges that they have to deal with. Raising their family. Once they come here. Once they get across the border and once they are able to settle down. Hopefully have work. There is always the attempt to bring the wife and the children, the people that they left behind and many succeed in doing that. It’s a constant crisis for them. And then you have children of undocumented people. Children that were brought here very, very young and they may go to school not knowing that they don’t have papers. And when they go to college then they find out that they are not eligible for financial aid, because they don’t have social security numbers. They don’t have legal status. They are not eligible for federal loans. They are not eligible for most of the support that’s given by college or university. Imagine that young man and women don’t learn about their undocumented status until they are at college age. They go through life thinking that I am as American as anybody else. They go through life interacting with others unaware of what their legal or illegal status is. And then they find out either when they apply for university submissions or when they apply for financial aid. It must be a horrible experience to have. But there are many, many young people in that situation. They are here without documents. Brought here as infants or very young children. Carried over by their mother or father. It’s a sense of limbo. We had a conference... and there are books written by

young people about their experience who were in just that kind of a situation. It's also causing a huge identity crisis about who I am. The legal response is to pick you up and ship you to Mexico. The country where you were born, but you have no sense of being a Mexican. Never lived in Mexico. It's not only a question of legality. There is much more to it. It's a much more complex situation for those people. And as I say there are a significant number of undocumented college student.

A: Would you say that the right winged party is exploiting the discussion about the undocumented and the discussion of the border?

B: The response to that kind of a situation is that, you are here illegally and you have to go back to Mexico or Central America. There is also stigmatization and blaming of the illegals in connection to the economy. It's all part of the complex situation in which we are living. But they are paying the prize in a way that very few others are paying the prize. They are considered as taking something from the United States and taking something from the US citizens. Taking something from someone who was born here. They are taking something. At the same time we talk about the brain drain. People moving out of this country highly trained and highly educated. They are leaving the United States. And these are people that could be educated and trained and prepared to assume important positions. But they don't see that. That is not recognized. You are here illegally and you have to go back to the country where you were born. El Salvador, Guatemala, Nicaragua or Mexico it doesn't matter. You have to go back.

A: Would you say that the people who vote for the right wing parties would link illegal and legal immigrants? To cut off legal immigrants and to not want them to integrate – is there a connection? Or do people differentiate?

B: The ideal for the far right is to stop immigration coming from South America. That's their goal to stop it. There are too many of them here already. Why should we open the borders? We don't need any more people, we don't need any more labor. There is no reason for it. Whereas in the 40s and 50s they welcomed workers, but right now the preference, the goal for the far right is to stop immigration all together. First the immigration from the south and then the immigration from Asia. They don't talk about immigration from Europe too

much. [laughs] Because they think the history of their families is from Europe. That's what they think. They imagine that. That's their imaginary singular America.

A: So they welcome migration when there is a similar cultural background?

B: Yes, people they identify with. It is primarily white, white population. How odd it is though that the primarily English speaking people – the Tea Party people – they don't have second or third languages. And I was thinking one day, what would they think of having someone from, it could be Germany, they primarily speak German... Is that an American model? Does it fit? Well... they are from Europe and they are white. [laughs]

A: It seems strange to define the national culture of any country. Because what is it?

B: Exactly. What is it? You in Europe are going through it. Especially in Germany, France and Britain. You will have to deal with the immigrant workers from East Europe going into your countries.

9 Abstract

Unsere gesellschaftlichen Strukturen unterliegen, heute mehr denn je, einem ständigen Wandel. Seit 1989, mit dem Ende des Kalten Krieges und durch das Aufkommen neuer Informations- und Kommunikationstechnologien, hat das Phänomen der Globalisierung einen neuen Level erreicht. Durch die Eigenschaft der Transnationalität und einer Aufweichung nationalstaatlicher Grenzen werden die Auswirkungen der Globalisierung heute noch spürbarer. In diesem Zusammenhang hat auch das Phänomen der Migration, welches von einer wachsenden Globalen Ungleichheit weiter angekurbelt wird, neue Ausmaße angenommen.

Aber wie soll nun das Leben innerhalb nationalstaatlicher Grenzen mit multikulturellen Bürgern gestaltet werden?

In der Vergangenheit basierten Integrationsmodelle, die meist von Wissenschaftlern aus typischen Immigrationsländern entworfen wurden, vor allem auf dem Paradigma der Assimilation von neu zugewanderten Bürgern. Allerdings haben diese Integrationsmodelle nicht zu dem gewünschten Ergebnis der Homogenisierung der Staatsbürger geführt – Migranten konnten der Aufforderung, ihre kulturelle Vergangenheit und somit einen Teil ihrer Identität abzulegen, nicht Folge leisten. Da durch die oben genannten Charakteristika der ‚neuen‘ Globalisierung der Kontakt zwischen Herkunfts- und Ankunftsland noch intensiver aufrecht erhalten werden kann, und man sich jederzeit die Sprache des Heimatlandes durch einen simplen Anruf ins Wohnzimmer holen kann, oder durch die virtuelle Teilnahme an der Taufe des Enkels, der tausende Kilometer entfernt ist, wird die Umsetzung und Vorstellung einer homogenen nationalen Identität und Kultur immer mehr in Frage gestellt. Ein Festhalten an einer imaginierten homogenen nationalen Kultur und Identität, die es ohnehin nie gegeben hat, scheint heutzutage nicht mehr mit der Realität, die uns umgibt, konform zu sein.

Daher sind Entwürfe neuer Integrationsmodelle längst nicht mehr ausreichend, denn es bedarf einer Reformation unseres Gesellschaftsmodells, das bislang

auf nationalstaatlichen Prinzipien basierte und zu einer zeitgemäßen Beschreibung unserer Realität nicht mehr brauchbar ist.

Das Modell der Hybridität, das im Diskurs der postkolonialen Kritik eingebettet werden kann, basiert auf Annahmen zu Kultur und Identität, die sich im ‚Raum‘ außerhalb nationalstaatlicher Grenzen verorten lassen.

Diese Arbeit versucht, basierend auf diesem Modell, eine zeitgemäße und konstruktive Integration von Migranten zu entwerfen. Das ‚Chicano-Movement‘ in Kalifornien, war ein Vorreiter im Kampf um ihr Dasein als Hybride Gruppe und Individuen. Es hat einerseits für die Anerkennung von gleichen Bürgerrechten gekämpft, ist aber andererseits auch für den Kampf um die Anerkennung ihrer hybriden Identität und Kultur bekannt. Dieser zweite Aspekt dieser einzigartigen Bewegung wird als Beispiel herangezogen, um ein funktionsfähiges Gesellschaftsmodell zu entwerfen, das auf Hybridität basiert und daher den Anforderungen unserer heutigen Zeit gerecht werden soll.

10 Curriculum Vitae

Name	Madlene Knoll
Date of Birth	16 th September 1984
Place of Birth	Freistadt, Upper Austria
Citizenship	Austrian
Contact	madlene.knoll@gmx.at

Education and Employment

2004	School Leaving Examination at HLW Freistadt; Secondary college for economics and tourism
2005	Study of Political Science and French at the University of Vienna
July 2006	Participant at an international aid project and teaching English in Ubon Ratchathani, Thailand
Aug–Sept 2006	French course at “France Langue” in Paris
Summer 2007	Summer School “China Know How” at Beida University in Peking and at Fudan University in Shanghai
2007	Study of International Development at the University of Vienna
Sept 2008–Feb 09	Internship at the Sino-German Cultural and Economic Association in Taipei, Taiwan
Sept 2008–Feb 09	Chinese course at the TLI in Taipei, Taiwan
July 2009	Participant at the Workshop „The Representation of the Palestinian cause in Europe“ in Damascus, Syria
Since August 2009	Employee at a centre for Unaccompanied Refugee Minors in Linz, Austria
Main focus of my studies	Migration and Integration Politics, International Development and International Politics
Languages:	German (mother tongue), English, French, Spanish, Chinese (speaking)