By the mid-twenty-first century, white Euro-Americans will be a demographic minority in the United States and Latinos will be the largest minority (25 percent). These changes bring about important challenges at the heart of the contemporary debates about political transformations in the United States and around the world. Latin@s are multi-ethnic (Amer-Indo, Asian, and Euro-Latin@s), multi-racial, multireligious (Jewish, Catholic, Protestant, Muslim, indigenous, and African spiritualities), and of varied legal status (immigrant, citizens, and illegal migrants). This collection addresses for the first time the potential of these diverse Latin@ spiritualities, origins, and statuses against the landscape of decolonization of the U.S. economic and cultural empire in the twenty-first century. Some authors explore the impact of Indo-Latinos and Afro-Latinos in the United States and others discuss the conflicting interpretations and political conflicts arising from the "Latinization" of the United States.
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From Traditionally Radical Chicanos/as to Radically Traditional Xicanas/os

Roberto Hernández

The Twenty-Eighth Annual Political Economy of the World-System (PEWS) conference, thematically titled “Latin@s in the World-System,” posed several questions, among which were: How to think about decolonization of the American Empire in the twenty-first century? Which traditions, imaginaries and identities will prevail within the Latin@ population? And how can Latin@s build a different relationship among themselves and with other groups...? My focus lies on three main themes: historical silences and distortions of the Chicano Movement, questions of spirituality and indigenismo, and lastly, a consideration of an ongoing spiritual run called the Peace and Dignity Journeys and the role Latinas/os, youth in particular, have been playing in it. The purpose of this essay is twofold. First, it is an attempt to delve into the complex role of indigenismo and indigenous spirituality amongst Chicanas/os specifically, and Latinas/os generally. While not much scholarly attention has been given to the matter, this piece is meant as a starting point that will hopefully lead to more questions, rather than an exhaustive effort. Secondly, and just as important, I
sinate my work within the framework of Chicana/o Studies, and in so doing, I aim to intervene critically in the sometimes dogmatic formulations of Chicano historiography and knowledge production generally. Historian Emma Pérez's analysis is thus useful, as she suggests four frames through which Chicano history has usually been articulated:

1. Ideological/Intellectual: "Chicanos are heroes/intellectuals.
2. Immigrant/Labor: "Chicanos/as are immigrant laborers" and/or "Chicanos/as are colonized workers."
3. Social History of the Other (as History of the Same): "Chicanos/as are also social beings, not just workers"; and
4. Gendered History: "Chicanos are also Chicanas."

These frameworks, Pérez argues, limit the lens by which we view history, as well as its content. Taking heed from Pérez, my intervention for an indigenous perspective in Chicana/o Studies, which I hope will become evident in this essay, also draws from "dialogue about the nature and direction of Chicano social science research" reached at the first NCCSS meeting (then National Caucus of Chicano Social Science) in 1973. I point here to the first of five points of consensus:

Social science research by Chicanos must be much more problem-oriented than traditional social science has been. Chicano research should aim to delineate the social problems of La Raza, (and I would add methodological, ontological and epistemological considerations) and actively propose solutions. Analysis should not be abstracted or disembodied from such pressing social concerns. Social science scholarship cannot be justified for its own sake: it must be committed scholarship that can contribute to Chicano Liberation (my emphasis).

While the five points of consensus were meant to outline a vision of the nature and direction of Chicano social science research, such vision has yet to be realized and it is arguable whether it is followed today. Also arguable is what was and is meant by "Chicano Liberation" and the limits of social science research. Although the subject of much debate in the 1960s as it is today, it is in thinking through this debate that epistemic and ontological considerations become crucial, as does the breaking away from strict disciplinary boundaries that define our sense of knowledge and knowledge production. Nonetheless, this paper is guided by a spirit of "committed scholarship" aiming to constructively and "actively propose solutions," in this case to political, ideological and TemporalSpatial questions of decolonization, spirituality and coloniality. By TemporalSpatial, I am referring to the five kinds of TimeSpace (episodic geopolitical, cyclical-ideological, structural, eternal, and transformational) Immanuel Wallerstein depicts in his study of historical systems. I also borrow from Walter Mignolo's assertion of the "epistemic potential" of Chicano and Latino Studies, to argue that the vision of liberation and decolonization has accompanied such programs since their inception, but has not been fully realized, in part, due to a failure to recognize the extent, depth, and reach of the coloniality of power, as Aníbal Quijano describes contemporary power relations. In other words, I am here proposing that it is through knowledge production from an indigenous or indigenista perspective that we may further the process of decolonization from the structural TimeSpace of the capitalist world-economy, which has lasted over 500 years, built, in part, on the suppression of indigenous knowledge and spirituality. Such a perspective entails a necessary break from Cartesian and binary logics that inform Western rationality which would, in turn, lead to significantly different relations to questions of land, ownership, social relations, modes of production and value.

Using the ongoing debates about identity politics and the political utility of nationalism as a departure point, this paper thus examines the history and historiography of the Chicano Movement. Contrary to most scholarly consideration of the period, which reduce it to a moment of nationalist fervor, I explore different tendencies that coexisted and continue today. I take the perspective and argue that heterogeneity has been a significant source of Chicano organizations' strengths, yet their inability to come to terms with such heterogeneity has also been at the root of their own limitations. In particular, I consider the origin of the Chicano Movement as a union of multiple organizations and struggles of similar, yet by no means identical, political persuasions, as the originating tension that has emerged time and time again as point of contestation, albeit in different manifestations. While I briefly consider the nationalist-internationalist debate that took center stage in the 1980s, my focus is the more recent engagements with decolonial indigenismo among Latinas/os, as informed since the 1960s.

Michel-Rolph Trouillot shows how history, its production and public memory reflect power relations since "Power is constitutive of the story...[it] does not enter the story... It precedes the narrative proper, contributes to its creation and to its interpretation..." Therefore, he continues, if one is to uncover the hidden stories, an inevitable series of questions arise: why, how, and by whom have the stories been silenced? Or told? The answers lay in an interrogation of power in its many manifestations, in this case a consideration of representations of the Chicano Movement made by participants who entered academia, as informed by the ideological perspective that has maintained a hegemonic position, namely nationalism.

As Black youth were breaking with their reformist-minded predecessors of the Civil Rights Era, affirming "Black Is Beautiful" stances, young Mexicanas/os were abandoning the assimilationist and reformist organizations and mobilizing to the thunderous chants of "Chicano Power!" and "¡Viva La Raza!" At the
forefront of the shift to a nationalist and militant politics (among other ideological tendencies) were youth frustrated with the inaction to the brutal injustices their communities were facing; namely police brutality, inadequate housing, job/wage discrimination and poverty. A major signifier of such a shift toward self-determination was the process of self-naming. In the 1960s many young Mexicanas/os began calling themselves Chicanas and Chicanos. They also adopted the concept of “Aztlán” (a “mythical” place from which the Aztecs were said to have migrated south to Tenochtitlán) in reference to the Southwest of the United States, a land that had previously been a part of Mexico. Aztlán, or the Southwest, therefore became a symbolic home to the Chicanas/os, many who romantically saw themselves as descendants of the Aztecs and hence fighting for their homeland.

On the heels of the now-famous National Chicano Youth Liberation Conference in Denver, Colorado, in March of 1969, where El Plan Espiritual de Aztlán, the subject of much recent criticism from the conservative right, was drafted, a second unrelated conference was convened by members of Chicano Coordinating Committee on Higher Education (CCHE) and held a month later in Santa Barbara. From this conference came plans on the part of the students present (over fifty student leaders who were selectively invited) to drop the names of their respective organizations and in exchange collectively take on the name of a new organization, Movimiento Estudiantil Chico/na de Aztlán (M.E.Ch.A.). Many of the students present were concerned with finding a way of operationalizing El Plan de Aztlán, which among other points, called for “UNITY” as its first point of action—a concept that would prove to be extremely problematic.

While high school students in Los Angeles and elsewhere had already been walking out of schools in protest of a failing educational system, what was significant about this conference was the formalization of the initiative that students took. In other words, while the Santa Barbara conference undoubtedly marked the birth of M.E.Ch.A., the self-representation of the event, which continues today, also reveals the vanguardism that has come to characterize many Chicano organizations. It is here that I differ with Carlos Muñoz’ argument in Youth, Identity, and Power, perhaps the most widely read volume on the Chicano Movement: “The adoption of the new name, and its acronym, M.E.Ch.A., signaled a new level of political consciousness among student activists. It was the final stage in the transformation of what had been loosely organized, local student groups into a single structured and unified student movement.” While adopting one name was a significant move, rather than accepting this romanticized view of events, I would argue the language of the Plan de Santa Barbara illuminated the fact that there was still a lack of unity on goals, principles and strategy. Instead, El Plan was very loosely and ambiguously written, as it spoke more to the multitude of varying perspectives present than to one single unified voice. While potentially positive if embraced for its heterogeneity, problems soon arose from the insistence on a cultural unity despite clearly varying views and class differences that existed. Although it did provide the necessary inspiration to further “movement” activities, different people, informed by distinct ideologies, took with them different readings of the Plan.

The loosely and ambiguously written Plan de Santa Barbara thus illustrated the initially generalist approach to a definition of Chicano Nationalism that was still emerging. While it was useful for creating a sense of social cohesion, its ambiguous nature remained and conflicts over ideology, among others, some new and some old, would arise. It was from these two initial conferences that the concepts of cultural nationalism, Aztlán, and Chican/o/a were being solidified and thus became the hegemonic discourse of the Chicano Movement.

A significant part of the utopian vision-in-progress was due to writings of a young poet, Alurista, whose poem “El Plan Espiritual de Aztlán” galvanized the moment; but from this poem, too, emerged different, diverging tendencies. Alurista has since gone down in history as a Chicano icon, despite his own later, and lesser known, rewriting of “El Plan Espiritual de Aztlán” in which he makes his own indigenous epistemological location more explicit. Few knew much about Alurista, at the time a student in San Diego, what mattered most was his poetry. A point that must be elucidated, however, is that Alurista, whose real name is Alverto Urioste, was himself an immigrant from Mexico City who had come to the United States with a clearer understanding of Nahual language and cosmology than most urban Chicanas/os. So while the terms Aztlán and Chicanos were becoming popularized, appropriated and romanticized for the purpose of the political mobilizations of the Chicano Movement, underlying Alurista’s poetry was nonetheless an entirely different cosmological understanding of one’s relation with the land and of the term Chicano itself, which I argue posits the condition of possibility for a distinction between what I will propose as “cultural nationalists” and “indigenists.”

Black scholar activist, Robert Allen, in Black Awakening in Capitalist America, writes how in the 1960s several parties with diverging interests were using the concept of “Black Power” in dramatically different ways. Allen distinguishes between the cultural nationalists, revolutionary nationalists, and bourgeois nationalists. Of the three, for example, the latter’s concept of Black Power was equated with Black Capitalism and shared the support of Richard Nixon. It is here, I argue, a similar analysis of the Chicano Movement can be sustained, and thus shift in an attempt to elaborate it in regards to the Chican/o/a experience of the 1960s.

In the July/August 2002 issue of Monthly Review, Jorge Mariscal and Betta Martinez, respectively, elucidate the internationalist tendencies of the Chicano Movement, rooted in 1900’s labor struggles. These coexisting tendencies came to a clash in the 1980s, embodied in the League of Revolutionary Struggle (LRS, known as Liga) and M.E.Ch.A. While accepted Chican/o/a history and popular lore maintains Liga were “outside communist agitators” attempting...
to "infiltrate" a presumably unified (nationalist) movement. Mariscal and Martinez' historical contextualizations help demonstrate Liga members were part of already existing internationalist tendencies within the Chicano Movement. Contrary to prescriptions of the period as solely a nationalist movement, Mariscal and Martinez attempt to rescue a more sophisticated political that existed. Mariscal elaborates the point in relation to Chicano Studies, which we still see reflected today in the numerous interest-based caucuses and ideological expressions of the National Association of Chicana and Chicano Students (NACCS). Mariscal states, "As Chicano Studies programs developed . . . during the early 1970s, ideological divisions would distinguish 'revolutionary,' 'nationalist,' and more traditional faculty and curricula." The heterogeneity made itself evident once again in the recent (2004) creation of an Indigenous Caucus. Nonetheless, a nationalist imaginary, of one variation or another, has always dominated, among Chicanas/os, circles, albeit at odds with Chicanas feminists, internationalist, poststructuralist and indigenous scholars since the inception of Chicano Studies.

Such divisions exist not only among faculty and curricula. They are also evident among students and activists in the community. However, rather than consider the ideological divisions as a sign of decline as it is usually portrayed and in which there exists the logic of a fading authentic moment, I believe it is more useful and, in fact, historically accurate, to speak of such divisions as the anxiety and inability to come to terms with the wide range of perspectives that coexisted alongside an often monolithic Chicano cultural nationalism. It was such inability to grasp a sense of a heterogeneous community, which led two major organizations in the 1970s, the August 29 Movement (ATM) and Centro de Acción Social Autónomo (CASA) to rival, for example, not (only) over ideology, but over what was the correct form Chicano Liberation would take: an independent Chicano nation in the Southwest or a return of the Southwest to Mexico. Both, however, had totalizing stances that included the outright erasure of the native populations in the Southwest. While some took to forms of nationalism that in effect erased the existence of native peoples such as the Chumash, Tohono O'odham, and Kumeyaay of the Southwest, others took a different approach. It is to these few, but important, examples I will turn my attention.

As an initial attempt to delve into the complex role of indigenismo and indigenous spirituality amongst Chicanas/os specifically and Latinas/os generally, I interrogate two aspects of said concepts, which for explanatory purposes I propose as a distinction between symbolic and concrete engagements with indigenous cultures and teachings. By symbolic and concrete engagements and commitments, I mean to distinguish between what I earlier posited as "cultural nationalists," on the one hand—those who simply invoke pre-Colombian imagery and symbols for political purposes, yet may discount indigenous perspectives, lived experiences, struggles and living peoples themselves—and "indigenistas," on the other—those who do actively engage and maintain spiritual and political commitments (this too is heterogeneous which I will touch on later) with the respective teachings of (their) traditional communities in a conscientious and respectful way. Another distinguishing characteristic of the latter group is their tendency to be more historically attuned and acknowledging of how different colonial histories and racialization processes have constructed present-day relations with other native peoples and one another in given spaces as negotiated by geopolitical borders. That is to say, I make a distinction between various reactionary political forms of cultural nationalisms and those who learn and make spiritual commitments to their own native teachings. As such, I focus on how some of the debates around indigenismo have thus manifested themselves in the context of discussions around the Chicano Movement and more recently, Latinas/os generally.

It is necessary, however, to acknowledge the numerous "indigenista" groups, many with their own distinct and often varying politics regarding indigenismo and spirituality. In this regard, it is difficult to speak of one monolithic form or manifestation of indigenismo, so I will limit myself to groups in California, Arizona and Colorado. I similarly will attempt to account for tendencies within the cultural nationalist organizations that are "officially" ambivalent and/or maintain often contradictory negotiations with indigeneity, M.E.Ch.A. in particular.

As Mariscal and Martinez remark about leftist tendencies, I contend that there have also always been, albeit limited in numbers, "indigenista" tendencies among the participants of the Chicano Movement. Perhaps most notably are the Arranda, Enrique and Sanchez families of San Diego and Arizona who have been involved with the Peace and Dignity Journeys, and Rocky Rodriguez and others in Colorado who were part of the Occupation at Wounded Knee in solidarity with the American Indian Movement. There were also several young Chicanas/os in the San Francisco/Oakland Bay Area who accompanied the group "Indians of All Tribes" in the November 1969 takeover of Alcatraz Island and others who joined Native students in creation of DQ University, a Native Chicano community college near Sacramento a few years later. There are also numerous groups of people who have been involved with Danza Azteca (Aztec dancing which is itself a form of prayer) and other forms of ceremonies. These examples point to a different understanding of, and relationship to, the term "Chicana/o" and, furthermore, the necessity to outline an indigenista conceptualization of the term Xicana/o.

Contrary to being the "derogatory term from the 1930s" as it is commonly described, the term Chicano is derived from the word Mejicano or Mexican, which is itself rooted in the word Mexicano (with the "x" being pronounced as "ch") within the Nahua language from which it stems. Mexican and his was thus in reference to the Mexico, or Aztecs as later called by the Spanish colonists, and was derived from the union of four terms: mestiz (moon), xictli (bellybutton), cayotl (offspring, child of), and natl (yes!). Although translations rarely do justice
to actual meanings of words, it is from these root words that *mesica* translates roughly to "children from the bellybutton of the moon." Likewise, *xicano*, from its Nahua/a base can be taken to mean an affirmation "Yes! I am a child of the bellybutton/earth!" So while in the 1960s young Mexicanos/os took to the streets and proudly proclaimed themselves Chicana/os, underlying this affirmation was a radically different cosmological understanding of one's relationship to self, the land, the earth and all living things, that Xicana/os have now consciously embraced.

On the other hand, there are cultural nationalist groups who although identity with the cultural referents of what is perceived as an indigenous past, do not extend such significance to an indigenous living present. While cultural nationalist groups, whose public presence is most known, make use of pre-Colombian imagery and symbols, they by and large discount an "indigenista" perspective and fail to connect with those who have engaged in and with the respective teachings of traditional communities as well as ongoing struggles of living native peoples, north and south. Marginalized from the annals of Chicano Movement history have been the internationalist tendencies and, I would argue, also strands of indigenismo.

In a parallel observation, Maria Tere Ceseña's work on the role of Dansa Asteca in Chicana/o communities, elucidates a similar point. She argues that through the presidency of Lazaro Cardenas, the years of consolidating the Mexican Revolution via Jose Vasconcelos' conceptualization of La Raza Comica, the State adhered to a "political rather than cultural (and much less 'biological') affiliation to "lo indigena" generally, and Cuauhtemoc specifically, erecting numerous statues in his honor, while denying the present-day indigenous reality of its own population. She interestingly notes that while revering this indigenous "past" in the process of modernizing Mexico through the narrative of Mesizaje. Emiliano Zapata, an indigenous hero of the Mexican Revolution, has never been "formally" revered by the state. While the terms political, cultural and biological are, in fact, very loaded and at times cannot be extricated from one another in their functional roles, what Ceseña argues resonates with is my assertion that cultural nationalists generally have taken to a political—albeit often defined, imagined, and manifested as cultural—affiliation to an indigenous identity, while not always being in tune with ongoing struggles of indigenous peoples today, beyond that of symbolic solidarity, if at all.

Instead, despite real histories of infiltrations on the part of the FBI's Counter Intelligence Program (COINTELPRO), the obscure rendezvous with Lliga in the 1980s led several nationalist organizations to institute rigid surveillance discourses, which has resulted in the blacklisting and ousting of those with internationalist and/or indigenista tendencies. Such organizations have adopted language warning against dual loyalties, ironically resembling the fundamentalist ranting of Samuel Huntington's warning of a Mexican "cultural threat" to the United States and President George W. Bush's paranoid assertions: "You are either with us or you are against us." Such similar proclamations by Chicana/o organizations are indicative of a presumed regime of truth, festing the looming demise of a "pure" or authentic moment or form; a negation of a long history of heterogeneity and failure to come to grips with that history. So while Partha Chatterjee has described nationalism as rational responses to colonialism, they, along with fundamentalisms, are not precolonial or premodern. Instead, as Minoo Moallem describes, they are "a by-product of the process of modernization and in dialogue with modernity. [While], fundamentalism's impulse is to counter modernity... as a moment of modernity fundamentalism is discontinuous with related premodern discourses. Moreover, fundamentalism opposes difference and claims cultural unity and homogeneity—an cultural unity and homogeneity that may have never existed—rather than accepting difference and working with similarly allied interests to achieve one's goals.

While there are now those that question what came out of the social upheavals of the 1960s—and, in fact, many of the legal/material benefits have been eroded—I argue that what emerged may not yet be—visible or even tangible. By this I mean the experience of Chicana/os making community with other Native peoples, north and south, and learning different native teachings; a situation that existed prior to the 1960s yet began occurring much more as a result of the political agitations of the period. While at times it has been hard for some Chicanas/os and Latinas/os to trace their indigenous blood, others have had families, who whether openly or discreetly, kept family genealogies indicating their indigenous lines. Historically speaking, however, many Chicanas/os have not always known their own lineage and have had to search through family albums and converse with relatives not always willing to acknowledge their own Indian blood. Although during the 1960s, the tendency was to romantically identify with the "Aztec Warrior/Princess" iconography popular in Mexico, pushed in part by the state, many Chicanas/os have since come to a better understanding of the complexities of colonisation in regards to the multiplicities of native ethnic communities and cultural identity, searching further into their own family histories and learning their respective languages and teachings.

Examples such as those aforementioned, who have since continued to build and influence the building of more community circles, set the stage for ongoing conversations between what is often called the North and South. Although some modernist historians have confused this issue of spatial manifestation and place the distinction of North and South at the U.S.—Mexico border, which presupposes the eternal existence of geopolitical divide and modern nation-state while not acknowledging the border divides native communities themselves, by North and South I am referring here to the continents. It is from these conversations that have been occurring with more frequency and intensity in the last four decades, across the North and South that, when an elder in the North had a vision of an Eagle and Condor with their necks intertwined, an image long known in the South, the spirit of the Peace and Dignity Journeys was set in motion.
The image of the Eagle and Condor is an image illustrative of the Prophecy of the Confederation of the Eagle and Condor nations—the Eagle representing the north, the Condor representing the south. The intertwined necks thus signify a "reunification" of native nations across the continent. With the proposed celebrations of 500 years of the Columbus voyage nearing, "In 1990 over 200 representatives of native nations from throughout Turtle Island (South, Central and North America) met in Quito, Ecuador to discuss, strategize, and take action on issues affecting Indigenous People." Once there, Elders from across the continent discussed the prophecy and the coming together of indigenous nations after centuries of colonization. "Inspired by this prophecy, elders proposed Peace and Dignity Journeys as a way to realize this unification. Through spiritual running and networking, indigenous peoples as a united force, from all over Turtle Island [would] reclaim peace and dignity by honoring indigenous values, ways of life, and current struggles of resistance to modern colonization." A commitment was made that every four years runners would gather at the northern and southern tips of the continent, Chickaloon Nation, Alaska and Tierra del Fuego, Argentina, and run south and north, respectively, until meeting near the center of the continent. The first three runs, in 1992, 1996, and 2000, met in Teotihuacan, site of Mexico pyramids (and a new Wak-Mari) near Mexico City. The fourth run, underway at the time of this writing, will meet in Kuna Nation, Panama, in late 2004. As the anticipation of the Quincentennial celebrations/protests of Columbus "discovery" of the New World began mounting and the indigenous summit in Quito, Peru, came and went, a new generation of young Chicanas/os who had begun referring to themselves as Xicana/o, had also been developing an indigenista perspective, looking beyond the limits and silences of an Aztlán-based cultural nationalism, embracing instead a hemispheric-wide mode of indigenous solidarity, cognizant of the 500 years of global capitalism that informs this historical system.

In an insightful essay entitled "Bucking the System: The TimeSpace of Antisystemic Movements," Richard Lee distinguishes between resistance in the short term and in the long duree. Speaking of the capitalist world-economy or modern world-system as its own historical system with an internal logic, with which social actors must grapple to affect long-term social change, Lee suggests that since the nineteenth century, "To be antisystemic increasingly meant restoring the exclusions of liberal universalism," short-term and short-sighted movements. Lee however points to "new" movements engaged in a "retargeting of action away from the nation-state" such as those founded on ecological/environmental, racial and gendered concerns, as long-term resistance movements. He argues these examples work through a TimeSpace of transformation of global capitalism and, furthermore, as "challenges to the premises of inequality associated with the structures of knowledge that began to emerge in the 1950s and 1960s" and continue to inform this historical system. It is thus that I suggest indigenismo exists and makes its presence alongside the Peace and Dignity Journeys in the context of transformational TimeSpace—resistance and social change in the long duree aiming to change the structures of knowledge that dictate how we think of ourselves in relation to the land, property, value, and each other.

As these younger indigenistas began organizing within M.E.Ch.A. since the early 1990s, two trends emerged. On the one hand, there are those who have taken a cultural nationalist view of la indigena, and on the other, there are those who have had a much more considerate, respectful view of, and relationship with, indigeneity across the Americas. I thus argue that in contrast to the cultural nationalists, there is a strong movement of youth in particular who have been increasingly brought up with a deeper understanding of indigenous teachings, which they have, in turn, taken on as the guiding framework upon which to focus their energies, politics and lives.

While some critics have argued that these developments are New Age appropriation of presumed "authentic" Northern teachings and past, the young Chicanas/os respond by invoking memory and a history of colonization that has resulted in generations of mestizaje. Others argue indigeneismo is nostalgia for the past. Mike Davis, in a recent talk on the rise of Pentecostalism and other popular religious movements among the urban slums, demonstrated a typical Marxist approach to religion and spirituality, one of inexplicability to "new" questions being posed to Marxism and the Left generally. However, what we find is not "new" turns toward the religious or spiritual, but rather a continuation of reliance, perseverance and resistance based on spirituality occurring in a context the Left has also failed to come to grips with. This is not "new," but a significant shift in paradigm from modernist notions of nationalism forcing one to ask: What is the intersection of spirituality and politics? What are the politics behind spiritual resistance? Or is it spirituality guiding politics? Can the two even be separated from one another? These questions are not meant to follow in the romanticizing footsteps of some cultural nationalists, but rather to provoke more questions to build on a topic long ignored.

So, while Josefina Saldaña-Portillo, in an essay “Who’s the Indian in Aztlán,” unjustly compares the mestizaje of Chicanas/os with the one invoked by the corporatist Mexican State in the 1930s, she also makes a generalized remark about M.E.Ch.A. not supporting the Zapastas by their failure to include them in one of their four points of action in the 1999 national conference. Saldaña-Portillo's generalization, however, speaks more to her not being in tune to the changing internal dynamics of M.E.Ch.A., which includes factions of cultural nationalists and indigenistas. She fails to realize the existence of an internal shift to an orthodox reading of the group's founding documents on the part of the cultural nationalist leadership at the time, which suggested M.E.Ch.A. could only support specifically "student-oriented" causes. Saldaña-Portillo also bases her own characterization on an idealized notion of the Zapastas as the "authentic Indians" while obscuring a history of colonization that resulted in the mestizaje, deterritorialization and detribalization of many, including those who call themselves Xicana/o.
The 1999 M.E.Ch.A. decision, in fact, came again on the heels of a split within the organization at the University of California, Berkeley, in November 1998, which has come to be emblematic of the larger debate I have here tried to shed some light on. "Such knowledge would, in contrast, clarify that several chapters and individuals do openly support the Zapatistas, among other native struggles, and in fact have themselves a different understanding of mestizaje and indigenismo than the corporatist approach to mestizaje of the Cardenas presidency and Mexican State, to which Saldana-Portillo compares M.E.Ch.A., Chicanas/os generally and the work of indigenista Gloria Anzaldúa, Borderlands/La Frontera: The New Mestiza specifically.

Irongically, a much-anticipated recent book by Eneste Chavez, ¡Mi Raza Primero!: Nationalism, Identity, and Insurgency in the Chicano Movement in Los Angeles, 1966-1978, reenforces the nationalist historiography and truncates any sense of continuity to the Chicana/o Movement by placing its time frame as 1966-1978. It thus adds to the tendency to dismiss the 1960s as "a thing of the past" with no lasting consequences. Instead, as we look toward the future of Chicana/o and Latina/o Studies and questions of decolonization of the capitalist world-system, what would help would be an acknowledgement on the part of movement scholars and participants alike to recognize and accept its heterogeneity, drop orthodoxy readings of "founding documents" and open up to communication and dialogue with all Latinas/os, including those that work from what I have tried to shed light on as an indigenista perspective. Similarly, any approach to a question of decolonization must necessarily work from spirit keeping in mind both as a short-term, as well as a longue durée approach, such as those that the networks created by the Peace and Dignity Journeys have been working to create, strengthen, and solidify since the early 1990s. In conclusion, Roland Wright in Stolen Continents: The New World Through Indian Eyes Since 1492, draws from native conceptualizations of TimeSpace and time immemorial to suggest that as a matter of example, if we take the time native peoples of this land have survived and lived here prior to 1492 to signify a month, then Columbus arrived on these shores only yesterday. In other words, the structural TimeSpace of colonization and global capitalism is a relatively recent phenomenon and as historical systems they are not eternal. On the other hand, the eternal TimeSpace of the indigenous stories and knowledge and the related transformational TimeSpace of the Peace and Dignity Journeys are by their nature "antisyrmatic movements" rather than the "mysticism" and "romanticized mythology" they are often accused of being.

Notes

I write this piece upon my homecoming to Huichol land in Jalisco. I begin this way in the spirit of the Peace and Dignity Journeys and reification of north and south. The title has thus emerged from conversations with numerous elders, friends and colleagues. What I will share herein I write with permission of my elders, the Peace and Dignity Medicine Staffs and their caretakers. Nuxtin nomcauyotan...

3. For more on the complicity of social sciences with colonialism and the need for undoing disciplinary divisions of knowledge, see Immanuel Wallerstein, Unthinking the Social Sciences (1995).
5. Remarks from seminar on Liberation Theology and Coloniality, University of California, Berkeley, April 21, 2004.
6. Quijano describes "coloniality of power" on three levels (nation-state, global and imaginary), which mutually reinforce one another. My focus herein is on the third: "thinking" and epistemology. For more on "coloniality of power" see Aníbal Quijano, "Colonialidad del poder, cultura y conocimiento en América Latina."
7. Few published works have begun to outline such a perspective. For more see Roberto Rodríguez, The X in La Raza (1997); Codex Tumanchan; On Becoming Human (1998); and Patrícia González, The Mud People (2003).
12. Ibid.
22. For more on recent Chicana/o indigenous identity formations see Patrícia González and Roberto Rodríguez, "Column of the Americas," distributed by Universal Press Syndicate and a compilation of their earlier columns, González/Rodríguez: Unict and Unencumbered, published by Ethnic Studies Publication Unit at UC Berkeley in 1997.
25. Ibid.
27. Ibid.
28. Ibid.
29. Mike Davis, "Species of Superurbanization: Marx and the Holy Ghost." This talk was part of The City: An Interdisciplinary Lecture Series, held at the University of California, Berkeley, February 5, 2004.
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