CHICANO MOVEMENT CHICANO STUDIES: SOCIAL SCIENCE AND SELF-CONSCIOUS IDEOLOGY

Raoul Contreras

Introduction

In the Spring of 1993, the University of California at Los Angeles (UCLA) made a dramatic concession to the demands of a 1960s-like protest by a coalition of Chicano/a students, faculty, and community activists. Forced to negotiate with this coalition, administration officials agreed to upgrade the "program" in Chicano Studies on that campus to "departmental" status.[1] This event was a significant chapter in a political movement for Chicano Studies that is now more than 25 years old.[2]

The focus of this article will be an examination of the events at UCLA in terms of their historical and social theoretical relationship to Chicano Movement politics. More specifically, it will examine how the events at UCLA reasserted Chicano Studies' central defining character as a social science *and* a "self-conscious ideology" of the Chicano Movement.[3]

The intent is to use this analysis to illuminate how the political events at UCLA reconfirmed that "self-conscious" social identification *as an ideology* is itself a central component of Chicano Studies. It will be argued that this is because a central ideological component of traditional social science, in opposition to which Chicano Studies emerged historically, is its own social identification, its own social identity, as a "non-ideology." That is, traditional social science is allegedly based in universalistic and disinterested academic values and traditions of the European Enlightenment.

This argument will be made through social theory based on the concept of ideology, the historical perspective of world systems theory, and the idea of Chicano Studies articulated during the Chicano Movement in journals such as *El Grito* and *Aztlán,* and in *El Plan de Santa Bárbara.* It will develop through five parts. First, there is a brief description of key political events at UCLA in 1993. Second, a theoretical view of ideology is elaborated. Third, the role of ideology in the political events at UCLA is examined. This will be done through an analysis of the idea of "legitimate social science" that was used to oppose Chicano

Studies on academic grounds. Fourth, a historical analysis unveils the ideology of "legitimate non-ideological social science," and finally, this article's idea of Chicano Studies is elaborated from analysis of early Chicano Movement writings.

UCLA, 1993

In early June 1993 administrative representatives of UCLA made a dramatic capitulation to student demands for a Chicano Studies Department. The significance of winning departmental status for Chicano Studies at UCLA was twofold. First, the university formally committed itself to providing academic resources that were commensurate with such status. This included hiring six new full-time faculty to be the teaching core for the new "Center for interdisciplinary Instruction in Chicana and Chicano Studies."[4] More importantly, by gaining departmental status the Chicano community at UCLA formally won the right to a "self-determination" concerning the development of Chicano Studies on that campus.[5]

The immediate catalyst for a sudden turnabout by the UCLA administration was a hunger strike by Chicano/a activists. Shortly before this action, UCLA Chancellor Charles Young, in a publicly aggressive fashion, had re-asserted the university position of adamant and categorical opposition to upgrading the campus' Chicano Studies inter-departmental program to departmental status.[6]

However, the willingness of the hunger strikers to hold out to the end gained national media coverage, and it provided the student-led movement at UCLA with a moral highground over its administrative adversaries. Further, the confrontational time frame imposed by the hunger strike tactic worked to the advantage of the Chicano Studies activists. It served to intensify and expand the political support of the Chicano community in Los Angeles and surrounding areas, and also drew some influential Chicano, other racial minority, and Anglo politicians into the coalition. According to university officials, this coalition of support that mobilized behind the hunger strike became a "gun to its head" and forced an accommodation to student demands.[7]

It would be a mistake, however, to view the Spring 1993 events at UCLA in terms of the single dramatic moment implied by the administration's image of conceding to a "gun to its head." Actually, as noted above, UCLA administration officials conceded to a student-led movement for Chicano Studies then

more than 20 years old on that campus. Even in a historically limited and narrowly immediate sense the hunger strike's impact developed from its coalescing and giving focus to a year-long organizing effort by various student groupings (Chicano/a, other racial minority, and multi-racial student groups).

For example, in May 1993, in an act that may have had even more bearing on the course of events than the hunger strike, Chicano/a students led a multi-racial mass student occupation and shutdown of the main administrative office building. This led to an assault by riot police, called for by UCLA's vice-chancellor, and mass arrests of students. In turn, this led to intensified organizing, rallies, and demonstrations which eventually led to the hunger strike. Further, these student actions were concurrent with a publicly circulated and widely publicized curriculum/organizational plan for a Chicano Studies Department that was developed by Chicano/a faculty at UCLA to challenge and contest the chancellor's opposition.[8]

The focus of this article, however, is not on those specific events, but on the politics of which they were an expression. Historically, these politics have characterized both the political process of forming Chicano Studies and Chicano Studies itself.[9] More precisely, the intent of this analysis of events at UCLA is to posit and to elaborate upon a central component of the *ideology* of those politics.

The argument is that "self-conscious" social identification, a social identity, as an ideology of the Chicano Movement is itself a central ideological component of Chicano Studies. The meaning and significance of this assertion presumes a theoretical view about ideology, and an analysis of ideology's practical role in the political events at UCLA.

What is Ideology?

In terms of its varied and even contradictory modes of utilization, arguably, there is no more problematic a concept in social science than that of "ideology."[10] Thus, elaborating upon the specific ideology characterizing the politics of Chicano Studies presupposes a theoretical statement about what the concept will refer to in this article. Terry Eagleton's theoretical and historical analysis of the concept generates two points that will be used in this article to explain the political role of ideology.[11]

First, he generalizes that ideology makes reference to the *relationship* between a system of beliefs and the way power is exercised in society. That is, ideology

refers to how a system of ideas, like Chicano Studies, can serve to legitimize specific interests, and a specific political agenda for pursuing those interests, within a field of competing interests and political agendas. In terms of this first point, a system of ideas is ideological if it serves to legitimize a specific interest and political agenda by providing intellectual explanation and moral justification for that interest and agenda.

Essentially, Eagleton's analysis suggests that a system of ideas, like Chicano Studies, is ideological if it serves to *circumscribe* a relatively specific political direction, orientation, and method. This would be accomplished by the way the system of ideas explains and morally justifies interests that underlie *social action* that aims either to preserve and maintain, or to erode and reformulate, the way that power is exercised within a given social order.[12]

Martin Seliger developed a working definition for this first point about the political role of ideology and how it will be used in this article.

> . . . (Ideology is) sets of ideas by which men posit, explain and justify ends and means of organized social action, and specifically political action, irrespective of whether such action aims to preserve, amend, uproot, or rebuild a given social order.[13]

Eagleton's second point in defining the political role of ideology makes reference to the constitution, or formation, of a specific social identity. He derives this idea about the relationship between ideology and social identity from the influential theoretical work of Louis Althusser.[14] For Althusser, ideology represented conceptually the "lived relations" by which a person's connection to society was expressed *and* produced. He used ideology to explain how a person is connected to social reality *through* one's affective relations with the world. Those affective relations, according to Althusser, were not necessarily self-conscious.

Althusser theorizes that a person experiences social reality through "lived" affective relations to it. Ideologically-speaking, one becomes bound up in that social reality when those experiences cause an individual to invest part of her or his identity, a crucial part of what it is *to be* oneself, into those lived affective relations to social life.[15] Essentially, Althusser was theorizing that it was through one's affective identification with a particular set of beliefs, meanings, values, ideas, or symbols that one's lived relation to social life, one's social identity, was expressed and produced.

In terms of this second point, a system of ideas, like Chicano Studies, can be ideological if that system of ideas becomes an object of individuals' affective identification. As such, the system of ideas serves as a nexus, or a meeting point, for those various individuals' affective relations to social life and becomes, like the hub linking the spokes of a wheel, a basis of common social identity among them.

Eagleton provided a working definition for this second point that explains the present article's idea about the political role of ideology.

> . . . ideology is no mere set of abstract doctrines but the stuff which makes us uniquely what we are, constitutive of our very identities . . . It appears often enough as a ragbag of impersonal, subjectless tags and adages; yet these shop-soiled platitudes are deeply enough entwined with the roots of personal identity to impel us from time to time to murder or martydom.[16]

Theoretically, the image of ideology generated by these two points is a combined intellectual/moral perspective toward the exercise of power in society, *and* a social identity that lives that perspective in its political life. Theoretically, then, the argument is that Chicano Studies is a social science, and it is a *socially based idea(s)* about the exercise of power in society. Importantly, this social base, the social identity of ideology, is constituted *through* its lived affective identification with the system of ideas manifested by Chicano Studies.

Chicano Studies and Legitimate Social Science

A first step in assessing the role of ideology in the political events at UCLA is analytically distinguishing the ideology from the politics in that situation. In this analysis politics will be used to refer to the conflict manifested by the "power processes" through which social order is sustained or challenged. Ideology will be used to analytically denote how these power processes generate, and *are generated by*, conflict within the field of signification (beliefs, meanings, values, ideas, and symbols).[17]

For example, in the events at UCLA, on the side of the Chicano Studies coalition, there were power processes such as the student occupation of the administrative building and the Chicana/o faculty's calculated publicized exposure of their plan expressing need for a Chicano Studies Department. On the UCLA administrative side, there were power processes like the chancellor's public pronouncement and institutional directive against a department, and the order to

forcibly remove students occupying administrative buildings.

Ideologically, these processes that characterized the Spring 1993 events at UCLA (re)generated, and were (re)generated by, conflict about the meaning or idea of social science.[18] These conflicting ideas served to explain and to justify, and thereby to legitimize, the political power processes of the student-led movement for Chicano Studies on the one side; and the political actions manifesting the chancellor-led university opposition to Chicano Studies, on the other.

It must be emphasized that this conflict of ideas was *not* a theoretical one in relation to a practical reality of the political power processes. Actually, in a logical sense, the conflict in ideas about social science at UCLA was *constitutive* of those political power processes.[19] This is the significance of the second theoretical point about ideology elaborated above.

This is to say that the political power processes on both sides at UCLA, but especially those of the Chicano Studies coalition, *presumed* the social construction of a relatively unified social force, moving in a relatively unified direction, and working through a relatively unified method of political activity. This social force emerged from what was otherwise, in terms of their motivation and orientation, a *relatively heterogeneous* assortment of individuals and groups. This socially constructed unity, presumed by the power processes at UCLA, was at its origin the social identity generated by those individuals' and groups' affective, though not necessarily self-conscious, identification with a Chicano Studies idea of social science. This identification provided the intellectual explanation and moral justification for their political commitments.

To fully grasp this sense of ideology as a specific socially constructed identity, it is necessary to guard against an overly rationalistic understanding of the role of ideology in the political events at UCLA. That is, the relatively unified social force manifested by the Chicano Studies coalition was *related* to the rationality of the idea of social science that was the object of the coalition's affective identification. However, it was the socially constructed identity, and not some commonly agreed upon rationality to the Chicano Studies idea of social science, that was the principled base for a shared discourse within the heterogeneously oriented and motivated Chicano Studies coalition. As suggested by a developed body of literature on theory of ideology, it was the social identity realized through ideology that was the base for a common discourse within the coalition for reaching political resolutions (compromises) to political problems (disunity and social

fragmentation) in a political way (organization).[20]

A Political Assault On Academic Values?

A brief analysis of UCLA History Professor Robert Dallek's Op-Ed piece in the June 9, 1993, *Los Angeles Times*, "A Political Assault on Academic Values," will draw out the conflict in ideas about social science manifested by the political events at UCLA that Spring. The premise is that Dallek's article was a representative popular or common sense expression of the idea of social science that served intellectually to explain and morally to justify the university's political opposition and resistance to Chicano Studies.

Sarcastically nominating the Chicano protest for that year's political correctness award, Professor Dallek summarized a litany of dangers, real and potential, to the university and its mission, that were allegedly manifested by the administration's "forced give in" to protesters' demands. For example, the agreements that ended the Spring 1993 political conflict at UCLA called for student participation in faculty hiring. This student participation, Dallek warned, would be a "sure fire prescription" for undermining UCLA's commitment to upholding "serious academic standards." The entire process by which Chicanos/as won their department was "a throwback," continued Dallek, to a time when people more intent on "advancing an agenda" than serving legitimate academic ends tried to impose their political ideas on the country's universities. The result, asserted Dallek, will diminish UCLA's integrity and further contribute to a "disuniting of America."

Addressing the specific issue of the Spring events at UCLA, Dallek argued that university departments were not created "to satisfy political demands." They were organized around disciplines that rested on knowledge and understanding developed over a long period of time. Significantly, he was here not only castigating the political means, he was questioning the legitimacy of the political goal as well, as he inferred that Chicano Studies "lacks the body of critical scholarship essential to an academic discipline."

Truly galling to an indignant Dallek was the tendency of student protesters to describe as racism the opposition to Chicano Studies departmental status by faculty members like himself. In fact, Dallek inferred, it was the political movement for Chicano Studies that was (presumably reverse) racist as he pointed out that "the answer to racism, ethnic bias, and gender discrimination is not a like

response." Do not the proponents of Chicano Studies know, chided a contemptuous Dallek, that the 19th century Irish immigrants, even though they were a despised minority, did not seek consolation in Irish studies.[21]

Residually, Dallek's opposition to Chicano Studies was also an outline for an idea about "legitimate social science". The way that opposition to Chicano Studies departmental status was intellectually explained implied the dominant university image of social science. It implied an idea of social science in which serious academic standards and legitimate academic ends are such because they are free and unrelated to political agendas and political ideas. "Legitimate social science" is departments and disciplines that organize distinct bodies of knowledge that have been developed over long periods of time; certainly they are not, like Chicano Studies, the satisfaction of political demands. Most importantly, the dominant university conception of social science is a place logically and morally removed from problems of race.

Central to my argument is that the idea of "legitimate social science" implied by Dallek's opposition to Chicano Studies is a *different* conflicting ideology of social science. In other words, "legitimate social science" is an intellectual explanation and moral justification for maintaining and preserving the social and political order of society. From this perspective, it is opposed to Chicano Studies because Chicano Studies is a challenge to that order. This conflict of ideologies is obscured, however, because the central, and the centralizing, idea in the system of ideas represented by "legitimate social science" is one that self-consciously posits a social identity as a "non-ideology."

The History of Legitimate Social Science

The argument for this proposition is broadly historical, and it is made through the framework of Immanuel Wallerstein's world systems theory.[22] While others, working from different perspectives and orientations, have made similar arguments about the ideology of social science, Wallerstein's work has the virtue of historically linking the conflict between the ideology of social science and the ideology of Chicano Studies.[23]

In an insightful analysis of the French Revolution Wallerstein argued that it catalyzed a fundamental transformation of the capitalist world economy *as a world system.*[24] The French Revolution, he argued, was the first truly anti-systemic uprising of the modern world where the masses seemed to seriously

contemplate state power. In Wallerstein's argument the world bourgeoisie, as a response to the French Revolution, accepted the idea of "normality of change" as the best way of *containing* the social forces underlying anti-systemic rebellion. In his argument this acceptance of the idea of normality of change by the world's ruling classes ushered in three sets of cultural institutions—Ideology, social science, and (anti-systemic) Social Movements—that have formed a central part of the culture of the capitalist world system ever since.[25]

Ideology, Wallerstein pointed out, was a worldview, a *weltanschauung*, or, figuratively, a common set of eyeglasses through which people interpreted their world. However, ideology was also a significantly specific case within this genre of worldview. In all times and places, Wallerstein argued, people had always constructed reality through one or more, historically manufactured, worldviews. The French Revolution, however, ushered in a particular brand of weltanschauung.

> It is one that has been consciously and collectively formulated with conscious political objectives. Using this definition of ideology, it follows that this particular brand of "weltanschauung" could be constructed only in a situation in which public discourse accepted the normality of change. One needs to formulate an ideology consciously only if one believes that change is normal and that therefore it is useful to formulate conscious middle run political objectives.[26]

In particular, three such ideologies developed during the 19th century—Conservatism, Liberalism, and Marxism. They were different political agendas about what normal change was and how it should be brought about. However, as Wallerstein pointed out, the cultural institutionalization of political agendas was historically related to that of social science. This was because the political agendas represented by the ideologies of Liberalism, Marxism, and Conservatism were concrete proposals requiring concrete knowledge of current realities. Without knowledge of how the world worked, it was difficult to concretely propose how to make it work better.

Further, as Wallerstein emphasized in this analysis of the historical significance of the French Revolution, just as ideology was more than mere weltanschauung, social science was more than another period or category of the social thought or social philosophy which preceded it, and that we have labeled under titles like "the Greeks" or the "Renaissance." In the 19th century it involved the empirical study of the world with the intent of understanding normal change and thereby affecting it. As such, social science was not the product of

solitary thinkers but that of a collective body of persons working within specific structures to achieve specific ends.

Social science was institutionalized, principally, within Europe's traditional university structure. The universities, which at the end of the 18th century were virtually moribund, were largely organized in the traditional four faculties of theology, philosophy, law, and medicine. However,

> In the course of the nineteenth century, there occurred a significant creation of new chairs, largely with the faculty of philosophy, to a lesser extent within the faculty of law. These chairs had new names and some of them became the forerunners of what today we call "departments."[27]

By the end of the 19th century these new chairs had stabilized into the primary "disciplines" defining the university's departmental structure of social science—politics, economics, sociology, anthropology, and history. Wallerstein's analysis reveals that the *origin* of this present-day core of social science disciplines and departments, dubbed "academically legitimate" by Dallek, was rooted in the *political victory* of the dominant *political agenda* that emerged out of the French Revolution. That is, the origin of our present-day disciplinary intellectual division of labor and its departmental organizational structure manifested the political triumph of liberal ideology as the then, and now, reigning ideology of the capitalist world economy.

> If we ask ourselves not merely why the medieval university's faculty of philosophy became differentiated into the multiple "disciplines" we know today, but why this differentiation took the exact form it took, we can see that its ultimate form reflected the reigning ideology of the nineteenth-century world system, classical liberalism in its British variant.[28]

The substance of Wallerstein's argument is to show a common origin for common fundamental premises that explain the form and content of both liberal ideology (and its political agenda) and social science. In terms of the 20th century ideological conflict between "legitimate social science" and Chicano Studies there were three significant ways in which liberal ideology was inscribed in the form and content of social science.

First, it was the liberal worldview that explained an intellectual division of social science as logically distinct bodies and types of knowledge. That is, it was a fundamental premise of the liberal political agenda that the great achievement of the modern world was the proper separation of the three spheres of human

activity: the public sphere of the exercise of power, the semi-public sphere of production, and the private sphere of everyday life. This liberal view of the world, argues Wallerstein, was the origin of the threefold division of knowledge—the political, the economic, and the socio/cultural—fundamental to contemporary social science epistemology and the organizational development of semi-autonomous departments of political science, economics, and sociology.[29] Especially significant in terms of this ideologically induced internal division of social science was the explicit epistemological demarcation between historical knowledge (and the humanities generally) and social scientific knowledge of the present.

Second, the specific form and content of the internal disciplinary and departmental demarcations of social science were inscribed with a liberal ideological premise of a cultural (and thus racial) supremacy of European Civilization.[30] This liberal premise of cultural supremacy will provide intellectual explanation and moral justification for 19th century European colonialist expansionism and racial domination.

Third, it was a liberal ideological premise of a universal bourgeois human nature that was the basis for assuming that there were universal laws of social reality that could be discovered by social science. This will account for an epistemology that emphasized study of objective, empirical, and individually discreet "facts," and a methodological organizing principle for social science based in the idea of objectivity.[31] It will be upon this liberal idea that social science will construct its social identity as a "non-ideology."

In making this argument about the common premises of liberal ideology and social science, Wallerstein pointed out that it was a way of *circumscribing* the study of social change in such a way that it would serve as an explanation and justification for the politically triumphant liberal social and political order.[32] This was the basis for the third and final aspect of Wallerstein's thesis about the historical significance of the French Revolution. That is, the third cultural institution spawned by this world systemic event was the transformation of "rebellion and opposition" into anti-systemic "social movements."

> . . . Once again, rebellion and opposition were not new. They had long been a part of the historical scene, as had been both "weltanschauung" and social thought. But just as "weltanschauung" now became ideologies and social thought became social science, so did rebellions and opposition become anti-systemic

> movements. These movements were the third and last of the institutional innovations of the post-1788 world system, an innovation that really emerges only after the world revolution of 1848. . . .
>
> There were, to be sure, two great forms of such anti-systemic movements, one for each main theme of the "French revolutionary turmoil" as it was expressed throughout the world system. There were movements organized around the "people" as working class or classes, . . . and there were movements organized around the "people" as *volk*, as nation, as speakers of a common language, what came to be known as the nationalist movements.[33]

What essentially differentiated the anti-systemic social movements after 1848 from prior rebellions and opposition was that the latter were spontaneous, short-lived, and largely uncoordinated beyond the local level. The post-French Revolution social movements, Wallerstein argued, were organizations and eventually organizations with bureaucracies.[34]

It was in this sense that the relationship of social movements to social science historically developed. While social science became an instrument for realizing the agenda of politically triumphant liberalism, those who sought to go beyond the limits of normal change ideologically framed by social science turned to the social movements. The anti-systemic social movements, unlike pre-French Revolution rebellions, *planned* the politics of social transformation. Like the liberal ideology of social science they expressed political agendas for ushering in normal change in a time frame that went beyond the short run.

In sum, Wallerstein's historical analysis of social science unveils an ideological and political origin for our present-day academically legitimate disciplines and departments. It also argues that there has been a historical conflict between social science and the ideas and plans for social change that have been manifested by oppositional social movements like the Chicano Movement.

This historical conflict has been only indirectly related to norms of academic legitimacy. Rather, at the core of the conflict have been opposing political agendas for realizing normal change. From this perspective, Wallersteins's historical analysis reveals the ideological deception of Dallek in counterposing the political movement for Chicano Studies against a presumably "non-political" dominant conception of social science.

On a more specific level, Wallerstein argues that social science's disciplinary division of intellectual labor was inscribed with an ideology and a political agenda that was masked by the universalistic premise of its liberal values and by its departmental structure. Moreover, it is a historical and macro-level explanation of

a racist orientation to the liberal ideology and disciplinary/departmental organization of the dominant conception of social science.[35]

The Racial Ideology of Social Science on the Mexican American

The absence of any substantive challenge to the liberal premises of 19th century social science served as confirmation for the assumed universalism that cloaked its ideological orientation and political agenda.[36] This absence of substantive academic rivalry was parallel and related to the absence of any substantive rival or challenge to the political dominance of Western Civilization and its liberal ideology over the global framework of the capitalist world economy. Despite the shocks of the First World War, the Russian Revolution, and the rise of fascism, this ideological hegemony of liberalism within the capitalist world economy, and within social science, remained essentially intact through the first half of the 20th century.

In this historical and world systemic perspective, the ideological and political-economic context for the origin of Chicano Studies was the anti-colonialism and worldwide social turbulence after World War II that reached its peak at the end of the 1960s. George Katsiaficas has elaborated upon the worldwide nature of these social and political developments in his global analysis of 1968.[37]

Wallerstein has emphasized the impact of these developments, that he refers to as the "Revolution of 1968," on the intellectual life of the university.

> As a revolutionary moment, 1968 has passed, and passed definitively. But so did 1848 as a revolutionary moment. However, 1968, like 1848 before it, has left enormous legacies. Among them is its impact on the universities and the world of intellectual discourse. What 1968 did was to break the total control over the world university system by the heirs of nineteenth-century thought and restore the university to its role as an arena of intellectual debate.[38]

In terms of the disciplinary division of intellectual labor, the fracturing of liberalism's ideological hegemony over social science had specific manifestations.

> The result has been disorder. Rehashed versions of early nineteenth-century conservatism have rushed to fill the breach. While noisy and aggressive, thus far they have been weak on intellectual substance, gaining credit primarily out of the discredit of the liberal-Marxist arena of consensus. On the other hand, new subject matters have appeared in the universities which derive directly from the 1968 world revolution: in particular, women's studies, and multiple versions of what generically might be called "ethnic" studies.[39]

The first formally academic Chicano Studies expression of this revolt against liberalism's ideological hegemony over social science was a journal that began publishing out of the university of California at Berkeley in 1967, *El Grito*.[40] The early *El Grito* (1967-1972) was characterized by its polemical intellectual war against Social Science on the Mexican American.[41] The idea of a Chicano social science emerged from opposition to traditional social science on the Mexican American.

During this period the editorial stance of *El Grito* was closely identified with the writing of the journal's editor and founder, Octavio I. Romano-V. An anthropologist at the Berkeley campus of the University of California, Romano wrote a series of articles that *began* as a critique of Social Science on the Mexican American as ideology.[42]

In those articles Romano argued that Social Science on the Mexican American was based in a set of beliefs, ideas, and values that framed and circumscribed a discourse that served to explain and morally to justify, and thereby to legitimize, a historical and continuing subjugation of Mexicans in American society. Central to the theoretical framework of Romano's critique was the separation of Chicano history from contemporary or social scientific studies of the Chicano.[43] That is, Romano argued that the ideological role of Social Science on the Mexican American presumed a marginalization of the Chicano historical experience of resistance to racial/cultural exploitation and oppression.

Significantly, in the concluding article of that series, however, Romano *expanded* the target of his ideological criticism to social science as an institution. What he argued was that the ideological orientation of Social Science on the Mexican American was rooted in the idea of objectivity.[44] Methodologically, Romano's argument went, the idea of objectivity was the intellectual linchpin for the social science born of the European Enlightenment. Summarizing domestic and international critics of this idea, Romano asserted that objectivity was a fallacy. Anticipating Wallerstein's historical and world systemic analysis, Romano argued that it was *through* social science's intellectual foundation in the idea of objectivity that its racist ideological role in relation to Mexican Americans was expressed.[45]

A Chicano Movement Idea of Chicano Studies

Romano's critique and rejection of objectivity, and thereby of the entire con-

struct of liberal intellectual premises that it methodologically grounded, implied the need for a new Social Science on the Mexican American.[46] In place of the fallacy of objectivity, Romano posited the notion of a "Chicano Self-Image" as a central value for this new social science.[47]

In relation to the problem of articulating an ideological framework for Chicano Studies, Romano never "self-consciously" identified as an ideology the work that culminated in the notion of a Chicano self-image. However, the Chicano self-image was an idea that presumed an organic linkage between a new Chicano social science and the Chicano Movement.[48] Romano's critique of Social Science on the Mexican American essentially attributed an epistemological status to the political movement of Chicanos.[49]

Most importantly, the focus of Romano's ideological critique of social science was the racism that was the "reality" veiled by the fallacy of objectivity. Thus, while never identified as an ideology, the value of a Chicano self-image was specifically a response to the ideological role of objectivity in veiling a racist, racial, and cultural dimension to the *social relations* of social science. As such, the Chicano self-image, asserted Romano, would be a case of the "studied studying the studiers."

> This situation is unique in the annals of American social science. It is unique because a population heretofore studied is now studying the studiers. The final outcome of this venture is yet to be revealed. Nevertheless, it promises to introduce perspectives that are unique in social science, perspectives which have their origin within a previously studied population (Mexican-Americans) whose objectifications in the past have not been an accepted, explicit, and integral part of traditional social science thought. As such, these perspectives will introduce a *self-image* into the arena of rational thought. If this self-image is rejected by non-Chicano social scientists, then, in effect, they will have rejected summarily the rationality of the Chicano.[50]

The Limits of Romano's Critique

The course and development of Romano's critique, in rejecting the methodological principle of objectivity, implied a re-conceptualization of social science. In so doing, Romano made a specific contribution to the theoretical elaboration of an ideology of Chicano Studies that can be generalized in terms of two points.[51]

First, it was *through* its intellectual foundation in the ideas and values of the European Enlightenment that the ideology of Social Science on the Mexican American was expressed. In other words, in Romano's argument, the problem

was *not* deviation from the intellectual premises, norms, and methodology defining academically "legitimate social science." The problem was not deviation from objective study of the Mexican American. Rather, the racist ideological orientation of Social Science on the Mexican American was rooted in the intellectual, normative, and methodological orientation of Enlightenment social science itself.[52] Thus, it was Romano who first asserted the claim of UCLA students in 1993 that the intellectual basis of the university's opposition to Chicano Studies was racist.

Second, in the development of Romano's argument the ideological role of Enlightenment social science necessarily rested on a distortion of Chicano history.[53] Reciprocally, he argued that the new Chicano social science would presume the recovery of authentic Chicano history. Thus, Romano was arguing for a relationship between Chicano history and Chicano social science that implied transcending "legitimate social science's" disciplinary and departmental borders between those fields.[54]

However, in terms of articulating an ideological framework for Chicano Studies, the notion of a Chicano self-image was fundamentally limited in a theoretical sense. As far as it was developed by Romano, it was a response to how the racial ideology of social science was expressed through a set of *historically specific* social relations of social science. One could say that it was specifically a response to the historical social relations between an Anglo studier and a Mexican American studied from the period of Manifest Destiny, in Romano's words, to the historical point of his critique.

In terms of articulating an ideological framework for Chicano Studies this implied that the Chicano self-image *could* be taken as equivalent to a Mexican American "studied" becoming a Mexican American "studier." The problem with this limited notion of a Chicano self-image was that it implied conceptualizing ideology in terms of homogeneous racial and cultural forms of thought, and Chicano Studies in terms of the perspective of an ideologically homogeneous Chicano culture and community. This will be an image of Chicano Studies that both proponents and opponents will debate.[55]

Theoretically, the broad parameters of this problem can be understood in terms of the work of Antonio Gramsci, who theorized on the relationship between ideology and community and culture.[56] Gramsci argued that the consciousness of subordinate groups is *typically* fragmented and uneven. Underlying

this fragmentation and unevenness, he wrote, was a basic conflict between *different* conceptions of the world. This basic conflict manifested the subordinate group's *internalization* of the official notions of the dominant group, on the one hand; and the subordinate group's practical experience, on the other.[57]

In Gramsci's analysis, this ideological conflict *internal* to subordinate groups was historically based. On the one hand, there was an *emergent* world view that a subordinate group displays in those historical periods when it acts as an "organic totality." In the Chicano historical experience this would correspond to the Chicano Movement.[58] On the other hand, there is the group's submission in more normal times to the ideas of those who govern it.

In terms of this Gramscian framework, the limitation of Romano's notion of a Chicano Self-image was its inadequate *ideological* distinction between the Chicano Movement and the Chicano culture or community to which it was organically related. That is, Romano never explicitly, self-consciously, identified his *own critique* of social science on the Mexican American *as an ideology*. Thus, he never developed *what* the Chicano self-image represented ideologically *within* Chicano culture and community. This absence of self-conscious identity *as an ideology* was the basis for the Chicano self-image's suggestion, on the plane of social theory, of an ideologically homogeneous Chicano culture and community. In terms of the above Gramscian framework, Romano's notion failed to explicitly identify Chicano Studies, ideologically, as the "self-image" of the Chicano Movement *within* an ideologically heterogeneous Chicano culture and community.

The Ideology of Chicano Studies

The concept of Chicano Studies that Romano's critique was striving toward was made in *Aztlán—A Journal of Chicano Studies*.[59] While historically following *El Grito*, *Aztlán* was the first official (university-sponsored and supported) scholarly journal devoted to Chicano issues. Published by Aztlán Publications, an arm of the then UCLA Mexican American Cultural Center, later re-named the UCLA Chicano Studies Research Center, the inaugural issue of *Aztlán* appeared in the Spring of 1970.

In relation to the above summarized inadequacy of Romano's Chicano self-image, the idea of Chicano Studies that emerged in *Aztlán* distinguished itself on both a theoretical plane of analysis and in terms of its ideological social identity.

On the theoretical plane, underlying *Aztlán's* analysis of Social Science on the Mexican American, was a perspective that *all* social science was ideological and political in its constitution. Second, there was explicit recognition of an ideologically heterogeneous Chicano culture and community.[60]

Ideologically, the idea of Chicano Studies found in the early publishing period of *Aztlán* was also distinguished by two related points. First, there was an explicit, self-conscious, identification of Chicano Studies *as the perspective of the Chicano Movement.* Second, there was an equally explicit identification of Chicano Studies as an anti-colonialist social science.[61] Articles by Raymond Rocco and Carlos Muñoz, Jr., in the second issue of *Aztlán* serve as exemplars of the social theoretical orientation and ideological social identity of Chicano Studies found in the early period of this journal.[62]

In terms of the theoretical limitation of Romano's Chicano self-image, Rocco presented an argument for an idea of social science as an ideological and political enterprise. In "The Chicano in The Social Sciences: Traditional Concepts, Myths and Images" he argued that critiques of Social Science on the Mexican American, like that of Romano, presumed a critical perspective toward what Rocco referred to as the "normative context of social science."[63] The argument was that the dominant perspectives of Social science did not acknowledge their own normative context. Methodologically organized in terms of an overarching idea of objectivity, social science did not acknowledge that "data, concepts, and facts" do not present themselves as such, "objectively." Rather, they were developed by the researcher and thus introduced a normative context in which the selected data, concepts, and facts exist.

Utilizing the then contemporary work of political scientists such as William E. Connolly, Grant McConnell, and Harry Kariel, Rocco asserted that Social science was "at root a normative enterprise" and an integral part of society's social and political order.[64] The work of social scientists would alter "the perspectives, the context, the alternatives" that would be relied upon to solve social conflict. In this sense social science was, by the nature of its social activity, ideological and worked to the benefit of certain sectors of society and to the disadvantage of other sectors.[65]

The point of this argument was that because the dominant perspectives of social science did not acknowledge their normative context they were "restricting and inhibiting" in terms of the normative contexts of the research they generated.

In other words, because social science did not acknowledge its *own* normative context, it inhibited the recognition of *other* normative contexts, like that represented by Romano's critique, as legitimate aspects of social science.

As long as social science failed to acknowledge its own normative context, and used this as a pretext to close itself to other normative contexts, Rocco's argument continued, social science would continue to be *limited* to an unacknowledged normative context of what he variously referred to as the "dominant culture," the "dominant sector," and the "power structure" of society.[66] Thus, consistent with Romano's critique of objectivity, Rocco had argued that the ideology of Social Science on the Mexican American was integral to a more inclusive ideology and social identity of social science as a non-ideological endeavor.

Rocco's analysis of social science, however, was not confined by the potential limitations of Romano's idea of social science as a self-image. In Rocco's analysis it was social science's normative stance toward the social and political order of society that explained its exclusion of the emerging Chicano Studies perspective. As such, Rocco's piece was theoretically anticipating the 1993 events at UCLA. His analysis was an argument that the conflict between Chicano Studies and "legitimate social science" was only indirectly related to norms defining academic legitimacy and more firmly grounded in conflicting ideological stances toward the social and political order of society.

In relation to the ideological social identity of Chicano Studies, Rocco's argument in "Myths and Images" was also a development in terms of the ideological homogeneity that was suggested by Romano. In Romano's argument the ideology of social science had been manifested by the historical exclusion of a Chicano self-image from "the arena of rational thought." Rocco argued, on the other hand, that social science had been closed to normative stances that challenged and contested the social and political order of society. In this specific case, social science was closed to Chicano Studies because it was closed to the ideology and politics of the Chicano Movement.[67] By framing the ideology of the Chicano Movement off limits, Social Science on the Mexican American was ideologically circumscribing the study of problems (politics) in the Chicano community to a liberal question of how much or how little the Mexican American was assimilated.[68]

Theoretically, the significance of Rocco's identification of Chicano Studies with the ideology of the Chicano Movement was that it implied an analytical

centrality for the recognition of an ideologically heterogeneous Chicano culture and community. In other words, the social identification of Chicano Studies with the ideology of the Chicano Movement presumed social theory in which all Mexican Americans were *not* Chicano (Movement).

> . . . One of the characteristics of the ideology of the "Chicano Movement" is the attempt to distinguish those of Mexican ancestry who are committed to the preservation of Mexican culture from those who are not. The term "Chicano" is used in a positive way to characterize the first category while a variety of epithets designate the latter category. Thus for the active core, "Mexican American" has definite, negative ideological connotations.[69]

"A Chicano Perspective"

Complementing Rocco's social identification of Chicano Studies with the ideology and politics of the Chicano Movement were two articles by Carlos Muñoz Jr., in the same issue of *Aztlán*.[70] In this work Muñoz was asserting that Chicano Studies was an anti-colonialist social science. In terms of this anti-colonialist social identity, the central point of "Toward A Chicano Perspective of Political Analysis" was its assertion of a racial and cultural identity for the Chicano community. The premise of Muñoz's argument was that an integral component of the ideology of social science was the relative insignificance of the Chicano in the study of racial problems in the U.S.[71] At the heart of this relative unimportance was social science's marginalization of the racial aspect of the Chicano community's history and culture.

Muñoz argued that the thrust of the dominant perspectives was to view the Mexican American as an "unassimilated caucasian." The principle reason for this lack of understanding was that it was predicated on Anglo cultural values and norms. Values and norms, Muñoz argued, that were historically based in 19th century colonialist race relations of manifest destiny.[72]

This theoretical de-racialization of Chicanos served an ideological role. It framed the intellectual understanding of problems in the Chicano community in terms of a de-racialized dynamic of ethnic assimilation. It thus served to obscure the scope and historical basis of racism in American society. Essentially, Muñoz's argument went, the problems of the Chicano community could hardly be rooted in racism, if Chicanos were not a (non-White) race.

In opposition to this de-racialization of the Mexican American by the dominant perspectives of social science, Muñoz asserted that the Chicano community

and culture was racially *mestizo.*

> Social scientists have failed to acknowledge the rich indian Mestizo heritage and non white "blood mixture" which have shaped the distinct cultural patterns and genetic characteristics of the Chicano. Mestizo has been a term alien to the vocabulary of social science... Even more importantly,... Assimilation has not been the prime goal of most Chicanos. This can be supported by witnessing the fact that a solid, if not the most solid, cornerstone of the ever growing Chicano movement is "cultural nationalism."[73]

Thus, Muñoz's assertion of a mestizo racial identity, on the level of social theory, also supported Rocco's central argument. The theoretical de-racialization of the Mexican American by social science served a role of ideologically framing, and thus limiting, solutions to community problems to a liberal politics of assimilation. In this sense Muñoz, like Rocco, was arguing that the academic conflict between social science and Chicano Studies was rooted in Chicano Studies' ideological identification with a Chicano Movement that was challenging the reigning order of society. And, like the UCLA students in 1993, Muñoz was arguing the centrality of race in this ideological conflict between Chicano Studies and social science.

Ideologically, however, Muñoz's piece also expressed an important development of Rocco's social identification of Chicano Studies with the Chicano Movement. This was because the theoretical framework for Muñoz's assertion of a mestizo racial identity was based on the idea that the Chicano community was an "internal colony." This was the significance of "On the Nature and Cause of Tension in the Chicano Community: A Critical Analysis" in the same issue of *Aztlán.*[74]

As social theory, the internal colony model explained the conditions in the Chicano community in terms of a colonialist historical experience. In this paradigm the mestizo identity was historically forged by the intersection of Euro-American colonialist exploitation and cultural oppression, and the historical Chicano resistance to that exploitation and oppression. The idea of Chicano Studies posed by Muñoz's internal colonial framework was one that would respond to the Chicano inequality generated by this history of exploitation and cultural oppression.[75]

Muñoz's internal colonial framework also placed Chicano Studies into Wallerstein's World Revolution of 1968. That is, Wallerstein argues that ethnic

studies, *as social science*, was a direct derivative of "1968." Ideologically, this was because the central thrust of this world revolution was an anti-colonialist one.[76] Thus, in Muñoz's work, the social identification of Chicano Studies with the Chicano Movement is also ideologically anti-colonialist.

The idea of Chicano Studies found in the early issues of *El Grito* and *Aztlán* was a response to the ideological role of social science on The Mexican American. It exposed social science as an intellectual explanation and moral justification of Euro-American colonialist exploitation and cultural oppression of Chicanos. Reciprocally, Chicano Studies, as posited by these journals, was an explanation and justification for a Chicano Movement that was contesting the relations of power inscribed in the economic, political, and cultural institutions in America. In this sense, however, the idea of Chicano Studies in those journals was *more* than a new social science of the Mexican American. It was a *self-conscious* anti-colonialist Chicano Movement ideology as well.[77]

Summary and Conclusion

The events at UCLA in the Spring of 1993 reasserted the central defining character of Chicano Studies as both a social science and a self-conscious ideology of the Chicano Movement. At the moment of its political constitution in 1968, Chicano Studies was both a noble and a novel idea about social science: noble because it was an idea about knowledge linked to anti-colonialist social justice and human liberation; novel because in contrast to the social science in opposition to which it historically emerged, Chicano Studies was self-consciously ideological.

This Chicano Movement idea of Chicano Studies was constructed in this article through the work of Romano, Rocco, and Muñoz. It was, however, a notion of Chicano Studies that was articulated most systematically by *El Plan de Santa Barbara*.[78] El Plan was the published proceedings of a 1969 conference of Chicano/a educational professionals and students intent on developing a master plan for Chicano higher education. Substantively, it was an expression of ideology by a body "representative of the activist social base of the political movement for Chicano Studies."[79] The political events at UCLA in 1993 suggest that this movement born in the social and political upheaval of 1968, and the idea of Chicano Studies upon which this movement was socially constructed, continues to be a necessary condition for the institutionalization of Chicano Studies as

social science.

El Plan is noted because the 1993 student movement at UCLA did not display overtly an understanding of the intellectual role of Romano, Rocco, and Muñoz in the ideological constitution of the struggle that those students were then leading. However, they did recognize *El Plan De Santa Barbara*, symbolically, as a representation of their political quest. It is in this sense that the idea of Chicano Studies posited by this paper is argued to have been the ideological base of the political movement that won departmental status for Chicano Studies at UCLA.[80]

The argument is that a necessary element in the construction of the social identity, the political movement, that generates the power to institutionalize Chicano Studies, is the idea of being an anti-colonialist Chicano Movement ideology. However, the review of the theory of ideology, Wallerstein's historical perspective on social science, and the analysis of the early *El Grito* and *Aztlán* also suggest that in order *to be* a challenge to the social and political order, Chicano Studies must be *self-consciously* ideological. In other words, a social science legitimization of Chicano Movement politics must at the same time be a legitimization of the role of social science as oppositional ideology.

Central to the system of ideas through which traditional social science legitimized *its ideological role* was the idea that "legitimate social science" is non-ideological. Wallerstein's historical perspective and the critical analyses of Social Science on the Mexican American in the early *El Grito* and *Aztlán* suggest that this capacity to be an ideology, through the idea of being a non-ideology, resides in its status as institutionalized social science.

For institutionalized social science the element of self-consciousness becomes relatively superfluous to the political processes of legitimizing its ideological role. This is because the legitimacy of institutionalized social science is self-evident and a given in its status as institutionalized social science. In other words, "legitimate social science" does not have to self-consciously reproduce legitimacy for its ideological role because its legitimacy is reproduced by the very organization, structure, and operation of institutionalized social science.[81]

As an oppositional ideology, however, Chicano Studies must be self-conscious about legitimizing its role. This is because the intellectual reasonableness or practicality and moral justification of challenging the social and political order of society is not self-evident or a given. It is not self-evident or a given, even and

most importantly to most of those who because of race, class, gender, and cultural aspects of their identity could affectively identify with the anti-colonialism of the Chicano Movement. This social identity, the constitution of the power for the processes of legitimization, must be self-consciously constructed.

This article's analysis of the 1993 political events at UCLA argues that those involved in the protest were reasserting Chicano Studies' central defining character as a social science and a self-conscious ideology. It is an argument that those political events indicated, once again, that a necessary element in the construction of the social identity, the political movement, that generates the power to institutionalize Chicano Studies as social science is a self-conscious idea of being an anti-colonialist Chicano Movement ideology.

NOTES

Citations are abbreviated. Complete publication data is included in the bibliography.

1 Significantly, the UCLA Chicano Studies "coalition" drew support and participation from other racial minority students and organizations, progressive "Anglo" students and organizations, and multiracial support from individuals, organizations, and politicians from Los Angeles and other Southern California communities.

2 On the historical struggle for Chicano academic programs in California see Acuña (1981); Contreras (1993); Gómez-Quiñones (1974, 1978); Muñoz (1981, 1984, 1989); and Padilla (1974). See the Op-Ed page of the *Los Angeles Times*, June 9, 1993, for opposing interpretations of the Spring 1993 events at UCLA. One article is by Robert Dallek, a Professor of History at UCLA, and is titled, "A Political Assault on Academic Values." The second article is by Rubén Martínez, a Los Angeles community activist/writer, and is titled, "The Emergence of LA's True Identity."

3 This proposition about Chicano Studies' "central defining character" is the basic conclusion of my dissertation. (Contreras 1993)

4 The "agreements" that were signed by UCLA administration officials and settled the Spring 1993 conflict are titled, "Framework for a Center for Interdisciplinary Instruction in Chicana and Chicano Studies." Copies are filed in the UCLA Chicano Studies Library.

5 A Chicano "self-determination" was central to the goals of the political movement that founded Chicano Studies. See the works cited in footnote #2 in this regard. Previously, I addressed the relationship, organizational and ideological, between the idea of self-determination and departmental status in terms of the political structure of the University. (Contreras 1993: 322-338)

6 The status of the Chicano Studies program at UCLA had been under formal university review for over a year. The conclusion of this review, which was overdue, was expected to express the

administration's response to calls to upgrade the program to departmental status. On April 28, 1993, a press release was issued by Chancellor Young stating that on the basis of this review Chicano Studies would continue to be structured as an as an inter-departmental program. The press release was a public rejection of departmental status. The timing of the press release angered Chicano Studies activists. It came on the day that most Chicano Studies activists at UCLA were attending, or observing, the funeral of César Chávez. A copy of the press release is on file at the UCLA Chicano Studies Research Center Library.

7 This is the way that UCLA history professor Robert Dallek, in the above mentioned article in the *Los Angeles Times*, described the administration's view of the hunger strike.

8 A "Proposal For The Creation of A Chicana and Chicano Studies Department" was developed by the "core teaching faculty" of the UCLA Chicano Studies program. A copy of the proposal, dated January 25, 1993, is on file at the Chicano Studies Research Center Library at UCLA.

9 Contreras 1993: 3.

10 See D.J. Manning and T.J. Robinson (1985), *The Place of Ideology in Political Life*; and Thomas Eagleton (1991), *Ideology: An Introduction* for comprehensive analyses of the concept of ideology.

11 Eagleton 1991: 5-20

12 *Ibid.*, pp. 45-61.

13 Martin Seliger 1976: 11.

14 Louis Althusser 1969; 1971.

15 Althusser 1971: 173-174

16 Eagleton 1991: 20.

17 Eagleton 1991: 11.

18 The substantive content of these conflicting ideas about social science will be developed through the rest of this article. However, it is pointed out now that the events at UCLA manifested a *re*-play of a historical conflict. In the historical struggle to institutionalize Chicano Studies, the first systematic academic expression of this conflict in ideas about social science was made through a series of articles by Octavio I. Romano. (Romano 1967, 1968, 1969, 1970) Romano's contribution to the ideology of Chicano Studies is examined later in this article. For more detailed analysis of Romano's role in the development of Chicano Studies see Contreras (1993), Olguin (1991), and Garcia (1992).

19 One reason for the developed discussion about "ideology" in this article is that the logic, sense, and significance of the central argument assumes a clear and distinct separation from a highly distorting "bias" that *dominates* both popular and academic understanding of the concept. In terms of the distinction between "theory" and "practice," that is so central to all social (and especially political) analysis, the distorting bias in both popular and academic thinking about ideology is to put it into the realm of "theory." The logic, sense, and significance of my argument assumes an understanding of ideology as a "meeting-point" of theory and practice. This is the image I attempt to convey with the word "constitutive." *Politics*, the political actions of political life, is constituted by power processes *and* ideology.

20 As exemplars for this literature on theory of ideology I would cite Manning and Robinson (1985), Eagleton (1991), Meszaros (1989), Geuss (1981), Gouldner (1976), and Therborn (1980). Collectively, this theoretical work itself represents an ideological spectrum that incor-

porates liberal, Marxist, Neo-Marxist, and Critical Theory on ideology. In addition, their writing shows that the above argument about the role of ideology in political life can also be found in the work of some conservatives, some neo-conservatives, and some postmodernists. Previously, I made an analytical summary of this "theory of ideology." (Contreras 1993: 66-88)

21 This analogy between "Irish Studies" and Chicano Studies is an expression of the "immigrant analogy." Roughly, this is the idea that the problems of late 20th century racial minorities in the U.S. are analogous to the problems (and their solution) of 19th and early 20th Century white ethnic immigrants. Over a generation ago, Robert Blauner argued that the "immigrant analogy" was a bedrock principle for an American "social science on race" that served a role of intellectually obscuring the colonialist historical basis for racial oppression in America (Blauner 1972). It is both amazing and characteristic of the ideological power of Dallek's idea of social science that the hackneyed "immigrant analogy," that was "academically" and "social scientifically" de-bunked 20 years ago by Blauner and others can be successfully utilized today without even bothering to camouflage it or dress it up in 1990's clothing. "Successfully utilized" in that no doubt it continues to mobilize/organize support for Dallek's and the university's opposition to Chicano Studies by ideologically framing a space where such opposition is intellectually reasonable and morally just, and most importantly, "not racist."

22 Wallerstein is the Distinguished Professor of Sociology and the Director of the Fernand Braudel Center for the Study of Economies, Historical Systems, and Civilizations, at the State University of New York, Binghamton. Some of the more significant work through which he has elaborated upon the world systems perspective include: *The Modern World System* (Three Volumes; 1974, 1980, 1989), *Capitalist World Economy* (1979), and *Historical Capitalism* (1983).

23 Wallerstein 1983, 1986, 1989a, 1989b, 1990. These articles, and others, are now included in a collection entitled, *Unthinking Social Science—The Limits of Nineteenth Century Paradigms* (Wallerstein 1991).

24 Wallerstein 1989a.

25 Wallerstein 1989a.

26 Wallerstein 1989a: 44.

27 Wallerstein 1989a: 48.

28 Wallerstein 1989b: 11.

29 *Ibid.*

30 *Ibid.*

31 *Ibid.*

32 Wallerstein 1989a.

33 *Ibid.*, 50-51.

34 Wallerstein 1983.

35 Some other scholars whose work makes a point of emphasizing the linkage between the political triumph of liberalism and the emergence, form, and content of 19th century social Science include Raymond Williams (1977), Alvin Gouldner (1976), Istvan Meszaros (1989), David Theo Goldberg (1993), and Eagleton (1991). Also relevant is Ronald Takaki's insightful analysis of the racial nature of the liberal ideas underlying the 19th Century development of economic and political institutions in the United States. Central to Takaki's analysis is the

relationship between these liberal ideas and the racialization of concepts of "progress" and "civilization" in American culture. (Takaki 1979) Reginald Horsman discusses some of the more overt racist expressions of 19th Century liberal social science in the U.S. (Horsman 1981) In particular, he explains how social science provided intellectual explanation and moral justification for racialized notions of progress and civilization and the realization of these notions of progress and civilization through racial domination of Native Americans, African Americans, and Mexicans.

In this regard, Robert Blauner's work has a specific political significance in relation to Chicano Studies. (Blauner 1972) A sociologist at UC Berkeley, Blauner was a "mentor" for some young academics who played important roles in the political movement for Chicano Studies. He was also an intellectual influence on many more. In his academic work Blauner argued that American social science (on race) was based in 19th Century Eurocentric premises. In his analysis these premises served the ideological role of obscuring *U.S. colonialism* as the historical basis for contemporary racial oppression in America.

In a different but conceptually related vein, Georg Lukacs in *History and Class Consciousness* also linked "bourgeois ideology" and the ideology of social science. (Lukacs 1971) Lukacs argued that the intellectual division of social science into "disciplines," that had come to be viewed as logically distinct categories of knowledge, served the purpose of veiling the ideology of social science. His argument was that "ideology" was a category of knowledge that can be fully grasped or apprehended only at the level of the "totality" of social science. The "reification" of the intellectual division of labor into apparently logically distinct categories of political science, economics, sociology, history, ... served the purpose of fragmenting and obscuring the "totality," and thus the ideology, of social science. (Lukacs 1971: 28) Lukacs' argument is consistent with Wallerstein's historical analysis that liberal ideology is inscribed in the intellectual disciplinary division of labor and departmental structure of social science. It is also a theoretical base upon which I build my own argument that the "organizational structure" of the University, in particular its "departmental" structure of social science, is itself an ideological form of organization. (Contreras 1993: 331-338)

[36] Wallerstein comments on one such academic challenge. In late 19th Century Germany a field developed called *Staatswissenschaft*. According to Wallerstein it represented a basic challenge to the tri-modal differentiation of the economic, the political, and the social, as well as the binary distinction between the universal present and the historical past.

The story of the institutional elimination of *Staatswissenschaft*, accomplished more or less by the 1920's, has never really been told (Wallerstein 1991: 97).

[37] George N. Katsiaficas 1987.

[38] Wallerstein 1989b: 15.

[39] *Ibid.*

[40] In his study of the Chicano Movement Carlos Muñoz identified *El Grito: A Journal of Contemporary Mexican-American Thought* as the "first Mexican American scholarly journal to appear in the United States." (Muñoz 1989: 63) The designation as "first" academic expression of Chicano Studies is qualified by recognition of the historical role of important individual intellectual precursors such as George I. Sanchez, Carlos E. Castañeda, Américo Paredes, Julian Samora, and Ernesto Galarza. (Muñoz 1989: 128-129) These scholars, it could be argued, were "doing" Chicano Studies as early as the 1930s.

[41] Contreras 1993: 155-204.

[42] Romano 1967, 1968, 1969. On Romano's role in the intellectual development of Chicano Studies see Contreras (1993), Muñoz (1989), Olguin (1991), and García (1992).

[43] Romano 1968.

[44] Romano 1970.

[45] Romano 1970: 11-12.

[46] Contreras 1993: 376-378; Olguin 1991: 151-155.

[47] Romano 1970: 12.

[48] Romano 1968, 1970.

[49] Contreras 1993: 232.

[50] Romano 1970: 12.

[51] Contreras 1993: 204.

[52] David Theo Goldberg's recent work on racist culture analyzes the racial basis of Enlightenment social science in terms of its intellectual, normative, and methodological premises (Goldberg 1993: 14-40).

[53] Romano 1968.

[54] Contreras 1993: 278-285.

[55] This image of Chicano Studies will be probed in an opportunistic fashion by those opposed to Chicano Studies in misleading debates about "insiders and outsiders." (Gómez-Quiñones 1971: 32; Mirande 1985) The substantive content of those arguments was to reduce the ideological critique of Social Science on the Mexican American to a narrow question of whether only Chicanos can do Chicano Studies. The validity of the debate rested on a premise that Chicano Studies was the perspective of an ideologically homogenous culture or community. (Contreras 1993: 292)

[56] Antonio Gramsci 1971.

[57] *Ibid.*, 348.

[58] Acuña 1981: 366; Contreras 1993: 14-38; Gómez-Quiñones 1977: 13; Muñoz 1989: 76-77.

[59] The original journal title was *Aztlán—Chicano Journal of the Social Sciences and The Arts.*

[60] Contreras 1993: 266-67.

[61] Contreras 1993: 369-380.

[62] Rocco 1970; Muñoz 1970a and 1970b.

[63] Rocco 1970: 89.

[64] The work cited by Rocco was: William E. Connolly's *Political Science and Ideology* (1967), Grant McConnell's *Private Power and American Democracy* (1966), and Harry S. Kariel's *Open Systems: Arenas For Political Action* (1969).

[65] Rocco 1970: 94.

[66] Rocco 1970: 90.

[67] Rocco 1970: 93.

[68] Rocco 1970: 90.

[69] Rocco 1970: 76.

[70] Muñoz 1970a; 1970b.

[71] Muñoz 1970: 16.

[72] Muñoz 1970: 20-21.

[73] Muñoz 1970: 17.

[74] This article was actually a short summary of a paper delivered by Muñoz at an academic symposium on the urban crisis earlier in the year. As such, this short piece, in itself, provided little theoretical explanation of internal colonialism. However, my concern in this article is the ideological role of internal colonial theory (Contreras 1993: 268-284). Ideologically, as an object of affective social identification, Muñoz's summary served as a representative of more developed theoretical elaborations of Chicano internal colonialism. For example, see Almaguer (1971); Barrera, Muñoz Jr., and Ornelas (1972); Blauner (1969, 1972), and Flores (1973).

[75] Muñoz 1970a: 24.

[76] Contreras 1993: 325-331.

[77] Contreras 1993: 268-285.

[78] A chapter in my dissertation is an analysis of El Plan as an expression of Chicano Movement and Chicano Studies ideology. (Contreras 1993: 317-365) The citation for El Plan is: Chicano Coordinating Council for Higher Education (1969). *El Plan de Santa Barbara.* Oakland: La Causa Publications.

[79] Contreras 1993: 319.

[80] The Chicano/a student movement of the California university and state college systems has consistently recognized, over the last two decades, *El Plan de Santa Barbara* as its idea of Chicano Studies. Organizationally, this has been mainly, but not solely, because of the students of El Movimiento Estudiantil Chicano de Aztlán (MEChA). This is because MEChA's origin, ideological and organizational, is also based in *El Plan de Santa Barbara* and the conference that produced the document. (Contreras 1993: 60-65; Muñoz 1989: 78-84)

[81] Contreras 1993: 331-339.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

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

Almaguer, Tomas. (1971) "Toward the Study of Chicano Colonialism," *Aztlán,* Vol.2, no.1 (Spring).

Althusser, Louis. (1969) *For Marx*; translated [from the French] by Ben Brewster. London, Allen Lane.

Althusser, Louis. (1971) *Lenin and Philosophy, and Other Essays*; translated from the French by Ben Brewster. [London] New Left Books.

Althusser, Louis and Etienne Balibar. ((970) *Reading "Capital".* translated [from the French] by Ben Brewster. London : Verso ; New York : distributed in the USA and Canada by Schocken Books.

Banks, James A. (1993) "The Canon Debate, Knowledge Construction and Multicultural Education," *Educational Researcher,* Vol.22 no.25: 4-14

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Dallek, Robert. (1993) "A Political Assault on Academic Values." Op-Ed page *Los Angeles Times* June 9, 1993.

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

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

Garcia, Richard A. (1992) "Creating a Consciousness, Memories, and Expectations: The Burden Of Octavio Romano," *Chicano Discourse.* Tatcho Mindiola Jr. and Emilio Zamora (eds.) Houston: Mexican American Studies Program, University of Houston.

Geuss, Raymond. (1981) *The Idea of a Critical Theory.* Cambridge University Press.

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

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

———. (1974) "To Leave to Hope or Chance: Propositions on Chicano Studies," *Parameters of Institutional Change : Chicano Experiences in Education.* Compiled by the Southwest Network. Hayward, CA: Southwest Network, 1974, p. 53-166.

———. (1978) *Mexican Students Por La Raza: The Chicano Student Movement in Southern California, 1967-1977.* Santa Barbara: La Causa.

Gouldner, Alvin Ward. (1976) *The Dialectic of Ideology and Technology: The Origins, Grammar, and Future of Ideology.* New York: Seabury Press.

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

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

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

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

Manning, D. J. and T. J. Robinson. (1985) *The Place of Ideology in Political Life.* London; Dover, N.H.: Croom Helm.

Meszaros, Istvan. (1989) *The Power of Ideology.* New York: New York University Press.

Mirande, Alfredo. (1985) *The Chicano Experience: An Alternative Perspective.* Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Olguin, R.A. (1991) "Towards an Epistemology of Ethnic Studies: African American Studies and Chicano Studies Contribution," *Transforming The Curriculum.* Johnnella E. Bulter and John C. Walter. (eds.) New York: State University of New York Press

Padilla, Raymond V. (1974) *Chicano Studies at the University of California, Berkeley : en busca del campus y la comunidad.* Ph.D Thesis -- University of California.

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

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

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

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

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

———. (ed.).(1971) *Voices; Readings From El Grito: A Journal of Contemporary*

Rosenau, Pauline Marie. (1992) *Post-Modernism and The Social Sciences.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Sanchez, Alfredo. (1974) "Chicano Student Movement at San Jose State," *Parameters of Institutional Change: Chicano Experiences in Education.* Compiled by the Southwest Network. Hayward, CA: Southwest Network.

Seliger, M. (1976) *Ideology and Politics.* London : Allen & Unwin.

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

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

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

———. (1980) *The Modern World-System II: Mercantilism and The Consolidation*

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

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

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

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

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

———. (1990) "Beyond Annales," *Radical History Review*, Vol. 49

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

Williams, Raymond. (1977) *Marxism and Literature.* Oxford.