

Mexican American Politics

by

Fernando Piñón

Cengage Learning
Not for Reprint

Table of Contents

Mexican American Politics.....1

Bibliography.....27

Cengage Learning
Not for Reprint

Introduction

The concept of “Mexican American politics” can easily, and erroneously, be misinterpreted. For those who do not believe in “hyphenated” Americans, it can invoke the notion of being separatist—one more way in which “Mexican Americans” manifest their resistance to acculturating into “American” society. This perception, commonly held, arises if one assumes “Mexican American politics” to be an offshoot of the civil rights movement of the 1960s and a result of the cultural awareness revolution of the 1970s. Yet, if politics is the exercise of power and authority within a political and social system, the political relationship between Mexican Americans and those who have wielded political power through the state is deeply embedded in the nation’s history.

It was the Spaniards who established the first European settlement in St. Augustine, Florida, and who went on to establish settlements in what are now the states of Texas, New Mexico, Arizona and California before the English settlements of Jamestown (1607) and Plymouth Rock (1620). It also was they who colonized Mexico, and their descendents who later established the Republic of Mexico, much of which later became part of the United States through the disputed Mexican-American War. Mexican Americans, then, have been an integral part of the history, the politics and the cultural dynamics of the United States since the country’s very inception.

If the role Mexican Americans have played is perceived as mostly submissive and minimized, it is because the group has not been vested with positions of political power. Rather, they have been minimized and marginalized by agents representing the dominant Euro-American cultural tradition. Accordingly, the political dynamics between Mexican Americans and Euro-Americans extends far into history and involves profound historical, cultural and social differences which have spawned astringent conflicts between the two groups.

Mexican American Politics

Mexican American politics can be appraised by reviewing voting preferences, assessing demographic characteristics or evaluating the group's political leadership. However, Mexican American politics has to be, above everything else, the study of the unifying forces which solidify the group. Without a common attitudinal bond to provide cohesiveness, purpose and direction, Mexican Americans would be nothing more than a mere agglomeration of people, a *muchedumbre*, connected only by their distinct social/economic/ethnic characteristics. Demographic characteristics in themselves are not forces of political unity; they simply are descriptive social and economic commonalities shared by a substantial number of members of the group.

A review of Mexican Americans politics must take into account the beliefs and ideologies embedded within the collective psyche of the group as well as the tangible and intangible factors which have defined and nourished them through the years: history, demographics, motivation and attitudes. Some are subjective traits that are difficult to determine with any scientific exactness, but political science is no longer confined, as it once was, to the description and analysis of political systems. It has extended its scope to theory and philosophy, has broadened its reach to numerous subfields such as international law, public administration and international relations, and has forged a working relationship with other disciplines such as sociology, anthropology, psychology and economics, which, while not precise sciences, do possess enough substantial empirical data by which to verify behavior, thus making them legitimate social disciplines.

The subjective unifying forces which glue Mexican Americans into a consciously connected, intra-directed, and politically cohesive group derive chiefly from four main historical periods. These created specific socio-political dynamics which molded the Mexican American political consciousness and created defined political behavior. These include Euro-American conquest and hegemony which brought about the politics of resistance; melting pot colonization which gave rise to the politics of assimilation; Mexican American cultural reawakening which created the politics of *La Raza*; and

emergence of the “Southern Strategy” and trickle-down-economics which ushered in the politics of class.

The first two categories reflect the original opposition of Mexican Americans to the Euro-American takeover of their territory and later their reaction to the imposition of Euro-American hegemony. The third involves efforts at self-actualization and the struggle for legal, social and cultural equality; and the fourth, still in development, is the gradual shift from ethnicity to class as a unifying political force.

The study of “Mexican American politics,” then, not only fits comfortably within the scope of political science, but it enhances the field by enabling better assessment of the total political system. As of 2002, there were 37.4 million Hispanics in the U.S. of which 66.9 percent were Mexican Americans, or about nine percent of the country’s total population. (1) The United States Census projects that the Hispanic population in the United States will increase dramatically within twenty years, and that in some states, Mexican Americans will be the majority population. (2) There also are substantial and worrisome demographic trends which place the Mexican American population in a precarious position that will require specific political initiatives. (3)

Yet, because political behavior is triggered primarily by cultural attitudes and political ideologies, the common attitudinal characteristics which bear on the group’s political dynamics are described. Is there, for example, a central, defined and accepted ethnic identity which connects Mexican Americans and transcends their social and economic differences? If so, how extensive is it, from where does it originate, and what impact does it play in shaping the group’s electoral behavior? Is there a particularly distinct political ideology which characterizes the Mexican American experience and, if so, how compatible is it with the dominant Euro-American ideology through which the structure and actions of our political system are justified? What role has traditional Euro-American ethnocentrism and homogeneity played in the political behavior and group consciousness of Mexican Americans?

One important caveat: given that semantics regarding the proper term designating Mexican Americans has long been a source of controversy because of the variegated nature of the group, the term “Mexican American” will be applied generically to people whose country of origin is Mexico, whether they are native-born, foreign-born, immigrants, residents or citizens both legal and illegal. It is assumed, however, that Mexican Americans are overwhelmingly *mestizos*—persons of mixed Spanish and Indian blood. While *mestizo* is used primarily as a biological term, it also encompasses common cultural socio/ethnic characteristics that are shared by the vast majority of Mexican Americans in the United States, (4) even though they may possess an assorted degree of indigenous lineage reflected primarily in their wide diversity of skin texture.

(1836 to 1920)

Euro-American conquest and hegemony:

The politics of resistance

The physical takeover of Mexican territory is romanticized in American history through the imagery of the westward movement, a century of bold, tenacious, freedom-loving and laborious people trudging through an uninhabited and hostile wilderness in covered wagons searching for land they could make yield and a Euro-American culture they could impose. As heirs of Protestantism, they believed they were adhering to the promise in the Book of Revelation that when troubles seem insurmountable, God would send his Church “into the wilderness” for safekeeping, (5) and there they would, as John Winthrop, a Pilgrim of the original Massachusetts Bay Colony had promised, help create their own new Jerusalem, their “City upon a Hill.” (6)

Yet, from the Mexican American perspective, the process of nation-building which followed the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo was no less than a process of colonization. As the conquerors and the conquered lived together side by side, it was not difficult to

determine who were the colonizers and the colonized. What evolved throughout much of the Southwest was a dual society divided by both historical and cultural distinctions that go deep into history. It was Spain and England engaged in a mutual struggle over mastery of the world; it was Mexico and the United States viewing each other suspiciously over disputed territory; it was Catholicism and Protestantism renewing their age-old doctrinal rivalry; it was the Mexican *mestizo* and the Euro-American judging each other with lethal paranoia over land that the former felt they should keep and the latter believed they should acquire.

From this historical perspective, then, it is somewhat ironic to witness the current debate over Mexican illegal immigration and read about the dangers of the “hispanization” of Euro-American society. (7) During the first decades of the 1800s, Euro-American illegal immigrants entering into what was then Spanish and later Mexican territory had illegally established a quasi-government bent on separating Texas from Mexico, and thus taking over the territory for themselves. They began to arrive in Texas in 1813, but by 1831 they outnumbered Spanish *Tejanos* ten to one. With the aid of the *Tejanos*, Euro-Americans went on not only to make Texas an independent country following the battle of the Alamo, but to establish a Euro-American hegemony that discriminated against the very people who had been willing to share their land with them.

Following Texas independence, Euro-American hegemony was further extended through the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo (1848) which ended the Mexican American War and forced Mexico to cede 525 square miles of its territory, which today includes parts of Colorado, Arizona, New Mexico and Wyoming and the whole states of California, Nevada and Utah. It was the physical takeover of their lands and the brutal cultural imposition which followed that led Mexican Americans to unite against a Euro-American rule they deemed oppressive and unjust.

The conflict between the two groups started soon after the war was over and perhaps it was an inevitable struggle: the clash of people reflecting the culture of two continents, two histories, and two ways of looking at the world. On one side were Euro-Americans, sons and daughters of England and heirs of Manifest Destiny, a competitive,

individualistic and acquisitive people who thought of themselves as children of destiny. On the other side were Mexican Americans, victims of the Spanish Conquest, neither fully Indian nor fully Spanish, representing a legacy of subservience first to the Spanish *Peninsulares* and then to the Spanish *Criollos*, a people whom Euro-Americans also looked upon as being from “a lower order, mostly peons, who feel no compunction in associating on the plane of social equality with the Black slaves of Texas.” (8)

To the now underclass Mexican Americans, the hallmark of Euro-American rule was racial prejudice, and it didn't take long for it to be culturally engrained into the new society. In 1857, for example, only nine years after the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, residents of Uvalde County in South Texas passed a resolution prohibiting Mexicans from traveling through the county except under a passport approved by an “American authority,” and in San Antonio committees of armed men were organized to hunt down and kill Mexicans on the highway. (9) In 1861, Confederate soldiers raided the *Rancho Clareño* in Zapata County and massacred several Mexican families in cold blood.

Prejudice against Mexicans was so virulent and rampant that Governor John Pease, fearing an all-out race war, told Texas legislators that “a vast number of Mexicans are law abiding and orderly. They perform the duties assigned to them well and cheerfully, and they are entitled to the protection of the laws in any honest calling they wish to select.” (10) The resentment against Mexicans reached such a level that a Mexican consul filed an official complaint against “the organized system of persecution, violence, expulsion and even murder which is directed against peaceable Mexicans.” (11) The source of animosities and violence, however, was neither political nor legal; it was social and as such could not be turned off by decree. So despite the call for reason and understanding, these atrocities continued.

Just before the turn of the 20th century, for example, Antonio Rodríguez, a Mexican national, was arrested by sheriff deputies in Rock Springs and accused of murdering a Euro-American woman. Within hours, a mob took him from jail, tied him to a tree and burned him to death. The local coroner noted it was done “at the hands of persons unknown” despite witnesses to the execution. (12) At about the same time, a 14-year-old

boy, Antonio Gómez, was asked to leave a place of business in Thorndale, Texas, but he refused to do so. A fight ensued and a Euro-American man died from a knife wound. Gómez was arrested but was taken from authorities by a group of men who beat him to death and dragged his body around town with a buggy. (13)

Nor were these atrocities confined to Texas. It is estimated that between 1848 and 1879, the period when Euro-Americans were consolidating their rule, Mexican Americans were lynched at a rate of 473 per 100,000 in population (14), vividly demonstrating that Euro-American hegemony was not imposed neither peacefully nor democratically, but violently and wantonly.

While not perpetrated by the government, these acts of violence were obviously sanctioned by a culture of racial resentment against Mexican Americans, one which contributed to the eventual exclusion of Mexican Americans from most forms of social, economic and public life, and their submission to a category of second-class citizens. Armed with a belief of racial and cultural superiority now embedded in the Euro-American culture, Mexican Americans were turned into strangers in their own land, segregated and oppressed. As Euro-Americans established their new rule, Mexican Americans were left with no choice but to accept or reject the hegemony that had been imposed upon them.

It was these acts of violent hostility and cultural oppression, coupled with the group's sense of ethnic consciousness, that formed the original nucleus of Mexican American unity. Thousands of Mexican Americans, rejecting Euro-American hegemony, opted to return to Mexico after the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, refusing outright to live under Anglo American rule. (15) Others, such as Laredo resident Nicasio Idar, started a newspaper (*La Crónica*) to denounce the injustices, urging Mexican Americans to organize and seek redress. Yet, the group didn't have the political strength to induce any changes, thus giving credence to an article in the *Houston Post* which noted that "there is very little sympathy for the greasers in this country." (16)

This inability to bring about change by working “within the system” led some Mexican Americans to take up arms against those they considered to be oppressors and invaders. In California, there were armed insurrections led by people like Joaquín Murrieta, Tiburcio Vasquez and Juan Flores. (17) In Texas, Juan Cortinas led such an organized rebellion that the armed conflict was elevated to the level of an official war, known as Cortina’s War. While these rebellions were squelched, the animosities between Euro-Americans and Mexican Americans continued for decades and, as Mexican Americans languished in their segregated *barrio* enclaves, their main sense of unity was pride in their heritage and disdain for the Euro-American homogeneity imposed upon them.

Although Mexican Americans could not harness this unity effectively, they nonetheless used their sense of ethnic identity to launch collective struggles against school discrimination, promote teaching Spanish in schools, encourage hiring of Mexican American teachers, and persuade Mexican Americans to boycott Euro-American businesses that discriminated, while supporting businesses owned by members of the group. Theirs was a protracted struggle which would bear fruit only in future generations. Their fight for equality and inclusion would face further tests when, after the Mexican Revolution of 1910, thousands of impoverished *mestizos* came into the United States, thus augmenting the cultural, economic, political and social cleavage between the two groups.

These newcomers were mostly illiterate *campesinos* who, after toiling for generations as indentured servants, had been brutally dislodged from the paternalistic autocracy of the *hacendado*. It was this group who Euro-Americans used to collectively define “Mexican American,” stereotyping them as a people whose destiny was to toil in the lower echelons of the economic ladder, and possessing a cultural identity so dissimilar they had to be taught how to be “Americans” through a process that was to be known as “the melting pot.”

From within all these contradictions there emerged a society in which the Euro-American was the Chosen, the Doer, the Decider, and the Dispenser of Justice by becoming the Teacher, the Land Owner, the Judge, the Politician, and the Minister. The

Mexican American, on the other hand, became the Dispossessed, the Disfranchised, the Outcast, the one who obeyed and who served by becoming the ranch hand, the clerk, the manual laborer, the janitor. The former represented positions of power that became hereditary and permanently entrenched among Euro-Americans, thus providing them continuance of authority. The latter embodied occupations of service that could be terminated at will, thus subjecting Mexican Americans to a continued dependence upon Euro-American overseers.

(1920 to 1960)

Melting Pot colonization:

The politics of assimilation

By the time of the closing of the American frontier in the latter part of the 19th century and the rise of American industrial power in the beginning of the 20th century, what had been established in most of the American Southwest was, in effect, a dual society. It separated the colonizer from the colonized, one where Mexican American children were sent to “Mexican” schools, where members of the group were segregated into their own neighborhoods, where Mexican Americans could not serve in juries, where jobs were limited to the lower rungs of the economic ladder, and where there were always the unspoken and unwritten social practices that sought to put “Mexicans in their place” by denying them equal access to private places and equal treatment in almost all facets of public life. Throughout this long period, the common link that held Mexican Americans together as a *folk* despite living in isolated and segregated cultural enclaves scattered throughout the Southwest was their shared ethnic bond and their common cultural kinship to Mexico.

But unlike previous times when this bond was used to defy, confront and resist, generations of Euro-American hegemony had taken its toll and Mexican Americans now came to believe that to survive in this dual society they had to conform and acquiesce to a Euro-American civilization they considered omnipotent. Instead of defiance, many had

been convinced they needed to “melt” into the system, and to comply they adhered to a new political strategy which required them to oppose the discrimination which marginalized them and kept them from main stream society; and make a systematic endeavor to incorporate into American society, thus giving rise to the politics of assimilation. For Mexican Americans, this was a dangerous shift because it was their attachment to shared ethnic consciousness that constituted the core of their unity, the basis of their strength and protection. Yet, it was the politics of assimilation that became the political hallmark of the period.

It was during this time that thousands of Mexicans came into the United States, welcomed when their labor was desired and unwelcomed when it was not. From 1910 to 1920 alone, some 219,000 Mexican Americans entered the United States, mostly due to the Mexican Revolution and the demand for workers in the post World War I industrialization period. Yet, in 1921, some 100,000 Mexican Americans were deported because of recession following the war. This melting pot period ends by the close of the 1950s when the sons and daughters of those who had served in World War II began to question the politics of assimilation.

The primary means through which the politics of assimilation was carried out was through hybrid socio-political organizations that went far beyond assisting members of the group in times of need or consoling those who had been aggrieved. These organizations had to involve themselves politically, a tough task which required maintaining and forging ethnic unity despite the political and social pressures imposed by melting pot ideology and the highly variegated nature of the ethnic group itself. Some Mexican Americans are white and can mix freely in Euro-American society, while others have darker skins and are easy targets for discrimination. Some are educated, others are not; some are poor, others rich; some cherish their unique ethnic identity, while others reject it.

Yet, despite these obstacles, the founders of these organizations knew that their advocacy for inclusion depended primarily on the unity that could be forged through the shared ethnic consciousness and national pride of the group, regardless of color or class

status. And it was through this unity that they would fight discrimination practices through the courts; acquire political influence by promoting responsible citizenship; and accelerate social assimilation by promoting the learning of English and fostering educational opportunities.

One of the first organizations that carried out these objectives was *La Orden de los Hijos de America* (Sons of America), founded in San Antonio, Texas, in the early 1920s. This organization was unique in that it sought to incorporate its members fully into Anglo American society by separating from other Mexican Americans whom they believed were not their social or economic equals. Its members wanted “to show Anglo Americans they were different from the trouble-making Mexicans.” (18) It urged its members to “use their influence in all fields of social, economic and political action in order to realize the greatest employment possible of all the rights and privileges and prerogatives extended by the United States Constitution.” (19)

This organization and others like it reflected the class conflict prevalent between the usually white and often middle class Mexican American who found it easier to assimilate into Euro-American society and the normally impoverished Mexican American *mestizo* who had more difficulty in getting accepted. The objective of the Sons of America, however, implied much more than a distinction of class differences; it was recognition that to be “accepted” by Euro-American society they had to be “different” from the “trouble-making Mexicans.” They were, in fact, admitting that legitimate political power could come only through Euro-American validation and not through their own efforts or achievements.

When Mexican Americans in the Texas Rio Grande Valley were turned down by the *Hijos de America*, they formed their own more inclusive organization in 1929, the League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC). Its goal was to “develop within the members of our race the best, the purest and most perfect type of a true and loyal citizen of the United States.” (20) Specifically, LULAC sought to fight against discrimination, encourage the learning of English among Mexican Americans, and foment unquestionable loyalty to the ideals, customs and principles of the United States. It

committed to working within the system to bring about inclusion and equality through the ballot box, education, self-improvement and cultural assimilation. At the same time it condemned “any radical and violent demonstrations which may tend to create conflict and disturb the peace and tranquility of our country.” (21) As such, LULAC fostered school attendance, provided scholarships and created special programs such as the School of the 400 which sought to teach preschool students at least 400 English words before they entered school. This program was the model for what later was to become the bilingual program established throughout the country as part of the “Great Society.”

Other Mexican American organizations followed. Dr. Hector P. Garcia founded the American GI Forum in 1948 in Corpus Christi, Texas, to advocate for Mexican American veterans of World War II who were being denied medical services by the U.S. Department of Veteran Affairs. Eventually it addressed the segregation and discrimination of about 300,000 Mexican Americans who served in the war. Its first campaign was on behalf of a soldier, Felix Longoria, who was denied funeral services in his hometown of Three Rivers, Texas. (22) Through the direct intercession of then Senator Lyndon B. Johnson, the American GI Forum succeeded in having Longoria buried in Arlington National Cemetery, a victory which prompted the creation of hundreds of other chapters throughout the country.

A variety of other organizations were created specifically to help Mexican American workers, such as the *Sociedad de Protección Mutua de Trabajadores Unidos*, founded in 1900 to fight cheap labor practices against Mexican American factory workers. Still other groups organized to protect particular workers, such as those in mining and agriculture.

Through these types of organizations, Mexican Americans began to work for social inclusion and political equality, and in many instances were successful. In the case of *Méndez v. Westminster*, (23) for example, a U.S. Court of Appeals ruled that children “of Mexican and Latin” descent could not constitutionally be segregated; in 1945 the Court ruled Mexican Americans could not be excluded from juries; (24) and in the early 1970s the Court ruled against the restrictive covenants which had forced Mexican Americans to

live in the “Mexican section” of most cities and towns. It was in this manner that Mexican Americans began to tear down the practices which discriminated against them. Despite the fact the vast majority of Mexican Americans are Catholic, for example, many Roman Catholic churches often seated Anglo Americans and Mexican Americans separately. This practice was followed in theaters, swimming pools, restaurants, hotels and other public places. (25) Besides being the catalyst to the eradication of these practices, the members of these organizations formed the nucleus of political support that allowed Mexican American politicians to gain public offices.

Perhaps the most famous prototype of this type of politician was Henry B. González, the first Mexican American since Texas’ independence to win a city council seat in San Antonio in 1953. He later became the first Mexican American to serve in the Texas Senate and later in the U.S. House of Representatives. González’ political trajectory reflected the politics of this era in that he fought passionately against any form of discrimination against Mexican Americans and ardently upheld the value of good citizenship, of working “within the system,” and being a “loyal American.” While in the Texas Senate, for example, he set a record by filibustering for twenty-two straight hours a set of bills which discriminated against Mexican Americans. Throughout his political career, which lasted until 1999, he supported bills that enhanced the standing of Mexican Americans in education, business, and employment opportunities.

Through these efforts, the barriers of discrimination began to be dismantled as Mexican Americans began to be better aware of their rights and better prepared to defend them. By the beginning of the 1960s, the fruits of their labor became apparent. In Texas alone, there were 736 Spanish-surnamed elected public officials. In the U.S. Congress there was Henry B. González and Eligio de la Garza; in the Texas Legislature there was one state senator, Joe Bernal from San Antonio, and ten house members. There were nine county judges, fifty-one county commissioners and six sheriffs. The other Mexican American officials were on school boards, in municipal government and minor county offices. These officials, mostly from South Texas, succeeded through the politics of assimilation, and they usually acknowledged it openly and proudly.

(1960-1980s)

Mexican American cultural reawakening:

The politics of *La Raza*

The politics of cultural reawakening reflected American society in the 1960s and the cynicism that developed because of the contradiction between the ideals and the reality of American democracy. After World War II the United States began to identify itself as the savior of freedom and democracy in the world; yet despite President Harry Truman's integration of the armed services in 1948, African American soldiers leaving their bases in the 1960s would not be allowed in most public places in the South. As public officials preached about the sanctity of the vote, African and Mexican Americans were often denied the right to vote either through physical intimidation or electoral shams such as literacy tests and poll taxes. Despite the *Brown* decision ending racial segregation in public education in 1954, schools remained segregated well into the 1960s, as did restaurants, hotels, public parks, buses and a host of other public and private entities.

While Mexican Americans were not as overtly discriminated against as African Americans, they also had a right to feel cynical about the contradiction between ideology and practice. Through the politics of assimilation, they had been prompted to get an education, but in many schools they were penalized for speaking Spanish and harassed for "being Mexican." School administrators, believing Mexican American students were not as capable as Euro-Americans students, often herded them into vocational schools despite academic potential. In response to this, Mexican American students staged massive walkouts in San Antonio, Texas, and East Los Angeles. As Mexican Americans began to forge change through the ballot box, legislative and municipal districts were gerrymandered to minimize their vote. And despite American ideology proclaiming equality both as a natural right through the Declaration of Independence and as a constitutionally protected right under the 14th Amendment, Mexican Americans were

denied positions of power simply because of who they were, not because of their capabilities.

To young Mexican Americans, the politics of assimilation their parents had embraced was one more symbol of the hypocrisy in Euro-American society. Likewise, organizations which their parents had used to attain inclusion and promote assimilation were deemed to have been co-opted, just as the Mexican Americans who felt they had “made it” under Euro-American rules were considered to have been duped into believing that to succeed they had to work “within the system,” which meant doing it “the Euro-American way.”

“The real puppets are the so called smart *mexicanos*, those people who feel elevated in status because Mr. Anglo tells him he is smarter than the other *mexicanos*,” wrote Jose Angel Gutiérrez, (26) one of the leaders of *La Raza Unida*. (27) *La Raza* also criticized those organizations which they felt had been used by Euro-Americans to brainwash them into adopting the politics of assimilation. “This traditional organization (LULAC) has education as the panacea for *Chicano* social ills,” he said, “but a thousand degrees from Harvard and speaking flawless English still will not change our status as colonial subjects.” (28)

Perhaps the catalyst to the politics of cultural reawakening was the election of President John F. Kennedy. In challenging Americans to join in forging a New Frontier, he was calling for a national commitment among equals, a new generation of political leadership which would finally discard the hypocrisy between the professed Euro-American political ideals and the reality which turned them into mockery. Like other Americans of that generation, Mexican Americans heeded the call to do what together “we can do for the country,” only to witness Kennedy’s assassination and reconfirm the standard practice of being promised ideals only to have them plucked out of their grasp.

With Lyndon B. Johnson as president, Mexican Americans welcomed the signing of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which sought to end legal discrimination based on race, color, creed, national origin and sex, and the Voting Rights Act of 1965, which sought to

eliminate most restrictions to voting, only to have President Richard Nixon minimize both through his “Southern Strategy.” (29) Senator Robert Kennedy and the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr. both espoused a country that would live up to its professed ideals and end the contradictions, but they, like President Kennedy, were both murdered.

These contradictions led young Mexican Americans to formulate a new model for political activity and social change which took into account what they believed was their true reality: Mexican Americans living in a colonized society as a culturally-conquered people. They acknowledged that the politics of assimilation had achieved some gains, but these were done at the expense of their cultural identity—a *quid pro quo* that provided inclusion at the expense of their *mexicanidad*, their ethnic identity. To this younger generation, its ethnic identity was deemed a fundamental right which could not be comprised because it was inherent in their personhood, a right equal to the right to marry, raise a family, earn a livelihood, get an education, and worship to the dictates of one’s conscience. (30) Accordingly, they opted to define themselves in their own terms, (31) referring to themselves as *Chicanos* and considering themselves to be the true heirs to the indigenous Aztecs that first inhabited *Aztlán*, which today includes much of the southwestern United States.

While the *Chicano* movement, which gave rise to the politics of cultural reawakening, is often considered to be a separatist initiative, it was really a rejection of the *quid pro quo* required under the politics of assimilation, an assertion that to “be an American” did not mean the *ipso facto* dismissal of their Mexican American heritage. It was the belief that Mexican Americans could not be *legally* equal if they were held to be *culturally* unequal, and that cultural authenticity would not come from a paternalistic pat-on-the-back for being a “good Mexican” or from a token gesture of acceptance. The new politics disavowed the notion that assimilation had to be a *quid pro quo*, an inclusion acquired silently, through the back door, like a great pretender hoping Anglo Americans could no longer single them out as being “Mexican American.”

La Raza’s deeply rooted sense of ethnic consciousness was unconditional, and any deviation would turn nonbelievers into a “coconut.” A case in point was Richard

Rodríguez, a Mexican American who in the late 1980s gained vast Euro-American acceptance by claiming that to succeed in the United States one had to discard one's ethnic identity. He was Ivy League-educated, well-versed in the urbane intricacies of U.S. socioeconomic life, a shining example of the "American Dream," yet he still believed that it was "only when I was able to think of myself as an American, no longer an alien in gringo society, could I seek the rights and opportunities necessary to full public individuality. The social and political advantages I enjoy today as a man result from the day I came to believe that my name is indeed, *Rich-heard Road-ree-guess.*" (32)

This sense of brotherhood bonded by a Mexican/*mestizo* consciousness became the ideological base of the new politics. It was an ideology diametrically opposed to the concept of the melting pot, and both Euro-Americans and Mexican Americans who felt at ease with the old politics immediately opposed it, thus dividing the Mexican American community. "The word *Chicano* runs against everything our people have always strived for," said Albert Bustamante, the longtime congressional aide to Henry B. González. "We want to be accepted as full-fledged Americans." (33) At a meeting held at St. Mary's University organized by young *Chicanos*, Gonzalez denounced them as "racial fanatics," "coiled rattlesnakes," and "criminal ruffians." (34)

For their part, *Chicanos* saw Congressman González as the "attack dog" of the Euro-American establishment, a powerful Mexican American who assailed those who disagreed with his politics of assimilation. (35) The paranoia caused by this divide ran so high that in a press conference in San Antonio in 1969, Gutiérrez said: "You can eliminate an individual in various ways. You can certainly kill him, but that is not our intent at this moment. You can remove the base of support that he operates from, be it economics, political or social. That is what we intend to do." (36) This comment was the top story in the morning *San Antonio Express* with a banner headline that read "Kill the *Gringo.*"

It was in this confrontational environment that the *La Raza Unida* Party was launched, and although it originally succeeded in gaining seats in Crystal City and in Dimmit and La Salle Counties, it failed to gain much support statewide. In the 1972

Texas gubernatorial campaign, *La Raza Unida* candidate Ramsey Muníz polled only 214,118 votes, or 6.2 percent. By contrast, Dolph Briscoe, at the time the biggest landowner in the state and the Democratic candidate, got 47 percent, or 1,633,493 votes. Hank Glover, the Republican candidate received 1,533,986, or 45 percent of the vote. *La Raza* received enough votes to claim it had established itself as the balance of power in Texas, but analysis showed that Muniz failed to win support in the fifteen counties with the highest concentration of Mexican Americans. Of these counties, Muníz won in only three: Zavala, Jim Hogg and Brooks. In these counties, Briscoe polled 97,164 votes compared to Muniz's 74,904. (37) Two years later, Muníz ran but fared worse, signaling the end of the political party in statewide races.

But *La Raza Unida* is important not for its attempt at electoral politics, but for its effort to unite Mexican Americans by appealing to their Mexican/*mestizo* ethnic consciousness at a time when there were systematic initiatives to minimize it. This appealed to and was widely accepted by young Mexican Americans who had been born into and raised under the politics of assimilation, so they should have been the least susceptible to the politics of ethnicity. Why, then, would they feel so strongly connected to it? *La Raza's* newly-found awareness in their ethnic culture was not truly new. It was expressed some eighty ago by Mexican intellectual Jose Vasconcelos, who claimed that the *mestizo* had acquired all the cultural virtues of other races, but that they had been brainwashed by Euro-Americans into ignoring the transcendental view of their mission. "Not only did they defeat us in battle, but they have defeated us ideologically. We lost a major part of our battle the day each one of the Iberian Republics launched its own national destiny, a destiny detached from each other without taking into account the commonality of interest in *La Raza*." (38)

It is this sense of kinship, borne out of the Mexican/*mestizo* consciousness through which *La Raza* sought to connect Mexican Americans regardless of class status or place of residence, and it is this Mexico/*mestizo* consciousness that formed the nucleus of their political ideology. It was an ideology of struggle for social, political and economic equality borne out of the *meztizo* historical experience. A Mexican *mestizo*, the child of

the Spanish and the Indian, was most marginalized by both the Indian, who saw him as an outcast, and the Spaniard, who regarded him as inferior. It was only after the Mexican Revolution of 1910 that Mexico officially recognized itself as a *mestizo* country, thus fusing the Mexican national identity with the *mestizo* social character.

In this new political environment, class supposedly counted more than ethnicity, but in reality Mexican *mestizos* suffered doubly. “As poor peasants and resident peons, they suffered an exploitation characteristic of their social class position; and as ethnic groups in a condition of inferiority, vis-à-vis *mestizos* and *creoles*, they were culturally oppressed by the carriers of the dominant culture, that is, they suffered an exploitation characteristic of their colonial situation.” (39)

According to *La Raza*, this double exploitation of class and ethnicity was still prevalent in Euro-American society, thus making the politics of assimilation a farce. An Englishman, Frenchman, or Irishman, for example, could come into this country and, under the concept of the melting pot, become fully entrenched in American society solely by detaching himself from his previous nation, learning English, dropping his accent and adhering to the customs of the United States. To become fully “American” these Europeans did not have to shed their ethnic identity because their ethnicity has been merged into the fabric of American society.

A Mexican American, however, cannot do the same for he cannot detach himself from the dark skin texture with which he is identified as a “Mexican.” Accordingly, many Euro-Americans still consider Mexican Americans as not “truly American” even if they have lived here for generations, speak perfect English and adhere to the ways of Euro-American society. Moreover, since most Mexican Americans in the United States have come from the impoverished and marginalized *mestizo* social class in their own country, they also remain marginalized through class distinctions in the United States. To be sure, Mexican Americans, like everyone else, can transcend class distinctions, but it is not possible for them to alter the dark-skinned biological characteristics of their ethnicity, leaving them always in a precarious and vulnerable situation.

This condition has created a duality that has characterized both Mexicans and Mexican Americans for generations. It prompted Mexican poet Octavio Paz to ask in the 1950s whether Mexicans were “Western Europeans and Spanish or Indian and Mexican?” (40) This is same question has beleaguered Mexican Americans for decades when Euro-Americans question whether Mexican Americans are “American or Mexican?” Paz was referring to a *cultural*, not a national or patriotic attachment. Similarly, while Mexican Americans have a strong affection to Mexico, their Mexico/*mestizo* consciousness is not a nationalistic. It is a romanticized attachment to the manner in which they lived their lives, a cultural connection vicariously manifested in the breaking of a *pinata*, the venerating of the Virgin of Guadalupe, the speaking of Spanish, the celebration of *Cinco de Mayo*, the rite of passage of a *quinceanera*, the love of *mariachi* music, and the attachment to a cuisine that has nourished them for generations.

These traditions, and many others, were the “Mexican” cultural connections that the Euro-American melting pot required them to eradicate from their lives in return for “becoming Americans” and this was the socio/political agreement *La Raza* so ardently and passionately rejected. It is this Mexico/*mestizo* consciousness that still lingers in the collective memory of the Mexican American mind even as *La Raza Unida* and *Chicanos* have actively departed from the scene. It is this cultural validation that frames the political dynamics of the group even today.

(1980 to present)

“Southern Strategy” and trickle down economics:

The rise of the politics of class

The 1968 presidential election which put Republican Richard Nixon in the White House signaled a definitive change in the political dynamics affecting Mexican Americans. Through his “Southern Strategy,” the politics of class began to emerge as a

systematic, unifying force among the Mexican American electorate, one which would compete with the politics of ethnicity. It was a strategy born out of the turbulent political times of the 1960s and driven by political expediency, yet it was not until the 1980 election of Ronald Reagan that it became institutionalized as part of electoral dynamics.

For Nixon, the 1968 presidential campaign presented a radically different political environment than the one he faced in 1960 when he lost to John F. Kennedy. Then, Kennedy's personal charisma, idealism, lofty rhetoric, plus the close association he had forged with César Chávez, Martin Luther King and the emerging civil rights movement had given him the presidency. This alliance gave Mexican Americans the opportunity to become politically active in presidential politics in a meaningful manner, and, with the creation of "Viva Kennedy" organizations, they contributed to Kennedy's victory. Before 1960, voting restrictions, pressure and/or intimidation had kept them out of direct political involvement, but this time they had powerful friends and allies to support them, and their involvement became both permanent and increasingly significant.

After Kennedy's assassination in 1963, President Lyndon Johnson reached out even further to African and Mexican American voters, empowering them through the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965. Then, through his "Great Society," he embellished their affinity to the Democratic Party by making government itself the catalyst to their economic empowerment. Through the "War on Poverty," and "feasible maximum participation from the poor," he sought the "elimination of poverty and racial injustice." (41) There was little doubt the Kennedy and Johnson legacies had won the electoral loyalty of minority voters to the Democratic Party.

By 1968, however, U.S. society was in a state of chaos, beset by violence and tragedy stemming from the Vietnam War and the adverse reaction of many from all ethnic groups to both the civil rights movement and the "War on Poverty." The social turmoil, reflected in violent anti-war protests, the threatening rise of Black and Brown Power movements, and white racial acts of hatred against primarily African Americans, culminated in the 1968 assassinations of both Robert F. Kennedy and Martin Luther King. It was this state of turmoil and fear that Nixon exploited to win the presidency

through the slogan of “Law and Order,” and it was under this political climate that the “Southern Strategy” was born, thus altering significantly the political dynamics of Mexican Americans.

At its core, the “Southern Strategy” sought to win elections in the South by exploiting racial anxiety among whites, contending that Republican candidates could not win substantial minority votes. It was a strategy that Ken Mehlman, the chairman of the Republican National Committee and George W. Bush’s campaign manager in 2004 acknowledged, saying: “By the 1970s and into the 80s and 90s, the Democratic Party solidified its gain in the African American community, and we Republicans did not effectively reach out. Some Republicans gave up on winning the African American vote, looking for the other way or trying to benefit politically from racial polarization. I am here to tell you we were wrong.” (42)

Regarding the Mexican American electorate, the Nixon strategy was twofold: co-opt Mexican American Democratic officials to break from the Democratic Party; and clandestinely help *La Raza Unida* Party so that it can draw votes away from Democratic candidates. These objectives were carried out primarily by a special White House political unit referred to as the “Brown Mafia” composed of Henry Ramírez, director of the Cabinet Committee on Opportunity for the Spanish Speaking (CCOSSP), Alex Armendáriz, a member of the Committee for the Re-Election of the President (CREEP), and William Marumoto, Tony Rodríguez and Carlos Conde from the White House staff. All were following the Nixon campaign directive to “capitalize on the incumbency.” (43)

In the summer of 1972, for example, Phillip Sanchez, director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, approved a grant for the Zavala County Health Corporation which was controlled by *La Raza Unida* Party. When it was vetoed by Texas Governor Preston Smith, Armendáriz urged Sánchez to override the veto because “should the poll gap tighten in Texas, the neutrality of *La Raza Unida* Party will be very helpful.” (44) When Sanchez vetoed the governor’s action, Armendáriz wrote, “*La Raza Unida* is pleased with the Zavala County Health Grant,” and then went on to urge the White House

to “spring loose” other *La Raza Unida* projects as such action would “mutually benefit the President and *La Raza Unida*. (45)

The Nixon strategy also called for buying Mexican American politicians. On July 27, 1977, for example, Houston Municipal Court Judge Alfred J. Hernández, a Democrat, publicly supported Nixon. “This year, we will not give our votes away for promises,” he said at a press conference. “This is the first time we have had a chance to vote for a president on his solid record of achievement for Spanish Americans.” (46) However, the press conference was coordinated by Republican strategists, and before the endorsement he got a letter from Marumoto saying, “If you implement your plans as we discussed, the President will adequately recognize you.” (47) Then, Marumoto wrote to Tom Clarke of CREEP, “The White House and CREEP endorse Judge Hernandez’s appointment should a vacancy occur in the federal bench in Texas.” (48)

While Nixon’s “Southern Strategy” could be dismissed as traditional “divide and conquer” electoral tactics, Ronald Reagan turned the “Southern Strategy” into a systematic, continuous plan masked with “acceptable” political ideology. Reagan’s strategy began the day he launched his 1980 presidential campaign, with a speech in the town of Philadelphia, Mississippi, the site where three civil rights workers had been slain in 1964. Through the clever use of “code” words which camouflaged racial biases among white voters, Reagan appealed to white racial resentment without sounding “racist,” a ploy Lee Atwater, a noted Republican political adviser proposed. “By 1968, you can’t say n..... It backfires. So you say stuff like forced busing, states’ rights, and all that stuff. You’re getting so abstract now ...we are doing away with the racial problem,” Atwater said. (49)

To white Southerners, however, “states’ rights,” and “racial quotas,” for example, conjures images of forced federal integration, of compulsory voting rights to African Americans, and generally, to a federal government’s imposition into their “way of life.” In fact, as Randall Clark, a law clerk for former U.S. Supreme Court Justice Thurgood Marshall, said, “The Reagan Administration policies reflect, reinforce and capitalize on widespread feelings that Blacks have received an undeserved amount of the nation’s

attention.” Then he continued, “This was done through arguments for race-blindness that were, in fact, exquisitely attuned to the racial sensitivities of the dominant white majority.” (50)

But Reagan’s most significant contribution to the “Southern Strategy” was in convincing people that the liberal democracy could, in fact, be strengthened through capitalist values which reflected, in his policies of militant imperialism, laissez faire capitalism and trickle-down-economics, the new conservative ideology. The values his policies promulgated, those of idealized individualism, self-interest, material accumulation, self-reliance, hard work, sobriety and sacrifice, were sold to people as if they were political values of equality, justice, fairness, rights and liberty. This was a complete reversal from the politics of Kennedy and Johnson who sought to improve democratic society by expanding political rights and economic opportunity. Reagan took the economic values of Alexander Hamilton, packaged them with the democratic language of Thomas Jefferson and sold them to the people as the means to improve the political system.

This political reversal put Mexican Americans in a quandary. Their struggle to achieve an equitable place in Anglo American society had been through the expansion of liberal democratic values, and their collective bonding had been through their sense of Mexico/*mestizo* consciousness. As an identifiable group that had been legally discriminated and segregated for decades, they formed a “protected class” that had attained the right to be “compensated for previous harm” under the law. They had been given a “leg up,” as President Johnson declared in 1965 at Harvard University. “But freedom is not enough,” he said. “You do not take a person who, for years has been hobbled by chains and liberate him, bring him to the starting line of a race and then say, ‘You are free to compete with all the others.’” (51)

Yet, the Reagan policies which focused on economic values turned the tables on Mexican Americans, for they could no longer expect satisfaction from government as an ethnic group because it would be taken as an admission of “preferential treatment” or “reverse discrimination,” both of which had become code phrases for anti-affirmative

action proponents who felt minorities were getting more than their just due. Through Reagan's capitalist values, blue collar and working poor whites, for example, would see Mexican Americans not only as an economic threat but as a group which had been given undue advantage by government. The "Southern Strategy" had evolved to such a degree that Mexican Americans were suddenly turned into an economic class vested with vulnerable political rights and questionable economic rights. The politics of class had begun.

This is why the 2006 protests supporting undocumented immigrants in cities throughout the country did not appeal to civil rights but to natural rights. In particular, the protesters emphasized the God-given right to work and make a livelihood which is the cornerstone of both philosopher John Locke's beliefs and the Declaration of Independence. They were, in effect, invoking the ideology of work promoted by Reagan's conservative doctrine, one deeply engrained in American culture. In proclaiming that "human beings are not illegal," and "we are here to work," the immigrants, most of which were from Mexico, were aligning themselves with the Biblical, Judeo-Christian creed stating that, "by the sweat of your brow you shall you will eat your food until you return to the ground, since from it you were taken; for dust you are and to dust you shall return," thus attaching themselves fully to a revered element of American society.

In fact, the work ethic has been institutionalized in U.S. ideology through what German sociologist Max Weber called the "Protestant Ethic," and through a host of Americans who believe in what congressman William Evarts said when he told a political gathering in 1856: "Labor, gentlemen, we acknowledge as being the source of all our wealth, of all our progress, of all our unity and value." (52)

This value, encompassing diligence to task, punctuality, deferred gratification and attaching primary importance to work, was what the immigrants presented in their appeal to the American conscience. It vividly represented a politics of class which derives not from the democratic political values of liberty, justice and fraternity but from the capitalist economic values of life, liberty and property.

The protests over undocumented immigration were a manifestation not only of the political environment Mexican Americans had been facing since the Reagan presidency, but a preview perhaps of what is to come.

Cengage Learning
Not for Reprint

End Notes

(1) According to the 2006 Current Population Survey, the Hispanic population of the United States includes people whose country of origin is Mexico, Puerto Rico, Cuba, and Central and South America

(2) The Mexican American population is concentrated in western states, and is projected to be a majority in Texas, California, New Mexico and Arizona.

(3) According to the U.S. Bureau of the Census, 50.6 percent of Mexican Americans have less than a high school education; 23.6 percent earn less than \$35,000 a year; and 22.8 percent live within the poverty level. Also, Mexican Americans are the youngest population group in the country, with 37.1 percent under age 18, which means their demographic group will have a longer-lasting impact on U.S. society.

(4) Knight, Alan, "Racism, Revolution and *Indigenismo*: Mexico, 1910-1940." The Idea of Race in Latin America. University of Texas Press, Austin, Texas, 1990. Knight argues that the term *mestizo* is a social as well as a racial term, given that ethnic identification such as language, dress, religion, social organization, culture and consciousness are capable of change. Thus the process of *mestizaje* is an achieved as well as an ascribed status.

(5) Wilson, John. Forging the American Character. Prentice Hall, New Jersey, 1997, p. 45.

(6) Stephen, Ambrose E. Rise to Globalization: American Foreign Policy 1938-1980. Penguin Press, 2nd edition, New York, New York, 1980, p. 12.

(7) Harvard Professor Samuel P. Huntington believes that Western civilization has two major variants: European and North American. He contends that the influx of "Latin American" cultures in the United States threatens the Anglo American identity of U.S. society, a premise held by a host of commentators, including Lou Dobbs and Pat Buchanan. "We are witnessing," Buchanan warned during his 2000 presidential campaign, "the hispanization of America and nobody seems to care. This is a very important issue for Americans, for our cultural heritage is on balance."

(8) History of Southwest Texas, Volume I. Lewis Publishing Co., Chicago, 1907, p. 161.

(9) Ibid., p. 162.

(10) Ibid., p. 163.

(11) Ibid., p. 163.

(12) "All Quiet in Edwards County--Lynching at Rock Springs done by Americans, says Ranger captain." San Antonio Daily Express November 22, 1910: p. 8.

(13) "Cobarde -- Infame e inhumano linchamiento de un jovencito mexicano en Thorndale, Texas." La Cronica November 16, 1911: p. 1.

(14) Powers, Elizabeth. "Life on the Texas-Mexico Border: Myth and Reality as Represented in Mainstream and Independent Western Cinema." Paper presented at meeting of International Communication Association, San Diego, California, May 27, 2003. (http://www.allacademic.com/meta/p.11135_index.html)

(15) Mexican Americans opting to live in Mexico founded the "twin" cities now located along much of the U.S./Mexico border such as El Paso, Texas and Juarez, Mexico, San Diego, California, and Tijuana, Brownsville and Matamoros, Laredo and Nuevo Laredo, Eagle Pass and Piedras Negras, Del Río and Ciudad Acuña.

(16) Mercado, J.J. "Facultad de perdonar." La Cronica September 21, 1911: p. 4.

(17) Navarro, Armando. "The Evolution of *Chicano* Politics," Aztlán: Chicano Journal of the Social Sciences and the Arts, University of California, Los Angeles, 1974, p. 59.

(18) Samora, Julian and Patricia Vandel Simon. History of the Mexican American People. University of Notre Dame Press, Notre Dame, Indiana, 1977, p. 173.

(19) Ibid., p. 174.

(20) Weeks, O. Douglas. "The League of United Latin American Citizens: Texas-Mexican Civic Organization." Southwestern Political and Social Science Quarterly, December, 1929.

(21) Ibid.

(22) Samora, p. 164.

(23) In *Mendez v. Westminster*, 161 F. 2^d 774 (9th Circuit, 1947), the case dealt with five Mexican American fathers who claimed their children, along with 5,000 other children of "Mexican ancestry" were victims of unconstitutional discrimination by being forced to attend separate "Mexican schools" in Orange County. To Mexican Americans, this case equaled the more famous *Brown v. Board of Education* case which declared the "separate but equal" doctrine unconstitutional.

(24) *Hernández v. Texas*, 347 U.S. 475 (1954).

(25) Samora, p. 170.

(26) José Angel Gutiérrez was a co-founder of MAYO (Mexican American Youth Organization), mostly a student organization that became active in voter education and voter registration and which later formed the nucleus of the *La Raza Unida* party.

(27) *La Raza Unida* party was formed in 1970 in Crystal City, Texas, by Jose Angel Gutierrez and Marío Compeán as a means to give a political option to Mexican Americans. Literally, *La Raza Unida* means the United Race, and it sought to unite Mexican Americans through their *mestizo* ethnicity.

(28) As quoted by the San Antonio Express News, June 7, 1977, p. 3-A.

(29) Realizing neither Nixon nor the Republican Party would get support from African American voters in the south following the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965, Nixon sought to attract traditionally Democratic white voters by using code language such as "States Rights" and by minimally enforcing civil rights laws.

(30) In *Meyer v. Nebraska*, 262 U.S. 390 (1923), the Supreme Court ruled that these are fundamental rights that are protected through the concept of “liberty” in the 14th Amendment.

(31) The U.S. Census Bureau has identified Mexican Americans through several appellations: Hispanic, Latin American, Mexican American, Spanish-speaking, etc. However, throughout the history of the United States they have been classified as “white.”

(32) Rodríguez, Richard. Hunger of Memory: the Education of Richard Rodríguez. Bantam Books, Toronto, 1981, p. 27.

(33) Kimball, Penn. The Disconnected. Columbia University Press, New York, New York, 1972, p. 217.

(34) Ibid, p. 219.

(35) When the Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund disagreed openly with Congressman González, he pressured the Ford Foundation to limit its funding claiming there was a picture of Ché Guevara on its office walls. He also went against those who claimed there was discrimination at Kelly AFB and voted against Senator Ralph Yarborough’s bilingual education bill.

(36) Shockley, John. Chicano Revolt in a Texas Town. Notre Dame Press, Notre Dame, Indiana, 1974, p. 23.

(37) Election returns compiled by Douglas S. Harlan, Texas Stats ‘72, County and Precinct Election Returns, 1972.

(38) Vasconcelos, José. "*La Raza Cósmica*." Editoriales Chrónocos, México, D. F., 1970, p. 31.

(39) Knight, Allen, p. 128.

(40) Romano, Octavio. "Social Science, Objectivity, and the *Chicanos*." *El Grito*, Vol. IV, No. 1 (Fall, 1970), p. 5.

(41) Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States, Lyndon B. Johnson, Book I (1963-64), p. 704-707.

(42) Allen, Mike. "RNC chief to say it was wrong to exploit racial conflict for votes." *Washington Post*, July 7, 2005.

(43) Undated memo introduced as evidence in the Senate Watergate Committee Hearings.

(44) Memo dated October 9, 1972, from Armendáriz to Frederick Malek. Watergate Committee Hearings.

(45) Memo dated November 2, 1972, from Armendáriz to Ken Cole. Watergate Committee Hearings.

(46) Memo dated June 8, 1972, from Armendáriz to _____. The recipient of this memo blacked out. Watergate Committee Hearings.

(47) Letter dated June 12, 1972, from William Marumoto to Judge Alfred J. Hernández of Houston, Texas. Watergate Committee Hearings.

(48) White House memo dated August 18, 1972, from William Marumoto to John Clarke. Watergate Committee Hearings.

(49) Herbert, Bob. "Impossible, Ridiculous, Repugnant." *New York Times*, November 9, 2007: p. 24.

(50) Kennedy, Randall. "Persuasion and Distrust: A Comment on the Affirmative Action Debate." *American Civil Rights Movement, Readings and Interpretation*, McGraw-Hill, Duskin, 2001, p. 493.

(51) Public Papers of the Presidents, p. 704-707.

(52) Wilson, John, p. 47.

Cengage Learning
Not for Reprint

See more of Cengage Learning PTR on Facebook. Log In. or. Create New Account. See more of Cengage Learning PTR on Facebook. Log In. Forgotten account? or. Create New Account. Not Now. Visitor Posts. Barry Hill.Â Coming in January 2015, Cengage PTR is publishing a six-book series about planning Your Money Life from acclaimed financial planner Peter Dunn! Deciding to learn and practice the techniques to overcome your nervousness and anxiety about public speaking means you are moving in the right direction to attain your academic, professional, and social goals. g n i n r t a n i r e L e p e R g r a o g f n t e o C N REVIEW QUESTIONS After reading. this chapter, you should be able to answer the following: 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. What is the academic term and its definition for speech anxiety?