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In 1968, the students, faculty, staff and community members of color at San Francisco State University (SFSU) initiated the first Third World Liberation Front (TWLF) movement for Ethnic Studies in the United States. After carrying out the longest student strike our nation had seen at that time, the SFSU TWLF movement successfully created the first and only College of Ethnic Studies in the United States. This radical victory represented a culmination for historically oppressed communities in their effort to achieve liberation in one area of their lives - education. The impact of this achievement reverberated throughout higher education, beginning with neighboring Bay Area universities and spreading across the country. Not only did the SFSU TWLF lead the way and inspire other young revolutionaries and activists to fight for culturally and politically relevant curriculum, but this achievement represented a moment of victory for the historically marginalized in the longue durée of American oppression and resistance.

In my dissertation I analyze the social, historical, and theoretical foundations of the 1969 Third World Liberation Front (TWLF) movement, which resulted in the creation of an Ethnic Studies Department at UC Berkeley. Utilizing this interdisciplinary approach, I weave together literary analysis, historical archives, qualitative interviews, and social theory. Most uniquely, I conduct an analysis of the educational implications of this historic moment to engender a holistic examination of the link between education and liberation for historically oppressed communities of color. I examine the TWLF as a campaign for self-determination that introduced politically relevant curriculum and pedagogy at UC Berkeley. My project contributes a new perspective to the role of student activism and, importantly, the role of women of color in fomenting change in higher education.

My research analyzes the TWLF as one of many pivotal moments in the longue durée of historically oppressed people fighting for their self-determination. A longue durée framework is an interdisciplinary method of examining and revealing how long-term political, social, and economic structures impact our social reality today (Lee, 2012). I use this concept and methodology as a tool to analyze the impact of race as an historical system and social construct. Utilizing a longue durée framework, I also trace the experiences of historically marginalized communities from the events that contributed to their racial formation to their struggles against systemic oppression, such as white supremacy and capitalism. Within this social movement cartography education was employed - first by African Americans, and later by other racialized groups - as a crucial tool in their efforts to fight for the liberation of their communities.
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Introduction

“Is it possible somehow to convey simultaneously both that conspicuous history which holds our attention by its continual and dramatic changes—and that other, submerged, history, almost silent and always discreet, virtually unsuspected either by its observers or its participants, which is little touched by the obstinate erosion of time?”

—Fernand Braudel,
Braudel Revisited: The Mediterranean World 1600-1800, p. 239

Scope and Purpose of Research

In 1968, the students, faculty, staff and community members of color at San Francisco State University (SFSU) initiated the first Third World Liberation Front (TWLF) movement for Ethnic Studies in the United States. After carrying out the longest student strike our nation had seen at that time, the SFSU TWLF movement successfully created the first and only College of studies in the United States. This radical victory represented a culmination for historically oppressed communities in their effort to achieve liberation in one area of their lives - education. The impact of this achievement reverberated throughout higher education, beginning with neighboring Bay Area universities and spreading across the country. Not only did the SFSU TWLF lead the way and inspire other young revolutionaries and activists to fight for culturally and politically relevant curriculum; this achievement represented a moment of victory for the historically marginalized in the longue durée of American oppression and resistance.

In my dissertation I analyze the historical foundation and theoretical framework of the 1969 Third World Liberation Front (TWLF) movement, which resulted in the creation of an Ethnic studies Department at UC Berkeley. I examine the TWLF as a campaign for self-determination that introduced politically relevant curriculum and pedagogy at UC Berkeley. The new course context was more than just culturally relevant: the study of Native Americans, Chicano/Latinos, Asian Americans and African Americans added a new study of the life, experiences, and culture of communities previously omitted from course curriculum. However, my definition of politically relevant includes the elements of culturally relevant and goes a step further, arguing that a strong radical politic influenced every aspect of the newly formed field of Ethnic Studies and Black Studies.

I chose UC Berkeley as my site focus: as an undergraduate and graduate student there, I had access to their campus-specific archives and to many activists still on campus. My research fills a gap in the literature because I analyze the social, historical, and theoretical foundations of the TWLF at UC Berkeley rather than simply documenting the movement. Utilizing this interdisciplinary approach, I weave together literary analysis, historical archives, qualitative interviews, and social theory. Most uniquely, I conduct an analysis of the educational implications of this historic moment to engender a holistic examination of the link between education and liberation for historically marginalized communities of color. My project contributes a new perspective to the role of student activism and, importantly, the role of women of color in fomenting change in university curriculum and pedagogy.
Most notably, what distinguishes my research is the analysis of the TWLF as one of many pivotal moments in the longue durée of historically oppressed people fighting for their self-determination. Published in 1949, this concept was developed by the French historian Fernand Braudel. The emphasis of this approach is dialectical: it is about how the history of the past informs the history of the present. This is an interdisciplinary method of examining and revealing how long-term political, social, and economic structures impact our social reality today (Lee, 2012). I use this concept and methodology as a tool to analyze the impact of race as an historical system and social construct. I do this in two ways. First, I focus on select moments in United States history that were catalysts in the racial formation and oppression of Native Americans, African Americans, Asian Americans, and Chican@/Latin@s. This requires a longue durée approach because one cannot understand the grievances of the students of color at UC Berkeley in the 1960s without an understanding of the impact and legacy of chattel slavery, white settler colonialism, the ‘yellow peril,’ or the Native American massacres that occurred over the course of three centuries. Second, by utilizing a longue durée framework, I trace the experiences of historically marginalized communities and their struggle for freedom against systemic oppression, such as white supremacy and capitalism. Within this social movement cartography education was employed - first by African Americans, and later by other racialized groups - as a crucial tool in their efforts to fight for the liberation of their communities.

The purpose of conducting this research is two-fold. First, utilizing a longue durée approach, I aim to shed light on the violent process by which the social construction of race was developed in the United States in order to engage readers in a critique of white supremacy and capitalism. Second, it is my intention to construct a narrative history of race, resistance, and education as a means of moving forward and creating greater access to Ethnic Studies and social justice curriculum for all children educated in the United States. To advocate for the expansion of Ethnic Studies, I believe we must first understand the radical roots and historical events that informed this movement.

Contemporary Relevance and Need for Study

The implementation of Ethnic Studies and similar programs across the country in the 1960s and 1970s was an enormous feat for communities of color systemically denied access to higher education and culturally relevant histories. In my dissertation I illustrate how establishing an Ethnic Studies Department at UC Berkeley created emancipatory power for marginalized students of color, fundamentally changing university course curriculum. Faculty hired for newly designed courses cultivated innovative methods to teach this groundbreaking subject, using an approach I define as a pedagogy of liberation. Teaching the Ethnic Studies curriculum also required challenging the dominant ideology of Eurocentricity and white supremacy within the institution, ideologies exemplified by the institutionalization of European/American values and perspectives in the Western educational cannon. Thus, students of color educated in American primary and secondary schools exist in a space where dominant hegemonic values are composed of the ideologies of whiteness, Eurocentricity, and capitalism. Cases in point include the teaching of Native American genocide and relocation as natural consequences of Manifest Destiny, or the recent description of enslaved African Americans as "workers" in a geography textbook by mainstream publisher McGraw-Hill Education (Fernandez & Hauser, 2015).
The regular occurrence of symbolic violence against students of color is one of the strongest arguments for establishing Ethnic Studies as a core component of K-12 education. Research conducted over the last fifteen years clearly illustrates that students of color exposed to predominantly Eurocentric curriculum disengage from school in higher numbers than their white counterparts. Research further shows that Ethnic Studies material improves student self-esteem, fosters a sense of positive identity, and raises rates of academic achievement (Sleeter, 2011, p. vii). The Third World Liberation Front movement was a clear challenge to the oppressive ideology of the dominant schooling system. Activists’ participation in creating culturally and politically relevant curriculum empowered students of color for generations. While the research contained in this dissertation focuses on the historical background and ideological framework that fomented Ethnic Studies in the 1960’s, my post-doctoral work will analyze the current movement in California to implement Ethnic Studies curriculum in K-12 education.

The subject of my dissertation is vital to understanding the political climate and impetus that fostered the creation of Ethnic Studies, so that future initiatives might have the greatest impact on creating and sustaining curriculum that encourages social justice. With the establishment of white supremacy in this country as both an ideological and material reality, people of color have struggled to survive genocide, displacement, enslavement, and general dehumanization. While certain historical moments and movements have challenged the practices of racial oppression and shifted the culture away from explicit racism, the reality is that communities of color continue to die prematurely due to state violence and structural racism (Roberts, 2012, Alameda County Public Heath Department, 2008). The continued crisis in our country wherein black and brown bodies are brutalized, dehumanized, and criminalized - to the point that a life-affirming movement, Black Lives Matter, was created and has been labeled controversial - is evidence of this truth. The public discomfort with the Black Lives Matter movement reflects a culture in which black lives are so devalued, and the process of devaluation is so naturalized, that any challenge to that dominant narrative is seen as offensive to white society. White society's insecurity and desire to remain at the top of the racial hierarchy is so pathological that it sees any movement by people of color to assert their humanity as an affront to white existence. Now more than ever, our society needs Ethnic Studies included in our K-12 education to provide our youth with an accurate history, critical thinking skills, and the radical empathy necessary to tackle the great injustice we are burdened with. Our community's survival literally depends on it.

The movement for Ethnic Studies began in California in 1968, but the vision for a curriculum that accurately represents the state's diversity and history remains a major part of state politics. In September 2015, the California State Assembly passed Assembly Bill 101, authored by Luis Alejo. Assembly Bill 101 sought to create a model ethnic studies curriculum for a state that now serves a student body comprised of 75% people of color (Decarr, 2015). Moreover, last year the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) approved an Ethnic Studies graduation requirement that will begin in 2019. The petition given to the LAUSD stated,

It is time that all LAUSD students have access to Ethnic Studies courses—courses that speak to students who have felt invisible and marginalized, to inspire and motivate them in their education, so that they learn their own history, engage actively in their own
learning, and connect in meaningful ways to the larger community (Quezada & Noye, 2014, n.p.).

The two aforementioned examples represent the continuing legacy of TWLF, serving as reminders of the necessity of providing and promoting Ethnic Studies programs for an increasingly diverse state population. The arguments for supporting an Ethnic Studies curriculum may have shifted since the tumultuous 1960's, but the instigating logic remains the same.

Students of color are more engaged and have a higher level of educational success if their communities are reflected in the school curriculum. However, the absence people of color in the conventional Eurocentric curriculum - not to mention the historically inaccurate narratives and information - continue to plague young people of color who now represent the majority of those publicly educated in California. This very phenomenon was a critique launched by the TWLF decades ago, but one that remains true to this day. On October 9, 2015, Jerry Brown vetoed AB 101, citing the bill's redundancy. Brown claimed the Instructional Quality Commission was currently "revising the History-Social Science Framework, which includes guidance on ethnic studies courses. Creating yet another advisory body specific to ethnic studies would be duplicative and undermine our current curriculum process" (Brown, 2015, p. 1).

This most recent political development reflects a devaluation of Ethnic Studies as a core component of the K-12 curriculum. Brown's dismissal of AB 101 reflects the perception of Ethnic Studies as an unnecessary, optional element of grade school education. Moreover, his suggestion that "guidance" on Ethnic Studies' topics is equivalent to mandatory curricula exemplifies a lack of comprehension of the fundamental differences differentiating Ethnic Studies' content and instruction from traditional approaches and subjects. Acknowledging the clear ideological and pedagogical contrasts of an Ethnic Studies curriculum makes evident the necessity of stand-alone Ethnic Studies programs. Responses to implementing Ethnic Studies have shifted from overt hostility - as in the 1960's - to symbolic violence. This transition reflects larger cultural and institutional changes of the last 50 years, most notably a structural and social transformation from explicit racism to "new racism." Under "new racism," obvious racist remarks are taboo - yet, racial inequality persists and is supported by institutional and individual discrimination (Collins, 2004; Bonilla-Silva, 2013; Logan, 2011; Wingfield & Feagin, 2010). Brown's veto mirrors the development towards a color-blind logic of inclusion, which reinforces the social and cultural domination of traditional disciplines - in other words, Eurocentric education. Brown's decision exemplifies a pattern of regulating the movement to embrace Ethnic Studies from marginal inclusion in order to calm political unrest, whilst simultaneously maintaining control over content and delivery. Ultimately such moves co-opt Ethnic Studies, separating it from its original purpose of directly challenging Eurocentric curricula and providing a more accurate and relevant education for marginalized people of color - and all students - educated in our state schools.

A review of California's history and social science curricula, as suggested by the Governor Jerry Brown, applies an additive approach to Ethnic Studies. This strategy ignores important history regarding the origins of how the field was developed. As a result of its commitment to larger social projects, Ethnic Studies was created within a framework of racial and social justice influenced by the civil rights movement, decolonization throughout the third world, and community efforts for self-determination. In short, pivoting on a unique pedagogy,
Ethnic Studies was created as a tool for empowerment. This fundamental premise is radically different from most disciplines, which simply prepare students for participation in the labor market. Further, Ethnic Studies' philosophy of education stands in stark contrast to traditional disciplines, which have long argued for an objective separation between researcher, student, and their "subjects" of study. Using an additive approach that tries to fold in Ethnic Studies' content into history classes is thus problematic due to this foundational difference in pedagogy. At best, an additive approach would include marginalized histories. Even so, Ethnic Studies should not be limited to a revised curriculum.

In the years following the establishment of Ethnic Studies programs, practitioners had to develop an innovative, empowering pedagogy. It is vital to remember that the TWLF and the creation of Ethnic Studies was not an isolated movement for a new curriculum, but rather part of a concerted effort to create a space in the university that served students, faculty, and staff of color holistically. Not only did Ethnic Studies nourish students of color in their desire to learn about their own communities; it was also a place where radical political ideologies and cultural practices were valued. Teaching Ethnic Studies, therefore, mandates a deep commitment to radical empathy not required in other fields. In history, philosophy, and anthropology (i.e., the traditional disciplines) "research subjects" are frequently fetishized, objectified, and deprived of agency. They are rarely considered masters, experts, or active agents in their destiny. Ethnic Studies deviates from such paradigms by reestablishing the humanity within research, prioritizing not only empathy, but also community connections to academic scholarship. These crucial divergences from traditional disciplines make Ethnic Studies a vital part of educational history.

Chapter Summary and Road Map

Chapter 1: Racial Formation and the Idea of America: The Ideological and Material Foundations of Racial Hierarchies in the United States

This chapter contains three parts. In Part I, I situate my dissertation in relation to previously published research on the development of Ethnic Studies and the rise of Third World ideology in the United States. In Part II, I highlight the development of racial hierarchies in the United States, beginning with colonization and the establishment of white settler societies. I analyze the emergence of race as a category for organizing society and as a justification for the oppressive institutions of chattel slavery and Native American genocide and relocation. By understanding how these events were shaped by the creation of race, I argue that the early colonial era established a new hierarchy wherein African and Native Americans occupied the role of the "other," or what Frantz Fanon refers to as a 'zone of non-being' (1967). This chapter does not intend to provide a comprehensive history, but rather, to give the reader a broad historical overview regarding the role that socially constructed paradigms have played in American history since the arrival of Europeans in the 15th century. This chapter also serves to address the significance of education through the presentation of key historical moments where communities of color - especially African Americans - identified education as a crucial component of their liberation. Lastly, in Part III, I conclude with the analysis of the influence that Third World/anti-colonial activism had on members of the TWLF. I discuss the importance of the 1955 Bandung Conference in Indonesia, where an Afro-Asian coalition was established as praxis for
decolonization. I focus on the transnational flow of radical ideologies and strategies that contributed to the radicalization of TWLF activists in the United States.

Chapter 2: Discourse on Ideology

This chapter contains three parts. In Part I, I engage with Antonio Gramsci and Louis Althusser, developing a framework on the topics of hegemony, power, and ideology from a materialist perspective. Through their discourse, I argue that the TWLF represented a radical bloc that challenged the dominant hegemony of the university by creating a crisis of authority for the administration. In Part II, I analyze three structures that contributed to the culture and ideology of the university in 1969. I argue that the 1960 Master Plan for Higher Education, the G.I. Bill of Rights, and the assimilationist recruitment policies of the university were efforts made by the state to maintain hegemonic power during an era of political uprisings. Lastly, in Part III, I identify Eurocentricity and white supremacy as core components of the university ideology. Thus, I connect the university as a colonial project to the longue durée of struggle for people of color in the United States. By the end of this chapter, it is clear why radicalized students of color organized to create Ethnic Studies, but also why they chose to identify white supremacy, capitalism, and paternalism as the source of their grievances.

Chapter 3: Coming to Know the Past: The TWLF at UC Berkeley 1969

Chapter 3 is divided into two parts. In Part I, I discuss the birth of the Ethnic Studies movement by analyzing the emergence of the TWLF at San Francisco State University in 1968. As the first campus to demand Ethnic Studies and the only university to achieve a College of Ethnic Studies in the country, San Francisco State University represents a transformative moment of victory in the struggle for politically and culturally relevant education. In Part II, I shift my focus to the TWLF at UC Berkeley in 1969. Here, I analyze the three major demands and critiques that the TWLF had of the university: 1) students demanded self-determination for Third World peoples; 2) students critiqued the capitalist nature of the university and argued that capitalism prevented education from serving an empowering and liberatory purpose in society; and 3) the students critiqued the administration's use of state violence (police, national guard, and sheriffs) against the TWLF protestors. Using oral histories and the strike archives, I analyze the complicated relationships among activists as well as the tensions that existed between students, university administrators, and agents of the repressive state apparatus. The most important emphasis for me in this chapter occurs in highlighting the voices of the activists and the unique experience of women within the struggle. My intention is to ground the experiences of TWLF women within the larger context of Third World Feminism born out of many of the radicalized power movements of the late 1960s. The chapter concludes by highlighting how the TWLF students clearly defined the need to create Ethnic Studies as an extension of a longer tradition linking education to liberation.

Chapter 4: The Struggle Continues: The Muscular Dream of the Third World Liberation Front at UC Berkeley

The contents of Chapter 4 are divided into two parts. In Part I, I employ a Lefebvrian spatial analysis to discuss the significance of the TWLF creating a politically radical space within the
university. I engage with Linda Tuhiwai Smith's work on decolonial scholarship to explain the vision and mission of the newly formed Department of Ethnic Studies and the institutional roadblocks they experienced in realizing that vision. In Part II, I examine the unique pedagogy and curricula that emerged in the first decade of the department. I analyze the dramatic changes to university course curricula realized immediately with the establishment of the Ethnic Studies Department and the historic significance of students achieving this goal. Here I engage with Paulo Freire and Frantz Fanon to discuss the power of utilizing education for liberation and the potential of this pedagogy in the project of empowering historically marginalized communities. My dissertation will connect the struggles of communities of color who have fought for their humanity in opposition to the ideologies and structures implemented by the dominant class to dehumanize them. The intention of my research is to emphasize the power that education has to emancipate communities of color, and to acknowledge the historical significance of education in liberating the oppressed.

Methodology and Methods

The research I conducted to carry out this project employs a socio-historical, qualitative and decolonial methodology. Socio-historical methods include utilizing a sociological theoretical analysis that looks at social structures and the creation of social categories, paired with analysis of historical primary source documents. As Tomás Almaguer stated, "racialization is an ideological process, an historically specific one" (2011, p. 3). My dissertation is also a qualitative research endeavor, utilizing what Sharan Merriam (2009) refers to as the ‘basic research' method. Merriam defines ‘basic research' as "motivated by intellectual interest in a phenomenon and has as its goal the extension of knowledge" (p. 3). However, my intention is that this research and its subsequent expansion will be applied beyond academia to influence educators, policy makers, and politicians alike to expand and institutionalize Ethnic Studies curricula in K-12 education. The philosophical nature of my qualitative research can be described as critical because my goal is that this research will be used to transform and change our society, not just analyze it (Merriam, 2009). To achieve this goal, I draw on Marxist, feminist, critical race, and decolonial theories to situate my analysis. Lastly, my research has been deeply informed by Linda Tihuawai Smith's text, Decolonizing Methodologies (2012), and thus I feel it is important to recognize the contributions of her work for both my intentions and my research practice. At the core of the research questions and arguments I put forth in this dissertation is the desire to tell this history from the perspective of those who were colonized and historically marginalized. As a first generation woman of color in the academy, I aim to ‘research back' as Tihuawai Smith calls it. This act requires a “‘knowing-ness of the colonizer' and a recovery of ourselves, an analysis of colonialism, and a struggle for self-determination” (Tihuawai Smith, 2012, p. 8).

My intended audience for this dissertation consists of those interested in the fight for social and racial justice. From this study, our society can learn from those who were successful at creating a completely new vision so that people of color could become active agents in their society and give voice to the struggles of the silenced. The success of the TWLF reaches far beyond the university system it changed, both ideologically and structurally. This movement, an example of successful student organizing and activism, also speaks to the universality of institutional oppression shaped by white supremacy and capitalism, and to the importance of
strategic resistance and alliances when working to achieve radical social change with material consequences.

The three types of qualitative research I engaged in were: narrative analysis, grounded theory, and critical qualitative. Narrative analysis includes analyzing the stories people shared with me in interviews as well as the stories I located in primary and secondary source materials. The grounded theory approach "seeks not just to understand, but also to build a substantive theory about the phenomenon of interest" (Merriam, 2009, p. 23). Lastly, critical qualitative research study engages in critiquing society "in order to raise consciousness and empower people to bring about change" (p. 23).

To conduct my research I used primarily three methods. First, the majority of my archival research came from analyzing over four hundred physical documents and artifacts, including: public records, newspapers, personal documents, popular culture documents, and visual documents located in the Ethnic Studies and Bancroft Libraries at UC Berkeley. I also used the following digital archives: University Archives on Calisphere, California Cultures, Free Speech Movement Digital Archives, and the Japanese American Evacuation & Resettlement Study Digital Archive (Bancroft Library, UC Berkeley). The second method that grounds my research, especially chapters 1-2, is a review of the relevant literature from the fields of sociology, history, anthropology, women of color feminism, education, decolonial studies, critical theory and legal studies. The third method that has informed my research is personal one-on-one interviews. Since 2007, when I began this research as an undergraduate in the history department at UC Berkeley, I have interviewed 12 participants. The interviewees were located through scanning the archives and conducting a snowball sampling, utilizing individual contacts referred to me, primarily by Ruth Rosen and Harvey Dong. The interviews were semi-structured, lasting between 45 minutes and 1.5 hours, and at the location of the participant's choosing. The first five interviews were recorded via tape recorder; six interviews were audio and visual recorded, and the most recent interview was conducted over the phone and audio recorded. Participants signed a consent form giving me the authorization to use their name and stories in my research. Most interviews were transcribed and coded according to major themes. My IRB CPHS has been approved twice: listed here is my protocol ID # 2012-03-4176.
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Chapter 1
Racial Formation and the Idea of America: The Ideological and Material Foundations of Racial Hierarchies in the United States

Introduction

This chapter serves as the historical foundation for the entire dissertation. The purpose of Chapter 1 is to provide the reader with necessary historical context to understand the relationship between racial formation, the growth of white supremacy and capitalism, and the resultant development of anti-blackness as an ideology in its many material iterations. I argue that the emergence of the TWLF arises from the experiences of oppression and acts of resistance within communities of color, situating the TWLF within the longue durée of the people of color fighting for self-determination and liberation. The research question driving this chapter is as follows: How has America’s history of institutionalized racial projects targeting non-white populations shaped the vision and priorities of the TWLF? By engaging with the relevant literature, I aim to address important legal, social, political and economic moments for Native Americans, African Americans, Asian Americans and Latin@ communities up to 1969. Clearly this chapter could be a dissertation on its own, and I have struggled with addressing this important topic with such brevity. Thus, the events discussed herein provide an illustrative, rather than comprehensive analysis, as well as differentiating my research from other projects on the establishment of Ethnic/Black Studies.

Part I of this chapter contains a literature review, situating my research within the larger field of Ethnic and Black Studies. Part II begins with an analysis of important theoretical frameworks that influence my discussion of racial formation. The theoretical conversation is followed by a comparative analysis of African American, Native American, Asian American and Latin@ racialization in the United States. I analyze how each of these communities was located in the racial hierarchy; how that racial hierarchy shaped their relationship to white supremacy and capitalism; and what major events contributed to shifts in each community’s positionality up to the 1960s. Part III concludes this chapter with a discussion of the rise of the international Third World, wherein formerly colonized peoples began to dream of a world where the ‘Darker Nations,’ Vijay Prashad called them, had - after centuries of colonialism - self-determination, economic control, and freedom to establish themselves. During this moment, revolutionary leaders convened, independent of any European or American presence; the plans that they forged for oppressed peoples worldwide caused the growth of a Third World Left in the United States. After centuries of exploitation and discrimination, people of color in America were similarly ready to shatter their chains and determine their destinies. Thus, the revolution in the streets transferred a radical energy to institutions of higher education – there, students formed the Third World Liberation Front, demanding the formation of Ethnic Studies.

My research sits at an interesting nexus between socio-historical research on social movements and radical activism, United States history, history of race and racism, and a theoretical analysis of power, ideology, and education. When discussing how my dissertation fits into the field, I will narrow my analysis to texts that directly address student movements for Ethnic/Black Studies; this is the main focus of my dissertation, and the area where I conducted my original archival and qualitative research. There are three ways in which my research on the TWLF is distinct. First, the theoretical analysis that runs parallel to the socio-historical narrative is something to which most scholars have not dedicated a substantial amount of attention. Most
of the books on the establishment of Ethnic/Black studies give primacy to the student dynamics of the protests and the development of new courses reflecting culturally relevant curricula. By utilizing a strong theoretical analysis, I extend the conversation about the student movement - and what was created beyond the material gains of space and new content - to include the psychological and political implications of the movement. I also use theory to add a depth of scope to all major components of the TWLF, most importantly analyzing the establishment of the department and the unique and radical praxis that evolved to teach Ethnic Studies. Second, while there has been an upsurge in research on the radical student movements of the 1960s, including many book length projects that mention the TWLF, few connect the student movement (especially for the non-Black students) and their demands to the longue durée of racial, economic, and social exploitation of these populations. Those scholars that do connect Black Studies to the legacy of racism and colonialism (DuBois, 1915 & 1970; Kelley, 1999; Normant, 2001) have not written at length about the TWLF at UC Berkeley. Additionally, most scholars who have written about the TWLF focus on the social movement that led to the development of the field rather than on the curricular and pedagogical impact that Ethnic Studies has had on higher education. If they do analyze the outcome, they usually focus on curricula (Wei, 1993) and less on the radical innovative and politically radical praxis developed to teach this new field. Third, men have authored most of the scholarship written about the TWLF, and few have emphasized the intersectionality of Third World women’s perspectives and how they contributed to creating new curricula and pedagogy that empowered their communities.

Lastly, I want to clarify that there are books that address certain elements of what I have identified as my original contributions; none, to my knowledge, speak to all three of these areas. Without the important contributions made by scholars who have written about this topic and influenced my understanding of this moment and of the movement for Black and Ethnic Studies, my project would not be what it is today. The following authors have provided a strong foundation for my research: Ula Taylor (2010); Fabio Rojas (2007); Cynthia Young (2006); Laura Pulido (2006); Nathaniel Normant (2001); Robert Allen (1992); and James Kyung-Jin Lee (2004). As a result of reading these texts, I have been able to expand upon their ideas to create a dissertation that seeks to illuminate new ways of contextualizing the struggle for Ethnic and Black Studies at UC Berkeley and beyond. It is my intention that my dissertation will be utilized beyond academia, hopefully to support current efforts to make Ethnic Studies a fundamental component of both K-12 and higher education curricula. My aim is to exemplify the ways in which Ethnic Studies can contribute to the development of a liberatory education system today, in an effort to revitalize public education, a topic crucial to the future welfare of our society.

**Part I: Literature Review for the Third World Liberation Front**

The following texts deal with either the topic of the Third World Liberation Front or the development of Ethnic and/or Black Studies. As previously stated, they have influenced my project in an important ways, and in this section I will highlight both what I have gleaned from their work and also what differentiates my research from the field. Laura Pulido’s *Black, Brown, Yellow & Left: Radical Activism in Los Angeles* (2006) analyzes the development of the Third World Left (TWL) in Los Angeles in the 1960s. Pulido is successful in contributing a truly comparative analysis of the African American, Chicana/o, and Japanese Left movements that took place in Los Angeles between 1968 and 1978. The trajectory of Pulido's writing begins with a description of the geographic, racial, and economic landscape of post-WWII Los Angeles. Pulido describes how people got involved in the movements and what influences they were
drawing from, outlining why some became leftist, and not nationalist or civil rights activists. Pulido draws on the work of Doug McAdam (1982), arguing that people joined the Left for two reasons: they experienced race or class oppression at an early age, and/or they were introduced by a family member; secondly, an opportunity to participate presented itself to them in a powerful way. Pulido describes the influence that residential racism had on people’s activism and political awareness, analyzing the racial hierarchies in Los Angeles, how they shifted during different historical moments, and why.

The similarities between our projects lies in our shared analysis of comparative social movements in radicalized communities of color during the 1960s and 1970s. Three areas that differentiate our research are: 1) geography: her focus on Los Angeles and mine on the Bay Area; 2) critical theory: my analysis includes more critical theory to explain the role of ideology in creating oppressive conditions the movement was protesting against; and 3) locale: my analysis is primarily concerned with the mobilization at UC Berkeley (and other universities), while Pulido’s book specifically engages with community organizing. Pulido addresses certain elements of the struggle that took place at the universities, but that was not a focus of her analysis.

Cynthia Young’s book, Soul Power: Culture, Radicalism and the Making of a U.S. Third World Left (2007) subsumes Pulido’s analysis of the growth of a Third World Left (TWL) in the United States; the sources that she draws upon, however, make her argument very different. At the core of Young’s project is a sentiment very relevant to my work. The following quote highlights our shared interests, and also our methodological concerns about approaching our projects. Young states:

This book considers how the discourses, ideologies, and aesthetic practices adapted from Third World anti-colonialism helped leftists of color reconsider and rethink their own local context and their position within the U.S. nation-state…This brings me to the most difficult and vexing problem posed by this project - the political and intellectual difficulties inherent in deploying the term Third World in a first world context. Strictly speaking, this book is not about the Third World (p. 11-12).

Young goes on to explain that her book is about how Third World events and culture impacted leftists of color within the United States; her clarification of this dilemma has been extremely helpful in my own struggle to understand what may have gotten lost or “mistranslated” when Third World language and anti-colonial strategies were employed, not only in the First world, but at the most prestigious public university in America. While I am still interested in the possible contradictions of this appropriation, it no longer prevents me from intellectually analyzing the movements in these very different locations. I also find Young’s definition of the term ‘radical’ useful for my own work; this is a major contribution, since the term is deeply imbedded in my historical contextualization of the impact that the TWLF had on the creation of radical curricula and pedagogy. Young’s states:

My use of the term radical reflects a belief that the cultural and political forms under consideration had profound counter-hegemonic effects in the social world…they imagined a social world in which forms of Third World
internationalism created new power blocs and dismantled imperial claims to domination (p. 11-12).

In contrast to Pulido, Young does include critical theory in her analysis of the Third World Left. While she cites Louis Althusser and Antonio Gramsci, as I do, Young does not engage with them on as deep a level as she does with Frantz Fanon. She similarly cites Fanon’s *The Wretched of the Earth* as having a “profound influence on much of the U.S. Third World Left” (Young, 2007, p. 226). However, Young uses critical theory largely to describe how a group of filmmakers at UCLA, known as the L.A. Rebellion, were influenced by it. Young focuses on Third World Left writers, filmmakers, grassroots activists, laborers and students in the United States. Thus, the scope of her population is much broader and more centered on cultural production than my own research. My work differs from Young - and from Pulido - in that I analyze the influence of the Third World in the context of the creation of new curriculum and pedagogy via the formation of the Ethnic Studies Department at UC Berkeley.

Fabio Rojas’ book *From Black Power to Black Studies: How a Radical Social Movement Became an Academic Discipline* (2007) is the text that most directly speaks to my project on the Third World Liberation Front at UC Berkeley: Rojas focuses on the TWLF at San Francisco State University, where the movement for Black and Ethnic Studies originated. When I first read his book four years into my research, I had one of those academic moments of fright, dismayed that someone else had already carried out my research. Upon examination of his work, however, I located important differences in our projects, both in topic and scope. First, I want to discuss the similarities of our research: 1) we both analyze institutions of higher education and the role that they play in reinforcing the status quo; we differ in our conclusions about the success of these efforts, 2) both of our findings centralize the role of radical social movements, particularly Black Power movements, as catalysts for the development of the TWLF, and 3) we share a similar critique of how the university assimilated and depoliticized the newly developed fields of Black and Ethnic Studies. Because of the closeness of our subjects - Black Studies for Rojas and Ethnic Studies, in my case - which both emerged from a particular historic milieu, there is resemblance in certain key themes. However, there are important areas of divergence in our projects that allow for very complex and diverse understanding of these movements.

Fabio Rojas was inspired to write his book after reading Bourdieu and Passerson’s *Reproduction, in Education, Culture and Society* (1990), somewhat disagreeing with their main argument that education reproduces the social and the class structure of a given society. Rojas argues instead that higher education “does not seem to be completely about reinforcing the status quo. In fact, the highly visible and public position of universities invites dissent and conflict” (Rojas, 2007, p. xii). Rojas was also interested in researching how universities responded to the political challenges of the 1960s in order to understand how the new field of Black Studies emerged out of these social protests. His examination is ultimately concerned with the institutional development of Black Studies (p. xiv); as a result, there are numerous important differences in our projects. First, I disagree with Rojas’ premise that because conflict and social movements occur at universities – even when they result in new departments – this somehow negates Bourdieu and Passerson’s argument that education reproduces the status quo. What my research has yielded is an understanding that new fields and people may emerge in higher education as a result of protest, but that without a major shift in the campus ideology and structure, those additions do not fundamentally change the purpose of education in a white supremacist and capitalist society such as ours. This finding in my research does not detract from
the very real accomplishments and contributions that Ethnic and Black Studies have made. In fact, the benefit of Ethnic Studies is a central theme in my dissertation; concomitantly, these important contributions have not shifted the ideological and practical reality that education in our society mostly reproduces social and economic conditions rather than disrupting them. In his conclusion, Rojas notes that his findings suggest that the success of Black Studies departments depends largely on their willingness to be “modified so they will be successfully integrated into existing institutions” (p. 214), and that they must able to adopt practices compatible with the broader campus culture. Rojas argues that Black Studies expanded the “institutional vocabulary” with scholarly contributions. Rojas also argues that the university forced the field to abandon certain elements of cultural nationalism and community education, resulting in a hybridization where both sides had to compromise for the unit to find stability. I will save my analysis of how this relates to the TWLF at UC Berkeley in my conclusion.

The second major distinction between my research and that of Rojas’ is my theoretical emphasis on the role of ideology, capitalism, and white supremacy. Where Rojas utilizes more social movement and organizational theory to ground his project, I engage with different variants of Marxism and critical race theory to understand the origins, achievements, and limitations of the TWLF at UC Berkeley. Lastly, my main argument that the development of Ethnic Studies is part of a longue durée of struggle, both within the United States and also impacted by international anti-colonial and anti-imperialist movements abroad, expands the scope of my project by hundreds of years, in comparison to Rojas. While Rojas centers the influence of Black Power and cultural nationalism on the development of Black Studies, he does not seriously engage with the longer history of struggle behind these movements of the 1960s. This is not a critique of his research, just an important note of distinction between the areas on which we chose to focus. Fabio Rojas’ From Black Power to Black Studies is an amazing documentation of the institutional history of Black Studies, its radical origins, and how Black Studies adapted to survive and thrive in academia. I appreciate both his findings and his methodological approach, which consisted of gathering resources and data from over three hundred people, and in providing a statistical analysis of program development across the country. His book confirmed many of the findings I was gathering during my research, pushing me to think of topics and areas not yet examined, ultimately helping me to develop a stronger theoretical framework to parallel the socio-historical narrative.

Lastly, Nathaniel Norment Jr.’s The African American Studies Reader (2007) has been an essential resource to navigate the vast literature on the development of Black Studies. It covers a massive range of topics from: 1) defining the field, 2) analyzing the role of women in Black Studies, 3) understanding the long historical perspective, 4) analyzing the philosophical/theoretical/political perspectives that have shaped Black Studies, and 5) delineating how the curricula developed over the years. It is one of the few books that connects Black Studies to a longer history of Black struggle. Because it is a collection of articles and essays from multiple contributors, however, it lacks the continuity and focus of a unified scholarly text. While artfully weaving multifarious voices together to contextualize the range of opinions and visions that people had for Black Studies during its inception, the text does not provide a clear argument about the legacy or impact that Black Studies has had on higher education. Rich with primary source voices of scholars and activists who participated in the development of the field, this text provides the reader with the context of the era and insight into what debates surrounded this social, political and educational movement. What my dissertation adds to Norment’s collection is an overall uniting of Ethnic Studies movements in relation to
Black Studies: they were one and the same at UC Berkeley. My longue durée analysis includes how the formation of race and racism - for multiple communities of color - contributed to the Third World Liberation Front and to the creation of Ethnic Studies. Lastly, my dissertation gives more emphasis, as well as an intersectional analysis, to the role that women played in the creation of the field and their impact on higher education.

While there are other texts that address the TWLF and the creation of Ethnic Studies, such as Robert Allen’s *Black Awakening in Capitalist America*, (1992) James Kyung-Jin Lee’s *Urban Triage* (2004), and Manuel Delgado’s *The Last Chicano* (2009), their contributions will be folded into other sections of this chapter and dissertation. I have chosen to limit my literature review of the TWLF to books that either focus on Ethnic Studies or that emphasize Third World Left activism and discourse, as these are the main components of my dissertation. As I mentioned in the introduction, the content analyzed here is illustrative rather than comprehensive, and I look forward to expanding each area more fully in my postdoctoral work.

Now that I have discussed what differentiates my research from other texts in the field, I will continue on to the next part of this chapter, which examines the social construction of race in the land that would eventually become the United States of America.

**Part II: Racial Formation and the Idea of America**

In Part II, I trace the development of racial hierarchies and racial formations in the United States in order to accomplish two tasks. First, to support my argument that the TWLF is part of a longue durée of struggle within communities of color, I address how people of color became racialized and otherized in the United States. Second, I examine the events contributing to the oppression of each racial group, in order to understand the unique positionality of these communities in relation to the dominant ideologies and institutions of white supremacy and capitalism. I have chosen to situate the struggles of people of color in relation to white supremacy and capitalism because I argue that these two forces have played the greatest role in relegating racial minorities to the category of historically oppressed/marginalized, a term I use throughout the dissertation. I will initiate this discussion with the text and theory that has served as the foundation for my analysis of how race came to be socially constructed in the United States. Michael Omi and Howard Winant’s *Racial Formation in the United States: From the 1960s to the 1990s* (1994) provides a language that situates the power dynamics involved in the development of social structures and racial categories in America. The theoretical contributions of *Racial Formation* will be followed by an historical analysis of specific events, beginning with the colonial period that contributed to the creation of racial categories that we live with today.

**Theoretical Framework**

Omi and Winant’s groundbreaking text, *Racial Formation in the United States: From the 1960s to the 1990s* (1994), provides a succinct yet thorough analysis of the history that race has played in the development of ideology and social structures in modern America. In a clear and cohesive manner, *Racial Formation* provides the reader with an understanding of how ethnicity, class, and nation paradigms have affected the racial formation of millions of people, as well as the limitations of such paradigms for addressing the all-encompassing and oppressive conditions of race in our society. Omi and Winant also highlight why the 1960s - the main temporal focus of my dissertation work - was a very important historical moment for peoples of color, given that race was front and center in American politics for the first time since the tumultuous days of the
Civil War. More importantly the authors’ theory of ‘racial formation’ advances our understanding of the socio-historical process that has degraded the humanity of both the racially oppressed and their oppressors (Césaire, 2000; Freire, 2010). In order to situate their theory, I want to start with their definitions of race:

*race is a concept which signifies and symbolizes social conflicts and interests by referring to different types of human bodies...Thus we should think of race as an element of social structure rather than as an irregularity within it; we should see race as a dimension of human representation rather than an illusion (Omi & Winant, 1994, p. 55, emphasis in original).*

Omi and Winant define their theory of racial formation as “the sociohistorical process by which racial categories are created, inhabited, transformed, and destroyed” (p. 55). Crucial to their definition of race and theory of racial formation is the understanding that, as a social construct, race cannot be essentialized as a natural condition; additionally, they posit that race is historically flexible and inherently political. Omi and Winant’s focus on the construction and the possibility for the destruction of racial categories provides my work with a critical optimism that suggests that through radical social change and ideological shifts, these oppressive categories can possibly be dismantled or transformed in a way that mitigates the violence they were built upon, which continues to shape the opportunities for life - and alternatively, contributes to premature death - in historically oppressed communities.

In tracing the historical development of racial categories, *Racial Formation* (1994) is most important to this chapter for the definitions, frameworks, and discussion of ideology. To address this issue, I am focusing primarily on Omi and Winant’s concept of racial project, and their discussion around the role of hegemony in creating and sustaining racialized communities. The authors’ argument that “racial formation is a process of historically situated projects in which human bodies and social structures are represented and organized,” (p. 55-56) is useful to my research as a way of understanding how each ethnic group’s placement in the racial hierarchy is fluid and connected to shifting dynamics at the structural level. For my project, racial formation theory contributes a critical understanding of the connection between social structures, hegemonic values, and the racialization of people of color.

Throughout this chapter I will reflect on and analyze different racial projects that contribute to defining the racial categories and hierarchies within our society. The authors define a racial project as “simultaneously an interpretation, representation, or explanation of racial dynamics, and an effort to reorganize and redistribute resources along particular racial line. Racial projects connect what race means in a particular discursive practice, and the ways in which both social structures and everyday experiences are racially organized, based upon that meaning” (Omi & Winant, 1994, p. 56, emphasis in original). Their emphasis on the redistribution of resources based on racial projects is another reason why this theory is central to my analysis, given my focus on how white supremacy and capitalism have shaped the material, social, and psychological experiences of communities of color. In an effort to understand the complexities of our diverse society, Omi and Winant have searched to find a theory that would explain the changing nature of race relations. Their work has been foundational to scholars of color and white allies who seek to find new ways of analyzing power relations between the

---

1 However it should be noted that the authors attempt to navigate a complex process which often pits scholars and activists into two camps: 1) those that adhere to explicitly challenging what they see as the problematic “utopian
dominant and subordinate classes in an effort to liberate our society from such inhuman dichotomies. The book also successfully dismantles the 'color-blind' or more recently 'post-racial' argument, arguing instead that race “will always be at the center of the American experience” (p. 5). Omi and Winant argue that if racism is to be challenged, it needs to be defined, in an effort to comprehend and attack the pervasive essentialism that exists on the right and the left. Because the authors do not delve into the colonial period of our nation’s history when race was first solidified, I will be supplementing their analysis (in the following section) with other authors who do examine that critical moment and the events that led to the construction of racial categories.

In addition to *Racial Formation*, the scholarship of Walter Mignolo (2005) is important to contextualizing the racial projects of the Indigenous peoples first exposed to the brutality of European conquest. Mignolo’s decolonial perspective also enriches racial formation theory by centering the perspectives of the subaltern to reimagine and rearticulate those first critical encounters between the colonizers and the colonized.² Walter Mignolo’s *The Idea of Latin America* (2005) first and foremost challenges the hegemonic understanding of the politics of mapping and the assumption that Latin America is a geopolitical entity. Further, Mignolo asserts that Latin America, and I adopt this analysis to contextualize the United States, is an idea that was created as part of European expansion. Mignolo’s methodology is to provide a decolonial theory to understand the colonial histories of the Americas outside of Europe proper. Utilizing a Fanonian, neo-Marxist, decolonial perspective, Mignolo argues that a decolonization of knowledge will allow the reader to imagine economic and political alternatives that will empower the *wretched of the earth*. What I find useful about Mignolo’s methodology for my dissertation is the language and praxis of a decolonial shift and the power of challenging histories and conceptions of reality (maps/countries/races) - which can be deconstructed and analyzed not as given facts - but rather, as constructed elements of racial/economic power structures designed to benefit white supremacy and capitalism.

Mignolo provides an important discourse to understand the influence of Modernity via the rhetoric of *discovery*. Discovery entails the triumphant imperial perspective, and is central to our understanding of modernity. Invention, on the other hand, is the critical (decolonial) perspective and language of those left behind and left out of modernity (Mignolo, 2005, p. xix).³ Mignolo argues that *discovery* and *invention* are two different paradigms reflecting the shift of the geo-politics of knowledge (pg. 3). In situating my theory of racial formation, Mignolo argues that the “discovery” of America and “the genocide of Indigenous peoples and enslaved African are the very foundation of ‘modernity’” (pg. xiii). Thus, he connects the structure of slavery to the ideology of modernity, assisting in my goal of tracing the influence of ideology on the lived experiences of people of color. Lastly, Mignolo’s text explicitly argues that the process of inventing America “required the simultaneous ideological construction of racism,” (p. 15) which is foundational to my theory on racial formation in the United States. In Chapter 4, I put Mignolo’s theory in conversation with Linda Tihuwai Smith’s theoretical framework and praxis

---

² Here I am referring to colonial projects of the Caribbean, starting in 1492. These events directly impacted North American indigenous peoples, who are the population I engage with in my research. This statement is not to suggest that colonization began in this location, but rather, that it is the beginning of European colonization in this region of world, relating to my specific research topic.

³ I appreciate Mignolo’s discussion of history as the privilege of European modernity, and he argues that those outside of it are what Eric Wolf called “people without history” (Wolf, 1982).
of ‘decolonizing methodology’ to addresses how decolonizing knowledge was at the center of TWLF movement.

The last theoretical framework I will highlight here as foundational to my analysis of the history of race and racism in the United States is Edward Said’s canonical cultural studies text, Orientalism (1979). Like Mignolo’s argument that Latin America was created as a result of the colonial experience, Said similarly posits that development of the “Orient,” which was associated with the East, (uncivilized, barbaric, non-European world) actually “helped to define Europe (or the West) as its contrasting image, idea, personality, experience” (Said, 1979, p. 1-2). Said’s contributions to analyzing Orientalism - the representation of the Orient in the West as a discourse - as opposed to simply a series of events, is one of the reasons his work is important in my analysis of race. Said pushes his readers to examine the systemic structure of Orientalism wherein in Europeans produced ideologies, academic disciplines, and institutions, all in the pursuit of power, domination, and hegemony. At the core of his thesis, Said argues that the discourse of Orientalism and the research it produced were more than European fantasies or misrepresentations of the “other.” In fact, Orientalism “created a body of theory and practice in which, for many generations, there has been a considerable material investment” (p. 6). Thus, Said’s analysis is useful to my dissertation for two significant reasons: 1) the literary and academic products of Orientalism represent the kind of scholarship that the TWLF was directly challenging in their struggle for Ethnic Studies; and 2) the ideologies inherent in the Orientalist perspective were crucial to the colonial endeavors, both in action and theory, that justified the genocide of Indigenous peoples, the enslavement of Africans, and more broadly, the “otherizing” on non-European/non-white peoples.

Said is invested in understanding the ideological and material implications of Orientalism, both in manufacturing consent and also in developing the imperialist objectives of the West. Said states that the cultural hegemony - the prominence and acceptance of certain ideas that influence a society - of Orientalism has contributed to its concretization in Western thought. Additionally, his concept of ‘positional superiority’ describes how the West sees itself as naturally superior to the “Orient” or, for the context of my research, the “Other.” Thus, through Orientalism, which is a project of modernity and colonization, a global hegemonic movement has situated non-Europeans as inferior to Europeans. This topic is clearly related to my own research, which aims to trace the influence of ideology in the development of racial categories and hierarchies. Much of what I appropriate from Said is a theoretical framework for understanding modernity - similar to Mignolo – however, through the lens of knowledge production. In conclusion, through Said’s work I have both a framework for discussing the hegemonic and Eurocentric ideology of the university at the time of the TWLF at UC Berkeley, and also a discourse for contextualizing how people of color came to be relegated as inferior within the white supremacist and capitalist structure of the United States. Now that I have highlighted some of the major frameworks that I engage with to understand the social construction of race, in the following section I will delve into the difficult task of briefly addressing some of the most impactful ‘racial projects’ for African Americans, Native Americans, Asian American and Latin@s, from colonization through the 1960s.

Creating Race: The Construction of the “Other”

In this section, I analyze the evolution of racial hierarchies, which I argue are defined in the first instance by the shift in the geopolitics of knowledge marked by the “discovery” of
America via Christopher Columbus. Michael Omi and Howard Winant describe the conquest of the Americas as “perhaps the greatest racial formation project” (1994, p. 62). Using Walter Mignolo’s *The Idea of Latin America* (2005), I am arguing that this defining moment thrusts onto an entire continent of people into the logic of modernity, wherein Europeans defined the construction of history in their own interests (p. xix).

With the advent of the modern state and the decline of feudalism, new ideologies and systems were formulated and instituted to meet the needs of fast expanding new economies. While Southern Europeans had contact with the non-European peoples of Asia and Africa prior the 16th century, Northern Europeans, on the other hand, did not (Smedley, 2007). Thus, during the colonial period of “discovery,” the West was wrestling with trying to identify, categorize, and dominate these new people of color they had come into contact with. Linda Tuhiwai Smith (2012) argues that liberalist ideas of modernity focused on the individual, who has the capacity to reason, on a society which promotes individual autonomy and self-interest, and on a state which has a rational rule of law which regulates a public sphere of life, but which allows individuals to pursue their economic self-interests (p. 62).

Therefore, the logic of modernity required a source of labor that could develop the land and economy in a manner that would allow Europeans to pursue their economic interests in the “New World.” Thus enters the second important development to American racial formation: chattel slavery, defined by the enslavement of Africans through legal and social dehumanization. From that decisive moment in which whites sought to equate blackness with chattel slavery in order to increase the ‘symbolic value’ of whiteness (Wilderson, 2005), all other communities of color have been hailed into a racial hierarchy to similarly justify their exploitation and domination for the benefit of white supremacy and capitalism. My use of ‘symbolic value’ of whiteness explains the social and legal choices made by European colonists to differentiate white laborers from African or Indigenous laborers as a way of increasing the social status of the whites/Europeans.

David Etlis’s 1993 article, *Europeans and the Rise and Fall of African Slavery in the Americas*, challenges the myth that African enslavement was the best economic option for the colonists. In fact, Etlis proves that white labor from convicts and vagrants would have had lower costs for transportation and collection than Africans. The choices and processes that led to the colonists’ development of African chattel slavery, despite it not being the most profitable, explain the complex reality of racial formation in the Americas. Etlis begins his argument with an analysis that parallels Tihuwai Smith’s discussion on modernity. He cites the rise of European notions of self and family as a catalyst for the colonial “insider” perspective which resulted in increased identification of non-Europeans as “outsiders.” Eventually their “outsider” status made their exploitation, commodification, and dehumanization more normalized.

Even the British colonists, in their long history of war and domination of the Irish, recognized the Irish as more familiar to them than the Africans and Indigenous peoples they would encounter in the Americas. Despite the associations between the Irish and Africans drawn by the British, the comparisons were more symbolic rather than material. Such comparisons were used to discriminate and dominate the colonized Irish rather than dehumanize them; the difference between these two forms of social control are monumental. Under the former, an Irish person could transcend their status through opportunity, completing their contract, or good fortune. This is evidenced by the fact that most Irish laborers were usually only sentenced to
seven or ten years of servitude as a punishment for their crimes. But if one is genuinely
dehumanized, they no longer are attributed with human characteristics, such as pain, suffering, or
love, making their mistreatment and permanent forced labor more justified in the eyes of the
oppressors. Ultimately, Etlis argues, it came down to the fact that many Europeans responsible
for the inhumanities of slavery found that coercion “was unconscionable for people like oneself
and appropriate for others…” (Etlis, 1993, p. 1415).

Etlis supports this logic by stating that throughout Europe even the most degraded people
from their own societies were never enslaved. For example, when the English captured Irish
soldiers during their colonization of Ireland and sold them in Barbados, they were still only
indentured for a maximum period of ten years (Etlis, 1993). Upon completion of their servitude,
the Irish were free to determine a course or their future; while they were exploited and mistreated
for a period of time, they were not denied their humanity permanently. Etlis concludes his article
with these important findings: 1) colonists were unable and unwilling to consider other
Europeans as chattel slaves; 2) despite the desire for maximum profits, there were “agreed upon”
limits to achieving those means; and 3) the countries least likely to enslave their own people, (the
British and the Dutch), carried out the most inhumane practices against non-Europeans. These
findings led Frank Wilderson (2005) to use Etlis’ argument to make his point that “what Whites
would have gained in economic value, they would have lost in symbolic value” (p. 15). In the
following pages, I will analyze the establishment of laws that concretized the devaluation and
dehumanization of Africans to the benefit of whites, resulting in the first descriptions of racial
difference in America.

In this section, I argue that the genocide, enslavement, and colonization of entire
populations becomes the purview of the non-European “Other,” and the predecessor to the social
construction we have come to describe as race. In addition to Omi and Winant’s definition of
race utilized above, I also find the following description useful to my analysis. In Part II, I situate
the experiences of Native Americans, African Americans, Chican@/Latino@, and Asian
Americans to understand their relationship with Eurocentricity, and eventually, white supremacy.
I will use the socio-historical method to discuss how these four communities come to be
categorized as human/non-human, European/non-European, and white/non-white, as well as
what impact those labels had on their history. Additionally, I will analyze how their identities
and races were formulated and reformulated due to the group’s relationship with the dominant
class.

Native American Racialization

I have chosen to initiate my examination of racial constructs using a chronological
approach, which starts with the European colonization of the Caribbean. As described above, the
“discovery” of the “New World” by Christopher Columbus in 1492 represents a monumental
shift in global history, one that would eventually result in the creation of the United States of
America and in a new way of dividing the world’s population. Anibal Quijano (2000) describes
the constitution of America as a new “model of power of global vocation” (p. 533) marking a
global entrance into modernity. Quijano identifies the two fundamental axes which American
power was established on as: 1) “the codification of difference between conquerors and
conquered in the idea of ‘race’” (p. 533); and 2) the new form of controlling labor via chattel
slavery. Therefore, it is unequivocal that the conquest of the Indigenous populations was the first
phase of the racialization process for America. However, it is important to note that the desire to
dominate and control populations based on a dichotomy of superiority and inferiority were
transported from the European political context. In order to situate the first interactions between Columbus’ conquistadors and the Indigenous Arawak peoples of Hispanola, I will address the two events that contributed to the conceptualization of difference and “othering” for Europeans, prior to their arrival in the Caribbean.

The first event is the Spanish Inquisition, which began in 1480, but was solidified in 1492 when Spanish Monarchs Ferdinand and Isabella ordered all Muslims and Jews to convert to Catholicism or leave the country (Golash-Boza, 2015). Quijano identifies this as “the first experience of ethnic cleansing exercising the coloniality of power in the modern period [that] was followed by the imposition of the ‘certificate of purity of blood’” (Quijano, 2000, p. 558). Thus, during the exact year that Columbus began terrorizing Indigenous peoples in the Caribbean through the practice of colonization, Spain was simultaneously carrying out their own internal colonization of people who shared their physical territory but who were deemed religiously inferior (Quijano, 2000). A second crucial moment in the development of race was the English colonization of the Irish. Many of the characterizations that the English used to oppress the Irish - labeling them uncivilized and immoral - would later be applied to Native Americans when the English colonized North America. This transmission of social categorization materialized because many of the early English colonizers in North America had actually fought against the Irish (Golash-Boza, 2015). Again, the concepts of “outsider” or “other” considered inferior to the Western European nation-states such as England served as a foundation for how the colonists self-identified, but also, how they categorized the new peoples they came into contact with, a categorization which they later imposed on Native Americans.

In this section I identify genocide, displacement, and invisibility as the three most influential racial projects contributing to the racial formation of Native Americans. By no means am I arguing that these events define this community, but rather that these experiences have shaped the way that Indigenous peoples were racialized through the period of the 1960s. One of the first consequences of colonization for Native Americans was the drastic decimation of 95% of the 100 million indigenous peoples that lived in the Americas, within just two centuries (Golash-Boza, 2015). The cause of this genocide was a culmination of events: contracting diseases from Europeans that Native Americans had no immunity to; warfare; enslavement; and general brutality at the hands of Europeans.

From the moment that Columbus stumbled across the Arawak people who inhabited Hispanola, he established a culture of vicious dehumanization and exploitation against Indigenous peoples. Desperate to secure gold and spices that he was sent to retrieve for the King and Queen of Spain, Columbus instituted barbaric methods of torture to achieve his goals (Zinn, 2004). In Bartolomé De Las Casas’ famous document, “The Devastation of the Indies: A Brief Account” (1542), the author provides a horrific narration of the treatment of the Indigenous populations of the Caribbean islands at the hands of Spaniard conquistadors. De Las Casas begins with a description of the natives as “devoid of wickedness and duplicity…with no desire to possess worldly goods” (De Las Casas, 1542, as cited in Zinn, 2004, p. 36). He has absolutely no harsh words to describe the Indigenous people other than as docile and apt for salvation. The Spaniards, on the other hand, De Las Casa characterizes as ravening beasts who terrorize the island’s inhabitants with “the strangest and most varied new methods of cruelty, never seen or heard of before…” (p. 36). De Las Casas unflinchingly reports the insatiable greed and villainous nature of the Spanish governors and agents, as well as the murder, rape, and torture of men, women, and children. One particularly vile scene depicts the Spanish stealing babies from their mothers’ breasts to throw them in rivers or skewer them on swords and pikes (p. 36). De Las
Casas is careful to note that the population of Hispanola decreased from three million to two hundred in less than sixty years. Additionally, he notes that Puerto Rico and Jamaica already had almost no inhabitants by the time he authored the account, unconscionably destroyed by these crimes against humanity.

On the mainland, the Native Americans of North America were not thrust into regular contact with the British until the early 17th century. In 1607, the first permanent English settlement was established in Jamestown. The English described the Indigenous population in terms similar to those of Columbus and De Las Casas - as kind and generous people willing to help the struggling colonists (Golash-Boza, 2015). However, like the Spaniards, the English were not concerned with building relationships with their new “neighbors,” but rather with dominating and controlling all of the resources they could plunder. The rugged individualism that marked the liberalism of modernity in Europe, discussed above, stood in stark contrast to the Indigenous way of life. Indigenous scholar Ward Churchill has described the Native American worldview as one which also encourages human beings to be “free, indeed, encouraged - to develop our innate capabilities, but only in ways that do not infringe upon other elements - called ‘relations,’ in the fullest dialectical sense of the word - of nature” (Churchill, 2002, p.17). Activities that broke this understanding created imbalance and were prohibited. When the European worldview was imposed upon Native Americans, in addition to disease and warfare, the consequences were catastrophic. Identifying the Native Americans as gullible, weak, and poorly armed, the English engaged in regular raids of native villages, burning and pillaging what they could (Golash-Boza, 2015). The constant warfare and capture of Native Americans was similarly devastating to the Indigenous mainland population as it was in the Caribbean, the only difference being that sometimes the mainland Native Americans were able to run away, something that was less possible on the islands. Not only did initial encounters between Native Americans and Europeans result in genocide; the act of genocide has been used continuously against Native Americans for centuries. Critical Genocide Studies scholar Alexander Hinton defines genocide as “the more or less coordinated attempt to destroy a dehumanized and excluded group of people because of who they are” (Hinton, 2012, p. 9-10). For Native Americans, the genocide has been not only physical, but cultural, as well.

Churchill (2002) and Sartre (1968) have both argued that - simply put - colonialism equals genocide. From the 1637 massacre of 800 Pequot on the Mystic River by the British, to the 1864 Sand Creek massacre where 28 men and 105 Cheyenne and Arapaho women and children were killed by Lincoln’s troops, Native Americans have been the victims of countless genocidal attacks carried out by European colonizers. Jaimes (1992) explains that by the mid-19th century, “U.S. policy makers and military commanders were stating - openly, frequently and in plain English - that their objective was no less than the ‘complete extermination’ of any native people who resisted being dispossessed of their lands, subordinated into federal authority, and assimilated into the colonizing culture” (p. 34). Jaimes cites some of the worst massacres that occurred during the 19th century: the 1863 Bear River Massacre of 500 Western Shoshones; the 1868 massacre of 100 Cheyenne at Camp Robinson; and the 1890 massacre of over 300 Lakotas at Wounded Knee (p. 35). In addition to these individual and military attacks on Native Americans, there was a second layer of genocide that occurred: the attempt to destroy Indigenous culture.

In the 19th century, the United States government decided, with the advent of mission and boarding schools, to add cultural genocide to the repertoire of Native American domination. With the Indian Wars winding down in the 1880s, the government began a new approach in
dealing with Native Americans (Jaimes, 1992). The emphasis on boarding schools, which ranged from day schools on the reservations to boarding schools that took Native children away from their families, many times indefinitely - was to assimilate Native American children into the dominant white culture. In 1870, Congress approved an annual appropriation of $100,000 to support the schooling of over 50,000 Native American children (Jaimes, 1992). In 1879, the first boarding school was established by former U.S. Army General Richard Pratt; with a successful resume of war against Native tribes, Pratt led the way to the cultural genocide of what was left of Native Americans. His motto was literally “Kill the Indian, Save the man,” referencing the destruction of Indigenous culture in order create a new ‘man.’ This consisted of Christianizing Native Americans as well as socializing them to American gender and class norms (Watras, 2004). Upon entering these boarding schools, especially those schools off of the reservation, children had their hair cut, their names changed, and their clothes taken away. Native language was prohibited, as well as any communication with their families; any other markers of their Indigenous culture, such as singing or practicing traditional dance, were prohibited (Jaimes, 1992; Noel, 2002). The role of capitalism and patriarchy in shaping these policies was evidenced in the “productive activities” that students spent half of their day doing at the schools. The boys were forced into manual labor and carpentry; the girls were trained in cooking, cleaning, sewing and other ‘feminized’ forms of labor. Some schools sent the children to white families to work as servants (Golash-Boza, 2015). The driving logic behind all of these actions was the racist characterization of Native Americans as uncivilized savages in need of assimilation into white culture, who, if they could only ‘leave behind’ their old ways, could enter modernity and become ‘productive’ members of society. As if these practices were not traumatizing enough, many children were beaten for breaking the rules or trying to run away; many fell ill or died from malnutrition. Despite the efforts of the American government, Jaimes (1992) notes that tribal leaders continued the traditional linguistic and spiritual practices “more or less in accordance with the time-honored educational customs of native peoples…with which indigenous cultures sustained themselves throughout the first half of the 20th century…” (p. 383). Like all people of color subjected to colonialism, it is important to recognize and acknowledge that in spite of the horrific oppression they experienced and continue to experience, Native Americans remain committed to building and expanding their communities and fighting for their self-determination.

The second racial project that has greatly impacted Native Americans is displacement and/or loss of land. In considering the history of America, perhaps the most important process in colonization was the acquisition of land, which was then used to develop social, economic and political structures. Sherene Razack brilliantly highlights the connection between space and race in her book Race, Space and the Law: Unmapping A White Settler Society (2002). During colonization, Europeans established a white settler society in North America through the dispossession of land “and [the] near extermination of Indigenous populations by the conquering Europeans. As it evolves, white settler society continues to be structured by a racial hierarchy” (p. 1). In a sad irony, white settlers, and eventually American citizens, consider themselves the most entitled to the land through a complex process of domination, land theft, and Eurocentric or revisionist history. Foundational to this logic was the legal doctrine of terra nullis, which posits that if the inhabitants of land were not Christian and do not practice the kind of acceptable European agriculture, then the land was deemed uninhabited and thus available for white settlement (Culhane, 1998, as cited in Razack, 2002). During different periods in American history, these policies were justified using shifting ideology, but one concept remains constant: that the “backward” and uncivilized native populations did not know how to develop the land
properly; thus, it is the right of white settlers to do so. Here, we see the combination of Orientalist ideology, positional superiority, and the development of Manifest Destiny rhetoric that would act as one of the most powerful ideologies in the dispossession of Native American land.

The 1783 Treaty of Paris, in which England quit-claimed its land interest to the newly formed United States, is one of the most illuminating demonstrations of white settler entitlement. During this process, England gave away land that they had “discovered” to the United States without any considering of the legal rights of those who already occupied the land (Churchill, 2002). Here we see the legacy of invisibility for Native Americans, who from the first encounter with the settlers were disregarded and dispossessed of any rights they might have to the land they inhabited. Other examples of this dismissal of Native American land rights were the 1803 Louisiana Purchase; the 1846 purchase of Oregon from Russia; and the 1848 Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo (Churchill, 2002). In 1832, John Marshal argued that the transmission of land from one European power to another did not “affect the rights of those already in possession, either as aboriginal occupants, or by virtue of a discovery made before the memory of man. It gave the exclusive right to purchase, but did not found that right on the denial of the right of the possessor to sell” (Marshal, 1832, as cited in Churchill, 2002, p. 43-44). However, these observations were not headed by either the government or white settlers during the era of Manifest Destiny, where the American government sought to extend its reach from the Mississippi to the Pacific Ocean, “ignoring indigenous right, not only to land but to liberty and often life itself, at every step along the way” (Churchill, 2002, p. 46). From the 1830 the Indian Removal Act, which legalized the displacement of over 70,000 Native Americans, to the 1859 Seminole removal from Florida, culminating with the 1887 General Allotment Act, which ended traditional practices of collective land landholding, the United States has ceaselessly dispossessed Native Americans of their land rights (p. 46). Forcing Native Americans onto reservations and then pushing them into cities during the 1950s “Indian Relocation Program” (Warrior & Smith, 1996), the white settler colonial mentality has continually and relentlessly pushed Native Americans to the periphery.

A consistent them in Native American interactions with the government is what appears to be an obsession of the United States to control the movement of Native peoples and to prevent them from practicing their traditions. In the 1950s, Indian Relocation programs were created and promoted by the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) as an attempt by the U.S. government to undermine reservation lifestyle and community. “Relocation” encouraged Native Americans to abandon their lives on the reservations for supposedly brighter futures in America’s urban cities. The BIA provided a one-way bus ticket, assistance to find work and housing, and free medical care for a year (Warrior & Smith, 1996). Although the “assistance” often never materialized, many Native Americans arrived at urban centers in the Bay Area and Los Angeles with no support and no community. One of the consequences of this program was that it reinvigorated the politicization of Native Americans during a heightened moment in American history. Native Americans went from poverty on the reservations to complete poverty and alienation in the cities. Psychologically they were not used to life in the city, which was highly competitive and very different from life on the reservation. Richard Oakes, one of the leaders of the American Indian Movement (AIM), the Alcatraz occupation, and a member of TWLF at SFSU, described his addiction to alcohol as a byproduct of his leaving the reservation during “Relocation.” Oakes states that,
Drinking seems to fill a void in the lives of many Indians. It takes the place of the singing of a song, the sharing of a song with another tribe. Drinking is used as a way to create feelings of some kind where there aren’t any (Warrior & Smith, 1996, p. 5).

All of these traumatic experiences, and more importantly the historical lack of ability to control one’s life, contributed to the radicalization of Native Americans during the 1960s. One of the unintended results of “Relocation” was that when Native Americans saw each other on the streets of a large urban city, they often rejoiced in making a personal connection. This was also true on the college campuses, where Native Americans students were the smallest population (often only 1-5 students total at any campus). Whereas prior to the political mobilization of AIM, Native Americans self identified by their tribal affiliation, during the Power movements of the 1960s and through the formation of AIM, Native Americans began to also identify collectively. This did not diminish or replace tribal affiliation, but it allowed for greater solidarity among Native Americans people and with other peoples of color.

In conclusion, my aim in this chapter was to identify the impact that genocide and land dispossession had on Native Americans. In discussing the uniqueness of Native American racialization, I want to invoke Soya Jung’s definition of race that she identifies as:

a political idea that classifies humanity into false categories in order to justify white supremacy. Race was used to resolve the fundamental contradiction between founding American ideas like freedom and equality on the one hand, and the use of slavery, genocide, and the exploitation of non-European people to build the U.S. economy and political structure on the other. Racial categories and their assigned traits shift over time and geography. They are defined not by science, but by laws, culture, ideas, and practices. Racism is the cumulative impact over time of systems and institutions that have used race to perpetuate white supremacy (2012, p. 4).

I have chosen to engage with this definition here because the emphasis on race being used to justify genocide and to create laws, such as land treaties and relocation, is something that resonates with the Native American experience.

One of the most important differences in understanding the racialization of Native Americans, in comparison to the other three groups I discuss, is that most Indigenous peoples do not adhere to or associate with the concept of race. Unlike African Americans or Asian Americans, who may self identify using those categories, many Native Americans continue to self-identify using their tribal affiliation. Native Americans or “Indian” as a racial category subsumes hundreds of different cultures with unique languages under a single category that is both colonial and derogatory (Chirchill, 2002; Quijano, 2000). Due to the overwhelming influence of space and land as defining characteristics in the experience of Native Americans, space and race for this community are intricately linked. David Goldberg pinpoints the essence of this connection, “Racisms become institutionally normalized in and through special configuration, just as social space is made to seem natural, a given, by being conceived and defined in racial terms” (Goldberg, 1993, as cited in Razack, 2002, p. 17). Also the inseparable history of genocide, which was a predecessor for loss of land, exemplifies how the white settler beliefs about Native Americans - as not worthy or capable of conquering the land - resulted in the development of their racial identity.
Through the creation of the “Indian,” “savage,” or Native American “Other,” many stereotypes have developed to justify the mistreatment, alienation, and exploitation of this population. Tomás Almaguer’s powerful book, *Racial Faultlines* (1994), analyzes the racial formation of communities of color in California during the last half of the 20th century. He offers two important points to the discussion of Native American racialization. The first is that by the time white settlers were establishing California, “Indians” were so dehumanized they were never even considered as part of the new California. Racialized as heathen, dirty, ugly and uncivilized, Almaguer traces the decimation of California’s native peoples between 1848 and 1870 as “California’s white population retained the most barbaric claim one person can hold over another: the right to murder with impunity” (p. 108). Second, the anti-capitalist nature of Native peoples - for example, the Ohlone emphasis on generosity and destroying one’s worldly possessions after their death - stood in stark contrast to the American culture of privatization and inheritance. Thus, the very core beliefs of Indigenous peoples in California was seen as a threat to the burgeoning “American way of life,” resulting in white settlers’ ruthless treatment of Native Americans. Almaguer argues that the genocide of Native Americans was “unquestionably, the most egregious chapter of the white supremacist transformation of the state” (p. 129). Throughout American history, the Indigenous inhabitants of these lands have been seen as an obstacle to European, and eventually, white advancement. Therefore, central to the racialization of Native Americans is the act of genocide, which whites used to position themselves at the top of the racial hierarchy. Lastly, the theft of indigenous territory and isolation of Native people to reservations served as attempt to render them invisible. In Chapters 5 and 6, I analyze how the Third World Liberation Front and the creation of Ethnic Studies was a form of making Indigenous issues and history visible again. In the following section, I discuss the racialization of African Americans, which in addition to Native American genocide, Quijano (2000) cited as the second fundamental axis upon which American power was founded.

African American Racialization

In this section I will analyze two racial projects that have contributed to the racial formation of African Americans in the United States. First, I will examine the development of chattel slavery, and the impact of that legacy on the economic, social, and political positionality of African Americans. Second, I will discuss the extreme lengths to which whites denied African Americans access to education. These two events are intimately linked to notions of superiority and inferiority and anti-blackness, concepts that are central to the racialization of African Americans. In many ways, the history of race as we know it today begins in the 1660s in the British colonies, when laws first emerge, explicitly applying different rights to African slaves as compared to European indentured servants. It is important to discuss that for the first 160 years of colonization of the Americas (1492-1660), Africans were present in the “New World” as sailors, as laborers, and as enslaved people.

The social position of African during the first century varied: some participated in the conquest of the Caribbean with the Spanish, and others arrived in the colonies as indentured servants who were able to earn wages, buy land, and intermarry with poor whites (Golahs-Boza, 2015). In 1619, the first Africans were brought by force to labor in Jamestown. The devastating winter of 1609-10, when more than 400 of the 500 colonists died from starvation and the elements, led to colonists to seek out the importation of enslaved Africans (Zinn, 2004). British colonists were not the first to use slave labor in the hemisphere, as the Spanish and Portuguese had been capturing African captives for almost a century, but they were the first to implement
this practice in the British colonies. The conditions during the first fifty years of colonization in Virginia can be described as dire. The powerful elite were not willing to labor, and as a result, there were massive food shortages (Zinn, 2010). Michaelle Alexander (2010) traces how life in the early colonial period was marked by the difficult lives of the poor indentured servants and slaves, struggling just to survive. The planter class, on the other hand, was consumed with finding enough labor to harvest highly valuable commodities, like tobacco. During this time, the development of social classes - with the powerful planter elite at the top and the exploited laborers at the bottom - led to the formation of strong working class bonds and mixed communities. Lerone Bennett Jr. describes this as a period where “the big planter apparatus and social system…legalized terror against black and white bondsmen” (Bennett, 1975, as cited in Alexander, 2010). In the 1660s, with the introduction of the slave codes, the fluidity among poor laborers began to shift.

Perhaps because of the strong bonds forming between the servant class, the rise of runaways due to horrible conditions, and/or somewhat stabilization of labor, in 1661 new laws began to emerge: one prohibiting English servants from running away with Africans, and the 1662 law forbidding intermarriage between free whites with Blacks and Indigenous people (Zinn, 2010). However, it is the passage of the 1662 Virginia law that states, “Be it therefore enacted and declared by this present grand assembly, that all children born in this country shall be held bond or free only according to the condition of the mother,” (Golash-Boza, 2015, p. 19) which truly established the development of chattel slavery. In 1676, the legal and social differentiation between white and black was made even more visible when Nathaniel Bacon led a failed multiracial rebellion against the Virginia planter elite. The indentured servants burned Jamestown to the ground, demanding an end to their servitude; they were unsuccessful, with some being killed, and others surrendering (Zinn, 2010). What happened next was monumental in the history of racial formation. Rather than punishing all those who revolted equally, the Virginia Assembly chose to release the white servants and hang the Black participants (Golash-Boza, 2015).

With this decision, white privilege was enacted and the use of race as a wedge in class struggle was born in the colonies. Alexander describes the special privileges afforded to poor whites, such as “greater access to native American lands, white servants were allowed to police slaves through slave patrols and militias, and barriers were created so that free labor would not be put in competition with slave labor” (Alexander, 2010, p. 25). Within a relatively short period of time, race was concretized within the colonies, resulting in both material and social/ideological benefits for whites at the expense of Africans. With deep fears of similar worker rebellions, the planter class began shifting their strategy, moving away from white indentured labor to the importation of African slaves (Alexander, 2010). With Native Americans viewed as a poor source of labor because of their knowledge of the land, and poor whites having too many opportunities to run away without capture, the capitalist class found their perfect labor source in Africans stolen from their homeland, alone in a new world, and easily identifiable as non-white. Although the Europeans arrived in the “New World” with a superiority complex firmly established, it is during this moment - the turn of 17th century - that white supremacy, as opposed to Eurocentricity, was solidified.

With the advent of white supremacy alongside the development of modern capitalism, the black body would become commodified; soon the condition of blackness and slavery became inseparable. Eventually, the notion that wage labor was the purview of whites and “unpaid” labor that of blacks contributed to one of the main tenants of the racialization of African Americans
This ideology becomes foundational - the hegemony of the United States. Evelyn Nakano Glenn’s *Unequal Freedom: How Race and Gender Shaped American Citizenship and Labor* (2002), places the connection between social structures and culturally produced notions of race and gender at the center of her analysis. Nakano Glenn’s book critiques the role of the ‘racial state’ as “an arena for creating, maintaining, and contesting racial boundaries and meaning” specifically in how they relate to who is granted citizenship and what labor opportunities they are afforded (p. 12). What differentiates Nakano Glenn’s analysis of the legal and economic oppression of Blacks in the South from Alexander is her ability, first to include gender in her analysis, and second to show how race and gender should be theorized and conceptualized “as interacting, interlocking structures” (p. 6) based on the social constructionist theory which looks at “both cultural meanings and material relations” (p. 8). At this point, I think the materialist argument for why Blacks came to occupy their position in American society has been made. In the following paragraphs, I want to delve into some of the social and cultural implications that chattel slavery had on the Black population.

As stated in the beginning of this section, chattel slavery is one of the most pervasive racial projects influencing the Black population in the United States. Denied their humanity, both socially but also legally, African Americans existed in what Frantz Fanon referred to as the zone of non-being. In contrast to the zone of being, where one is considered fully human, the zone of non-being is defined as “an extraordinarily sterile and arid region, an utterly naked declivity where an authentic upheaval can be born” (Fanon, 1967, p. 8). The dehumanization of African Americans took many forms, all of which were attempts to dominate the population completely and prevent rebellions and uprising that have always been a part of the history of enslavement and oppression. As we saw with Bacon’s rebellion, but especially true in the wake of the Haitian Revolution that succeeded in liberating the enslaved and also in expelling the French colonial powers in 1803, the threat of revolution and fear of reprisal for the horrors of slavery were tangible for the oppressors. In 1788, Thomas Jefferson wrote “Notes of the State of Virginia” and after pages of describing Blacks an inferior, lazy, and incapable of grief, the last words of his essay express the fears that I’m sure many of the oppressors felt in the quiet hours of the night as they reflected on the dehumanization that was part of daily life on plantations. Jefferson concludes, “Indeed, I tremble for my country when I reflect that God is just: that his justice cannot sleep forever” (Jefferson, 1788, cited in Foner, 2011, p. 130). Through this example, we are pushed to analyze the complexity of race and racism in America. White people actively oppressed African Americans, committed countless atrocities against them, and despite their best efforts to ignore the humanity of the oppressed, were forced to consider the moral repercussions for their actions. However, the “consideration” Jefferson - or anyone else who participated and protected the institution of slavery - had regarding the morality of their actions means little, if not followed up by action.

One of the important myths of white supremacy was the notion that African Americans did not feel love or grief the same way as whites did: this logic was used to justify everything from selling children from their parents to denying Blacks the right to marry. In Frederick Douglas’ autobiography (1845), the author recounts many traumas from his life under slavery. One of the most illustrative of the dehumanization and commodification of Blacks was his description of the “valuation” process that occurred when his master died and his estate needed to be appraised. Douglas describes a scene in which, at the age of twelve, after living in Baltimore for about seven years and learning to read and write, he was forced to return to the plantation for this vile occasion. Douglas writes,
We were all ranked together at the valuation. Men and women, old and young, married and single, were ranked with horses, sheep, and swine…Silvery-headed age and sprightly youth, maids and matrons, had to undergo the same indelicate inspection. At this moment, I saw more clearly than ever the brutalizing effects of slavery upon both slave and slaveholder. After the valuation, then came the division. I have no language to express the high excitement and deep anxiety which were felt among us poor slaves during this time. Our fate for life was now to be decided. We had no more voice in that decision than the brutes among whom we were ranked. A single word from the white men was enough - against all our wishes, prayers, and entreaties - to sunder forever the dearest friends, dearest kindred, and strongest ties known to human beings (1845, p. 47-48).

The tearing apart of families is a defining characteristic of the American version of chattel slavery, where children were born into permanent slavery and the bonds of families were ignored by both the states and the individuals who owned and traded humans as property. In Tera W. Hunter’s book *To 'Joy My Freedom: Southern Black Women's Lives and Labors After the Civil War* (1997), the author explores the ways that newly freed black women, from the end of the Civil War through WWII, sought to find freedom in the city of Atlanta, and the political and social strategies they employed to combat racism, economic exploitation, and the entrenched institutions of white supremacy. One area where Black families practiced their new freedoms, post-emancipation, was in the right to marry. During slavery, marriage between the enslaved was prohibited, although long term fully committed relationships were the foundation of slave families. Due to slavery and the chaos of the Civil War, these unions were often tested, as spouses would be separated for years, sending love letters to the Freedman’s Bureau and churches in an effort to find their spouses. Hunter writes that “emotional bonds were sometimes so intense that spouses would choose to suffer indefinitely if they could not be reunited with their lost loved ones” (p. 40). Hunter notes that the desire to protect their families was followed by the desire for literacy and education as top priorities of ex-slaves.

**Forbidden Fruit: Education and Self-Determination**

I want to start this section by returning to the research question driving this chapter: *How has America’s history of institutionalized racial projects, targeting non-white populations, shaped the vision and priorities of the TWLF?* One of my main arguments in this dissertation is that the Third World Liberation Front is part of the longue durée of people of color struggling for their freedom. At the foundation of this argument is the emphasis that African Americans placed on education during Reconstruction, beginning in 1865, as crucial to their freedom. Denying African Americans access to education has been a systemic project of white supremacy that continued long after Reconstruction ended. Thus, scholars such as Waldo E. Martin Jr. have argued that the *Brown v. Board of Education* ruling in 1954 was arguably “the most important Supreme Court ruling in United States history” (Martin, 1998, p. 1). The reason for such a powerful argument lays not only in the fact that the Brown ruling overturned the dehumanizing 1896 *Plessy v. Ferguson* decision which upheld state sanctioned racial discrimination (ibid), but for me the *Brown* decision reflects a monumental shift in our nations history to educate black children. In the following pages it will become clear that this endeavor has been one that agents of institutions of white supremacy have fought hard to prevent.
In the following pages, I will illustrate the impact of denying blacks access to education during slavery, and how their mobilization of schools and dedication to learning served as the first crucial step in the struggle for Ethnic Studies. As such, the analysis occurring in the following pages is of vital importance to my overall project.

White supremacy - and vessels of the state that materialized it - considered the ability to read and write such a powerful tool that they prohibited the enslaved from these activities. An 1831 North Carolina Act reflects the typical concerns and punishments the state had regarding the education of slaves. In summary, the law prohibited anyone from teaching a slave to read or write, or from offering them books or pamphlets. White people could be charged a fine of $100-$200 dollars for committing the crime, and free Blacks were subject to imprisonment and no less than twenty whippings, and no more than thirty-nine. Again, I return to Douglas’ autobiography to analyze a first person narrative on this subject. Douglas describes how he came to learn to read and write: leaving the planation for the first time in his life, he was sold to a young couple in Baltimore. He was immediately surprised at the kind nature of his new mistress, who began teaching him basic literacy. The lessons - and his mistress’s friendly demeanor - came to an end when her husband learned of their actions and forbade his wife from continuing (Douglas, 1845). In this example two important points should be gleaned. First, that Douglas describes how a once kind hearted woman who had never owned a slave before, when given the “fatal poison of irresponsible power” was transformed in such a way that the “cheerful eye, under the influence of slavery, soon became red with rage; that voice, made all of sweet accord, changed to one of harsh and horrid discord; and that angelic face gave place to that of a demon” (1845, p. 33). Second, seeing the dread in his master’s eyes upon learning of their activities, Douglas was inspired “with a desire and determination to learn” (1845, p. 34). This desire was not limited to Douglas, but rather was representative of the vast majority of African Americans during Reconstruction.

James D. Anderson’s *The Education of Blacks in the South 1860-1935* (1998), chronicles how former slaves led the movement for universal education in the South, challenging the planter’s ideology, which denied education to the majority (including poor whites), believing that such an intervention would disrupt the social hierarchy and the right of “familial authority over children” (p. 4). The white planter class knew the power of literacy, as they had been denying Blacks the right to read or write since slavery’s inception; they were aware that reading and writing gave Blacks the opportunity to challenge their oppression, organize rebellions, and stay connected to their families. All of these possibilities were viewed as a threat to the racial system. As a result, education and literacy became the single most popular demand from former slaves (p. 5). Anderson notes that the “foundation of the freedmen’s educational movement was their self-reliance and deep-seated desire to control and sustain schools for themselves and their children” (p. 5). While the black community wanted to control this movement, they welcomed support from northern missionaries, the Republicans, the Freedmen’s Bureau, and even the Union Army to achieve their goal. W.E.B. Du Bois has written extensively on this subject, contextualizing the massive push for universal education and the role that blacks played in that effort. He argues, “Public education for all at the public expense was, in the South, a Negro idea” (Dubois, as cited in Provenzo, 2002, p.158). The significance of the efforts and achievements of Blacks to create their own education system should not be understated. The leadership and community engagement by the Southern Black population resulted in changing
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the meaning of public education, and also exemplified the seriousness with which Black people saw their freedom as being connected to education, a theme that is at the heart of my dissertation. In 1866, the first national Superintendent of the Freedman’s Bureau, John W. Alvord, wrote about his experience at the “native schools,” the term used by whites to describe Black-run and operated schools in the South. Alvord estimated that by 1866 that there were already 500 of these schools throughout the South (Anderson, 1998, p. 7). The massive proliferation of “native schools” supports the data that these schools were starting up before the end of the Civil War, and also, that Blacks were more than capable of creating a society in which they were full citizens. The latter point is significant because the power of white supremacy had convinced most white Southerners, and white Americans in general, that Black people were uncivilized, lacking the cognitive ability to control their own lives. Thus, slavery was a justified method of social control. Anderson notes that the Black-run schools became “a test of their capacity to restructure their lives, to establish their freedom” (p. 12). When northern white-run schools were opened in the South to provide a less expensive option for Black students, Black families still chose to spend more of what little money they had to send their children to Black-run schools. The Sabbath schools also provided another space for Black children to receive an education, even if only on the weekends or evenings. By 1885, the African Methodist Episcopal church reported having 200,000 pupils in Sabbath schools (p. 13). Anderson argues that in the post-emancipation South, Black educators “emerged from among the rebel literates…slaves who had sustained their own learning process in defiance of the slave owner’s authority. They viewed literacy and formal education as a means to liberation and freedom” (p. 17). The rebellious nature of these educators also signifies that Black intellectuals have always existed in resistance to white supremacy.

Additionally, Hunter (1997) identified a similar scenario in her book when she described the arrival of a New England teacher in Atlanta in 1865 traveling to the south to help establish schools. Upon his arrival, he found that Blacks had already opened a school in a church basement with what little money the Black community could spare, with labor and food donated by members of the community. In 1865, Black ministers formed the Savannah Education Association (SEA), which operated and staffed schools with all Black teachers. Hunter notes that the fight for education and politics went hand in hand in Georgia, and despite the Freedman’s Bureau attempt to keep the organization apolitical, the SEA changed its name to the Georgia Equal Rights and Education Association “explicitly linking equal rights in the political arena with the pursuit of education” (p. 41). Again, Black people have historically linked educational opportunity and political freedom to their pursuit of liberation. They achieved their goals by combining the limited resources within their community, seeking to keep control of Black education in the hands of Black people. What connects the Black movement for education during the 19th century to those of the 1960s are the following themes: the passion and deep desire for education; the right to self-determination; the linking of education to liberation; and the emphasis on Black community control of education.

In his essay, “Does the Negro Need Separate Schools?” (1935), Du Bois eloquently opens with the following statement:

The proper education of any people includes sympathetic touch between teacher and pupil: knowledge of the part of the teacher, not simply of the individual taught, but of his surroundings and background, and the history of his class and group… (p. 328).
DuBois clarifies throughout his essay that segregation is necessary only because racism is so rampant that it denies Black children the opportunity to learn freely when they attend white schools. Du Bois speaks of the violence Black children experience when their parents force them into schools where the “white children, white teachers, and white parents despised and resented the dark child, made a mock of it, neglected or bullied it, and literally rendered its life a living hell” (p. 330). DuBois argues that if it could be ensured that Black students would receive caring, sympathetic instruction from white teachers in a mixed class, then that would be preferred. Unfortunately, in 1935 Du Bois did not see that as a realistic option; thus, he favored segregated schools.

Dealing with the reality of ideological and institutional racism that prevailed in the 1930s, Du Bois stated, “Under such circumstances, there is no room for argument as to whether the Negro needs separate schools or not. The plain fact faces us that, either he will have separate schools or he will not be educated” (1935, DuBois, p. 330). Unfortunately, many elements of this argument remain relevant today. As Noguera (2001) argues, Black males are more likely than any other group to be punished with suspensions and expulsions in school; more likely to be classified as “retarded” and placed in special education; generally they are the most stigmatized group within the schools (p. 432). While segregation is not the solution to educational and social inequity in the 21st century, one thing that resonates from DuBois’ argument here is the link between creating educational settings that consider the humanity and experiences of historically oppressed peoples. The call for spaces and educators who understand the unique needs of people of color is a concept at the core of the TWLF and their demand for relevant curricula, self-determination, and the right to decide to who was qualified to teach.

In concluding my analysis of the racial formation for African Americans, I want to highlight three important findings. First: the development of chattel slavery, an all-encompassing social and legal dehumanization, was unique to the United States. Therefore the fact that African Americans were subjected to this cruelty for over two centuries means that a major factor in the racialization of African Americans is the notion that they have come to represent “un-free,” coerced, and enslaved labor (Nakano-Glenn, 2002; Quijano, 2000). Second, the shifts in how the dominant society racializes African Americans have gone through many iterations in our nation’s history, ranging from complete dehumanization to Jim Crow disenfranchisement, and more recently, the logic of color-blind racism. Despite these shifts, one thing has remained constant: the dominance of white supremacy and capitalism in shaping laws and institutions has ensured that African Americans remain disenfranchised in many ways. This is evidenced by Michelle Alexander’s (2010) examination of the rise of the prison industrial complex, which she argues was developed to maintain control over Black bodies when the Jim Crow system was legally destroyed with the passage of Civil Rights legislation of the 1960s. Her argument is that the structures which are in place in our society have changed very little since Jim Crow; that in fact, the greatest changes have come in the language used to wage war against poor Black men. The last point I want to highlight is that much of African American racialization rests on the mythology of their inferiority in comparison to whites. One of the tools used to try and “prove” this argument was denying African Americans access to education. While it was seen as dangerous in the hands of Black people, education came to represent freedom and liberation for many in the Black community. Armed with the ability to read labor contracts, communicate with employers and family, and even become producers of knowledge, the struggle for relevant education in communities of color is initiated by African Americans at the turn of the 20th century. This will serve as a turning point in the longue durée of achieving Ethnic Studies.
In the following section, I will analyze the racial formation of Asian Americans.

Asian American Racialization

In this section I will identify two racial projects that have contributed to the racialization of Americans. The first is the concept and practice of legal and social exclusion, resulting in stereotypes like the ‘perpetual foreigner.’ The second racial project is the way in which Asians have been utilized as a racial wedge and vessel of anti-black racism, usually to the benefit of capitalism and white supremacy. In the 18th and 19th century, racist/Eurocentric pseudo-science was being developed to categorize people of color and argue their biological inferiority to whites. For example, Carolus Linnaeus (1707-1778) created the four major groups of humans (Americanus, Asiaticus, Africanus, and Europaenus); this ideology became so prevalent and important to the solidification of racial ideology that it can still be seen in our society today (Golash-Boza, 2015). The descriptions Linnaeus used to categorize humans are so ridiculously subjective and Eurocentric that they are worth highlighting as representative of how ideology becomes materialized through institutions like the law. Below are the four main groups of humans, corresponding to the four major continents.

Americanus- reddish, choleric;...obstinate, merry, free;...regulated by customs.

Asiaticus- sallow, melancholy,...black hair, dark eyes,...haughty, ...ruled by opinions.

Africanus- black, phlegmatic, relaxed;...women without shame,...crafty, indolent, negligent, governed by caprice.

Europaenus- white, sanguine, muscular, inventive, governed by laws.

Linnaeus was succeeded by Samuel George Morton (1799-1851), Paul Borca (1824-1880), Madison Grant (1865-1937) and others who labored to measure skulls, determine intelligence, predict morality, and generally make judgments about non-Europeans (Golash-Boza, 2015, p. 25).

This pseudo-science was used to justify everything from slavery and genocide to citizenship rights. In the context of Asian American racialization, this logic was applied to create laws excluding Asians from entering the country. Through the development and distribution of Asian stereotypes, the United States created the first major immigration legislation, and as a product of the era it was explicitly racist. The Chinese Exclusion Act (1882) was unique because it outlawed one specific race and ethnicity, the Chinese. In the first few chapters of Helen Zia’s Asian American Dreams (2000), the author provides the historical context of Asian immigration to the United States and how Asians were received and racialized.
Different from Native Americans colonized in their lands and African Americans forced en-mass to come to the United States, Asian Americans occupy a distinct location in the American racial hierarchy. In the 16th century, Manila and Spain were trading partners; occasionally, Filipino sailors, who were servants on the Spanish ships, would ‘jump ship’ in the Port of New Orleans. These runaways settled some of the first Asian American communities in the United States in Louisiana (Zia, 2000). After the emancipation of African Americans, Chinese coolie labor was brought to the United States to replace slave labor. Zia describes how the United States capitalists and Southern economy used coolie labor as an economic hammer against the newly won rights of Blacks. The coolie’s place in the economic system also created resentment within the Black community, because Blacks saw them as undercutting their right to sell their labor as Freemen and Freewomen.

In Helen Jun’s *The Race for Citizenship: Black Orientalism and Asian Uplift from Pre-Emancipation to Neoliberal America* (2011), the author traces the tensions between the African American and Asian American communities and how they were racialized in relation to one another. In constant competition for work and survival during Reconstruction, many Blacks participated in Black Orientalism, which she defines as “a concept that situates the contradictions of black citizenship in structural relation to America Orientalism and Chinese immigrant exclusion” (p. 6). In daily practice, this would occur when African Americans, especially in Black journalism, participated in Orientalist discourse that “otherized” Asians as foreign and untrustworthy. Thus Jun argues that post-emancipation Blacks constituted their humanity and newly gained citizenship in contrast to the ‘barbary’ of the Oriental alien. What is powerful about Jun’s analysis is that she examines the complex forces behind the highly racialized discourse of African American and Asian Americans without demonizing either group. For example, even though the Black community and Black press intensified their Orientalist portrayal of the Chinese as criminal and sexually depraved in the wake of the Chinese Exclusion Act, Jun contextualizes why they appropriated this discourse. By analyzing the racial terror, widespread practice of lynching, and economic disempowerment that plagued the Black Southern community, Jun achieves the difficult task of explaining a complex moment in American history that pitted people of color against one another in the service of white supremacy and capitalism. What is important about Jun’s analysis is that she argues, convincingly, that one cannot fully understand the racialization of Asian Americans without examining how they have been positioned in relation to blackness.

Zia (2000) examines the influence of Chinese immigration during the Gold Rush of the 1850s, when Orientalist ideology began influencing the manner in which this group was racialized. During the height of the “Yellow Peril” in the 1870’s, Asian Americans, mostly Chinese, were racialized as pollutant carriers of disease, an economic threat to white workers, and a threat to nation, race, and family. The “Yellow Peril” era resulted in mass hysteria against the Chinese: riots against Chinese homes and businesses, murders, and lynchings were common. In 1882 the U.S. Congress passed the Chinese Exclusion Act, barring Chinese immigration and forbidding Chinese immigrants from becoming citizens, a direct consequence of the fears whites had of Asians, as well as the economic threat the Chinese posed by participating in the gold industry (despite racist taxes, levies, and laws written against them). Zia describes this law as “a prohibition that would inhibit Asian American political development for decades to come” (p. 28). As Chinese exclusion continued, other Asians began immigrating to the United States to fill the void left by the Chinese in the labor economy.
When the Japanese immigrated in the wake of the Chinese exclusion, they tried to differentiate themselves from the Chinese to avoid the same oppression and violence; ultimately, they faced similar racism and citizenship exclusion. Here we see a pattern for people of color - whether African American or Japanese - of trying to avoid racist attacks by attempting to differentiate themselves from those most publicly victimized by white supremacy. Interestingly, Asian Indians were treated differently upon arriving in the United States because they were assumed to be Caucasian, although this brief rise in the racial hierarchy was soon rescinded. In 1923, Bhagat Sing Thind brought his case for citizenship to the Supreme Court, arguing that because he was Sikh, and thus legally Caucasian, he should be granted citizenship. Despite agreeing with the technical logic that Thind was indeed Caucasian, the Court denied him citizenship because “it is a matter of familiar observation and knowledge that the physical group characteristics of the Hindus render them readily distinguishable from the various groups of persons in this country commonly recognized as white.”\footnote{United States v. Bhagat Singh Thind, 261 U.S. 204 (1923).} The court’s decision proved just how subjective and fluid notions of race are. At times, it was about blood; in this case, Thind was denied citizenship because of his brown skin and other cultural markers. Essentially, he didn’t look white. Zia argues that since “Indians were not white, they could not become citizens, nor could they own land or send for their wives from India” (Zia, 2000, p. 33.) This ruling was applied retroactively; one American Asian Indian even committed suicide over the ruling (ibid).

Korean immigration was also different, in that many Koreans came to the U.S. through missionaries as Christians. They did not reside in ethnic communities, doing their best to mix into white society, again trying to avoid the experience of their Asian predecessors. Koreans claimed to be liked by whites, better than the Chinese, but the material reality of their position in the labor pool put them in same category as other Asians. The Filipino experience was unique, initially, because the Philippines was a American territory, and after 1924, Filipinos were the only Asians eligible for immigration with United States passports. Zia argues that whites were outraged by Filipino immigrants and their supposed propensity for white women. This led whites to actually call for Philippine independence to prevent Filipino citizenship in America. Zia states, “Their racially inflamed arguments persuaded Congress to pass another law specifically targeting Asians, the Tydings-McDuffie Act of 1934, converting the Philippines into a commonwealth. Immediately, all Filipinos were reclassified as Aliens and prohibited from applying for citizenship because they weren’t white” (Zia, 2000, p. 25). Helen Zia effectively argues that the racialization of Asians was in large part defined by being given the status of aliens, who being “neither white nor black, turned them into objects of hostility and revulsion who could be used as racial wedge by unionists and capitalists alike” (p. 36). Thus, the Asian experience in the United States, and their location in the American race hierarchy have been shaped by ideologies of inferiority used to justify their exclusion until the moment their labor is required.

In the aftermath of the attack on Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, Japanese Americans become the ultimate ‘alien enemy.’ On February 19, 1942, President Roosevelt signed Executive Order 9066, ordering that all Japanese people be sent to interment camps. Zia argues that, “the demonization of the Japanese allows other Asian Americans to become American” (Zia, 2000, p. 40). In attempt to save face with their Asian allies, the United States repealed the exclusion and denial of citizenship to the Chinese in 1943, and that of Filipinos and Indians in 1946. Thus, the exclusion of Japanese from American society resulted in greater inclusion for other Asian communities. The manic actions of the American government here truly reflect the fluidity of
racial formation and the role of politics and the economy in shaping racial discourse and policy. Close to the end of WWII, Japanese American GI’s of the 442nd Division, most of whom volunteered to prove their allegiance to America, broke through the German defenses in Italy. Zia describes how Japanese Americans were among the first to liberate Nazi concentration camps in Dachau, Germany. However, the U.S. military commanders decided it would be bad public relations if Jewish prisoners were freed by Japanese American soldiers whose own families were imprisoned in American concentration camps. As with the transcontinental railroad photographs seventy-five years earlier, the Japanese American soldiers who liberated Dachau were MIH - Missing in History” (p. 40).

The closure of the Japanese internment camps in 1946 culminated the end of an era in Asian American racialization. The ideologies of exclusion and ‘yellow peril’ were transformed yet again as the country experienced the post war boom of the 1950s. With the birth of the term “Asian American” emerging from student movement and the TWLF at UC Berkeley during the turbulent decade of the 1960s, Asian Americans would again be used as a social hammer against other people of color.

The second major development in Asian racialization is the construction of the “Model Minority Myth.” The purpose of this myth reflects the legacy of using Asians as a vessel to control the Black population’s struggle for social and economic freedom. Soya Jung (2012) contextualizes the emergence of the model minority myth, which defined “Asian Americans as law-abiding and hardworking, and implicitly enforcing the permanent criminalization of Blackness” (p. 17). Scott Kurashige also analyzes the longer history behind the model minority myth in his text, Shifting Grounds of Race: Black and Japanese Americans in the Making of Multiethnic Los Angeles (2010). To summarize, Kurashige highlights multiple ways the state helped to prop up the image of Japanese Americans, in particular after WWII. He too starts with the William Petersen 1966 NY Times article, but he then looks back to the mid 1940s, when the military began publicizing the bravery and loyalty of the Japanese American 442nd (Kurashige, 2010, p. 187). Especially after Japan was defeated by the US, a new paternalistic image formed in American popular culture: Japan’s central role as a sphere of influence against communist China and Korea ultimately contributed to the improvement in how Japanese Americans were perceived, shifting them from enemy to ally, albeit by force (p. 200). Lastly, by the 1950s the Los Angeles port was doing more business with Japan than with any other country; with Asia becoming more central to their economy, the city wanted a more cosmopolitan image. Thus, the “world city” was born, and Japanese Americans were placed at the forefront of the rise of Asian Americans as they emerged as the model minority (p. 201). The transformation of the Japanese from ‘ultimate enemy’ to ‘model minority’ represents a defining characteristic of Asian American racialization, which Zia describes as, “Friend today, foe tomorrow” (Zia, 2000, p. 46).

In conclusion, when analyzing the racialization of Asian Americans, it is important to remember that the model minority myth and yellow peril ideologies are intricately linked. If Asian Americans are perceived as being too smart or too good in a capitalist environment, they are still deemed a threat that must be contained (Jun, 2011). The tropes used to racialize Asian Americans continually work to “otherize” them as the perpetual foreigner. More than African Americans and Native Americans, the position of Asian Americans within the American racial hierarchy has proven to be more fluid. Perhaps this is because they did not arrive in the United
States as a significant population until almost two centuries after African Americans and Native Americans. Thus, their identity was not solidified in the way it was for the other groups. Whatever the reasons, their fluidity does not negate the fact that they have been oppressed by white supremacy and exploited by capitalism. In our society where race is often discussed in the context of a black/white binary, the experiences of racism and discrimination for Asian Americans has often been silenced. I hope through this dissertation to provide a space where their stories and contributions are acknowledged so that they are no longer Missing In History, as Helen Zia (2000) famously wrote.

**Chicano/Latino Racialization**

Before I begin my analysis of Chican@/Latin@ racialization, I want to clarify that the point of this chapter is to situate the experiences of these four racialized communities in order to contextualize the demands of the TWLF at UC Berkeley in 1969. Therefore, in the case of Latin@ I need to clarify that in 1969 at UC Berkeley the majority of the Latin@ population was of Mexican descent with a small population from Puerto Rico. While there is no demographic data that disaggregates the “Hispanic” population, the fact that the only Latin@ student group was made up of Mexicans, in addition to anecdotal confirmation with interview participants, has led me to this conclusion: in this section I will discuss mostly the Mexican/Chican@ and Puerto Rican experience in the United States. As I stated in the introduction, this chapter is not meant to be a comprehensive history of race and racism in the United States; rather, my goal is to illuminate pivotal moments that have contributed to my analysis of the TWLF at UC Berkeley as part of a longue durée of struggle. In this analysis I will focus on how colonization and the position of Latin@ in the labor market have had the greatest impact on Chican@/Latin@ racialization.

Carlos Muñoz Jr.’s *Youth, Identity, Power: The Chicano Movement* (1989) is central to my analysis of Chicano racialization because it directly addresses the major shifts in identity for this population during the 20th century. Muñoz argues that Mexican Americans “more than any other racial group in the United States have been given a multitude of identity labels” (Muñoz, 1989, p.19). He also emphasizes that these identities are both given, as stated above, and also internalized, depending on many factors, such as class, region, and urban or rural location. For example, Mexican Americans in northern New Mexico self-identify as Hispanos, while in Colorado, Spanish-American is the preferred identifier. Muñoz also suggests that the multiple identities result from the fact that Mexican Americans are perhaps the most racially diverse (Indigenous, African, Spanish, Irish, etc.) group of non-white people in the country (p. 19).

The history of racialization for Chican@s in the United States starts with America’s colonial expansion West. The Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo (1848), which marked the end of the Mexican American war, technically made those Mexicans still residing in the United States fully fledged U.S. citizens; this citizenship, however, was considered second-class, at best. Evelyn Nakano Glenn (2002) argues that the Mexican’s ambiguous citizenship status resided somewhere between the Black, white, Indian racialization. Carlos Muñoz begins with the origins of Mexican colonization and economic exploitation by the United States, asserting that, “Like Native American people, Mexican Americans were subjected to a process of colonization which, in addition to undermining their culture, relegated the majority of them to a permanent pool of cheap labor for US capital” (Muñoz, 1989, p. 31). Exploited as a fundamental source of labor for developing Western states and their economies, Muñoz argues that the conquered nonwhite population never benefited from “the fruits of capitalist development. Even the once privileged
Mexican gentry who welcomed the white colonizers with open arms soon lost their social status and political power with the formation of a new class structure” (p. 31). Mexican American racialization, similar to that of African Americans, was subject to periods where rabid patriotism and eugenics shaped the hegemonic ideology to vilify them. Precisely because of their mixed heritage, they were defined as “promiscuous…apathetic peons and lazy squaws [who] prowl by night…stealing anything they can get their hands on” (p. 34). Thus, Mexican Americans became the melting pot for all negative stereotypes associated with Native Americans and African Americans.

Schools were crucial in the formation of Mexican American identity, and as locales where labour power was reproduced. Muñoz argued that American schools taught the “virtues of capitalism,” which resulted in a form of cultural imperialism where second generation Mexican Americans were taught to adopt anything deemed American while rejecting their Mexican heritage. The relationship between education and social reproduction will be discussed at length in the following chapter. However, it is important to note here that Mexican American education and the project of assimilation is exemplified best in the efforts of the YMCA, backed by funding from JP Morgan and John D. Rockefeller, who sought to incorporate Mexican Americans the same way that European immigrants had been incorporated at the turn of the century. Schools became important sites of “Americanization” during the 1920s, 1930s, and 1940s, when the issue of the “Mexican Problem” was at the center of cultural and economic fears promulgated by xenophobists. While assimilation was the goal, similar to the Native American boarding schools discussed earlier, Mexican children were not forced to leave their families during the assimilation efforts of the 20th century.

Mexican-Americans of the 1930s and 1940s believed in the power of democracy and the WPA programs and G.I. Bill that benefitted them, creating a generation that was complex: one critical of racism and segregation, but also the product of Americanization efforts and anti-communism, which resulted in a sort of hybrid-ethnic patriotism. Slowly, those who entered the professional class sought to challenge some of these racial stereotypes, but the dominance of cold-war politics prevented mass mobilization against the economic structure that oppressed the majority of Mexican Americans. This era of racialization reflects the efforts of Mexican-Americans trying to find a home in the American capitalist system by adopting identities that were non-threatening to white supremacy.

In the 1960s, Mexican American youth began to shift away from pro-American patriotism that defined much of the period throughout McCarthyism, moving towards an ideology that valued and reignited the interest in their Mexican origins. Inspired by the Delano strike of 1965 and the influence of the Teatro Campesino, a new generation that would soon name themselves Chicanos was emerging. Ysidro Macias, an undergraduate from UCB and future leader of the TWLF, had a major influence on the shifting identity of Mexican American youth through his plays at the Teatro Campesino. In his play The Ultimate Pendejada, this was most evident when he “dramatized the rejection of the assimilation of Mexican-American identity and the emergence of Chicano identity” (Muñoz, 1989, p. 68). While the farm workers’ struggle began to mobilize the youth, the strength of the Mexican-American ideology was still strong for many: reflecting anti-communist values, they did not yet form solidarity with other third world or leftist struggles. The shifting identity was reflected in another, more militant struggle: on June 5, 1967, the Alianza Federal de Mercedes, founded by Reies Lopez Tijerina, took over a county courthouse, “taking twenty hostages…This was the first militant armed action taken by Mexican Americans anywhere in the Southwest for over a hundred years, and it became
a source of inspiration for some student activists, especially in New Mexico” (p. 73). The group wanted the return of their lands, stolen by Spanish colonizers; a connection to their Indigenous lands and culture was emerging as a significant element in Chicano identity. The search for their lost history was epitomized by Corky Gonzales’ poem - and soon to be anthem of the Chicano Movement - *Yo Soy Joaquín*. Muñoz describes the poem as “a journey back through history, a painful self-evaluation, and wandering search for my people and, most of all, for my own identity” (p. 76). It is clear that decades of racism, segregation, forced Americanization, and assimilation had taken its toll of the Mexican American’s sense of identity; the developments of the late 1960s proved to be a sort of therapy for a young generation desperately seeking their place in a shifting political and social landscape marked by civil rights and power struggles for political rights and social justice. By the March 3, 1968 student “blow outs” in East Los Angeles and the TWLF protests at SFSU and UC Berkeley in 1968 and 1969 respectively, the Chicano movement and identity was taking hold, especially among students and workers.

The 1960s student and youth movements created a space for the new Chicano identity - influenced by anti-colonial, anti-capitalist, and nationalist rhetoric - to grow and take shape. In March of 1969, the organization Crusade for Justice held a national conference in Denver, Colorado, entitled “National Chicano Youth Liberation Conference.” Many of the themes in the conference dealt with the search for identity: the participants felt that their liberation would come from looking to “revolutionary,” or I would add, counter-hegemonic role models, such as street youth and ex-convicts. They also called for a “total rejection of gabacho culture - the culture of the white Anglo-Saxon Protestant” (Muñoz, 1989, p. 92). This clear demarcation between old and new identity addresses how a social movement can contribute to the racial formation of a group.

Part of this new identity was to win political and economic control for their communities and to advocate for militant self-defense (Muñoz, 1989, p. 93). Similar to the militant Native American student activists who were also emerging during this time, Chicanos connected their struggle to the loss of land. Thus, the imagery and popularity of Aztlán, the mythical region where the Aztecs originated, came to reflect the desire to connect to the land, which had been stolen from them through colonization. ⁶ For the purpose of understanding shifting racial identities, this text exemplifies the material and ideological forces that contributed to Mexican American racialization and how, in opposition to what they deemed oppressive, and with lessons learned from other social movements, Chicano youth of the 1960s fought to create their own identity using the history and mythology of Mexico. Another major force in the development of this new identity of radical activism was the voice of Chicana activists who pushed the movement’s agenda to consider the gender, not just racial, oppression within the Chicano culture.

Born from the civil rights and ethnic nationalist movements of the 1960s and 1970s, Chicana feminist thought, like Black feminist thought, represented the failure of “radical” movements to address the multiple layers of oppression existing within their communities. Alma Garcia in *Chicana Feminist Thought* (1997) argues that, “Chicana feminist thought reflected a historical struggle by women to overcome sexist oppression but still affirm a militant ethnic consciousness” (Garcia, 1997, p. 1). She notes that although Chicano cultural nationalism, or
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⁶ Luis Leal, (1988) writing on the symbolism of the Chicano movement, notes that after March 1969, “Aztlán has become the symbol most used by Chicano authors who write about the history, the culture, or the destiny of their people; and the same thing occurs with those who write poetic novels or short stories. During the spring of the following year, 1970, the first number of the journal of Aztlán was published, and in it the Plan was reproduced in both English and Spanish” (p. 10).
Chicanismo advocated resistance to their racial and economic oppression, it did not address the issues of women or queer activists. Contrary to what some scholars have written, Garcia argues that Chicana feminism occurred alongside the movement rather than after it. Thus, “from their nationalist base, these Chicana activists began to evolve also as feminists” (p. 3). Chicanas sought to bring the multiple oppressions they faced to the forefront to unite against male dominance, or machismo, within their organizations.

Chicana feminist Anna Nieto Gomez proclaimed that Chicana issues of equality, freedom, and self-determination “like the right of self-determination, equality, and liberation of the Mexican (Chicano) community - is not negotiable” (Garcia, 1997, p. 5). Most men within the movement challenged these comparisons and dismissed or attacked the feminists for appropriating what they deemed a “white” theory. But Chicanas continued to challenge the “Ideal Woman” imagery perpetuated my men in El Movimiento who described said woman as “strong and long-suffering” - the woman who creates a “safe haven” for her man, her family, and the movement. Gomez, like the author bell hooks, cited the source of women’s oppression within the patriarchy and the social structures that fostered it.

The oppression of people of color and always been multiplied for women in the United States. In Unequal Freedom: How Race and Gender Shaped American Citizenship and Labor, Evelyn Nakano Glenn (2002) focuses her research on precisely this intersection. I have argued in this chapter that race is fluid and shifts based on many factors within society, namely a group’s relationship to labor (capitalism) and white supremacy. Nakano Glenn also emphasizes how race and gender are not static but contextualized by the historic contexts, and should be theorized and conceptualized "as interacting, interlocking structures" (Nakano Glenn, 2002, p. 6), based on social constructionist theory, which would examine “both cultural meanings and material relations” (p. 8). This is evidenced by the experiences of Mexican women, post 1848, especially in California. Tomás Alamaguer (2011) describes this era when Californian was a “white masculinist preserve for European-American men” (p. 32). Part of the specifically gendered history of Mexican women at this time was that they were viewed by white settlers as “spoils of war awaiting the amorous embrace of the white man's "valiant arms" (p. 61). In the eyes of Anglo men, Mexican women were forced into a dichotomy, in a very capitalist sense. They were either assigned value and considered worthy of Anglo men, as in the case of upper-class Mexican women. Or if they were poor, then they were devalued and viewed as expendable (Almaguer, 2011). This very gendered experience reflects that in a white settler society, women of color experienced dehumanization because of their race, while simultaneously being elevated as sexual property. The colonial legacy of conquering land and pillaging Native women has contributed to the racialization of Mexican and the stereotypes associated with them. The stereotype of the “Cantina Girl” depicted the Mexican female as hyper sexual, enticing, and alluring (Keller, 1994) reflecting the desires of the colonizer, also serving as a justification for sexualizing and dominating women. Thus, the racialization of Mexicans and/or Chican@/s, like all groups, depends on geography, gender, class, and the historical moment. Next, I will analyze the racial formation of Puerto Ricans, who occupy a unique location in the American racial hierarchy as current colonial subjects.

In Colonial Subjects: Puerto Ricans in a Global Perspective (2003), Ramón Grosfoguel uses numerous theories to exemplify the multifarious ways in which political/social/economic structures and policies have influenced the racialization of Puerto Ricans. For the purpose of this chapter, I will focus on his analysis surrounding the affect of the “context of reception.” Grosfoguel defines “context of reception” as the crucial task of locating each “racial ethnic group
within the broader context of the core-periphery relationships of the country of origin and the United States” (p. 130). For Puerto Ricans, in Grosfoguel’s analysis, this means understanding the political role the island played during the cold-war era was as a “symbolic showcase” of American-sponsored democracy, in contrast to Soviet sponsored communism in Cuba. The manner in which these showcase models played out on the islands was very different from the experience island immigrants had in the United States. During the 1950s and 1960s, the United States funneled large amounts of money to the island to create a strong welfare state, and to protect both workers (and their benefits and wages) and the unemployed. This created an economic boom and standard of living significantly higher than neighboring Caribbean countries. Just as any economic improvement plan for the poor has its capitalist catches, the American government acknowledged that, “By extending labor rights to Puerto Rican workers, the pro-annexationist position of the labor movement was strengthened” (p. 55). The United States romanced the Puerto Rican labor movement, thwarting a serious national demand for self-determination; they were successful in establishing Puerto Rico as a commonwealth in 1952, despite the fact that Puerto Ricans had gained U.S. citizenship as colonial subjects in 1917. When the courtship ended, there were two serious consequences for the Puerto Rican people. First, as a result of the now “undesirable” labor conditions and stagflation of the 1970s, Puerto Rico became “unattractive to labor-intensive industries” (p. 58). Although migration had been an integral aspect of the “symbolic showcase” model - flights to the U.S. had been very inexpensive - those migrating out of Puerto Rico to the U.S. in the 1970s were different from the first generation. The new immigrants were poorer and less educated, thus contributing the negative (Black) racialization experience post 1973 oil crisis.

Now that I have historicized the affect that the symbolic showcase model had on immigration of Puerto Ricans in the U.S., I can better describe how “context of reception” helps my work in understanding racial formation in the U.S. Using a “context of reception” approach allows scholars to analyze the migration process of a particular ethnic group holistically, taking into account the time period when they migrated; the reason for their leaving the periphery nation and moving to the core; their economic position within the periphery and core; and how they were received socially/politically/economically once they arrived in the core country. For Puerto Ricans entering the U.S., the “context of their reception” had everything to do with the manner in which they were racialized. Although the first waves of Puerto Ricans emigrating to the U.S. were well received due to higher education levels, the majority of Puerto Rican emigrants identified in the U.S. were poor, criminal, uneducated, and most importantly, Black (Grosfoguel, 2003, p. 180-182). Because Puerto Ricans have access to citizenship in the metropole, “migration thus becomes more accessible to the poorest sectors of the colonial population,” (p. 183). This relationship was also fostered by American businessmen, who recruited working class Puerto Ricans to fill labor shortages. Grosfoguel employs the terms “new racism” and “cultural racism” to describe the experience of racism that periphery migrants face in the core nation. This type of racism is historically specific and “articulated in relation to poverty, labor market opportunities, and marginalization” (p.195). Once American businessmen found cheaper sources of labor, the discourse about Puerto Rican workers changed. They were soon lumped with Blacks and Mexicans in the “culture of poverty” debate, and thus excluded from the labor market. Currently, they have one of the highest poverty rates in New York, at 40% (p. 199).

Grosfoguel’s analysis expands on Omi and Winant’s (1994) definition of Racial Formation through the discourse of colonial world-systems, connecting the way migrants from
the periphery become racialized into the “global racial/colonial formation” (Grosfoguel, 2003, p. 210). This text broadens the geographical lens by analyzing capitalism, not only as it pertains to social structures within the U.S. as Omi and Winant did, but in relation to colonies abroad. Grosfoguel provides new insights about the process of racial formation for Puerto Ricans, successfully historically situating this group’s experience, as Omi and Winant had called upon future scholars to do.

In conclusion, the racialization of Chican@s and Latin@s was influenced, in the first instance, by their experience with European colonization. First colonized by Spain and then the United States, many Mexicans and Puerto Ricans have more diverse ethnic backgrounds than Chinese Americans, as an example. This diversity and proximity to blackness, in both Mexico and Puerto Rico, means that some members of these communities will experience a more complicated relationship with white supremacy in the United States. Just as Asian American and Black racialization are intertwined, so too are Asian and Mexican. In 1882, when the Chinese Exclusion Act went into affect, agribusiness lost a major source of labor. Subsequently, agribusiness owners recruited laborers from neighboring Mexico to fill the shortage. By 1930, the Mexican population in the United States had grown to over 1.5 million (Golash-Boza, 2015).

When the Great Depression hit and poverty was at its height, white workers’ xenophobia and racist fears pushed the government to carry out massive deportation raids. Thus, similar to Asians, Mexican Americans have been seen as an expendable source of cheap labor in times of need and a threat when white interests are vulnerable. Similar to Asian Americans, at different times the United States government has sought out the labor of Mexicans and Puerto Ricans, and at other times, vigorously opposed their entry, or actively forced their deportation.

In the following section I will transition into the topic of how the Third World, as a political project, emerged in the 1950s, and the impact that had on American communities of color. But first I want to summarize some of the undeniable connections between the social, economic, and political oppression of people of color - not just in general - but in relation to one another. More specifically, it is not just that Blacks and Chinese were both exploited by southern plantation economies, but that Chinese coolie labor was recruited as a result of Black emancipation. It is through this deep interconnection of experiences that a comparative framework is not only preferable but also necessary to any discussion on racial formation or racialization in the United States. For example, the torrid history of whites battling for economic control over bodies of color, defined by the Black/White binary, made its way West with those who would eventually reconstruct the racial categories and economic structure of California. Whether it was the animalistic vocabulary used to describe the Native Americans in order to justify their murder and enslavement, the hyper-sexualization of Chinese men and women to portray them as a threat and justify their exclusion from the economy, or simply the desire to control and exploit the labor of all four communities of color studied in this text, the ideology of white supremacy and the use of the legal system to control populations of color cannot be separated from the geographic location where these tactics were first perfected, the American South.

**Part III: The Bandung Spirit**

“The Third World was not a place. It was a project. During the seemingly interminable battles against colonialism, the peoples of Africa, Asia, and Latin America dreamed of a new world.” Vijay Prashad *The Darker Nations: A People’s History of the Third World* (2007, p. xv).
In this section I will analyze the growth and expansion of Third World ideology in the United States during the 1960s. Resulting from centuries of dehumanization, exploitation, and oppression - as discussed earlier in the chapter - I will trace some of the most important events that catalyzed the development of this “project” and what it meant for communities of color in the United States. The quote above resonates so deeply with what I have come to understand about the TWLF and its vision for communities of color, for UC Berkeley, and also higher education more broadly. By contextualizing the Third World as a project, rather than a place that fits certain economic and political qualifications, oppressed peoples made a profound and radical linguistic act of solidarity. Rather than focusing on the differences of their experiences as people of color, they chose to emphasize a shared history of struggle, resistance, and resilience. Without a deep commitment to this act of revolutionary love, and without the cautious optimism to dream of an alternative future, the world we live in today wouldn’t exist. This section will continue to support my thesis that the Third World Liberation Front (TWLF) at UC Berkeley was part of a longue durée of struggle intimately tied to colonialism, imperialism, and racism, where people of color fought for self-determination and the right to transform their dreams into realities.

The discourse and self-identification of the Third World can be traced to the 1955 Bandung Conference. The term was coined by French demographer Alfred Sauvy in 1952 to describe people at the bottom of the social hierarchy: it was reclaimed by revolutionaries and nationalists as a means of “inverting that political, economic, and social hierarchy; it meant challenging a global order in which the vast majority of nations pursued the ever-shrinking horizon of First World status” (Young, 2006, p. 2). However, it was at the historic 1955 gathering of twenty-nine Afro-Asian countries that the term gained its popular meaning. Vijay Prashad’s The Darker Nations: A People’s History of the Third World (2007) provides a critical analysis of the impact that this meeting had on the formation of the Third World as a revolutionary political project.

The 1955 gathering provided a space for independence leaders such as India’s Jawaharlal Nehru, Egypt’s Gamal Abdel Nasser, Ghana’s Kwame Nkrumah, and Cuba’s Fidel Castro to formulate a platform of demands based on the needs and aspirations of the ‘darker nations.’ Gathering in Bandung (1955) and Havana (1966), they crafted “an ideology and set of institutions to bear the hopes of their populations” (Prashad, 2007, p. xv). As the world was forced into communist or anti-communist camps during the height of the Cold War, Prashad outlines how “the darker nations amassed as the Third World. Determined people struck out against colonialism to win their freedom. They demanded political equality on the world level” (p. xvi). They refused to participate as pawns in the West’s battle for global ideological and economic supremacy; rather, they developed a vision for the future that centered the subaltern. The historic nature of this moment cannot be understated. As nations who had won or were in the process of fighting for their independence, these leaders represented the voice of centuries of silenced and exploited peoples. This gathering also welcomed Black radicals from America who were inspired by the solidarity they witnessed, and who also connected the struggle of African Americans to their colonized brothers and sisters abroad. While both DuBois and Robeson were denied passports to travel to the conference, DuBois did send a letter of solidarity, stating: “We colored folk of America have long lived with you yellow, brown, and black folk of the world under the intolerable arrogance and assumptions of the white race” (DuBois, 1955, as cited in Young, 2006, pg. 1). The conference generated much more than the symbolic identity of the
Third World; it also led to the creation of Third World policies that sought to mitigate economic, environmental, political, and social ills that disproportionately harmed historically oppressed peoples and nations.

In addition to fighting independence movements in their home nations, Third World leaders used the United Nations as the main institution to carry out their work. Through their work in the General Assembly, they offered the demands of the Third World, such as the UN Conference on Trade and Development (Prashad, 2007). One of their greatest material demands, however, was “the redistribution of the world’s resources, a more dignified rate of return for the labour power of their people, and a shared acknowledgment of the heritage of science, technology, and culture” (p. xvii). Prashad notes that the greatest accomplishment of the Bandung conference was the creation of the Afro-Asian-Latin United Nations bloc. This coalition, in addition to the socialist bloc, led the fight against “dollar imperialism,” offering a counter to the Western model of development.\(^8\) The conference and resulting Third World bloc were also deeply committed to nuclear disarmament because, as Prashad argued, “[t]he colonized also knew how such weapons cultivated a detached sadism among those who had their fingers on the trigger” (p. 41). Their alternative and radical vision of the future was ultimately deterred by many factors - some internal, and others externally imposed upon them.

Prathad discusses how many of those dreams of solidarity and empowerment for the oppressed were never truly materialized, at least not for the poor majorities of the Third World. Some of the reasons these visions failed were internal problems within the home nations, such as protecting the old elite groups in power, or using violence against native groups that advocated for communism. However, many of the Third World nations fell victim to external forces that were invested in the failure of their revolutions. For example, the economic embargo and failed 1961 American invasion, known as the Bay of Pigs, were explicit attacks on Fidel’s Cuban government and people. In addition to these direct attacks on Cuba, the United States also committed major resources to Puerto Rico, setting the neighboring island up as a “symbolic showcase” of United States sponsored “democracy,” which was posited against the Soviet/communist “showcase” that was Cuba (Grosfoguel, 2003). While these events did not succeed in overthrowing the revolutionary leadership in Cuba, the fall of the Soviet USSR in 1991 and the subsequent loss of Cuba’s greatest international ally exposed the vulnerable position the island was in as a result of Western intervention. Thus, the methods that Western nations utilized to control and manipulate the Third World under neoliberalism and neocolonialism stunted the development and success of many anti-colonial movements’ ability to thrive.

Perhaps most detrimental to the Bandung nations were the neoliberal policies deployed by the International Monetary Fund, World Bank, and World Trade Organization that forced borrowers to sign structural readjustment agreements that “liberalized” their economies, opening them to the kinds of exploitative trade and labor agreements they had experienced under colonialism. Prashad’s analysis of the rise of neoliberalism and the inability of many of the Third World independent nations to alter power relations between the dominant class and the masses is not the subject of this research. It is very important to recognize that many of the proposed
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\(^8\) Despite efforts to create alternative economic models, Prashad notes that by the 1970s, many nations from the Afro-Asian-Latin bloc needed to borrow money from the World Bank and International Monetary Fund. The nations were forced to agree to “structural adjustment” as terms of the loans, and with that they found themselves back under the economic control of the West. The rise of neoliberalism and the New Right in the 1970s and 1980s was the death of many of the dreams that the Third World had envisioned at the Bandung Conference.
policies of the Bandung and Havana conferences were not ultimately realized; however, the context of my research is not about the outcome of post-independence Third World nations - per se - but rather, the influence of their historic effort to mobilize an anti-colonial and revolutionary bloc that inspired people of color in the United States. During the time of the TWLF at UC Berkeley, the future of these Third World nations was not yet known; my analysis is not as concerned with the success of anti-colonial movements in a long-term material sense, but rather I emphasize the ideological and psychological (in a Fanonian way) legacy that Bandung and the Afro-Asian-Latin bloc held for historically oppressed communities in the United States.

What was realized through Bandung was that nationalist leaders of the Third World were able to meet and “celebrate the demise of formal colonialism, and pledge themselves to some measure of joint struggle against the forces of imperialism” (Prashad, 2007, p. 32). The speakers at the conference, while optimistic about their proposals, were cautious to note that even if the formal practices and institutions of colonialism were falling, the practice of imperialism, including European economic and intellectual control, remained. They were not naïve about the methods of the West; with centuries of collective struggle, they knew intimately well what the West was standing to lose as a result of their activism, and the lengths to which their former colonizers would fight to maintain hegemonic, if not literal, control over the ‘darker nations’ (Prashad, 2007).

One of the reasons that leaders of the Bandung Conference were well versed in policies of the West was that many of them were educated abroad. Sukarno, Nehru and U Nu of Burma - all took advantage of the educational opportunities that colonialism offered to middle and upper class families (Prashad, 2007). Educated in European institutions, these leaders took advantage of their experience, turning their education into a training ground of sorts for the intellectual or passive revolution that preceded the military efforts that eventually led to their independence. This effort by the colonizers to assimilate and educate selected members of the subaltern speaks to how the dominant class uses education as a means of social reproduction. However, like the attempts of American universities to assimilate and depoliticize people of color, especially African Americans, through inclusion in higher education during the 1960s, these efforts backfired. Rather than pacify the population, as was intended, Third World leaders and students of color in the United States took their colonial educations and used it to liberate themselves. While the scope of their efforts to attain self-determination was drastically different, the spirit behind their activities comes from a shared experience of colonization, imperialism, and general dehumanization. Again, as DuBois (1935) stated above, ‘colored folk’ worldwide share an intimate knowledge of white supremacy in all of its deadly manifestations, and this experience is a powerful bond that can serve as a foundation for liberation.

All of the events and achievements of the Bandung Conference contributed to the development of a concept/feeling/sentiment known as the “Bandung Spirit.” Third World intellectuals described this as an understanding that the “colonized world had now emerged to claim its space in world affairs...a refusal of both economic subordination and cultural suppression - two of the major policies of imperialism” (Prashad, 2007, p. 45-46). These sentiments so clearly influenced the TWLF at UC Berkeley. From their demands for self-determination to their language and staunch critique of capitalist and cultural exploitation, the shared grievances of the international Third World were translated through the “Bandung Spirit” into communities of color and institutions of higher education in the United States. The legacy of Bandung is the creation of an ideology that would empower a generation of activists, contributing to a psychological affirmation that would fuel movements for social justice and
center the plight of those silenced by the violence of colonialism and white supremacy. In the following section I will analyze how the Third World identity developed in the United States and what theories and practices were generated from this movement.

The Third World Within

During the late 1960s, people of color began articulating their oppression in the context of the long history of colonialism and imperialism. Undoubtedly, this was influenced by the increased access to Third World literature, the expansion of media coverage, and the rise of very public individuals making this connection. Public figures and political leaders such as Fidel Castro, Muhammad Ali, Malcolm X, Stokley Carmichael, Angela Davis and Harold Cruse represent a small fraction of those who spoke out about the domination and subordination of people of color, particularly African Americans, in the United States. However, as discussed above, this discourse was articulated much earlier by influential figures such as W.E.B. DuBois, A. Philip Randolph, and Paul Robeson. The difference in delivery and utilization of this knowledge, however, impacted its accessibility and popularity. For example, during DuBois’s era, the main method of distributing knowledge was through academic and editorial writing, teaching and mentoring, public speaking and conversations among ‘fellow travelers’ and activists. Even with powerful and national Black newspapers of the day, such as Crisis magazine, New York Amsterdam News, and the Chicago Defender, Dubois and the radical cadre of intellectuals and activists of the era did not have the broad audience their successors would have.

By the mid to late 1950s, the ‘time-space compression,’ as Cynthia Young (2006, p. 9) has called it, connected people of color in the United States to the writing and activities of revolutionaries from across the Third World. This phenomena included the more affordable publication and circulation of radical literature from Mao’s Little Red Book to Fanon’s The Wretched of the Earth, but it also included national news and television coverage of protests and the violent response of the police (Young, 2006). Many have cited the power of these images with catalyzing support for the civil rights movement and anti-Vietnam protests, as visuals of fire hoses and coffins flooded the nightly news. As a result of this burgeoning visual media culture, the resurgence of self-determination and anti-colonial ideology by groups such as the Black Panther Party was reaching new audiences across the nation. In 1967, the Black Panther Party led an armed march on the California state capitol to protest the Mulford Act, which had been passed in large part to prevent them from carrying out their armed patrols of Oakland police. Prior to the march, Huey Newton made sure to alert the press of their activities. That evening news stations across the country aired their protest and held interviews with Black Panther Party co-founders Newton and Eldridge Cleaver. This event, and many others like it, defined this pivotal moment in American social movement history when radical voices reached audiences that DuBois and his contemporaries were never able to address. Thus, while the discourse of Newton, Angela Davis and Stokely Carmichael was not new, their message of Third World Solidarity and the essence of the ‘Bandung Spirit’ reached new populations, contributing to the growth of a Third World identity within the United States (see figure 2).

In Cynthia Young’s Soul Power (2006), the author discusses the way in which Third World activists from the U.S. were connecting their struggles to the international Third World movements. Young discusses how Harold Cruse, LeRoi Jones, and Robert F. Williams became seriously engaged in a debate over the possibility for armed revolution in the United States after their visit to Cuba. “Jones and Williams argued that U.S. urban communities were segregated,
brutally suppressed, and exploited in ways that mimicked the conditions defining the Third World colonies,” (p. 5). As a result, some felt that armed struggle would be the primary path for Blacks to liberate themselves. While Cruse agreed with the colonial nature of the Black experience in America, he disagreed with the potential success of armed revolutionary struggle. Rather, Cruse advocated for “a ‘cultural revolution’ that would challenge U.S. state practices from within and offer a powerful ideological and cultural alternative” (p. 5). The solidarity between radical activists in the First world and their inspirational counterparts in the Third world does not always result in consensus regarding the actual similarities between the struggles in the two locations. In fact, the debate over what strategy would be effective in the United States - armed physical attacks or cultural and social revolution - is a topic that will be discussed further in Chapter 2 when I analyze the work of Italian revolutionary Antonio Gramsci.

Cruse’s alternative is precisely what author William Van Deburg (1992) argues was the most important aspect of the Black Power movement - the lasting sense of cultural pride represented by community programs, art, and institutionalized change, such as the creation of Black Studies. Harold Cruse wrote in 1962 that the Black population has always existed as a colonial being in the United States, in that their arrival and enslavement “coincided with the colonial expansion of European powers,” (Cruse, 1968, as cited in Young, 2006, p. 6). Thus, Cruse’s appropriation of internal or domestic colonization precedes Fanon in the United States as a means of explaining the material and psychological conditions of Black and Brown people as they relate to colonialism abroad. The differences between the two forms of colonialism are technical, not ideological.

In a 1997 interview, Black Panther member Kathleen Cleaver talked about how the Black Panther Party took its position on class “from Malcolm X. And our positions on nationalism were what we called ‘revolutionary.’ We followed Fanon, and we also followed Nkrumah” (Cleaver, 1997). Throughout the interview, Cleaver connects the ideology and praxis of the Black Panther Party to other oppressed people of color throughout the Third World. She explained how the Black Panther Party was international:

We would have been part of an international revolutionary vanguard that would have restructured the economy, restructured the educational system, taken the United States out of the role of world policeman, and made it the American people's revolutionary United States…We could not have succeeded without the success of these partners and these people around the world (Cleaver, 1997).

This sentiment is echoed repeatedly by scholars such as St. Claire Drake, who wrote an article entitled “Black Studies and Global Perspectives,” (1984) where he specifically analyzes the influence that global movements, ideologies, and anti-colonial struggles had on the development of Black Studies. St. Claire Drake declares that Kenya’s Mau Mau, Kwame Nkrumah, and South Africa’s ANC are some of the “heroes of militant black youth for a decade before Black Studies programs burgeoned” (Drake, 1984, p. 230). Drake also highlights the evolution of the Student Non-violent Coordinating Committee’s (SNCC) organizing tactics from Civil Rights Non-violence toward a more militant revolutionary stance, similar to that of the Black Panther Party, as well as the role that SNCC played in organizing with the African Liberation Support Committee. These links highlight the very transmission of radicalism that I argue are at the center of youth movements for Ethnic Studies and Black Studies.
The political transformation of SNCC acts as a case study of the influence of the ‘Bandung Spirit’ on people of color in the United States. Where the organization was once a leader in the youth segment of the traditional Civil Rights Movement, eventually through travel and exposure to Third World literature and activists, they developed into a critical contingent of what Cynthia Young refers to as the Third World Left. This sense of connection to the Third World and to the experiences of colonialism is evident in a speech Stokely Carmichael, one of the leaders of SNCC, gave at a gathering of revolutionaries in Cuba in 1967. Carmichael stated:

We greet you as comrades because it becomes increasingly clear to us each day that we share with you a common struggle; we have a common enemy. Our enemy is white Western imperialist society. Our struggle is to overthrow that which feeds itself and expands itself through the economic and cultural exploitation of non-white, non-Western peoples - the THIRD WORLD. Black people in the United States are a part of this Third World...Our people are a colony within the United States; you are colonies outside the United States (Carmichael, 1967, as cited in Allen, 1992, p. 6-7).

Carmichael’s statement is strongly connected to the main themes presented at the Bandung Conference that I outlined above. The emphasis on economic and cultural exploitation and the expressed need for solidarity among those previously colonized nations that Carmichael, the Black Panthers, and other growing radical movements centralized, speaks to the appropriation of the ‘Bandung Spirit’ within the United States.

Conclusion

In this chapter I have discussed some of the most transformative moments for people of color in the United States which contributed to their racialization. The abundance of historical data and narratives of oppression and resistance have been provided in order to acknowledge the longue durée of struggle people of color have faced. Central to my analysis has been examining the ways in which white supremacy developed alongside capitalism in the United States, establishing structures of systemic racism, many of which still exist today. By illuminating the cumulative impact of race and racism, I sought to provide a historical foundation for why students of color fought for Ethnic Studies at UC Berkeley. Inspired by successful anti-colonial and anti-imperialist mobilization throughout the Third World, students at UC Berkeley demanded their own liberation. This chapter discussed the legacy of African Americans creating their own schools and connecting education to freedom, something that was continued during the TWLF.

By 1968, when the TWLF was initiated at San Francisco State University, students had already been exposed to ideas of Third World solidarity and international struggles for self-determination by the Black Panther Party and other organizations such as SNCC. Throughout the decades of the 1950s and 1960s, the transmission of radical and Third World literature and ideology had thoroughly permeated the radical youth movements of the day. With the rise of independence movements abroad, where the formerly colonized were breaking their chains, students of color developed solidarity around their shared history of enslavement, genocide and colonization. Thus, the history described in this chapter is intended to serve as context for why
students of color at a prestigious university in the First World would appropriate the language of Third World radicalism for their movement.

In 1969 at UC Berkeley, students of color formed a powerful coalition, one born out of the historical trauma experienced in their communities but strengthened by a sense of solidarity. Despite their different experiences of oppression, they shared one important thing in common. Linda Tuhiwai Smith explains what united them: "colonized peoples share a language of colonization, share knowledge about their colonizers, and, in terms of a political project, share the same struggle for decolonization" (2012, p. 47). Through their efforts to decolonize the university, the Third World Liberation Front at UC Berkeley put the histories of the oppressed in the forefront. They shut down the campus and demanded to be heard. They carried out a revolt that forced the colonial institution to concede space and power to Third World bodies. They demanded a space to write their people into history, and they succeeded.
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Chapter 2:  
Discourse on Ideology

In the previous chapter I analyzed pivotal events that have impacted the racial formation of African Americans, Native Americans, Asian Americans, and Latin@s in the United States. I also concluded Chapter 1 with an analysis of the rise of international Third World solidarity efforts concretized during the Bandung Conference in 1955. I described the ways in which colonization and imperialism faced an international crisis during the 1950s and 1960s, and how the 'wretched of the earth' mounted successful guerilla wars against their oppressors to gain formal political independence. I also traced the impact many anti-colonial Third World movements had on communities of color in the United States. The research question driving this chapter is: What role does ideology play in our education system? What was the ideological hegemony of UC Berkeley in 1969 when the TWLF was initiated?

In order to provide a complex understanding of how the TWLF directly challenged the ideological hegemony of UC Berkeley, I organize the following chapter into three sections. In Section I, I provide a Gramscian and Althusserian theoretical foundation with which to understand the revolutionary ideological challenge the TWLF posed to the university; engaging the theories of Antonio Gramsci and Louis Althusser offers a helpful analytic with which to understand the power and potential of social protest in disrupting oppressive ideologies. I discuss the ideological foundations of the American education system and the role education has played in upholding the power of the dominant group. In my research, the dominant group is defined by those who have held the greatest power historically in the United States - white men of the capitalist class.

In Section II, I analyze three structures or racial projects that contributed to the culture and ideology of the university when the TWLF was established in 1969. I analyze the 1960 Master Plan for Higher Education, the G.I. Bill of Rights, and the assimilationist recruitment projects of the 1960s as examples of efforts by the State to maintain hegemonic control in light of growing social justice movements demanding structural change. Each of these projects reflect the flexibility of the hegemonic power structure and the strategy of its agents to appear to acquiesce to the demands of subordinate groups, while ultimately seeking to maintain control of the ideology and economic structures upholding their dominance.

In Section III, I conclude the chapter by identifying Eurocentrism and white supremacy as the ideological hegemony of the university in 1969. I discuss how ideologies of Eurocentrism and white supremacy have had material consequences on the lives of historically oppressed communities. Tracing the impact of these ideologies clarifies why and how the TWLF emerged as a radical bloc. By examining the ideological hegemony of UC Berkeley in 1969, I argue the TWLF movement, as a form of protest, strategically attacked Eurocentrism/white supremacy, capitalism, and paternalism.

The purpose of this chapter is two fold. First, I intend to explain how the State uses ideology to control the material reality of subordinate groups. Alternately, the oppressed masses can also deploy ideology to advance liberation. Second, I ground an initial theoretical analysis with specific examples of State power and ideological hegemony at UC Berkeley in the 1960s. A primary goal of this chapter is to put theory and praxis in conversation with the greater aim of illustrating that an analysis of the TWLF must take ideological hegemony seriously, in order to fully appreciate both the achievements and limitations of student struggle.
Part I: The Implications of Gramsci & Althusser in an Educational Revolution

In order to properly understand the radical origins of the TWLF, I discuss how the TWLF directly challenged the oppressive hegemonic ideologies of the university. I appropriate and complicate Louis Althusser and Antonio Gramsci’s analyses of Western Europe's exploited proletariat to include race in a United States context. Beginning with the Italian theorist Antonio Gramsci, whose writing predates Althusser, I trace the evolution of neo-Marxist theory of ideology.

Thinking in a 'Gramscian Way'

Gramsci's work, *Prison Notebooks*, (2003) is apropos to my project because it contextually speaks to the conditions of advanced Western capitalism during the 1950s and 1960s. Inspired by participating in the revolutionary workers’ movement of Turin, Italy as a university student, Gramsci "became the first Marxist theorist to work with the problems of revolutionary change in 20th century Western European society and the first to identify the importance of the struggle against bourgeois values i.e., an ideological-cultural struggle" (Burke, 1999, 2005). Specifically, Gramsci’s more fluid and complex notion of hegemony diverges from the traditional Marxist interpretation, creating a space in which the subordinate classes (be they racial, gender or class-based, as per my analysis) are not fixed as subjects of domination. This differentiation is crucial to my analysis of the successes and shortcomings of the TWLF movement.

Gramsci pushes against Karl Marx's theory, which argues that the ruling class retains power mostly through violent control and coercion. Gramsci complicates Marx by contending that pure force is not enough to subdue the working class masses, arguing instead that the creation of a culture of consent is crucial in preventing the proletariat from organizing a socialist revolution. According to Marx, the base consists of the economic structure, i.e., the economic conditions necessary in a capitalist economy such as the relation between capital (ownership of the means of production) and labor (reliance on wage laborers) (Marx et al., 1955). The superstructure therefore consists of institutions like education, organized religion (church), political entities such as Parliament, the judicial system and the mass media. Marx’s greatest concern is the history of class struggle and the contradiction of capitalist exploitation, resulting in what Marx projects as an inevitable proletariat revolution. Marx therefore prioritizes his analysis of the base over the superstructure in his writings, leaving room for a deeper understanding of the ideological forces at play in a capitalist society. Herein lays the significance of Gramsci's contributions, which essentially differentiate Marx’s superstructure into forces that were “overtly coercive and those that were not,” (Burke, 2005, para 10) thus creating space for a discussion of ideological hegemony and the subsequent alternative means of forcing change in civil society.

It is important to note that although Gramsci's analysis is an extension of Marx’s notion of superstructure, Gramsci emphasizes the ideological and cultural implications of oppression and resistance as connected to the material reality of the base. This is precisely why his

---

9 In his work on creating an Althusserian theory of race, Zeus Leonardo (2009) argues that although Althusser did not discuss race, Althusser’s theory of ideology "is useful for a study of race, which is as much a problem at the ideological level as it is at the material level" (p. 202).
framework is applicable to a critique of white supremacy. Gramsci’s theory encourages scholars to examine the impact of ideology and its subsequent material consequences - a predominant theme of the TWLF movement. As Stuart Hall reminds us, “[t]here can be no hegemony without the decisive nucleus of the economic” (Hall, 2016, n.p.). However, Hall further discourages the oversimplified logic that if the people “can only get hold of the economy, you can move the rest of life” (n.p.). This is why Gramsci’s analysis of the superstructure - including its institutions and the role of ideology - is important for a dialectical critique of capitalism.

First, the state maintains its power and dominant position through the deployment of coercive forces such as the police, the military and the criminal justice system, which fall under the purview of what Gramsci termed the ‘political society’ (Gramsci, 2003). Second, the dominant group maintains its power through the realm of ideological hegemony. Gramsci’s hegemony can best be described as “the permeation throughout society of an entire system of values, attitudes, beliefs and morality that has the effect of supporting the status quo in power relations” (Burke, 2005, np.). Hegemony also plays out in the second realm of control - termed ‘civil society’ - made up of schools, family, unions, religion, and other spaces where non-coercive influence takes place (Burke, 2005).

The second method of control can be understood as the internalized form of domination, in contrast to the external domination imposed by explicit state violence via ‘political society.’ (Below I will discuss in greater detail how these two paths are dialectically linked, rather than functioning in an either/or scenario.) A key element of the securing of hegemony is the acceptance of dominant beliefs. These beliefs become so normalized they reach the level of ‘common sense,’ resulting in such a deeply rooted internalization of the dominant group’s ideologies that the non-ruling populations accept them as their own. Hegemony is realized when the oppressed masses, socialized by the dominant society, participate “in various institutions, cultural activities, and many other forms of social interaction, the dominant classes ‘lead[ing]’ the society in certain directions” (Buttigieg, 2005, p. 44). External domination is administered when the state feels it must discipline “those groups who do not ‘consent’” (Gramsci, 2003, p. 12). In other words, when the state has failed to manufacture consent within the ‘civil society,’ it turns to violence to ensure that its dominance prevails. Therefore, redistributing power and material resources requires shifting the ideological hegemony towards one that serves revolution.

Dismantling the hegemonic consent of the dominant group is one of the most important arenas in which marginalized populations initiate and agitate for a shift in power dynamics. One of Gramsci’s most profound contributions is a framework with which to shift ideology toward a proletarian hegemony, (later called counter-hegemony), and the strategies, called ‘war of positions,’ with which to reach that goal. Rather than overlay Gramsci’s ideas and suggestions for creating social change onto the TWLF, I aim rather to follow Stuart Hall in thinking in a “Gramscian way” (Hall, 2016). While Gramsci is not the explicitly named revolutionary icon of the TWLF, Gramscian analysis provides a critical language with which to explain the methods and ideology of the TWLF. Gramsci’s theory of ideological hegemony and the strategies of pushing for a proletarian or counter hegemonic movement illuminate an important and overlooked analysis of the radical praxis of the TWLF.

More than simply analyzing the power of ideological hegemony in society, Gramsci provided a framework for how to create social and structural change at different levels. Historically, in the United States these are ideologies that oppress people of color, women, queer communities, and the working class. Gramsci outlines two paths for challenging the dominant ideology. The first is a nod to traditional Marxist praxis defined as a ‘war of maneuver.’ This
tactic is characterized by direct a physical assault against entities of the state. Michael Omi and Howard Winant describe this as “a situation in which subordinate groups seek to preserve and extend a definite territory, to ward off violent assault, and to develop an internal society as an alternative to the repressive social system they confront” (Omi & Winant, 1994, p. 81). In traditional Marxism, this military tactic and the eventual establishment of communism are prioritized. By validating the influence of ideology and creating a role for the proletariat to revolutionize and influence ideology, Gramsci paves a path for writers like Frantz Fanon and Paulo Freire, who build on his ideas for liberation. Gramsci’s theories pushed scholars to consider the ideological factors preventing the oppressed from organizing for revolutionary change. By analyzing the multitude of social and ideological factors that influence the masses or detract them from revolutionary organizing, Gramsci contributed to the development of concepts like ‘false consciousness,’ which Georg Lukács (1971) and Herbert Marcuse (1964) took up later in the century. Gramsci strengthened our understanding of additional and dialectically compatible strategies for achieving revolutionary change through his discourse on the ‘war of position.’

The ‘war of position’ or ‘passive revolution’ expands the stages of achieving revolutionary change in a region with a strong ‘civil society.’ Robert Cox defines a ‘war of position’ as one that “slowly builds up the strength of the social foundations of a new state…creating alternative institutions and alternative intellectual resources within existing society” (Cox, 1983, p. 165). This concept, like all of Gramsci’s work, is a product of his revolutionary activities: Gramsci was an active agent in a revolutionary struggle. He was both a founding member and leader in Italy’s communist party, but he also suffered drastic consequences for his leadership: imprisoned by Mussolini’s fascist government for eleven years, Gramsci was released only on his deathbed. These facts are an important part of the context within which his theory of ‘passive revolution’ was born. He developed this theory, not as an intellectual exercise, but rather because the conditions in Italy and other locations of advanced Western capitalism required it. Gramsci recognized that a different strategy was necessary in places that had a more developed civil society that differed from Czarist Russia, which had inspired much of Marx’s theorizing. Therefore, it is important and necessary to remember that these concepts were developed with the goal of ‘winning’ a literal war against fascism and capitalism.

There have been rigorous debates among Gramscian scholars as to the implications of focusing on the ‘war of position’ or ‘passive revolution.’ Perry Anderson (1976) warns that shifting the focus to ideology detracts from the power of state coercion, thus reducing the potential for revolutionary struggle and opening the door for the appropriation of Gramsci by reformists. Peter Thomas (2009) resists this logic, suggesting it is a misreading of the foundation of Gramsci’s theory in which hegemony and domination are dialectically connected to consent and coercion. Thomas suggests that interpreting the ‘war of maneuver’ as more revolutionary than the ‘war of position’ misses the integration and necessity of both, in a dialectical sense. Gillian Hart provides further critical analysis of over-simplified readings of Gramsci’s work. Hart clarifies "far from being ‘located’ in civil society, hegemony traverses political and civil society; but it is political society that predominately sets the terms of traversal" (Hart, 2013, p. 192). Put differently, hegemony is not excluded from the purview of ‘political society.’ In fact, the agents of political society choose how and when to intervene in terms of upholding the hegemonic power of dominant groups. Similarly, coercion is not absent in the production of hegemony. Dialectics are constant, the result of a delicate balance between coercion and consent in the
production of hegemony. Hegemony is never static or unmovable. Therefore, different locales of struggle require different methods of mobilizing a revolutionary bloc. Like capitalism, hegemony’s great danger lies in its ability to adapt and appropriate enough of the subaltern's ideas or culture to keep them from feeling totally alienated. However, as history and Gramsci have shown, the dominant group’s ability to maintain their power is not absolute.

In the following chapter, I apply these concepts to theorize that the TWLF expanded the idea of proletariat hegemony to include racialized or third world ideology. I use ideology over hegemony for certain analytical reasons, but for the moment will note that shifting the former does not require acceptance by the majority of a society. Given Gramsci's theory of ideology and the importance of the ruling class as the driving weight behind the ideology of the masses, some of his successors advance the notion that in order to release the grip of the dominating group, a ‘counter hegemony’ must originate with the masses. The "ideological bond" that Burke (2005) describes as holding together dominant and subordinate groups must therefore be broken. However, this undertaking is complicated in that the masses have already ‘bought in’ (at varying degrees) to the dominant ideological hegemony. In this framework of creating a counter-hegemonic bloc, the oppressed must value ideological change in order to achieve the structural change defined by traditional Marxist revolutionary thinking (Burke, 2005). It is in this pursuit of shifting ideology, in favor of and from the ranks of the proletariat or racially oppressed, that I invoke the project ‘war of position.’

Additionally, Gramsci suggests ‘organic intellectuals’ have the potential to influence this ideological, or counter hegemonic, shift. He envisions the role of the organic intellectual as one who "can no longer consist in eloquence … but in active participation in practical life, as constructor, organiser, ‘permanent persuader,’ and not just a simple orator…" (Gramsci, 1971, as cited in Burk, 2015, para 23). The organic intellectual agent stands in great contrast to the ‘traditional intellectual,’ who, with professional training (professors, lawyers, etc.) is often aligned with the ruling groups, though they consider themselves "objective" (Burke, 2005). The language can be confusing here, because Gramsci argues that intellectuals grow organically in their element, thereby rendering the role of education paramount to his analysis. Traditional intellectuals are products of "the educational system to perform a function for the dominant social group in society" (Burke, 2015, para 19 ? ). The TWLF, however, exemplifies the growth of a powerful working class, third world, radicalized, organic intellectual.

Gramsci advocates looking to the ranks of the proletariat for their participation in revolutionary change, but also theorizes as to potential areas in which their integration can have a greater impact. In either case, Gramsci’s intentions to centralize the proletariat and provide them with a critical and revolutionary education is one of many reasons his contributions are critical to an analysis of the TWLF. Gramsci's vision aligns closely with the TWLF mission of curriculum and pedagogy, originating from those oppressed by capitalism, colonization, racism, and sexism. Louis Althusser's work extends Gramsci’s conversation regarding education, its role in reproducing labor power, and the potential of a revolutionary education for the TWLF.

**Althusser, Ideology, and Education**

Thirty years after Gramsci’s untimely death, Louis Althusser continued the project of taking ideology seriously in materialist analysis. Through Althusser we can imagine and work toward creating a subaltern ideology that does not need to reach the level of hegemony. This means that the oppressed can create empowering ideologies which function within a larger
dominant hegemonic one. In other words, meaningful material and ideological shifts can occur even while the dominant hegemonic group remains in power. However, Althusser does not imply an imposed limitation, but rather the first of many in challenging the dominant hegemony. While some may argue (Anderson, 1976) the concept is reformist and ultimately detrimental to greater revolutionary aims, that logic misses the dialectical necessity of a cultural shift that precedes mobilization of the proletariat. Additionally, I contend the creation of radical ideology provides a third space from which liberation can grow and partially allay marginalization.

Extending Marx's analysis from Capital Volume 2, Althusser (1971) delves into how the means of production are reproduced in a capitalist society, examining the role of the reproduction of labour power. Althusser concludes that the reproduction of the necessary skills - i.e., the training of the proletariat - occurs more frequently outside the confines of the factories, and moreover, that such training is a byproduct of the "capitalist education system," (1971, p. 132) along with other influential institutions. Thus, the educational process has bearing on both ideological influences and material impact in working class communities.

While Marx does not write abundantly on the topic of education, he does emphasize an analysis of education, power, and socialization. Marx writes that education is a tool of socialization, and that communists must intervene in order to “rescue education from the influence of the ruling class” (Engels & Marx, 1848). Herein lies the importance of examining what ideologies, histories, and myths are perpetuated or disrupted in public education. If we can identify the influence of the ruling class in education, we can begin to create alternative forms of ideology via knowledge and power relations. I therefore focus primarily on Louis Althusser’s analysis of education via capitalist reproduction to contextualize how TWLF activists challenged capitalism on the UCB campus. Additionally, I engage Althusser's framework of the Ideological State Apparatus (ISA) and Repressive State Apparatus (RSA) in my analysis of the mission and tactics - and the administrative response - to the TWLF.

In Lenin and Philosophy (1971), Althusser turns his attention from the reproduction of the means of production to the reproduction of labour power. He shifts toward an analysis of the educational system, which, in modern advanced capitalist societies is the only state institution charged with serving all children. This mandatory requirement makes the education system the most powerful state sponsored entity for both those who will become the owners of the means of production as well as its managers. Education therefore functions as a training ground at all levels in capitalist reproduction. Althusser argued in Lenin and Philosophy that in school children learn “the rules of good behavior, i.e., the attitude that should be observed by every agent in the division of labour, according to the job he is destined for...reproduction of labour power requires not only the reproduction of its skills, but also, at the same time, a reproduction of its submission to the ruling ideology…” (p.132). In an institution of higher education such as UC Berkeley, these mechanisms take on new meaning, given the exclusive nature of admissions and the influence graduates will have in their fields of work.

Althusser’s contributions on how education serves as a mechanism for capitalist reproduction requires an understanding of how people (as subjects) give ideology its meaning. In other words, Althusser stated, “there is no ideology except by the subject and for subjects” (Althusser, 1971, p. 170). To explain this logic he employs the concept of interpellation. Interpellation is a process that hails (or calls in) a concrete individual, and when that individual responds to that call, they are transformed into a subject. The very act of responding suggests that the subject recognizes himself or herself in the way they have been identified. For example,
white supremacy (as an ideology) is made concrete when white individuals recognize and act in a way that subordinates non-whites. If white people recognize themselves as superior to non-whites, then they have become subjects of white supremacy, and simultaneously, they are interpellated by white supremacy. In the context of education, students become subjects of capitalism through their participation in institutions that reproduce capitalism.

Alternatively, the TWLF can be seen as a direct assault on that interpellation. By trying to establish an anti-capitalist and anti-white supremacism space within the university, students denounced that they were subjects to those ideologies. They refused to be recognized or interpellated in that manner. Rather, they fought for a new subjectivity, one that recognized them as empowered subjects of socialism and nationalism; more explicitly, they identified as Third World subjects. This identity was one that connected them to the independence movements abroad and to the oppressed masses that both suffered under and defeated their colonizers.

The stakes and effects are magnified - the end goal being to either reproduce agents of capitalism or, alternately, provide a platform that encourages social justice, community engagement, and self-determination. For example, the TWLF protests surprised administrators and faculty because of the assumption that first generation students of color would be grateful for placement with the institution. This is true in many contemporary cases and throughout history. Frequently, marginalized people who gain access to institutions from which they have been previously excluded often ‘tow the line’ because the stakes are high in terms of economic and community responsibilities (i.e., contributing to household income). However, with the growth of radical ideology and the development of organizations focused on addressing racism on campus, students of color shifted their approach from one of accommodation to the dominant ideology, to one directly attacking it. Third World Liberation Front students risked degrees from the prestigious university to explicitly challenge ‘ruling ideology.’ Many of them were the first in their families to attend college, and the consequences of resisting both capitalism and white supremacy were high; yet their ability to do so is one of the greatest legacies that the TWLF bestows upon the modern university. It was not, however, without repercussions.

Althusser's work on the role of the Ideological State Apparatus (ISA) and Repressive State Apparatus (RSA) is an important analytic with which to frame the radical ideology and praxis of the TWLF. It moreover explains the administration’s use of State violence and oppression to control the movement. The language of ‘the State apparatus’ has both geographical meaning and ideological and material underpinnings. Althusser defines the State as a repressive force that intervenes on behalf of the interests of the ruling class (Althusser, 1971, p. 137). Ultimately, according to Marxist theory of the State, “the proletariat must destroy State power and all State apparatus” (p. 141). In order to advance his theory of the State, Althusser distinguishes between State power and the institutions of the State apparatus, leading to his distinction between the Ideological State Apparatus (ISA) and the Repressive State Apparatus (RSA). The ISAs are comprised of many private or intimate institutions such as religious ISA, educational ISA, family ISA and cultural ISA. The RSAs are comprised of mostly public institutions like the army and the police. The ISAs are distinguished from the RSAs in that the former ‘function’ by ideology as opposed to violence. However, like Gramsci, Althusser is careful to note the dialectical connection between the ISA and the RSA in that each utilize both violence and ideology to serve their functions. The difference lies in predominance of one mode over another. For example, RSAs function primarily through force and secondarily through ideology; the opposite is true for the ISAs, which function primarily through ideology and secondarily through force (p. 145). Althusser is quick to note, "There is no such thing as a purely
ideological apparatus" (p. 145). This becomes clearly evident at UC Berkeley, where the dominant ideology is reflected in most of the systems and structures that comprise the university.

I conclude this section by discussing important similarities and differences between Gramsci and Althusser’s work in order to see how each helps us understand the TWLF movement more holistically. First, I address Gramsci’s notion of ‘civil society’ and how it clearly inspired Althusser’s description of the role of the ISA. Both deal with institutions like unions, family, and education, focusing predominantly on the construction and impact of ideology. Both theorists’ discussions of education inform my analysis of the overall impact that the TWLF had on communities of color and in the longue durée of challenging white supremacy and capitalism. Additionally, both see the vital importance of fomenting an ideological shift or ‘war of position’ before a full out assault on the capitalist State - or ‘war of maneuver’ - can be effective. Both theorists envision the role of ideology as being in dialectical relationship with the classical Marxist emphasis on the base (economic material reality). This emphasis is reflected in Gramsci’s analysis of the ‘political society,’ which is almost identical to Althusser's RSA because both are still committed to a classical Marxist interpretation of the State as maintaining control in large part through violence and coercion. In summary, both authors acknowledge the deeply violent nature of the State as well as the importance of grounding their theories of ideology in the material world. However, they also advance an economic analysis to take seriously the influence of complex cultural and ideological forces shaping the willingness of the masses to participate in a communist revolution. Their similarities reflect a critical shift in Marxism toward recognition that forces equally powerful to economic exploitation can account for how and why the proletariat did or do not become class conscious.

Gramsci and Althusser’s explorations of ideology provide a framework with which to analyze the oppressive elements of ideology. More importantly, they legitimize the potential of subaltern ideologies in the struggle for revolutionary change. This legitimization allowed for a truly dialectical discourse on the interconnectedness of ideology and the economic base in understanding both the conditions of the subaltern and the potential for them to reach class-consciousness. I extend the analysis of class-consciousness to include Third World and anti-colonial consciousness of the TWLF in 1969 with two key distinctions: emphasis and language.

Emphasis and language are important factors to theorizations of power and ideology with vast implications for creating a more just society. For Gramsci, hegemony is the lens through which he perceives the role of the dominant class and the necessary shifts required for the proletariat to take first steps toward revolution (Gramsci, 1971) Althusser, on the other hand, chooses to narrow the scope to ideology rather than hegemony. In the Althusserian context, the difference in emphasis illuminates the power of ideology as more autonomous from the dominant forces rather than dependent on them (Althusser, 1971).

The development and growth of Black Power ideology during the 1960s had a profound impact on many third world communities in the United States. It also had a material impact on the children who benefitted from free breakfast programs, the families who received health care and food, and the students and parents who were educated through the Panther schools and other services. This example illuminates how a radical shift in ideology, one that denies white supremacy and promotes the beauty and richness of Black people and culture, can have a tremendous material impact even within an oppressive system. However, despite moments of national coverage, the rapid mobilization of Black Panther chapters across the country, and even the development of Black Studies and Ethnic Studies, tangible efforts never replaced the dominant U.S. hegemony. The most notable reason is the quick response of the RSA in the form
of the FBI and local police efforts to destroy the Black Panther Party through propaganda, arrests, and explicit violence. A Gramscian analysis expects such a response by the ‘political society’ or RSA to punish those unwilling to consent to the dominant hegemony. Therefore, if success is gauged by the ability to replace the dominant hegemony of white supremacy and capitalism, then many radical contributions of the 60’s are minimized despite their various impacts.

Ideology, then, must be a principal analytic in investigating the impact and legacy of the TWLF and the radical milieu of the 1960s, with the concepts of ‘hegemony’ or ‘hegemonic’ remaining important to characterizing the ideology of the dominant group. I proceed to an analysis of the structures contributing to the growth in the number of students of color at UC Berkeley. This will lead into a discussion of the dominant ideology of the university, in order to frame the significance of the TWLF and the ways in which the movement radically challenged and influenced the university.

**Part II: Materiality and Structures that Colored Higher Education**

The 1960s were shaped by the rise of the Civil Rights Movement, student protests, general social unrest, and the responses of the dominant groups in power to address these mobilization efforts. For the first time since the Civil War, race was front and center in national politics (Omi & Winant, 1994). Beginning with the 1947 Mendez v. Westminster case in California, which created a legal precedent for the 1954 Brown v. Board of Education decision, a powerful momentum was building, one challenging the legal vestiges limiting the rights of students of color in the United States. The success of the Civil Rights Movement to push for and demand the passage of the 1964 Civil Rights Act and the 1965 Voting Rights Act was an attempt to rid the country of the de jure segregation of the Jim Crow era. The 1964 Civil Rights Act attempted to break down the racial barriers for people of color and women in the workplace and educational institutions. The 1965 and 1968 Acts expanded the protection to include voting rights and housing, respectfully (The Civil Rights Act of 1964, Library of Congress, n.d.).

After the passage of these laws, universities started surveying the ethnic background of their students. Prior to the passage of the Civil Rights Acts of the 1960s, there was little need to track admissions: over 90% of the incoming freshmen were middle and upper class white students (Freshman Admissions at Berkeley, 1989, para 1). The first survey of ethnic composition - conducted in 1966 - revealed that of the 26,000 registered students, 2.7% were Chinese and 2.5% were Japanese. By 1968, the survey revealed that only 2.8 % of UC Berkeley undergraduates were African American, followed by 1.3% “Hispanic” (para 9). Additionally, in 1968 the UC regents voted to increase admissions for students who did not meet the eligibility standards from 2% to 4%, in an effort to increase non-traditional students (para 9). These efforts, including the development of the Educational Opportunity Program (EOP) in 1964, contributed to the growth of students of color on the UC Berkeley campus. In the following section, I have highlighted three different efforts that laid the foundation for the TWLF to emerge on campus.

The highly racialized environment of the 1960s affected most aspects of American culture, including education. In Section I, I analyze the impact of the Master Plan for Higher Education, the G.I. Bill of Rights, and broader assimilationist projects aimed at narrowly including alienated communities of color (particularly African Americans), in order to situate the growth in the number of students of color at UC Berkeley by 1969. I frame these events as structural responses to challenges against racism implemented by the dominant group in order to
maintain control over a segment of the population actively engaged in transforming society. They are prime examples of the flexibility of dominant hegemonic structures which - when necessary - adjust their practices to include members from marginalized groups. In some cases, such as the G.I. Bill and the recruitment of people of color into higher education, these efforts were aimed at appeasing and subduing a portion of the disenfranchised with the hopes that they would cease challenging the State. In the case of the Master Plan, there is a mixed legacy concerning both the origins and the ultimate impact that the Master Plan had on students of color.

The 1960 Master Plan for Higher Education

My examination of the 1960 Master Plan for Higher Education (Master Plan) contains three points of particular interest to my project. The first point focuses on the general mission to completely restructure the three types of California public higher education institutions, providing new mandates for ‘the division of labor’ amongst these institutions. Restructuring had the greatest impact on prospective students. While some students gained greater access to higher education, others were deemed ineligible according to the new admission policies. The second point is the complete omission of race from the plan; the third point relates to the use of data, collected to make the argument for expanding the state’s public higher education. What can be gleaned from this critical moment in the state’s history during which the ideology for free and expanded education was translated into action? The Master Plan is an important entryway with which to examine the events that led to the establishment of the project.

A series of bills, resolutions, and two constitutional amendments introduced in 1959 to the California State legislature were designed to "(a) either to establish or to study the need for new institutions, (b) change the functions of the existing institutions, and (c) change the present structure for the organization, control, and administration of publicly supported higher education in the state," leading to the creation of the Master Plan (Master Plan, 1960, p. 20). The urgency of the research was rooted in the rapid growth of the state population and thus, the number of those eligible to attend state-funded public higher education. The report projected that between 1960-1975 there would be more than one million students in state schools with over 600,000 of them full-time. That number was nearly triple that of the rate of full time students in 1958, mandating urgent action to address the expansion of new institutions and subsequent governing regulations. The research committee for the Master Plan attributed the cause of the rapid growth in student populations to a 50% birthrate increase post WWII (p. 45-46). Another important factor (discussed in greater detail later) was the impact of veterans attending college on the G.I. Bill, an increase beginning a decade earlier (1948-1958), but remained a contributing factor (p. 45). One of the biggest structural impacts of the Master Plan on higher education was the recommendation—eventually accepted by the state legislature—that admission into the Junior Colleges, the State Colleges, and the University of California be more rigidly (or objectively) administered. The new requirements for California residents stated that 100% of high school graduates could attend the Junior College; the top 33 ½ percent of high school graduates could be admitted into the State University; and the top 12 ½ percent of high school graduates could be accepted to the University of California (p. 73). At the foundation of this plan was the predication that junior colleges would be expanded to serve more students. At this level, students could attain lower division credits; junior college courses were the most cost effective for the state, streamlining the issue of serving a growing population and providing higher quality
Finally, the plan stipulated that non-residents would have higher admission standards. This caveat was in place as a means of strengthening the education of California's populace. At first glance, the changes appeared to provide greater equality, in that they created admission standards ostensibly devoid of race or class background, ensuring a place for every young Californian in public higher education. Upon closer inspection, the impact was more complicated: policies that ignore race and other categories of social stratification rarely serve the interests of those outside the dominant group.

First and foremost, the Master Plan includes no mention of race - literally. The analytic is not engaged even once in the report. The 'color-blind' approach renders the document problematic, especially in the sections that address future retention and opportunity. For example, the authors note the changes would not guarantee higher education for all of California's young adults. The report cites "formidable barriers that prevent many high school graduates of real ability from furthering their education are lack of incentive, early marriage, interruption for military service, and shortage of financial resources" (Master Plan, 1960, p. 77). With the exception of ‘financial resources,’ the listed factors are presumed choices made by the student. The presupposition thus ignores material and structural barriers preventing many young students of color from graduating from high school and attending college.

When highlighting opportunities that might improve support for students, the authors suggest increased guidance counseling, "plentiful housing and job opportunities,” and the availability of schools in the community of residence (p. 77). Again, such suggestions do not address the impact of structural racism in schools that tracked students of color into service sector jobs or remedial courses; the additional familial burdens many poor families of color faced; or the psychological impact of living in segregated neighborhoods and being generally dehumanized in our society. I am not suggesting that the predominantly white, almost exclusively male, team who produced this document in 1960 would have realistically engaged in such discussions, but the omissions are important. That those charged with the responsibility of researching future trends in public education made no reference to an increased attendance by students of color or other 'non-traditional' students reflects the invisibility of those populations in the dominant group. By the time this report was published (in 1960), the 1964 Civil Rights Act had not yet been passed, rendering a serious discussion about Affirmative Action, minority recruitment and retention all but invisible.

The third point of interest in the Master Plan is the proposed research to fund this massive endeavor—more importantly, the argument encouraging Californians to increase funding for a stronger public higher education system. The research factors involved in making such over-sweeping improvements included: taxable income, use of taxes for education, and the desire of Californians to fund these efforts. The last point is most important for the purposes of this study. The research team asked: "To what extent do California’s citizens value higher education as a state service? What priority, in terms of state appropriations, should be assigned to public higher education as a function of the state? Should the state devote more of its resources for higher education as compared with other state functions?" (Master Plan, 1960, p. 183). For an answer, the team reviewed data on state spending for higher education in comparison to the rest of the nation.

Their results were as follows. California spent only (.46%) - less than one half of one percent of its budget on funding public higher education, ranking 34th in the nation. In fact, only nine states west of the Mississippi spent more than twice as much as California (Master Plan, 1960, p. 185). In terms of per capita spending, between 1952-8, the state contributed (.68 %) of
one percent on higher education expenditures, with 24 states still spending more than California (p. 185). Overall, the report imparted a sense that California's population was booming, and that more should be invested in public higher education. In addition, the committee felt that California had the potential and resources necessary to improve the services offered through state-funded education. The team made a powerful statement regarding the issue of tuition, stating, "the traditional policy of nearly a century of tuition-free higher education is in the best interests of the state and should be continued" (p. 173). This is a vital point to make within the context of contemporary austerity measures in higher education. It proves that despite their conservative leanings, along with protecting their status as the dominant group, they were still invested in providing free college for California residents (albeit the student population they envisioned was primarily white). The group cited a speech by President of University of Minnesota James L. Morrill, who decried calls by some to raise tuition, saying:

This notion is, of course, an incomprehensible repudiation of the whole philosophy of a successful democracy premised upon an educated citizenry. It negates the whole concept of wide-spread educational opportunity made possible by the state university idea. It conceives college training as a personal investment for profit instead of a social investment (Morrill, 1958, p. 20).

The righteous condemnation of students bearing the financial burden of their education speaks volumes of the ideological hegemony of public education, and perhaps the desire of the dominant group to retain control over one of the most powerful ISAs. The authors were ultimately positive in their predictions that the state legislature would adopt their recommendations. They explained the funding of their research: "the high-level support California has given education over the years convinces the Master Plan Survey Team that whatever is required in the future to offer qualified students an efficient program of public higher education will be provided by the citizens of the state" (Master Plan, 1960, p. 191-2). The emphasis on 'qualified' students throughout the report reads like a coded disclaimer, justifying the possible exclusion of some students i.e., non-traditional and people of color, from the Master Plan. Other scholars have also studied the impact of the Master Plan from a critical race perspective.

In his book Student Movements for Multiculturalism: Challenging the Curricular Color Line in Higher Education, David Yamane describes the TWLF at San Francisco State University (SFSU) as “the first major minority student-led protest and the longest of all student protests in the sixties” (Yamane, 2001, p. 13). Yamane also contextualizes the strike as a response to the implementation of the Master Plan. The severe decrease in students of color was one of the main concerns in the SFSU strike. It was reported that African American student enrollment at SFSU had dropped from 11% in 1960 to only 3.6% by 1968 (p. 13). Student demands reflected the seriousness of their concerns regarding open admissions, the establishment of an Ethnic Studies College, and finally the right to self-determination in curriculum and faculty hiring for the different ethnic minority groups. Yamane’s data speaks to the impact of the Master Plan at SFSU. Other scholars, however, analyze the Master Plan within the context of the significant opportunities it provided for California’s college students.

In his book Urban Triage, James Lee discusses the Master Plan in a different, more empowering context. He states it “guaranteed state-financed higher education for all California students, on the heels of steady growth…and concomitant high economic development in the
state...the creation of a coordinated higher education system in California was viewed as indispensable...’ (Lee, 2004, p.190). The influence of the Master Plan is an example of the interconnectedness of structure and ideology in higher education. It reflects the complexities the impact of a statewide education overhaul that in some ways provided more opportunities to qualified and usually traditional students, while closing doors for students of color who no longer met the admissions requirements. The Master Plan reflects both the political and structural control of the dominant class over higher education while also illustrating the ideological hegemony of the system. As is the case today, non-traditional students face countless structural roadblocks in their path to education, such as working to support their families, not having the cultural capital of parents with advanced education, and systemic racism and tracking within high schools (Bourdieu, 2011; Lamont & Lareau, 1988). Additionally, of all nineteen people who participated in the committee’s authoring the Master Plan, all but one was male (not including the Assemblywoman Dorothy M. Donahoe, who offered the resolution). This document - and subsequent structural material effects it had on the populations accepted to higher education institutions - reflects the Eurocentric and patriarchal ideology contributing to university hegemony.

While the Master Plan (at the time of its inception) may have been most detrimental to communities of color and other nontraditional students because its metrics for admission were based on success in high school, the context of our current crisis in higher education warrants a different engagement with it. In light of the increasing privatization of public education as a result of tuition hikes and shrinking Cal Grants as well as other forms of subsidies, today the Master Plan may be viewed more as James Lee describes it. He argues it provided a safe guarantee for some, where one did not exist previously or currently. Yet, historical context and location play a huge role in understanding the Master Plan.

Aaron Bady and Mike Konczol wrote an article in the fall of 2012 for Dissent: A Quarterly of Politics and Culture entitled, “From Master Plan to No Plan: The Slow Death of Public Higher Education.” In it the authors reflect on the Master Plan as the “high-water mark for public education... nothing more than a blanket commitment from the state to educate all the California students who wanted an education and, in doing so, to facilitate the kind of class mobility that has placed public education at the center of American civic life” (Bady & Konzcol, 2012, para 8). The article focuses on then Governor Ronald Reagan’s attempt to destroy the Master Plan, within a greater effort to privatize state schools in 1969; Reagan viewed the Master Plan as “creeping communism” (Bady & Konzcol, 2012, para 32). More than anything, the article signals how students today (co-author Aaron Bady is currently a graduate student at UC Berkeley) are reflecting on an era in which Democrats and Republicans fought to expand the public education system in order to sustain and spur a healthy functioning economy and society. Lastly, the authors highlight a key transformation in higher education, one steered by Neoliberal policies, which shifted course from the state providing the public goods to one where people were provided with “coupons for the purchase of those goods in the private market” (Bady & Konzcol, 2012, para 29). UC Regent Richard Blum is the central figure, used to describe how Neoliberalism has been detrimental to public education. Despite the position he holds as an entrusted figure in UC leadership, Blum is “not only the largest shareholder in two for-profit universities, Career Education Corporation and ITT Educational Services, but also, as Peter Byrne reported in a 2010 exposé, oversaw investments for the UC’s $63 billion portfolio at a time when UC invested in the very same two for-profits” (Bady & Konzcol, 2012, para 31). This explicit conflict of interest highlighting the divestment of public education—literally using
public funds to benefit for-profit colleges—is but one example of many in which Neoliberal policy has failed Californian constituents to advantage the capitalist class. Today, the Master Plan seems like a mirage to students straddled with college debt at unprecedented levels. While the Master Plan was in no way perfect and indeed had negative consequences for students of color and low-income families, in comparison to the present system, it represented an effort by politicians on both sides to invest in free public education. Such a notion is so removed from our current corporate culture that any advocates are mislabeled socialists. Instead, Reagan’s legacy of attacking public education is alive and well. David Harvey’s argument “the accumulation of capital and misery go hand in hand, concentrated in space” (Harvey, 1982, p. 418) is apt, given the context of the death of public education. We find public education at the behest of capitalists. Students of color at UCB in the late 1960s represented those most affected by what Harvey terms “organized abandonment” - their communities forgotten - “buried by the creative destruction of capital’s movement in and out of lands, and the discursive and territorial spaces cleared by political bulldozers” (p. 418). TWLF activists consciously aware of the economic, social, and political death that pervaded their communities used their access to higher education to demand a space where such issues could be analyzed, studied, and addressed. Another example of institutional reforms affecting higher education and the student body that eventually became the TWLF is the G.I. Bill of Rights.

The G.I. Bill of Rights

The second structure I will analyze, The G.I. Bill of Rights, played a monumental role in expanding the student population attending college in the 1960s; it was also instrumental in growing the California college system. After four years of deadly combat in WWII and over a decade of economic depression leading up to the war, the Servicemen’s Readjustment Act of 1944, better known as the G.I. Bill of Rights, served to support veterans, helping them to readjust and contribute to civil society. In an effort to prevent the post-war radicalism that had permeated American society after WWI, political leaders sought to empower the “greatest generation,” investigating ways to prevent depression and other social ills to which veterans might succumb (Greenberg, 2013). The desire to prevent another rise in radical social organizing by veterans trained for combat exemplifies the dominant group's ability to create powerful structures that best serve their interests. They learned to use their structural power to influence ideology - such as legitimizing a bill that funded education for veterans - in hopes of appeasing this group while simultaneously growing a base for their military operations, maintaining the facade that they valued the labor of their soldiers.

Milton Greenberg, WWII Veteran and recipient of the G.I. Bill, makes a few interesting points on the legacy of the bill in his article, “How the GI Bill of Rights Changed Higher Education” (2013). He cites the massive campus enrollments of college age baby boomers during the 1960s and 70s, (many of them veterans attending college under the G.I. Bill), as spurring a “huge public investment in the development and expansion of colleges and universities, as well as community colleges” (Greenberg, 2013, np). This growth in the higher education system shifted the population of those who earned college degrees. Prior to the 1944 bill, the majority of university-educated were very elite, white, male, and single. Veterans challenged this characterization, pushing universities to be more inclusive of students who were racial minorities, older, married, and who had children. This is evidenced by the Master Plan team's recommendations that new and existing campuses become more family and veteran friendly.
Lastly, while this article was very useful in providing context as to how the G.I. Bill affected higher education, I want to challenge one of the author’s arguments. Greenberg states at the end of his piece that

[T]he GI Bill may appear to have been a huge welfare program, but it would be wrong to treat it as such. It was a special law for a very special time, made available only to veterans and unrelated to need. The government provided the incentive and made the money available, but the individual decided not only how and where to use it but whether to use it at all (2013, np).

I take issue with the implication made in the above quote that the G.I. Bill is not a form of welfare. The author is clearly trying to distance the subsidized services that benefitted him from the other forms of government support pathologized by Neoliberal politicians such as Ronald Reagan. While the concept of welfare has been demonized post 1960s as a detriment to a free-market economy, it has actually existed in some form since the United States was still a colony under Great Britain. The modern programs we associate with welfare, such as The Social Security Act (SSA), passed by FDR in 1935 to assist the poor during the Great Depression; Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC); and Women Infants and Children (WIC) - all are examples of programs that seek to support a certain population, such as unemployed families and mothers. Just like the G.I. Bill, they are a product of a “very special time”: recipients have to meet certain qualifications, and those qualified decide whether to apply and use the funds or not. The only significant difference between the G.I. Bill and other forms of government welfare is the distinction around ‘need.’ On this point I turn to Evelyn Nakano Glenn and her work on the devaluation of caregiving in an advanced capitalist society.

Nakano Glenn puts forth the argument that the definition of a good society is marked by one that cares for those “who cannot care for themselves…those that can care for themselves can trust that, should they become dependent, they will be cared for” (Nakano Glenn, 2000, p. 84). In this article she traces the ways in which caregiving, mostly by women, has lost its value as capitalism has prioritized wage earning over emotional and in-home labor. Prior to the normalization of wage earning jobs, the work that family members did in the home was valued because it contributed to the survival and stability of the community. Once capitalist labor practices were normalized, exploitation increased and more women ‘fell behind’: the labor they had always done was now unpaid and thus devalued. When women needed extra support from welfare programs, their lives and choices were scrutinized. Nakano Glenn also highlights the gendered and racialized hierarchies built into these systems. Often, Black and Latino single mothers were denied AFDC because they were always considered “employable” by definition of their location in the surplus labor pool: this marker was not applied to white women (p. 85). Nakano Glenn concludes the article by calling on society, although she fully acknowledges the structural and ideological hegemonic forces at play, to discard the rabid individualism and notions of free choice that permeate our culture “in favor of notions of interdependence among not wholly autonomous members of a society” (p. 94).

The focus of Nakano Glenn's work on caregiving easily translates to the context of education, where providing free public education can and should be a marker of that society's dedication to fostering an educated populace and raising the quality of life for its citizens. Education, like caregiving, requires time and a loss of wages during the years of enrollment. It is also more and more necessary for a young person to be able to support themselves and their
loved ones. And like caregiving, we are living with the repercussions and violence that capitalism has inflicted on education. College degrees, while serving as the minimal requirement for any entry-level position, continue to lose their value, as evidenced by the opportunities currently provided by a bachelor’s degree. Coupled with the skyrocketing tuition and the crippling debt many students graduate with, the impact of capitalism on higher education has killed the possibility of interdependence that once made education a symbol of a strong society, similar to welfare. To suggest that the G.I. Bill is different from welfare because it is not based on ‘need’ reflects so much of what is problematic about the discourse surrounding public services in the United States. To help someone in need is seen as a sign of weakness, both on the part of the recipient unable to fulfill the fantasy of rugged individualism highly valued in our society, and for the entity providing support. As is often the case, there is little examination of the system that exploits and disenfranchises people to the point they cannot support themselves, further contributing to a culture of ‘blaming the victim.’

Thus, at our best, the American welfare and government subsidy programs, including the G.I. Bill, reflect our effort to support individuals who both meet the qualifications and need the assistance. The G.I. Bill, despite the anti-radical political motivations behind its passage, produced an unexpected outcome. Many veterans returning from Vietnam in the 1960s and 70s were radicalized by what they witnessed in the war. The anti-racist, anti-imperialist ideology circulating throughout the Third World and among minority GI’s especially resonated with veterans of color. This had an unexpected consequence on the TWLF movement by allowing working class, radicalized, people of color access to the University. Contrary to the government’s assimilationist intentions, this group led one of the most radical protests in the history of higher education. Compared to the exclusionary nature (as members of the TWLF saw it) of the Master Plan, I am arguing that the G.I. Bill was beneficial to the underrepresented groups who would later fill the TWLF ranks - the point of departure being that the institution never intended that these populations would defy them. Both are examples of legislative efforts purposed to create change in the system and structure of higher education, and to hail as many youth into structures that encouraged consent and participation in civil society; both contributed to the politicization of college students who would later join the TWLF.

The Limitations of Assimilation

Lastly, on the topic of the State initiating inclusion of people of color into civil society via education, I want to briefly engage with Omi and Winant’s book *Racial Formations* (1994) to contextualize the ideology behind UC Berkeley ‘opening its doors’ to more racial minorities in the post Civil Rights Movement (CRM) era, thus recruiting many of the students of color who subsequently participated in the TWLF. In their description of the Ethnicity Paradigm, Omi and Winant highlight the publication of Gunnar Myrdal’s *An American Dilemma* in 1944. They argue that the book marked the ascent of the ethnicity paradigm to a position of theoretical dominance…Assimilation was viewed as the most logical, and ‘natural,’ response to the dilemma imposed by racism. Indeed, Myrdal, drawing on the work of E. Franklin Frazier (as Daniel Patrick Moynihan was to do twenty years later) suggested that there was a ‘pathological’ aspect to black culture which only full assimilation could cure (p. 16-17).
The popularity of this theory can be attributed as one of the reasons universities across the country began increasing admission to students of color. Similarly, scholars like Glazer and Moynihan saw the CRM as something which the Ethnicity Theory paradigm should support because the “demands were intelligible and comprehensible within the ethnicity framework” (Omi & Winant, 1994, p. 19). What these assimilationist scholars misinterpreted about the CRM was that although it was physically non-violent, the demand for civil rights and respect that defined the movement was in fact ideologically violent to the system and structures of white supremacy (Leonardo & Porter, 2010). This is precisely why an analysis of the dominant ideology is important in contextualizing the impact and legacy of the TWLF. The challenges the movement posed and the gains it made in creating a Department of Ethnic Studies are greater than the material achievements of new courses and faculty hired to teach them. The fact that the TWLF directly and publicly called out the violence of white supremacy, paternalism, and capitalism embedded in the university represents an important moment where truth-telling (hooks, 2000) is affirmed and the struggles of the oppressed are validated. Defining violence as a dialectic wherein two groups - one dominant, the other subordinate - within a society are constantly viewing the others’ actions as violent is an important topic to investigate, and I turn to Zeus Leonardo and Ronald Porter to facilitate this discussion.

Zeus Leonardo and Ronald Porter (2010) have complicated the discourse of non-violence in analyzing how MLK Jr. and the CRM were both perceived, and in reality, violent against oppressive racist ideologies. Working from a Fanonian analytic, Leonardo and Porter engage in an important project focused on analyzing the psychic and ideological violence of ‘safe space’ discourse in classrooms where racial justice is the imperative. More broadly, they emphasize the importance of a Fanonian understanding of violence in the context of education, with the specific goal of working toward a humanizing violence that liberates both the oppressed and the oppressor, in a similar vein to that of MLK, Jr. (2010). Their work has become essential in my analysis of the TWLF and will be discussed in greater detail in Chapter Five, but for the moment I want to engage with their work on the Civil Rights Movement. The failure of assimilationists to predict or understand the rebellion of students of color admitted to universities in an effort to de-radicalize them through inclusion is closely tied to their white male privilege and location in the academy. Glazer and Moynihan's optimism about the Civil Rights Movement did not account for the feelings of millions of white Americans and their dedication to staying at the top of the racial hierarchy, deeply committed to challenging any efforts that would increase the rights and opportunities of non-whites. Again, we return to the topic in which efforts by the subordinate group to achieve any form of liberation, or even small gains in human rights, are seen as a violent act against the dominant group.

Additionally, Leonardo and Porter clarify that simplistic or literal interpretations of violence prevent us from understanding the potential humanizing violence that is central to liberatory social movements, such as the Civil Rights Movement. Leonardo and Porter write:

King adopted a non-violent platform, but this did not involve coming to the negotiating table to seek a compromise. To the contrary, the tactics of agitation deployed during the 1960s’ Civil Rights movement were intended to establish a necessary crisis and willingly performed violence against both whites and a system of white domination. Dr. King (1996) asserted, ‘Nonviolent direct action seeks to create … a crisis and foster such a tension that a community which has constantly refused to negotiate is
forced to confront the issue. It seeks so to dramatize the issue that it can no longer be ignored’ (2010, p. 144-145).

The authors also argue that advocates of non-violence were well aware that whites would perceive their efforts as a form of violence (Leonardo & Porter, 2010). This organic knowledge on the part of the oppressed results from generations of trauma experienced by people of color, where they were forced to live and act in subservience for their survival - particularly for African Americans, who have been forced to abide by slave codes, Jim Crow segregation, and more recently, gang injunctions and over-policing. Historically oppressed communities are well aware of the rules of conduct imposed on them by the dominant class. What separates the resistance of people of color - perceived as violent to the dominant group - from the violence imposed from above, is repression. Working from the standpoint that Fanon was not interested in reproducing repressive violence, Leonardo and Porter advocate for a humanizing violence to "shift upwards the standard of humanity" (p. 145). They clearly define the difference between white violence that is "indicative of a certain death drive" from acts of violence carried out by the oppressed that "possesses a humanizing, life-affirming moment" (p. 146). The distinction between these two forms of violence is necessary when analyzing the intention and response to social justice movements in our society. This clarification explains why the dominant group staunchly opposes such movements, and this recognition also challenges the notion that physically non-violent movements are somehow less radical than those justifying physical violence. In fact, if we include a Gramscian way of thinking, non-violence can be constituted as a part of the passive revolution or ‘war of position.’ This logic will be examined further in Chapter Five.

Leonardo and Porter’s complication of violence and non-violence are important to my argument that the TWLF was an anti-hegemonic struggle. While the TWLF employed direct action strategies against the University, even their non-violent strategies were in staunch ideological opposition to the dominant ideologies of the University, and thus labeled violent. The response by University officials to the TWLF speaks to a larger trend by the dominant class during this era of social justice movements. In the context of the 1950s and 1960s, when J. Edgar Hoover and the FBI were most powerful and the counter-intelligence-program (COINTELPRO) was most active, they mastered the art of defining what groups were a threat by mobilizing the Repressive State Apparatus (RSA) against them. Groups targeted by COINTELPRO ranged from anti-Vietnam organizers, the Communist Party USA, feminist activists, and MLK, Jr.’s Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC) - which Hoover declared a "hate group." The fact that a non-violent Christian organization led by the world's most famous advocate for peace and reconciliation was defined as a 'hate group' exemplifies the dialectic surrounding notions of violence, hate, and ideology. This brings us back to the topic of proximity to the dominant group in power. If a member of the subordinate class is denied civil and human rights and chooses to organize for freedom, this threatens the status quo, and by extension, the power of those in the dominant group. That threat is perceived as a violent attack on the dominant group’s way of life. Alternatively, if the subordinate class member does nothing, then the violence inflicted on them economically, systemically, and personally invariably leads to premature death.

While there is an entire field of Afro-pessimism dedicated to the topic of premature death, natal alienation, and social death\(^2\), for the purpose of this chapter my use of premature death

---

death is limited to the health impact that institutionalized racism has had on communities of color. In 2005, David Satcher, the former Surgeon General of the United States - along with other health experts - reported that in 2002 over 83,000 African Americans had died prematurely, meaning that if they were white they would have still been alive. Today that number is closer to 100,000; for a generation (1940-1999) of African Americans, the number of premature deaths is approximately 4 million (Roberts, 2012, cited in Golash-Boza, 2015, p. 326). This data reflects a magnitude of violence akin to mass genocide, and does not even take into account the millions of lives lost due to the trans-Atlantic slave trade or subsequent enslavement in North America. A 2008 Alameda County public health report found that an African American child born in West Oakland had a 15 year shorter life expectancy that a white child born in the Oakland hills. That same African American child is 1.5 times more likely to be born premature, seven times more likely to be born into poverty, twice as likely to die of heart disease and cancer, three times more likely to die of stroke (Alameda County Public Health Department, 2008). This evidence confirms what communities of color have known to be true since the colonization of North America and the resultant genocide of Native Americans, enslavement of African Americans, and countless other horrors committed against non-white groups in the name of white supremacy and civilization. Racism is deadly, and the concretized violence experienced by the oppressed must be stopped in order to ensure the very existence of our communities. While assimilationist practices might appear innocuous, at their core they attempt to prevent the oppressed from fully realizing their condition in order to prevent the difficult and violent ideological and material shifts necessary for achieving social justice in the United States.

Ultimately, assimilationist scholars viewed the Civil Rights Movement as a movement for black integration and assimilation. However, this was not the reality for many students of color once they gained entry to the university. Professor of African American Studies Hardy Frye shared his experience in this area. In 1968, Frye was one of about sixty Black students recruited to UC Berkeley: he was a graduate student who excelled during his undergraduate work at Sacramento State College. When Frye entered the Sociology Department in the winter of 1968 and subsequently became involved in organizing the Black Studies movement, he received extreme pressure and criticism from professors and administrators who thought he and other Black recruits 'should be grateful they were admitted.' When he and other Black students threw typewriters out the fourth floor windows in protest, the professors were outraged and confused by anger they could not situate. Frye told them, “You know we might just burn the motherfucker down, too” (H. Frye, personal communication, September 15, 2011). This angered his mentor so much that the professor did not speak to Frye for his remaining five years at UC Berkeley. This interaction reflects how newly admitted students of color were empowered by the culture of radicalism permeating universities during the 1960s, which ultimately shaped their experiences more than assimilationists could have predicted. James Lee does an amazing job of situating these structural reforms and the students’ responses when he states, “If the state sought to expand its guarantees onto populations as a bulwark against further mutiny, thereby managing those who had formerly been excluded from the social wage, it could not fully contain its energies-at least for the moment-of a multiracial population stirred to redefine the terms of how they were to be included” (Lee, 2004, p. 5). This is yet another example of structural decisions made by University administrators - in an attempt to control what they perceived as potentially dangerous populations - by integrating them into civil society via education. Due to their lack of empathy and inability to recognize the struggle that African Americans and other people of color faced in the United States, their theories and predictions failed to acknowledge the long history of
resistance and resilience in communities of color. By ignoring the history of these communities’ capacity to build for themselves what white supremacy had tried to deny them, white scholars, administrators and agents of the State were blindsided by demands made by activists in the 1960s.

I will now shift from the discussion of the material structures that influenced the student body of the university in the 1960s to an analysis of the dominant ideology of the university. This last section of the chapter will round out my discussion of the major factors that contributed to the ideology and culture of Berkeley in 1969. This analysis is necessary to fully understand why the TWLF emerged as a student movement for self-determination.

Part III: Eurocentrism and white supremacy as the dominant hegemony of the University

In addition to capitalism, which was discussed above using Althusser, and to which I will return when analyzing the TWLF, two of the most influential ideologies that define university hegemony are Eurocentricity and white supremacy. While these two terms are undeniably linked by their goal of proving Europeans and whites superior to non-Europeans and non-whites, there are important distinctions related to the historical context of their formation. Many scholars acknowledge that the social construction of race as we know it today was developed in the British colonies of North America during the 1600s (Zinn, 2010; Smedley, 2007; Quijano, 2000; Omi & Winant, 1994). However, this codification of difference used by the European colonizers to distinguish between the conquered and the colonized (Quijano, 2000) has earlier roots in colonialism, where those in power expediently established a colonial ideology upon arrival. This ideology was built upon cultural and eventually racial hierarchies (Kelley in Césaire, 2000, p. 9).

It is necessary to understand the practice of colonialism in order to situate the development of Eurocentric ideology. It is not as important to my analysis to debate whether the ideology of Eurocentrism predates the practice of colonialism or whether it is a byproduct of the practice; what is important is to understand the relationship between the ideology and the practice, and the impact on those involved. Aimé Césaire's critical work in *Discourse on Colonialism* concentrates precisely on the impact of colonialism for both the colonized and the colonizer. Robin D.G. Kelley summarizes the importance of Césaire’s work, stating that it "demonstrates how colonialism works to ‘decivilize’ the colonizer: torture, violence, race hatred, and immorality constitute a dead weight on the so-called civilized, pulling the master class deeper and deeper into the abyss of barbarism" (Kelley in Césaire, 2000, p. 8-9).

This is relevant to my analysis of the University: like colonialism, a Eurocentric education prevents students and the University from accessing their full humanity. Like the master class that is de-civilized by practicing colonialism, students and educators who participate in ideological and sometimes physical violence that contributes to Eurocentric knowledge are similarly harming themselves. Whether conscious of this or not, practitioners of Eurocentrism prevent themselves from knowing and engaging sincerely with the entire non-white population of the world. Any scholar truly interested in knowing the world, its population, medicine, law or history must first separate themselves from the destructive practice of colonialism which destroys the past in order to erase the contributions of the colonized (Césaire, 2000). In the following chapter I will return to this concept as I argue that the TWLF was not only a movement to empower third world students and employees, but was also an effort to grow the humanity and integrity of the university. This humanizing violence, as Leonardo and Porter have defined it, is necessary for any practical and socially responsible education.
This section provides a critical conversation, albeit brief, of the deep roots of colonialism that have sustained the Western university system of education. It is important to recognize this history here because it speaks to ways in which practice, such as colonialism and capitalism, have influenced ideology and the education system in the United States. While there are many book-length examinations of this topic, for the purpose of my dissertation, I am highlighting some of the most important linkages. Manning Marable argues, “Eurocentricity is based on White-supremacist notions whose purposes are to protect White privilege and advantage in education, economics, politics, and so forth” (Marable, 2000, p. 548). Additionally, I use the term ‘Eurocentrism’ because it denotes a world-view that, implicitly or explicitly, posits European history and values as “normal” and superior to others, thereby helping to produce and justify Europe's domination within the global capitalist world system. In her groundbreaking book Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples (2012), Linda Tuhiwai Smith explores how imperialism and colonialism are embedded in Western research, theory, and history. Her work serves as an inspiration and a model for scholars, activists, and historically oppressed people to 'research back' against empire in an effort to theorize "our own existence" (p. 30). While her work is specifically focused on Indigenous peoples, it provides a critical lens, language and methodology that speak to the experience of many communities of color. In an effort to respect her work and the community she serves, I wish to apply some of her important concepts to the discussion of people of color in the United States.

Smith argues that colonialism is just one expression of imperialism, and that imperialism is defined as the project which began in the fifteenth century to expand Europe's economy, subjugate ‘others.’ Imperialism, Smith argues, has also created a field of knowledge (Smith, 2012, p. 22). In much of the anti-colonial writing, there is a central theme that defines the colonial experience: the process of dehumanization that colonizers rely on to carry out atrocities committed in the name of so-called civilization. Frantz Fanon described this location for the colonized as the ‘zone of non-being’; his mentor Aimé Césaire named the process ‘thingification’; Edward Said discussed the way in which the West constructs the colonized as the ‘Other.’ What all of these terms have in common is a history of violence, of trying to steal the humanity of the colonized in order for the colonizers to justify their brutality. Smith 'writes back' an important truth about the impact of these centuries old practices stating, "Imperialism still hurts, still destroys, and is reforming itself constantly" (p. 20). Similar to the way in which education reproduces capitalism, Western research and education also reproduce the violence of colonialism.

In his canonical text, Orientalism, Said (1979) illuminates the role that education and research play in the construction and distribution of the concept of the ‘Other.’ The production of scholarship within capitalist institutions authorizes and solidifies the dominant Eurocentric views of the Other by "describing it, by teaching about it, settling it, ruling over it” (as cited in Smith, 2012, p. 2). One of the most harmful legacies of Eurocentrism and colonialism in education has been the “research” conducted by Western scholars to justify the dehumanization of the colonized. Horrible atrocities have been committed in the name of research against people of color. In the nineteenth century “scientists” used the practice of craniometry - measuring skull size - to try and prove that whites were superior to other races. James Marion Sims experimented with - and tortured - countless enslaved women in the United States, conducting
vaginal surgery without anesthesia on enslaved women in order to provide his white patients with better care; eventually, Simms would gain academic recognition as the ‘father of modern gynecology.’ Even the act of enslavement was justified by pseudoscientists of the day, and political leaders such as Thomas Jefferson simultaneously degraded the mental capacities of African Americans while attributing them with super human strength, and thus fit for a life of manual labor. Jefferson's words, in the following quote, reflect the “research” of his day conducted through observations by white overseers and agents who captured, transported, and sold African Americans, all the while keeping meticulous records of their ‘subjects’:

They seem to require less sleep. A black after hard labour through the day, will be induced by the slightest amusements to sit up til midnight, or later...Their griefs are transient. Those numberless afflictions...are less felt, and sooner forgotten with them. In general, their existence appears to participate more of sensation rather than reflection (Jefferson, 1788).

Time and again the colonized people of the third world have been described in these animalistic ways in research and broader social conversation. It is the research, however, that has proven to cause perhaps the greatest harm because it attempts to legitimize horrors the human mind would normally find abominable. This is one of the reasons I argue that white supremacy is pathological; it literally turns people who, generally speaking, care for their loved ones into violent socio-paths devoid of empathy. Through the process of Other-ing, the colonized becomes unlovable, inhuman, and thus as fungible as any other 'creature' whose life will be sacrificed for the supposed benefit of the oppressors.

Smith describes the process of 'systemic fragmentation' as a consequence of the imperial research agenda that carves up the indigenous world into "bones, mummies and skulls...artwork to private collectors, languages to linguistics, 'customs' to anthropologists" (Smith, 2012, p. 29). To this day, UC Berkeley holds the remains of approximately 12,000 Indigenous peoples and over 400,000 artifacts in the Phoebe A. Hearst Museum of Anthropology (Paddock, 2008). Just as Smith articulated, the lives of colonized peoples become 'subjects of research' to the Western scholar: the damage lasts for generations. This is just one of many grievances Indigenous peoples have with the University - which sits on Ohlone land - and it exemplifies the trauma that 'systemic fragmentation' has on communities to whom burial rights are a fundamental tradition. From the 'human zoos' of the 19th and 20th century Worlds Fairs, where colonized people were put in cages and adorned in 'traditional' garb as a source of entertainment to the ever watchful colonial/imperial eyes; to the Tuskegee Syphilis experiments, carried out by the Public Health Service and Tuskegee Institute for over forty years, affecting more than 600 African American men, denying them penicillin to observe the affect of the disease on the body - historically oppressed people have been forced to live or die in the name of research. For these reasons and countless more, the Western university is defined by the dominant hegemony of Eurocentricism, and the legitimization of these practices influences almost every aspect of the lives of historically marginalized peoples.

The hegemonic acceptance of this way of thinking has so deeply permeated our society that is reflected in everything from beauty standards to educational standards. In the United States skin color stratification, defined as a "system in which resources such as income and status are distributed unequally according to skin color" (Golash-Boza, 2015, p. 124), exemplifies the material impact of Eurocentric ideology on the lives of people of color. Everything from longer
prison sentences to higher rates of receiving the death penalty have been associated with skin color stratification (Hochschild & Weaver, 2007) affecting dark skinned African Americans and Latin@s the most. In a 2008 study, Joni Hersch conducted research with new immigrants and found that the lighter their complexion, the more likely they were to earn higher wages, with a pay disparity of 17% between those with the lightest skin compared to those with the darkest skin color, regardless of education and language acquisition (Hersch, 2008, as cited Golash-Boza, 2015, p. 124). This reality has been shaped by centuries of European colonialism across the world, where class and eventually race dictated the kind of labor done by a person. Thus, light skin was a sign of the upper class, non-slaveloaded, who were spared from working outside in the fields, on the railroads, or other manually laborious positions (Rondilla & Spikard, 2007; Saraswati, 2010; Saraswati, 2012). This practice continued in the U.S. during the colonial period, when race was concretized through the legalitization of chattel slavery via the slave codes that correlated African ancestry - in other words Blackness - with enslavement and the literal loss of one's humanity through the process of becoming permanent property. For the enslaved, even manumission (gaining one's freedom) was more likely for those who worked in the Plantation house compared to those working in the field (Hunter, 2005), resulting in the development of colorism within the African American community. The dehumanization of colonized and enslaved populations, paired with the perception that paid labor was a privilege of whites, continues to be reflected in the labor force today.

There are numerous examples of skin color stratification having a material and subsequently psychological impact on communities of color. Lighter skin is associated with material benefits such as gaining freedom, higher wages, and avoiding incarceration. However, these benefits do not insulate people of color from the psychological harms inflicted on communities that disproportionality experience trauma resulting from white supremacy. Psychiatrist and author Bessel van der Kolk (2015) wrote a book about the impact of childhood trauma on the brain. In a 2015 interview, van der Kolk argues that traumatic experiences physically alter the structure of the brain. He shows that children who experience terror in early childhood will suffer from confusion, anger, and shutting down; they will be affected by these feelings for their entire lives. According to this research, the brain is formed by feedback that it receives from the environment (Van der Kolk, 2015). Therefore, factors such as living in constant fear of violence, traumatic separation of loved ones, denial of food and shelter, and so many of the conditions that have been and continue to be imposed on oppressed communities of color, result in physical and psychological intergenerational trauma. When I argue that oppressive ideologies have profound material consequences and must be challenged, it is grounded in the lived experiences and bodies of communities of color. Only in the last several decades has research been conducted in the United States to confirm these experiences11. The growing literature on the health impact of environmental racism (Williams & Collins, 2001; Lovasi et al., 2009; Isacson, 2013) further cements the argument that Eurocentrism continues to negatively affect the lives of poor people of color.

For Native Americans in particular, there is a direct correlation between the legacy of colonialism and their health. In a 2014 article, Claire Gordon explores the health crisis currently

---

11 This is also why a Fanonian analysis is relevant. Fanon had been writing about the psychological impact of colonization and racism since the 1950s. However, his research was aimed at a specific colonial subject, and although scholars have appropriated his work for people of color suffering trauma in the U.S., the development of empirical research in a contemporary context is an important advancement for a study of racism and its impact on people of color.
facing the Native American community. Gordon highlights the impact of diabetes, injuries, sexual abuse, tuberculosis and suicide. In one article, Professor Irene Vernon explains that Native Americans are the "sickest racial, ethnic population in the United States" (Gordon, 2014, para. 4), from having the highest rates of diabetes and suicide of any racial group, to structural impediments, such as lacking hospitals on the reservation for emergency medical care. Anibal Quijano stated it well when he argued that the racial axis that we live with today "has a colonial origin and character, but it has proven to be more durable and stable than the colonialism in whose matrix it was established. Therefore, the model of power that is globally hegemonic today [race] presupposes an element of coloniality" (2000, p. 533). Quijano reminds us in “Coloniality of Power” that Eurocentrism is based on two principal founding myths: first, the idea that the history of human civilization is centered in Europe; second, a view of the differences between Europe and non-Europe as natural (racial) differences, and not consequences of a history of power (p. 534). Now that we have discussed some of the implications of colonialism and Eurocentrism, we will move on to a discussion of white supremacy.

To define white supremacy, I turn to Zeus Leonardo (2009), who argues, “the concept of white supremacy names the group in question. It is unequivocal in its capacity to name whites as the group enforcing its racial power…supremacy is also unambiguous; it signifies a group’s attempt to establish absolute control” (p. 42-43). This is different from white privilege, which is when whites receive unearned advantages because they are identified as white (Leonardo, 2009; McIntosh, 2000). White supremacy is more concerned with pursuing and maintaining white domination (Leonardo, 2009) and with the explicit subordination of non-whites. White supremacy is also different from Eurocentrism; white supremacy is unique in that it is an ideology born in America. As previously discussed, notions of identifying as white or black did not occur until the late 1600s in the American colonies, where such differences began entering the legal discourse (Zinn, 2010). While one may be ignorant of the white privilege they benefit from, white supremacy is characterized by an explicit effort to posit whites at the top of the racial hierarchy. Borrowing from the hierarchies established by colonizers such as the Spanish over the Jews and the British over the Irish, white supremacy made clear the roles of both the dominant and subordinate groups in a society (Smedley, 2007). The rapid genocide of Indigenous peoples, the decision that they did not make a productive labor force, and the subsequent relocation to reservations - rendered Native Americans more invisible in the racial hierarchy. African Americans, however, were hailed into a duality that put them in total opposition to whites. This position has resulted in centuries of de jure and de facto practices that seek to limit the opportunities and freedom of African Americans. From this black/white binary, all other communities of color have been assessed by white supremacy and assigned social positions depending largely on their proximity to Blackness, their labor potential, and varying other conditions. While powerful, these positions remain flexible, and the positionality of people of color has shifted up and down, depending on changes in the economy, world politics, and at times, social activism.

While the definition of white supremacy has been discussed at length in previous chapters, here it is important to acknowledge that like capitalism and even more so like colonialism, this ideology has influenced higher education. In both theory and practice, white supremacy has impacted who is admitted to universities, what is taught, who is responsible for teaching, and the campus climate for students of color. In the following chapter, specific examples of white supremacy at UC Berkeley will be provided for analysis.
In the U.S. it may be easier to locate racial oppression, if one does so at all, in the context of white supremacy, due to the history and visible nature of white supremacism. The history of the Ku Klux Klan (KKK) reflects the dialectics of the material/ideological struggle for hegemony. In the wake of the South's defeat in the Civil War, poor whites found that their status in society - one that was premised on Black inferiority and enslavement - was being challenged. Not only were African Americans no longer the property of whites, they quickly materialized their freedom by running for political office, creating schools, and rebuilding their lives (Franklin and Moss, 2000). Beyond the individual and group terrorism of the KKK, white supremacy similarly shaped the economic and social landscape. In the post-Reconstruction Era after 1877, the new definition of working class became the purview of whites (Alamguer, 1994), and thus any other group vying for economic opportunities was harassed and often terrorized. Similarly, newly arrived European immigrants in the late 19th and early 20th century quickly adjusted to the reality shaped by white supremacy, and assimilated as best they could to enter the white race, which again was often associated with access to employment (Ignatiev, 1995). Because whiteness has for so long been associated with material opportunities and success, shifting the ideology of white supremacy has proven a difficult task.

When racial superiority is the defining factor in one's identity, it is not easily relinquished, especially in times of economic and social upheaval; for many poor whites exploited by capitalism, clinging to their hatred of the Other and their supposed superiority works as a coping mechanism. As I write this chapter, I am bombarded with news of the resurgence of the KKK in light of Donald Trump's 2016 presidential campaign. Emboldened by his explicitly racist discourse, which appeals to a white imagination defined by a real loss in economic - and a perceived loss - in social status, Trump legitimizes the hate of the Other on which this country was founded. Any progress made at challenging explicit racism has been perceived as an assault on whites. At best it has been replaced with 'color-blind racism'; at worst, those sentiments are still alive and well. James Baldwin (1955) writes, "I imagine one of the reasons people cling to their hates so stubbornly is because they sense, once hate is gone, they will be forced to deal with pain" (p. 101). This statement reminds me of Césaire referring to America as the 'modern barbarian,' and that this trajectory of hatred for the Other robs us of our humanity. The scars of white supremacy are so deep, and the healing that must occur may seem daunting, but it is important to remember that considering this work optional reflects one's relative privilege. The historically oppressed know that struggle and freedom are not optional, but a destiny. Our communities literally cannot afford to wait. The TWLF represents a moment where third world peoples mounted a strategic campaign to challenge Eurocentrism and white supremacy, first within the institution, and ultimately in the broader society.

Conclusion

In conclusion, Eurocentricity, especially as it relates to the university, is so deeply imbedded in the culture and curriculum of the academy that it has reached the apex of hegemony; it is completely accepted as the norm and considered commonsensical. Both Eurocentricity and white supremacy are terms that represent powerful ideological tools that have material consequences for both people of color and the white population. We see both of these ideologies exemplified by the institutionalization of European/American values and perspectives in the western educational cannon. It is my intention to argue that students of color, educated in American primary and secondary schools, exist in a space where the dominant hegemonic values
are composed of the ideologies of white supremacy, Eurocentricity, and capitalism. Thus, those students who challenged the oppressive structure and the ideology of the schooling system represent an anti-hegemonic bloc.

In the following chapter I delve into the Third World Liberation Front movement at UC Berkeley to examine how historically marginalized students challenged the dominant hegemony of the University by fighting for their right to self-determination and politically and culturally relevant curricula. By utilizing archival sources and interviews I conducted with TWLF participants, I trace the specific grievances of students of color, analyze the powerful relationship between students and workers, and critique the use of State violence to repress their movement. Much of the ideology discussed in this chapter, as well as the material repercussions of these beliefs, will be concretized within a socio-historical analysis in the following chapter.
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"Coming to know the past has been part of the critical pedagogy of decolonization. To hold alternative histories is to hold alternative knowledges. The pedagogical implication of this access to alternative knowledges is that they can form the basis of alternative ways of doing things"

-Linda Tihuwai Smith- 2012

The guiding research questions for this chapter are: What were the demands and grievances of the Third World Liberation Front at UC Berkeley and how were they connected to the hegemonic ideology of the university? What was the Ethnic Studies department able to accomplish in their first ten years, what were the limitations and achievements? In section I of this chapter, I delve into the origins of the Third World Liberation Front (TWLF) student movement at UC Berkeley by discussing the first TWLF movement for Ethnic Studies - which started at San Francisco State University in 1968 - and the impact that movement had on students of color everywhere. Next, I shift my focus to UC Berkeley, and analyze the origins of the TWLF, presenting three major critiques of the university that radicalized students of color articulated: 1) the institution denied self-determination to third world peoples; 2) capitalist practices were detrimental to an empowering education; and 3) the use of state violence against protestors reflected the degree to which the university was invested in maintaining their domination. Here, Gramsci becomes crucial in understanding both the ideologies that the TWLF movement was challenging, but more explicitly, the tactics protestors utilized to achieve their goal of establishing Ethnic Studies. For example, Gramscian analysis predicts the use of state violence that we witnessed during the strike because of the successful 'crisis of authority' created by TWLF activists. Additionally, placing the TWLF in the realm of a 'war of position' aptly describes how a radical movement in education actually contributes to a larger revolutionary bloc. Framing the historical creation of Ethnic Studies with critical theory, I provide a multivalent explanation for why the TWLF formed and the impact its activists sought to have on education. In this chapter I utilize the archive of primary source written material from the strike and the voices of interview participants to contextualize the demands of Third World students during the protest. It is my intention to portray the sense of urgency that motivated the TWLF activists, and also to highlight the powerful student/worker alliance that formed the base of the movement.

The purpose of this chapter is to acknowledge the profoundly radical history of the TWLF at UC Berkeley, and to include it as a key moment of resistance in the longue durée of marginalized peoples fighting for their humanity. Here, I extend the conversation from Chapter 1, on black education in the South, discussing how the TWLF brought other marginalized people of color into a movement where education was seen as an act of liberation for those long denied access to their history. At UC Berkeley, the Afro-American Student Union was the first group to demand their own department; from their call to action and negotiation with the Administration, the umbrella organization known as the Third World Liberation Front emerged. Thus, Black students provide a link between the struggle for politically and culturally relevant curriculum dating back from the Reconstruction Era and Du Bois’ African-centered scholarship of the late 1800s and early 1900s, to the growth of Black Power and anti-colonialism of the 1960s. Through
the personal narratives presented in this chapter, I hope to convey the deep commitment TWLF activists had to changing society for communities of color in an effort to liberate themselves from both the material and ideological forces at the root of their dehumanization. A critical component of this chapter is highlighting the contributions of women from the TWLF and weaving their experiences into my analysis. This is essential because men have predominantly authored the scant literature on the movement. Additionally, the experiences of women provide a more complete picture of the intersectionality of social movements in the 1960s. Lastly, I aim to illuminate the power of education and student movements in contributing to radical social change outside the university. By discussing the Gramscian strategies and different outcomes of the TWLF movement, I want to analyze the successes and limitations of such efforts, with the intention of making theory applicable to current student and social movements.

In 1968 at San Francisco State University (SFSU), students, faculty, staff, and community members of color, demanded the creation of new men and women in university curricula via the establishment of Ethnic Studies. At SFSU (1968), and eventually at UC Berkeley (1969), students who identified with the struggles of colonized third world people throughout the diaspora forged their humanity - or as Fanon suggested - became "men," by continuing the legacy of African Americans forged during Reconstruction, wherein they connected their education to their liberation. The implementation of Ethnic Studies - as a College at SFSU and as a department at UC Berkeley - represents the fusion of radical theory and praxis, resulting in the creation of spaces that validated the experiences of those long denied the right to study their history. What was also liberatory about this new curriculum and pedagogy was the explicit challenge Ethnic Studies posed to the dominant narrative of American history, one that previously dehumanized, invisibilized, and pathologized communities of color. Through the creation of politically and culturally relevant curriculum, a new human was introduced to the academy, one whose origin was radical and whose body carried the weight and resilience of hundreds of years of oppression and resistance.

To understand the claims made by TWLF students against the university, it is important to situate the role of capitalism and white supremacy in the university as hegemonic ideologies. I have chosen to use the term hegemony because, as outlined in the previous chapter, it speaks to fact that white supremacy/Eurocentrism and capitalism are deeply imbedded in university culture, practices, and systems. Also, these ideologies have reached the level of common sense and acceptance by the campus majority, so much so that when the TWLF demanded classes that were not only about Europeans, it was seen as controversial. The fact that students of color would want to learn about their own contributions was a concept totally foreign to a campus majority embedded in the status quo. The dominance of white supremacy and unquestioned Eurocentricism of curricula had long been accepted because white privilege prevented the majority population from realizing there was an absence of curricula from non-European cultures. However, after the passage of the 1965 Civil Rights Act and the development of Educational Opportunity Programs, (EOP), increased recruitment efforts created a small growth of students of color who began trickling into the university. These new racialized bodies, paired with a strong radical ideology that permeated the Bay Area in the 1960s, fomented an anti-hegemonic bloc that sought to directly challenge both the ideology and the structure of the university. Their inability to replace the dominant ideology does not detract from the fact that they did create a strong ideological bloc that forced the entire campus community to take their demands seriously, ultimately bypassing the traditional rules of the establishment in creating a department of Ethnic Studies.
I. The Birth of the TWLF: San Francisco State University 1968

On November 6, 1968, one of the longest, most intense, and successful student protests was initiated at San Francisco State College, now known as and referred to herein as San Francisco State University (SFSU). Radical students of color organized under the banner of the Third World Liberation Front (TWLF), reflecting the influence of anti-colonial rhetoric on urban communities of color in the 1960s. For four months - until March 20, 1969 - students, faculty, staff and community members led a protracted battle against the college administration: they were successful in creating the first, and to this day, only College of Ethnic Studies. Numerous events foregrounded the development of the TWLF at SFSU, such as faculty grievances, a rise in the presence of radical organizations on campus, and the desire of the students of color to learn their history and use their education to improve the conditions of their community. Fabio Rojas, author of *From Black Power to Black Studies*, has described the SFSU strike for Ethnic Studies as “one of the most memorable moments in American education history” (2007, p. 45). The TWLF at SFSU served as a powerful model for students, who, at other campuses, were simultaneously working toward the goal of creating culturally and politically relevant curriculum to actualize their own vision for demanding an education that sought to empower historically oppressed peoples.

The TWLF at (SFSU) ignited the organization of minority students across the country, shifting the zeitgeist to empower students to feel that they could shape education to meet their needs. Even more profound was the completely radical discourse the TWLF was engaged in. They didn’t just want new courses: they demanded new standards that centralized the liberation of their communities. In a press release commemorating the 40th anniversary of the 1968 strike, Denize Springer wrote that in the wake of the establishment of the College for Ethnic Studies at SFSU, a report issued by the Education Resource Information Center in 1981 concluded that 8,805 Ethnic Studies classes were being taught at 439 college campuses across the country (2008). Currently, the College of Ethnic Studies at SFSU serves approximately 6,000 students each semester. Not only have the accomplishments of the 1968-1969 strike yielded a truly unique and revolutionary educational space at SFSU; the victory of their TWLF movement contributed to a shift in the self-psychology of people of color, affirming their social, cultural, and intellectual contributions. Heavily influenced by the Black Power Movement and the Black Panther Party, the College of Ethnic Studies contributed to a paradigm shift wherein people of color asserted their self worth and self-determination. Thus, like the aforementioned movements that directly contributed to the organization of the TWLF at SFSU, Ethnic Studies from its inception has been concerned with addressing both the material conditions of oppressed peoples, and challenging the dominant narratives imposed upon their communities.

Three important factors contributed to the development of a culture at SFSU, which was ripe for mobilization of the TWLF. The first highly influential factor was the organization of Black students on campus. In 1963 the Black Student Union (BSU) was formed. However, when Jimmy Garrett, a member of the Black Panther Party and Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC), enrolled as part of a mission to organize Black students, the intensity of Black mobilization grew (Rojas, 2007). Rojas describes the impact of Garrett’s arrival on the SFSU campus as...
A new stage for black students at the college. For the first time, a charismatic person with years of experience in the civil rights movement tried to convert the black student club into a platform for revolutionary action...he believed that students needed black consciousness (p. 52).

Garrett pushed for a nationalist movement that taught fellow black students to identify and challenge racism on their campus, which in turn, led to the call for black studies. The strong presence of black activists on campus - paired with a growing trend for administrators to allow students to lead courses on topics of their choice - led to the development of the Experimental College in 1966 (Rojas, 2007). The development of black studies courses taught in the E.C. served as a training experience for those committed to creating an Ethnic Studies department. Additionally, numerous racially charged incidents between BSU and white students, between the BSU and the college, and lastly, the suspension of Black Panther student George Murray, led to the BSU/TWLF strikes. The disgruntled faculty - frustrated since 1965 by 1.8% faculty pay cuts, long standing grievances of heavy course loads, not enough time for research, and a desire for more graduate programs - resulted in a faculty primed to support the institutional change the TWLF called for (Rojas, 2007). Ultimately, the national climate of campus protests, combined with administrators who did not know how to address the mounting grievances and tactics of activists, paired with a culture of radical self-determination, led to the successful BSU/TWLF strike at SFSU.

There are so many nuances and important details about the strike for Ethnic Studies at SFSU and the creation of the first and only college of Ethnic Studies. However, because the emphasis of my research is on UC Berkeley, I am focusing on the influence the strike had broadly on other students. Harvey Dong, UC Berkeley TWLF member, described how the SFSU strike influenced UC Berkeley student involvement. He said, “I think because of the fact that they [SFSU] had started it, and Berkeley had continued and then the other campuses like Cal State Northridge joined, it was pretty big,” (H. Dong, personal communication, August 2, 2007). The formation and growth of student activism contributed to a community of solidarity among students, faculty, staff and local workers. Massive protests and riots ensued as a result of the demonstrations and subsequent police repression at SFSU. Not only were the students fighting for education reform, they also faced a formidable opponent in the interim President of their college, S.I. Hayakawa, a politically conservative administrator who aligned himself closely with the Governor of California, Ronald Reagan. The TWLF and the guerilla tactics employed by the students created a crisis of authority on campus that led to state politicians and leaders heavily criticizing both the students and the campus administrators. Rojas summarizes the impact of these pressures. He states, “any public concession to students was quickly interpreted by California state political leaders as a capitulation to disorder. Protest from below and public censure from above converged in a vise-like grip that crushed San Francisco college administration” (2007, p. 77).

The strategies of SFSU TWLF activists were provocative and at times violent because they were based on guerilla tactics used in the third world. During the strike at SFSU, nine bombs were set off on the campus, hundreds of classes were interrupted and canceled, the campus was closed numerous times, local and state law enforcement were used, and two campus Presidents lost their jobs as a result of the chaos. Students referred to their tactics as ‘the war of the flea,’ combining constant harassment and disturbance with public intimidation and embarrassment (Rojas, 2007). There were many setbacks for the students, and hundreds were
arrested and beaten by the police; but their greatest opponent was university president Hayakawa, who took their threats seriously, yet prepared to outlast their activism. The UC Berkeley student newspaper, *The Daily Californian*, described the struggle Hayakawa saw himself engaged in with students at the college:

I believe profoundly in academic freedom, but I also want to emphasize the academic part of it...freedom to debate and discuss and weigh the merits of any body of ideas. The concept of academic freedom involves ‘freedom of speech,’ and not complete freedom of action.\(^{12}\)

As a linguist, Hayakawa strategically presented himself and the plight of administrators in opposition to the perceived chaos created by the TWLF activists. Despite his attempts to pit the community against the students, a coalition of political support for the TWLF flooded onto the SFSU campus.

An announcement in *The Daily Californian* on January 3, 1969, advertised car pools to SFSU to support the TWLF faculty and students who were striking. The paper announced a National Week of Solidarity being organized by TWLF at SFSU, and a Statewide Strike Support Organizing Committee for the week of January 6-13, 1969. They declared their support of “the coordinated efforts of more than 50 colleges and high schools in support of demands of the Black Student Union and Third World Liberation Front for minority group self-determination in their educations.”\(^{13}\) This proclamation of support for SFSU students created a relationship between TWLF student activism on both campuses. Despite knowing that UC Berkeley African American students had been organizing their own movements for Black Studies since 1968, the Berkeley administration did not concern itself with the events at SFSU. Neil Smelser, a UC Berkeley faculty member and administrator during the Free Speech Movement (1964), clarified this point: “We were parochial; we didn’t pay much attention to SF State. As far as I can determine, Berkeley reacted to the pressure, movements, and events only in its own context” (N. Smelser, personal communication, April 4, 2008). Although UC Berkeley officials were unconcerned with the events at SFSU, many members of their campus community were actively engaged in supporting the TWLF movement across the Bay.

At SFSU, two thousand supporters, including students, activists, community members, and the local American Federation of Teachers ultimately shut down the campus before the Winter Holiday of 1969. Governor Reagan vowed, with his usual contempt for student activists, that the college would remain open and undisrupted “at the point of bayonets if necessary.”\(^{14}\) Despite threats made by government and university officials, the TWLF and faculty strike continued. Student and faculty pressure increased against the university; their now interconnected efforts to gain better working conditions and Ethnic Studies created a strong coalition, one that would become necessary to sustain the longest university strike in United States history. The legacy of the SFSU strike cannot be understated. The BSU/TWLF activism provided a framework and model for students of color dedicated to fighting for Ethnic Studies by any means necessary. Their tactics were radical and often led to strong opposition. However, they speak to the influence of third world anti-colonial movements on students of color in the
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United States. Their choices were a reflection of the times; revolutions were spreading throughout the third world; victories were being won by the oppressed. Meanwhile, across the Bay at UC Berkeley, unmet demands by students of color, especially those of the Afro-American Student Union, led UC Berkeley students to begin planning their own TWLF strike.

II. The Third World Liberation Front at UC Berkeley: A Moment, a Movement

Although UC Berkeley activists launched their TWLF movement in January 1969, the movement for establishing culturally and politically relevant curriculum was sparked three years earlier. Like many college campuses in the nation including SFSU, the 1960s represented a time when unprecedented student activism was shaping the way institutions conducted business. In the wake of the tumultuous Free Speech Movement (FSM) at UC Berkeley in 1964 - a movement where students from all political backgrounds mobilized to retain their right to advocate and solicit membership for political causes - there was a critical momentum growing for student-initiated courses (Delgado, 2008). While the FSM was a mostly white and upper middle class movement, it led to important institutional committees that created some space for a race conscious curriculum. Education reform was critical to some of the leaders of the FSM, like Michael Rossman and Brad Cleveland. Although this issue has never been as widely publicized as the political issues, it was an important element of the FSM that has not yet been profoundly analyzed by academics. Michael Rossman was most concerned with the educational dimension of the movement and wrote,

During the three months of campus crisis we began to articulate a radical critique of higher education from the top to bottom—from the elitist composition of the Regents and the shaping of departments and curricula by government contracts, through the grading system and dormitory rules and student powerlessness in departmental affairs, to the content and process and premises of classes themselves (Rossman, 1974).

Rossman’s words provide a first person account of how the FSM was more than a movement fighting solely for political freedoms. The truth is, the empowerment the students experienced through their collective action led them to question a multitude of issues. One of the committees created by the Academic Senate in the wake of the FSM was the Muscatine Committee, chaired by Charles Muscatine, professor of English. The importance of the administrative response to the FSM is that it represented an institutional reaction to a student movement. As a result of the Muscatine report, the Board of Educational Development (BED) was created. This board was very influential, and has been called the primary educational legacy of the FSM by Julie Rueben, professor of English at Harvard University. BED was important: it was created solely as a response to the FSM, and played a vital role as a training ground for students to create their own curriculum (Delgado, 2008).

Graduate student Rick Brown created the Center for Participatory Education (CPE) in the winter quarter of 1966-1967, at the same time that the Experimental College (E.C.) was being established at SFSU. CPE’s formation followed soon after BED began operating in 1966 (Rueben, 2002). The significance of CPE was its role as primary contributor of courses to BED, which were then turned into new courses created by students for students. Its curriculum was very critical and represented the ‘relevant’ topics that students were discussing, such as race
relations, political activism, non-violence and the looming Vietnam War. When describing the need for BED to a post-FSM campus community, the Muscatine report stated, “The Board's responsibilities are directed to the reception, encouragement, authorization and review of experimental instructional programs. Such programs include any innovative course, curriculum (partial or total), teaching practice, or alteration of existing requirements (e.g., grades, residence, breadth)” (Muscatine, 1968). This administrative call for reform led to an innovative process of creating new classes in 1966.

Similar to the E.C. at SFSU, UC Berkeley’s BED program lasted only as long as the students didn’t challenge the power and hegemonic ideology of the university. As soon as the classes reflected a truly critical ideology, the administration sought to close the program. From the early stages of BED, there were disagreements between students and faculty over just how much power the students should have in creating new courses. In 1968, the administration was deciding whether they would allow a course proposed by CPE students to be taught by Eldridge Cleaver, a member of the Oakland-based Black Panther Party. This course was an example of what many tenured faculty feared: non-certified persons teaching radical and non-academic courses for university credit. Like the Murray decision at SFSU, the Cleaver incident was a turning point for students. The students were either going to have power over the curriculum they perceived relevant, or they were going to go on challenging the administration. This conflict over educational governance revealed a disconnect between how students and administrators defined education reform. On November 22, 1968, following the Cleaver incident and subsequent protests, the Regents interfered by mandating new rules for non-faculty. They established a rule that non-faculty members could no longer be lecturers for courses offered for credit. The administration expressed concern that many of the CPE and other student-initiated courses were ‘primarily propaganda,’ and lacked the academic grounding expected to receive credit from the University of California at Berkeley. The November ruling came five months after the Afro-American Student Union had submitted their proposal for a department of Black Studies at UCB. Yet again, the mobilization of black students for politically relevant education, their advocacy for Black Power representatives on campus, and the administration’s refusal to accept these conditions served as a powder keg to ignite an even broader coalition of students and workers on campus.

In April 1968, the Afro-American Student Union (AASU) submitted a proposal for a Department of Black Studies to UC Berkeley Chancellor Roger W. Heyns. By August 1968, African American scholar Dr. Andrew Billingsley had been appointed to assist the Chancellor in developing a Black Studies Department. In November, Dr. Billingsley submitted his proposal for Black Studies, and on December 3, 1968, Dean Knight submitted the proposal to the Executive Committee for review and approval. However, when the Executive Committee met to discuss the proposal, they acted in a manner that convinced Black students they were not willing to collaborate and honor the vision that the Afro-American Student Union had for the department. For example, both Dr. Billingsley and black students were excluded from the meetings; the committee removed the community engagement element from the proposal; rejected student participation in the implementation of the department; and even debated whether it would become a department, or exist only as a "program.”\footnote{Third World Strike at University of California, Berkeley collection, CES ARC 2015/1 Ethnic Studies Library, University of California, Berkeley. Location: 1.1 TWLF box 1 Folder 1- 1969 TWLH hist/chronology "The chronology & background of the TWLF strike” flyer} The actions of those on the Executive
Committee reflected the deep ideological chasm between Black students radicalized and ‘schooled’ during an era of Black Power and anti-colonialism, and university gatekeepers tasked with overseeing the implementation of a new curriculum and pedagogy. University administrators were facing a crisis they had never experienced before: students were demanding a greater role in fundamental areas that had long been the purview of tenured faculty and the administration. Additionally, these students were not willing to accept incremental change; they wanted greater power and self-determination, and they wanted it immediately.

The pedagogical innovation that Black Studies wanted to establish, such as the community engagement requirement, exemplifies Gramsci's call for active commitment by the new organic intellectual. The struggle for power over how these new intellectual and community engaged spaces would be established was a point of conflict that would remain throughout the TWLF strike, and eventually during the design of the Ethnic Studies Department at UC Berkeley. Ultimately, the TWLF would challenge the power historically reserved for the Faculty Senate and university administrators regarding content and delivery of curriculum. It is precisely in this local of resistance that historically marginalized people demanded respect and self-determination. They wanted to decide who was qualified to teach, what would be taught, and the praxis necessary to deliver the material.

On January 10, 1969, AASU called for a public meeting to discuss the future of Black Studies and the possible need for a strike. During that meeting, the Afro-American Student Union (AASU), the Mexican American Student Confederation (MASC), the Asian American Political Alliance (AAPA), and the Native American Party discussed the need to form a coalition, undoubtedly inspired by the TWLF at SFSU. On January 14, 1969, students formed a strike committee to mobilize white students who represented the campus majority. Finally, on January 21, the Afro-American Student Union (AASU) joined with Mexican American Student Confederation (MASC), Asian American Political Alliance (AAPA), and Native American Party to officially form the Third World Liberation Front at UC Berkeley. Harvey Dong explained the importance of this coalition, and how they combined their efforts to gain support:

The most important tactic was the gathering of, and coalition building between different ethnic groups pulling together their own people, and having meetings with the general student population. The majority of the general population was white. I think because of the continuous meetings and discussions, we were able to turn a lot of minds around. You could see the campus solidarity begin to turn. Then there was the TWLF strike committee, which consisted of almost every radical political group in Berkeley...They also had a lot of outreach efforts in dormitories... They made efforts to speak to ethnic communities, and they went to churches. I think that made a big difference in terms of minimizing the intensity of riots against the students (H. Dong, personal communication, August 2, 2007).

The alliance described by Harvey Dong was critical in forming a united front in the following months when police brutalized students and the tense campus climate peaked.

When interviewing women who participated in the TWLF I was moved by the different factors that facilitated their involvement. Betty Kano decided to join the TWLF in her first semester at UC Berkeley because she had also participated in the movement at SFSU. She

explains some of the factors that influenced her: “I had gone to San Francisco State and participated in the first strike by students and the organization of student employees... And then of course the Black Panthers and their involvement in calling out for an Ethnic Studies College was something that really galvanized my imagination at UC Berkeley” (B. Kano, personal communication, June 7, 2012). Lucha Corpi, who supported the TWLF because her husband was one of the organizers, described the culture of the movement wherein most of the male organizers were much older, many of them veterans attending UC Berkeley on the G.I. Bill, and many already active in other political organizations. Lucha Corpi was not a student, but rather an employee working on campus to support her family while her husband was a full-time student (L. Corpi, personal communication, June 7, 2012). LaNada Warjack’s involvement in the TWLF began a year earlier in 1968 when she was admitted as the first Native American student to UC Berkeley. Her journey reflects the culture of solidarity among Third World peoples in the Bay Area during the 1960s. Warjack was supported in transferring to UC Berkeley with the help of a Black minister at the Mission Rebels in San Francisco. When she arrived on campus, Chicano students mistook her for a Chicana and invited her to their meetings. She explains, “I told them I wasn’t Chicana but that I would join them. They recognized their native roots, so I joined their organization until they assisted me in getting support from affirmative action in recruiting other Native Students. I had about a dozen students there when we went on strike, but I always had the inside information from the Chicano student organization because I was a member of them also” (L. Warjack, personal communication, February 18, 2016). Not only was LaNada Warjack the first Indigenous student at UC Berkeley, she was also the only woman in a position of consistent leadership within the TWLF. The TWLF soon realized that their struggle was connected to many other groups, both on and off campus. Their broad platform, challenging capitalist exploitation and fighting for self-determination, would inspire other organizations on campus to mobilize simultaneously. Like many of the social movements of the 1950s and 60s, the TWLF could not have been successful without the support of allies and other struggling peoples who saw the interconnectedness of their oppression and fought to liberate each other.

Why We Strike: Foundation and Principal Grievances of the TWLF

The most central issue to the TWLF at UC Berkeley was the demand for self-determination of people of color within the university. All other demands - such as increased recruitment of students, faculty and employees of color - stem from the notion that third world people needed to have control over third world spaces. In the pamphlet, “This is What We Demand,” the TWLF concludes their six-page manifesto with the following statement:

This university does not meet the educational needs of Third World communities. The reason we have made liberation demands is to ensure that we gain our rightful autonomy and self-determination in the university. This will permit us to chart the educational destinies of our communities.”
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This statement reflects the anti-colonial agenda throughout Third World, where independence was defined by the ability to control the social, political, and economic future of the newly liberated nation. With the demand for self-determination came three additional critiques of the university fundamental to the TWLF activists. The first critique was that the curriculum of the University was Eurocentric and did not reflect the history and contributions of people of color. The second critique problematized the ever increasing capitalist practices and the negative consequences they imposed on the campus community. Lastly, the university’s deployment of state violence in response to the TWLF became another main point of contention between the students, their supporters, and the administration. These will be the three areas I emphasize in my discussion and analysis of the TWLF at UC Berkeley.

On January 22, 1969, with picket lines at every major entrance of the campus, TWLF made five demands. First, establish a Third World College with four departments. Second, Third World persons must be appointed to administrative, faculty, and staff positions at all levels in all campus units. Third, increase admission, financial aid, and academic assistance for Third World students, work-study positions for minority students in minority communities and on high school campuses. Fourth, Third World people must control all Third World programs on campus. Finally, no disciplinary actions should be taken against the student strikers. I want to emphasize the importance of the fourth point in discussing the influence of international anti-colonial efforts and their impact on the local TWLF movement. The exact language of the fourth point is important here. In this passage, TWLF students explained Third World control over Third World programs:

At this point, this is the heart of the strike. Based on unwillingness to have Third World programs for Third World students to benefit Third World communities which are run or dominated by all white academic committees and structures of the university.

The struggle of Third World people to gain control of the systems and structures within newly decolonized nation-states was one of the biggest debates raging during this period; the importance of transition of power was also crucial for TWLF activists in envisioning the future of Ethnic Studies. At the core, the TWLF was directly assaulting the hegemonic power structure of the university. Evelyn Nakano Glenn expands Gramsci’s hegemony as, “The taken for-granted practices and assumptions that make domination seem natural and inevitable to both the dominant and subordinate…This point is particularly relevant to race and gender, where power is lodged in taken-for-granted assumptions and practices…” (2002, p. 16). It was precisely these taken-for-granted assumptions of what curriculum should be taught, who should teach it, and what qualifies as research that TWLF students and supporters protested. Aligned with workers on and off campus, the protestors challenged long accepted policies, practices, and structures that had become “common sense” in the way that both Gramsci and Nakano Glenn describe.

Paternalism or Self-Determination? This is the Issue

In Fanon's *The Wretched of the Earth*, perhaps the most influential anti-colonial text for TWLF activists, the author was clear in calling on those once colonized to create a completely
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new society that would nurture and sustain their liberation. He wrote "The third world must not content to define itself in relation to the values which preceded it. On the contrary, the underdeveloped countries must endeavor to focus on their very own values as well as methods and style specific to them" (2004, p. 55). The fourth demand of the TWLF explicitly called on this logic of creating a new structure within the university that would function according to methods that addressed the unique needs of historically marginalized communities - needs that had never been considered in either the structure or practices of the university at large, due mostly to the foundational principals of those who established institutions of higher education and their explicit role in colonial and imperial projects throughout the Third World. The TWLF was clear that they were demanding a redistribution of power relations, prioritizing communities of color and their needs within the university for the first time. This was a completely new concept for an institution built on a strict hierarchy composed of faculty and administrators. Thus, it is clear that the TWLF emerged as counter hegemonic bloc to the ideology that dominated the academy. The TWLF’s emphasis on community engagement and participation in the future of Ethnic Studies is a prime example of the conflict between the liberatory/anti-colonial praxis envisioned by the TWLF versus the "traditional” or colonial model accepted by most of the university faculty and administration. A more robust discussion of the University as a colonial and imperialist space will occur in the following chapter, but this point is important here in order to situate the demands of the TWLF and to understand the response by university administrators.

The TWLF was very clear in arguing that their movement was about more than simply adding curriculum within the institution as it was. Rather, they wanted “the power of Third World students, faculty, and community leaders to determine the course of instruction most relevant to their own lives, to the survival of their communities and independent identities.”

In their demand for Third World administrators, they went even further to explain that the TWLF committee must approve anyone selected. This was an effort to prevent the influence of people of color who did not share the vision of the organizers from gaining control of the new department or college. Overall, they demanded that Third World people be in control of every aspect of the establishment of this new field, from program development to decisions about funding and allocation of resources. The emphasis on self-determination is yet another example wherein the longue durée of racism and oppression of people of color has resulted in a deep desire to put their freedom into practice. In a flyer distributed to gain campus support, the TWLF declared,

The TWLF demands that an autonomous Third World College be established, with its own admissions policy and disposal of funds…nothing else is acceptable. A college controlled by the administration and the Regents with their racist, big business interests could never serve the needs of minority people who are directly oppressed by these interests.

---
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In this statement, the TWLF was explicit in identifying the hegemonic ideologies of capitalism and racism as key reasons for creating an autonomous space. Denied their place in the academy for so long, once people of color began to organize and create a vision and mission for the Third World College, they were adamant in their rejection of the dominant ideology of the university.

In the previous chapter, I discussed the history of American higher education in the context of colonial and imperial expansion and as a location where Eurocentrism and white supremacy were validated. Here, I want to highlight some of the voices of the white student body, in order to provide a context for what it was like to be a student of color UC Berkeley in 1969. On January 30, 1969, a graduate student from the English Department at UC Berkeley penned an editorial to the campus newspaper entitled, “A True WASP’ Responds to Strikers” (Figure 3). Her opening words reflect sentiment common among many - however, not all - white students on campus. She writes,

“You who demand ‘Self-determination’ lack the necessary intelligence to succeed. You have been nurtured too long by a Welfare society where ‘something’ is demanded for ‘nothing’…You exist here, now, in a national territory called the United States of America…If you truly are dying of the spiritual needs of you ethnic ancestors, then go and be welcomed into the bosom of your Chinese, Mexican or African villages…”

The author’s words represent the deep xenophobic and nationalist sentiment of white Americans who, bombarded with images of empowered people of color directly attacking the racism in America, grasped even tighter to their sense of superiority. Feeling threatened and self-entitled - many white students, faculty, and administrators - expressed a paternalistic disappointment with the TWLF movement. The following section contains perhaps most the most offensive language of this letter. The author writes,

But, reacting as a true WASP, I must say what really angers me is your apparently complete misunderstanding of what ‘self-determination’ means. To me it is akin to the definition of the so-called ‘self-made’ man. And it is certainly allied to the very roots of American-ness, for this nation was founded by a handful of men who also wanted to be self-determined…They certainly did not change the inflexible society under whose laws and practices they felt oppressed. They got the hell out…These first independent Americans determined themselves in a realistic manner and provided the spirit and attitude that has since been reflected in American history. So you who would be ‘self-determined’ leave off your picketings and strikings and petulant tantrums. Do not expect the majority of Americans to hand you your daily-earned tax money for your separate school…

The disturbing paternalism voiced in this letter, where the author so casually refers to Third World students as unintelligent and ungrateful people who should essentially ‘love America or leave it,’ exemplifies the very reason why the TWLF demanded that all Third World spaces be
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run by Third World peoples. The Eurocentric narratives wherein Pilgrims survived through their own ‘self-made’ ingenuity only to conquer a land devoid of civilization, where Indigenous peoples are erased from history, has left generations of ‘educated’ people perpetuating these troubling ideologies. The ignorance and revisionist history, personified by the internalization of white supremacy and Manifest destiny mythology clearly displayed by the author, only strengthens the argument for why an Ethnic Studies curriculum was needed. Herein lays a critical point of departure: for white Americans who identify and define their history within narratives of colonization and land theft, it is very difficult to relate to notions of self-determination from the position of the oppressed and colonized. There were white graduate students who supported the TWLF; however, they were usually those inclined to support the Civil Rights Movement, and despite Berkeley’s radical legacy, there was never more than a small fragment of students protesting in the 1960s. It was just that those few students brought a lot of attention to their causes. From the Free Speech Movement to the Vietnam War protests, there was never more than a small contingent of white student radicals on campus. It is important to note that many more conservative white students shared the sentiments of the woman who wrote the above letter, which reflected the dominant campus culture.

In addition to demanding self-determination, the TWLF identified the oppressive nature of capitalism in higher education as a systemic issue particularly detrimental to students of color. Some of the most ardent support of the TWLF came quickly from campus employees who tied their exploitation to the cause of Third World students. In the following section I will highlight the significance of the student/worker alliance in the establishment of an anti-hegemonic bloc.

The TWLF students and some of their supporters clearly understood and critiqued the relationship between capitalism and education in their movement. They were unapologetic in their critique of the university’s role in reproducing capitalist exploitation. One flyer distributed during the TWLF by the Independent Socialist Club on campus stated,

> It is nothing less than a showdown of students, teachers and communities demanding control of education to make it relevant to their needs, against the political and economic forces represented by Reagan and the Regents, who are insisting on control of education to keep it relevant to their needs, mainly the production of various levels of technicians, managers and apologists for corporate capitalism…”

Such statements were common and illustrate that the TWLF’s challenge of capitalism was both a central component of their discourse and primary tenet of their anti-hegemonic struggle.
FROM THE DAILY CALIFORNIAN "LETTERS TO THE EDITOR" THURSDAY, JANUARY 30, 1969

'A True WASP' Responds to Strikers

You who demand "self-determination" lack the necessary intelligence to succeed. You have been nurtured too long by a Welfare Society where "something" is demanded for "nothing" and where the socialist tendency has been to eradicate all distinguishing lines between good, better, and best; as well as bad, worse, and worst. You keep missing the point in all your irresponsible ravings.

You exist here, now, in a national territory called the United States of America. We are not nor do we claim to be or be like Chinas or Mexico or Africa. We have been called the melting pot because so many peoples of varying ethnic and national origins came to our shores voluntarily (except for the Blacks, as a whole) because for whatever their standard of values, they thought America was the place to be. And then they became Americans, not Italians or Poles or Mexicans. Now, in the name of mature and realistic thinking, can you expect "America's present national life" to be anything but American. If there are faults, and there are, then work to correct them, but do not expect to chop America into little pieces called China, Mexico, or Africa. If America has appeared segregationalist in some areas before and now, ultra-segregationist tactics won't solve the difficulty. Two wrongs never did make a right and this other cliché was founded on real life. If you truly are dying of the spiritual needs of your ethnic ancestors, then go and be welcomed into the bosom of your Chinese, Mexican or African villages. Now there is a place that could really use your potential to learn and your new awareness! Far be it from America to keep you here!

But, reacting as a true WASP, I must say that what really angers me is your apparently complete misunderstanding of what "self-determination" means. To me it is akin in definition to the so-called "self-made" man. And it is certainly allied to the very roots of American-ness, for this nation was founded by a handful of men who also wanted to be self-determined. So they got on a boat and batted their way to a strange and succorless soil and determined themselves from scratch. They did not ask that the Establishment pay their way with funds paid by all. They did not demand that those many believe in their cause and therefore subsidize it. They did not expect to find house-hands factories to welcome them in from the elements and the hostile environment. And they certainly did not change the inflexible society under whose laws and practices they felt oppressed. They got the hell out and came to a land where there was not even a never-experienced-only-heard-about ethnic ancestry to shout about. These First Independent Americans determined themselves in a realistic manner and provided the spirit and attitude that has since been reflected in American history.

So you who would be "self-determined" leave off your picketings and strikings and petulant tantrums. Do not expect the majority of Americans to hand you their daily-earned tax money for your separate school. We do not agree with your criteria for admission, instruction or financial aid. If you truly want your own school go build it, with money you earned. Taxpayers have every inalienable right to determine what their money buys. The market is glutted with striking students and there are few buyers. Stop trying to sell yourselves and start "determining" yourselves from scratch. Then you'll have the also inalienable right to direct where your money goes and what it buys you.

--Linda Eagan
TA, Spanish

AFTER READING THIS, YOU SHOULD BE READY TO HELP!!!
Forging Anti-Capitalist Solidarity

The relationship between education and the ideology of capitalism puts Althusser and Gramsci in conversation. Much of my analysis on the influence of capitalism on education has been discussed in the previous chapter and will be contextualized when I analyze the primary sources and grievances from the TWLF and employee unions. However, I will highlight that both Gramsci and Althusser saw education as an important analytic with which to understand capitalism’s influence and control over modern society. For Gramsci, “The school system was just one part of the system of ideological hegemony in which individuals were socialized into maintaining the status quo” (Burk, 2005). The relationship between Gramsci’s ideological hegemony and Althusser’s Ideological State Apparatus (ISA) is the centralization of ideology and education as the vessel, utilized by the capitalist class to control the labor of the masses. Just as significantly, ideology serves as a means of controlling how the masses both perceive themselves in society as well as their acceptance of their position within the established class hierarchy. Without the powerful influence of the ISA and the hegemony of the ruling class, the proletariat, as Fanon would later write in the “Wretched of the Earth,” would realize their oppression and act to eliminate it.

The Third World Liberation Front was explicit in its efforts to resist capitalism, a system it viewed as an oppressive element of the educational apparatus. Its activists challenged the ideology of exploitation in the university by demanding curricula focused on liberation and political relevancy, and the unionized workers used the crisis of the TWLF to align their labor needs with those of the students. This student/worker alliance masterfully synthesized the exploitation experienced by both groups in terms of allocation of university funds and the impact of racism on their performance and overall experience within the institution. When the TWLF strike began its forty-day strike at UC Berkeley, it was supported very early on by the local American Federation of Teachers 1570; American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME) Local 1695; minority faculty and administration; the Associated Students of the University of California; community organizations; and even local bay area workers from the Chevron Oil refinery. The importance of this student/worker alliance lay in the solidarity and efforts made by the small striking organizations to create a collective consciousness and stronger political front. Harvey Dong explained how students supported the Richmond Oil Works Union by striking with them; workers, in turn, came to campus to support the students on campus (H. Dong, personal communication, August 2, 2007). This student/worker alliance is a profound reminder of the culture of solidarity that flourished in the 1960s, garnering victories for working class people from the United States to France and Mexico City.

On February 18, 1969, in Communiqué #5 flyer, the TWLF announced a mutual assistance pact with the workers at the Richmond Oil refinery. It stated that the Richmond Oil Works Union had voted to affiliate with the TWLF to support the campus struggle. The language employed is again reflective of the international mobilization against capitalism. The announcement stated,

Workers and students are beginning to realize that there is a common basis for their struggles against the same oppressive system. We must not limit our strike to the campus alone! We must gain POWER FOR THE PEOPLE on all fronts...LET US SHOW OUR
SOLIDARITY WITH OUR BROTHERS IN RICHOMD. JOIN THE PICKET LINE! SHUT IT DOWN!24

Additionally, locations for students to car pool to the Richmond refinery to support the workers on their picket lines were advertised for the following day’s protest. Flyers advocating these alliances were abundant in the archive, and they represent a critical legacy of the TWLF movement at UC Berkeley. They highlight the intersectional nature of the TWLF, pushing our understanding of this student protest beyond the limits of curricular development and empowerment toward an analysis that captures the holistic nature of the movement’s demands.

The AFSCME support of the TWLF provides some of the most critical discourse on the use of police violence and the role of employees in the student’s movement. In a flyer titled “Their Cause is Our Cause,” the AFSCME refused “to remain neutral in this crisis situation. We will not be the ‘good Germans’ of our time, turning our heads while certain ethnic groups are systematically and brutally excluded from the institutions, benefits and positions of power in our society.”25 The following week their language escalated and expanded to include the long history of Third World oppression in the U.S. Their declaration, titled, “The Enemy is the Same,” (Figure 4) read,

The Third World people are fighting for basic rights they have been denied for the past hundred years. They will not be silenced by threats, bribes, or token concessions. If the working people of this country look away while suppression of the Third World continues, we risk a full-scale civil war. We cannot fail to support their just demands.26

This show of solidarity is yet another example of how students and university employees identified linkages between racial oppression and capitalism on campus. During the first week of the strike, AFT membership began expressing their own oppression by the university. They aligned their mission with that of the TWLF. AFT membership stated university salaries were not competitive and that the University of California was “clearly one of the worst anti-union outfits around.”27 The longer the strike continued, the greater the crisis grew, culminating with the growing presence of police forces on campus during the month of February 1969.
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Are the Third World demands any of our business? AFSCME 1695 is demanding implementation of these demands. Why?

Our union was formed to give UC employees a voice in determining their working conditions. We are not willing to be unthinking cogs in the machinery: we want “self-determination” for employees, just as the Third World people want it for their communities. We are concerned about the policies we as employees must carry out at UC. Our efforts to be heard have been met with the same deaf ear encountered by the TWLP. We understand their frustration well.

Things are becoming more and more polarized. The wealthy and powerful interests in the state are grouping, not only to defend their position of power, but also to suppress the efforts by others to get a fair share of the pie. This country has enough wealth for everyone to have proper housing, food, clothing, health care, education, and leisure. But all Americans will not get their share without a struggle. Working people must take the side of the Third World in this fight, unless we want to let ourselves be played off against one another by the few people who have the real power.

The Third World people are fighting for basic rights they have been denied for the past hundred years. They will not be silenced by threats, bribes, or token concessions. If the working people of this country look away while suppression of the Third World continues, we risk a full-scale civil war. We cannot fail to support their just demands.

The college proposed by the Third World students and faculty is designed to meet the needs of their communities for leaders, managers, teachers, and organizers. These young Third World people must be trained now, so that they can guide and educate the generation now in high school and grade school. This is at the heart of the TWLP demands. It is a shame and a scandal that the University of California, which claims to serve the needs of the people of the state and takes taxes from the people irrespective of their color, does not already have such a college.

March 5, 1969

(labor donated)

UC Clerical, Technical, and Professional Employees
AFSCME Local 1695 Temporary headquarters: 2527 Dwight #10
849-1156

Figure 4- “The Enemy is the Same”
The Repressive State Apparatus: Creating a Crisis of Authority

In Chapter 4, I discussed the role of Antonio Gramsci’s concept of the ‘war of position’ in the struggle for liberating historically oppressed people. Robert Cox defines a ‘war of position’ as one that “slowly builds up the strength of the social foundations of a new state…creating alternative institutions and alternative intellectual resources within existing society” (Cox, 1983, p. 165). Previously, and here again, I argue that the TWLF represents a war of position for people of color: at the core of the movement is the student’s clear intention to create new educational institutions that will serve to empower historically marginalized communities, rather than oppress them. Additionally, the students themselves serve as the ‘alternative intellectual resources,’ along with those from their community with whom they collaborate in the creation of their new field of Ethnic Studies. The fear the TWLF created at SFSU and UC Berkeley was based on more than their apparent “radical” attire or method of self-defense; rather, it was the direct challenge to the long-standing ideologies and practices of the university that posed the greatest threat. Between the large protests, the picket lines and the oppressive use of State violence against students, the TWLF created a true ‘crisis of authority’ for the UC Berkeley administration.

Gramsci talks about the role of ‘crisis’ in many iterations in Selections from Prison Notebooks, from the crisis of Parliamentarism to the crisis of hegemony. For the purpose of analyzing the TWLF, I am appropriating his language of how: 1) ‘crisis’ can result in expedited and decisive structural change; and 2) how a crisis of hegemony and crisis of authority challenged the leadership of administrators at UC Berkeley, forcing the implementation of Ethnic Studies. I am well aware that Gramsci was not talking about changes in university structures or the hegemony of a specific location (college campus); however, I find that thinking in a ‘Gramscian way,’ as Stuart Hall has said, is useful for my analysis of the TWLF. In many ways I am shrinking down Gramsci’s theory of the State, at large, for one that focuses on the university as a mechanism of the State. It is important to note that the crisis created by the TWLF was the result of an earlier practice within both the institution and the State, one whose central goal was to prevent rebellion. As discussed in Chapter 4, efforts to assimilate African Americans and young G.I.’s returning from the war resulted in the growth and recruitment of students of color in higher education. This was expanded even more after the passage of the 1965 Civil Rights Act and the implementation of Affirmative Action in admission policies. However, against the intentions of the dominant class, some of these new recruits became the core organizers of the TWLF. Therefore, in the State’s effort to include the subaltern by giving them a greater stake in institutions of civil society - a tactic that is at the core of maintaining their dominant position - what resulted was the growth of a anti-hegemonic bloc. Unable to foresee the growth of anti-colonialism and the impact it would have on students of color in the first world, the State’s strategies of inclusion would eventually blowback against the UC Berkeley administration.

The students’ success in creating a crisis of authority was partially planned and partially the result of how the university chose to respond to student mobilization. The TWLF directly challenged paternalism, racism, and capitalism in hopes of creating a new educational space with liberation of subaltern peoples as their goal. The students were clear in their intention to shift the ideology of the university, resulting in the pursuit of a ‘war of position.’ While they did not explicitly use that language, my analysis of their strategies leads me to make the argument that the creation of Ethnic Studies was the result of a partially successful ‘war of position’ that led to
a crisis of authority for university administrators. In a liberal democracy such as the United States, Gramsci argued that the State maintained control through a balance of coercion and consent. When the oppressed no longer consent to participate in the dominant hegemony, or rather when they openly challenge it, then the State turns to coercion and violence to suppress the movement. In the university’s attempt to maintain control of the campus, both as a means of conducting business and due to great pressure from state leaders and politicians, they steadily increased the use of police and State forces. Ironically, for the administrators, the crisis escalated in favor of the TWLF the more the university tried to control the movement with agents of the Repressive State Apparatus (RSA), as Althusser called them (Althusser, 1974).

Between February 5 and 27, 1969, police used mace and tear gas on students and supporters, arresting over 150 students and suspending 36 (Wang). Neil Smelser was a 34 year-old faculty member in Sociology when he assumed the difficult position of liaison to student political affairs in January 1965, in the wake of the Free Speech Movement. In our interview, he described (from an administrative perspective) the conflict he felt whenever the police were called on campus to suppress the students. Dr. Smelser stated that during the Free Speech Movement, (a mostly white student protest), the administration was always nervous when they called in the Alameda Sheriff’s Department because “police ineptitude created a lot of problems, and particularly it was their excess that we feared... they were almost our enemy, but we needed them” (N. Smelser, personal communication, April 4, 2008). Dr. Smelser went on to detail the increased hostility and violence toward student activists he witnessed during TWLF. He claims that leadership on campus identified “irresponsible” students as Black. As a result, the police harassed African American students more often than their white counterparts. One night, the police physically assaulted two African American men Dr. Smelser was walking with before he was able to step in to explain that they were his students. He said, “The police were that hot, and the students were perceiving that. You see, there was a lot of violence in that strike; I observed a lot of it.” He continued, “So in a way, the police were more oriented to violence than I think then they were in earlier cases... They were more out of hand in the Third World strike” (N. Smelser, personal communication, April 4, 2008). This faculty perspective confirms what many TWLF students felt to be true - that the administration was aware of excessive violence at the hands of police, yet continued to deploy them on campus. This interview, in addition to the archival documentation of faculty complaints about police brutality, contributes to my analysis that the TWLF created a successful crisis of authority at UC Berkeley, resulting in the use of State violence to suppress their uprising.

Faculty disapproval over the use of state violence was clear throughout the TWLF strike. After witnessing a particularly disturbing attack on TWLF strikers by the Alameda Sheriff’s department, associate professor of plant pathology Fields Cobb wrote a scathing letter to the campus administration and community. In it he stated objectively that while the TWLF was blocking Sather Gate in violation of campus rules, the reaction of the police to frantically charge the peaceful protest resulted in

The worst kind of behavior, and that the timing of the arrests was extremely ill-advised…the viscous use of clubs was, at best, unnecessary. Based on my observations
on Thursday, February 27 and on an earlier occasion, the behavior of one deputy in particular seemed to be sadistic.\textsuperscript{28}

Cobb goes on to describe an encounter in which he was able to discourage some members of TWLF who wanted to confront the sheriffs after this incident. Numerous TWLF communiqué flyers remind activists to resist provocation by police, despite the “pigs’ continued wild rampage of brutal beatings and arrests.”\textsuperscript{29} The language in these flyers reflected both the culture of radical activism during the late 1960s and the intense conflicts in which students found themselves with agents of the state.

The University’s conflicting relationship with the police raises an important question about the ultimate use of violence on campus. While Dr. Smelser was no longer part of the administration during TWLF, his comments as a faculty member provide insight into how important it was for the administration to “restore order” despite campus concerns about police brutality. In fact, Governor Ronald Reagan, who had repeatedly condemned student activism at UCB, sent the National Guard to campus on February 27, 1969 (Figures 5-7), an act that made many on campus feel violated. Harvey Dong explained that the response to the National Guard actually resulted in more support for the TWLF, politicizing otherwise uninterested students and faculty. One example was the collective response of the Students of the School Librarianship, who penned a letter (Figure 8) to the campus administration, calling for the establishment of an Ethnic Studies Department, demanding that the Governor’s state of emergency be immediately rescinded, and stating “recent police action on this campus has resulted in personal injury and terror and for this very serious reason cannot be justified for any purpose.”\textsuperscript{30} The more the administration and state officials relied on the repressive state apparatus, the more the campus community rallied to end the strike. This is not to suggest that all those calling for the administration to meet the TWLF demands were in support of the new department, but rather, that the crisis of authority TWLF created at UC Berkeley was proving successful.

Many professors felt that the National Guard and use of violence was an intrusion on academia. However, university employees were also outspoken in their critique of police presence of campus. AFSCME Local 1695 created a pamphlet entitled, “Shut it down or give us combat pay,” (Figure 9), where they declared,

We cannot engage as business as usual when the campus has become a police state. Nor can the issues of TWLF dispute be settled when armed battles are pitched in Sproul Plaza…More police on campus will not mean protection for employees. On the contrary, every time police forces increase, the violence escalates.\textsuperscript{31}
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Over the course of the strike, the TWLF had the support of the local American Federation of Teachers 1570 (teaching assistants); AFT 1928 from SFSU; and the American Federation of Labor, AFSCME Local 1695 (clerical workers), who all agreed not to cross picket lines.

Figure 5- Tear Gas used against TWLF strikers at UC Berkeley
Figure 6- Alameda Sheriffs Making Arrest During TWLF February 1969
Figure 7- Arrest of Jaime Solis-Sager During TWLF Strike February 1969
In four open meetings of the students of the School of Librarianship, University of California, Berkeley, the following statements were adopted, and they constitute a revised and final expression of our views of the current situation on this campus:

1. We believe that the state of violence on this campus has reached an intolerable level and that no responsible person can any longer remain silent.

2. We condemn the irresponsible actions, unjust arrests, and vicious brutality that have been displayed by elements of the police contingents on this campus, especially the Alameda County Sheriff's deputies.

3. Although violence and brutality of any kind are unacceptable, brutality directed against persons is of a different and more deplorable nature than injury to property. Recent police action on this campus has resulted in personal injury and terror and for this very serious reason cannot be justified for any purpose.

4. We call on the administration to make every effort possible to have police action restrained to a level consistent with the law and with human justice.

5. We call upon the Faculty Senate, and particularly the Senate members of the School of Librarianship faculty, to take a stand on the issue of police brutality as they have previously taken a stand of the issue of student violence.

6. We urge the Faculty through the Academic Senate to proceed with all possible speed in the establishment of the proposed Department of Ethnic Studies.

7. We request that the state of emergency be rescinded immediately and that the use of police force be in the hands of the Chancellor.

8. We condemn all destructive and disruptive acts and urge the University administration, faculty, and strike leaders to seek an immediate solution to the issues underlying the campus situation.

Students of the School of Librarianship
University of California
Berkeley, California 94720
Figure 9- “Shut it down or give us combat pay”

Last week employees were tear-gassed, chased, hit by rocks, even beaten on this campus. When they voiced complaints, the administration denied responsibility. The police are in charge, we were told. Employees requested the Chancellor to invoke Rule 14.2f and send them home with pay. He failed to take any action, and workers have taken it upon themselves to invoke the rule, refusing to work under intolerable conditions.

We cannot engage in business as usual when the campus has become a police state. Nor can the issues of the TWLF dispute be settled when armed battles are pitched in Sproul Plaza.

Local 1695 demands the following from the administration:

1. In accordance with University Rule 14.2f, the campus must be closed, with full pay for all employees, until working conditions become tolerable.
2. A just resolution of the situation on campus by: an end to Reagan’s declaration of a “state of emergency”, implementation of the TWLF demands and the AFT 1570 demands; and removal of the police; unlawful arrests of peaceful union pickets halted and all current charges dropped.
3. Implementation of a comprehensive in-service training program emphasizing the training and promotion of third world employees; recruitment and new hiring of only third world applicants until minorities are fully represented in all departments and classifications.
4. Health plan fully paid by Regents.
5. Unemployment compensation.
7. Rights of employees to organize guaranteed,
   a. No firing except for due cause (including employees on probation)
   b. Negotiation sessions to end in formal, written agreements
   c. Payroll deduction of union dues
   d. Binding outside arbitration as the final step of the grievance procedure
8. Amnesty—no disciplinary action against any employee who has been out on strike at any time since the TWLF strike began.

Our members continue to support the AFT strike by refusing to cross the picket lines. We call upon those employees who are continuing to work not to do our
Additionally, the Richmond Oil Workers Union Local 1-561 sent members to the TWLF picket lines, and students reciprocated this show of solidarity. With mounting support from Berkeley High School students (Figure 10), local families, and numerous other UC Berkeley campus organizations, the administration was faced with a dilemma - continue to repress the TWLF and risk losing more campus support, or negotiate for the establishment of Ethnic Studies. With violence escalating, the TWLF released a flyer entitled, “Police Riot.” In it they address the violence of the police, the numerous unions and organizations that support the TWLF, and lastly, they clarify why they have chosen strategies that people may disagree with:

We recognize that we cannot expect the Administration to grant our demands without a struggle, because our demands challenge the power of the authorities of this state…The attempted repression of our strike attests to our effectiveness, the power of the people is threatening the authorities’ control…Together we will win!  

This moment of crisis, brought on by a failed effort of the dominant group to subsume students of color into the traditional university, reached its climax once a strong collective (or third world historical bloc) was formed by students and workers. Gramsci described a process wherein the masses organize themselves to become the agents of historical transformation and thus creators and leaders of a new historical bloc (Caruso & Nardis, 2011). While Gramsci was talking about the creation of new political parties and not social movements within the existing political structure, I am arguing that the TWLF at UC Berkeley and SFSU do represent a new historical bloc. This new bloc is a product of anti-colonial struggles in the third world and Black Power and Civil Rights Movements locally. It reflects a culture of radicalism that was beginning to permeate throughout historically oppressed communities in the United States. Therefore, the success of the TWLF was in creating a movement based on a wide range of issues that mobilized marginalized people across the campus and the local community. By definition, the TWLF created a crisis wherein the administration had to declare the campus “ungovernable” and bring in the National Guard. With this final act of violence - the occupation of a public university by military forces who dropped tear gas on the on the campus community (Figure 11) - the administration was forced to negotiate. With both national and international news coverage of the dissent, the crisis reached its peak in the first week of March 1969. It did not take long for the blowback to hit the President’s office once the National Guard was deployed. Ultimately, the TWLF was successful at garnering the strong community support they needed in order to negotiate an agreement with the University. Faced with mounting criticism, the administration was forced to make a decision to be able to return the university to operating status. Both the protestors’ persistence and the institutional need for order governed the administration’s ultimate response to the strike. On March 4, 1969, the Berkeley Division of the Academic Senate convened and voted in favor of the establishment of an Ethnic Studies Department that would report directly and only to the Chancellor, and that the structure
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Third World People at U.C. BERKELEY are on strike! We are waging a battle against institutional racism— that same racism which allows our people to be murdered by pigs in our communities— that same racism which allows thousands of our people to live and die in starvation— that same damn racism which has always robbed our communities and people of our principle human right— that of SELF-DETERMINATION.

The Third World Liberation Front at this university— including Blacks, Asians, Chicanos, and Native Americans— are soliciting your help and support in our liberation efforts. Some of our Third World Liberation Front demands which will directly benefit you high-school students in the near future include the following:

TWLF has requested these specific demands for immediate implementation:

1) Admission, financial aid, and academic assistance to any Third World student with potential to learn and contribute as assessed by Third World people.

2) 30 Work Study positions for the Chinatown and Manillatown projects, and 10 BOP counselors, including full-time Asian Coordinator.

3) Expansion of Work Study program jobs to the AASU East campus Berkeley High School Project, to include at least 30 positions.

As high school students, you stand in an effective position. First, the demand for a Third World College on the U.C. campus will benefit greatest those students who are now at the high school level. All of you will then have the choice of attending the University of California, and the ability of making that choice is a part of your own self-determination. As high school students you possess the ability to HELP IN THIS STRUGGLE. You can help to make sure that our people— Mothers, Fathers, Brothers, Sisters and Children— will possess the power of self-determination.

SUPPORT THE THIRD WORLD STRUGGLE THROUGH A ONE-DAY SYMPATHY STRIKE

POWER TO THIRD WORLD PEOPLE!
Figure 11- “Battle of Berkeley: A National Guard Helicopter Gasses the Campus”
“be of sufficient flexibility to permit evolution into a college.” On March 7, 1969, after meeting with President Nixon, UC Berkeley President Hitch approved the Department of Ethnic Studies, to begin instruction in the fall 1969 (Wang).

These moments, where subaltern communities challenged the power of the institution, represent the success that can be accomplished through a strategy of creating a crisis of authority. In one flyer, the TWLF is unequivocal in their demand that “racism must be eradicated in the University and in the society, and…we are forced to organize independently of the Regents and to challenge their power.” In that same flyer, they list “to end racism” as their first demand. By holding ‘guerilla warfare’ strategy sessions, the TWLF, and Asian American Political Alliance in particular, spread information about how a smaller group can defeat a more powerful enemy. Flyers from these series quoted Mao Tse Tung (Figure 12), providing further evidence of the influence of third world anti-colonialism, not only on the ideology of the TWLF, but also on their praxis. While the TWLF was successful in creating a crisis of authority for university administrators, they were limited in having all of their demands met. In the following chapter I will discuss some of these limitations and situate them in a Fanonian framework of post-independence struggle.

Women of the TWLF

The 1969, TWLF at UC Berkeley was an effort to decolonize the university modeled on the decolonization of the Third World. When arguing for the necessity of a decolonizing methodology, Linda T. Smith states, “The organization of school knowledge, the hidden curriculum and the representation of difference in texts and school practices all contain discourses which have serious implications for indigenous students as well as for other minority ethnic groups” (2012, p.11). TWLF activists took the organization of ‘school knowledge’ to which Smith refers very seriously. They envisioned the potential impact of their movement as vital to their liberation as internally colonized people. One of the greatest achievements of the TWLF was in building a powerful coalition of students and workers to address their interrelated oppression within a Eurocentric and capitalist institution. This student/worker alliance is an element of the movement that has not been thoroughly analyzed in previous scholarship, and it is my intention to centralize the importance of that union because the implications remain relevant today. Students and university employees make up the majority of the campus community, yet
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35 In Robert Allen’s book Black Awakening in Capitalist America (1969), the author argues that African Americans are a colonized population within the United States. He defines colonialism as a tool used to exploit people, land, and labor for profit by the dominating party. He argues that the colonizing power uses certain portions of colonized community to rule, as an early form of pacification and divide and conquer, and that those who helped the colonizing power are rewarded with meaningless but important sounding positions. Lastly he defines colonialism as a system that breaks and destroys the “native” culture. He uses the example of enslaved families’ that were shattered and torn apart, forced to practice a new religion and culture not their own. Based on that logic he states that African Americans live in the US under a system of domestic colonialism.
they have historically been denied voice and agency within the institution. Together these two groups have the power to seriously disrupt the operation of university: that lesson is one we must always remember. Another group that has been hidden in the archive and history of the TWLF at UC Berkeley are the women who made the movement possible. In my interviews with women of the TWLF I found that the factors that influenced their participation were more nuanced than for the men.

Most of the women I interviewed agreed that there was gender parody in regards to women’s devotion of time and labor to the TWLF. Women were active in meetings, organizing materials, preparing for events, and picketing; there were even a few women who negotiated with the administration. However, the strong sense of male chauvinism that permeated many nationalist movements of the 1960s was also present in the TWLF. It is important to note that the four groups of the TWLF each had a unique gender dynamic within their smaller circles. I have heard for years, anecdotally, that the Asian American Political Alliance was one of the more egalitarian organizations. Betty Kano spoke about the gender dynamics and explained that, “We [women] ended up doing more of the writing work and getting things organized and keeping things maintained… The guys kind of made more strategic decisions, but among the Asian Americans we did meet in a room together, kind of loosely, it wasn’t that hierarchical. In a way women did have a level of influence” (B. Kano, personal communication, June 7, 2012). Chicana TWLF members reflected on more experiences of sexism they faced with the machismo of male members in the Mexican American Student Confederation. Lucha Corpi elaborates,
Certainly during the time during that you had to walk the picket line, women were there just as much, and as present as the men. But in other areas there wasn’t that much equality. Again, it was a nationalistic movement…But certainly there were certain expectations women were supposed to do what the men said. The male point, the Chicano point, was the voice of the movement, of that nationalistic movement. We all as women understood that that was part of it: that we had to rally together. But at the same time, they were expecting us to just do as told and that was just no longer possible...There was hardly no equality in that sense” (L. Corpi, personal communication, June 7, 2012).

The Native American Party was founded and led by LaNada Warjack, who felt she was not only respected by members of her organization, but also by the male leadership of the other three groups. LaNada explained that

They [men] always had three or four male leaders in their organizations, and it was just me…I know they always recognized the Native American component, whether I was male or female. I don’t think they regarded me as less. I think that they always recognized me and the Native American students, even though there was only a few of us (L. Warjack, personal communication, February 18, 2016).

LaNada Warjack also shared stories of bringing her young son to meetings and protests and the impact that had on the movement. On one particular occasion, CBS was supposed to do a special show on the ‘militant TWLF.’ She explained,

So we went over there and I had my son with me, a little boy, he was about 2 years old. Of course the guys were playing with him and we were all laughing, we were not the image that they wanted. They wanted to see this militant group of men with their egos. Maybe with me and my son it kind of softened up the group. They didn’t go with their special on us because were not projecting that militant image that they wanted. I know that just the presence of a child changed that whole interaction with each other…They didn’t want to see us as good people. I think it was really important to have that input and image of a woman and a child. Along with all those forces we had working together, you have the women and children there, too” (L. Warjack, personal communication, February 18, 2016).

Like many movements of the era, gender politics were complicated and varied, based on the multitude of personalities and even the circumstances of the day. Beyond their relationships with men in the TWLF, most of the women interviewed discussed the community building among women that was crucial to the development in third world feminism.

Women in the Asian American Political Alliance were publishing articles about women’s issues, and their critiques reflect the burgeoning rise of third world feminism. In the November 1969 AAPA Newsletter, half of the publication was devoted to Women’s Liberation. They discussed the low enrollment of women in the university, high drop out rates, disappointing employment status in menial positions, and the persistence of male chauvinism transplanted from the ‘homeland,’ only to be combined with American patriarchy. They challenged the notion that ‘women have it better today,’ and pushed for gender equality in radical circles. “If Asians really
care about freedom, we must concern ourselves with the women’s liberation struggle.” Again, different elements of the TWLF were addressing issues of sexism based on the members and activities of that organization. Lucha Corpi explained that a lot of the Chicanas were writers and poets, but the male leadership often dismissed their art. At times the men would invite the Chicanas to their poetry night as a form of tokenism. She explains the irony of this position given that

The interesting thing is that Chicanos were always saying that we are the tokens [in the institution]. Well, we [women] were the tokens of the tokens in that sense. They didn’t give much importance to our arts; they felt it was nice for us to have a hobby. It was nice that we were doing these things, but they were not giving very much attention to us…(L. Corpi, personal communication, June 7, 2012).

Corpi goes on to explain that through this alienation, Chicana women began to flourish on their own, and for the next generation there was a growth of published Chicana writers and poets. She concluded,

In a way it was a blessing that we were ignored because then we could pretty much set things to what we liked to do and the direction in which we wanted to go, and it wasn’t always the direction of the movement (L. Corpi, personal communication, June 7, 2012).

It is clear that women in the TWLF were living with the consequences of what Patricia Hill Collins refers to as ‘the matrix of domination.’ Collins complicates and challenges the previously used “additive approach” of Standpoint Theory, arguing that Black Feminist Thought sees all forms of oppression (gender, race, class, religion) as part of a larger structure of domination. Thus, she exemplifies how Black women challenge multiple spheres of domination everyday (2000, p. 203). Women in the TWLF had to face the racism, capitalism, and paternalism along side their male comrades; however, they also experienced sexism both from internal and external forces. It is no surprise that in the years following the establishment of Ethnic Studies, cutting edge courses focused on women’s issues such as “Issues in Domination: Race and Sex-An introduction,” “Third World Women,” and “Asian Women in America” were created. The TWLF was followed by many other efforts to change and expand curriculum. In 1970 Ruth Rosen taught the first Women’s History seminar, following energized women’s protests on campus that started in 1969 and continued into the early 1970’s. In Sociology, Pauline Bart and Arlie Hochschild explored new fields of study and created groundbreaking courses on the sociology of women and the family. Gradually, most departments in the humanities and social sciences fielded new courses that investigated race and gender issues. In 1976, the Women’s Studies program was founded at UC Berkeley, gaining departmental status in 1991. In 1986, June Jordan joined the faculty in African American Studies, and through her activism, poetry, and scholarship, she paved the way for many women of color at UC Berkeley. Her acclaimed

36 Third World Strike at University of California, Berkeley collection, CES ARC 2015/1 Ethnic Studies Library, University of California, Berkeley. Location: 1.42 TWLF box 1 Folder 42 December 68-Feb 1970- Organizations: Asian American political Alliance- newspaper Vol. 1 No. 1 - Vol. 2 no. 2
37 Course Catalogue “Department of Ethnic Studies Fall ‘75 Courses” Ethnic Studies Library-not catalogued.
course “poetry for the people” represents a snapshot of Berkeley during a particularly powerful moment for women of color. In many ways, the women of the TWLF forged a path that benefitted those most marginalized in our society, women of color. To them I dedicate this chapter.

Conclusion

The subject matter of this chapter centralizes the experiences of people of color, and of women of color within the university, as well as their movement to assert their humanity in a society that constantly sought to dehumanize them. The Third World Liberation Front was one of many events in the longue durée of activism initiated and carried out by people of color, wherein education was seen as a crucial tool with which the oppressed could achieve liberation. Using oral histories as the living archive of TWLF activists and primary source archival documents collected during the movement, I analyzed the complicated relationship between students, university administrators, and agents of state violence. The audience for my dissertation consists of those interested in the fight for social and racial justice within the academy, institutions of education, and beyond. This research illustrates a blueprint - a successful case study from which to learn how people of color can become active agents in their society and give voice to the silenced. The success of TWLF reaches far beyond the university system it changed, both ideologically and structurally. This movement, an example of successful student/worker organizing and activism, also speaks to the universality of institutional oppression shaped by white supremacy and capitalism, and to the importance of strategic resistance and alliances when working to achieve radical social change with material consequences.

Ronald Bailey, in his essay *Black Studies in Historical Perspective*, extrapolates on this concept in relation to the Black Studies movement, saying,

> The use of the term Black Studies is by implication an indictment of American and Western European scholarship. It makes a bold assertion that what we have heretofore called ‘objective’ intellectual activities were actually white studies in perspective and content; and that a corrective of bias, a shift in emphasis, is needed, even in something called ‘truth’ is set as the goal (2001, p. 229).

By challenging the European cannon, TWLF activists successfully created liberatory curriculum and pedagogy within Ethnic Studies. Establishing a department was only the first step in a long process toward achieving self-determination in their education. TWLF members were not naive about the difficulties they would face ahead. In many ways, their project remains unfinished. In the first Ethnic Studies course catalogue published, the opening page reads: “Under no circumstances should it be assumed that our strike has ended...Our struggle for self-determination has just begun.”

> The TWLF and subsequent creation of Ethnic Studies challenged the Eurocentric ideology of the university structure, demanding that politically relevant non-Eurocentric forms of knowledge be included in the institution, and that People of Color have the self-determination and autonomous control of their department. The creation of programs like Ethnic Studies thus
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represent a decolonial shift. In *The Idea of Latin America* (2005), Walter Mignolo defines a
decolonial shift as the ending the ideological cycle where modernity is seen as the goal. Instead,
this sea-change moment advances a space in which “‘modernity’ is decolonized…and the
‘monologue’ of one civilization (Western) is no longer enforced” (xix). This insertion of multiple
perspectives on civilization and history - from the positionality of the oppressed - puts the
decolonial shift into action through the creation of liberatory curriculum and pedagogy via the
Third World Liberation Front movement that began at San Francisco State University, and
quickly spread to UC Berkeley.

In the following chapter, I delve into the details of how the Department of Ethnic Studies
was developed in the wake of the TWLF. Born out of a tumultuous student protest, the newly
formed department faced many institutional roadblocks in its effort to manifest the vision
developed almost a year earlier. Through a Freirian lens, I will discuss the achievements and
limitations of education as liberation for historically marginalized communities within
Eurocentric institutions. Against their vision, the TWLF was forced to develop a Department
rather than a College of Ethnic Studies; I will discuss the implications of this concession for their
goal of creating a decolonial space within the university. Lastly, I will engage with Frantz Fanon
to critique the ways in which the dominant ideologies of white supremacy and capitalism
prevented the Department of Ethnic Studies from achieving its full radical potential.
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“During decolonization the people were called upon to fight against the oppression. Following national liberation they are urged to fight against poverty, illiteracy, and under development. The struggle, they say, goes on. The people realize that life is an unending struggle.”

-Frantz Fanon (2004) *The Wretched of the Earth*
Introduction

In this chapter, my goal is to weave theory and history into a narrative that addresses the complex realities surrounding the establishment of Ethnic Studies at UC Berkeley. This chapter engages with relevant theory to explain the ideological dynamics involved in trying to implement radical changes to an institution grounded in the dominant ideologies of capitalism and white supremacy, as well as the technical aspects of program development. The driving research questions for this chapter are: *What kind of space was the Ethnic Studies Department able to establish in the wake of the TWLF? What purpose did Ethnic Studies serve in the long durée of historically oppressed communities fighting for their self-determination in opposition to the dominant class?*

I use a theoretical construct to help to explain the relationship between the administration and the new Ethnic Studies Department. Given that Ethnic Studies was a new area of study committed to making education relevant for historically oppressed peoples, a theoretical framework can also illuminate what political and ideological concepts influenced the new curricula, and how the new content of the Ethnic Studies Department was taught.

In Part I, “Creating a Space for Race within the Ivory Tower,” I employ a Lefebvrian spatial analysis to explain the significance of the TWLF and their achievement in creating a separate politically radical space within the university. I engage with Linda Tuhiwai Smith’s notion of decolonial scholarship to situate the vision and mission of the new department in the context of resisting the larger colonial project of the university. Analyzing the struggles that the newly formed department faced in creating technical systems and structures that fit their vision for self-determination, I delineate the challenges the TWLF experienced attempting to create a decolonial space within a traditional university while being confronted with many institutional limitations.

Part II, “Revolutionary Praxis & Curricula: Education as Liberation,” is dedicated to examining the pedagogy and curricula that developed during the first ten years of the Ethnic Studies Department. I utilize the archive of course offerings and university documents - in addition to scholarship of critical educators - to discuss both the outcome of the TWLF and the impact of the liberatory curricula and pedagogy developed within the Ethnic Studies department.

In this chapter I define the TWLF as an anti-hegemonic movement that created a radical ideological bloc comprised of historically oppressed students and workers demanding self-determination and liberation. A movement is anti-hegemonic when social and sub-cultural groups resist being dominated by the hegemonic social and political forces in power (Ramesh, p. 5). Ethnic Studies, then, is more anti-hegemonic than counter-hegemonic, if counter-hegemonic is defined as "organized social challenge that eventually replaces the former political order" (ibid). The difference lays in the degree to which the shift in ideology was successful in changing the structure of the university and those in power. Although the TWLF changed higher education through the implementation of new curriculum and pedagogy, it failed to replace the political order or structure of the University. In fact, it is precisely because the structure and ideology remained intact that the stability of Ethnic Studies as a field continues to be undermined. The current proposal to cut 40% of the funding to the SFSU College of Ethnic Studies; the debate surrounding Ethnic Studies in K-12 education: both serve as prime examples of how the field of Ethnic Studies remains undervalued and controversial. The Third World Liberation Front *did* challenge Eurocentrism, white supremacy, and capitalism - but it was not successful in replacing those ideologies across the UC Berkeley campus or within higher education more broadly. It did however force the university to start addressing the topic of student, staff, faculty and curricular diversity, a topic which has continued to grow in discourse over the years.
Ethnic Studies was built upon a deeply political foundation that connected students who challenged the dominant hegemonic narratives on their campus to larger international movements engaged in shifting power dynamics in the Third World. Brent Hayes Edwards centers an important and often overlooked history regarding the link between the use of the term African Diaspora and its connections to Pan-Africanism, internationalism, the creation of Black Studies, and African anti-colonialism of the 1950’s and 60’s (Edwards, p. 49). Edwards supports the students’ claims that Ethnic Studies (or Black Studies, as was his focus) constitutes an “epistemological challenge” (p. 56) to the American academy. Moreover, Black Studies - and the concept of the African Diaspora in the United States - is deeply intertwined with anti-colonial movements abroad.

The purpose of this chapter is to situate the achievements and limitations of creating an Ethnic Studies department under great pressure, and with little resources. As the last chapter of my dissertation, this conversation concludes my brief analysis of over three hundred years of struggle for people of color in the United States. It represents the moment when all of the work committed to making education available and meaningful for these communities was realized within the academy. It also addresses those dreams that remain unfulfilled, and the need for continued efforts to fight against the inequity and racial oppression that still exists.

**Part I: Creating a Space for Race within the Ivory Tower**

“…resistance often works outside the law and uses violence in order literally to take space. As Mitchell (1995) shows, this spatial politics allows marginalized groups to create ‘spaces of representation’ through which they can represent themselves to the wider public and insert themselves in the discourses of the bourgeois public sphere.”

Eugene McCann (1999). *Race, Protest, and Public Space: Contextualizing Lefebvre in the U.S.*

The TWLF identified self-determination as the most important demand in their struggle and the guiding factor in their vision for creating a Third World College. They defined self-determination as the right and ability of Third World people to control Third World spaces in all aspects - from staffing to course content. In the aftermath of the strike, students were tasked with adjusting their vision of creating an Ethnic Studies college to the reality of a creating a department. Immediately, the concept of space- of autonomous space and power - had to be reevaluated, given this new institutional constraint. As the quote above reflects, the TWLF is a perfect example of a marginalized peoples taking space initially denied them to create a ‘space of representation’ where they would be empowered to accurately write themselves into history.

In this section I will utilize Lefebvre’s concept of ‘abstract space,’ specifically via its articulation in Eugene McCann’s article *Race, Protest, and Public Space* (1999). Here, I will use theory to understand the conditions that the Ethnic Studies Department faced, calling upon Linda Tuhiwai Smith’s argument that theory “helps us to interpret what is being told to us, and to predict the consequences of what is being promised” (2012, p. 40). Such an application of theory is perfect for this moment in the department’s history, due to the TWLF’s constant struggle to actualize the promises and recommendations put forth by the administration during the strike. Just as the TWLF strike represented a challenge to the dominant hegemony of the university, the establishment of a physical space that housed Ethnic Studies has also been highly contested by the administration.

In this section I identify the University as a place of ‘abstract space,’ one that Henry Lefebvre (1991) argues “implies a tacit agreement, a non-aggression pact, a contract, as it were, of non-
violence…each individual is supposed not to attack those he [sic] meets; anyone who transgresses this law is deemed guilty of a criminal act...” (McCann, 1999, p.169). This agreement has been held historically between a mostly white upper class male population of students, faculty, staff and administrators at UC Berkeley - albeit endemic to higher education in general, as well. Complying with this agreement benefitted most agents within the institution in many ways, as power was being reproduced from one generation of the dominant group to the next. As campus demographics diversified during the 1950s and 60s, suddenly the homogeneity began to be comprised, and new contracts were required. Ultimately, when students of color decided that their needs were not being met, they broke the ‘non-aggression’ pact and formed the TWLF.

Lefebvre’s important contributions to the role of power and public space render his work very useful for a critical examination of anti-capitalist and anti-colonial movements in public educational settings. Lefebvre also belongs to the same French Marxist tradition and epoch as Louis Althusser. Lefebvre’s seminal text, The Production of Space, was published in 1974, just three years after Althusser’s Lenin and Philosophy, which I analyzed in Chapter 4. Both authors critically analyze power and ideology: their work speaks well to each other in my overall project. While Lefebvre’s work was concerned mostly with critiquing power and space from a traditional Marxist and Eurocentric framework, scholars such as Eugene McCann have taken up the important project of appropriating Lefebvre’s analytic to include race and gender.39

I argue that the university reflects and acts through the concept of ‘abstract space’ because it meets the requirement that “the production of abstract space is to render it ahistorical, devoid of any indications of the social struggles around its production, or traces of the concrete space it replaces” (McCann, 1999, p. 168). Specifically, the university relies on subjects who do not question the colonial legacy of American higher education, (as discussed in Chapter 4), or the fact that all “public” land in the United States was acquired through the violence of white settler colonialism. This history of white settler colonialism not only resulted in the loss of land and the genocide of indigenous peoples, but alternatively, it resulted in the hegemonic notion that white people were unquestionably entitled to the land (Razack, 2002). The legacy of this entitlement plays out in the university, especially when people of color demand power and space.

During the strike, the TWLF had decided that a college was the ideal space for this new field. As one document stated, “Most existing university faculty and departments have had a century or more in which to develop multi-ethnic approaches…but they have been largely unable to do so because of their own ethnocentric, ‘culture-bound’ values…These same faculties cannot now be expected to do a good job with the kinds of courses which they have in the past rejected or failed to consider as ‘academically worthy’ subjects.”40

From its inception, the Department of Ethnic Studies at UC Berkeley faced many difficulties in establishing itself as a space autonomous from the rest of the university. The reality of institutionalized racism had genuine consequences for students of color. Professor of Ethnic Studies and TWLF supporter Elaine Kim shared a similar sentiment, connecting the desire for autonomy to the anti-colonial culture that influenced the strike. After the TWLF, those who had been admitted to traditional programs were
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more confident than ever in the need for culturally and politically relevant curriculum, something denied to them in their home departments. Dr. Kim also stated that any anti-colonial model of the time, such as that in Algeria, would have never advocated putting Algerian Studies in the French Department. In an interview she elaborated, “It had to be autonomous. It had to be something where we would make the decisions of who was qualified to teach... not the way they viewed relevant education, it would have been great” (E. Kim, personal communication, July 25, 2007). Kim’s statement reveals the importance of having a separate department, as part of an effort to decolonize Ethnic Studies and differentiate it from the colonial history of the rest of the university. It also reveals a sense of disappointment in not achieving a truly independent college.

On March 4, 1969, the Academic Senate voted 550 to 5 to support the creation of an Ethnic Studies Department that reported directly to the chancellor - one flexible enough to eventually grow into a college. In July 1969, the chancellor created an advisory committee to make recommendations for the new Ethnic Studies department, and professor Troy Duster was selected as its chair (Taylor, 2010). By October 1969, however, Duster had resigned from his position due to lack of clarity from the administration regarding policies and procedures, funding resources, and a general feeling that the committee was “hollow” in its capacity (Taylor, 2010). Furthermore, Duster published an article in the Daily Californian following these events in November 1969 entitled, “In Search of the Third World.” Professor Ula Taylor’s powerful article, “Origins of African American Studies at UC-Berkeley,” highlights Duster’s critiques succinctly:

Duster believed that it would take at least two years to stabilize and “an atmosphere of tight controls and suspicious overseeing will produce a delayed reaction that seeks to obtain more naked political power” (Duster 1969). It was hard for Duster to imagine Third World students not interpreting “their constrictions of movement as the manacles of political powers that want to go as slow as possible, or that want to go nowhere at all” (Duster, 1969, as cited in Taylor, 2010, p. 259).

In the March and April of 1990, UC Berkeley student Julie Tover conducted interviews with eight people involved in the establishment of Ethnic Studies, including Vice Chancellor Roderick Park, Afro-American Studies coordinator William Banks, and professors Elaine Kim, Margaret Wilkerson, Clyde Taylor, Clara Sue Kidwell, Roy Thomas and Reginald Jones. Throughout this chapter I will refer to these interviews because Julie Tover gleaned some very important insight from key administrators and faculty involved during this tumultuous period in the department’s history. The early interactions between the administration and advocates of Ethnic Studies exemplify the challenges that the department faced in trying to establish a strong foundation.

During the fall quarter of 1969, the Ethnic Studies department worked tirelessly to pull their programs together. Taylor states how they “recruited faculty and staff, gathered teaching materials, and learned University regulations...The staff worked extremely hard, sometimes between 60 and 80 hours per week” (Taylor, 2010, p. 259). Despite these efforts, some members of the department felt that their work was in vain, due to the over-arching power of the chancellor to either approve or veto their decisions.

Lucha Corpi, who had worked on campus as an administrative assistant prior to and during the
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TWLF, joined the Ethnic Studies Department as part of their staff. In an interview she expressed her frustration negotiating with the administration:

In terms of how the administration viewed the department, how we were doing, and our dealings with it as an executive committee in charge of hiring faculty and other staff and in terms of formulating curriculum and things like that, it was always like pulling teeth. They were not going to give us anything that we wanted the way we needed it. It was always a question of money, always a question of mistrust. That’s basically it. They did not trust that we could get it together. They kept stalling and kept going around. They led us to believe one thing, then they would change their minds. It was just very difficult to deal with the administration (L. Corpi, personal communication, June 12, 2012).

In 1974, professor Clara Sue Kidwell was hired to teach in the Native American Studies program. Although this was more than four years after the establishment of the department, her perspective about how the administration viewed Ethnic Studies is relevant here. Kidwell expressed that when she first arrived she felt that “…the administration sort of wanted Ethnic Studies to go away, and felt that if they simply ignored it, it would indeed go away…I think the University's attitude was what I could call a kind of benign neglect. ‘Leave them alone, let them fight it out, they'll eventually do themselves in, and they will go away. And if they succeed, well, then we'll deal with that when it happens’” (Clara Sue Kidwell, interviewed by Julie Tover, April 3, 1990).

These narratives help contextualize my argument that the administration did not reinforce the growth and vision the TWLF had fought for and that the Academic Senate had voted to support. It is also important, however, to remember that there was no precedent for establishing a department in this manner. Reflecting on whether the Academic Senate included the statement about the potential development of a Third World College as a means to end the strike, former Vice Chancellor Roderick Park shared these administrative insights:

Obviously there were many motivations among the faculty at that time...there was a huge range of ideas both pro and con. In retrospect a lot of people were uncomfortable with the way things had been developing: they really didn't know how to deal with the issue. I think some of them honestly thought this was the right thing, others were sort of consumed with guilt of some kind...some people did it because they thought ‘God...just give them a piece of the action over there somewhere and don’t bother me.’ It had all those elements in it (Roderick Park, interview by Julie Tover, March 26, 1990).

During the early years of program development - when student and faculty radicalism was at its peak - the relationship between the administration and the department reflected a deep ideological chasm. For the administration to meet the needs and comprehend the vision of the new department, they would have had to shift: 1) their understanding of power; 2) the purpose of higher education for historically oppressed communities; and 3) their role as participants in settler colonialism, a project they have yet to fulfill.

In 2009 the Department of Ethnic Studies at UC Berkeley conducted a Self-Study (referred henceforth as Self-Study). This document provides very useful data on the institutional history of the department, specifically regarding the decades-long struggle to find a suitable “location” for Ethnic Studies within the University. What is clear from the Self-Study is that since its inception until 2009
(when the Self-Study was published), Ethnic Studies at UC Berkeley was granted very little support to grow into a healthy department, much less a college. For example, the department did not have its first full time faculty member until Ronald Takaki, in 1971; the first chair of Ethnic Studies Carl Mack was so overwhelmed trying to run four programs that he retired by the end of his first year (Self-Study, 2009). Until full-time faculty members were hired, graduate students with master’s degrees mostly taught the early courses: they were actually the ones responsible for getting Takaki hired (E. Kim, personal communication, March 25, 2016).

The early years reflect both the ideology of the TWLF but also the challenges of trying to create a radical space within a traditional institution. Elaine Kim explains how this dynamic played out:

> everybody collected a salary and then we put it in the pool and we divided it so that the people who were secretaries got the same amount as the people who were lecturers.
> Everybody worked only half time, because everybody was supposed to spend half time in the community...It was a little haphazard” (Elaine Kim, interviewed by Julie Tover, March 26, 1990).

Eventually, the pooling of salaries in Asian American Studies failed, and the half-time status prevented the department from attaining full-time faculty, something that was necessary for stability and representation in the Academic Senate. Kim continues, "I was told to go back and get my Ph.D. and I did because people said that if I didn't get a Ph.D., I couldn’t get a regularized position..." (ibid). These details are important because they reflect the diversity of complex issues that the newly formed department was up against. Ethnic Studies was trying to create new systems and structures different from those based on traditional capitalist hierarchies, yet the changes they made within their space were in opposition to the rest of the university culture and practices.

In 1972, the university created the Collins Committee to conduct the first of three external reviews of Ethnic Studies: their overall recommendations were that the university should be put in charge of curricula, faculty, and overall management of the department (Wang, cited in Self-Study, 2009). These recommendations reflect the persistence of the administration’s paternalistic attitude towards the field and the newly formed department. The entitlement of the dominant group is also relevant here, in that they still thought they knew more about what this new field needed to flourish than those responsible for its creation. After less than two years as a department, it had already been determined that the faculty and staff were incapable of managing their affairs. Here it seems Duster’s predictions about the administration constricting movement and growth were confirmed.

In 1970, the first chair of Ethnic Studies, Carl Mack, established an Executive Committee to develop a plan for the college. In 1974, and again in 1976, the department submitted proposals for a College of Ethnic Studies. Despite initial support for the effort in 1969, all such proposals were rejected by the administration (Self-Study, 2009). Year after year, the dream of establishing a college appeared less likely: even the recommendations of the external review committees for expansion into a Division of Ethnic Studies never materialized. After the Collins Committee recommendations, the campus Provost, Roderick Park, decided that he would negotiate the Ethnic Studies department’s budget separately, by each individual program, rather than as a whole (Wang, cited in Self-Study, 2009).

With the idea of a college rejected and the programs scrambling over funding, in 1972 the Bowker administration designated William Banks, who was one of many instructors in the program, as the Afro-American Studies coordinator. By dismissing Ron Lewis, who had served as the Afro-American coordinator since the program’s inception, the Bowker administration broke the 1969 TWLF agreement by bypassing faculty and student input when making their decision (Taylor, 2010).
reasons for dismissing Lewis - from the administration’s perspective - was that Lewis was misusing funds, and that he had established a culture of intimidation within the program. Almost immediately there were rumors that this decision was based on the Chancellor’s desire to move Afro-American Studies to the College of Letters and Sciences, a claim the administration denied. In an interview in 1990, Vice Chancellor Roderick Park described the administration’s position on Banks’ appointment:

Bowker…I’m sure, considered eliminating the program because of the way it was going, but he had decided instead to fire Ron Lewis…and he asked me to sit down with some of the elements and some of the people in there, Banks and others, to try and turn it around, to move it more in the University direction (Roderick Park, interviewed by Julie Tover, March 26, 1990).

There are multiple perspectives on Ron Lewis’ abilities as a coordinator; however, what I want to emphasize is the clear manipulation on the part of the Administration to determine the future of Ethnic Studies.

Unilateral decisions about leadership such as this led to student and faculty protests of Afro-American courses generally, and a boycott of Banks’ classes the following term. Two weeks after the protests, all of the locks in the Afro-American Studies program were changed; two administrators were moved to other campus departments. Banks was ‘cleaning house,’ and described the personnel changes as necessary, in order for him, “to have someone I could have confidence in to help implement my program” (Lenhart, 1972, cited in Taylor, 2010, p. 260).

By describing Afro-American Studies as ‘his program,’ it is clear that a fundamental philosophical shift was about to occur: the solidarity the TWLF had been built upon was quickly eroding. Despite continued protests by the Black Student Union and numerous faculty concerns, Banks rebuilt the department with faculty from prestigious universities, quickly shaping it into a more “traditional” discipline. Finally, in the spring of 1974, Banks put forth a proposal to move Afro-American Studies into the College of Letters and Science. Again, protests erupted: a letter from the Chancellor to Banks promised tenure, “not primarily on the basis of scholarship, for you will have little time for that, but primarily on the basis of your administrative work” (Young, 1974, cited in Taylor, 2010, p. 261), leaving many feeling that Banks’ appointment had been premised on his role of extracting Afro-American Studies from the Ethnic Studies Department. On October 14, 1974 the move was approved; Banks received his tenure, despite having no book publications (Taylor, 2010). When asked about why he put forth this proposal, Banks shared that he and others had felt that the program needed to be institutionalized; Banks thought the move meant that “Afro-American Studies would be permanent on this campus…in a way that you don’t have to worry if a ‘good’ chancellor is coming in” (William Banks, interviewed by Julie Tover, March 20, 1990). The argument that Ethnic Studies was more vulnerable because it reported directly to the Provost and Chancellor was a legitimate concern, due to the high probability that a new administration would not be supportive of the Ethnic Studies Department’s radical efforts. However, most students and faculty within Ethnic Studies in the first decade did favor their unique agreement.

As the Self-Study (2009) notes, with the loss of Afro-American Studies, the remaining three programs of Ethnic Studies continued to think of ways to grow their curricula, eventually creating the Comparative Ethnic Studies program in 1975. In 1980, the second external review took place, and there
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42 In his 1990 interview with Julie Tover, William Banks stated that he regretted accepting the position as coordinator during that controversial time, although he did feel that he made many positive contributions.
were more recommendations for growth into a division or absorption into the college, with each program becoming a department. However, no such developments were ever approved by the administration. Additionally, the recommendation from the 1972 Collins committee that each program be granted six FTE’s (full-time employees) was also never achieved. Despite the creation of a PhD in Comparative Ethnic Studies in 1984, no additional FTE’s were approved. Year after year, the department struggled to offer more courses, despite never gaining the faculty continuously recommended by the administration’s own external review committees. Finally, in 1992, the last Ethnic Studies external review was completed: while they did approve a research center, they did not recommend a division or more FTE’s. The last effort to find an institutional ‘home’ or location for Ethnic Studies, again proposing their own division, came in 1993 and was rejected by Provost Carol Christ. Instead, she pushed for a move to the College of Letters and Science (Self-Study, 2009). In 1995, the department faculty voted to join the College of Letters and Science. Despite agreeing to Provost Christ’s recommendations, shortly after the move, the department of Ethnic Studies was told they “would have to merge and downsize its programs and staff” (Wang, cited in Self-Study, 2009, p. 63).

Although there are many more institutional moments that are important in understanding the relationship between the Ethnic Studies Department and the administration, I have chosen to focus on those that relate specifically to the struggle to establish a physical location or ‘space’ for the department after the TWLF. Thus, I will now return to the spatial analysis that opened this section. One could interpret the desire to move Ethnic Studies into the College of Letters and Science as an act of inclusion by the dominant administrative group - an invitation to have a stake in “their” public space. Given the circumstances surrounding the move - the fact that the department’s wishes to have their own college or division were continuously rejected - and that, upon joining the College of Letters and Science, their programs were cut, there is enough evidence to indicate that the move was not an act of investment in Ethnic Studies. Elaine Kim reflected that Ethnic Studies was always in a precarious position within the university; she stated it was “always an unwelcome interloper in the institution” (Elaine Kim, interviewed by Julie Tover, March 26, 1990).

The legacy of the TWLF is complicated when analyzing their ability to secure ‘spaces of representation’ (Mitchell, 1995; Smith, 1992) or ‘counter-spaces’ (Lefebvre, 1991) where the interests of the historically marginalized are institutionally validated and empowered. In a literal sense, the very existence of the department means that they did achieve a ‘space of representation,’ where the histories of people of color are taught and legitimated in academia. Yet, a more critical examination of power and self-determination reflect the limitations of trying to create a decolonial space within a colonial institution. Without a shift in the dominant ideology of the university, the Ethnic Studies Department remained in a precarious situation. They relied on the institution for the support and approval of major decisions; and yet, they were trying to act in a manner fundamentally different from those in power.

The establishment of an Ethnic Studies Department at UC Berkeley can definitely be read as a ‘counter-space’ that challenged the preconceived definitions of how public space, such as a university, should be used. In the following section I will analyze the innovative curricula and pedagogy that the department created, which further supports that the spaces where Ethnic Studies were taught actually influenced the development of new theory and praxis focused on the experiences of the subaltern. I think it is equally important, however, to note the limitations of what Lefebvre described as an ongoing process wherein the State and capital are constantly trying to maintain a homogenous abstract space (1991). Similar to the process wherein the State allows the subaltern to influence the dominant hegemony just enough to prevent them from feeling alienated and possibly rebelling, the university is also capable of conceding a certain amount of space to marginalized groups in response to their protests.
Both situations reflect the adaptation of State power, which has learned to be more flexible, and the dialectical nature of hegemony, that balances coercion and consent to maintain its power.

Both the extraction of Afro-American Studies from Ethnic Studies and the absorption of Ethnic Studies into the College of Letters and Science reflect a dynamic of fierce opposition, and eventual reluctant acceptance: what was once protested against was eventually consented to. One of the biggest challenges for student movements, especially those led by historically marginalized peoples, is that students are transitory and the administration is much more permanent. Of course leadership changes within the institution, but most people selected to positions of power uphold the ideology and culture of their predecessors unless they are brought in expressly to create a shift. This dynamic has resulted in the administration having additional power to ‘wait out’ any particular protests they do not want to address. By analyzing the events discussed in this first section, a pattern emerges regarding the relationship between TWLF/Ethnic Studies Department and the administration. Despite numerous attempts to incorporate the recommendations of academic committees, ultimately the administration chose to proceed with the plan they deemed most suitable, reflecting the paternalism that the TWLF had challenged in 1969.

The demand for self-determination, specifically as it relates to the power of third World people to control Third World spaces, is something that has eluded the department. Ultimately, the university paternalism that the TWLF had criticized during their protests remained: the administration continued to directly influence the structure and future of Ethnic and Afro-American Studies. William Banks openly agreed that the administration was “strictly paternalistic; they’ve mastered the art of paternalism...” (William Banks, interview by Julie Tover, March 20, 1990), and he provided his situation as an example of how the administration used rewards and offers of advancement to move Afro-American Studies in the direction they saw fit. The administration was also adept at convincing faculty that integration into the traditional model provided “credibility as an academic on par with other academic units” as Professor Reginald Jones explained the reason for the move to Letters and Science (Reginald Jones, interview by Julie Tover, March 27, 1990).

Here again, the influence of the dominant ideology - as pushed by the administration - demonstrates its power to include just enough of the subaltern’s interests without risking its own position. The administration’s actions define how the ‘hegemonic domain of power’ works within institutions, wherein ideology is used “to absorb and thereby depoliticize oppressed groups’ dissent” (Collins, 2000, p. 299). Alternatively, one could argue that the attempt to maintain a radical counter-hegemonic movement within the confines of the dominant group’s space was perhaps farfetched. Audre Lorde’s famous words speak truth to this effort, “For the master’s tools will never dismantle the master’s house. They may allow us to temporarily beat him at his own game, but they will never enable us to bring about genuine change” (Lorde, 1984, p. 112). Perhaps the success of the TWLF to create a crisis of authority and get a department of Ethnic Studies approved was the temporary victory. The failure to secure a College of Ethnic Studies and the separation of Afro-American Studies reflect the inability of this particular movement to achieve the broader institutional shift they envisioned within their timeline. However, over the past forty-six years the university has slowly shifted the way in which they talk about race, racism, and issues of increasing diversity in admissions, staff, and faculty hiring.

Despite all the challenges facing the faculty, staff and students in the Department of Ethnic Studies, their scholarship has persisted, contributing many important advances in the field, including an emphasis on Women of Color feminist thought, Decolonial poetry and literature, Queer Theory, and
Critical Theory. Achieving a space of representation for historically marginalized communities in the academy was historic, even if there were setbacks in utilizing the space to meet the original vision.

Here, it is also important to address a topic that has been widely debated in Ethnic Studies, which is reflecting on: 1) how the context of the 1960s influenced the early demands of the department, and 2) how to address cultural shifts that have occurred since its inception. Unlike most departments, Ethnic Studies was born out of a revolutionary movement and culture that truly believed the ‘wretched of the earth’ were going to prevail in achieving their liberation. With successful Third World independence movements as their inspiration, the TWLF was committed to a particular vision that served as the foundation of their organizing. The challenge of developing a field of study so strongly connected to a particular time and politics is that inevitably - when there are political and social shifts or backlashes - all that is tied to the previous way of thinking is threatened. Either the field adapts or it faces the possibility of atrophy. Such was the case with the Ethnic Studies Department. Early on they abandoned the language of “Third World” in their title. The Self-Study argued that the eventual celebration of Comparative Ethnic Studies on the UC Berkeley campus required a rejection of “first the radical spirit of international solidarity with the global South (implied in the early use of the Third World), and second, of the nationalistic undertones of the ethnic-specific programs” (Self-Study, 2009, p. 61).

An analysis of the implications of this change in discourse is a topic I plan to examine more in the future. For this project I will conclude that some scholars have labeled these shifts and efforts at “professionalization” as a form of de-radicalization or de-politicization of Black Studies and Ethnic Studies (Allen 1969, Rojas 2007, Norment 2001). Alternatively, others have argued that adopting certain practices from the traditional fields was necessary to provide Ethnic Studies with a level of legitimacy and rigor considered the cornerstone of academia. The movement toward standardization and institutionalization of both Black Studies and Ethnic Studies gained steam during the period between 1980-2000 (Norment, 2001). However, for my analysis of what Ethnic Studies curricula and pedagogy contributed to the university I will limit my discussion in Part II to the first fourteen years of the department at UC Berkeley, (from 1969-1984). In the following section I will discuss how one of the factors that differentiated Ethnic Studies pedagogy and curricula from many traditional fields was its political and cultural relevance to communities of color. I will analyze how both the intentions and the outcomes of this unique theory and praxis developed, and what contributions this effort has made to understanding the longue durée of people of color connecting education to their liberation.

**Part II: Revolutionary Praxis & Curricula: Education as Liberation**

Those who fought to establish Ethnic Studies at UC Berkeley were driven by a strong desire to make their education relevant to the needs of their communities. In addition to the anti-colonial rhetoric reflected in their name and their vision, the students were also pragmatic about developing courses and gaining training to genuinely improve the lives of people of color. Thus, they shifted the purpose of education from one that reproduces the hegemonic power dynamics to one that creates a new class of...

---

organic intellectuals - those with the skills to organize and persuade other members of their community. Therefore, the organic intellectuals produced in spaces like Ethnic Studies could serve as interlocutors in the ‘passive revolution’ to educate and provide services for their peoples, contributing to the growth of a radical bloc and also, potentially, an ideological shift.

In this section I will analyze Linda Tuhiwai Smith’s notion of a decolonizing methodology, and put her work in conversation with Paulo Freire and Frantz Fanon to discuss the praxis necessary to transform higher education in the United States into a vessel for empowerment rather than a tool of the dominant class. There is a level of appropriation of Freire’s work (originally written in the context of educating the most impoverished and illiterate communities in Brazil) that I adapt in order to apply it to students of color at the most prestigious public university in the country. Similarly, employing a Fanonian framework to this population requires an understanding that Fanon’s theories cannot be imposed without recognition of the difference in historical context. I am not arguing for sameness in conditions, one that would equate TWLF students to those living under colonial rule in the Third World; rather, I am using the theoretical language of power and education to understand the political project that is Ethnic Studies. By analyzing the courses created in Ethnic Studies and the new pedagogy employed to teach them, I argue that Ethnic Studies was successful in applying elements of a decolonizing methodology.

Tuhiwai Smith’s book has proven critical to my analysis of the TWLF because her project succinctly explores the imperial and colonial legacy of violence against indigenous communities by way of Western academic research. Tuhiwai Smith’s critique of Western research methodologies aligns closely with the criticism that the TWLF had of the University, which explains their demand for self-determination and the establishment of a Third World College. Both Tuhiwai Smith’s framework and praxis align closely with the vision and pedagogy central to the early development of the Ethnic Studies Department. For example, at the center of her decolonizing methodology is the practice of ‘researching back,’ which involves a “‘knowing-ness of the colonizer’ and a recovery of ourselves, an analysis of colonialism, and a struggle for self-determination” (2012, p. 8). This description directly speaks to the TWLF’s primary demand for self-determination, and also to their overall project of Third World peoples to “determine the course of instruction most relevant to their own lives, to the survival of their communities and independent identities,”44 as expressed in their flyers. By studying their own histories, Ethnic Studies students would also begin to contribute research on the topic, something explicitly absent in the dominant curricula. Tuhiwai Smith identifies the act of historically oppressed peoples reclaiming their history as “a critical and essential aspect of decolonization” (2012, p. 31). Clearly there is a shared ideological connection that ties Tuhiwai Smith’s work to the TWLF movement. In the following pages, I will examine how the courses developed in Ethnic Studies addressed the content and methodologies that Tuhiwai Smith outlines as important for indigenous peoples. Like so many of authors that I engage with, I am appropriating her focus on indigenous peoples to include communities of color in the United States generally.

The courses created in the Ethnic Studies Department provide the best examples of the curricular and pedagogical innovations the TWLF students fought for and implemented. In January 1969, Manuel Delgado wrote about the creation of a new course, Social Analysis 143X, The Mexican-American Population. During the height of the TWLF movement, this course was developed as a model of what

---

Ethnic Studies could offer students of UC Berkeley. It described an experimental pedagogy which included a term paper written by the instructor and graded by the students and the option for students to write a paper in either Spanish or English in one of three styles: academic, journalistic, or underground newspaper. The course also provided students with an editing service that would select especially well-written papers to be held in the Library, as well as an open forum at the end of each class where students could bring up topics relevant and important to them. Providing a space for students to grade their instructors and giving the students the agency to act as leaders in the classroom is reflective of the praxis Paulo Freire termed ‘co-intentional learning.’ Through this process, historically oppressed peoples are supported to engage as active participants in their liberation (Freire, 2010).

The critical pedagogy applied in Social Analysis 143X is also evidenced in the instructor’s vision for how the course will serve the needs of historically oppressed communities. The course instructor, Octavio Romano, describes the purpose of the course as to encourage the Chicano to realize “that he must regain control of his historical function of participation. He is the force in opposition as he reinforces his active role as an innovative pioneer. As a student, he attempts to fashion his education to conform to his living needs and aspirations.” Additionally, the course speaks to the importance of students of color writing their own history and theories that apply to their unique experiences as colonized subjects, a process Tuhiwai Smith refers to as “theorizing our own existence” (2012, p. 30). When historically colonized/marginalized/oppressed peoples become the researchers and producers of knowledge on their community, they liberate themselves from the West and the old practices of research designed to dominate and legitimize their colonization.

In the first Ethnic Studies Department course catalogue for spring 1970, sixty-eight courses were offered. Black Studies provided the most with thirty courses offered; Asian Studies followed with nineteen; Chicano Studies offered twelve courses; Native American Studies had six courses, and finally, there was one comparative “Third World Core Course.” Opening the pages of the catalogue, what is striking is first the art, which portrays revolutionary images of Vietcong fighters, the Mayan calendar, a clenched fist, phrases reading “Free Alcatraz,” and beautiful images of African and Indigenous symbolism. These images are important because they represent the infusion of Third World culture and radical politics into a document put on display for all the University to see, one designed to recruit potential majors. The second impression one gets is that the course titles and descriptions portray the unapologetically political nature of the department. Below is a list of some of the courses offered in the Spring Quarter of 1970, reflecting the culture and content of the newly formed Department of Ethnic Studies. I have chosen a breadth of offerings because the content and subject matter described below provide some of the best evidence of how the politics and ideology of the TWLF were translated into the curricula and pedagogy.

**Black Studies**

“Afro-American Experience in Nutrition: Introduction to the science of nutrition as it relates to the Black Community…Analysis of malnutrition & starvation within the Black community. Function of Black professionals working in the fields of Nutrition & Public Health.”

---


“Afro-American Experience in Law: Introduction to law as it relates to the Black community... Historical examination of the social, economic, political & legal events which illustrate the need the Black community has for Black attorneys. Special emphasis on civil rights period. Function of the Black attorney in the Black Community.”

“Afro-American Politics: Delineation of Black Movement in America. Afro-American Politics, mechanisms of oppression & political economy of exploitation are examined. Special consideration given to the politics of the Black American Community, Revolutionary Nationalism, Cultural nationalism, & the Black Student Movement.”

Other unique course titles in Black Studies included: Black Dance, Afro-American Psychology, Afro-American Art, and African French Literature—taught in French.

Asian Studies

“Introduction to Asian Communities: Cross-cultural analysis of social, political, and economic structures of the Asian communities in America. Emphasis on understanding the dialectics of the collective vs. individual through participation in community change. Readings will draw upon the political writings of 20th century socialists.”

“Seminar on Asian Women: Seminar will survey the roles and perspectives of women in Asian countries, and compare and contrast these women to their Asian American counterparts. Emphasis will be on the role of women in social & revolutionary change.”

“Seminar on Third World Studies in Primary and Secondary Schools: Seminar will survey the present programs in primary and secondary schools, and point out needs in various Bay Area schools.”

Other courses included: Comparative Asian Student Movements, Asian Music, Mao Tze Tung Thought, and Asian American Drama.

Chicano Studies

“English Rhetoric and Communication Skills: A two-quarter composition and reading course at the 1A-1B level designed especially for students with Spanish/English bi-cultural/bi-lingual background... Where traditional courses develop writing out of what is first read and then discussed, La Raza seeks to develop English expression by students drawing on their own immediate experience for themes and issues to communicate in speech and writing.”

“The Research Paper for La Raza Students: A course that will focus on composition of research papers of short to middle length, information retrieval techniques will be reviewed but particular emphasis will be placed on recoding information in experiential and community-interview contexts. Techniques of information gathering and preservation for Chicano cultural-historical purpose.”

“American Justice and La Raza Communities: The course will move from historical review of the relationship between Chicanos and the American legal system, to the specific examination of law enforcement practices and attitudes in the community, the discrimination within the Court system, and the Chicano prison experience. The course will also look at attempts to organize the Chicanos to overcome the continuing oppression by the American legal system. Visits to jails, courts, and other
facilities, and discussions with pintos at the prisons, will be required (and arranged). Guest speakers will also be included and will include police, probation officers, and attorneys.”

Native American Studies

“American Indian Liberation: Introduction to problems and processes involved in the Native American efforts to liberate themselves, economically, socio-politically, and psychologically from the effects of European conquest and class domination. Focus will be on the contemporary field of Indian affairs and upon probably future development but emphasis will also be given to past Indian resistance liberation movements.”

“American Indian Art and Contemporary Developments: Painting, sculpture, and crafts both traditional and contemporary with emphasis on the historical aspect of Indian arts and its development up to present day. The Indian artist-craftsman point of view and approach will be emphasized.”

“Introduction to Sioux Language and Culture: Introductory understanding of history, traditions, and modern life of the second largest Indian group in the United States.”

“Ethnic Studies 100 - The Third World Concept: An introduction to the Third World concept designed primarily to bring together members of American Third World groups at the University…Topics for discussion include: Colonialism, psychology of oppression, neo-colonialism, Bandung 1955 and other Third World milestones. Special emphasis will be placed on comparative experiences of Third World peoples in the U.S. and a related term ‘project’ will be required.”

In the following section, I will analyze the praxis of these courses and others, in order to understand what new teaching practices were created to teach such revolutionary content. Then my analysis will return to the content, delving into an examination of the factors that influenced the development of truly innovative and empowering courses for historically marginalized peoples.

A Pedagogy for the Oppressed

Paulo Freire’s Pedagogy of the Oppressed (2010) has been described as one of the foundational texts for the field of Critical Social Theory (CST) in education (Leonardo, 2004). More specifically, it provides the tools for developing critical pedagogy for historically oppressed peoples. In Zeus Leonardo’s article, “Critical Social Theory and Transformative Knowledge: The Functions of Criticism in Quality Education,” Leonardo defines and contextualizes CST as “an intellectual form that puts criticism at the center of its knowledge production... In quality education, criticism functions to cultivate students’ ability to question, deconstruct, and then reconstruct knowledge in the interest of emancipation” (2004, p. 12). Freire has contributed some of the most influential concepts to CST and education, such as his critique of the “banking” practice in education, and alternatively, his commitment

47 All courses listed were found in: Course Catalogue “Department of Ethnic Studies, Spring 1970.” Ethnic Studies Library—not catalogued.
to dialogue and liberatory praxis. For the purpose of my project, I am most engaged with Freire’s philosophy that education should serve to liberate the oppressed: in fact, it is one of the driving themes throughout my dissertation. Freire’s philosophy of praxis is of central importance and will be put in conversation with Tuhiwai Smith’s decolonizing methodology. Additionally, I am influenced by his discussions on the dialectic of domination and liberation, and the importance of creating critical dialogue that empowers students and teachers to learn from one another.

The courses listed above are evidence of how the critical, anti-colonial, nationalist, and Marxist theory that grounded the TWLF movement eventually informed the praxis of the Ethnic Studies Department. Freire had a term for this process - where critical consciousness informs practice: he called it conscientizacao, defined as “learning to perceive social, political, and economic contradictions, and to take action against the oppressive elements of reality” (2010, p. 35). Members of the TWLF were not reading Freire like they were reading Fanon or Mao during their movement; in fact, Pedagogy of the Oppressed was not translated into English until 1970. However, the spread of radical anti-colonial and Marxist literature throughout the Third World resulted in multiple theorists and scholars writing about the dialectic of domination and liberation from the perspective of the subaltern. Thus, a phenomenon of connectedness was occurring during this historic epoch of the mid 20th century, wherein the colonized were collectively “theorizing their existence” (2012) as Tuhiwai Smith calls it.

When I began researching the TWLF and creation of Ethnic Studies, I immediately noted that the early praxis, pedagogy, and curricula of the department embodied a Freierian framework without the founders realizing it. Freire once said that when he first read Antonio Gramsci’s work during Freire’s exile from Brazil, he had a profound realization: “I read Gramsci and I discovered that I had been greatly influenced by Gramsci long before I had read him. It is fantastic when we discover that we have been influenced by someone’s thought without even being introduced to their intellectual production” (Freire, 1995). One explanation for this simultaneous development of liberatory education, occurring thousands of miles apart and within very different oppressed communities, is the shared exposure both groups had to revolutionary Third World literature developing during this time. For example, during the 1950s and 1960s, Albert Memmi, Edward Said, Anibal Quijano, Aimé Césaire, Che Guevara, Frantz Fanon, and Paulo Freire were all writing about the experiences of the colonized, the legacy of imperialism, and the need for revolutionary change. Their method of achieving liberation differed, depending on their positionality, location, and the context of the specific movements they examined. Some of these theorists were explicitly in dialogue with each other: for example, Césaire mentored Fanon. But oftentimes, they were engaging from afar, or not directly at all.

This analysis is important to note because in my discussion of Freire and the TWLF, I am arguing that the Ethnic Studies department put into practice many of the recommendations Freire offered in Pedagogy of the Oppressed organically, without having been explicitly exposed to the Brazilian’s work. This phenomenon of connectedness is reminiscent of Tuhiwai Smith’s declaration that “colonized peoples share a language of colonization, share knowledge about their colonizers, and, in terms of a political project, share the same struggle for decolonization” (2012, p. 47). As a result of this shared history of oppression, colonization, and resistance, the TWLF and Freire were intrinsically connected through their fundamental desire to see the oppressed achieve self-determination via education. Again, both Freire and the TWLF elected education as a means of regaining their humanity, as peoples dehumanized for so long by the dominant society.

In this section I employ a Freierian logic to argue that the TWLF and subsequent early Department of Ethnic Studies represent the power that knowledge and liberatory pedagogy can insert into an oppressive institution. As discussed in Chapter 4 and Chapter 5, I refer to the University as an oppressive institution, given the history of excluding people of color from the academy, and also due to
the impact that Western research has had on communities of color, such as justifying their inferiority or naturalizing their domination (Tuhiwai Smith, 2012). Additionally, I define liberatory pedagogy or praxis as one that actively and explicitly works to mitigate the impact of social, historical, political and economic exploitation. Thus, I analyze how Ethnic Studies employed a Freiérian pedagogy and decolonial methodology to establish a praxis of liberation.

The courses listed above reflect the commitment that Ethnic Studies made to the local communities of color: this is especially evident in the unique pedagogy and method of teaching used by the instructors. For example, in the Asian Studies course, “Seminar on Third World Studies in Primary and Secondary Schools,” students worked with local schools to identify and address the needs of the particular school site. Lucha Corpi described the intention behind the development of new courses in Ethnic Studies in the early years. She explained how each program was concerned with providing material services to their home communities: “We needed social workers, we needed people in public health, we needed legal aid” (L. Corpi, personal communication, June 12, 2012). Even in courses that didn’t include a specific community outreach component, these issues were still addressed, preparing students to work with communities at a later juncture. For example, the Black Studies course, “Afro-American Experience in the Law,” emphasized both the need for and function of Black attorneys for the Black community. Similarly, the Chicano Studies course, “The Research Paper for La Raza Students,” focused on the techniques needed to gather and preserve cultural and historical information for the benefit of their own community. This is a prime example of a decolonizing methodology that Tuhiwai Smith promotes, wherein the indigenous researcher prioritizes the needs of their community, and through their research they work with the community to create tools and programs that address the community’s unique circumstances. This is the definition of liberatory education, one that serves to empower, work in collaboration with, and strengthen the community. Kathie Irwin clarifies the necessity of this work, “Real power lies with those who design the tools - it always has. This power is ours. Contained within this imperative is a sense of being able to determine priorities, to bring to the center those issues of our own choosing, and to discus them amongst ourselves” (Irwin, 1992, cited in Tuhiwai Smith, 2012, p. 40). Not only did Ethnic Studies students gain necessary training and knowledge to serve their communities while enrolled in these courses: many of the initiatives they created as students remain today.

In an interview, TWLF activists and student Betty Kano explained the power of the politically relevant curricula and pedagogy for students and neighboring communities:

That was a very important issue in terms of Third World Liberation Front and its primary purpose at the beginning, which was community organizing. I think that was a part of Maoism that students were exhorted to go into the community and bridge the gap between the elitist educated and the working people. So we made this conscious effort to do that...When I was there we worked on a curriculum that involved student activism. Studying student movements, like the May 4th movement, using that as a model of substance to teach… In Oakland, the Filipinos for Affirmative Action and Asian American Health Center, really important and strategic community organizations, were formed because of the student activists of that time… they are still around now and that is a huge effect... That legacy continues...(B. Kano, personal communication, June 12, 2012).

---

By introducing a liberatory and community-centered pedagogy, the Ethnic Studies Department was able to have an impact that extended beyond the walls of the institution. This is precisely the outcome that Freire and Tuhkiwai Smith were advocating - that education be structured to benefit historically colonized and oppressed peoples. At the center of the community outreach was the practice of being in dialogue with the community one was to work with. TWLF members emphasized the practice of asking community members what they needed during their fieldwork; in conversations with them, they explained how this practice developed as a result of their early organizing efforts.

At a book reading for Manuel Delgado’s autobiography in 2011, I spoke with a woman who had been part of the Asian American Political Alliance and TWLF at UC Berkeley. She described how some of the students in the Asian American Studies program had wanted to start a breakfast program for children in San Francisco’s Chinatown, modeled after the Black Panther Party’s program. However, when the students began working with the community, they realized that it was the older generation of single Chinese and Filipino men who had never married, as a result of Asian exclusion laws and the shortage of single women during the first half of the 20th century, who needed their help the most. As a result of conversations held with community members, the students adjusted the services they offered. These narratives speak to the convergence of philosophy shared by the TWLF and Freire.

It should be noted that the efforts to maintain the commitment to the community work were strained over the years. The reasons for this were technical, yet also manipulated by the University. The attempt to build a strong connection between Ethnic Studies within both the University and the community was challenging. Students were a constantly shifting population, and community organizations needed stability. Elaine Kim elaborates on some of the difficulties the department faced in carrying out that work:

The idea was very good, but...the way things were structured, both our tenuous position at the University and the kind of difficulties that were faced in the community organizations...So structurally, it was pretty insecure, both in the community and in the university. Originally, the whole idea was that people came from places that had lots of need, and what they were learning in the university had nothing to do with those needs. On the contrary, the kinds of things we were learning were only to educate us away from those places that we came from, so that we could never return to them (Elaine Kim, interviewed by Julie Tover, March 26, 1990).

Despite these challenges, the community work component remained a part of the Ethnic Studies curricula for many years. As professor Clara Sue Kidwell noted, Berkeley is an elitist institution that respects research and professional training above all else; eventually, the creation of the Ph.D. program and hiring of ‘traditionally trained’ faculty is what solidified the department’s acceptance by the institution, in her opinion (Clara Sue Kidwell, interviewed by Julie Tover, April 3, 1990).

Freire wrote at length about the essence and necessity of dialogue as a human phenomenon. He explains, “[w]ithin the word we find two dimensions, reflection and action, in such radical interaction that if one is sacrificed - even in part - the other immediately suffers. There is no true word that is not at the same time praxis. Thus, to speak a true word is to transform the world” (2010, p. 87). This quote speaks directly to the process of engagement that Ethnic Studies advocated in their courses, especially those designated to conduct fieldwork. By 1975, all the programs in Ethnic Studies had a fieldwork course dedicated to working with and supporting local communities of color. After ten years as a department, the Ethnic Studies course catalogues provided a clear indication as to how an Ethnic Studies
education can be centered on liberation and social justice. The Asian American Studies course offering for 1979-1980 opens with a comprehensive history of the department and an ongoing commitment to establishing a College of Ethnic Studies. It then details the objectives, methodology and pedagogy of the program, stating:

Through our courses we hope students will develop a critical understanding of the institutions which directly affect Asian American communities and individuals, especially the areas of employment, housing, health care, education, the mass media and government. We provide students with systematic channels for being involved in community work on a responsible and effectively-planned basis…The second objective is to carry on research that would promote social change. We do this through accumulation of accurate information about current community, national, and international issues and struggles, and careful analysis of these issues in order to provide guidelines for action…The third objective is for faculty, staff, and students to participate directly in community projects and struggles on an individual as well as programmatic basis, providing support for community work whenever needed and appropriate.49

By developing a pedagogy centered around communication with the community, the Ethnic Studies Department exemplified the work Freire recommended for the elite, in which they eliminate the antagonism that exists between them and the historically oppressed, resulting in a revolutionary partnership which “grows out of communion with the (united) people” (2010, p. 173, italics in original). The work of the Ethnic Studies Department reveals is the revolutionary potential for education to have a positive and liberatory impact on historically oppressed communities when and if the praxis is grounded in a critical decolonizing methodology. Through an authentic engagement with local communities of color, Ethnic Studies students were successfully engaging in the work of generating solutions to assist the oppressed in overcoming their systemic domination. Such a methodology requires that the researcher/student/faculty/department create alternative ways of teaching and learning. Therefore, not only must the praxis and philosophy about the purpose of education change, but the content must also reflect the vision for liberation. In the following section, I will analyze how Ethnic Studies curricula contributed to the humanization of people of color in the academy.

Education for the People: Transforming the Curricula

I opened Part II of this chapter by analyzing the praxis of the Ethnic Studies Department because the history of Ethnic Studies has often focused on the originality of the course content and less on the radical methods required to make the content meaningful. Therefore, I wanted to highlight the ways in which the radical politics and consciousness of the era were translated into new teaching and learning practices, laying the foundation for my argument that the TWLF exemplified Freierian praxis. Freire has been said to represent the beginning of dialogical theory in education as an extension of the theory of communicative action (Habermas, 1984) and the notion of dialogic imagination (Bahktin, 1981). Freire’s theory is an existential search to locate oppression and to support the oppressed in their struggle to become free human beings. The project of returning the oppressed to their ‘full human’ status,

something that colonization and other forms of domination denies them, is where Freire and Frantz Fanon are in conversation with one another.

The scholarship of Frantz Fanon provides a unique perspective on the discourse on colonization because of Fanon’s training in medicine and psychiatry, as well as his lived experience as a colonial subject who traveled with the French military during WWII. Eventually, in 1954 he returned to Algeria and joined the Front de Libération Nationale, the anti-colonial/nationalist independence movement. While his seminal text, *The Wretched of the Earth*, is most often cited in the context of radical politics of the 1960s, I am going to start with an analysis of his first major work *Black Skin, White Masks* (1952).

In analyzing the longue durée of white supremacy and capitalism that serves as the foundation for racial formation in the United States, the need of the dominant class to dehumanize people of color is a central theme. In *Black Skin, White Masks*, Fanon focuses on the impact of colonialism on the Black psyche. While his analysis belongs to the Black subject living under colonialism or neo-colonialism, I think his medical diagnosis also speaks to the experience of the Black community in the United States.

His analysis translates well to the American context because at the core of his argument is the notion that Black people living under colonialism exist in a “zone of non-being, and extraordinary sterile and arid region, an utterly naked declivity where an authentic upheaval can be born” (1967, p. 8). It is my intention to argue that the creation of Ethnic Studies represents one example of an ‘authentic upheaval’ born from the mobilization of historically oppressed peoples who demanded recognition as full citizens, full humans, influenced by - and part of - a decades-long struggle where African Americans, Native Americans and other people of color challenged their oppression by the dominant class. This ‘zone of non-being’ serves as a powerful way to describe the impact of dehumanization, the effort to deny people of color, and African Americans specifically, their human rights. Examples of this horrific practice include the classification of enslaved African Americans as property rather than humans in order to justify the atrocities committed against them (Zinn, 2010).

Although the formal institution of slavery was outlawed with the passage of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution in 1865, the legacy of this ideology has outlived the institution and can still be seen in public discourse and actions, especially those of the State. From the popularity of public lynching in the Jim Crow South to the vilification of young men of color killed by the police today, studies show that white Americans, and even people of color, still hold misconceptions that suggest African Americans have a predisposition to violence and crime (P.H. Collins, 2004), or that their culture is deficient (Bonilla-Silva, 2013).

In April 2016, a University of Virginia research team published their survey of more than 200 white medical students and found that 40% of first and second year students and 25% of residents believed that Black patients had “thicker skin” (Hoffman et al., 2016). The study also found that Black patients were less likely to get the proper treatment from those doctors surveyed compared to white patients. The authors cited the history of this country wherein a biological difference between Blacks and whites was used as a justification of slavery; they also cited the mistreatment of Black people by the medical field as reasons for why these beliefs and practices still exist (Hoffman et al., 2016). All of these stereotypes are a hangover from the colonial period through the Jim Crow era, when the dominant class conjured up fears about the animalistic – non-human – character of African Americans to justify institutions upon which American capitalism and white supremacy were dependent. However, as recent medical research suggests, these ideologies and beliefs continue to have deadly economic and social consequences.

The effects of medical mistreatment in combination with experiencing discrimination have lead some researchers to argue that racism actually takes a physical toll on the body, something Fanon argued nearly half a century ago. Clark et al. (1999) found that African Americans who experienced racism and
discrimination responded with feelings of fear, frustration and other stresses that scientist have argued cause higher production of hormones in the adrenal glands, weakening the immune system. I cite this current data for two reasons: first, I want to highlight the importance of an area of scholarship that Fanon forged, and which others have continued to advance; and second, I want to acknowledge the real and measurable effects that racism still has on the minds and bodies of people of color today. For these reasons, it is important to analyze the impact that liberatory education can have on our society, in the hopes that we can change both the ideology and practices that perpetuate this violence. Therefore, Fanon’s psychoanalysis of the impact of racism and colonization will be used to discuss one of the impacts that Ethnic Studies had for students of color: affirming the positive contributions of historically marginalized peoples as a form of resistance, and nurturing a positive self image.

In William Van Deburg's *New Day in Babylon* (1993), the author focuses on the historical contributions that Frantz Fanon made to the Black Power movement as a Black Third World psychiatrist. Fanon's writing has been described as a fundamental starting point for Black Power ideology by some of the movement leaders: "Eldridge Cleaver termed *The Wretched of the Earth* 'an historical event' - the 'Bible' of the black liberation movement" (1993, p. 60). Similarly, many black liberation activists cite the book, which was translated into English in 1965, with greatly affecting African Americans’ sense of connection with the Third World. Bobby Seale, co-founder of the Black Panther Party, claimed to have read *The Wretched of the Earth* six times. Van Deburg details the lineage of Fanon’s work in connection with the establishment of a proud Black identity. He continues, “Eventually, a positive psychological foundation was laid, which contributed to a long term rise in black self-esteem. It was this existentially positive sense of individual and group empowerment that had the greatest impact on black lives in recent years” (Van Deburg, 1993, p. 51). This is in fact his thesis - identifying the positive cultural and psychological contributions that Black Power had on Black America beyond the limits of its political agendas. In a similar vein, I am arguing that the new curricula in Ethnic Studies and Black Studies created a space where learning about and validating the histories of communities of color also contributed to a positive group identity. This impact – as well as some of the courses and community organizing efforts - was directly influenced by the Black Panthers and other radical movements actively engaged in promoting the beauty, strength, and power of their people. In the following paragraphs I will analyze how certain curricula employed a Fanonian praxis, and thus how the Ethnic Studies Department was part of the political/psychological project to empower the oppressed.

One of the most important contributions that Ethnic Studies as a field has made to the academy is training young scholars of color to conduct research of their own communities. As discussed in the previous section, “field work” and “research methodologies” courses were foundational to the burgeoning Ethnic Studies curricula at UC Berkeley. In 1970, the department offered six such courses; by 1979-1980, that number had grown to 14 courses, despite the loss of Afro-American Studies. Tuhiwai Smith noted that in the academy, history and the study of particular peoples has been reserved for those considered "fully human" (2012, p. 33, italics in original); therefore, those discarded in the zone of non-being, as Fanon termed, were deemed pre-historic, or erased from history altogether. This powerful observation speaks to why the curricula in Ethnic Studies is tied to the liberation and humanization of people of color: the very act of training future researchers to write and publish about those communities previously invisibleized, or even worse, pathologized, contributes to their becoming ‘fully human.’ However, it should be noted that just because new decolonized research is/has been made available does not mean that the Western academy has readily accepted it.

In *Black Skin, White Masks*, Fanon is ultimately concerned with returning man, but the Black subject particularly, to their “proper place”: in other words, to humanize them (p. 88). Inherently this project requires teaching subaltern about the great contributions of their people and providing analytical tools to understand their current conditions. It should be noted that Fanon was cautious about “the strivings of contemporary Negroes: to prove the existence of black civilization to the white world at all costs” (p. 34). However, I don’t think this is in reference to radicalized scholars who were writing about the experiences of the subaltern and their conditions, such as Fanon, but rather of those trying to “prove their worth” to the dominant group instead of working to liberate their communities.

In 1970, Black Studies offered a course on Afro-American Psychology that was concerned with defining Black psychology, and in examining the “abnormal” psychology that had developed in the Black community mostly as a result of systemic oppression. By 1975, with Black Studies no longer a part of Ethnic Studies, the Comparative Ethnic Studies program began offering a course entitled, “The Effects of Racism on Child Development,” which explored “the effects of racism on Third World Children. Included will be direct effects of racism on individual growth and personality development.” By 1979-1980, all four programs in the department offered courses that explicitly placed an emphasis of the psychological impact of racism on the respective communities. Their titles reflect the diverse ways that each program addressed the topic, such as: Chicano Studies 170 - Institutional Racism in the Chicano Community; Chicano Studies 176 - Chicanos and Mental Health; Native American Studies 165 - Child Development in Native American Communities; Asian American Studies 150 - Asian American Family and Personality; and Ethnic Studies 100 - A Comparative Analysis of Racism in America: An Historical Perspective.

Using different methods, these courses were naming racism, and thus the legacy of colonial violence, as the culprit for much of the psychic harm inflicted on communities of color. They ranged in scope from the institutions or ideologies they examined, such as health care, education, white supremacy and American culture generally, and the ways in which these ideologies or institutions committed psychic violence against people of color. Freire argued that the dehumanization of the oppressed takes place on material and psychic levels; therefore, a dialectical response must address both these areas (Ronald, 2001). Through these courses it is evident that the Ethnic Studies Department at UC Berkeley was utilizing a Freirian praxis, wherein the courses were developed to serve the immediate material and psychological conditions caused by capitalist exploitation of and racism against people of color. In a flyer explaining the goal of the Third World College, the TWLF stated they would “provide an education of the highest quality while allowing students to retain their cultural identity, thus enabling them to return to their communities to live and create an atmosphere conducive to political, social, and economic changes.” The political/social commitment reflected in this statement is representative of how Freire and Fanon’s vision for liberating the subaltern was utilized by the TWLF, eventually materializing in the Ethnic Studies Department.

When Fanon wrote *The Wretched of the Earth*, he was imbedded in the Algerian independence movement. His focus was more concerned with the question of how anti-colonial struggle impacts the psyche of the colonized, and what shifts would occur after independence. As a result, there is an overlap with his first publication on the topic of how oppression affects the subaltern. Yet, there is also a new lens through which he was writing, one that was shaped by the radical guerilla warfare culture of which
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he was a part. Unlike *Black Skin, White Masks*, the publication of *The Wretched of the Earth* had almost an immediate audience among Third World Leftists in the United States. For social justice movements like the TWLF, Fanon’s words spoke truth to their experiences with the dominant class. When Fanon stated, “The colonized must be made to see that colonialism never gives away anything for nothing. Whatever gains the colonized make through armed or political struggle, they are not the result of the colonizers’ goodwill or goodness of heart but to the fact that he can no longer postpone such concessions” (2004, p. 92), it was as if he was providing a handbook for those working for decolonization. This theme was seen in numerous TWLF flyers, and also on the image that this chapter opened with. After months of striking, the TWLF was under no illusion that negotiating the details of their department would be easy.

In addition to Fanon’s writing, other anti-colonial media was influencing the American Third World Left. In 1966, the revolutionary film *The Battle of Algiers* was released amidst the height of decolonial movements and the growth of student radicalism in the United States. Peter Mathews’ 2004 article, “The Battle of Algiers: Bombs and Boomerangs,” credits the incredibly detailed portrayal of guerilla warfare set against a colonial occupier with inspiring the Black Panther Party and the Irish Republican Army to adapt the film into training manuals (Mathews, 2004). The author even references Fanon, “For Fanon, violence is endemic to colonial rule, tightening its grip over decades and centuries, finally leaving no option save bloody payment in kind,” (Mathews, 2004) thus resulting in the “moment of the boomerang” (Sartre, 2004) where the ‘Wretched of the Earth’ return the violence against the oppressor. The undeniable link between radical anti-colonial movements in the Third World and the evolution of organizations such as the Black Panther Party that sought to create a people’s liberation in America, are largely held together by the glue of Fanon’s powerful call to action. The influence of nationalist ideology and radicalism of the era were also deeply imbedded in the Ethnic Studies curricula.

In the 1970 Ethnic Studies course catalogue, there were three Chicano Studies classes that addressed the nationalist movements of the day, and two such courses in Asian American Studies; Afro-American Studies had two courses that explored the nationalist and Black Power movements. As discussed in Chapter 1, Native Americans did not engage in “nationalist” discourse because their struggle was more focused on sovereignty and tribal affiliation. For Native North Americans, it was less about the Third World and more about indigeneity and First Nations. In 1975, Afro-American Studies offered a course entitled “African Liberation Movements” that studied “the philosophies, strategies, and tactics of the African Liberation Movements in Southern Africa.” In 1979-1980, Ethnic Studies 140 – “Colonialism and Internal Colonialism” offered students the opportunity to survey the “major writings dealing with the experience of Third World people under colonialism.” Additionally, the Ethnic Studies Department’s choice to continue to use the term “Third World” to describe communities of color in the United States in their curricula up until 1984, the last course catalogue that I examined, reflects their ongoing commitment to the radical politics of decolonization from which the department was conceived (despite their dropping it from the department name). Another critical area that Ethnic Studies curricula contributed to was the burgeoning field of Women of Color Feminism.

In the Spring 1970 course catalogue, there was only one course in the Ethnic Studies Department committed to the woman’s perspective, and it was in Asian American Studies. By 1975, Ethnic Studies, Asian American Studies, and Chicano Studies offered courses on women. In 1979-1980, the same three
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classes were offered again, in addition to a second course in Chicano Studies entitled “Chicana Writers,” and a course on “Native American Women” from that program. The 1983-1984 course catalogue had the same five courses from 1979-1980, with no additional growth in this area. What these courses offered was a space for women of color to connect, research and discuss their unique experiences and also contribute to new scholarship on a topic quickly spreading among women of color who had participated in the Civil Rights, nationalist, and power movements of the 1960s. Women discussed their common grievances of working toward racial, social, and political power while oftentimes being oppressed by the men in their organizations. However, they quickly went beyond these topics to develop theories, strategies, and organizations that would advance their interests, which included: healthcare, employment, community education, childcare, and much more.

The development of Black, Chicana, and Third World feminisms resulted from women feeling exploited and sometimes even abused by men they considered their brothers in struggle. Patriarchy was a significant reality for women in the Black Power Movement: it affected their organization for liberation and exemplifies the hegemonic power of dominant ideologies, even in racially anti-hegemonic spaces. In Chapter 3 of Ain’t I a Woman (1981), bell hooks describes the “Imperialism of Patriarchy” and its impact on Black men’s treatment of Black women in the struggle for Black liberation. Hooks traces the historical emasculation of Black men through the denial of power; gaining independence, they coupled their liberation with asserting masculinity and dominance over Black women (hooks, p. 94). Despite the fact that women were central organizers and activists in Black movements for equality and power, their calls for women’s issues to be addressed either fell on deaf ears or were overtly challenged. hooks names many men in the Black Power Movement and Civil Rights Movement (Garvey, Malcolm X, MLK Jr., Amiri Baraka) as leaders that “righteously supported patriarchy” (hooks, p. 94).

She further used Amiri Baraka’s own words in a 1970 issue of Black World to explain the culture of patriarchy. Hooks quoted Baraka, stating, “We cannot understand what the devils and the devilishly influenced mean when they say equality for women. We could never be equals…nature has not provided thus” (hooks, p. 95). Baraka’s words speak to a common theme in social movement history of the 1960s wherein men often tried to deny the intersectionality of their female comrades’ struggle, opposing any emphasis on women’s liberation as a “white problem” irrelevant to communities of color. Later in the chapter, hooks describes Baraka’s play Madheart, in which the black male protagonist physically abuses - literally beats his black girlfriend into submission - as a way to reclaim masculine control after feeling powerless because he could not preventing her from being raped (hooks, p. 106). With no critique of the double trauma experienced by the girlfriend, in the play these actions become naturalized and the misogyny remains intact. This dismissal of the gendered and raced oppression that women of color faced was a huge factor in the development of specifically Black and Chicana feminism, which took explicitly intersectional approaches.

Stephen Ward’s analysis on this subject, “The Third World Women’s Alliance: Black Feminist Radicalism and Black Power Politics,” provides a very insightful perspective on the development of this field. Ward argues that Black Feminism is a crucial part of the ideological legacy of the Black Power Movement, and also that “a central objective of Black Power era feminism was to create an autonomous political identity for black women activists…In the process they developed a political analysis that identified and theorized the intersections of race, gender and economic exploitation in American society” (2006, p. 120). The Third World Women’s Alliance (TWWA) was a reflection of so many similar organizations of its time. It grew out of the Black Women’s Liberation Committee, a caucus within the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC), eventually including Asian American and Latina women. Eventually their membership grew, as well as their political education programs, and in 1971 they created the newspaper, “Triple Jeopardy,” which highlighted an anti-colonial analysis and
discourse on the current ideological movements of their day, such as the Black Panther Party and the women’s liberation. The newspaper provided more than political updates: it also gave women resources to deal with everyday issues, such as reproductive rights and family planning.

Lastly, I want to emphasize that TWWA, and other organizations like it, were concerned with more than reactionary politics, such as challenging “expressions of male chauvinism, but were also advancing arguments for deeper revolutionary purpose, theory and commitment; they were, in effect, applying and extending Black Power thought” (Joseph, 2006, p. 144). While the TWWA is not related to my project on the creation of Ethnic Studies, it reflects an important ideological and cultural movement that the women’s courses in Ethnic Studies were also a part of. For many women of color, the 1960s nationalist and power movements failed to address key elements of their oppression. However, these limitations created an opportunity for more radically inclusive spaces in which women critiqued the boundaries of heteronormativity, patriarchy and white liberal feminism. The simultaneous development of these women’s organizations and the growth of Third World Women’s Studies speak to the empowerment of oppressed communities to develop their own spaces and intellectual pursuits as part of their liberation.

The Ethnic Studies curricula, like the department in general, reflected the mobilization of radicalized communities to develop services that would ameliorate the oppression they experienced. Born during a revolutionary moment in American history, the department shared some similarities with other movements attempting to reshape centuries of exploitation. They faced opposition by the dominant class who undermined their success by withholding necessary resources, and they also had to navigate efforts to co-opt or depoliticize Ethnic Studies. Despite these challenges, the Ethnic Studies Department at UC Berkeley was part of a larger movement that did successfully create ‘spaces of representation’ for students historically denied access to higher education.

Conclusion

The authors discussed in this chapter allow us to analyze what resulted from the TWLF’s goal of creating an alternative, decolonized space within the belly of the Euro-Centric intellectual beast. By analyzing their theories and recommendations for making education serve the needs of the oppressed, we gleaned some important examples of how the Ethnic Studies Department truly did contribute to the empowerment of local communities of color. I hope that this chapter has exemplified how Ethnic Studies paved the way for a new dialogue in the academy, one where students could realize the “muscular dream” of their oppressed communities. The concept of the “muscular dream” comes from Fanon’s (2004) argument that the “dreams of the native are always of muscular prowess; his dreams are of action and of aggression…”During the period of colonization, the native never stops achieving his freedom from nine in the evening until six in the morning” (p. 51). Thus, I see the TWLF’s dream of creating a Third World College as a sort of muscular dream, something that they had envisioned, but which they had been unable to complete. While the appropriation of Third World language and strategies for independence movements in the First World requires a careful analysis of the difference between the two locals, the solidarity shared amongst the two is critical to understanding this period in American history. It is also integral to understanding why students of color demanded a Third World College and risked everything to achieve it. Although the TWLF at UC Berkeley only gained a department and not a Third World college, as they had intended, the fact that oppressed students of color organized, mobilized, and realized the creation of a new educational space in the face of immense opposition displays great power and possibility.

These efforts define the creation of politically relevant curriculum and pedagogy. It is more than simply culturally relevant, which studies the life, experiences, and culture of communities of Native
Americans, Chicano/Latinos, Asian Americans and African Americans, topics previously omitted from the course curriculum. My definition of politically relevant includes the elements of being culturally relevant, yet also goes a step further to argue that at their inception, these programs of Ethnic Studies and Black Studies had a strong political, even radical, framework that influenced every aspect of their newly-formed field. Highlighting the voices and experiences of women of color in the TWLF and during the establishment of the department is central to my project. Because predominantly male leadership has authored the scant writing extant on the movement, my dissertation aims to give voice to the women who influenced and made possible this feat. This dissertation intends to act as an analysis of the movement for Ethnic Studies that highlights the profound anti-hegemonic impact Ethnic Studies had on higher education. This chapter was dedicated to historicizing the events that contributed to making diverse and non-traditional racial and gendered histories available in the academy. It has been my intention to contribute a new analysis regarding the role of student activism and women of color in changing university curriculum and pedagogy, an important topic largely neglected by related research.

Including the work of Frantz Fanon was important to this chapter because so much of his commitment to liberating the oppressed relates to the vision of mission of the Ethnic Studies department. In Black Skin, White Masks, Fanon offers a powerful declaration when he states the purpose of his research: “I believe the fact that the juxtaposition of the white and black races has created a massive psychoexistential complex. I hope by analyzing it to destroy it” (1967, p. 12). Oftentimes when one conducts historical research, such as this dissertation, it can feel that the project is less impactful for communities experiencing oppression today. The work feels distanced from our communities and those we want to serve through the knowledge we produce. However, in reading his statement, I am reminded of the necessity of analyzing the roots of racism, oppression, and exploitation: by understanding these experiences and teaching others about them, we are better armed to destroy the conditions that perpetuate these injustices. Similarly, sharing examples of successful efforts to empower the oppressed offers important insight for the work we do today. In the conclusion that follows this chapter, I will emphasize how my dissertation is relevant to current social and educational movements today. I will offer a framework for utilizing the vast historical data and analysis that I have written for current social justice efforts.
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Conclusion

“Let me say, with the risk of appearing ridiculous, that the true revolutionary is guided by strong feelings of love. It is impossible to think of an authentic revolutionary without this quality.”


Writing the conclusion for my dissertation is bittersweet, and the reflections offered here are a humble beginning - as a person unapologetically committed to social justice, as an educator, and as a researcher - to a conversation I will continue to explore and advance in all my future work. The conclusion feels, both literally and symbolically, like the culmination of almost a decade of my life, and it represents the end of an experience that has shaped me in profound ways. So many tears have been shed to complete this process, so much time with loved ones has been sacrificed; the institution was not established with us in mind. But we are here, and this is my contribution.

In these final pages I hope to honor the labor and sacrifices made by our elders in the TWLF who fought against so many odds to create a space of revolutionary love in an institution that didn’t want us, in a country that has tried to kill us, in a world dominated by greed and exploitation. The reflections I put forth in relation to the state of the Ethnic Studies department today reflect that same commitment to revolutionary love upon which our department was built. Sometimes love requires holding up a mirror to those we are engaged with, pushing them to be their best, reminding them of their purpose. Many critical frameworks, such as Black Feminist Thought and Women of Color Feminism, used this strategy when addressing the important grievances of women within the nationalist and revolutionary movements of the 1960s. Necessary shifts have occurred in Ethnic Studies since its inception, adding new frameworks (like those aforementioned) as well as advances in methodology. It is from this position that I offer my thoughts on how we have strayed from our praxis of revolutionary love, and how we can reclaim that most vital commitment to our communities.

Ethnic Studies has provided me with a language to describe, challenge, and change the injustices that plague our society. It has inspired me to be an active agent of change in any space that I am in, and to be the best mentor and educator I am capable of, in order to continue the cycle of revolutionary love from which I have benefitted so deeply. Lastly, for me to be an ethnic studies and critical pedagogy practitioner means to take seriously the project of ‘education as liberation,’ honoring the call that bell hooks has outlined below:

> To educate as the practice of freedom is a way of teaching that anyone can learn. That learning process comes easiest to those of us who teach who also believe that there is an aspect of our vocation that is sacred; who believe that our work is not merely to share information but to share in the intellectual and spiritual growth of our students. To teach in a manner that respects and cares for the souls of our students is essential if we are to provide the necessary conditions where learning can most deeply and intimately begin (hooks, 1994, p. 13)

In this conclusion I will identify three areas pivotal to strengthening and expanding Ethnic Studies in the 21st century. First, I will reiterate the key priorities the TWLF identified when they were establishing the Ethnic Studies department: priorities that I argue are radical and
necessary to support the empowerment of historically oppressed peoples. These findings will be used to analyze what work remains unfulfilled and what future actions can support a recommitment to these priorities. Second, I argue that Ethnic Studies practitioners today should be knowledgeable about why these original priorities were set, and be clear about their intentions to carry out the work necessary to serving the unique needs of our students and communities. I will also offer critical insight about the current trends in the Department of Ethnic Studies at UC Berkeley today, so that we may strategically reassess where we have been successful in meeting our goals, and where and why we have areas for growth. Third, I will offer suggestions about how the knowledge of our past can be applied to serve the current needs of our communities.

The Third World Liberation Front: The Struggle for Self-Determination

I have argued throughout this dissertation that the priorities of the TWLF were grounded in both the longue durée of oppression and struggle that people of color have faced in the United States, as well as the historic success of Third World anti-colonial liberation movements during the 1950s and 1960s. A sense of urgency inspired the mobilization of many radicals during the second half of the 1960s. In October 1966 Huey Newton and Bobby Seal founded the Black Panther Party for Self-Defense; in June of that year, Stokley Carmichael shouted “Black Power” for the first time at the “March Against Fear” in Mississippi. These events contributed new energy to an already established movement for black liberation (Joseph, 2006; Allen, 1992). Then the tumultuous year of 1968 was ushered in by the Tet Offensive, which shattered Washington’s narrative that the United States was winning the Vietnam War. This was followed by the assassination of Martin Luther King Jr., which resulted in rebellions erupting throughout the country (Elbaum, 2002). For many, the murder of King reflected the death of non-violence as an effective tactic to overcome the brutality of white supremacy. I argue that there was a shift from protest to resistance, from resistance to revolution - between the mid and late 1960s. Between 1964 and 1968, there were 321 urban rebellions. These were a reflection of both the shift in movement strategy, but more organically, they represented the frustration and heartbreak of the ‘wretched of the earth,’ a pain that Martin Luther King Jr. so eloquently addressed (Elbaum, 2002, p. 21) in a 1966 interview with Mike Wallace, who attempted to pit King’s non-violence against Stokley Carmichael’s black power movement and the growing urban rebellion. King probably surprised many when he responded: “I contend that the cry of ‘black power’ is, at bottom, a reaction to the reluctance of white power to make the kind of changes necessary to make justice a reality for the Negro. I think that we’ve got to see that a riot is the language of the unheard” (King, 1966, as cited in “MLK: A Riot is the Language of the Unheard,” 2013, italics in original). With these words, King acknowledged that his efforts were not separate from others committed to black liberation, despite a difference in tactics. Like the radical nature of the early Ethnic and Black Studies programs, King’s own radicalism has been separated from his legacy in order to appropriate and depoliticize his revolutionary struggle against white supremacy (Allen, 1992; Leonardo & Porter, 2010).

Within this highly political and radical historical milieu the TWLF was born. The TWLF movement was a product of both the ‘Bandung Spirit’ and burgeoning power movements rising from the ‘domestic colonies’ (Allen, 1992) of the barrios and ghettos across America. The TWLF had one broad goal that served as the umbrella under which all other demands fell: self-determination. Most people assume that the demands of the TWLF were centered on creating politically and culturally relevant courses, considering this has been the area in which their
movement has perhaps had the most impact. Their primary concern, however, as well as all of their subsequent demands, originated from the call for self-determination. These two issues are intertwined, because in order to develop the radical curricula Ethnic Studies required institutional power. By the third day of the TWLF strike at UC Berkeley in 1969, given the concerns voiced by the campus community, the movement decided that they needed to clarify the specific meaning of the term ‘self-determination,’ as well as the meaning of their demands in general. The pamphlet they produced, entitled “The Strike Explained,” was sixteen pages in length, covering their definition of self-determination; their five demands; their response to the administration’s critique that they needed to use “proper channels;” and much more (Appendix I). 58

I want to provide their definition of self-determination because it was the overarching goal driving their movement. Intentionally, I quote the following statement at length because the power and clarity of their intentions is foundational to the arguments I offer herein:

The TWLF is demanding the end of all forms of racism in the university. The end of racism requires first of all that Third World peoples are proportionately represented in terms of faculty, administrators, and specific numbers of admissions. But the TWLF is demanding far more than that; they are demanding ‘self-determination.’ This means a recognition that racism in America has involved not only economic deprivation and the failure of white society to provide Third World people with a meaningful education, but also the systemic destruction of whole peoples and the deliberate attempt for more than three hundred years to obliterate the basic sense of dignity of entire groups of people...It means recognizing not only the TWLF demands for jobs and admissions, but also recognizing that they are peoples with unique histories, cultures, problems and needs. It means recognition of the necessity for members of these unique cultures to define for themselves what it means to study these cultures. It means that one cannot take the position of the administration which expresses concern for Third World studies programs and then turns around and requires a structure of white control which denies the validity of those cultures by asserting the ability of whites to judge and plan for members of these cultures. How can one study in dignity one’s own culture, a culture filled with white denials of its peoplehood, within structures that continue these same denials?

But there is more than this to the demand for self-determination. The Third World students are concerned that the university serve the needs of their communities...The TWLF is concerned with developing structures that move towards guaranteeing that the university will be involved in programs that directly benefit their oppressed Third World communities. Self-determination means that Third World people must have the power to set up such programs, that choices as to curriculum, faculty and administration will take into consideration not just academic requirements but also the needs of Third World communities and see
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that it is these community needs and not those of the white community which prevail. Is this an unjustified request?\textsuperscript{59}

In summary, the most important elements comprising the TWLF’s demand for self-determination were: proportional representation of people of color in the university; recognition of Third World peoples’ histories; Third World control of their new space (college or department); and making the university accountable to serve the needs of Third World communities. In many ways, the TWLF achieved what Frantz Fanon called on the colonized people to do with their liberation. Fanon wrote, “Let us decide not to imitate Europe and let us tense our muscles and our brains in a new direction. Let us endeavor to invent a man in full, something which Europe has been incapable of achieving” (Fanon, 2004, p. 236).

Without having read the work of Paulo Freire, the TWLF was clearly employing a critical pedagogy, one that Freire outlined in his 1968 canonical text, \textit{Pedagogy of the Oppressed} (2010). The reason these movements were in philosophical conversation - although unknowingly - is because they were both created within struggles that sought to liberate historically marginalized peoples through a radical intervention in the education system. While the population Freire was committed to serving (Brazil’s most impoverished, illiterate, and exploited) was drastically different than the students at one of the most prestigious universities in the world, what united them was a history of systemic oppression. These movements were connected through a belief that education should be more than the consumption of knowledge: that it should emerge from the concerns of the oppressed masses and provide solutions to serve the needs in those communities.

Critics of the TWLF suggested that their demands were beyond reach, moving too fast, expecting too much without respecting the proper channels of the university. Fanon (2004), quick to address this tactic as a method of control utilized by colonizers during the struggle for decolonization, explained, “So they say the colonized want to move too fast. Let us never forget that it wasn't such a long time ago the colonized were accused of being slow, lazy, and fatalistic” (p. 35). The importance of tracing the similarities between the TWLF and anti-colonial movements in the Third World is not to suggest a direct comparison of condition, but rather to emphasize our shared history of colonialism, imperialism and white supremacy that transcends national boundaries. This frame of analysis speaks to the broad reach that hegemonic forms of domination have on the oppressed, globally, and also the lengths to which those in power will go to maintain their position.

For example, the opening line of the TWLF declaration states that their movement is “demanding the end of all forms of racism in the university.”\textsuperscript{60} This demand - and even the more grounded call for a college of Ethnic Studies - were often dismissed as utopian fantasies. Here again, Freire is important to situate the necessity of dreaming as instrumental to the critical pedagogue; he states, “I can’t respect the teacher who doesn’t dream of a certain kind of society that he would like to live in, and like a new generation to live in; a dream of society less ugly than we have today” (Freire, 1996, as cited in O’Donnell et al., 2004, p. 34). Thus, in their efforts to lay out their vision for the proposed College of Ethnic Studies, the TWLF allowed themselves to dream of a future they wanted for themselves, and for those who would follow. It is important
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to acknowledge that critical pedagogy, like many theories, is rooted in a certain utopian ideology. This is required because dismantling the systems, structures, and ideologies that have supported the long history of oppression and exploitation of the masses necessitates inventing a future drastically different than what we have become accustomed to.

One of the most important findings I have gleaned through my research is that the TWLF did more than establish critical pedagogy and revolutionary curricula within the first ten years of the department’s history: they demanded a new infrastructure and the hiring of people of color to run the department. The significance of this finding is that Ethnic Studies not only added new content; they fundamentally changed the *purpose* of education within the confines of the department. As discussed in the previous chapter, Ethnic Studies implemented a decolonizing methodology that fought to make education relevant to the needs of historically oppressed communities. They demanded that the people who understood the needs of their community be employed to implement their curriculum. Never before had the elite, predominately white institutions of higher education in the United States been forced to consider this population.

The TWLF was explicitly committed to creating an educational space different from anything at UC Berkeley or the American education system in general. In the United States, education has been primarily used to reproduce social inequality (Althusser, 1974; Bowles & Gintis, 1976; Fischer et al., 1996; Woodson, 1933; Blau & Duncan, 1967). The *TWLF of 1969 established certain priorities to radically disrupt this process and make education a tool for the community empowerment of historically oppressed peoples.* As discussed in Chapters 2 and 4, the ideological and pedagogical shifts the TWLF made were elements of a “war of position,” one comprised of the many movements thriving during the 1960s. These efforts mobilized to challenge the hegemonic grip of white supremacy, capitalism, and other forms of domination in the United States. These movements were so successful that they either became targets of the state - such as the Black Panther Party - or ended up falling victim to co-optation and the neoliberal agenda.

**History as Praxis: Lessons from 1969 for Today**

The Department of Ethnic Studies at UC Berkeley has gone through numerous transformations, crisis, and rebirths in the past the forty-six years. As a result of our history – in which we forced our way into the academy - we have experienced both the economic hardships higher education has been forced to endure, as well as the unique pressures to either conform to the dominant culture of the university or face exclusion and atrophy. In this section, the impact of these circumstances will be analyzed in order to evaluate both what we have achieved, and what work remains incomplete.

One major political, social, and economic project that has influenced our education, the Third World, and almost every aspect of our lives, is the rise of neoliberalism. The theory of neoliberalism argues that society will be best served and advanced by “liberating individual entrepreneurial freedoms and skills within an institutional framework characterized by strong private property rights, free markets, and free trade” (Harvey, 2005, p. 2). There is an emphasis on utility and “accountability” in stark contrast to the language of social responsibility and community concern that was popularized during the 1960s. Despite the language of freedom and “free trade,” the state actually plays an active role in deregulating markets, privatizing once public services, and strategically restructuring debt to maintain control of nations, markets, and the global economy (Harvey, 2005; Prashad, 2008). Theory is put into practice when the state
limits its interventions, unless intervention serves the aforementioned goals. The exception to this rule, of course, is when it comes to protecting private property and markets, at which time the state employs its repressive agents, such as the police, the military, and their legal systems (Harvey, 2005). Ronald Reagan’s 1980 election to the presidency represented a conservative backlash to the social and political progress of the 1960s. It also ushered in the full implementation of neoliberal policies in the United States, the violence of these actions reverberating throughout the Third World.

The collective Third World dreams that emerged from the Bandung (1955) and Havana (1966) conferences have been largely dismantled, due to both crushing debt and the failure of many of the once-revolutionary leaders to translate those freedoms won during decolonization into real change for the majority of their poor populations (Prashad, 2008). Between 1970 and 2000, the debt owed by sixty “low-income” countries to the World Bank grew from $25 billion dollars to $523 billion, despite paying $550 billion in principal and interest during that time (Prashad, 2008, p. 276). The pressures of neoliberal agencies - such as the International Monetary Fund and World Bank - on ‘the darker nations,’ as Prashad calls them, have been catastrophic. With the collapse of the USSR, the United States and Britain were virtually unchecked in their global hegemonic influence. Globalization was solidified; quickly, the Third World was cast back into a position where they were exploited for natural resources and cheap labor to the benefit of transnational corporations and the national ruling classes. So many of Fanon’s cautions from The Wretched of the Earth about life post-independence were realized. Working conditions were not often restructured; the values of those in power were not fully decolonized; the last was certainly not made the first (Fanon, 2004). However, neoliberalism did not kill the spirit of many poor peoples, who went on to challenge the privatization of their land and water (Prashad, 2008). Additionally, in Bolivia, Evo Morales was elected as the first indigenous President; in Venezuela, Hugo Chavez emerged as an outspoken socialist opponent of Western powers.

In sum, despite new efforts of the Western nations to regain global domination through neoliberalism and take back what they lost during decolonization, the subaltern peoples of the Third World continue to fight for the right to live with dignity and be able to determine a future for their children. The impact of neoliberalism within higher education has profoundly restructured funding mechanisms, increasing privatization, tuition and fees. One of the most detrimental effects of neoliberalism for Ethnic Studies has been the heightened emphasis on utility and professionalism. This turn has been used to further influence the department’s political philosophy, hiring practices, and admissions policies.

At UC Berkeley, and within higher education generally, neoliberalism has resulted in the dangerous combination of increased tuition - almost yearly - and simultaneous budget cuts. The era of bi-partisan support for public education, a hallmark of ‘embedded liberalism,’ has largely gone extinct. A major factor in rising tuition costs was Ronald Reagan’s efforts to privatize higher education, beginning in 1969, which led to easing restrictions on the assessment of fees (Brady & Kozol, 2012, para 9). This, paired with a move within the Republican Party to the far right, has resulted in the dismantling of a commitment to higher education. Today the tuition at California’s universities is catching up to the cost of private education, and fewer low income families can afford to take on the debt of an undergraduate degree, a degree that means significantly less on the job market than it did in 1960s.

The establishment of the Ethnic Studies Department at UC Berkeley was followed up
with the institutionalization of the American Cultures’ (AC) requirement in 1991. In the wake of the successful anti-Apartheid divestment movement on campus, students and faculty of color used the momentum to push the university to “desegregate the campus, desegregate the curriculum” (Noguera, “Introduction to the AC Requirement”). The students and faculty protested for an Ethnic Studies’ graduation requirement, and the university resisted; they compromised, creating ‘American Cultures.’ The establishment of this undergraduate requirement, and the vision of those who fought to create it in the context of expanding the reach of these ‘silenced histories’ to the entire undergraduate student population, was profound. However, like so many efforts to substantively address institutional racism and discrimination, the impact has had mixed results.

Despite the passage of the American Cultures requirement, the increase in the hiring of faculty of color has been lackluster. The 2013 UC Berkeley Diversity Snapshot reports that UC Berkeley ladder rank faculty are still only 3% African American, 5% Chicano/Latino, 1% Native American, 13% Asian, and 77% white (2013 UC Berkeley Diversity Snapshot, Table 4, p.7). Only 7% of full professors come from underrepresented groups (this does not include Asians), compared to 83% for white professors (2013 UC Berkeley Diversity Snapshot, Table 5, p.7). This is only a marginal increase of approximately 3% since the institutionalization of the AC requirement (2013 UC Berkeley Diversity Snapshot, figure 3, p. 8). While the vision of AC was deeply committed to increasing faculty of color, the assumed logic was that traditional departments would diversify faculty in order to offer new courses to meet the AC requirement. In practice this goal has yet to be achieved.

Under significant pressure to make an undergraduate degree profitable in a neoliberal society, gains made during the 1960s to increase the university/community partnership have been dismissed as “extracurricular,” defunded, or de-radicalized. In 2015, the Eastbay Express wrote a powerful piece on a new AC program entitled, “American Cultures Engaged Scholarship,” (ACES). Sarah Burke’s article, “Tumbling the Ivory Tower,” described the importance of the program, which “presents a radical democratic alternative-breaking down the ivory tower by bringing the university’s brain power to issues in the communities that surround it, and learning directly from those communities in the process” (Burke, 2015, para 10). The success of this Freierian methodology has resulted in the development of thirty-eight ACES courses, founded on the belief that “diversifying the curriculum must extend beyond the Band-Aid solution of offering multicultural perspectives to actually changing how students learn and who they learn from” (Burke, 2015, para 19). However, the implementation of courses built on critical pedagogy has not been met with enthusiasm and support in all areas of the campus.

Khalid Kadir, who teaches an ACES course in engineering, was interviewed for the article and explained that his course was considered “a threat to the objectivity of the rest of the coursework” (Kadir, cited in Burke, 2015, para 42). Additionally, because the university does not value community service and engagement as it does research, teaching ACES courses can put the faculty in a politically and professionally vulnerable position. After five years, the program developed and carried out by Dr. Victoria Robinson and Suzan Akin has exhausted their $947,000 Haas donation; they are now in the precarious position of having their budget approved by the university. I am hopeful that the strong community partnerships, high student enrollments, and support of the Vice Chancellor of Undergraduate Education, Katherine Koshland, will be enough to sustain and advance the very important work of the ACES program. ACES has revived an important standard and commitment set by the TWLF and early Ethnic Studies
Department to work in collaboration with Bay Area community organizations.

The importance of the critical pedagogy and curriculum of the ACES courses represent the great potential of investing in an education that fosters a Critical Ethnic Studies approach. Dr. Robinson, as well as being director of American Cultures and the ACES program, is also a member of the Ethnic Studies faculty. Her commitment to the priorities of community engagement and critical scholarship reflect the unique and powerful contributions of our field. It is important to remember that Ethnic Studies curricula is not an ‘alternative’ approach to traditional disciplines: it is the unrelenting commitment to correct centuries of ahistorical, inaccurate, and racist “research” that has reached the apex of hegemony in our society.

European, white settler, and colonial perspectives have so deeply permeated every aspect of public life, especially in academia, that those who dare challenge them are often marginalized. And no one wants to live in the margins; it is a cold unforgiving place that constantly induces the natural instinct of fight or flight. This is not to suggest that beauty and creativity don’t emerge from the margins, we know they do; but they grow in spite of their oppressors. I am saddened to say that in relation to our original purpose of serving those students and communities disempowered of by the dominant society - Ethnic Studies as a field, and in many respects, within our department - is now choosing flight more often than fight. We have neglected our service to community for a taste of institutional recognition.

Race, Space, and Revolutionary Love: The Beautiful Struggle Ahead

An important part of offering critique from a place of love is to start with affirmation. Change is natural and can be an important indicator of growth. Beautiful and empowering changes that have occurred since the TWLF are the emphasis and centralization on Women of Color Feminism and Queer Theory - two fields and frameworks silenced and marginalized during the formation of the TWLF and the many radical movements of the 1960s. Additionally, our faculty and alumna has written some of the most canonical Ethnic Studies texts, pushing forward discourse on the intersectionality of race, gender, class, sexuality, and immigration. Graduates of our programs are now teaching at institutions across the country, or have become lawyers and public servants working on critical social issues of our day, like the Prison Industrial Complex, sex trafficking, youth empowerment, and food justice. Lastly, the efforts initiated by the TWLF have pushed the broader campus to talk about race and diversity in ways that didn’t exist before the movement. The discourse on diversity has become institutionalized at UC Berkeley with the establishment of a Division of Equity and Inclusion. This space carries out very important work providing funding, support, educational resources and training to students of color – programs I benefitted greatly from during my time at UC Berkeley. These contributions are important to acknowledge as a means of validating the victories of many people who fought hard to effect change, but praise has its limits, and can often become a distraction from the difficult work that remains.

When I think of the work we have to do in Ethnic Studies, I consider it a labor of love. Therefore, the exertion that lies ahead is beautiful because it contributes to the project of emancipation and revolutionary love. Anyone who has been in a long-term relationship knows the importance of checking in, evaluating your actions, and recognizing their impact. It is in that vein that I provide the following reflections. The overarching critique that I have about the
current state of Ethnic Studies at UC Berkeley is the distance that we have drifted from some of our core principals. Again, I am not suggesting that we shouldn’t grow and shift our thinking from those who fought in 1969, but there were many things the TWLF got right: first and foremost - the demand that historically oppressed people have power in society and in the university. They demanded the power to determine, for themselves, the course of their new field as well as all decisions related to materializing that goal.

Gary Okihiro provided a poignant critique of contemporary Ethnic Studies in his 2010 article, “The Future of Ethnic Studies” Okihiro argues that the field is not being threatened primarily by racists and ‘outsiders’ but that the danger lies in how we have moved away from the political project that is Ethnic Studies. According to Okihiro, its political edge has been “[d]eliberately blunted” (Okihiro, 2010, para 14). The emphasis on ‘professionalization’ has resulted in the Ethnic Studies department operating within the dominant framework of the university. As I have outlined in this dissertation, the dominant framework is rooted in white supremacy, capitalism and neoliberalism. Therefore, when we “professionalize,” what we are really doing is acquiescing to those powers; in the process, we lose what differentiated us from those structures in the first place.

For example, of the nineteen faculty listed on our department’s website, not one holds a PhD in Ethnic Studies. This fact undermines the significance of our degree and our field. If we do not value an Ethnic Studies degree, than who will? It should be a minimum requirement that prospective faculty understand the values this department was founded on and have a deep commitment to serving, mentoring, and producing knowledge for historically marginalized communities. It should be noted that at least half of the faculty received their PhDs before it was common for Ethnic Studies to offer graduate degrees; however, we have had at least five hires in the last ten years during which there have been an abundance of candidates from our field. There are many scholars with traditional degrees who operate from a political commitment to Ethnic Studies, and that is appreciated, however recognizing our own degree is of critical importance. This critique is in no way personal: it speaks instead to institutional trends and departmental choices, which have material consequences for our field. I fear that our department has fallen into the trap that Okihiro identified as the failure of Ethnic Studies “to articulate the compelling intellectual and social necessity of our field for any educated person” (Okihiro, 2010, para 13). We are certainly not alone in this challenge; many other Ethnic Studies departments across the country face a similar dilemma. That said, I think now is the time to reevaluate our vision and our intentions as Ethnic Studies practitioners.

I will start with myself. I conclude this dissertation by stating that my intention in writing on this topic is unapologetically political. I hope that the longue durée approach to understanding the TWLF and creation of Ethnic Studies reminds the reader that Ethnic Studies should be an applied praxis. Our histories cannot and should not be taught in a traditional manner; we emerged in radical opposition to the status quo, and our praxis must reflect that. It is not enough to study race: we must actively engage in dismantling the ideologies and systems that give race meaning. The events and concerns in our communities - such as fighting against deportation, gentrification, water pollution, and the ongoing policies of genocide against Indigenous peoples, police and state violence, and the Black Lives Matter movement - must inform how we engage with our students.

Freire’s problem-posing method of critical pedagogy requires “the posing of problems of human beings in their relations with the world” (Freire, 2010, p. 79). This requires being in dialogue with our students and with the communities we are here to serve. We must act in
resistance to everything the university was built on, such as imperialism and Eurocentric elitism. We must resist the institutional urge to act antagonistically toward the masses outside of the ivory tower; rather, we need to forge a revolutionary movement and leadership that “grows out of communion with the (united) people” (Freire, 2010, p. 173). In other words, we cannot align ourselves with historically oppressed people without first creating space for them, and second, allowing ourselves to learn from them. Without the correct practices, we engage in what Freire termed false generosity.

I hope that my reflections on the current challenges we face - as a field and as a department - push forward discussions among those with the power to shift the systems, structures, and practices in our beloved space. This is work that only we can do. Through authentic dialogue I believe we can create a new, authentic revolution for Ethnic Studies in the 21st century. Without dialogue, such efforts to shift the culture and purpose of a space become more akin to a coup (Freire, 2010, p. 128).

I have written about our history so that it may serve a purpose for the present - a challenge that Howard Zinn proposed to historians - that he argued either reinforces the status quo or directly challenges it (1970). As Zinn stated, “the historian cannot choose to be neutral; he writes on a moving train” (1970, p. 35). In all honesty, writing these words is terrifying. Holding up a mirror to a place I consider home is difficult. But if I didn’t have the deepest feelings of love and appreciation, I wouldn’t take this risk. I would walk away with my PhD from UC Berkeley in hand and never look back.

That is impossible for two reasons. First, I believe in Ethnic Studies at UC Berkeley. I am proud to have earned my degree from a department realized through the struggles of young people who risked everything to make the department a reality. I have been blessed with amazing mentorship, pushed to become a rigorous scholar, and exposed to knowledge that I will carry with me indefinitely. Second, Ethnic Studies is alive in our youth and in our students who have carried out numerous hunger strikes and protests to defend this space. I cannot think of a time that students in history or anthropology starved themselves to protect their faculty, staff and curricula. We owe the youth, and ourselves because we are united, our fullest commitment to keeping Ethnic Studies alive, engaged, and connected to the needs of our historically oppressed communities.

As I write this conclusion on May 11, 2016, four students at San Francisco State University, Hassani Bell, Ahkeel Mestayer, Julia Retzlaff and Sachiel Rosen have just completed a 10-day hunger strike in defense of the first and only College of Ethnic Studies (COES) in the nation. The negotiations yielded $482,806 for the COES rather than the proposed cuts of $200,000, which had sparked the protest on May 1, 2016. The funding will be used to hire new tenure-track faculty in Africana Studies and to advance the college with the establishment of two courses in Pacific Islander Studies (Barba, 2016). The Third World Liberation Front at San Francisco State University has been revived to address this newest crisis. In honor of the legacy of the TWLF, I want to close with these students’ words:

Our work as a coalition is to put an end to the systemic racism that invests in the mass incarceration of our people instead of in their education. We must stand together to resist the systemic racism that has allowed murdering police forces to go unpunished.
We must resist the systemic racism that has allowed the mass displacement of San Francisco’s community. It is time we rise up as the people and put an end to the systematic silencing of our narratives and communities (Third World Liberation Front, 2016).

These events are only the most recent in the longue durée of Ethnic Studies. The road to self-determination and freedom is long but the youth and their commitment to social justice gives me hope. The reflections I have offered about Ethnic Studies represent our current challenges but they in no way permanent; change is guaranteed. I am optimistic that change will be empowering.
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After three days of informational picketing, convocations, and speaking engagements, the Third World Liberation Front finds it necessary to clarify its position on certain functional aspects of the Third World College and the strike.

The questions most often raised are in regard to the structure of the Third World College, admission requirements, autonomy, and the role of Third World Students in the decision-making process of the College.

The Third World College is envisioned as a major academic sub-division of the University such as Agricultural Science, Chemistry, Engineering, Environmental Design and Letters and Sciences. It would accept students directly from high school or as transfers from other institutions and provide them with a thorough background in one or more of the ethnic study programs including familiarity with other related fields and general fields of knowledge.

Although a student enrolled in the Third World College might take courses in other colleges or schools, his degree requirements would be determined by the College's deans, department chairmen and faculty. Students and community leaders would participate equally at all levels of the decision-making apparatus.

The Third World College will have its own administrative officials and its own regulations for obtaining degrees. ALL STUDENTS WILL BE EXPECTED TO SATISFY REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE ON THREE LEVELS: UNIVERSITY, THIRD WORLD COLLEGE, AND FIELD OF CONCENTRATION i.e., department of Black Studies, Chicano Studies and Asian Studies.

Admission to the Third World College will be based primarily on their potential to learn as determined by the Third World College's Admissions office. Measurements of potentiality will be designed to take into account the cultural differences and diverse life experiences of those applying for admission. Upon acceptance to the Third World College, applicants will receive financial academic assistance needed to insure their success in completing degree programs. Enrollment in the college will not be restricted solely to Third World people, but because of the nature and purpose of the College, Third World people will be given primary consideration.

Administrators, non-academic personnel, and faculty will be recruited and hired on the basis of their awareness of the problems facing Third World people and their ability to provide an educational experience relevant to the aspirations of Third World people.
The goal of the Third World College will be to provide an education of the highest quality while allowing students to retain their cultural identity, thus enabling them to return to their communities to live and to create an atmosphere conducive to political, social, and economic changes.

The demand for autonomy and control of the college by Third World people was necessary to retain the flexibility and latitude required to develop a meaningful curriculum and course content.

To allow the white majority to control the Third World College would result in its conformity to existing organizational and academic standards which have proven ineffective in fulfilling the pressing needs of our society. The role of the Third World College within the Third World communities, its political and economic orientation, and its definition of Third World people, will serve to counteract the domination over Third World people.

The Third World Liberation Front has established a progress committee to oversee implementation of the College. TWLF specifically requests of the administration, and the other powers that be, that they immediately establish the structure of the Third World College. The structure will consist of a declaration of the existence of the Third World College with guaranteed funding, open positions for co-deans associate.

The Third World Liberation Front has established a progress committee to oversee implementation of the College. TWLF specifically requests of the administration, and the other powers that be, that they immediately establish the structure of the Third World College. The structure will consist of a declaration of the existence of the Third World College with guaranteed funding, open positions for co-deans, associate deans etc., co-admissions officers, co-personnel officers, and chairmen for the individual departments of Asian Studies, Black Studies, and Chicano Studies recruited and hired by Third World faculty, Third World Students and Third World Community leaders.

The further developments and implementation of the Third World College will be carried on by these administrators in conjunction with the Third World Liberation Front.

To further the education of the University community, TWLF asks Chancellor Heyns to declare a suspension of classes so that a university meeting might take place on Tuesday, January 28, 1969, and that there the TWLF proposals be discussed by TWLF students and faculty with those administrators and faculty members capable of implementing them. And we challenge Chancellor Heyns to a publically televised debate between himself and TWLF and Third World faculty members on the merits of the TWLF proposals.
what does the TWLF want: SELF-DETERMINATION

The TWLF is demanding the end of all forms of racism in the university. The end of racism requires first of all that Third World peoples be proportionately represented in terms of faculty, administrators and specific numbers of admissions. But the TWLF is demanding more than that; they are demanding "self-determination". This means a recognition that racism in America has involved not only economic deprivation and the failure of white society to provide Third World people with a meaningful education, but also the systematic destruction of whole peoples and the deliberate attempt for more than three hundred years to obliterate the basic sense of dignity of entire groups of people. Dealing with racism also means facing up to racism on this level. It means recognizing not only the TWLF demands for jobs and admissions, but also recognizing that they are peoples with unique histories, cultures, problems and needs. It means recognition of the necessity for members of these unique cultures to define for themselves what it means to study these cultures. It means that one cannot take the position of the administration which expresses concern for Third World studies programs and then turns around and requires a structure of white control which denies the validity of those cultures by asserting the ability of whites to judge and plan for members of those cultures. How can one study in dignity one's own culture, a culture filled with white denials of its peoplehood, within structures that continue these same denials.

But there is more than this to the demand for self-determination. The Third World students are concerned that the university serve the needs of their communities. Much has been said about how the university has served the interests of the dominant white community and especially the business community. The TWLF is concerned with developing structures that move towards guaranteeing that the university will be involved in programs that directly benefit their oppressed Third World communities. Self-determination means that Third World people must have the power to set up such programs, that choices as to curriculum, faculty and administration will take into consideration not just academic requirements but also the needs of Third World communities and see that it is these community needs and not those of the white community which prevail. Is this an unjustified request? Clearly the needs of Third World communities are so great that every institution in America can be called upon to help. Since these needs have not risen accidentally, but are the result of hundreds of years of deliberate suppression, white institutions have a special responsibility to help.
Even more than this, the needs are so great and pressing that strictly academic criteria for judging programs seem most inappropriate. A course on Mexican history from 1510 to 1583 might be academically desirable, but a course dealing with the problems of Mexican-Americans in regaining their property rights in New Mexico might be more relevant to the immediate needs and concerns of the Mexican-American community. At this moment in history who can demand that academic consideration take precedence over the needs of the Third World communities? Moreover, whites do not have the right to make that choice. That choice must rather lie in the hands of those people for whom the choice is a question of survival, those people who are members of the Third World community.

THIRD WORLD ENROLLMENT

There has been a great deal of confusion about this demand. What is being asked for, and all that has been asked for, is that "admission to the Third World College...be based primarily on...(Third World applicants) potential to learn as determined by the Third World Admissions Office" (TWLF statement). Standards for admission for Third World applicants have to be set by those people whose commitment to Third World cultures and whose understanding of those cultures are clear. This can only be done by an admissions office controlled and administered by Third World individuals.

The demand arises, first of all, out of a rejection of the normal standards for admission. Many white students have raised objections as to the validity of standards such as grades and SAT tests, and for Third World youth such criteria are even more invalid. Entrance exams, for instance, assume a white middle class high school education and then test the individual on his grasp and interpretation of what has been taught. How do you test a Third World person who refuses to believe the distorted education that he did receive?

There is an additional problem. Any significant attempt to have the university serve the needs of Third World people requires the recruitment of Third World youth in large numbers to the university to take university programs which offer education directly related to their needs. It is a twofold problem of admissions and programs. There would be no point in recruiting Third World youth to the university if there is to be no program for giving them a relevant education. On the other hand, even with such a program being offered, recruitment is difficult because of widespread apprehensions about the university in Third World communities, apprehensions clearly justified by the university's action in the past and society's actions in general. For a hundred years, Third World people have simply not been welcomed by the
university even if they did want to come here. To remedy this, it will take a dramatic and positive change in admissions policy that is a clear sign to Third World communities of a change in attitude. Such an act would be the placing of admissions decision-making power into the hands of an office staffed and controlled by Third World people.
4. The demand for Third World control over Third World programs

This demand concerns the central issue of self-determination, a demand which has been discussed in detail earlier in this pamphlet.

5. That no disciplinary action be administered in any way to any student, worker, teacher, or administrator during and after the strike as a consequence of their participation in the strike.

The final demand concerns amnesty for persons involved in the strike. This type of demand is similar to the law that apartment dwellers who raise grievances with their landlords not be evicted for doing so. The university, by its refusal to meet the just demands of the TWLF has created a situation where those concerned have to take direct action. The TWLF and supporting strikers are in effect doing the university's work for it. If the demands are just, then those who fight for them should not be penalized.

---

**TW College—A Realistic Demand?**

**ARE THE STRIKE DEMANDS REALISTIC?**

One objection to the posing of these demands as strike demands, is that the demands cannot realistically be met in full, and therefore a strike is futile or rash. Let us take the question of a Third World College. That the administration was willing, when pushed, to set up a Chicano Studies program and a Black Studies Department indicates the feasibility of establishing a Third World College. Since the Third World people would take on the task of initial administering and hiring, no new demands would be made on university manpower.

There is no shortage of money. Funds could be appropriated from the Urban Crisis program, claimed to be the university's response to urban needs. Funds could and should be channelled off from war research programs into people-serving programs like the Third World College. The priority should be that which serves the people; the Third World College is such a proposal.
HAVE THE "PROPER CHANNELS" BEEN EXHAUSTED? IS THE ADMINISTRATION ACTING IN GOOD-FAITH?

Many students and most faculty members respond to the strike demands with an understandable anxiety about the exhaustion of "proper channels." Let us look at the history of the use of these channels.

It has now been 9 months since the Afro-American Student Union presented its proposal for a department of Afro-American Studies to Chancellor Heyns. The program proposed was well conceived and left few questions unanswered regarding its nature. Following this submission of the AASU proposal, Dean Knight expressed his intention to work closely with the AASU. However, Knight re-wrote the proposal which became a secret document. A spokesman for Dean Knight noted in the Jan. 20 Daily Californian that "once a proposal gets into review channels it is not made available to other people."

The Administration's refusal to recognize the essential issue of self determination for Third World people was not limited to their paternalistic attitude to the TWLF. It is significant that both David Blackwell, head of the implementing committee for Black Studies, and U. C. Black Assistant Chancellor for Student Affairs Andrew Billingsley, were excluded from key administrative meetings on minority problems. The administration is unwilling to allow Third World participation in the department on a decision-making level. The executive committee of the College of Letters and Science kept the administration's version of the AASU proposal for creation of the department from the Third World people and made decisions, directly affecting the lives and programs of the Third World peoples, without consulting them or informing them of the nature of these decisions. Further, the L&S Executive committee has no plans to include Black students on the implementing committee. In fact, as Professor Seabury noted, student participation on decision-making level "was never formally discussed." (see Daily Cal, Jan. 16).
The Administration makes continual references to extensive efforts on behalf of minority persons. What does the record show? Heyns's "extensive efforts" have resulted in the addition of four blacks, nine Mexican-Americans, and one Indian to the faculty. If Third World minorities were given employment and admitted to student status up to their percentage in the state, their numbers would increase by over 8,400.

University authorities have frustrated reasonable attempts to participate in the implementation of Third World programs, obscuring their intransigence with tokenism:

1. The Chicanos asked for a Presidential Assistant with decision-making powers. The University gave them, as a result of long negotiations and of the arrested 11 Chicanos, an assistant to the President whose contract stipulates that he can do no more than suggest.

2. It took months of long negotiations merely to have the Administration approve a course proposed by the Asians, that all parties considered to be reasonably structured and designed.

3. The Political Science department turned down a proposed Black Studies course on Racism, Colonialism, and Apartheid, and one week later the same department granted tenure to a racist who the University of Kentucky would not have.

One of the essential aspects of the Third World College is the program's emphasis on Third World community involvement. The Administration's proposal specifically excluded field work study from the curriculum, clearly contrary to the vital needs of the Third World people.

The above history indicates that in addition to being frustratingly complex, the "proper channels" have denied the fundamental right of self-determination for Third World peoples. In this context it can be argued that American society is thoroughly permeated with a maze of "proper channels" which serve to censor, deflect and suppress those energies that seek to realize just demands such as the demand for self-determination. In the University, a reflection of the society it serves, academic "proper channels" perform much the same function. It is not merely that these bureaucratic channels are frustratingly complex. Much more important, these proper channels have denied the fundamental right of self-determination for Third World peoples.
Now we can answer the question of whether the administration acted in good faith. First, it should be remembered that the administration has only reacted to the demands of the TWLF. It has not initiated programs of substantial import without first being put "up against the wall." Second, these channels have attempted to cut out the more substantial parts of the Third World proposals, i.e. field work study and community involvement. It is not enough that the administration make concessions on personnel matters. Much more important is the question of giving the Third World policy making power. Third, the administration has remained adamantly opposed to the crucial issue of self determination. Going through "proper channels" has only resulted in nine months of denial of the most fundamental needs of the Third World students. The deadline for submission of the University's budget is February 14. For these reasons the TWLF has had to turn to a strike at this time to try to implement their programs. This history should make clear that the administration's intransigence has left the TWLF with no recourse but to call a strike.

**Discrimination at BERKELEY!**

The University follows a pattern of racial discrimination in its hiring practices. At present, despite all the effort Heyns claims to have made, out of a total of 16,123 employees on the University campus only 1440 or 9% are Third World people. With four to five thousand hirings last year, the number of jobs held by minorities increased by only 306. If minority people were employed equal to their representation in the state it would mean an increase of 2300 more employees. Simply to bring the number of minority students up to their percentage in the state, to parallel the employment situation, would require admission of 6500 more students. Thus in both academic and non-academic matters it is evident racial discrimination operates in the University.

Finally, the University is racist in that it actively aids in the suppression of efforts of Third World people to take control of and better their own life situation. This University has been deeply involved in the Vietnam morass, both by technological research and with social scientists advising the government on how best to wage a political struggle. Counter-insurgency research projects, such as Project Camelot have drawn heavily upon the Berkeley faculty; this campus is one of the centers for research on chemical and biological warfare, most of which would be used against people of the Third World. At home the University has actively intervened in the struggle between the growers and the grape strikers--on the side of the growers; it has been active also in devising sham schemes like "black capitalism" to try to co-opt Third World people, and prevent them from making meaningful changes relevant to their lives.
"Lowering" of Educational Standards

Many white students have expressed concern that acceptance of the
IWLF demands for a Third World College with open admission for members of
the Third World will somehow lower the educational standards of the University and the value of a University degree. But is this really the case? Students at Berkeley and elsewhere are insisting that the kind of education presented at the University is not a value-free experience, and that education must become relevant and directed to answering real questions about society's needs. However, the University as it presently constituted is a white middle-class institution, and the education offered there reflects the cultural values of the white middle-class.

Obviously, the entrance of large numbers of Third World people into the University will change this. They will have the group power, which a few individuals do not have, to resist the pressure to submit to a culture which is alien and basically hostile to them and the community they represent. A Third World College, controlled by its students and staff, will be a place where the previously excluded ideas and perspectives of oppressed peoples can enter the University.

On the other hand, the distribution of economic and political privilege in this country is such that Third World children are prevented from acquiring certain skills that white middle class children learn as a matter of course. It will take intensive efforts and sacrifices on our part to enable Third World students to gain what schools in the ghettos and barrios have kept from them. If we do not accept this responsibility however, what we are really saying is that we accept the system of privilege which gives us access to elite jobs because we were born into middle class white families and condemns other to low paying and menial jobs.
Is A Strike Coercive?

We have been conditioned to accept the violence and force used by the privileged class of this society but not the force with which oppressed peoples react. Yes, the strike is coercive but so much more is the normal, non-strike functioning of the University. To speak of the coercive aspects of the strike as immoral while at the same time silently acquiescing to the planned violence of the society and the University's role in it, is in every sense hypocritical. For example the University's war and war-related research (the H-bomb was designed here, for a start), and chemical-biological warfare research, directly implicate it in America's war against the Vietnamese people and other oppressed peoples in Latin America and Asia. The University's counter-insurgency research make this institution a partner to the government's ruthless oppression of ghetto rebellions. The University has aided the growers in fighting the grape-strikers. Furthermore, the very resistance of the University to the creation of a Third World College and Third World-controlled enrollment makes it a partner to the oppression forced on the unprivileged classes of society.

To participate in the strike is, admittedly, to participate in an act of coercion but it is one very different from the coercion that made the demands necessary in the first place. The act of striking manifests the determination aimed at and necessary to the achievement of certain demands. If the TWLF demands are just, as we hope you will be convinced that they are, then you are faced with a choice of either fighting for those demands or acquiescing in the denial of them. If we are forced to use a strike, it is not out of choice but out of necessity in facing such a coercive society and university. One cannot in this kind of situation escape from the relative uses of coercion, because there is no middle ground. One is either a participant in the limited coerciveness of a strike or one participates by acquiescence in the continuing oppression of Third World people in this society and university.
Why Should Whites Support the Strike

The TWLF demands will go a long way toward accomplishing self-determination for TW students. This is in the self-interest of white students both because it establishes the major principle of equal student participation and because it carves out a niche where this principle may become a reality.

But there is another and even more important point. Many whites believe that racism is detrimental only to those who are discriminated against. But whites are also victims of racism because it brings about a false perception of reality. This false perception of reality is in part created and reinforced by an education which distorts or omits the histories, experiences, contributions, and present conditions of TW people in this country. This is often done in a very subtle and perhaps unconscious way. TW students constantly notice it but white students rarely do.

The establishment of a TW College, which would be open to white students as well, will help to perpetuate a more honest and fuller perception of reality by correcting the distortions and filling in the omissions about TW peoples which characterize so many courses in the university. This can be a major step toward eliminating the racism which makes victims of us all.

The TWLF has taken the initiative for student self-determination and for the elimination of racism in education. Supporting the demands of the TWLF becomes, therefore, not simply an act of paternalistic altruism, but an act of self-interest. The struggle of the TW students is the struggle of all students. When the demands of the TWLF are realized, a major step toward the goal of relevant education for all students and toward significant social change will have been made.
Do TWLF demands lead to segregation

The TWLF has repeatedly stated that their intent is not to keep white people out of their program. It is simply a question of who is going to control the College and make the basic decisions on the functions and directions of the program.

The whole point of the TWLF program is to create institutions which can help Third World people develop the strength that will make racial animosity unnecessary. Clearly, as long as whites insist that they can tell Third World people how to study and define their own culture, or experience, racial animosity is only going to increase. Mutual self-respect (with white respect for Third World cultures most clearly lacking in the past) is the way to build good relationships.

The important thing that Third World people are interested in is not whether they can sit in the same classroom or live next door to a white person. Their concern is with whether they will have an opportunity to receive a decent education which is relevant to their needs and aspirations.

◆ Can the Strike Win? ◆

It is clear that the University can only maintain its legitimacy in the eyes of the community and the people of California when it can project the image that it is "educating the students." In order to do so, it must show that students are in class and carrying on the supposed activities of the University. Without the students in class, the University has no apparent legitimacy and can not maintain its support from the people.

It would not require a complete shutdown to establish the TWLF and the Strike Support groups in a position of power. At a certain point in a political confrontation, the growing support makes for a qualitatively different condition of political power. As classroom attendance declines, tremendous pressure is directed on both the Chancellor and the faculty to come to grips with the substantive issues involved in the strike. The struggle at S.F. State illustrates the fundamental fact that a significant number of people engaged in concerted action can ultimately transform the conditions of power.
**Why Stick Your Neck Out Now?**

**Why Should I Be Amongst the First to Go on Strike?**

This question is often used as a smokescreen for those individuals unwilling to make the sacrifice of class attendance to support the much more vital implementation of the Third World programs. There would be no need to answer this question if the large numbers of students who support the demands, yet hide behind their anxiety that their fellow students won't join with them, expressed their beliefs on the picket lines. If every supporter is unwilling to make the first step, then the just demands of the TWLF will never be met.

Written and Distributed by

**TWLF**

and

**Strike Support Committee**

**STRIKE NOW!**

For information call 642-6727

Errata: Demand 3a of the TWLF should read "Admission, financial aid and academic assistance for all Third World students who can and contribute."
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