# "Compromising *La Causa*?": The Ford Foundation and Chicano Intellectual Nationalism in the Creation of Chicano History, 1963–1977

*Victoria-María MacDonald*
*Benjamin Polk Hoffman*

In the early 1970s the first large cohorts of Chicano PhD scholars entered academia, often hired into faculty positions at newly created Chicano departments or centers. These Chicano scholars came after earlier pioneer Mexican-American historians such as Carlos Castañeda and George I. Sánchez at the University of Texas, Austin; Julian Samora of the University of Notre Dame; and Carlos Cortés of the University of California, Riverside. Instead, they came of age during the fluorescence of the Chicano *movimiento* of the 1960s and 1970s.[1] The academic identities of the first Chicano PhD scholars were firmly grounded in *Chicanismo*, a term which emphasizes ethnic nationalism, political and economic equity, and cultural and community pride.[2]

This essay explores a period of rapidly developing collective consciousness among this group whom we call "Chicano intellectual nationalists" as they negotiated with new forms of power and political capital in academia. The creation of a new field of history, which challenged old paradigms with revised interpretations, was aided through grants from private foundations. Specifically, the Ford Foundation's funding of Mexican-American research projects and scholars from the mid-1960s to the height of *el movimiento* in the 1970s exemplified this

Victoria-María MacDonald is Unit Coordinator and Assistant Professor of Minority and Urban Education, Department of Teaching, Learning, Policy, & Leadership at the University of Maryland. Benjamin Polk Hoffman is Faculty Research Assistant, Department of Counseling, Higher Education and Special Education at the University of Maryland. The authors would like to thank Guadalupe San Miguel, Jr., Marcos Chor Maio, and anonymous reviewers for their thoughtful comments on earlier versions of this essay.

[1]Mario T. García identifies these pioneer schools from different fields in *Mexican Americans: Leadership, Ideology, & Identity, 1930–1960* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1989). As feminist scholars have demonstrated, this first generation was largely male and the key players in this essay were all male, hence the use of the term "Chicano."

[2]Juan Gómez Quiñones, *Chicano Politics: Reality & Promise, 1940–1990* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1990), 189–90.

 

shifting terrain. The changing and complex interactions between the Ford Foundation, Mexican-American/Chicano Studies as a discipline, and newly identified Chicano intellectual nationalists are explored in this article. In so doing, we reveal (1) the complex role that private foundations played as progressives or conservators in U.S. education, (2) a reliance among philanthropic organizations on historical experiences with African Americans as a guide for dealing with Chicanos, (3) the self-determination of Chicano scholars during a critical stage in *el movimiento*, and (4) the impact of these projects on the Chicano/a community. We argue that in this radical phase of the Chicano movement, identity politics occasionally trumped conceptions of a greater good for the community. Drawing our work, in part, theoretically on examinations of the relationship between philanthropists and the social sciences, we further argue that foundations such as Ford attempted to shape the new discipline of Chicano history.[3] The Ford Foundation used the selection of scholars and hiring of program officers to create cultural brokers between the Foundation and tenets of Chicano ideology. However, unlike the often hegemonic portrayal of foundations exerting their power over communities, Chicanos resisted and placed their own imprint on the characteristics of new Chicano research. Because this is only one foundation, we do not assume that all interactions between Ford and Chicanos operated similarly. Rather, this essay emphasizes the complex intersectionality of these competing forces as our main argument.

Scholars have examined whether philanthropic assistance has represented a form of cultural imperialism or a transformative role in a society or academic institution/department/government agency.[4] Closely related to this essay, researchers have examined the role of private foundations in the development of African-American history and higher education as a form of cultural imperialism, and as significant shapers of U.S. higher education.[5] However, foundations' roles as either

[3]Theresa Richardson and Donald Fisher, ed., *The Development of the Social Sciences in the United States and Canada: The Role of Philanthropy* (Stamford, CT: Ablex Publishing Corporation, 1999).

[4]See the classic work, Robert Arnove, ed., *Philanthropy and Cultural Imperialism: The Foundations at Home and Abroad* (Boston: G.K. Hall, 1980); Ellen Condliffe Lagemann, ed., *Philanthropic Foundations: New Scholarship, New Possibilities* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1999). For an up-to-date overview on U.S. institutions, see Andrea Walton, "Philanthropy in Higher Education: Past and Present," in *Philanthropy, Volunteerism & Fundraising in Higher Education*, ed., Andrea Walton and Marybeth Gasman, ASHE Reader Series (Boston, MA: Pearson Custom Publishing, 2008), 3–11; and J. Craig Jenkins and Craig Eckert, "Channeling Black Insurgency: Elite Patronage and Professional Social Movement Organizations in the Development of the Black Movement," *American Sociological Review* 51 (December 1986): 812–29.

[5]The relationship between African Americans, private foundations, higher education, and the creation of Black Studies departments and centers is explored in Fabio

transformative agents or cultural brokers have not been adequately explored in the works of Chicano history or higher education historiography. This essay, part of a larger project on the relationship between Ford Foundation and Chicano/Latino scholarship, draws attention to the rich possibilities available for scholars of Latino higher education and philanthropy to examine the complex dynamics at play in the evolution of new lines of research in the late twentieth century.

## The Changing Ideologies of the Ford Foundation

Eventually overshadowing the Carnegie Foundation in its funding, scope, and wealth, the Ford Foundation emerged in the Cold War era as one of the most influential shapers of higher education, domestically and globally.[6] In the 1960s and 1970s as the student and civil rights movements demanded new research, curricula, and demographic representation in higher education, the Foundation correspondingly realigned its priorities. President McGeorge Bundy's appointment in 1966 heralded a shift in the Foundation's priorities. Former National Security Advisor to Presidents John F. Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson on the Vietnam War, Bundy believed that the Foundation's power could be harnessed to reduce the domestic strife and cultural and racial clashes of the turbulent 1960s and 1970s through educational programming and projects.[7]

Mexican American, Puerto Rican, Native American, and Asian communities joined the movement forged by the African-American

---

Rojas, *From Black Power to Black Studies: How a Radical Social Movement Became an Academic Discipline* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2007); and Noliwe Rooks, *White Money/Black Power: The Surprising History of African American Studies and the Crisis of Race in Higher Education* (Boston: Beacon Press, 2006). Historical interpretations of the role of philanthropies and black higher education are explored by James Anderson, *The Education of Blacks in the South, 1880–1935* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1988); Eric Anderson and Alfred A. Moss, Jr., *Dangerous Donations: Northern Philanthropy and Southern Black Education, 1902–1930* (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2001); William Watkins, *White Architects of Black Education* (New York: Teachers College Press, 2001); and Mary Beth Gasman, *Envisioning Black Colleges: A History of the United Negro College Fund* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2007). The role of the Rockefeller and Ford Foundations in bringing students from diverse backgrounds to elite institutions is covered in Victoria-María MacDonald, John Botti, and Elizabeth Hoffman Clark, "From Visibility to Autonomy: Latinos and Higher Education in the United States from 1965–2005," *Harvard Educational Review* 77, no. 4 (Winter 2007): 474–504; and Andrea Walton, "Building a Pipeline to College: A Study of the Rockefeller-Funded 'A Better Chance' Program, 1963–1969," *American Educational History Journal* 36, no. 1 (2009): 151–69.

[6]Ellen Condliffe Lagemann, *The Politics of Knowledge: The Carnegie Corporation, Philanthropy, and Public Policy* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989), 178–81.

[7]Alice O'Connor, "The Ford Foundation and Philanthropic Activism in the 1960s," in Ellen Condliffe Lagemann, ed., *Philanthropic Foundations: New Scholarship, New Possibilities* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1999), 188.

community, demanding their inclusion within the discourse of civil rights and educational equity. As a result of the agitation of the "new" minority groups for recognition, and coupled with the Foundation's commitment to social justice beyond the traditional black-white paradigm, Ford expanded its programming for these groups. As will be noted, Ford had funded some projects prior to the late 1960s for Latino-related areas but had not explicitly categorized them within funding for a specific ethnic group. Further, the Foundation maintained its support of historically black institutions but expanded their mission for educational opportunity and equity to build the new disciplines of Afro-American and Ethnic Studies at predominantly white institutions.[8] A significant report reviewing the Foundation's work in race and ethnicity noted the reorientation: "This action was taken in recognition of the fact that although black Americans constitute the largest single ethnic minority in the United States, other ethnic groups—notably Mexican Americans, Asian Americans, Puerto Ricans, and American Indians – have made important contributions to American history and culture that have received little, if any, scholarly attention."[9]

The Foundation's domestic policy change from almost exclusively supporting the development of culturally relevant materials and scholars in black history and sociology to including other ethnic and racial groups came under the aegis of Higher Education and Research, a new program area organized in 1969.[10] A significant internal document, informally called "The Raspberry Report" (1970), outlined this expansion in the area of higher education and race and ethnic studies.[11] The report's authors drew upon their past experiences with black scholars and institutions: "We believe that the lessons we have learned from our venture into Afro-American Studies, and the experience gained by the Foundation over the course of a decade in the field of area studies, can provide useful guidelines for the design and development of a major

[8]Leaders in the black higher education community and within the Foundation expressed alarm over the post-desegregation era shift in policies. See Inter-Office Memorandum from Samuel DuBois Cook to Mr. McGeorge Bundy, "Board Discussion of Predominantly Negro Colleges (PNC's)," 30 March 1970; and Mr. Benjamin E. Mays to Mr. McGeorge Bundy, 10 April 1970. Box I, Folder 6, Series I. President Office Files—Bundy, Armsey, James 1970–1973, The Ford Foundation Archives, New York City. Hereafter, the Ford Foundations Archives in New York City will be referred to as FF Archives.

[9]The Ford Foundation, *Research on Race and Ethnicity Sponsored by the Education and Research Division and Its Forbears—1951–1973 (A Report for the Ford Foundation Task Force on Race and Ethnicity)*, #3701, August 1973, 20, FF Archives.

[10]Ibid., 18.

[11]In an Inter-Office Memorandum this 1970 report is explicitly called "*The Raspberry Report*," although the origin of the title is not yet known. Harold Howe II to Mr. McGeorge Bundy, 17 May 1971. Box 1, Folder I, Series I. President Office Files—Bundy. Howe, Harold 1970–1971, FF Archives.

effort in the field of ethnic studies."[12] For example, in the Black Studies field, the Foundation maintained a stance that racial identity would not preclude a scholar's opportunity to receive funding. The report stated that "although some aspects of the black experience can best be defined and explained by blacks, race should not be the determining factor in deciding who should prepare, teach, or take such courses."[13]

In support of this integrationist approach, the Foundation consulted historians such as John Hope Franklin and C. Vann Woodward. Ford cited Woodward's 1969 essay, "Clio with Soul," to justify its stance on promoting racial inclusivity. In this monograph, Woodward stated, "Either black history is an essential part of American history and must be included by all American historians, or it is unessential and can be segregated and left to black historians."[14] The question of whether Black Studies, or later Chicano Studies, should be situated philosophically and/or physically within the cognate departments of social science disciplines or as standalone departments represented a critical divisive issue in the creation of both fields. The Ford Foundation's self-publications and critical analyses by Fabio Rojas and Noliwe Rooks examine aspects of these internal dissensions in the development and continuation of the field of Black Studies, which eventually followed the separatist model.[15]

In the Raspberry Report, Ford pledged support for developing ethnic studies on the basis of *topic and/or project*, but not exclusively the racial or ethnic identity of the scholar. Applied to Chicano Studies, the Foundation thus articulated a similar position to Black Studies, declaring "the ethnic studies program we have in mind would provide equal opportunity for all competent scholars who have a significant contribution to make, regardless of skin color or ethnic origin." The Foundation did promote a form of affirmative action, however, by adding that they "would give non-WASP scholars high priority in the research and teaching activities of the ethnic studies centers."[16] The Raspberry Report's recommendations linked Mexican-American intellectual activists to African Americans, stating, "Like the Blacks, they want what

[12]Ford Foundation, Special Projects. Education and Research Division, *Higher Education for Under-Represented Minorities. FY 1971, FY 1972 and Three Years Beyond. (The Raspberry Report)*, #002846. 19 January 1970, 55, FF Archives.

[13]Ibid., 44.

[14]C. Vann Woodward, "Clio with Soul," *Black Studies—Myths and Realities*, A. Philip Randolph Educational Fund, September 1969, as appears in Footnote 20 in *The Raspberry Report*, FF Archives.

[15]Fred E. Crossland, *Minority Access to College: A Ford Foundation Report* (New York: Schocken Books, 1971); Ford Foundation, *Inclusive Scholarship: Developing Black Studies in the United States: A 25th Anniversary Retrospective of Ford Foundation Grant Making, 1982–2007* (New York: Ford Foundation, 2007); Rooks, *White Money/Black Power;* and Rojas, *From Black Power to Black Studies*.

[16]*The Raspberry Report*, 58, FF Archives.

they want now. In many instances, their demands for ethnic studies are couched in the same rhetoric as that used by black militants in pressing for black studies, and include the same set of justifications."[17]

The Foundation's stance on resisting what was later termed "identity politics" in academia was tied to Ford's insistence that their support for ethnic and racial minority-related topics was neither a reactionary nor a knee-jerk response to the swirl of civil unrest at the time. These disturbances, which included, in their view, black militancy, activist faculty, student demands for culturally relevant materials, and a nationalist insistence upon scholars who matched the backgrounds of their topics, did not fit with the Foundation's goals.[18] As a consequence, the Foundation's stance on funding research and projects relating to race and ethnicity emphasized that its long-term contribution would be intellectually rigorous and vital scholarship, not its viability in the realm of activist politics. As will be seen in our examples, the Foundation did not wield absolute power over its gift giving; rather, a complex interplay of historical antecedents, timing in the ascent of Chicano cultural nationalism, Foundation philosophies, the leadership of particular program directors, identity politics, and broader trends in *el movimiento's* development in the mid-1970s affected Ford Foundation policy.

The Ford Foundation's financial commitment to Chicano and Ethnic Studies between 1969 and 1973 was significant.[19] As a jumpstart for scholars interested in writing dissertations on racial and ethnic issues or for the infrastructure required to create long-term self-sustaining Chicano Studies or Native American Studies research centers, hundreds of millions of dollars were expended in the decade of the 1970s. The expenditures are particularly significant given that the Foundation had come under assault by the Nixon Administration in 1968–1969, the Vietnam War had exhausted political and funding energies among many constituents, militant Black Power ideology was causing a reconsideration among many liberals, and the economic recession had slowed overall donor gift-giving.[20] In 1960, the Foundation's dedicated

[17]Ibid.

[18]Rooks, *White Money/Black Power*, 61–92.

[19]Throughout this article we will be referencing the Annual Reports of the Ford Foundation. Over the course of our research, Ford has changed the format of their online archives several times and the scope of years one can access online. Because of this, when we cite an Annual Report, we will include a specific title if noted, otherwise we will include the generic title *Ford Foundation Annual Report* followed by the year of the report and begin referenced and specific page numbers (when called for). Electronic copies of the Annual Reports for limited years can be found at http://www.ford foundation.org.

[20]*Ford Foundation Annual Report*, 1976; O'Connor, "The Ford Foundation and Philanthropic Activism," 188; Walton, "Building a Pipeline to College," 161, 164. Without engaging in the debates over the rise and fall of the Black Power movement, there

domestic funds on issues of race and ethnic identity totaled one-half million, only 3% of the domestic budget. In 1970 that amount had increased to thirty-two million, or one-half of the Foundation's domestic budget, an extraordinary increase. By 1972, a total of $235 million had been expended in the Higher Education Research program.[21]

The scope and range of gift giving to Chicano and Puerto Rican Studies during this era was significant.[22] For example, between 1970 and

---

is nonetheless a solid literature that has chronicled the reaction of the militant black nationalist movement among whites, including Gareth Davies, *From Opportunity to Entitlement: The Transformation and Decline of Great Society Liberalism* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1996); Allen Matusow, *The Unraveling of America: A History of Liberalism in the 1960s* (New York: Harper Press, 1984); Gary Gerstle, *American Crucible: Race and Nation in the Twentieth Century* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2002); and Devin Fergus, *Liberalism, Black Power, and the Making of American Politics, 1965–1980* (Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 2009).

[21]In 1969, the Foundation established a Task Force on Race and Ethnicity to determine the amount of funds utilized on projects relating to these issues from the beginning of its founding. The information in this paragraph is from one of the three reports subsequently issued on this topic. Ford Foundation, Shirley Teper to Basil Whiting, "Race and Ethnicity Task Force: Report on National Affairs Research Thrusts," 14 March 1973, 1, FF Archives.

[22]Historical analyses and autobiographical reminiscences of the development of Chicano and Puerto Rican Studies Centers rarely analyze the Ford Foundation's role in their development. With the passage of the 1969 Tax Reform Act tightening restrictions on foundations such as Ford, the Foundation turned away from more activist type of organizations and channeled funds through less controversial institutions such as higher education. There is scattered evidence that the radical arm of the Chicano *movimiento* condemned co-option possibilities among recipients of Ford monies. Armando B. Rendón, for example, warned Chicanos to avoid their "dependence on the private gringo bureaucracies that the Ford Foundation and other foundations represented." Armando B. Rendón, *Chicano Manifesto* (New York: Macmillan, 1971), 122. Ernesto B. Vigil briefly discusses Rodolfo "Corky" Gonzales and the Crusade for Justice's critique of former Chicanos who had been co-opted into government positions and private sector institutions such as Ford. See Ernesto B. Vigil, *The Crusade for Justice: Chicano Militancy and the Government's War on Dissent* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1999), 52–53. For general interpretations of this era see George Mariscal, *Brown-Eyed Children of the Sun: Lessons from the Chicano Movement, 1965–1975* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2005),chap. 6; Lauro H. Flores, "Thirty Years of Chicano and Chicana Studies," in Johnnella E. Butler, ed., *Color-Line to Borderlands: The Matrix of American Ethnic Studies* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2001): 203–33; Refugio I. Rochín and Dennis N. Valdés, eds., *Voices of a New Chicana/o History* (East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 2000). Juan Gómez Quiñones, *Chicano Politics: Reality and Promise, 1940–1990* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1990) mentions the Ford Foundation's role in providing the funds to start the Southwest Council of La Raza and the Mexican-American Legal Defense and Education Fund, but not the Foundation's role in providing seed money for Chicano Studies Centers and departments. See also Ignacio M. García, *Chicanismo: The Forging of a Militant Ethos among Mexican Americans* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1998); and Michael Soldatenko, *Chicano Studies: The Genesis of a Discipline* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2009), which devotes two pages to Ford's funding of the Chicano Commission on Higher Education, 99–100. The activist organization, The Mexican-American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF) was started with a grant of $2.2 million. More research has been conducted on this organization. See older works such as Guadalupe

1973, the Foundation granted 261 awards to students writing dissertations on Mexican-American, Puerto Rican, Indian, or Asian-American topics, an expenditure totaling over one million dollars. An examination of the lists of students receiving awards for dissertation studies reveal a number of early Chicano and Puerto Rican scholars who have shaped the field. Examples from the listing of 1972–1973 award winners include historians Richard Griswold and Louise Año Nuevo Kerr.[23] As donor to these dissertation awards, Ford maintained that it reserved the right to stipulate that the "ethnic identity of the dissertation writer" would not prohibit receipt of the award.[24]

In this overview of the range and scope of Ford's support for Mexican-American scholars and research, only the Foundation's point of view is provided. In the case studies below we reveal the often contentious atmosphere that surrounded a Foundation project as the Mexican-American scholarly community grew and politicized during the 1960s and early 1970s.

---

San Miguel, Jr., "*Let All of Them Take Heed*": *Mexican Americans and the Campaign for Educational Equality in Texas, 1910–1981* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1987); and Karen O'Connor and Lee Epstein, "A Legal Voice for the Chicano Community: The Activities of the Mexican American Legal Defense and Education Fund, 1968–1982," *Social Science Quarterly* 65, no. 2 (June 1984): 245–56. Newer interpretations are included in Maurilio Vigil, "The Ethnic Organization as an Instrument of Political and Social Change: MALDEF, A Case Study," *Journal of Ethnic Studies* 1, no. 2 (1990): 15–31; Benjamin Marquez, "Mexican-American Political Organizations and Philanthropy: Bankrolling a Social Movement," *The Social Service Review* 77, no. 3 (2003): 329–46; Lori A. Flores, "A Community of Limits and the Limits of Community: MALDEF's Chicana Rights Project, Empowering the 'Typical Chicana,' and the Question of Civil Rights, 1974–1983," *Journal of American Ethnic History* 27, no. 3 (Spring 2008): 81–110; and Tom I. Romero, II, "MALDEF and the Legal Investment in a Multi-Colored America," *Berkeley La Raza Law Journal* 18, no. 1 (2007): 135–46.

[23]Examples are: Jose Bernardo Cuellar, "Death in the Chicano Community: An examination of death-related beliefs, attitudes and behavior among Chicanos in the greater Los Angeles area" (PhD dissertation, UCLA), received $4,907.00; Richard Griswold, "A Social History of the Mexican American Community in Los Angeles, 1850–1890" (PhD dissertation, UCLA) received $4,000; Lawrence A. Cardos, "Emigration of Mexican labor to the United States, 1900–1930: An Analysis of Socio-Economic Causes" (PhD dissertation, University of Connecticut) received $5,000; Louise Ano Nuevo Kerr, "The Mexicans in Chicago: World War I to 1970" (PhD dissertation, University of Illinois) received $5,000; and Frederic A. Bruton, "The Politicization of the Mexican-American in Three Texas Cities, 1945–1960." (PhD dissertation, Tulane University) received $2,800. "Appendix A—Dissertation Fellowship Awards Recommended by the Selection Committee for 1972–1973" in *Research on Race and Ethnicity Sponsored by the Education and Research Divisions and Its Forbears—1951–1973: A Report for the Ford Foundation Task Force on Race and Ethnicity*, #3701, August 1973, 1–8. FF Archives.

[24]*Research on Race and Ethnicity Sponsored by the Education and Research Divisions and Its Forbears*, 22.

## Prelude to Chicano Intellectual Nationalism: The Mexican-American Studies Project (UCLA)

> Less than ten years ago when the staff of the UCLA Mexican-American Study Project searched for literature in the little-known field of Chicano studies, books, journal articles, and other materials written by Chicanos themselves were almost non-existent. Most studies available had been written by Anglos . . . A few Anglo surrogates did leave indelible marks in the history of la raza. As radical champions of the oppressed in the best sense of the term, they wrote and spoke for a people who were not yet able to control the instruments of writing and publication.[25]
>
> Ralph C. Guzmán, 1973

Social science scholars from the latter end of the generation, which George J. Sánchez has called "The Mexican American Generation," received their doctorates in the 1950s and early 1960s, often entering academia as solitary figures in their respective departments.[26] Indeed, as late as 1969, the Ford Foundation reported that only nine individuals with Spanish-surnames earned PhDs that year, and among the approximately 250 Mexican-American and Puerto Rican faculty members in the United States in 1969, only 115 held doctoral degrees.[27] As the Ford Foundation stepped into funding topics on Mexican Americans, a complex interplay emerged between newly self-identifying Chicano scholars, Anglo writers and scholars, and the Foundation. Debates over the right of a group to author their own history, sociology, or anthropology were particularly heightened in an era which witnessed the entrance of a critical mass of Chicano scholars into the academy.

However, tucked away under categories such as "Special Programs," or "Social Development," Ford Foundation program officers had granted limited funds for research and educational programming related to Latinos prior to 1966. These pre-Chicano era funds were diverse in nature. A study of social stratification and social mobility in Puerto Rico was funded in 1954. Then almost three hundred thousand dollars was given for bilingual schooling programs serving Cuban refugee children in Miami from 1963 to 1965. Julian Samora of Notre Dame University was identified as principal investigator for the US-Mexico Border Study project in the 1965 *Annual Report*, and in 1964 UCLA received a multi-year grant for a "comprehensive study of the

---

[25] Ralph C. Guzmán, "Chicano Control of History: A Review of Selected Literature," *California Historical Quarterly* 52, no. 2 (Summer 1973): 171.

[26] García, *Mexican Americans*; and George J. Sánchez, *Becoming Mexican-American: Ethnicity, Culture, & Identity in Chicano Los Angeles, 1900–1945* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993).

[27] *The Raspberry Report*, 19 January 1970, note 7, 62, FF Archives.

social, economic and political status of Mexican-Americans," subsequently called The Mexican-American Studies Project.[28]

The Mexican-American Studies Project at UCLA was an ambitious social science research endeavor. Based upon multiple research sites, surveys, focus groups, interviews, and other in-depth social science research data collection techniques, the project culminated in 1971 with the publication of a volume entitled, *The Mexican-American People: The Nation's Second Largest Minority.*[29] The three principal investigators were political scientist and historian Ralph C. Guzmán (1924–1985), the only Mexican-American PhD on the research team, Joan Moore, and Leo Grebler. Guzmán, similar to other early Chicano PhDs such as Julian Samora (1920–1996), must have felt himself torn between the pull of promoting research on and by Chicanos while balancing the need for external research funds. Guzmán wrote of this tension in 1973, expressing the need for Chicano scholars to remain dependent upon "Anglo surrogates" as co-authors and producers of research on Mexican Americans while Chicano scholars learned the "tools of scholarship."[30]

Resistance from the Mexican-American scholarly community, to even a partially Anglo-authored study, arose quickly after the research team for the Mexican-American Studies Project was created in 1964. Anglo authors of the volume responded defensively in its preface, tracing the history of factionalism in the project. Co-author Leo Grebler perceived that "our appearance in the field was causing considerable apprehension . . . our credentials as faculty members of a large university and researchers for a project financed by a large foundation placed us squarely with the 'Anglo establishment.'"[31] Justifying their role in the study as a transitional point in Chicano collective consciousness, Grebler and Moore stated, "this book is part of the current discovery of Mexican Americans in the United States. Even the grant that made our study possible was the first of its kind. No national foundation had

[28]The Foundation reported, "Made grant for ESL in Dade County, FL public schools which teach over 20,000 children of Cuban refugee families." $278,000 was allocated over a 2-year period. *Ford Foundation Annual Report*, 1963, 108. The US-Border Study project is mentioned as early as 1965, the sum of $198,000 "in further support of US-Mexico Border Studies Project," *Ford Foundation Annual Report*, 1965 (accessed 10 April 2010). The Ford Foundation, Report sent from Shirley Teper to Basil Whiting, *The Race and Ethnicity Task Force: Report on National Affairs Research Thrusts*, 14 March 1973, 6–7, Group #3701, FF Archives.

[29]Leo Grebler, Joan W. Moore, and Ralph C. Guzman, *The Mexican-American People: The Nation's Second Largest Minority* (New York: The Free Press, 1971). A fascinating update to this original study was conducted recently when scholars at UCLA found the original surveys from this project during a library renovation. See Edward E. Telles and Vilma Ortiz, *Generations of Exclusion: Mexican Americans, Assimilation, and Race* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 2008).

[30]Guzmán, "Chicano Control of History," 170–75.

[31]Grebler, Moore, and Guzman, *The Mexican-American People*, 5.

ever before given funds for major research on this minority group."[32] In this statement, Grebler and Moore were incorrect because of both Carnegie and the General Education Board's (GEB) funding to George I. Sánchez.[33] The Principal Investigators further emphasized the rapid shift in Chicano consciousness that occurred in the years from when the research project began in earnest (1964) and the eventual publication of the book (1971): "Our research work began when these changes were barely discernible. The encounter of the research with a minority seeking a new self-definition must be noted here because it became part of the process of redefinition... To enter this fabric in the charged social climate of the 1960s could not but intensify the issues always present when the scholar sets out to study a disadvantaged minority."[34] Employing a positivist paradigm, the Anglo authors emphasized the virtue of their "scholarly objectivity" versus activist passion.[35]

Chicano scholars critiqued the paternalistic tone of the Anglo authors' description of the relationship between the investigators and the community it researched. Indeed, push back from the Chicano community was channeled through the new corridors of intellectual cultural capital that Chicano scholars were creating. Juan Gomez-Quiñones notes in a footnote to a 1972 article that in 1966 the Education Council of the Mexican-American Political Association had convened to discuss and publish a formal objection to the project. According to Gomez-Quiñones, Manuel H. Guerra and Y. Arturo Cabrera prepared "An Evaluation and Critique of 'The Mexican American Studies Project' a Ford Foundation Grant Extended to the University of California at Los Angeles."[36] Gomez-Quiñones summarized their objections to the grant as a focus on limitations of "a frame of reference [which] stems from a prosaic point of view which is outmoded and unrealistic or a patronizing sentimentalism which flirts with a new-colonialist attitude, or a racist complex."[37]

Substantive critiques of the volume's impact upon future research on Mexican Americans and social science research were formalized in the *Social Science Quarterly*'s symposium review of the book in 1971,

---

[32]Ibid., 3.

[33]Carlos K. Blanton, "George I. Sánchez, Ideology, and Whiteness in the Making of the Mexican American Civil Rights Movement, 1930–1960," *Journal of Southern History* 72, no. 3 (August 2006): 569–604; Lynne Marie Getz, "Extending the Helping Hand to Hispanics: The Role of the General Education Board in New Mexico in the 1930s," *Teachers College Record* 93 (Spring 1992): 500–15; and George I. Sánchez, *Forgotten People: A Study of New Mexicans* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1940).

[34]Ibid., 4.

[35]Ibid.

[36]Juan Gómez-Quiñones, "Toward a Perspective on Chicano History," *Aztlan* 2, no. 2 (Fall 1971): note 68, 47.

[37]Ibid.

which included both Chicano and Anglo perspectives. At the crux of the debate, from the Anglo contributors' points of view, was the question of whether, despite limited participation of Chicano scholars, the work could receive a fair review, particularly since it was the first significant volume ever published on the contemporary economic, educational, sociological, and political status of Mexican Americans. Thus, sociologist Norval D. Glenn at the University of Texas, Austin, opined that "a few of the more nationalistic Chicanos are likely to take a totally negative view of the book... regardless of the contents."[38] Similarly, John H. Burma of California State Polytechnic College, likened *The Mexican American People* to Gunnar Myrdal's *The American Dilemma*, a classic comprehensive study on race written from an outsider perspective and funded by the Carnegie Foundation. Burma used the example of *An American Dilemma* to point out the limitations of intellectual nationalism: "It will not meet with the approval of all Chicanos, but this cannot be avoided when one Chicano activist professor in this author's locality refused to take a look at a new book on Mexican Americans, because the author is not a Chicano."[39]

Chicano respondents to the symposium included Rodolfo "Rudy" Alvarez, at the time an Assistant Professor of Sociology at Yale who decried the study's lack of "*relevant*, historical perspective in their treatment of the Mexican-American people. It is a complete and inexcusable travesty of any notion of intellectual objectivity and all responsible social scientific disciplinary perspective to begin such a large scale study with the year 1900."[40] Alvarez was unabashed in declaring his Chicano consciousness in his essay, proclaiming, "as for me, I am a Chicano, I am rooted in this land, I am the creation of a unique psycho-historical experience. I trace part of my identity to Mexican culture and part to United States culture, but most importantly my identity is tied up with those contested lands called Atzlán!"[41] Alvarez, along with his newly found sense of Chicano identity, moved west to UCLA as a professor of sociology and director of the Chicano Studies Center, also funded by Ford. Alvarez's criticism of the Foundation would not end with *The Mexican American People*, as he also becomes involved in the politics of a future Ford Foundation project.

---

[38]Ibid., 9.

[39]John H. Burma, California State Polytechnic College. "Another American Dilemma: Finding 'The Unknown Minority,'" *Social Science Quarterly* 52, no. 1 (June 1971): 34.

[40]Rodolfo Alvarez, "The Unique Psycho-Historical Experience of *The Mexican American People*." Originally published in *Social Science Quarterly*, 52, no. 1 (June 1971): 46. Quotation from reprint in Renato Rosaldo, Robert A. Calvert, and Gustav L. Seligmann, eds., *Chicano: The Evolution of a People* (Minneapolis, MN: Winston Press, 1973), 45–55.

[41]Ibid., 53.

## *La Cronica/The Chronicle*, The Ford Foundation, and Chicano Intellectual Nationalism[42]

Drawn chiefly from the working classes, Chicano scholars entered academia as symbols of the Chicano *movimiento* fighting against the system and all forms of institutional and societal oppression.[43] "Chicano nationalism," as described by George Mariscal of UC-San Diego, both created a sense of ethnic and racial pride among Mexican Americans, while pitting them against the might of mainstream Anglo society. According to Mariscal, nationalism possessed both strengths and weaknesses in pushing forward a cause. In this study, we note that intellectual nationalism certainly provided a cohesive means for new Chicano scholars to attempt to control *who* would write their history and *what* would be written.[44] The Ford Foundation, in its informal policies, deliberately sought advice from Chicano scholars concerning projects, contributing to a belief that Chicano input was valued. However, in this new venture involving Mexican-American historical curricular materials, neither the Foundation nor the Chicanos ultimately won their ideological battles. Chicano scholars compromised one of the tenets of intellectual nationalism, *mi raza primero* (my race first), operationalized through only the use of Chicano scholars. The Foundation compromised by also partially giving into Chicano demands. The creator of the project suffered from time delays, frustration with academic bickering, financial sacrifices, and inability to secure a Chicano publisher for his materials. The intended recipients of the materials—Mexican American and other high school and college youth from the Southwestern states—were the largest losers in not receiving curricular materials about the chief historical group, which settled the area along with the Native Americans.

Into this highly politicized context stepped the Ford Foundation and Robert Miller, a Brandeis graduate and former participant in the black Civil Rights movement.[45] Miller, through the creation of media materials relevant to the black experience, identified a need in the high school curriculum for primary source materials that would reflect new trends in black history and engage adolescents.[46] In response, he created

---

[42]The bilingual newspaper's English language version was titled *The Chronicle* and Spanish language version, *La Cronica*. To avoid confusion and for simplicity we are calling it *La Cronica* in the text.

[43]Mariscal, *Brown-Eyed Children of the Sun*.

[44]Ibid., 11–14, 171–209.

[45]Resume of Robert A. Miller, ca. 1974. Grant 73–82, reel R-1765, section 1, FF Archives, In his resume it states that Miller received a B.A. in History with a minor in Politics in June of 1963 from Brandeis University, Waltham, MA.

[46]Media materials include: Black television show scripts and the Obie Award winning documentary, RIOT! Resume of Robert A. Miller, ca. 1974. Grant 73–82, reel R-1765, section 1, FF Archives.

the *Black Chronicle* between 1968 and 1972, a curriculum package for Black History focused around 14 newspapers. Each of these papers represented a likely periodical from an important time in Black History. The newspaper dates ranged from 1778 to 1956, basically taking the student from the birth of the United States up to the Civil Rights Era. *The Black Chronicle* also included two LPs (long playing records) containing audio recreations of a radio newscast covering major events in Black History, overhead transparencies, and a teacher guide.[47]

Correspondence in The Ford Foundation Archives documents a diverse range of black stakeholders supporting its publication in addition to documenting the number of school districts in the greater New York City area that had adopted the *Chronicle* for their classrooms.[48] Buoyed by the success of the *Black Chronicle*, Miller then began formulating a plan for a similar set of curricular materials on Mexican-American history. In the spring of 1972, Robert Miller proposed to Ford Foundation the creation of a set of bilingual historical newspapers. Prior to undertaking archival research, he had secured two study/travel grants from the Ford Foundation to spend six months in Mexico City studying the Spanish language and Mexican culture to better prepare him for research in the U.S. Southwestern archives and to undertake translations from original Spanish documents, if necessary.[49] The Ford Foundation expressed initial excitement about the project but also requested Miller provide recommendations from scholars familiar with *The Black Chronicle* and from Chicano leaders and scholars. In granting Miller a study/travel grant, the Foundation was following its program guidelines of sponsoring relevant *subjects*, not the scholar's racial or ethnic background. However, the recommendation process for the larger grant, involving input from the Chicano community, indicates Ford's awareness of ethnic politics at the time, regardless of their stated policy.

Clifton Johnson, Executive Director of the Amistad Research Center at Dillard University, wrote Marshall Robinson, Program Officer for Higher Education at Ford, that "as a teacher and specialist in Negro history," he could highly commend Miller's work on the *Black*

[47]John W. Greene, "Black Chronicle," *The Journal of Negro Education* 42, no. 2 (1973): 227–29.

[48]Clifton H. Johnson, Executive Director of The Amistad Research Center to Marshall Robinson, Program Officer in Higher Education (Dillard University, New Orleans, LA), 6 April 1972. Grant 73–82, reel R-1765, section 4, FF Archives.

[49]Miller received $3,750.00 and $11,167.40, "to conduct research and prepare a plan for establishing a newspaper in Mexican-American History" and "to carry out research for a newspaper project in Mexican-American History and attend Berlitz language training program in Mexico City, Mexico." See Appendix B: Travel and Study Awards in the Field of Race and Ethnicity, 1967–1973, in "Past and Present Foundation Funded Research on Race and Ethnicity," in *Research on Race and Ethnicity Sponsored by the Education and Research Divisions and Its Forbears—1951–1973*, FF Archives.

*Chronicle*. Johnson astutely captured the nascent stage of Mexican-American history stating, "the need in this area [Mexican American history] to be even greater than in the field of Negro history. Not only is the quantity less of recent writings based on scholarly research than in Negro history, but there has been less effort over the years to preserve the primary resources, particularly those written in English . . . consequently . . . he must do much more extensive research and use both English and Spanish sources."[50] By the early 1970s, Miller reported that over 300,000 copies of the *Black Chronicle* had been distributed through Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc.[51]

In contrast to the positive support among the black community for his project, there were mixed reactions among Chicano scholars and activists. In what was clearly a political coup for Miller, Chicano activist and founder of the radical land reclamation movement, Alianza de los Pueblos Libres, Reyes Lopez Tijerina lent his support to *La Cronica*. Tijerina's credentials as a grassroots Chicano activist, who had been imprisoned for his efforts to challenge illegal land acquisitions, lent Miller's project unparalleled credibility. Tijerina wrote Robinson at the Ford Foundation of his confidence in Miller directing the project based on "the research he has been doing on Chicano history." Tijerina emphasized the follow-through of one of Miller's important pledges and strategies to "sell" his product to the Chicano community. "Clearly," Tijerina added, "Chicanos must play an important role in the project and the fact that the majority of the research and writing staff will be Chicano fills this vital need."[52] Indeed, in the grant proposal, Miller committed to hiring almost twenty Chicano graduate students, scholars, journalists, and writers to assist with the project, a commitment that was honored.

Dr. Carlos E. Cortés, Associate Professor and Chairman of Mexican-American Studies at the University of California-Riverside, also championed the project. Cortés's contention that the project would "provide educational materials in which both the Chicano people and Ford Foundation can take pride," indicated support from one of the pioneer Chicano PhD's in History. Cortés eventually joined the project as an advisor, emphasizing Miller's "inclusion of active Chicano

[50]Clifton H. Johnson to Marshall Robinson, 6 April 1972. Grant 73–82, reel R-1765, section 4, FF Archives.

[51]"Precis," in *Grant Report*, proposal submitted to Claremont University Center, ca. 1972, 4. Grant 73–82, reel R-1765, section 1, FF Archives; and Robert A. Miller to Marshall Robinson, 30 October 1972, "Meeting with Rudy Alvarez and Vice Chancellor Wilson on October 9 in Wilson's UCLA Office." Grant 73–82, reel R-1765, section 4, FF Archives.

[52]Reyes Lopez Tijerina to Marshall Robinson, 19 July 1972. Grant 73–82, reel R-1765, section 4, FF Archives.

historians," as critical to the project's ability to "reflect positively on the Chicano experience."[53]

The Ford Foundation's modus operandi in the 1960s and 1970s for grant giving was to solicit input from community leaders and scholars.[54] In one of these fact-finding trips into the field, Marshall Robinson met with Mexican-American leaders such as historians Rodolfo "Rudy" Acuña and Julian Nava. Although trained as an historian, Nava was also a political activist and broke a significant political barrier in 1967 through his election as the first Mexican-American member of the Los Angeles Board of Education in over one hundred years. Nava met with Robert Miller in the summer of 1972 concerning the project. Bucking the positive trend, Nava expressed his disappointment to Robinson concerning Miller's leadership, asking, "I wondered why Ford Foundation did not offer an opportunity for Mexican American talent to do such a job." Nava emphasized his own version of *mi raza primero*, explaining, "It is a serious matter for many of us who want to promote Mexican American abilities in such areas that available talent goes untapped."[55] Nava, the politician, eventually threw his support behind the project, particularly after the Mexican-American Educational Commission formed after the Chicano "blowouts" formally declared support for *La Cronica*. However, Nava the historian, clearly expressed his cultural intellectual nationalism, shaped by his own evolution from Mexican-American scholar to Chicano activist.

Born in 1927, Nava forged a career as an historian, politician, and diplomat, but maintained his central connection as a professor of history at California State University, Northridge from 1957 to 2000. In the early years of *el movimiento*, Nava created historical anthologies accessible to both younger readers and the scholarly community to access primary sources. In 1970, with support from the Anti-Defamation League, he published *Mexican-Americans: A Brief Look at their History*, after also publishing a textbook for youth in public schools entitled, *Mexican Americans: Past, Present, Future* with the American Book

[53]Dr. Carlos E. Cortés, Associate Professor of History and Chairman, Mexican-American Studies, University of California, Riverside to Marshall Robinson, 26 July 1972. Grant 73–82, reel R-1765, section 4, FF Archives.

[54]Marshall Robinson emphasized to Julian Nava, "Our interest in this project is contingent upon the support of sensitive and knowledgeable Mexican Americans; and Robert Miller has taken the same position. We hope therefore that the project will have your endorsement." Marshall Robinson to Julian Nava, 21 August 1972. Grant 73–82, reel R-1765, section 4, FF Archives.

[55]Julian Nava, Board of Education, City of Los Angeles to Marshall Robinson, 2 August 1972. Grant 73–82, reel R-1765, section 4, FF Archives.

Company in 1969.[56] His next work, published in 1973, exhibited a much stronger sense of his evolving identity as a Chicano. In his anthology, *!VIVA LA RAZA!*, Nava stated that he hoped the collection would give "the objective reader a chance to determine for himself the near-sighted and chauvinistic nature of much of United States history... The author proudly proclaims himself a Chicano and urges others to adopt the term."[57]

Robinson defended the Foundation's support of the project to Nava, reminding him that, "my conversation last spring with you and Rudi Acuna [sic] was one of our reasons for pursuing this idea with Miller; the need for realistic, interesting historical materials about Mexican Americans, is as you noted, one of the pieces of the puzzle."[58] Julian Nava eventually gave his support to Miller and the project, emphasizing, as did Tijerina and Cortés, that the involvement of Mexican Americans was one critical aspect. However, he pointed out to Robinson that for Chicanos, "At this point in our development we must put all possible emphasis upon development of a new leadership. Mr. Miller needs this help far less than talented Chicanos."[59] Robinson eventually did receive lukewarm support from Julian Nava, but *La Cronica* had stepped into an era of rapid collective identity development among new faculty as Chicanos, a shift that at the zenith of the Chicano movement reflected a narrow interpretation of who could and could not write Chicano history.

## *La Cronica*, 1972–1973

In 1972, Rodolfo Acuña published *Occupied America: The Chicano's Struggle Toward Liberation*. The book was an instant hit among Chicano scholars and widely adopted throughout courses in the new Chicano Studies departments. Even today, *Occupied America* remains a staple in the Chicano Studies curricula.[60] *Occupied America* came at the vanguard of a new movement of Chicano intellectual nationalism in Mexican-American historiography.[61]

---

[56]Julian Nava, *Mexican Americans: A Brief Look at their History* (New York: Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 1970); and *Mexican Americans: Past, Present, Future* (New York: American Book Company, 1969).

[57]Julian Nava, *!VIVA LA RAZA!: Readings on Mexican Americans*, (New York: D. Van Nostrand Company, 1973), x.

[58]Marshall A. Robinson, Officer in Charge, Division of Education and Research to Mr. Julian Nava, 21 August 1972, 1. Grant 73–82, reel R-1765, section 4, FF Archives.

[59]Letter to Marshall Robinson from Julian Nava, Member Board of Education, City of Los Angeles, 6 October 1972. Grant 73–82, reel R-1765, section 4, FF Archives.

[60]Roberto Rodríguez, "The Origins and History of the Chicano Movement," in *Voices of a New Chicana/o History*, 301.

[61]Albert M. Camarillo, "The 'New' Chicano History: Historiography of Chicanos of the 1970s," in *Chicanos and the Social Sciences: A Decade of Research and Development*

Chicano Studies flourished in the 1970s. Mexican-American graduate students could study with scholars who shared similar backgrounds and ideologies, unlike the previous generation who resented "rely[ing] on Anglo scholars . . . teaching us about ourselves."[62] The years from 1970 to 1980 were formative in the training of a generation of Chicana/o historians.[63] Between 1970 and 1974, approximately eighty articles on Chicano history appeared in nine journals, and some historians began to lament the "rush" to publication of works on Chicanos prompted by publishers' demands and interests.[64] During the early 1970s, Chicano scholars were coalescing their newly found intellectual cultural capital into institutional form with the creation of influential journals such as *Aztlán: Chicano Journal of the Social Sciences and the Arts* (1970); *Journal of Mexican-American Studies* (1970), and, in 1972, creating the National Association of Chicana and Chicano Studies (NACCS). Seeking support for his Mexican-American history project and an institutional home in 1972, Miller and *La Cronica* collided head on with the zenith of Chicano intellectual nationalism.

The Chicano Studies Center at UCLA had been created with funding from the Ford Foundation.[65] Marshall Robinson logically believed *La Cronica* might find the center a receptive institutional home from which to base the sixty thousand dollar project. Writing to his contact Rodolfo "Rudi" Alvarez, Chicano sociologist and head of the center, Robinson alerted him that a "young man by the name of Robert Miller" would be contacting him soon for a meeting about an innovative Mexican-American curriculum project. Already aware of the resistance of some Chicanos, Robinson noted, "needless to say, we would have preferred to have the project carried out by a

---

*(1970–1980)*, ed., Isidro D. Ortiz (Santa Barbara, CA: Center for Chicano Studies, 1983), 9–17; Michael Soldatenko, *Chicano Studies: The Genesis of a Discipline* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2009).

[62] Roberto Rodriguez, "The Origins and History of the Chicano Movement," 302.

[63] Rios-Bustamante, "A General Survey of Chicano/a Historiography," in *Voices of a New Chicano/a History*, 252.

[64] Gómez-Quiñones, "Toward a Perspective on Chicano History," note 8, also critiqued the hasty publication of works that were insufficiently adept at battling old stereotypes. Albert Camarillo, from his perspective in the 1980s, commented that "most of these historical overviews were rushed into print so as to capitalize on a growing interested audience. As a result, most of these Chicano history texts are overly impressionistic and do not push analyses or interpretations much beyond that examined by Carey McWilliam's *North From Mexico* first published in 1948." Unfortunately, Camarillo does not identify which works he believed were too hastily published. Albert Camarillo, "Observations on the 'New' Chicano History: Historiography of the 1970s," Working Paper Series No.1 (Stanford Center for Chicano Research, January 1984): 4. Accessed 11 December 2011 at: http://ccsre.stanford.edu/pdfs/WorkingPaperSeriesNo1.pdf.

[65] *Ford Foundation Annual Reports*, 1968–1975.

Mexican-American journalist-historian."[66] Robinson apparently requested that Alvarez discuss the project with his colleagues at UCLA and other institutions and report back to him. Alvarez's report to Robinson was pointedly negative, at times caustic, and peppered with numerous alleged assertions from unnamed colleagues throughout the California university system.

Alvarez summarized for Robinson four major objections to the project: (1) Departments or Centers of Chicano Studies did not believe such a project was part of the university domain. (2) Alleged exploitation of the Chicano community by the Ford Foundation. According to Alvarez, "everyone with whom I have checked resents the idea of the Ford Foundation 'once again' funding a project whereby 'the Chicano community becomes the source of pecuniary gain by those who have consistently exploited us.'" It appears that in this instance, Alvarez's informant is referring to the 1960s Mexican-American Studies Project at UCLA. Implicating Miller even further, Alvarez asserts that "rather deep resentment" existed because it appeared that Miller was trying to "legitimate himself and his project by affiliation with a group of Chicanos, use Ford Foundation money to underwrite the idea," and subsequently provide a "nice cover for the operation by having it published by a Chicano firm." (3) Highlighting the emergence of a "talented tenth" of Chicanos, Alvarez then refuted that there were "no Chicano journalist-historians who could do this . . . This summer an association of Chicano historians was formed under our auspices and included six Ph.D.'s and eight M.A.'s"—apparently referring to the initial formation of the NACCS. (4) Alvarez concluded his lengthy letter by stating that numerous individuals believed "Mr. Miller has very close friends within the Foundation." Alvarez acknowledged, "I do believe some responses toward the Foundation were harsh, especially in view of its broad scale help over the years."[67] Alvarez's report clearly disturbed Robinson and he reacted defensively and pragmatically.

In his response to Alvarez, Robinson honed in on the essential goal of the project and its beneficiaries—Mexican-American adolescents. Robinson displayed little patience for academic politicking and cultural nationalism at the expense of something helpful to the overall community. Frustrated, the Foundation officer concluded that "even though we are concerned about the oft-cited rape of Chicano history and its impact on the young, we really do not want to see this concern

[66] Rudi Alvarez, Chicano Studies Center, University of California Los Angeles to Marshall A. Robinson, 24 July 1972. Grant 73–82, reel R-1765, section 4, FF Archives.

[67] Rodolfo Alvarez to Marshall Robinson, 18 August 1972, 1. Grant 73–82, reel R-1765, section 4, FF Archives.

regarded as a mechanism for exploitation. There are just too many other things to do to advance the human condition."[68]

During the month of September 1972, a flurry of letters between Alvarez and Robinson hammered out the crux of the objections to the project, but Alvarez clearly took stock of the political capital he was expending in fighting the project with Robinson and eventually backed down. As director of the Chicano Studies Center, and recipient of considerable funding from the Ford Foundation, Alvarez stood to lose considerably if he excessively antagonized Robinson, the newly appointed Deputy Vice President at Ford.[69] In a fawning manner uncharacteristic of Alvarez's earlier rhetoric, he extended an invitation to Robinson to come and visit the UCLA Chicano Studies Center, as "we dearly wish to demonstrate to you what we have accomplished against all odds; but not without the greatly appreciated help of the Foundation."[70] The Deputy Vice President of Ford Foundation then reassured Alvarez directly that he need not be worried about Ford's funding of the center, but clearly utilized his standing to remind Alvarez that Ford had the power to give, and take away, funding. "Have no fear about my curiosity about your Center. We watch our investments carefully – and I will surely be on your doorstep one of these days."[71] While Miller and Robinson continued to seek an institutional home for *La Cronica*, support from constituents most closely in touch with school level needs continued in the fall of 1972.

In contrast to the hostility in academia, Miller found affirmation from community-based organizations such as the Mexican-American Educational Commission (MAEC) in Los Angeles, which was formed under the jurisdiction of the Board of Education of Los Angeles. MAEC was a monitoring committee composed of parents, teachers, and community members to protect the interests of Chicano students in the Los Angeles school system after the Los Angeles high school "blow outs" of 1968.[72] Miller reported to Robinson that he had presented the

---

[68]Ibid.

[69]Robinson, a PhD economist, joined the Ford Foundation in 1964, was appointed Vice President in 1972 and remained until 1979. He continued his philanthropic career as President of Russell Sage Foundation from 1979 to 1986. He passed away in 2006. See obituary in *The New York Times*, 13 January 13, 2006, accessed 11 December 2011 at: http://www.nytimes.com/2006/01/13/nyregion/13ROBINSON.html

[70]Rodolfo Alvarez to Marshall A. Robinson, Deputy Vice President, Division of Education and Research, 13 September 1972, 3. Grant 73–82, reel R-1765, section 4, FF Archives.

[71]Marshall A. Robinson to Rodolfo Alvarez, 21 September 1972, 1–3. Grant 73–82, reel R-1765, section 4, FF Archives.

[72]In his postscript, Miller notes, "P.S. I presented the project idea last night to the Mexican American Educational Commission in East Los Angeles. The Commission was formed after the East Los Angeles high school walkouts to represent the Chicano

project idea to a group composed of "about fifty community members, including working and professional people, and parents and teachers, who received the idea warmly, and passed a resolution supporting it."[73] In a subsequent letter from the MAEC, they confirmed their resolution stating, "We feel that material on Chicano history is urgently needed in our public schools and its imaginative presentation format will further insure its usefull [sic] ness. Mr. Miller has undertaken a valuable project and we wish him success in his endeavor."[74] Similarly, the Alhambra, California City Schools wrote to Miller in November of 1972 stating that it had "recently launched a full-fledged Chicano Studies program at Mark Keppel and San Gabriel High Schools." Mrs. Margarita Vela Banks, Human Relations Specialist for the schools, noted that the district had already utilized the *Black Chronicle*, and were "very interested in acquiring a similar series about Chicano history and affairs. A journalistic approach to the many controversial issues that a Chicano Studies class entails can do much to instill interest, stimulate inquiry and especially appeal to young people who are often 'turned off' by texts."[75] During the latter part of 1972, while schools in the Southwest became acquainted and interested in the adoption of *La Cronica* (often through Miller's extensive personal marketing and lobbying) and some colleges explored adoption of the curricula for their undergraduate level courses, final negotiations for *La Cronica's* institutional home were carried out between The Ford Foundation and The Chicano Studies Center at Claremont.

The intense politicization surrounding the *La Cronica* project spurred the Foundation's leadership to actively seek a program

---

community and to express its feelings on educational issues to the Los Angeles School Board. Last night's meeting was attended by about 50 community members, including working and professional people, and parents and teachers. After crucifying a representative of the school board who described 'another federal vocational program' to them, they heard my description of the project, received the idea warmly, and passed a resolution supporting it. I should have a copy of the resolution soon." Robert Miller to Marshall Robinson, 30 October 1972, 2. Grant 73–82, reel R-1765, section 4, FF Archives. For detailed information on the Los Angeles blow outs see Ian Haney Lopez, *Racism on Trial: The Chicano Fight for Justice* (Cambridge, MA: The Cambridge Press of Harvard University Press, 2003); and Victoria-María MacDonald, ed., *Latino Education in the United States, 1513-2000: A Narrated History* (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2004), chap. 7.

[73]Robert Miller to Marshall Robinson, 30 October 1972, 2. Grant 73–82, reel R-1765, section 4, FF Archives.

[74]Letter from Raul P. Arreola, Executive Secretary and Kay H. Gurule, Chairperson. Textbook Taskforce, Mexican American Education Commission, Board of Education City of Los Angeles, October 30, 1972. Grant 73–82, reel R-1765, section 4, FF Archives.

[75]Letter from Mrs. Margarita Vela Banks, Human Relations Specialist, Alhambra (CA) City Schools, 28 November 1972, 1. Grant 73–82, reel R-1765, section 4, FF Archives.

officer of Latino descent, someone who could act as a broker between the community and the Foundation. Marshall Robinson, with direct experience in the delicate negotiations between Chicanos, Anglos, and the Foundation, wrote in early 1972 to Vice President of Education Harold Howe II, former U.S. Commissioner of Education and activist for the War on Poverty and integration.[76] Robinson requested from Howe permission to hire a "mature Mexican-American to help us deal with the educational problems of this 'second largest minority.'"[77] He articulated to Howe that the new officer must be of Hispanic descent: "The cultural, social and regional differences between these people and the blacks are enormous and constitute a strong argument against the use of black staff members for this work."[78] Furthermore, Robinson reminded them that "from an affirmative action standpoint, we are overdue in recruiting a Mexican-American."[79] The ideal candidate, in his opinion, would not only be able to handle both higher education and K-12 projects but also be a good facilitator as "a major focus of our work will be at the point of culture clash between the Chicano youth and the educational institution."[80]

Vice President Howe responded immediately to Robinson's plea, writing a letter to Ford Foundation President McGeorge Bundy the next day. In his confidential memorandum he urged, "we need a staff member who comes from a Spanish-speaking background who can help us design and carry through programs related to Mexican-American and Puerto Rican minorities. Since we must choose between these two in making an appointment, we suggest a Mexican American."[81] Howe supported Robinson's suggestion noting the alignment with the Foundation's priorities, stating, "[since] new program directions for the next five years focus on minorities, lack of representation on our staff of the Spanish American background group is a handicap in both internal planning and external negotiations."[82]

---

[76]Wolfgang Saxon, "Harold Howe II, 84, Fighter Against Segregated Schools," *The New York Times*, 3 December 2002, accessed 30 June 2010 at: http://www.nytimes.com/2002/12/03/us/harold-howe-ii-84-fighter-against-segregated-schools.html

[77]Marshall A. Robinson to Mr. Harold Howe II, 28 February 1972. Subject: Staff Assignments. President Office Files—Bundy, Box 1, Folder 2, Series I, Group 2, Howe, Harold 1972–1973, FF Archives.

[78]Ibid., 1.

[79]Ibid.

[80]Ibid., 2.

[81]Confidential Inter-Office Memorandum, Subject: Divisional Staff: (1) Requests for replacements, (2) Report on Turnover, Harold Howe II to McGeorge Bundy and Arthur D. Trottenberg, copied to Marshall Robinson and Mr. Meade, 29 February 1972. President Office Files—Bundy. Box 1 Folder 2 Series I Group 2. Howe, Harold 1972-73, FF Archives.

[82]Ibid.

Whomever Ford hired would be the first Hispanic program officer in the Foundation's long history and would fill a difficult role. This individual would be called upon to balance their status in a prestigious and affluent foundation with ties to the Chicano community that viewed Ford as part of the "Establishment." Access to this seat of power represented both a coup for the Chicano community and a peril over co-option. Abel Amaya, director of the Chicano Studies Center at Colorado State University was hired as Program Officer in 1972.[83] In this position, Amaya was thrust into one of the country's most powerful philanthropic organizations, a feat no person of Hispanic descent had accomplished previously, and at the same time, he would be conducting negotiations as both a representative and employee of the Ford Foundation but also as someone who had come of age intellectually and politically in the *movimiento* era.

## The Mexican-American Studies Center, Claremont Colleges, and *La Cronica*: Compromise or Compromising *La Causa*?

> I do hope that you understand that some of my counterparts at Northridge, San Diego, USC & UCLA (to say nothing—about some vocal members of my faculty) thought and still think I did a disservice to la causa . . . regardless of what you may have gleaned from the conversation when you were here at the Center, we do have some realistic and sophisticated carnales [brothers] here. *I realize Ford can't take care of all the needs of Aztlan.*
>
> Edward Quevedo, Director, Mexican-American Studies Center, The Claremont Colleges, 1973[84]

The negotiations between Claremont Colleges, Ford Foundation, and Robert Miller represented a compromise between the ideals of Chicano intellectual nationalism, which placed a premium on *mi raza primero* (my people first), control over the authoring of Chicano history, and Ford's power and influence. Foundation money was particularly valuable during the early 1970s when an economic recession was stalling many initiatives of the War on Poverty and the protracted Vietnam War

[83] According to biographical information on the University of Southern California El Centro Chicano website, Amaya received a BA in Latin American Studies from the University of Arizona, a Master of Arts degree in History from Southern Methodist University in Texas, and had not yet completed his dissertation in U.S. and Latin American Relations: University of Southern California, "Previous Directors," El Centro Chicano, accessed 30 June 2010 at: http://sait.usc.edu/elcentro/about/history/previous-directors.aspx. He was granted a five-year leave of absence from Colorado State University to join Ford.

[84] Edward Quevedo, Director, Mexican-American Studies Center, The Claremont Colleges, Human Resources Institute to Abel Amaya, Program Officer, The Ford Foundation, Division of Education and Research, 16 March 1973. Emphasis in italics ours.

had pulled both attention and funds away from civil rights initiatives.[85] Furthermore, while some Chicano nationalists had demonized Ford as a "capitalist" enterprise (often misconstruing the corporate arm of the Ford Motor Company with the autonomous nonprofit Foundation), right wing politicians such as President Nixon, conservative Republicans, and others viewed Ford Foundation President McGeorge Bundy and his officers as subversives and left wing ideologues.[86]

Thus, in the spring of 1973, when the director of the Claremont Chicano Studies Center signed off on the "Statement of Mutual Agreement," with Ford, Miller, and his center, Quevedo knew that he was treading dangerous waters in fighting for the project to be housed at the Claremont Colleges. In a memorandum to Amaya, Ford's unofficial "cultural broker" between the Foundation and the Chicano community, Quevedo explained to his *carnale* (brother—term utilized frequently among Chicano activists) that he had selected pragmatism over *Chicanismo*. "Let me be candid with you about one of my reasons for putting myself on the line in fighting my cohorts to let Miller's Chronicle land here. I wanted a tie with the Foundation and I wanted our students and staff involved with a good project."[87] Quevedo's co-optive stance is an important revelation of how the Ford Foundation's prestige and link to powerful networks and funds was critical to the acquisition of cultural capital for new Chicanos, despite the gamble in antagonizing fellow Chicano intellectual nationalists. The all-Chicano research team fulfilled Quevedo's goals. Research assistants in their doctoral programs are currently highly ranked and tenured Chicano professors. For example, Edward J. Escobar, a PhD candidate in History at UC-Riverside at the time, is currently Associate Professor of Transborder Chicana/o and Latina/o Studies at Arizona State University; Ramón D. Chacón, also in a History PhD program, is currently Associate Professor of History at Santa Clara University; and Félix Gutiérrez, a PhD candidate in Communications at Berkeley during the project, is currently Professor of

[85] O'Connor, "The Ford Foundation and Philanthropic Activism in the 1960s," and see also concerns about funding cuts aborting civil rights and social justice projects discussed in: Adhoc Committee on Racial Policy Issues, *RACIAL POLICY ISSUES: Summary of Discussions and Recommendations, Ford Foundation*, #010883, ca. 1976, FF Archives.

[86] Ernesto B. Vigil, *Crusade for Justice*, 52–53; David Halberstam, "The Very Expensive Education of McGeorge Bundy," *Harper's Magazine* (July 1969): 21–41; and Diane Ravitch, *The Great School Wars: New York City, 1805–1973: A History of the Public Schools as Battlefield of Social Change* (New York: Basic Books, 1974), 397.

[87] Edward Quevedo to Abel Amaya, 16 March 1973. Grant 73–82, section 4, FF Archives.

Journalism and Communication at the Annenberg School, University of Southern California.[88]

Because of the complexity and tension accompanying *La Cronica's* final placement at Claremont, a formal "Statement of Mutual Agreement" was drafted between the three parties to avoid further conflict and divisiveness. Most of Ford's projects included contracts between parties that were less detailed. Miller was assured of his copyright ownership of the newspapers and, in return, two tenets of *Chicanismo* were incorporated into the agreement, *mi raza primero* (my people first) and cultural nationalism. In both these cases, Ford ultimately compromised its own stance on identity politics. First, Miller agreed that "subject only to professional qualifications required for the job... staffing will be Chicano, bilingual, and familiar with Chicano history." Further, to protect misappropriation of Mexican-American history, Miller agreed that the Claremont Colleges and Chicano Studies Center "will participate in reviewing project copy to assure historical accuracy," as "any historical document depicting the Chicano experience in the SW is of critical concern to Chicanos."[89] Finally, the Chicano Studies Center included a clause hoping to protect its integrity among Chicanos, asserting that the Center is "charged with reflecting a concern for Chicano identity on and off campus... this document can be made available to all Chicanos who might express support for or concern about such a project."[90] In this compromise, Ford permitted a layer of scrutiny over the intellectual integrity of the history appearing in *La Cronica* and sacrificed its former policies resisting Chicano intellectual nationalism.

## The Legacy and Meaning of *La Cronica* and Mexican-American History

> He [Bob] had been experiencing difficulty in recruiting Chicano research personnel with investigative background [sic] in Southwest history and who were at the same time willing to function under the directorship of a "gringo."

[88]A full list is available under "Summary of Staff." Memorandum, Marshall A. Robinson to Howard R. Dressner via Harold Howe II, "Subject: Supplement to Grant 73–082," Claremont University Center, 5 March 1973, FF Archives. Currently faculty were located through an internet search to their institution home pages, and are respectively at: http://www.asu.edu/clas/transborder/faculty_escobar.htm (accessed 10 December 2011); and http://annenberg.usc.edu/Faculty/Communication%20and%20Journalism/GutierrerzF.aspx (accessed 10 December 2011).

[89]"Statement of Mutual Agreement Between The Chicano Studies Center of the Claremont Colleges and Ford Foundation Project '*Chicano Chronicle*,'" n.d. but handwritten note on top "Rec'd week of 4/23/73." Grant 73–82, section 1, FF Archives. Statement signed by Edward Quevedo, Director and Robert Miller, Project Director.

[90]Ibid.

Abel Amaya to Gail Spangenberg, 1973[91]

As the first issues of *La Cronica* rolled off the presses in 1973, the sixty thousand dollars from the Ford Foundation were rapidly dissipating. Miller was funding a large staff of twenty Chicano graduate students and scholars not only at Claremont Colleges, but at several regional sites throughout the Southwest. Miller immediately applied for another grant to maintain the project's momentum after funding expired at the end of 1973. However, the bitter taste of Chicano politics remained among the Ford Foundation's program officers. They were unwilling to engage in a project that had caused so much consternation and would, in one foundation officer's words, continue to "stir the embers of a battle that still goes on below the surface."[92]

Gail Spangenberg, Program Officer assigned to the Chronicle project beginning in January of 1973, was sympathetic to Robert Miller's dedication to the project and although initially she "expressed some doubts" about further funding, in November of 1973 she indicated that she had "softened some in my views on this matter," understanding that the Foundation's role in its funding meant that "its success can be assured only by more help from us." Spangenberg understood that, as an Anglo, her position regarding the project was in less jeopardy than Chicano Program Officer Abel Amaya. Amaya had taken a five-year leave of absence from his position as a professor at Colorado State University in the History Department and Chicano Studies Center to work for the Foundation.[93] Chicano activists who joined "Anglo" organizations, even as brokers, were often suspect to whether they had been co-opted and whether their loyalties lay with *la causa* or the dominant society.[94] Spangenberg explained to Miller that extra funding "might cause us some problems of a different nature because of the pressures put on Abel by the Chicano community as a whole."[95]

However, she supported Miller sufficiently to at least ask both Benjamin Payton, a new director, and Abel Amaya, if there was any possibility of securing further funding, adding, "Incidentally, Marshall Robinson was most directly involved in the early, and sometimes hysterical, negotiations that led to the grant, and someone might wish to

[91]Abel Amaya to Gail Spangenberg, 6 June 1973. Grant 73–82, section 4, FF Archives.

[92]Benjamin F. Payton to Gail Spangenberg, copied to Abel Amaya, "Re: *Chicano Chronicle*," 30 November 1973. Grant 73–82, section 4, FF Archives.

[93]USC El Centro Chicano, "El Centro's History: Previous Directors," USC Student Affairs, accessed 11 December 2009 at: http://www.usc.edu/student-affairs/elcentro/history_previous_directors.htm.

[94]Ernesto B. Vigil, *Crusade for Justice*, 52–53.

[95]Inter-Office Memorandum from Gail Spangenberg to Ben Payton, "Subject: *Chicano Chronicle*, 21 November 1973." Grant 73–82, FF Archives.

get his current views."[96] At this juncture, Amaya was unwilling to put himself again in a highly contentious position. He told Spangenberg that he concurred in denying renewal of the program. Furthermore, in an indication that Amaya's own identity had shifted toward a modus operandus of co-option, he added in the margins of his letter to Spangenberg, "we should keep consistent with stands we took in developing the grant and in the position we took with resisting Chicanos."[97]

The Ford Foundation continued to evade pleas from Miller for additional funding, despite new information in the fall of 1973 that the project had received "endorsements from the Los Angeles, Alhambra and Riverside school boards, and strong interest from Chicano and Anglo publishers."[98]

Gail Spangenberg's continued lobbies to her colleagues for assistance with the project did not alter Ford's strong "no-role" stance. After funds ran out at the end of 1973, Miller continued to fund the project with his own savings.[99] Miller's efforts finally paid off with a large federal grant, which arose from the desegregation era. In the summer of 1974, an Emergency School Aid Act (E.S.A.A.) from Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) in the amount of $135,205 was awarded to *La Cronica* to continue development and production and provide the Pasadena (CA) Unified School District and other schools with copies.[100] Furthermore, Miller reported to Spangenberg that the newspapers were "being used successfully in social studies, language, and high intensity reading programs in the Pasadena Unified School District, the Chaffey School District and in Cal State, Dominguez Hills."[101]

Although it appeared in early 1974 that ideological cultural nationalist forces might cause Miller's *La Cronica* to fold and become a failure for Miller after years of investment, he felt personal

---

[96]Ibid.

[97]Abel Amaya to Gail Spangenberg, 6 June 1973. Grant 73–82, section 4, FF Archives.

[98]Robert Miller, Director of the *Chicano Chronicle*, The Claremont Colleges to Gail Spangenberg, Assistant Program Officer, Higher Education and Research, Ford Foundation, October 29, 1973. Grant 73–82, section 4, FF Archives.

[99]Clifford T. Stewart, Associate Provost of Claremont University Center wrote to Spangenberg in June of 1974 announcing the HEW grant and stating, "As you may know, the project has been without financial resources since December, 1973." Clifford T. Stewart to Gail Spangenberg, Assistant Program Officer, 26 June 1974. Grant 73–82, section 1 supplement, FF Archives.

[100]Ibid. The provost requested assistance from the Ford Foundation to pay about $6,000 in additional overhead to supplement the HEW grant, but that amount does not appear to have been granted; Robert Miller to Gail Spangenberg, 20 October 1975. Grant 073–82, section 4, FF Archives.

[101]Miller appended a list of over forty organizations in his letter dated October 20, 1975 that had given the *Chicano Chronicle* support by 1975, but the attachment dated 29 June 1977 does not appear in Foundation records.

vindication when Rudy Alvarez, one of the project's greatest antagonists, was ousted from his position as Director of Chicano Studies at UCLA in 1974 by his own Chicano community. Miller sent newspaper article clippings to Marshall Robinson from UCLA's paper, the *Daily Bruin*, with headlines screaming CHICANOS SHUT DOWN STUDIES CENTER. The article read, "The Chicano Studies Center (CSC) was closed down indefinitely Monday by a group of students who have been calling for the resignation of the Center's director Rodolfo Alvarez. The group, numbering almost 75, occupied the Center all day, thus immobilizing it and halting its regular services. They plan to continue the Center's shutdown until Alvarez resigns."[102] Handwritten flyers of the rebellion called for his resignation and a mass meeting stating, "He has committed a moral crime; the betrayal of his people, and the concept of Chicano Studies. We can no longer tolerate his opportunism, his administrative incompetence and his lack of awareness of the Chicano community."[103] Miller sent these materials to Robinson, now Vice President of Resources at Ford, with a note, "Thought you might like to see how Chicanos view Rudy Alvarez as a representative of the Chicano community. It is this impression that I've had of him from the very beginning and tried somewhat unsuccessfully to convey to you in those difficult times in 1972."[104] Although students were leading this revolt, faculty members could also have been assisting the students in the background, part of the contentious atmosphere often found in academia.

Although Miller never received more funding from Ford, he did have the continued moral support of Program Officer Gail Spangenberg with whom he corresponded through 1977. Spangenberg, in turn, continued to lobby for Miller's project in securing a publisher, a goal never achieved during the years Ford maintained records of the grant.[105] Miller documents numerous meetings with Chicano-owned publishers who offered encouragement, but never a contract. Eventually, the large publisher Harcourt-Brace included *La Cronica* in its publications, but evidence suggests this did not occur until the early 1990s. Future

[102] Newspaper clipping, *UCLA Daily Bruin* VCII, no. 34 (15 May 1974), attached to letter from Robert Miller to Marshall Robinson, ca. 1974, FF Archives.

[103] Copy of hand written flyer calling for meeting on May 15, 1974, attached to letter from Robert A. Miller to Marshall A. Robinson, ca. 1974, FF Archives.

[104] Robert A. Miller to Marshall Robinson, Vice President Resources and the Environment, n.d. Letterhead is from *LA CRONICA*, Scripps College Service Building, The Claremont Colleges, FF Archives.

[105] Inter-Office Memorandum from Gail Spangenberg to Ralph Bohrson, Subject: *La Cronica*, 29 July 1977. Grant 73–82, FF Archives.

research on this project will involve interviews of key personnel, including university officials' perspectives.[106]

The examples in this study, two among dozens of projects the Ford Foundation underwrote at universities during the late 1960s through the 1980s focusing on Latinos, can illuminate only some of the complex interplay occurring between one subgroup in active identity transformation—Chicanos—tradition bound entities: the philanthropic organization, higher education, and (in the case of *La Cronica*,) the independent researcher. The histories of these events do not fit neatly into ongoing debates between scholars over the extent of intellectual imperialism powerful philanthropies have wielded, or not wielded, over the recipients of funding.[107] The Chicano intellectual nationalists in this essay exerted considerable self-agency in their determination to maintain the right to author their own history and social science research. They utilized traditional academic channels such as independent conferences assessing new scholarship, peer-reviewed journal dialogues, and Chicano-created and run journals and magazines to critique attempts at cultural imperialism. They fought back against Ford's determination to keep identity politics out of the creation of a project on Mexican-American history, but also compromised in several areas. Thus, *La Cronica* did receive funding, despite many protests that such a project should only be run by a Chicano. The involvement of more than twenty Chicano graduate students and scholars proved the tipping point for most supporters. Co-option, the great worry among most Chicano activist scholars entering academia in the 1970s, was a reality that could not be ignored. Quevedo's acknowledgment that Ford's money and prestige would be beneficial for *la causa* and for the Center meant that he had to go against his own, more radical,

[106] Unfortunately, at this stage in our research, we have a "cold trail," with Miller. He took a position at the progressive organization Change as Director of Special Projects in the late 1970s, writing to Gail that he was eager to return to New York and work on educational projects on "a much wider scale." Gail Spangenberg, on the other hand, with a more unique last name, owns her own educational consultant company in New York City but has not returned voicemails or emails. Rudy Alvarez is still at UCLA in Sociology; Carlos Cortés is retired and has written a memoir about growing up in Kansas City, Abel Amaya is also recently retired after twenty years at USC and teaching part-time at Cal State Dominguez. Julian Nava has also retired and left his biographical materials at UCLA. Their perspectives and analyses will certainly balance the perspectives from these primary sources, albeit over a forty-year period of reflection. Unfortunately, Julian Samora, Ralph Guzmán, Harold Howe II, and Marshall Robinson have all passed away.

[107] One of the more recent examples exists between Pierre Bourdieu, Loïc Wacquant, and Edward E. Telles concerning the Rockefeller Foundations' involvement in Brazil's racial affirmative action research and scholarship. See Pierre Bourdieu and Loïc Wacquant, "On the Cunning of Imperialist Reason," *Theory, Culture & Society* 16, no. 1 (1999): 41–58; and the response, Edward E. Telles, "US Foundations and Racial Reasoning in Brazil," *Theory, Culture, & Society* 20, no. 4 (2003): 31–47.

colleagues and their more separatist stance. Furthermore, individuals like Amaya were thrust into positions most likely to encourage co-option through brokering to his former Chicano colleagues and being employed by the same hegemonic force the *movimiento* had railed against. Soldatenko and Vigil have written briefly about these roles, but more can be learned through investigating the various phases of radicalization, compromise, and co-option that social movements in the United States have undergone.[108]

From the Foundation perspective, the program officers' first instinct to view Mexican Americans, as parallel to African Americans is a typical one that has received limited scholarly attention. As MacDonald, Botti, and Hoffman demonstrate, federal officials, university administrators, and foundation officers developing Hispanic initiatives were initially surprised to understand how distinct the historic path has been for Latinos.[109] Ford, after four decades of continuous support for what it termed "Predominantly Negro Colleges," determined in the late 1960s and early 1970s that other groups such as Asian Americans, Native Americans, Mexican Americans, and Puerto Ricans, also merited funding. Thus, this essay also illuminates the expansion of programs at one foundation during shifting demographics, and the impact of the black civil rights group on other populations. The Foundation's stance against reacting or responding to black militancy or, later, Chicano militancy, lessens, as Ford's leadership believed that channeling black militancy into academic pathways would temper civil unrest and strife.[110] Infighting among Chicanos, the narrow construction of intellectual nationalism, and rejection of Millers' project took program officers by surprise. Their lack of understanding that Chicano scholars had *just arrived* to academia (unlike the longer journey of black scholars within segregated historically black institutions) is visible as they exclaimed over what looked like sabotage to its own community. In this scenario, all stakeholders (Foundation, Chicanos, Robert Miller himself) compromised their values to complete the project. The need for Chicano historical materials at the pre-collegiate level and post secondary level were never in question, but *who* could create and access these materials was the contested point in the contentious early 1970s. Furthermore, while African-American scholars had long ago raised questions over their history and its factual and ideological development, for example,

[108] Soldatenko, *Chicano Studies*; Vigil, *Crusade for Justice*; and Jenkins and Eckert, "Channeling Black Insurgency."

[109] MacDonald, Botti, and Hoffman, "From Visibility to Autonomy," reveals how the U.S. federal government, Rockefeller, and Ford Foundations viewed the creation and passage of federal legislation for Hispanic Americans in higher education in the early 1960s through 1980s as interchangeable with the black experience.

[110] See Rooks, *Black Power, White Wealth*, and Rojas, *From Black Power to Black Studies*.

Carter G. Woodson and *The Mis-Education of the Negro*, the creation of the *Journal of Negro History* in 1916, and culturally rich institutions which held in their libraries histories of the black experience, Chicano history/studies was a nascent field and its guardians were protective of its development to maturity. Chicano former activist and scholar Ian Haney Lopez acknowledges, "In evaluating the Chicano Movement, we can lament that an excessive focus on race led activists to emphasize identity issues over material concerns, cultural purity over coalition building, masculinity over gender equality and group autonomy over structural reform."[111] As more scholars examine the complicated role of the development of Chicano Studies as a field, the role of philanthropists in its development, and the scholars themselves, we can continue to build a history that is both self-reflective and also draws upon the primary documents and remembrances of its key stakeholders.[112]

[111] Haney Lopez, *Racism on Trial*, 237–38.

[112] During the research for this project, it was noted how many stakeholders had recently passed away. While Julian Samora's history is being preserved at the Julian Samora Institute, this is also a call for more interviews with members of the Chicano movement while they are available as living documents.