

WE ARE *AMERICANOS*: RACE, RHETORIC, AND RESISTANCE IN LATINA/O  
STRUGGLES FOR U.S. CITIZENSHIP

by

J. DAVID CISNEROS

(Under the Direction of Vanessa B. Beasley and Edward M. Panetta)

ABSTRACT

Over the last two decades, pundits and politicians have discussed with growing urgency the changes that “Hispanics” and “Latina/os” are bringing to the United States. This project problematizes these debates by showing that Latina/os have played an active role in (re)making the contours of U.S. identity throughout history. My argument is twofold: that the position of Latina/os’ in the U.S. has been structured by a fundamental tension of citizenship between inclusion (i.e., assimilation) and exclusion (i.e., difference), and that Latina/os have struggled with these tensions by crafting their own discourses of U.S. citizenship. I develop these arguments through analysis of three historical moments in which Latina/os negotiated U.S. citizenship. In the first case study, I examine the California Constitutional Convention of 1849, an instance in which early “Latina/os,” or native Mexican *Californios*, negotiated their newly granted U.S. citizenship after the Mexican-American War. At the Constitutional Convention, I argue, Californios enacted a *compromise* citizenship by striking a balance between their own traditions and the pressures of assimilation they faced as new U.S. citizens. In the second case study, I consider a Latina/o struggle with U.S. citizenship from the 1960s. The Mexican-American activist Reies López Tijerina and his organization the *Alianza Federal de Mercedes*

fought for rights and land grants in New Mexico and the Southwest. I show that Tijerina constructed a *border* citizenship that migrated between citizen and foreigner, between inclusion and exclusion. Finally, I examine a modern movement for Latina/o citizenship—La Gran Marcha of March 25, 2006, in which half a million Latina/os and immigrants protested federal immigration policy—to show how contemporary struggles for U.S. national belonging differ. Flouting pressures of inclusion and exclusion, La Gran Marcha fused multiple forms of discourse and transnational political traditions to craft a *hybrid* U.S. citizenship. In the conclusion, I draw together these three case studies to discuss the common elements of Latina/o citizenship and Latina/o identity in the United States. I find that studying Latina/o citizenship speaks to the ever-changing role of Latina/os in the U.S. and to the problematics of U.S. citizenship more generally.

INDEX WORDS: citizenship, Latina/os, rhetoric, Californio, California Constitutional Convention, Reies Tijerina, La Gran Marcha, immigration, protest

WE ARE *AMERICANOS*: RACE, RHETORIC, AND RESISTANCE IN LATINA/O  
STRUGGLES FOR U.S. CITIZENSHIP

by

J. DAVID CISNEROS

B.A., Mercer University, 2003

M.A., Baylor University, 2005

A Dissertation Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial

Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2009

© 2009

Josue David Cisneros

All Rights Reserved

WE ARE *AMERICANOS*: RACE, RHETORIC, AND RESISTANCE IN LATINA/O  
STRUGGLES FOR U.S. CITIZENSHIP

by

J. DAVID CISNEROS

Major Professors: Vanessa B. Beasley  
Edward M. Panetta

Committee: Celeste M. Condit  
Thomas Lessl  
Pamela Voekel

Electronic Version Approved:

Maureen Grasso  
Dean of the Graduate School  
The University of Georgia

August 2009

DEDICATION

For Arquímedes and Hortensia, and for Leticia, whose struggles made all this possible.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Since it is impossible for me to acknowledge in this limited space all those to whom I am indebted, I hope it suffices to express my gratitude for a few of the many people who guided, supported, and inspired me during the writing of this dissertation and, more broadly, during the graduate education that this project culminates.

My advisor, Dr. Vanessa Beasley, has not only shaped this dissertation, but she has also immeasurably contributed to my writing, thinking, teaching, and the development of my goals and values. I thank her especially for her diligence throughout our “long-distance” mentoring relationship. I am also greatly indebted to Dr. Edward Panetta for his personal and professional support, particularly in those moments when I needed a mentor to whom I could talk face-to-face. The members of my dissertation committee—Dr. Celeste Condit, Dr. Thomas Lessl, and Dr. Pamela Voekel—have helped me to ask hard questions and expand my thinking; I am grateful for their intellectual and professional guidance. Dr. John Murphy offered suggestions and encouragement throughout this process, and Dr. Darrel Enck-Wanzer also contributed to the germination of many of the ideas in this project. I thank both of them and all the other scholars and mentors who have aided me sometimes without even knowing it these last four years.

In addition, I am forever in debt both personally and professionally to my colleagues and friends at the University of Georgia for their support. They have contributed to my scholarship and my development in less formal but no less significant ways. I especially should thank Kristen, Eric, Betsy, and Matt for being persistent counselors, readers, and advisors. Equally as important, they have immeasurably enriched my life as friends.

Finally, I am thankful for my family. They too deserve thanks and credit for their persistent support throughout my graduate career. Thank you all for your unconditional encouragement, for the patience you all have shown me throughout this process, and for the long-suffering you have endured on my behalf. I hope you all know how much you are written on every page of this document.

Thank you all,

David



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....	v
CHAPTER	
1 INTRODUCTION: LATINA/O STRUGGLES FOR U.S. CITIZENSHIP .....	1
2 COMPROMISE CITIZENSHIP: RACE, RHETORIC, AND NATION IN NINETEENTH CENTURY CALIFORNIA .....	34
3 BORDER CITIZENSHIP: REIES LÓPEZ TIJERINA AND TESTING THE LIMITS OF U.S. CITIZENSHIP .....	84
4 HYBRID CITIZENSHIP: THE INTERSECTIONAL RHETORIC AND TRANSNATIONALISM OF LA GRAN MARHCA .....	139
5 CONCLUSION: WE ARE <i>AMERICANOS</i> .....	185
BIBLIOGRAPHY .....	206

## CHAPTER 1

### INTRODUCTION: LATINA/O STRUGGLES FOR U.S. CITIZENSHIP

Between March and May of 2006, several million people, mostly documented and undocumented immigrants, engaged in organized protests of proposed federal immigration legislation in cities such as Chicago, Denver, Los Angeles, and Washington, D.C.<sup>1</sup> In Chicago, for example, 100,000 people marched, while in Washington, D.C., 40,000 protestors gathered outside of the Capital building. Demonstrators in Milwaukee numbered almost 15,000, while in Denver and Detroit nearly 50,000 congregated. The largest and most influential of these protests was dubbed “La Gran Marcha” (The Great March) of March 25, 2006. Almost a million people—mostly of Latin-American descent—filled the streets of Los Angeles in one of the largest demonstrations of recent history.<sup>2</sup> La Gran Marcha was one of the earliest protests of 2006, and it spurred a wave of marches across the country lasting for close to two months. In Los Angeles, Latina/o citizens and immigrants mobilized in opposition to restrictive immigration legislation that, among other measures, called for a massive wall along the US-Mexico border and would have made illegal immigration a felony with stricter penalties.<sup>3</sup> Protestors organized by the thousands, demanding that immigrants be granted rights, protections, and a clear path to nationalization.<sup>4</sup> “We are not here to beg for citizenship,” said Bishara Constand, a Palestinian immigrant protesting in San Francisco. “We are here to demand citizenship. Who built this country? Immigrants!”<sup>5</sup>

Constand's comments typify a major conflict in contemporary debate about citizenship: the tension between exclusion and inclusion. For example, the recent protests by Latina/os and immigrants represent a demand for inclusion. Immigrants clamor for political and cultural belonging in the United States. In response, those who lobby for stricter laws of nationalization attempt to make inclusion more difficult by strengthening the border, understood as both a literal and figurative demarcation, around the United States. These efforts to police the boundaries of "American-ness" exemplify the need for exclusion, the need to demarcate citizens from non-citizens. As Vanessa B. Beasley puts it, "nationalism is a double-edged sword, an efficient tool for promoting shared identity, perhaps, but one that may also encourage exclusion, intolerance, and even inhumanity."<sup>6</sup> The tension between inclusion and exclusion, according to Bonnie Honig, is the fundamental problem of democratic politics.<sup>7</sup> On the one hand, more and more people cry for citizenship. On the other hand, there must be limits to citizenship, otherwise the status is meaningless.

The drive to keep citizenship an exclusive category has historically taken shape through the exclusion of minorities based on their race, ethnicity, or sex. For example, scholars from a variety of fields show that, throughout history, racial and ethnic identity has been a fundamental component in the formation of political community.<sup>8</sup> Migrant groups, like racial minorities, are also often framed as "impossible subjects" or "aliens" and excluded from full national belonging.<sup>9</sup> This is particularly true for Mexicans (as well as other Latina/os), since the popular label of "illegal" marks migrants, residents, and citizens alike as criminals, preventing their acceptance into U.S. society.<sup>10</sup> Concurrent with this legal exclusion, contemporary discourse, whether in media outlets, politics, or public controversies, continues to construct racialized binaries of the citizen and the foreign outsider. For those racial and ethnic minorities who

struggle to attain recognition, American citizenship often “requires one to give up a full personhood to gain another—hence, to make a choice between national citizenship and cultural citizenship.”<sup>11</sup> In other words, racial/ethnic minorities and migrants are often forced to sacrifice their racial or cultural distinctiveness to attain recognition as U.S. citizens.

While citizenship is a contested idea, there is much at stake in exploring the dimensions of inclusion and exclusion that take shape in minority struggles for national belonging. Citizenship signifies more than just a legal category; to be a citizen is to be privileged to rights, political agency, economic access, cultural inclusion, and symbolic recognition by dominant society.<sup>12</sup> Furthermore, as recent protests by Latina/os and immigrants demonstrate, many individuals are willing to struggle and suffer to attain citizenship. As William V. Flores argues, “for many groups, such as racial minorities, women, gays, the disabled, and others, the struggle for full citizenship and full membership in U.S. society has involved demands that extend beyond those of traditional white males.”<sup>13</sup> Minority groups, such as Latina/os and migrants, find ways to carve out space for themselves in dominant society. Meanwhile, citizens seek to solidify the boundaries that distinguish them from “outsiders.”

By studying these struggles for national belonging, we can learn much about the endemic tensions of American citizenship, for as sociologist Gershon Shafir argues, “bringing together alternative citizenship frameworks and pitting them against each other” could help address the challenges of citizenship in both theory and practice.<sup>14</sup> Certainly, studies of the Civil Rights movements and women’s suffrage movements have taught us that we can benefit from further understanding how minorities renew, reframe, and remake the dynamics of U.S. citizenship.<sup>15</sup> Yet we need to know more about the enactment of citizenship by Latina/o groups. While scholars have begun to examine how African Americans and women negotiated the boundaries

of U.S. citizenship throughout history, we know comparatively less about how Latina/os struggle with U.S. citizenship. How do the tensions of exclusion and inclusion impact Latina/os struggling to attain full U.S. citizenship? Do Latina/os negotiate these tensions through their public discourse? How have Latina/os sought national belonging?<sup>16</sup>

Like other groups, Latina/os have attempted to carve out their own space for inclusion in American citizenship traditions, and in this project I will examine some of those historical enactments of Latina/o citizenship. Through rhetorical analysis of three specific moments in U.S. history in which Latina/o groups struggled to attain full U.S. citizenship, this project tells a story about how Latina/os have seen themselves fitting into the American national community. As a consequence, this project also tells a story about the evolution of American citizenship and the tension between inclusion and exclusion that drives it.

In this chapter I explain why Latina/os are the focus of this study and justify the theoretical and methodological confines of this project. In the first section, I explain the choice to study Latina/os' struggles with U.S. citizenship in particular. Latina/o citizenship is worthy of study both intrinsically and for how it can improve our understandings of U.S. citizenship in general. The second section justifies a rhetorical perspective toward the study of citizenship. I draw on the work of rhetorical scholars to show that an understanding of citizenship grounded in discourse can provide unique insights into how the parameters of U.S. citizenship are constructed, challenged, and preserved. Next, I describe and defend the moments of Latina/o citizenship I chose to study. I justify my choice to study Latina/o citizenship struggles both synchronically (in situated moments of articulation) and diachronically (across U.S. history), rather than centering on contemporary Latina/o discourse. This chapter concludes by previewing the argument I will make throughout the course of this dissertation. Although it is beyond the

scope of this project to provide a complete history of Latina/o struggles with U.S. citizenship, I hope it will begin to sketch some important commonalities and some key differences in how Latina/os have articulated U.S. citizenship across time.

### **Why Latina/os?**

As scholars and political pundits never tire of noting, Latina/os are forming an increasingly important demographic, economic, and political force in U.S. society.<sup>17</sup> Since the turn of the century Latina/os have become the largest minority group in the United States. Moreover, studies show the bulk of this increase in the Latina/o population comes not from immigration (though that is still a significant factor) but from natural sources (i.e., births).<sup>18</sup> This means that a growing group of Latina/o citizens are coming to terms with their national and cultural identity. As a consequence, sometimes competing ethnic and cultural allegiances can create frictions in the lives of Latina/os' in the U.S. Latina/o citizens struggle with "established notions of rights, responsibilities, obligations, entitlements . . . and national 'belonging.'"<sup>19</sup> These struggles for political and cultural inclusion are evident in controversies surrounding Latina/os' status as full U.S. citizens, such as debates over bilingual education, ethnic identification, and access to government services.

Latina/o struggles for legal, political, and symbolic recognition, then, speak to the power citizenship plays in contemporary society. Yet many Latina/o groups have also had a unique and turbulent historical relationship with the United States. For example, U.S. citizenship was imposed on some Latina/os, particularly Mexicans and Puerto Ricans, unilaterally. As Hector Amaya notes, "the origins of Latina/o history in the United States were legally defined by the imposition of citizenship."<sup>20</sup> Much of Mexican-Americans' and Puerto Ricans' histories have been characterized by struggles to accommodate the tensions of U.S. citizenship. Furthermore,

many Latina/os have negotiated their relationship as dual citizens—of the United States and of other Latin American countries. This is certainly true for Mexican-Americans and Puerto Ricans, but also for many other Latina/o groups who have become U.S. subjects, from Dominican-Americans to Salvadoran-Americans.<sup>21</sup> In terms of their geographic location, their political and economic dependence on, and their historical ties to the U.S., Latina/os live in the “shadow” of the superpower. Certainly, while U.S. identity has been influenced by political and economic developments in Latin America at least since the Monroe doctrine, Latin American and Latina/o identity are inextricably tied to the U.S. by virtue of these historical and contemporary connections.<sup>22</sup>

In sum, because Latina/os are the largest racial minority group in the United States, and considering the historical relationships between Latina/os and the U.S., studying Latina/o citizenship is an important corrective to a “largely oppressive black and white dichotomy that continues to reign in mainstream discussions of race and ethnicity.”<sup>23</sup> Latina/o experiences can illuminate the theoretical and practical tensions of citizenship and racial difference. In fact, Latina/os are intricately connected to larger problematics of citizenship. Suzanne Oboler argues:

Focusing attention on Latino/a citizenship provides an invaluable opportunity for academics, policymakers, and the society at large to broaden ideas and practices about democratic citizenship and democratic governance, nationally and regionally. . . . Indeed, as the Latino/a experience attests, it is not citizenship per se but the lack of it that fuels political debates and conservative measures today.<sup>24</sup>

By virtue of these connections between Latina/os’ racial, ethnic, and geographical identities, Latina/os have experienced the tensions of U.S. citizenship in unique ways throughout their history. Latina/o citizenship movements demand investigation both on their own terms and for

what they can teach about U.S. citizenship more generally. One of the primary ways Latina/os and other minority groups have articulated their sense of belonging in the national community has been through rhetoric, or public discourse. Thus a discursive perspective on citizenship can help us trace and explain Latina/o citizenship struggles.

### **Why Rhetoric?**

As scholars increasingly come to terms with contemporary Latina/o citizenship struggles, a common theme emerges. In the absence of formal recognition or inclusion as citizens, Latina/os use a variety of cultural or discursive practices to claim social space and enact national belonging. For example, in a collection of essays edited by William Flores and Rita Benmayor, scholars explored various discursive activities, from street performances and murals to local workers' strikes, to show that Latina/os articulated citizenship therein.<sup>25</sup> More specifically, William Flores presented several case studies of Latina/o groups using cultural practices to craft local expressions of citizenship. He focused on a community in San Jose, California during the late 1970s and early 1980s that created a health care fair and a cultural solidarity organization to solidify local ties and protest local INS raids.<sup>26</sup> According to Flores, through these community activities, the Latina/os of San Jose, California created an ethnic expression of community citizenship. Essays in a more recent volume edited by Suzanne Oboler expand these studies to the education, labor, and cultural initiatives of a variety of Latina/o groups beyond Mexicans and Puerto Ricans.<sup>27</sup> In sum, studies of Latina/o citizenship examine how

cultural phenomena—from practices that organize the daily life of individuals, families, and the community, to linguistic and artistic expression—cross the political realm and contribute to the process of affirming and building an emerging Latina/o identity and political and social consciousness.<sup>28</sup>



These cultural activities, such as community organizations, artistic expression, or demonstrations of cultural solidarity, are examples of ways Latina/os living within the United States craft a sense of belonging through public discourse. Latina/o strikes, public health fairs, cultural organizations, and so forth demonstrate that rhetoric, or situated, public, and persuasive discourse, is a central means through which Latina/os constitute themselves as American citizens, even when they are excluded from formal citizenship. Yet to understand these Latina/o struggles, I must first explain the role of public discourse more generally in our notions of U.S. citizenship. Therefore, this section outlines some common themes that structure our understandings of citizenship, and then discusses what a discursive perspective of citizenship could entail. Finally, I return to the contemporary scholarship on Latina/o citizenship I have just introduced to explain how the discursive (or more specifically, rhetorical) perspective on citizenship taken in this project can supplement this work.

### **Dimensions of U.S. Citizenship**

Even though citizenship is a contested term—contested both by those defined as citizens and those defined as non-citizens—we can identify several common elements. I outline four dimensions of citizenship that dominate our contemporary understanding of the term: legal, political, social, and symbolic.<sup>29</sup> These four dimensions are evidenced in the daily practices of citizenship in the U.S. as well as in the laws and traditions that structure U.S. citizenship. The political, legal, and social dimensions of citizenship are perhaps its most obvious components.<sup>30</sup> These dimensions of citizenship operate from what Andrew Dobson astutely recognizes as a contractual framework.<sup>31</sup> In exchange for allegiance to the nation state, the individual receives legal recognition and political/social rights. The symbolic dimension of citizenship is less clear yet no less important, for it is often a terrain of considerable contestation and negotiation.<sup>32</sup>

Despite its differing dimensions, U.S. citizenship is still defined by the basic tension between inclusion and exclusion.

In its most traditional sense, citizenship is a legal category. To be a citizen means to have legal recognition and membership granted by a “territorially sovereign state”—most commonly a nation-state.<sup>33</sup> Along with this legal recognition comes the granting of certain legal rights, often conceived of as freedom from government restriction and freedom to seek one’s welfare and happiness. In this most limited tradition, citizenship is a contractual relationship attained naturally (by birth) or by legal decree. This legal notion of citizenship clearly evidences tensions of exclusion and inclusion, since the very purpose of legal recognition by the nation state is to demarcate the citizen from the foreigner.

In a larger sense, one could also identify political aspects of citizenship. Political citizenship can be viewed as active and faithful participation in public life. As Johnston notes, political citizenship is connected to but not dependent upon legal citizenship. For example, even “before naturalization, the legal permanent resident already enjoys certain rights and responsibilities” such as “a responsibility to pay taxes, register for military service, and send the family’s children to school.” Political citizenship is less a matter of legal status and more a “process of *expanded involvement in evolving public institutions* [emphasis in original].”<sup>34</sup> It encompasses both a duty to participate in the institutions of the state and the rights that come from being recognized as a political subject.

Political citizenship, like legal citizenship, can be granted, limited, augmented, and contested. Often, minority groups struggle for both legal citizenship and political citizenship, that is, for legal recognition and also for political inclusion. At other times minority groups work for political citizenship independently of legal citizenship. For example, during the African-

American Civil Rights Movement of the 1960s, though African-Americans already possessed legal citizenship, many groups struggled for voting rights and equal treatment under the law—elements of political citizenship. These examples, too, demonstrate a tension between exclusion and inclusion; in the face of demands by minorities for political inclusion, there is a competing tension to make political citizenship the special identity of a select few.

Within this contractual view of citizenship, in which individuals exchange national allegiance for rights and responsibilities, one could also talk about social (or economic) citizenship. Social citizenship encompasses the social and economic security of the individual through the right to work, to own property, the access to education, and the availability of social support, for example.<sup>35</sup> Though some of these elements often lie outside of the state, nevertheless citizenship authorizes one to be an equal participant in the social and economic sector of public life. For example, racial/ethnic minorities and women struggle to attain full social citizenship in the form of equal pay for equal work, access to public education, and the availability of welfare and other forms of social support. Latina/os have struggled with social elements of citizenship for decades, as the farm worker movements of the 1960s demonstrate.<sup>36</sup>

As these three dimensions evidence, our conventional understandings of citizenship entail a contractual relationship between membership in a nation state and the rights and responsibilities that come with national belonging. Certainly these dimensions not only structure our scholarly understandings of citizenship but also our public practices of citizenship. Immigrants seek citizenship to become authorized legal subjects and to receive political and social rights.<sup>37</sup>

Besides these legal, political, and social manifestations, citizenship is also part of what Charles Taylor has called “modern social imaginaries,” or worldviews that subsume our common

myths, traditions, identities and political practices.<sup>38</sup> In a symbolic sense, citizenship is a central component of Western culture. “Citizenship is not just a legal status,” summarizes Will Kymlicka, “but also an identity, an expression of one’s membership in a political community.”<sup>39</sup> As Benedict Anderson famously articulated, citizenship can be an “imagined” characteristic, one that is constructed through a common past and a collective future. Furthermore, this “imagined” dimension of citizenship—created by common symbols, myths, and traditions—forms the glue of community.<sup>40</sup> Citizenship is, in the symbolic sense, a shared history and a common purpose that forms the cornerstone of the nation-state.

This symbolic dimension of citizenship is one of the first signs that public discourse is an important element of national belonging, for it acknowledges that citizenship operates through signs, myths, narratives, and rituals to create individual and group identities. Symbolic citizenship is intricately connected to legal and political citizenship, since access to those material realities depends upon symbolic recognition as member of the “imagined” community. This is certainly true for Latina/os and immigrants, whose status as legal and political outsiders stems, in part, from a lack of symbolic recognition.<sup>41</sup> Yet the legal and political realities of citizenship often operate on a separate trajectory from its symbolic elements. Thus, it is often easy for U.S. citizens to grant migrants symbolic citizenship by labeling the U.S. an “immigrant nation” without guaranteeing migrants political or legal rights.

The symbolic dimension of U.S. citizenship provides the first clues to what a discursive or rhetorical perspective could bring to citizenship studies. In the next section I explain the insights that could follow from studying the ways that national belonging—in its legal, political, social, and symbolic dimensions—is constructed and contested through moments of public discourse. The discursive view of citizenship is not a separate dimension of citizenship but

rather a methodological perspective for understanding how citizenship is articulated in the public sphere. While the symbolic dimension of U.S. citizenship acknowledges that large scale myths and traditions contribute to the U.S. national community, a discursive perspective could further elaborate these processes of community building by studying the ways that the “people” constitute themselves.<sup>42</sup> In other words, rather than focusing on how national belonging is defined through law, political and economic institutions, or historical national myths, a discursive view of citizenship would focus on how national belonging is *enacted* through situated *public discourse*. The next section outlines a discursive perspective for studying U.S. citizenship, one that conceives of U.S. citizenship as primarily a discursive act. Being that Latina/os enact U.S. national belonging often in the absence of legal, political, economic, or even symbolic recognition, a discursive view of citizenship is central to understanding Latina/o struggles with U.S. citizenship.

### **Citizenship: A Discursive Perspective**

A discursive perspective conceptualizes citizenship not just in a nation’s laws, institutions, myths, or traditions; instead it examines how individuals and groups articulate U.S. citizenship in public discourse. When taken as a discursive construct rather than an identity category, citizenship shifts, in the words of Robert Asen, “from a status attribute to a way of acting.”<sup>43</sup> That is to say, individuals enact citizenship through a host of discursive actions, including consuming information, engaging in public discussions, participating in public ceremonies, voting, demonstrating, and other performances of national belonging. This is not to say that citizenship is wholly discursive, for laws, institutions, and traditions granting formal inclusion (or exclusion) still exist. But viewing citizenship as a way of acting rather than as an attribute means that even those individuals, like Latina/os and migrants, who are excluded from

formal dimensions of citizenship can enact national belonging through their own discourse. To elaborate on this methodological perspective, this section explains what a focus on citizenship as a discursive construct entails, and then outlines how that perspective can build on current work concerning Latina/o citizenship.

Focusing on the enactment of citizenship in public discourse is important because discourse is the fundamental building block of the public, which I define here as the space in which “citizens test and create social knowledge in order to uncover, assess, and resolve shared problems.”<sup>44</sup> The public, in the words of Michael Warner, is “a space of discourse organized by discourse.”<sup>45</sup> Circulation of texts—whether speeches, images, media reports, or conversations—constitute individuals into citizens of a concerned public, and this public deliberates and acts in response to those discourses. Legal, political, and social dimensions of citizenship only account for these discursive enactments of U.S. national belonging as effects of, or perhaps contributors to, institutional and formal conditions of citizenship. Viewing these public discourses through the symbolic dimension of citizenship, one would find it difficult to see them as constitutive of national myths and public imaginaries on the grand scale. A discursive approach to citizenship, however, opens up questions of how, why, and to what end these mainstream dimensions of citizenship take shape in societal interactions between citizens (and non-citizens). It is communication itself that “constitutes the ‘primary loyalty’ of democracy.”<sup>46</sup> As John Dewey pronounced, “debate, discussion, and persuasion” form the engine of citizenship.<sup>47</sup>

By viewing citizenship as a discursive construct, this project shifts focus from the *category* of citizen (and the laws, traditions, and myths that define it) to the *enactment* of citizenship. I view citizenship as an enactment, a “mode” of civic engagement one can take up. In other words, even those who lack citizenship in the political, legal, or even symbolic sense can

*perform* citizenship on a daily basis through rhetorical acts.<sup>48</sup> As Flores and Benmayor make clear, enactments of citizenship, even by those not considered full citizens, “cross the political realm” and impact “social space,” or the range of public values and decisions that affect the polity as a whole.<sup>49</sup> Thus the discursive perspective on citizenship views other citizenship dimensions as constituted through rhetorical enactments. Community activism, artistic expression, speeches, conversations, cultural demonstrations, protest, and even economic activity can be viewed as avenues for discursive enactment of citizenship.

Recognizing the discursive articulation of citizenship is important when considering the struggles of minorities such as Latina/os and migrants. For these groups, citizenship is often enacted on a daily basis through “a process of active, willful uptake”; Latina/os “take up” citizenship in the absence of other forms of recognition.<sup>50</sup> The immigrant protests of 2006, for example, demonstrate that Latina/os and migrants can constitute themselves as practicing and participating citizens even though they lack legal, political, social, or even symbolic inclusion. Furthermore, in the absence of federal immigration reform, defenders of “dominant logics” of U.S. citizenship—like the Arizona minutemen (private citizens who “police” the Arizona-Mexico border)—protect the boundary between exclusion and inclusion through their own discursive enactments of U.S. citizenship.<sup>51</sup>

A focus on citizenship discourse can build on scholarship in sociology, political science, anthropology, and Latina/o studies concerning how citizenship is enacted by Latina/os in a “broad range of activities.”<sup>52</sup> For example, William Flores analyzes health care fairs and other cultural demonstrations to show that Latina/os are engaging in citizenship practices.<sup>53</sup> Other scholars expanded their studies to Latina/o protests or cultural narratives, but they often examined these acts from an ethnographic perspective, which focuses on presenting the

individual voices of the participants.<sup>54</sup> While previous studies have done much to establish the fact that Latina/os negotiate U.S. citizenship, I am interested in exploring how Latina/o citizenship is enacted through their rhetoric in particular.

By focusing on Latina/o “rhetoric” I mean a specific *type* of discourse that is persuasive, public, and that is situated in a particular political, social, and cultural context. Rhetoric is central to citizenship because rhetoric is public discourse that is persuasive and directed toward the creation of social truths. Latina/o rhetoric—whether in the form of speeches, protests, art, or discussion and debate—is public and persuasive; it interpellates and has “resonance” with others.<sup>55</sup> In other words, Latina/o groups use rhetoric to constitute themselves as citizens and to negotiate with dominant society the tensions between exclusion and inclusion. Latina/o rhetoric is also particular to its historical and cultural context, for the relationship of Latina/os to U.S. society has changed over time. Studying the ways Latina/o communities organize health fairs or labor groups merely establishes the conditions in which Latina/o groups come together to forge their discursive citizenship. Scholars have shown that contemporary Latina/os *are* enacting U.S. citizenship in a number of practices. But I build on these studies by analyzing Latina/o citizenship rhetoric to understand *how* and *to what end* Latina/os negotiate U.S. citizenship. This project will provide a richer picture of past and evolving Latina/o struggles with U.S. citizenship by showing how Latina/os have enacted citizenship through public and persuasive discourse in the face of pressures for assimilation or exclusion. Through their citizenship rhetoric, Latina/os have been “a force in history.”<sup>56</sup>

Apart from providing further attention to Latina/o rhetoric, this project also traces Latina/o citizenship struggles through several historical moments. Perhaps because Latina/os are only now becoming a mainstream social and political force, research on Latina/o citizenship



focuses on contemporary enactments, contributing to the presumption that Latina/o citizenship is a recent phenomenon rather than an ongoing struggle endemic to Latina/os' positions in U.S. democracy. Recent volumes on Latina/o citizenship, for example, demonstrate this focus on contemporary enactments rather than on tracing the evolution of Latina/o citizenship over time. The work of William Flores, Suzanne Oboler, Nicholas De Genova, and others largely focuses on enactments or organizations of modern-day Latina/o communities. Even the work on Latina/o citizenship by communication and media scholars tends to exhibit a presentist bias by focusing on Latina/os' engagements with representations in mass media or popular culture.<sup>57</sup> As Lorrin Thomas notes, "scholars are only beginning to look at the politics of citizenship from the point of view of social history."<sup>58</sup> Tracing the historical evolution of Latina/o citizenship is important for more than just scholarly ends. Those interested in addressing contemporary challenges of Latina/o citizenship, like immigration, must address how tensions of U.S. national belonging have been negotiated successfully or unsuccessfully throughout history. In the section that follows I draw together these theoretical strands to introduce the questions that will drive this project.

### **What Next? Research Questions and Methodology**

To understand the evolving struggles of Latina/os with American citizenship, this project examines three moments in which Latina/o groups negotiated the tensions of inclusion and exclusion and enacted U.S. national belonging through their rhetoric. At some moments in history, Latina/os privileged assimilation into U.S. culture, while at other moments Latina/os challenged U.S. citizenship more directly. Put differently, at some moments in history, Latina/o citizenship focused on gaining access to the contractual dimensions of citizenship, while at other moments Latina/os confronted and remade U.S. citizenship on their own terms.

Specifically this dissertation asks: How have Latina/os dealt with tensions of exclusion and inclusion in U.S. citizenship? In the face of these pressures, have Latina/os created a space for belonging by enacting citizenship? If so, how do Latina/os enact citizenship to fit their political, cultural, and social histories? Have Latina/os used rhetoric to enact U.S. citizenship in its legal, political, social, and symbolic dimensions? How have those strategies changed over time? Is the rhetorical enactment of citizenship a uniquely contemporary strategy undertaken by Latina/os? If so, what did their earlier relationships with U.S. citizenship look like?

To address these questions, I examine three moments of articulation in which Latina/os crafted rhetoric of U.S. national belonging. In Chapter 2, I examine the citizenship discourse of *Californios* (or native Californians inhabiting the territory before U.S. settlement) during the debates of the 1849 California Constitutional Convention. With the signing of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo in 1848 that ended the Mexican-American War, these Mexicans were forced to negotiate their new position in the U.S., including their new status as U.S. citizens. Through the treaty of peace, Mexico transferred both land and inhabitants to U.S. control, resulting in several decades of radical changes in the lives of Californios. In the California Constitutional Convention, Californio delegates had one of their first opportunities to negotiate their newly granted U.S. citizenship in legal, social, and political terms. Through a rhetorical analysis of the proceedings of the 1849 Constitutional Convention, I show how Californios crafted a *compromise citizenship* discourse aimed at marrying their Mexican citizenship traditions to the racialized citizenship traditions of their Yankee counterparts. Chapter 2 elucidates one of the earliest instances of Latina/os enacting U.S. citizenship through public discourse within an institutional context.

Just over one hundred years later, in the late 1950s and 1960s, Latina/o citizens again crafted a unique discourse of citizenship as a means to negotiate their national belonging. In Chapter 3, I examine the citizenship rhetoric of the 1960s radical Chicano group *La Alianza Federal de Mercedes* (Federal Alliance of Land Grants) and its leader Reies López Tijerina. Tijerina's discourse, some argue, was more radical and confrontational than other Chicano leaders like César Chávez. Yet his agenda was also explicitly concerned with demanding the government comply with the rights it had granted to Latina/o (specifically Chicana/o) citizens. Through rhetorical criticism of one of Tijerina's most famous speeches and two of his public letters, I outline the contours of his *border citizenship*. In contrast to the compromise position of Californios in the nineteenth century, Tijerina's border citizenship moved between radical critique and pragmatic negotiation, appropriating some conventional citizenship narratives while challenging others through radical rhetoric. In other words, while the Californios sought compromise, Tijerina's rhetoric and activism exhibited a border quality; much like the physical condition of migration, Tijerina at times enacted inclusion into U.S. citizenship, and at other times constituted a separate ("foreign") and oppositional Latina/o citizenship. Although this was not the only discourse of Latina/o citizenship circulating in the 1960s, this case study provides an important and under-examined corollary to the more well-known Chicana/o movements of the time. Moreover, this second case study, like the first, will help to trace history of Latina/o citizenship rhetoric.

The final case presents a contemporary moment of articulation for Latina/o citizenship. By virtue of their growing demographic and economic presence in society, Latina/os have secured more political rights and cultural recognition than in the past. Nonetheless, Latina/os still face challenges concerning their U.S. citizenship, and the immigration protests of 2006—to

which I have referred throughout this chapter—provide evidence of these struggles. Thus Chapter 4 discusses the largest of these protests, La Gran Marcha of March 25, 2006, held in Los Angeles. By analyzing video documentation of the protest, I argue that Latina/o protestors enacted a mode of citizenship discourse that asserted U.S. national identity but was hybrid in its rhetorical form, content, and purpose. The *hybrid citizenship* of La Gran Marcha negotiated tensions of inclusion and exclusion by fusing multiple cultural traditions and diverse forms of discourse into a mode of citizenship that challenged the “hermeneutic preeminence of nations” “without losing sight of the ‘potent forces’ nations have become.”<sup>59</sup> The discourse of citizenship in La Gran Marcha of March 25, 2006, can contribute to answering questions concerning Latina/o citizenship. In the context of the other case studies, Chapter 4 provides contemporary insights into enduring questions of U.S. citizenship, including the tensions of exclusion and inclusion.

Even though these three case studies differ, they share a conceptual and historical unity. They share a conceptual unity since each represents a moment where Latina/os enacted U.S. citizenship self-consciously through discourse. In other words, the three case studies I analyze in this dissertation show that U.S. citizenship is performed by minority groups in the absence of formal recognition and inclusion. Throughout the nineteenth century, Californios were forced to negotiate the status of their newly granted U.S. citizenship and reconcile it with their traditions. Around 100 years later, throughout the 1950s and 1960s, the perceived failure of the citizenship rights granted to Californios compelled Chicana/o leaders like Reies Tijerina to organize and enact their national belonging. Finally, in contemporary society, after many gains made by these civil rights movements, Latina/os expand their notions of citizenship, connecting with other groups (such as migrants) to perform trans-national citizenship. Therefore despite their

differences, the three case studies each represent a moment during which Latina/o groups negotiated citizenship through discourse in response to dominant traditions.

Second, these three case studies share a historical unity that makes them appropriate for this project. In these three case studies, Latina/o groups struggled to accommodate, adapt, or resist mainstream U.S. citizenship, at least as articulated in U.S. laws, institutions, myths, and traditions. In some instances, Latina/os negotiated terms of legal and political citizenship, while in others they responded to symbolic traditions of the time. The first case study—Californios' efforts to adapt to citizenship in the nineteenth century—presents one of the first Latina/o struggles with U.S. citizenship. The next struggle I analyze from the 1960s came after decades-old policies of assimilation and repression of Latina/os.<sup>60</sup> Latina/o groups in the Southwest, in New York, and in Puerto Rico had faced restrictive government policies for decades—policies that forced the learning of English, often punished Latina/o cultural expressions, contributed to economic oppression, and frequently justified physical segregation of Latina/os.<sup>61</sup> For the most part, racism and xenophobia dominated the landscape until civil rights leaders of the 1950s and 1960s, including Tijerina and the Alianza movement, fueled a larger effort to change repressive policies.<sup>62</sup> The final case study—La Gran Marcha of 2006—demonstrates the evolution of Latina/o struggles for citizenship rights into modern society. As a whole, this project demonstrates that Latina/os have been an integral part of U.S. citizenship at least since the nineteenth century; to understand contemporary Latina/o citizenship we must trace the evolution of these demands over time.

Another important aspect of this study develops from the fact that the case studies differ in the form of rhetoric created by Latina/os. The case studies range from political oratory and deliberation, to social movement rhetoric, and finally to public protest. Thus each chapter

includes discussion of specific critical methods appropriate to the discourse under analysis.

Overall, I rely on the method of rhetorical criticism, which entails situated critical analysis of public, persuasive discourse. Together, the chapters demonstrate the changing rhetorical form of Latina/o discourses of citizenship and elaborate on the models of citizenship these groups presented in the content of their rhetoric. Over the three different historical moments of these case studies, Latina/os enacted their citizenship through different rhetorical strategies, and they enacted different visions of Latina/o citizenship, each with distinct goals. Taken over time, then, these three case studies point to the evolution of Latina/o citizenship throughout U.S. history.

Though these three groups are different in their national origins and ethnic/cultural identity, they each provide a window into different articulations of Latina/o identity. In this project I use the term “Latina/o” to refer to U.S. citizens (or residents) of Latin American or Caribbean descent. The term “Latina/o” (as opposed to terms like “Latin American” or “Hispanic”) is arguably more precise because it encapsulates the human agency of a common ethnic, linguistic, and cultural self-identification that binds United States residents of Latin American/Caribbean descent.<sup>63</sup> In other words, naming these diverse groups (Mexican Californios, Chicanos, and Mexican/Central American immigrants) “Latina/os” highlights their voluntary ethnic/racial identification and their cultural/linguistic heritage. In addition, “Latina/o” encapsulates the common experience of racial oppression and exclusion experienced throughout history by many U.S. citizens of Latin American descent.<sup>64</sup> In each case, despite differences in historical time period, these groups shared the heritage of Latin American origins, the Spanish language, and a common experience as colonized or displaced peoples, all of which form common threads of the Latina/o experience.<sup>65</sup>

Recognizing the commonalities these groups share (commonalities which allow me to talk about changes in Latina/o citizenship), I also acknowledge the differences between them. Juan Poblete summarizes the difficulties this project will encounter in attempting to speak about a unified Latina/o experience.

[The] plurality of identification processes [of Latina/o groups] . . . moves back and forth between the national and the transnational, sometimes privileging panethnic forms such as Hispanics, Latinos/as, or people of color, and at other times emphasizing closer forms of national, regional, or more local identification.<sup>66</sup>

Because of these complexities, in this project I trace both the shifts in articulations of Latina/o citizenship as well as its enduring elements. Rather than compare these case studies or erase their differences, my goal is to *track* or *trace* discourses of Latina/o citizenship across different contexts and periods. Since the case studies herein share a conceptual and historical unity, this study will provide the opportunity to speak, not only to the tensions of U.S. citizenship, but also to the particular problematic of Latina/o citizenship and *latinidad* (or Latina/o identity) more generally.

One final difficulty this project will encounter is with its focus on Latina/o citizenship in the context of race and ethnicity. While the demarcations of U.S. citizenship have been drawn along racial and ethnic lines, sex and gender have also formed axes of inclusion and exclusion in the politics of U.S. citizenship. Likewise, scholars have shown that Latinas, Chicanas, and gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgendered Latina/os face multiple forms of exclusion based on their racial, gender, and sexual identities.<sup>67</sup> This project does not address the unique citizenship struggles of Latinas, Chicanas, and gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgendered Latina/os. Acknowledging this inherent limitation, by focusing on the struggles of Latina/os with the racial

and ethnic tensions underlying U.S. citizenship, this dissertation furthers our understandings of Latina/o citizenship and provides impetus for future scholarship on these questions. To this end, I preview the arguments developed throughout this dissertation in the final section of this chapter.

### **Race, Rhetoric, and Resistance in Latina/o Struggles for U.S. Citizenship**

As this chapter demonstrates, citizenship is a contested term with many conflicting legacies. Yet citizenship is also a central component of contemporary social and political life. The dimensions of citizenship—legal, political, social, and symbolic—are important for both material and cultural reasons. Status as legal citizen can ensure public acknowledgment and protection, while guarantees of political and social citizenship provide both rights and responsibilities for participation in civic and economic life. Finally, when a group has access to symbolic citizenship, they often enjoy cultural recognition. However, underlying all of these dimensions of citizenship is the tension between exclusion and inclusion, or belonging and segregation, which is endemic to United States citizenship.

Though it is not the only boundary around which U.S. citizenship has been demarcated, racial and ethnic identity is a primary marker of the U.S. citizen. Joel Olson, for example, argues that U.S. citizenship has historically been a form of racial privilege which only grants equality to whites.<sup>68</sup> In other words, U.S. citizenship is one of the “racial projects” of the United States. According to Michael Omi and Howard Winant, a “racial project” is a moment of articulation in which discursive categories of racial meaning combine with institutional structures to create a symbolic and material moment of racial formation. In the words of Omi and Winant,

*Racial projects* do the ideological ‘work’ of making these links [between structure and representation]. *A racial project is simultaneously an interpretation, representation, or*



*explanation of racial dynamics, and an effort to reorganize and redistribute resources along particular racial lines [emphasis in original].*<sup>69</sup>

Certainly race and ethnicity are not the only structures of exclusion that define U.S. citizenship. As the work of Susan Zaeske and others has shown, patriarchal notions of U.S. citizenship have excluded the political participation of women as well as racial minorities.<sup>70</sup>

The first argument of this project, though, is that Latina/os too have struggled with this process of racial exclusion underlying U.S. citizenship. This is a point other scholars have advanced. Scholarship on Latina/o rhetoric, for example—which takes shape through a variety of perspectives, including a focus on mass media rhetoric and political rhetoric—helps show how representations of Latina/os in U.S. pop culture and politics advance stereotyped views of Latina/o citizens and immigrants.<sup>71</sup> Latina/os are often portrayed as dangers that demand control or as a vulnerable group that needs to be assimilated. Dominant representations of Latina/os and Latina/o migrants—including discourses of threat, danger, foreignness, or assimilation—continue to influence U.S. society.<sup>72</sup> These discourses contribute to racial formations that influence social attitudes and public policy; Latina/os find it difficult to receive full recognition as citizens when they are viewed as social dangers or outsiders. This project shows how these social attitudes and stereotypes of Latina/os are transformed through traditions and practices of citizenship, into elements of the U.S. racial project.

A second argument I advance is that Latina/os have not been passive victims of these processes of racial formation. I provide a sense of how Latina/os have *resisted* these stereotypes and dominant understandings of U.S. citizenship. Latina/os negotiate and/or defy dominant traditions of U.S. citizenship by enacting their own sense of citizenship. In the absence of formal or symbolic recognition, Latina/os rhetorically enact unique modes of citizenship that assert their

national belonging. Though these discourses of citizenship differ based on the historical time periods and conditions under which they were articulated, Latina/os enact their own agency and constitute themselves as citizens, even in the face of pressures for exclusion. I argue that Latina/os have been active forces shaping the evolution of U.S. citizenship for over one hundred and fifty years. Rather than being a “sleeping giant” only now awakening, Latina/os are intricately connected to U.S. democracy.<sup>73</sup>

Third, this project shows that those interested in addressing contemporary challenges of minority citizenship, like the 2006 Latina/o and immigrant protests, must attend to how those tensions have been negotiated successfully or unsuccessfully throughout history. When surveyed through select moments in history, Latina/os’ rhetoric of citizenship speaks to the challenges that face minority groups struggling to negotiate a place within dominant society. Latina/os first had to be recognized as legal citizens before they could challenge the conventions of American citizenship. Later, they struggled for full political and social inclusion. Finally, in contemporary society Latina/os join forces with documented and undocumented immigrants to expand the bounds of national belonging.

On the one hand, this project develops how Latina/os have won greater access to citizenship, speaking to the flexibility of the U.S. national community even in the face of pressures for exclusion or assimilation. On the other hand, throughout this project I make clear we must temper this optimism. Though the 2006 Latina/o immigrant protests were a nationwide watershed moment in contemporary Latina/o history, the story of Latina/o citizenship continues to develop. When we consider the backlash against analogous demonstrations by Latina/os and immigrants in 2007, in which peaceful protestors were struck with batons and shot with rubber bullets by police dressed in riot gear, the gap between the United States’ citizenship ideals and

practices seems stark.<sup>74</sup> In the face of this brutal and violent backlash against the efforts of Latina/os and immigrants to achieve recognition as full citizens (in legal, political, social, and symbolic terms), to be free to organize and demonstrate, and to secure their own welfare, this project demonstrates how little the basic parameters of American citizenship, and the dynamics of inclusion-exclusion endemic to it, have changed.

In any event, Latina/o struggles with U.S. citizenship have become prominent in contemporary politics, evidenced in a variety of developments from nationwide immigrants' protests to the proliferation of political groups mobilizing for Latina/o rights. And while the term "Latina/o" is a relatively new political development, to understand the contemporary struggles of Latina/os for U.S. citizenship rights we must put them into historical context. In truth, though they may seem like recent phenomena, Latina/o citizenship struggles stem as far back as the relationship between the United States and Latin American people. The next chapter treats one of the earliest moments of Latina/os crafting rhetoric of U.S. citizenship, which took place in the California Constitutional Convention of 1849. The convention—held in Monterey, California—provided a forum for Californios (Mexican citizens native to California) and American settlers to negotiate the terms of a new state government after the end of the Mexican-American War. As one of the first Latin American groups granted U.S. citizenship, the Californios faced unique challenges in navigating their new national identity. As such, the next chapter elaborates on one of the first moments Latina/os struggled to (re)make U.S. citizenship.

### **Notes for Chapter 1**

1. In this project I use the terms "immigrant" and "immigration" despite their arguably ethnocentric connotations, which imply a "teleological" element by presuming migration from another country into the static U.S. nation-state. Nicholas De Genova, *Working the Boundaries: Race, Space, And "Illegality" In Mexican Chicago* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2005), 56-94. These terms

can occlude the more complex nature of transnational migration and entrench the exceptionalism of the U.S. as the supposed immigrant's paradise. Despite these drawbacks, I use the terms "immigrant" and "immigration" for two reasons. First, in the context of specific examples, I discuss Latina/os who have migrated *into* the U.S. Second, since my project revolves around Latina/os living in the U.S. who try to craft visions of U.S. citizenship, "immigrant" may be more specific. In places where I speak of migrants or "migration" more generally, without this teleological presumption, I use those words instead.

2. Teresa Watanabe and Hector Bercerra, "How Djs Put 500,000 Marchers in Motion," *Los Angeles Times*, March 28 2006.

3. House of Representatives Bill 4437—colloquially called the "Sensenbrenner Bill" for its sponsor in the House of Representatives Jim Sensenbrenner (R-WI)—was officially entitled "The Border Protection, Anti-terrorism, and Illegal Immigration Control Act of 2005." After much debate about competing immigration proposals, the House passed HR 4437 on December 16, 2005. In its original form, the Sensenbrenner Bill authorized a number of stricter initiatives to control illegal immigration. Among many changes, it called for the building of over 700 miles of fence along the US-Mexico border, it mandated immediate deportation of undocumented immigrants (by ending the policy of "catch and release"), and it classified both undocumented entry and the aiding of undocumented immigrants as felonies.

4. Richard D. Pineda and Stacey K. Sowards, "Flag Waving as Visual Argument: 2006 Immigration Demonstrations and Cultural Citizenship," *Argumentation & Advocacy* 43 (2007).

5. Quoted in Katharine Mieszkowski, "'We're Here. We're Not Going Anywhere,'" *Salon.com* (2006, April 11).

6. Vanessa B. Beasley, *You, the People: American National Identity in Presidential Rhetoric* (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2004), 5. For a collection of essays concerning the problem of inclusion and exclusion in presidential immigration rhetoric see Vanessa B. Beasley, ed., *Who Belongs in America?: Presidents, Rhetoric, and Immigration* (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2006).

7. Bonnie Honig, *Democracy and the Foreigner* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2001).

8. Erin McNeal Reser, "Unequal Freedom: How Race and Gender Shaped American Citizenship and Labor," *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 9 (2006); David Theo Goldberg, *The Racial State* (Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers, 2002); Rogers M. Smith, *Civic Ideals: Conflicting Visions of Citizenship in U.S. History* (New Haven, CN: Yale University Press, 1997); Mae M. Ngai, *Impossible Subjects: Illegal Aliens and the Making of Modern America* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2004).

9. Ngai, *Impossible Subjects*.

10. Nicholas De Genova, "The Legal Production of Mexican/Migrant 'Illegality,'" in *Latinos and Citizenship: The Dilemma of Belonging*, ed. Suzanne Oboler (New York: Palgrae Macmillan, 2006); Renato Rosaldo, "Cultural Citizenship, Inequality, and Multiculturalism," in *Latino Cultural Citizenship: Claiming Identity, Space, and Rights*, ed. William V. Flores and Rina Benmayor (Boston: Beacon Press, 1997); Hector Amaya, "Latino Immigrants in the American Discourses of Citizenship and Nationalism During the Iraqi War," *Critical Discourse Studies* 4 (2007); Nicholas De Genova and Ana Y. Ramos-Zayas, *Latino Crossings: Mexicans, Puerto Ricans, and the Politics of Race and Citizenship* (New York: Routledge, 2003).

11. Blanca G Silvestrini, "'The World We Enter When Claiming Rights': Latinos and Their Quest for Culture," in *Latino Cultural Citizenship: Claiming Identity, Space, and Rights*, ed. William V. Flores and Rina Benmayor (Boston: Beacon Press, 2006), 48.

12. Douglas B. Klusmeyer, "Introduction," in *Citizenship Today: Global Perspectives and Practices*, ed. T. Alexander Aleinikoff and Douglas B. Klusmeyer (Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 2001); R. Falk, "The Decline of Citizenship in an Era of Globalization," *Citizenship studies* 4 (2000). Beyond its legal or political components, citizenship has

pervaded other elements of U.S. society. It is, as Gershon Shafir notes, “a central axis of Western political philosophy.” Gershon Shafir, “Introduction: The Evolving Tradition of Citizenship,” in *The Citizenship Debates*, ed. Gershon Shafir (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1998), 2. One can find appeals to citizenship in the rhetoric of politicians, political campaigns, or corporations. Anne T. Demo, “The Class Politics of Cultural Pluralism: Presidential Campaigns and the Latino Vote,” in *Who Belongs in America?: Presidents, Rhetoric, and Immigration*, ed. Vanessa B. Beasley (College Station, TX: Texas A&M University Press, 2006). Appeals to citizenship have been identified in war rhetoric, historical social movements, and in corporate and consumer culture. Hector Amaya, “Dying American or the Violence of Citizenship: Latinos in Iraq,” *Latino Studies* 5 (2007); Greg Dickinson, “Selling Democracy: Consumer Culture and Citizenship in the Wake of September 11,” *Southern Communication Journal* 70 (2005); Angela G. Ray, “The Rhetorical Ritual of Citizenship: Women’s Voting as Public Performance, 1868-1875,” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 93 (2007); Reser, “Unequal Freedom: How Race and Gender Shaped American Citizenship and Labor.”

13. William V. Flores, “New Citizens, New Rights: Undocumented Immigrants and Latino Cultural Citizenship” *Latin American Perspectives* 30 (2003), 88.

14. Shafir, “Introduction: The Evolving Tradition of Citizenship,” 2-3.

15. Angela G. Ray and Cindy Koenig Richards, “Inventing Citizens, Imagining Gender Justice: The Suffrage Rhetoric of Virginia and Francis Minor,” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 93 (2007); Danielle S. Allen, *Talking to Strangers: Anxieties of Citizenship after Brown v. Board of Education* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004); Celeste Michelle Condit and John Louis Lucaites, *Crafting Equality: America’s Anglo-African Word* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993); Ray, “The Rhetorical Ritual of Citizenship.”

16. I use the term “Latina/o” to mean U.S. citizens or residents of Latin American or Caribbean descent. This is certainly a contested term, and I do not wish to authorize one term or definition over another (e.g., “Hispano,” “Latin American,” and so on). I will return to the question of what I mean by Latina/o later in this chapter. But generally, Latina/o is a more accepted term because it connotes cultural, historical, racial/ethnic, and linguistic similarity without essentializing the diversity of the community of U.S. citizens and residents of Latin American and Caribbean descent. See Suzanne Oboler, *Ethnic Labels, Latino Lives: Identity and the Politics of (Re) Presentation in the United States* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1995).

17. U.S. Department of Homeland Security, “Yearbook of Immigration Statistics: 2004,” ed. Office of Immigration Statistics (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Homeland Security, 2006).

18. Richard Fry, *Latino Settlement in the New Century* (Washington, D.C.: Pew Hispanic Center, October 2008).

19. Raymond Rocco, “Transforming Citizenship: Membership, Strategies of Containment, and the Public Sphere in Latino Communities,” in *Latinos and Citizenship: The Dilemma of Belonging*, ed. Suzanne Oboler (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006), 303.

20. Amaya, “Dying American,” 12.

21. Greta A. Gilbertson, “Regulating Transnational Citizens in the Post-1996 Welfare Reform Era: Dominican Immigrants in New York City,” in *Latinos and Citizenship: The Dilemma of Belonging*, ed. Suzanne Oboler (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006); Susana B. Coutin, *Nations of Emigrants: Shifting Boundaries of Citizenship in El Salvador and the United States* (Cornell: Cornell University Press, 2007); Nicholas De Genova, *Racial Transformations: Latinos and Asians Remaking the United States* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2006).

22. Howard J. Wiarda, *The Soul of Latin America: The Cultural and Political Tradition* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2001).

23. Bernadette Marie Calafell, *Latina/O Communication Studies: Theorizing Performance* (New York: Peter Lang, 2007), 137.

24. Suzanne Oboler, "Redefining Citizenship as a Lived Experience," in *Latinos and Citizenship: The Dilemma of Belonging*, ed. Suzanne Oboler (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006), 22.

25. William V. Flores and Rina Benmayor, eds., *Latino Cultural Citizenship: Claiming Identity, Space, and Rights* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1997).

26. Flores, "New Citizens, New Rights."

27. Suzanne Oboler, ed., *Latinos and Citizenship: The Dilemma of Belonging* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006).

28. William V. Flores and Rina Benmayor, "Constructing Cultural Citizenship," in *Latino Cultural Citizenship: Claiming Identity, Space, and Rights*, ed. William V. Flores and Rina Benmayor (Boston: Beacon Press, 1997), 6.

29. While scholars from fields such as political theory, international relations, sociology, and anthropology have developed dozens of taxonomic explanations of citizenship, I focus on these four dimensions as overarching themes of citizenship. I have drawn these themes from the literature on citizenship, but I do not intend to provide them as a prescriptive or ascriptive taxonomy. I do not aim to authoritatively review or represent scholarship on citizenship studies. My goal here is to trace several functions or dimensions of citizenship in political theory and practice and to explain what a rhetorical perspective on citizenship can bring to this debate.

30. Smith, *Civic Ideals*; Thomas Alexander Aleinikoff and Douglas B. Klusmeyer, *Citizenship Policies for an Age of Migration* (Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 2002); Ngai, *Impossible Subjects*; Peter H. Schuck, *Citizens, Strangers, and in-Betweens: Essays on Immigration and Citizenship* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1998).

31. Andrew Dobson, *Citizenship and the Environment* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003). Dobson thoroughly reviews literature on citizenship studies (more than I could do so in this limited space). He also provides a more overarching taxonomy of citizenship types than I do. Dobson contends that one could talk about citizenship in line with certain overarching political traditions, such as liberal citizenship and civic republican citizens. Civic republican citizenship stems from the Roman tradition and sees citizenship as obligation or allegiance to the state, while the liberal tradition conceives of citizenship as a system of rights and protections granted by the state. As Dobson notes, despite the differences between these two traditions, they are united by a *contractual* (social exchange) framework. Dobson's critique of these traditions takes shape in his post-cosmopolitan view of citizenship, to which I will return in chapter 4. While Dobson astutely summarizes some of the contractual elements of citizenship in the literature, he does not take into account the rhetorical or symbolic dimensions of national belonging.

32. Flores and Benmayor, eds., *Latino Cultural Citizenship*.

33. Falk, "The Decline of Citizenship in an Era of Globalization," 5.

34. Paul Johnston, "The Emergence of Transnational Citizenship among Mexican Immigrants in California," in *Citizenship Today: Global Perspectives and Practices*, ed. T. Alexander Aleinikoff and Douglas B. Klusmeyer (Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 2001), 255-6.

35. T. H. Marshall, *Citizenship and Social Class, and Other Essays* (Cambridge: University Press, 1950).

36. De Genova and Ramos-Zayas, *Latino Crossings*.

37. Schuck, *Citizens, Strangers, and in-Betweens*; Noah M. Pickus, *Immigration and Citizenship in the Twenty-First Century* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 1998).

38. Charles Taylor, *Modern Social Imaginaries* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2004).

39. Will Kymlicka, "Multicultural Citizenship," in *The Citizenship Debates*, ed. Gershon Shafir (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1998), 184.

40. This symbolic dimension of citizenship is something that scholars of nationalism have long recognized. National identity is fundamentally constructed through shared symbols, myths, and narratives, such that, creating an "imagined community" can solidify the notion of citizen. Benedict R.

Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, rev. ed. (London: Verso, 2006). In other words, history demonstrates that it is often only after these symbolic elements of citizenship are developed that communities can construct the legal, social, and political dimensions of citizenship. E. J. Hobsbawm and T. O. Ranger, *The Invention of Tradition* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992).

41. This lack of recognition is expressed most fiercely in the legacy of societal racism that Latina/o and other naturalized immigrants often face. Rudolf De Cillia, Martin Reisigl and Ruth Wodak, "The Discursive Construction of National Identities," *Discourse & Society* 10 (1999).

42. A discursive view of citizenship would enable us to study, not only how the "people" are constructed by dominant institutions, but also how the people can constitute themselves as such as an alternative to (or in opposition to) symbolic recognition by the nation state. As Michael McGee argues, who counts as the American "people" in the United States is rearticulated and reiterated using collective histories and foundational texts of the nation. The notion of "Americans" is not only constituted by those who control these national symbols, but individuals can also appropriate and challenge dominant constructions of the American people through discourse. Michael C. McGee, "In Search of 'the People': A Rhetorical Alternative," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 61 (1975). See also Maurice Charland, "Constitutive Rhetoric: The Case of the Peuple Québécois," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 73 (1987).

43. Robert Asen, "A Discourse Theory of Citizenship," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 90 (2004), 204.

44. G. Thomas Goodnight, "The Personal, Technical, and Public Spheres of Argument: A Speculative Inquiry into the Art of Public Deliberation," *Journal of the American Forensic Association* 18 (1982), 214.

45. Michael Warner, *Publics and Counterpublics* (New York: Zone Books, 2002), 68.

46. Asen, "A Discourse Theory of Citizenship," 197.

47. John Dewey, *The Public & Its Problems* (Athens, OH: Swallow Press, 1927/1954), 208.

48. Viewing citizenship as discursive enactment means also that national belonging could be performed through more than just conventional, public, political acts (e.g. voting, engaging in deliberation, giving speeches, and so forth). For example, one could purchase U.S.-made products as an enactment of citizenship. Dickinson, "Selling Democracy: Consumer Culture and Citizenship in the Wake of September 11." One could organize a community voting drive to secure others' citizenship rights and to perform political citizenship. Monica W. Varsanyi, "'Getting out the Vote' in Los Angeles: The Mobilization of Undocumented Migrants in Electoral Politics," in *Latinos and Citizenship: The Dilemma of Belonging*, ed. Suzanne Oboler (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006). One could even use photography, murals, or some other form of artistic expression to challenge and redefine symbolic elements of citizenship such as national symbols or myths. Bernadette Marie Calafell and Fernando Delgado, "Reading Latina/o Images: Interrogating Americanos," *Critical Studies in Media Communication* 21 (2004). Though these activities are very different, they are all discursive attempts to perform U.S. national belonging. In this project I focus on rhetorical forms of discourse, but the diversity of these approaches attests to the utility in conceptualizing U.S. citizenship as a discursive construct.

49. Flores and Benmayor, "Constructing Cultural Citizenship," 6, 15. Though William V. Flores and Rina Benmayor give this dimension of citizenship the name "cultural citizenship," they, like many communication scholars, speak of "a range of social practices which, taken together, claim and establish a distinct social space." Flores and Benmayor, "Constructing Cultural Citizenship," 1. I group both the "discursive" and "cultural" notions of citizenship together because they both speak to the way citizenship is constructed, articulated, and enacted in discursive practices. Scholars of cultural citizenship often study citizenship in public forms of rhetoric, such as protests or demonstrations, without using the vocabulary of rhetorical studies. On the other hand, Asen recognizes that "discourse may entail talk, but it also involved other modes of symbolic expression," though they may not be explicitly rhetorical. Asen, "A

Discourse Theory of Citizenship,” 207. Therefore I group both discursive and cultural approaches, in spite of a different vocabulary, since they share a common view of citizenship.

50. Asen, “A Discourse Theory of Citizenship,” 196.

51. J. David Cisneros, “Contaminated Communities: The Metaphor of ‘Immigrant as Pollutant’ in Media Representations of Immigration,” *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 11 (2008). I draw this notion of “dominant” logics from the work of John Sloop and Kent Ono. Kent A. Ono and John M. Sloop, *Shifting Borders: Rhetoric, Immigration, and California’s Proposition 187* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2002). Logics are public modes of thinking or frameworks of judgment that are shaped through discourse. Dominant logics are the logics of mainstream society, of the public sphere, of government, and of those in power, while vernacular logics are contextual and belong to particular minority groups or counter-publics. I use this vocabulary because it links dominant modes of thinking (about citizenship) with power and discourse.

52. Flores and Benmayor, “Constructing Cultural Citizenship,” 15.

53. Flores, “New Citizens, New Rights: Undocumented Immigrants and Latino Cultural Citizenship “.

54. Rosaldo, “Cultural Citizenship, Inequality, and Multiculturalism.”; Rocco, “Transforming Citizenship.”

55. Warner, *Publics and Counterpublics*, 77.

56. David Zarefsky, “Four Senses of Rhetorical History,” in *Doing Rhetorical History: Concepts and Cases*, ed. Kathleen J. Turner (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1998), 29.

57. I will review the scholarship from the fields of communication and media studies later in this chapter. However, there is a growing body of work on Latina/o citizenship from this perspective. Jillian M. Báez, “Towards a Latinidad Feminista: The Multiplicities of Latinidad and Feminism in Contemporary Cinema,” *Popular Communication* 5 (2007); Amaya, “Dying American.”; Isabel Molina Guzmán and Angharad Valdivia, “Brain, Brow, and Booty: Latina Iconicity in U.S. Popular Culture,” *Communication Review* 7 (2004). Overall, this work focuses on 1) the media representations of Latina/os that structure Latina/o citizenship and 2) Latina/o media that provide more diverse representations of Latina/os’ roles in U.S. society. This work can be supplemented by my analysis, which focuses on how Latina/o groups through history use rhetoric to constitute themselves as citizens.

58. Lorrin Thomas, “‘How They Ignore Our Rights as American Citizens’: Puerto Rican Migrants and the Politics of Citizenship in the New Deal Era,” in *Latinos and Citizenship: The Dilemma of Belonging*, ed. Suzanne Oboler (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006), 35.

59. Micol Seigel, “Beyond Compare: Comparative Method after the Transnational Turn,” *Radical History Review* 91 (2005), 63.

60. J Molesky, “Understanding the American Linguistic Mosaic: A Historical Overview of Language Maintenance and Language Shift,” in *Language Diversity, Problem or Resource?: A Social and Educational Perspective on Language Minorities in the United States*, ed. Sandra McKay and Sau-Ling Cynthia Wong (Cambridge: Newbury House, 1988).

61. Lisa A. Flores, “Constructing Rhetorical Borders: Peons, Illegal Aliens, and Competing Narratives of Immigration,” *Critical Studies in Media Communication* 20 (2003).

62. James Crawford, *At War with Diversity: US Language Policy in an Age of Anxiety*, Bilingual Education and Bilingualism ; 25 (Buffalo, NY: Multilingual Matters, 2000).

63. Juan Poblete, “Introduction,” in *Critical Latin American and Latino Studies* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2003).

64. Benigno E. Aguirre and Rogelio Saenz, “A Future Assessment of Latinismo,” *Latino Studies Journal* 2 (1991).

65. To be sure, the term “Latina/o” can be rife with inaccuracies and fraught with dangers when we use it to refer monolithically to people of Latin American descent. For example, the term “Latina/o” is a modern development; *Californios* certainly did not recognize it as a form of ethnic or cultural



identification. Nevertheless, as much as the three case studies (and the groups they represent) differ, they speak to some of the common experiences that characterize Latina/o identity in the United States. The groups I analyze here share common ethnic, historical, and linguistic characteristics that tie their struggles together. Suzanne Oboler, explains some of these elements of the Latina/o condition that have tied U.S. citizens of Latin American descent together over time: “A key component of the specificity of the populations identified as Latina/os in the United States is the fact that they have always been and continue to be constructed by themselves and others in the context of both international and U.S. historical referents. . . . What has changed . . . is not Latina/os’ sense of ourselves as communities bound by language, by cultural heritage, by an acknowledgement of our Latin American heritage, by the common goal of expanding and protecting Latina/os’ rights, by the aim of improving our lives and the communities’ standards of living. Rather what is at issue is the different emphasis in U.S. politics on ethnic categories and their changing attributions and the state’s distribution and withdrawal of resources on the basis of those terms since the 1960s.” Though Oboler writes in the context of shifting labels of identification (Hispanic, Spanish American, Latina/o) in the twentieth century, her analysis explains the fundamental conceptual factors that unify the groups I analyzed here. Though they differ in their terms of self-identification, the three Latina/o groups in this dissertation—Californios, Mexican Americans, and modern-day Latina/os—are not only constructed now as “Latina/os” by dominant U.S. society, but they were constructed, in a similar sense, at that time as subjects in relation to “international and U.S. historical referents.” In other words, beyond the common elements of language and cultural heritage (e.g., ties to Spain and Native American groups), these groups were defined in opposition to the colonial and racial elements of U.S. national identity. This unifies their struggles for citizenship under similar themes of race, nation, and colonialism that justify drawing them together in this project. Oboler, *Ethnic Labels, Latino Lives*, xiv-xv. In this sense, I believe referencing these diverse groups as Latina/os is justified, all the while recognizing that, in some ways, this is an act of interpretation on my part. Yet since the groups I analyze share some common cultural and historical similarities, and since the idea of panethnic identity or Latina/o identity has circulated for some time, I term the phenomenon at the heart of this project “Latina/o citizenship.” See Edna Acosta-Belén and Carlos E. Santiago, “Merging Borders: The Remapping of America,” in *The Latino Studies Reader: Culture, Economy, and Society*, ed. Antonia Darder and Rodolfo D. Torres (Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers, 1998), 32.

66. Poblete, “Introduction,” xx-xxi

67. Lisa A. Flores, “Creating Discursive Space through a Rhetoric of Difference,” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 82 (1996); Molina Guzmán and Valdivia, “Brain, Brow, and Booty.”; Isabel Molina Guzmán, “Mediating Frida: Negotiating Discourses of Latina/O Authenticity in Global Media Representations of Ethnic Identity,” *Critical Studies in Media Communication* 23 (2006); Angharad Valdivia, “Latinas as Radical Hybrid: ‘Transnationally Gendered Traces in Mainstream Media,’” *Global Media Journal* 3 (2004).

68. Joel Olson, *The Abolition of White Democracy* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2004). See also Michael Omi and Howard Winant, *Racial Formation in the United States: From the 1960s to the 1990s* (New York: Routledge, 1994).

69. Omi and Winant, *Racial Formation in the United States*, 56.

70. Susan Zaeske, *Signatures of Citizenship: Petitioning, Antislavery, & Women’s Political Identity* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2003). See also Amy S. Greenberg, *Manifest Manhood and the Antebellum American Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005); and Smith, *Civic Ideals*.

71. Mass media rhetoric, whether in the form of news, television, movies, or magazines, creates recurring representations of Latina/os. Being part of the dominant and often implicitly racialized logics of U.S. society, these representations frequently contribute to public fears and stereotypes. Leo Chavez and Bernadette Calafell, for example, both analyzed popular magazines to show the images of Latina/os circulated by this form of print mass media. Chavez concluded that magazines visually frame Latina/o

immigrants through certain metaphors of invasion, danger, and destruction. Leo R. Chavez, *Covering Immigration: Popular Images and the Politics of the Nation* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001). Calafell analyzed *Latina* magazine to show how the racialized archetype of the Latina virgin/whore is deployed. Bernadette Marie Calafell, "In Our Own Image? A Rhetorical Criticism of *Latina* Magazine," *Voces: A Journal of Chicana and Latina Studies* 3 (2001). Hector Amaya studied President Bush's 2003 granting of posthumous citizenship to two Latina/o soldiers killed in the Iraq war. Amaya, "Dying American." See also Amaya, "Latino Immigrants in the American Discourses of Citizenship and Nationalism During the Iraqi War." Amaya examined media reports and interviews of military officers; he argued that the granting of posthumous citizenship was an undemocratic action since it *forced* citizenship on the deceased Latina/os and obscured undemocratic elements of the armed forces—elements that contribute to the overrepresentation of poor minorities in the military. Angharad Valdivia expanded this mass media perspective to popular film and television, showing how race and gender stereotypes influence representations of Latinas. Angharad Valdivia, *A Latina in the Land of Hollywood and Other Essays on Media Culture* (Tucson, AZ: U of Arizona Press, 2000). Further studies of mass media rhetoric explore similar themes. Otto Santa Ana, *Brown Tide Rising: Metaphors of Latinos in Contemporary American Public Discourse* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2002); Fernando P. Delgado, "Coloring the Screen Bronze," *Text & Performance Quarterly* 15 (1995); Hugh Mehan, "The Discourse of the Illegal Immigration Debate: A Case Study in the Politics of Representation," *Discourse & Society* 8 (1997). These same dangerous and destructive stereotypes often work in mainstream political rhetoric—from campaigns to speeches—resulting in immigration, education, or welfare policies that hurt Latina/os. Kent Ono and John Sloop's study of California ballot initiatives to ban social services for immigrants demonstrated that similar metaphors of danger, pollution, and destruction are used by politicians and political campaigns to produce fear and to drum up support for anti-immigrant measures. Ono and Sloop, *Shifting Borders*. Lisa Flores showed that these framings of Latina/os and of immigrants are nothing new but stem at least as far back as the early 20<sup>th</sup> century. Flores, "Constructing Rhetorical Borders."

72. Fernando P. Delgado, "When the Silenced Speak: The Textualization and Complications of Latina/O Identity," *Western Journal of Communication* 62 (1998); Anne T. Demo, "Sovereignty Discourse and Contemporary Immigration Politics," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 91 (2005); Demo, "The Class Politics of Cultural Pluralism."

73. The metaphor of the "sleeping giant" is a common one used to reference the political "awakening" of the Latina/o population in the twenty-first century. See, for example, M. Ball, "2008 election: Historic Hispanic vote seen," July 10, 2008, *Las Vegas Review-Journal*, available at <http://www.lvrj.com/news/24307374.html>, accessed August 20, 2008. This is an understanding of Latina/o political mobilization I hope to problematize in this project by showing how Latina/os have been struggling with national belonging as long as they have been members of the U.S. national community. Latina/os have, in fact, never been "asleep" to the politics of U.S. citizenship.

74. Associated Press, "Cop Tactics at Immigration Rally Draw Ire," May 2, 2007, *CBS News*, available at <http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2007/05/02/national/main2751936.shtml>, accessed February 19, 2009. Police in cities across the United States responded with excessive force to efforts to duplicate the demonstrations of 2006. In Los Angeles, The May Day mêlée, as it was dubbed by news media, saw police officers strike protestors and members of the news media with batons indiscriminately in an attempt to disperse the crowd. The resulting controversy over the police's response led to an LAPD investigation and the resignation or reassignment of several police officers and administrators. Duke Helf and Richard Winton, "LAPD Takes Blame for Park Melee," *Los Angeles Times*, October 10 2007.

**CHAPTER 2**  
**COMPROMISE CITIZENSHIP: RHETORIC, RACE, AND NATION IN NINETEENTH**  
**CENTURY CALIFORNIA**

In the California Constitutional Convention of 1849, Californio and Anglo delegates representing their respective districts discussed the creation of a new state government. Over the course of these two months of deliberation, Californio delegates found many opportunities to shape their newly granted status as U.S. citizens. One of the first moments in which Californios had occasion to negotiate their new U.S. national belonging came on Wednesday, September 5, 1849, just two days into the deliberations of the Convention. On this crisp, clear afternoon, Jose A. Carrillo, a Californio delegate from Los Angeles, addressed his colleagues, and one can imagine the precarious position in which Carrillo placed himself as he rose to speak. Three years earlier, in 1846, Carrillo had been fighting the Yankee interlopers on his native soil in defense of Mexican sovereignty. Two years later, in 1848, he watched as a defeated Mexico ceded California to the United States in a treaty of peace. Now in 1849 Carrillo stood before the same Americans he had once fought against, this time as a fellow citizen of the United States.<sup>1</sup> Though U.S. citizenship was legally guaranteed to Californios by the treaty of peace between the U.S. and Mexico, Carrillo still clamored for recognition by his fellow American delegates. “Although a gentleman belonging to this body had stated,” Carrillo affirmed forcefully that “it was not the object of the Convention to form a Constitution for the [Mexican] Californians, he

begged leave to say, that he considered himself *as much an American citizen as the gentleman who made the assertion* [my emphasis].”<sup>2</sup>

These brief comments from the opening days of the California Constitutional Convention of 1849 belie the popular belief that Latina/os are only now struggling to define themselves as U.S. citizens. Instead, Carrillo’s quotation illustrates that a unique discourse of Latino citizenship took shape in the mid-nineteenth century United States. During the California Constitutional Convention of 1849, Californios faced critical questions concerning the terms of their newly granted U.S. citizenship. Would they be accepted as full members of the American political and cultural community? Or would they be excluded from or forced to assimilate into traditions of American citizenship? How far would their newly granted citizenship extend? Though time spent living side by side in California had smoothed over some of the friction between each group’s political culture, differences remained. Distinct Mexican and American traditions of citizenship made some of the debates at the Convention difficult to resolve. Yet the Californios used the opportunity to craft a negotiated version of American citizenship, one that integrated some of their traditions into the citizenship traditions introduced by their Yankee counterparts. In this chapter, I explore the Californios’ rhetoric of *compromise citizenship*. By investigating the citizenship discourse of some of the earliest Latinos, my aim is to contribute to the knowledge about the legacy of Latina/o citizenship struggles and how they inform present conditions.

I call the model of U.S. citizenship evident in Californios’ discourse “compromise” citizenship because it was characterized by negotiation by each of the parties (Americans and Californios) over the terms of legal citizenship.<sup>3</sup> Californios’ discourse exhibited a compromise rhetorical form that privileged negotiation over confrontation or resistance. Moreover,

Californios made a series of concessions to Americans on the terms of their legal citizenship, and in return they sought accommodation of their Mexican and Californian traditions. The resulting Constitution exhibited dominant American traditions of citizenship but was sprinkled with explicit concessions to Californios in several areas.<sup>4</sup> Rather than hold on to their Mexican traditions or assimilate wholeheartedly into American citizenship, the Californios sought to compromise over the terms of their new contract of national belonging.

To expound on this model of discursive citizenship evidenced in the California Constitutional Convention of 1849, I take a rhetorical history approach to the convention proceedings, which entails situating the delegates' discourse within its intellectual and material contexts. If one is to understand how negotiation and compromise over citizenship took place in Monterey, California over those two months of deliberation, understanding the citizenship traditions of the delegates and the historical context of the Constitutional Convention is crucial. In what follows I consider the Californios' discourse of citizenship surrounding two key issues, suffrage and language rights, describing the ways they struck a compromise citizenship in their rhetorical form and content. I conclude by considering what this compromise citizenship discourse teaches about contemporary Latina/o struggles with U.S. citizenship. First, I briefly describing the project of rhetorical history I will undertake, outlining its parameters and explaining what it can bring to the study of Latina/o citizenship in the California Constitutional Convention of 1849. While historical scholarship has sketched the contexts and contours of California's first constitutional convention, I hope to add to this work with careful consideration of how Californios used rhetoric to negotiate the terms of their newly granted American citizenship.<sup>5</sup>

## Foundations of Rhetorical History

My analysis in this chapter builds on historical study of the California Constitutional Convention of 1849 by employing the methodological perspective of rhetorical history. Certainly, considering the context of the convention is important, as previous work by historians demonstrates. But, as I described in the previous chapter, a rhetorical perspective is necessary because ultimately the delegates used rhetoric to negotiate the parameters of citizenship. By focusing on the intersections of rhetorical theory/criticism and the historical study of public address, a rhetorical perspective, as David Zarefsky stated, “enable[s] us to understand historical events differently.”<sup>6</sup> The goal of this rhetorical history approach is to fuse historical study with rhetorical scholarship to construct a collective memory of important public address.

Rhetorical history entails two strands of analysis: an instrumental strand, which speaks about the events to which rhetoric responded, and a constitutive strand, which investigates the ideals and traditions upon which significant public address drew. The instrumental stream of the rhetorical history project calls for the study of rhetoric as, in Zarefsky’s terms, a “force in history.”<sup>7</sup> Yet rhetorical history does more than ask what public address did in its historical context; it also entails the study of rhetoric in and through the intellectual traditions that public address molds and shapes.<sup>8</sup> James Jasinski explains that this “constitutive” stream of rhetorical history does “not abandon the instrumental perspective” but expands the focus of rhetorical scholarship to include “the question of what happens *to* ideas *in* practice.”<sup>9</sup> One example of this project of rhetorical history is John Murphy’s essay “The Language of the Liberal Consensus,” which shows how the pervasive language of liberalism prevalent in post-WWII society proved both a rhetorical exigence and resource upon which Jack Kennedy built his economic speech at Yale University.<sup>10</sup> Another important essay in this project of rhetorical history is Jasinski’s

work on Henry Clay's defense of 1850 slavery compromise measures; Jasinski shows how Clay drew on the American legacy of prudence to craft a rhetoric of compromise intended to stave off civil war.<sup>11</sup>

On the one hand, rhetorical criticism will be central to my analysis, for rhetorical history can "deepen" our knowledge of traditions of citizenship only when we put those traditions into a "field of discursive action."<sup>12</sup> On the other hand, attending to the historical, intellectual, and political contexts of the Convention is central to understanding how these "ideologies" of citizenship circulating in the "rhetorical milieu" of the Convention were converted "in light of common experience" into new strands of citizenship.<sup>13</sup> In what follows, I will outline the intellectual and often performative traditions of citizenship in Mexico and the United States in the mid-nineteenth century, and I show how these traditions were translated into the Convention debates concerning U.S. citizenship.<sup>14</sup> Without understanding how Californios and Americans thought about and practiced citizenship (both similarly and differently) during the nineteenth century, it is impossible to understand their citizenship rhetoric.

In the previous chapter, I discussed how the evolution of American citizenship has taken shape through tensions of inclusion and exclusion.<sup>15</sup> Race and ethnic identity have been primary components along which U.S. citizenship is drawn, and racial formation has been a central element of American political and social evolution.<sup>16</sup> In other words, to be a citizen there must be a non-citizen, which in the United States has often been defined as a non-white "other."<sup>17</sup> In the nineteenth century, citizenship was a part of this racial project that subjugated nonwhite, non-Anglo, and non-European peoples.<sup>18</sup> American citizenship was part of a larger racial project that defined American identity in racialized terms, entrenched it in a system of racial categorization, and codified it in institutions of social and political exclusion. In fact, Omi and Winant call

nineteenth century America a “racial dictatorship.”<sup>19</sup> In sum, American citizenship during the mid-nineteenth century was conceived primarily as white, male, Christian, and of (northern) European descent. This legacy of citizenship formed part of a racial project to which Californios had to adapt their own contingent and localized traditions of citizenship. The resultant discourse in the Constitutional Convention of 1849 was a compromise citizenship in both rhetorical form and content.

To begin I will discuss the historical and material context of California in the 1840s that led to the calling of a Constitutional Convention in 1849. Then my rhetorical analysis of the convention proceedings will show how traditions of citizenship at the time presented both rhetorical exigence and rhetorical resource to Californios attempting to craft their places as U.S. citizens. These two traditions of citizenship—the American and the Mexican—were neither wholly distinct nor monolithic, yet they did form popular understandings of citizenship at the time. Differences in logics of citizenship were bound to clash on the Western frontier during the Constitutional Convention of 1849. Californios, in turn, used rhetoric as a form of “symbolic action” to craft a contractual, negotiated, and compromise enactment of citizenship between these competing traditions.<sup>20</sup>

### **California Clashes: Citizenship, Californios, and Constitutions**

The calling of a California constitutional convention in 1849 was but one significant moment in decades of radical change on the Western frontier. In only three years (from 1846-1849), California had gone from a semi-autonomous Mexican province to an American military territory. In September of 1849, the forty-eight elected convention representatives convened in Colton Hall in Monterey, California, many with the hope that a state constitution quickly ratified by the population would speed California’s entry into the Union. Delegates to the California



Constitutional Convention were diverse, including American northerners and southerners, Californios, and European settlers; they had sundry occupations, such as lawyer, merchant, and farmer.<sup>21</sup> This variety “proved a safeguard and a moderating influence,” in the words of one historian, since “all [delegates] were compelled to compromise at different times.”<sup>22</sup> Over the course of two months, the eight Californio delegates and forty American delegates to the Constitutional Convention debated and discussed the parameters of a new state government.<sup>23</sup>

Perhaps the Californio delegates (all from Southern California) were fearful that, because of language barriers and a numerical disadvantage, they would quickly be marginalized in the convention, for, despite representing different districts, when the Convention convened, the Californios “entered Colton Hall proudly decked out in traditional garb and sat at one table.” According to historian Leonard Pitt, this demonstration of unity was effective since it showed the “Yankees” that if they “hurled insults or grew surly, the Californios could threaten to bolt the chamber and give the convention a black eye in the federal Congress.”<sup>24</sup> Considering how, in less than ten years, Californios had lost their land and government to the Americans, perhaps their symbolic defiance was understandable.

Even before America’s conquest of California, relations between Californios and American settlers were complex, with a number of stereotypes creating regular culture clashes.<sup>25</sup> Throughout the early nineteenth century, Americans had trickled into Mexican California where many were admitted into Mexican citizenship once they became settled, acquired land, and assimilated into society. Some Americans even served political office in the Mexican *ayuntamientos* (provincial governments) or as *alcaldes* (local governors).<sup>26</sup> Generally speaking, however, American settlers’ disdain for Californios and California society grew as they increased in numbers, confirming their popular feelings of Manifest Destiny.<sup>27</sup> The Americans’

presumption of cultural superiority was never more evident than in revolts by a group of American “filibusters” in 1846 to wrestle California from Mexican control.<sup>28</sup> These Bear Flaggers captured Californio government officials and took control of pueblos until the escalating conflict expanded the Mexican-American War into California. When the war ended on February 2, 1848, with the signing of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, California underwent even more drastic changes.

Legally, the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo both transferred the land of California to the control of the United States and defined California’s inhabitants as subjects, whether citizens or residents, of the American government.<sup>29</sup> “The Constitution of the United States, the safeguard of all our civil rights,” wrote Secretary of State James Buchanan, “was extended over California” with the signing of the treaty.<sup>30</sup> These rights and safeguards quickly came under attack with the discovery of gold in California in 1848. The Gold Rush, with its unexpected influx of Anglo settlers and its resultant rise in lawlessness, displaced Californios from their land and their political power, straining already tense relations between natives and conquerors.<sup>31</sup>

In truth, the California Constitutional Convention of 1849 would signal one of the first opportunities for Californios to enact their newly granted American citizenship in the face of these monumental changes. Considering their recent conquest, forcible assimilation, and political and economic usurpation, the Californios’ act of solidarity at the start of the Convention could be viewed as purposefully symbolic. In part, though, the Californios may have entered Colton Hall in unison also out of expediency, since many of the delegates spoke little or no English and would need translation from the Convention’s interpreter. Nonetheless, it is significant that the eight Californio delegates showed this solidarity so early, overlooking the obvious differences between them.<sup>32</sup>

Throughout the California Constitutional Convention of 1849, Californios had to negotiate between Mexican citizenship traditions (*vecindad*) and the American tradition of white, male citizenship. As a result, Californios used rhetoric to marry these diverse conventions of citizenship. Californios struck some legal compromises with the Anglo delegates, but often they failed to achieve accommodation. And while some concessions did not benefit Californios, the model of compromise citizenship they crafted in the form and content of their rhetoric is significant. Furthermore, by seeking legal compromise over the terms of national belonging, the Californios were able to claim a degree of social space, rights, and recognition in dominant American society.

As I alluded to previously, one of the first moments Californios made their voices heard in these debates was when, just two days into the convention on September 5, 1849, Jose A. Carrillo rose to speak about his newly granted U.S. citizenship. At first look, Carrillo's insistence that he was "as much an American citizen" as the Anglo delegates may seem a fairly simple appeal for assimilation. But, considering the different intellectual and material traditions of citizenship Californios and Americans brought to the negotiating table, this statement more precisely demonstrates the Californios' enactment of a compromise citizenship.

Though only 33 out of 40 American delegates and four out of eight Californio delegates had arrived in Colton Hall by September 5, the convention considered an important matter that day: whether to craft a constitution for a state government or a federal territory. What degree of independence in relation to the U.S. government would California have? Were Californians ready to be Americans? Initial debate on the question took place between William M. Gwin—a farmer from Tennessee representing San Francisco—and Stephen Foster—a native Missourian farmer from Los Angeles. These two delegates discussed whether to put the question of

statehood to a vote. Gwin “did not think there was a member on this floor in favor of a Territorial Government”; on the contrary, Foster “was opposed at present to entering into a State Government. He desired, and so did others, to have the vote separate and distinct.”<sup>33</sup>

Jose Carrillo entered this discussion with a plea to consider the desires of Californio citizens. Carrillo was the oldest member of the convention at 53 years old. He was also the most respected and experienced of the Californio delegates, having “been in the thick of things for three decades, first as a plotter of rebellions, then as a soldier, and finally as a signatory to the treaty of Cahuenga” that ended the Mexican-American War in California.<sup>34</sup> According to the proceedings of the Convention, Carrillo stated that

he represented one of the most respectable communities in California, and he did not believe it to be to the interest of his constituents that a State Government should be formed. At the same time, as a great majority of this Convention appeared to be in favor of a State Government, he proposed that the country should be divided by running a line west from San Luis Obispo, so that all north of that line might have a State Government, and all south thereof a Territorial Government. He and his colleagues were under instructions to vote for a Territorial organization. He took this view, because he believed it to be to the interest of his constituents. And although a gentleman belonging to this body had stated, that it was not the object of the Convention to form a Constitution for the Californians, he begged leave to say, that he considered himself as much an American citizen as the gentleman who made the assertion (22).<sup>35</sup>

Carrillo proposed that the northern half of California, heavily populated by mostly Anglo settlers (and the site of most of the gold sought after by Americans), could form a state government, while the southern portion, sparsely populated and inhabited by mostly Californios, remain a

territory. In this, the first real debate of the Convention, Carrillo represented the apparent desire of the newly conquered Californio population to remain a separate and independent Territory of the United States.<sup>36</sup>

Carrillo's position, of course, created consternation for the American delegates who had designs on ratifying a state constitution for quick approval by the federal Congress.

Paradoxically, though, it was through an appeal to his status as citizen of the United States that Carrillo—representing the Californios—demanded special accommodation for his people.

Following from his position as U.S. citizen, Carrillo presented his plan to divide California in half, accommodating each community's needs and interests. Considering the Mexican tradition of *vecindad* that, more than likely, informed Carrillo's understanding of citizenship, his appeal for regional government to resolve the tensions between north and south becomes clearer.

More so than in the United States (which was experiencing its own crisis of federalism at the time), mid-nineteenth century Mexican citizenship was located primarily in the pueblo and the regional government.<sup>37</sup> As Guerra summarizes,

The existence of a unique Mexican nation . . . was not questioned. Its political structure, however, was not Unitarian. It was pluralistic: a conglomerate of pueblos, states, cities, and villages of varying importance but with equal rights and engaging the government through multiple pacts.<sup>38</sup>

The Mexican citizen was less a member of a national or political body and more a member of a local community or neighborhood; he (as citizenship was only extended to males) was the *vecino* (or neighbor). *Vecindad* (neighborhood)—which Federica Morelli defines as “an essentially territorial and juridical concept of identity, tied to local cultural values, to the community in which the subject worked and exercised his political, social, and cultural action”—became an

important marker of the locus of citizenship.<sup>39</sup> Because of this localized nature, Mexican citizenship was often more cultural and quotidian than legal; that is to say, markers of citizenship were evident in the degree of one's integration into community life.<sup>40</sup> When an inhabitant became a full and respected member of the community—often defined as achieving an “honest way of life” in the eyes of other community members—he was accepted as a *vecino* (neighbor/citizen) and allowed the respective rights of citizenship, including suffrage.<sup>41</sup>

Thus Carrillo's plan to split California into two halves to address its vast regional, geographic, and cultural differences mirrored the regional structure of Mexican citizenship. Californios saw themselves as citizens of their towns, their regions, and of their province (California) primarily, even though they also saw themselves as Mexican citizens.<sup>42</sup> Just as it was logical to be a “Californio” and also a “Mexican,” Carrillo appealed to his new American citizenship and at the same time demanded southern Californians be specially accommodated with a regional government. Carrillo's rhetoric—his proposal to divide California in two—struck a compromise position. He noted that “as a great majority of this Convention appeared to be in favor of a State Government,” he was willing to compromise with his Yankee counterparts (22). His short speech demonstrated a negotiated discourse of citizenship that married American political language of representative democracy (such as reference to his “constituents”) with a Mexican tradition of regional, corporatist political identity.<sup>43</sup>

The American delegates responded to Carrillo's rhetorical appeal to U.S. citizenship in generally positive terms. Stephen Foster, also a delegate from Southern California, granted Carrillo's premise that the Californios were equal citizens, yet he interpreted their wishes differently:

Although acting under instructions similar to those of his colleague [Mr. Carrillo], [Mr. Foster] did not believe that a majority of his constituents wished a separation. There was no doubt they desired a Territorial Government, but he believed they would prefer to bear their share of the burden of a State Government rather than divide the country (23).

Kimball H. Dimmick, a delegate from San Jose, also concurred with the premise of Carrillo's argument:

As to the line of distinction attempted to be drawn between native Californians and Americans, he knew of no such distinction himself; his constituents knew of none. They all claimed to be Americans. They would not consent to be placed in a minority. They classed themselves with Americans. . . . The Constitution was to be formed for their benefit as well as to that of the native born Americans (23).

Like Foster, Dimmick granted Californios full status as citizens, equal with Anglo Americans. Nonetheless, Dimmick and Foster disagreed with Carrillo, because, as Americans, the Californios "were nearly unanimous in favor of a State Government" (23). Though these Yankee delegates praised Carrillo's appeal to his American citizenship, they arrived at a different conclusion than he. Perhaps this was partly because of expediency, for most Americans saw statehood as economically and politically advantageous. Yet the near unanimous Yankee support for statehood also stemmed in part from a different conception of citizenship than their Californio colleagues held.

The Americans brought a more nationalistic sense of citizenship to the debates. Though the mid nineteenth century saw increasingly "divisive" conflict over the sources of U.S. citizenship, the conventional historical view presents the mid nineteenth century as an age of expanding citizenship and political participation in the United States.<sup>44</sup> Political theorist Rogers

Smith notes that the mid-nineteenth century was for a long time regarded as the period in which America fulfilled its true democratic ideals.<sup>45</sup> Suffrage and political participation expanded, for many states eliminated property requirements and other impediments to full white male suffrage.<sup>46</sup> Increasing public deliberation and expanding voting rights contributed to an invigorated public culture characterized by lively debate, rowdy public rallies, and mass displays of political solidarity. Moreover, popular belief in America's Manifest Destiny during the Jacksonian era meant that Yankee delegates saw no room for provincial accommodation within American society; as new Americans, the Californios should assimilate.<sup>47</sup>

Ultimately Carrillo's measure to split California in half was defeated, and the delegates voted overwhelmingly (29-8) to craft a state constitution. Yet Carrillo's rhetoric demonstrates the compromise citizenship I identify in the Californios' discourse. Californios sought a negotiated, legal compromise on the terms and conditions of their citizenship. Since legal citizenship entails recognition as a political subject, Californios strove to constitute themselves as American citizens in the Convention. They employed a compromised discourse of citizenship to better integrate their Mexican/Californian traditions and practices. As such, Californios crafted one of the first Latina/o rhetorics of citizenship.

The debate on September 5 spearheaded by Jose A. Carrillo would only be the first time Californio and Yankee delegates would clash over questions of citizenship. Debates concerning citizenship took place over two other main issues: suffrage and language accommodation. Both were primary areas around which Californios negotiated their legal status as (new) Americans. In the next section, I discuss the Californios' discourse of citizenship concerning these two issues.



### **Shaping Citizenship: Suffrage and Language Rights**

Suffrage was one of the first issues of citizenship Californio delegates confronted at length; the debate on the subject began on Wednesday, September 12. Suffrage was evidently of major concern to the Californio delegates, as they raised the issue three other times during the convention before they reached a satisfactory compromise. But, the question posed on Wednesday, September 12, not even two weeks into the convention, concerned the qualifications of suffrage. The provision under consideration granted suffrage to “white male citizens of the United States,” but New Yorker Edward Gilbert, representing San Francisco, offered an amendment to include “every male citizen of Mexico who shall have elected to become a citizen of the United States” (61). Gilbert’s initial amendment concerned the legal provisions of suffrage. Since the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo granted Mexican citizens all the rights of American citizenship, argued Gilbert, they should be given suffrage.

Legal questions quickly became tied to racialized American traditions of citizenship. Charles Botts, a forty-year-old delegate of Monterey originally from Virginia, professed concern at the outset that this new treaty obligation should not compromise the traditions of citizenship practiced in America. In his words, he was concerned “that citizens of Mexico who had become citizens of the United States should be placed upon the same footing with ourselves; that white citizens alone should be admitted to the right of suffrage” (63). Botts feared that opening up suffrage to all Mexican citizens could dilute the strict racial make-up of American identity. Interestingly, then, Botts reframed the question under consideration from Gilbert’s concern of how to accommodate Californios (according to the treaty of peace) to the question of how best to preserve America’s racial project (that only whites be considered citizens).

Naturally, Botts and other American delegates operated from the racialized logic of citizenship of the Jacksonian era. The mid-nineteenth century was a time of deep political division and exclusion, particularly concerning the make-up of citizenship. While suffrage and political rights were liberalized in one way by being universally applied to white men, “inegalitarian racial and gender conceptions were more directly and pervasively endorsed in [citizenship] law . . . than ever before.”<sup>48</sup> Moreover, despite drastic differences, “both [political] parties [i.e., the Democrats and the Whigs] agreed that white Christian male dominance must prevail.”<sup>49</sup> This “dark side” of citizenship was not only evident in the legal and institutional practices of the mid nineteenth century, but popular beliefs about citizenship and American identity in the Jacksonian era also evidenced some of these exclusionary, racist, and patriarchal tendencies. A belief in Manifest Destiny meant that the western frontier was bequeathed to America by Providence, and inevitably Americans would subjugate the wilderness and bring American civilization to the natives.<sup>50</sup> Thus American citizenship during the mid-nineteenth century was intricately tied to a larger racial, colonial project which combined racial hierarchy, martial patriarchal identity, and structures of political and social exclusion (most obviously slavery). To be a citizen was to exercise the public privileges of white, Christian, American maleness.<sup>51</sup>

This racialized and exclusionary view of citizenship clashed with a more contingent notion of citizenship in the Mexican and Californio political tradition. In the United States, racial and gender barriers limited citizenship to white males, but in Mexico citizenship was constitutionally and practically extended to indigenous people (*indios*) and *mestizo* (mixed race) men as well as to all Mexican men of European origin (*criollos*). Perhaps because the racial caste system of colonial New Spain was more complex and multileveled than the distinct racial

project of the U.S., or perhaps because the Spanish colonizers more explicitly attempted to “civilize” indigenous people to European ways (as evidenced by the Spanish mission system), limitations on Mexican citizenship in the nineteenth century more regularly revolved around social class and community identity than racial identity. Either way, Mexican citizenship traditions left open the possibility of inclusion for racial minorities like indigenous people and mixed race Mexicans as long as they became *vecinos*—integrated into local community life.<sup>52</sup> As Annino notes, “by the end of the eighteenth century, the Indian was no longer imagined as spiritually ‘miserable.’ Rather, he was materially miserable.”<sup>53</sup> This social class element of citizenship was evident in the Mexican concept of “*gente de razón*,” a term literally meaning “people of reason” used to refer to *criollo* Mexicans, and also applied in limited form to *indios* and *mestizos* who assimilated into society.<sup>54</sup> Under Mexican traditions, the source of citizenship was localized and the identity of the citizen fluid. *Indios* and *mestizos* were recognized as citizens when they rose out of their material conditions and became “civilized” members of the community.

These traditions and practices of citizenship—the American and the Mexican—formed the ideological and political backdrop of American delegates in the Constitutional Convention of 1849; in turn, they structured the Californios’ attempts to enact their newly-granted American citizenship. Returning to the debate over suffrage, while Mr. Botts’ remarks that “white citizens alone should be admitted to the right of suffrage” exemplified racialized traditions of American citizenship, Californio delegates, led by Pablo Noriego de la Guerra, rose quickly to articulate an alternative view of citizenship as a site for compromise (63). De la Guerra was a lawyer by training and a member of an influential and landed Santa Barbara family; he had knowledge of Mexican law, both as a practicing attorney and as a long-serving public official under Mexican

rule. In this case, de la Guerra attempted to strike a compromise between the racialized view of American citizenship evidenced in Botts' remarks and a citizenship which was based on *vecindad*, which was open to non-white people as long as they became *vecinos*.

De la Guerra began his response by begging the question of the terminology used by Mr. Botts and other American delegates to describe the basic racial component of citizenship. "It should be properly understood in the first place," he began, "what is the true signification of the word 'white?'" (63). De la Guerra's question subtly challenged the racialized project of American citizenship and its applicability to the California context (where mixed race peoples like *mestizos* were more recognized in society). His question implied that those delegates who proposed to limit citizenship to whites only were putting forth an arbitrary system of categorization. In the remainder of his comments, de la Guerra seemed to carve out a space for Californios within the American system of racial categorization. He argued, "Many citizens of California have received from nature a very dark skin; nevertheless, there are among them men who have heretofore been allowed to vote, and not only that, but to fill the highest public offices" (63). In contrast to the American system, de la Guerra offered as a corrective the Mexican tradition of citizenship, which granted indigenous and mixed-race people suffrage and rights to hold political office as long as they became integrated members of community life. "It would be very unjust to deprive them of the privileges of citizens," he noted, "merely because nature had not made them white" (63).

To bolster his argument, de la Guerra had the aid of fellow delegate Manuel Dominguez, the *mestizo* banker from Angeles County whose presence embodied de la Guerra's concern for indigenous and mixed-race Californios. By drawing attention to those indigenous people and *mestizos* in Mexican society, like Dominguez, who could *act* white (by paying taxes, adopting

white culture, owning property, and so forth), de la Guerra sought to emphasize that the presumed whiteness of American racialized citizenship could be imitated. De la Guerra crafted a compromise strategy in his rhetorical form and content through *mimicry*—an “almost the same, but not quite” that problematized the American standard of white citizenship.<sup>55</sup> Mimicry describes how subjugated ethnic, racial, or cultural groups, like the Californios, could negotiate power with dominant society through appropriating its conventions.<sup>56</sup> In concrete terms, de la Guerra used his privileged status as white Californio to question the racial make-up of American citizenship. He demanded that “it should be properly understood in the first place what is the true signification of the word ‘white’” (63). In this short opening statement, de la Guerra questioned the whiteness articulated by Botts and other American delegates. Being *criollo* himself, de la Guerra was “almost the same” as the Anglo-American delegates. Yet his ethnic and cultural differences (and, more particularly, those of his *mestizo* colleague Dominguez) created a mimicry—an almost but not quite—which, in a sense, served to underscore the socially constructed and exclusionary racial project of American citizenship to those around him. The American delegates could not and would not articulate the true signification of the word “white” because de la Guerra problematized that distinction through his mimicry of white, American citizenship.

While de la Guerra’s argument concerning suffrage exhibited mimicry (i.e., almost, but not quite), his short speech also exhibited a different compromise appeal. By relating the experiences of indigenous and mixed race Californios who had been citizens under the Mexican government, de la Guerra appealed to what Chaim Perelman and Lucie Olbrechts-Tyteca term “presence.” For Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca, rhetorical presence foregrounds certain proofs, topics, or experiences making them act on the ongoing deliberation. In their words, “by the very

fact of selecting certain elements and presenting them to the audience, their importance and pertinency [sic] to the discussion are implied. Indeed, such a choice endows these elements with a *presence*, which is an essential factor in argumentation [emphasis in original].”<sup>57</sup> By selecting and bringing forth the experience of mixed race Californians (like Dominguez), de la Guerra implicitly complicated the American delegates’ racialized view of citizenship. “Many citizens of California have received from nature a very dark skin,” argued de la Guerra, “nevertheless, there are among them men who have heretofore been allowed to vote, and not only that, but to fill the highest public offices” (63). *Indios* and *mestizos* had been citizens, public servants, and voters under Mexican law—they were community members—which meant they should be recognized under the new system. By using the very terminology he had problematized (i.e., “white”), de la Guerra attempted to compromise or negotiate exceptions to the racialized categorization of American citizenship.<sup>58</sup>

Anglo delegate Charles Botts responded to de la Guerra’s discourse of mimicry and rhetorical presence by shifting debate away from the meaning of “white.” Botts would not define or defend whiteness or sketch the parameters of white identity; instead he focused his remarks on redrawing the racial project by describing those categorically defined as non-white and thus unworthy of citizenship.<sup>59</sup> Botts shifted the discussion from the demarcations of his racial system (which, as de la Guerra’s remarks attempted to show, did not fit the Californio context) through the use of a sign warrant. Darker skin colors were not significant per se, he noted, but only insofar as they “indicated the inferior races of mankind” (63). Botts stated that “he would be perfectly willing to use any words which would exclude the African and Indian races” (63). Botts denied de la Guerra’s call to recognize the presence of mixed race Californios; he turned the debate back to the locus of essence.<sup>60</sup> Which were the “inferior races” whose essence

disqualified them from citizenship? Being a member of the community—the *vecindad*—was irrelevant; racial identity was the essential marker of citizenship. By turning the debate to the question of racial essence, Botts' remarks deflected from de la Guerra's mimicry and presencing of indigenous experience.

De la Guerra responded to Botts and other delegates' comments and questions, attempting to strike a conciliatory tone. First he made an appeal to legal authority rather than racial category; he stated that "according to Mexican law, no race of any kind is excluded from voting." "So far were [Indians] considered citizens" under Mexican law, he stated, "that some of the first men in the Republic were of the Indian race" (63). By bringing the debate back to the question of Mexican law concerning citizenship, which was recognized by the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, de la Guerra crafted an enthymeme in support of granting indigenous and mixed-race people citizenship. If Mexican law granted indigenous people citizenship, and the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo recognized Mexican citizenship law (as all the delegates knew), it was legally required of the California Constitution. Perhaps this new, legal argument would yield more compromise than de la Guerra's earlier attempts to foreground (presence) the rights and experiences of *indios* and *mestizos*. Since many of the American delegates wanted to write a constitution that would adhere to all treaty obligations and federal laws to accelerate California's statehood, Californios' appeals to legal precedent worked in concert with more compassionate attempts to presence indigenous people.<sup>61</sup>

De la Guerra's (and others') legal appeals were more successful, it seemed, at producing debate about suffrage, citizenship, and race. Yankee delegates now considered the Californios' calls for compromise and inclusion of racial minorities. However, the ensuing debate left de la Guerra, who could only speak limited English, behind. One line of argument developed by the

Anglo American delegates in response to de la Guerra's remarks revolved around dissociation of the racial category of the "Indian."<sup>62</sup> In a reversal of Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca's paradigmatic appearance-reality hierarchy, many delegates commented on the potential value of acknowledging the apparent, mixed-blood, descendants of Indians while excluding the real, full-blooded Indian, which they viewed as truly miserable. Dimmick argued that, "where there was here and there a good Indian, capable of understanding our system of government, he had no objection to making such provision as would entitle him to vote" (64). William M. Gwin, a forty-four year old southern farmer recently immigrated to California, was probably, like his southern colleague Mr. Dimmick, familiar with these racial arguments; "He did not think the descendents of Indians should be excluded, but the pure uncivilized Indians should not be permitted to vote" (65). Debating the meaning of "Indian race" did not present indigenous peoples' experiences as citizens; instead American delegates debated who could fall under the racial categorization of American citizenship. But these discussions demonstrated that de la Guerra's appeals to Mexican traditions of *vecindad* may have provoked the Yankee delegates to consider expanding their definitions of American citizenship. In the end, though American delegates considered extending the rights of citizenship to *mestizo* Mexicans, their arguments merely affirmed the racial project at the heart of American citizenship in the mid-nineteenth century.

To try to bring the heated debate back to the original question (who could be allowed to vote?), de la Guerra again relied on rhetorical presence to foreground the experience of indigenous Californios and their need for accommodation within the American racial project. In response to another delegate, de la Guerra "requested that gentleman [Mr. Hoppe of San Jose] to place himself in the position of one of those Indians" and to "suppose he had to pay an equal tax



with all other persons, to sustain the expenses of the State,” as many *indios* and *mestizos* who owned property did. De la Guerra asked, “Would it not be most unfair to deprive him of equal privileges, when he had to bear an equal burden? . . . The gentleman, he hoped, would readily perceive the great injustice of such a provision” (70). De la Guerra brought the experience of these indigenous and mixed-race people to the forefront by asking his fellow delegates to experience the world from the position of a racial minority—to “place” themselves in the Indians’ “position.” On the one hand, de la Guerra was asking American delegates to acknowledge an alternative tradition of citizenship—one based on community life rather than legal or racial structures. On the other hand, since neighbor meant citizen in the Mexican tradition, de la Guerra’s attempts to present the experience of indigenous and mixed race Californios in his rhetoric, in a sense, *made them* neighbors/citizens.

De la Guerra’s rhetorical strategies—i.e., legal argumentation, mimicry, and rhetoric of presence—evidenced a compromise citizenship discourse, a marriage of Mexican and American citizenship language. Yet de la Guerra’s arguments also presented a place of conflict between Californio and American notions of citizenship. While for de la Guerra the act of paying taxes and being a contributing member of a community was sufficient to receive political rights, many of the American delegates saw citizenship as a more rigid legal category based on racial identity. By refocusing the debate on the experience of indigenous Californios and subtly connecting their struggle to the American axiom of “no taxation without representation,” de la Guerra’s remarks forged a position of compromise between American citizenship and the realities of political life in pre-conquest California.

The suffrage provisions were taken up again a little over two weeks later on the evening of September 29. As in the early debates, Californios continued to use an appeal to rhetorical

presence by trying to foreground and make concrete the experience of indigenous people as members of the community (*vecindad*). Californios also developed arguments based on legal authority during this second debate. Finally, Californios relied on rhetorics of collective memory in their appeals for expanding the rights of suffrage. As the only delegate with over 20 years of experience in public office, Pablo Noriego de la Guerra once again spearheaded the position of the Californios to allow *indios* and *mestizos* to vote. De la Guerra began the debate on suffrage with a long and impassioned speech in which he opposed racial classifications on suffrage. In his speech de la Guerra again gave presence to indigenous peoples' experiences as members of the community.<sup>63</sup> De la Guerra began by emphasizing the gravity of the issue. Suffrage was “a point of very great importance to himself and to California—a question as interesting as it was important.” He felt compelled to speak, for “he should be doing a very great injustice to his constituents” if he did not. At the outset of de la Guerra's remarks, he presented the needs and experiences of his constituents—community members and Californio citizens. To de la Guerra, the provision to allow only white men the right to vote seemed illogical and inconsistent. He argued,

By the proposed amendment, all Indians were excluded, while at the same time it allowed all foreigners who might choose to come to California and reside for a few years, to become citizens. You allow the Kanaka to come within your territory and admit them to citizenship, when he is as ignorant and as foolish as any Indian in California. And yet you exclude the native Indians from enjoying equal privilege with him.

How could those well-established *mestizos* and *indios* be excluded from voting while other men—just recently arrived—could exercise citizenship? De la Guerra's appeal to recognize Californios of indigenous and mixed race was grounded in the community-based tradition of

Mexico. By including popular stereotypes and racial slurs surrounding another group of indigenous people—Hawaiians and other Pacific islanders (“Kanaka”)—de la Guerra exposed the potential hypocrisy of this racialized system of citizenship. It was not only unjust but foolish to grant rights to the “Kanaka” immigrants, who were also indigenous, while excluding native Californios (of course whether or not “Kanaka” were granted suffrage was a point that was under debate as well). Thus de la Guerra’s argument demonstrated the double-edged nature of compromise rhetoric. By appealing to popular racism surrounding another racial/ethnic group to negotiate with the dominant, racialized traditions of U.S. citizenship, de la Guerra reified the system of racial classification he seemed to be resisting.

After exposing the inconsistency of some American delegates’ arguments, de la Guerra again introduced a long narrative about the native Californio Indian. He rhetorically transported the delegates back through the history of indigenous people in California, letting them bear witness to the experiences of indigenous people that made them worthy of inclusion as citizens. “It has been asserted by some members,” He argued, “that Indians are brutal and irrational. Let those gentlemen cast their eyes back for three hundred years and say who were the Indians then.” De la Guerra narrated indigenous life three hundred years earlier, before the colonization of California by Spain. He traced the indigenous peoples’ roots as a “proud and gifted race”

capable of forming a government for themselves. If they were not so much enlightened as now, it was not for want of natural gifts, but because the lights of science were not then so bright as now, even in Europe; and they could fall but simply upon the natives of the soil.

By tracing the history of indigenous people in California before the conquest, de la Guerra’s remarks worked to rewrite collective memory of *indios* in the New World. The new historical

memory de la Guerra offered through his narrative challenged conventional racist stereotypes of Indians and rhetorically constituted them as citizens/neighbors.

In the rhetorical appeal to collective memory, according to Bruce Gronbeck, “some present need or concern is examined by calling up a past, shaping it into a useful memory that an audience can find relevant to the present.”<sup>64</sup> Specifically, de la Guerra rewrote the delegates’ collective memory of California’s Native Americans to inform the present question of suffrage. *Indios* were not ignorant, foolish, or inferior, but were a “proud and gifted race,” with “natural gifts,” which was “capable” of governance. What led to their material condition was not their inferior essence (as some American delegates had argued) but the circumstances of their location far from Europe; for “the lights of science” had not reached the New World soon enough. In Burkean terms, by shifting from agent of action (*indios*) to scene (geography), de la Guerra showed that Indians were in fact worthy of attaining citizenship; once they became *gente de razón* (people of reason) by transcending these material conditions, their proud history showed that *indios* and *mestizos* could be good citizens.<sup>65</sup>

In the first half of his speech, de la Guerra transported the delegates back in time to witness the evolution of the indigenous Californians before the conquest. Yet it was not necessary to look back three centuries, said de la Guerra. He “bid them look back but for half a century. All the work that was seen in California, [sic] was the work of Indians led by some foreigners. If they were not cultivated and highly civilized, it was because they had been ground down and made slaves of.”<sup>66</sup> De la Guerra shifted responsibility for Indians’ poor material conditions to Spanish colonizers, who had exploited Indians into squalor. Nevertheless, Indians had been industrious enough to help build the state to its present glory. The racial essentialism of some delegates was unfounded, for Indians “were intelligent and capable of receiving

instructions, and it was the duty of the citizens to endeavor to elevate them and better their condition in everyway, instead of seeking to sink them still lower.”

In his speech, de la Guerra first used rhetorical presence and then narrative of collective memory to foreground the experiences of indigenous people in California and to prove that they were as much members of the community as the *criollo* Californios. His speech transported the delegates through moments in the history of California to prove that Native Americans were central to the state and to disqualify any of the beliefs that Native Americans were an inferior race (as American citizenship traditions would suggest). Through all of these appeals, de la Guerra’s discourse again exhibited the rhetorical form of mimicry by embodying the “almost the same, but not quite” of the assimilated Californio citizen. By “normalizing’ the colonial . . . subject” in his performance of American citizenship, de la Guerra demonstrated that white American citizenship could be performed by indigenous people and *mestizos*, and he subtly illustrated the “ambivalence” of this system of racialized citizenship.<sup>67</sup>

Because of this subtle critique, though, it was significant that de la Guerra ended his speech by again making room for compromise and negotiation with the Yankee delegates. “If it was the will of the Convention to exclude the body of Indians,” he hoped exceptions would be made for those Indians who held property and paid taxes, and should therefore be offered the rights of full citizenship. Though, based on his remarks, de la Guerra encouraged the delegates open up suffrage to all indigenous people in California, perhaps he recognized that his position would require some compromise with the American delegates. This was certainly proven true in the responses to de la Guerra’s oration, in which several delegates expressed their concerns with providing suffrage for indigenous people. Despite de la Guerra’s attempts to rewrite the Americans’ stereotyped memory of indigenous people, many delegates expressed fear that

allowing Indians to vote opened the door to manipulation by those who would take advantage of an inferior race. J. D. Hoppe commented:

Was there a man, he would ask, who was willing to place himself on a level with the Indian or the negro [sic]? Not he, for one. The proposed amendment was loose in the extreme. Where were those Indians who were to be admitted by this amendment? They were along the Pacific coast, populating the *ranchos*. There was not a *ranch* where you would not find fifty or a hundred buck Indians, and the owner could run these *freemen* up to the polls, and carry any measure he might desire [emphasis in original].<sup>68</sup>

Instead, the delegates held to their position that voting be restricted to white men, for only white men could be trusted to be independent, reasonable, and responsible voters.

De la Guerra was unable to challenge or circumvent the racial project inherent in American citizenship of the time. He responded by modifying his position, abandoning his appeals for compassion, and adopting a pragmatic, compromise position. He stated that “he did not at all desire that the mass of Indians should vote, and he had expressly said so”; only that the Indians owning property who would be eligible to vote under Mexican law “were not more than two hundred,” and for pragmatic reasons, should be granted suffrage. “For himself,” he summarized, “he only proposed that those who were entitled to a vote by virtue of holding property, purchased under the Mexican laws prior to the cession of California, should still be permitted to exercise that right. There was no fear of two hundred votes having any serious effect in a population of 60,000.”<sup>69</sup> Several of the American delegates to the convention were still suspicious about expanding suffrage to racial and ethnic minorities. But de la Guerra assured them that granting suffrage to eligible Indians was a legal necessity and a minor

inconvenience. After some maneuvering to try and delay or amend the vote on expanding suffrage rights to *indios* and *mestizos*, the measure was taken and defeated by only one vote.

Ultimately, the Californio delegates were unable to achieve a compromise on suffrage on the floor of the convention. September 29 was the last time this element of citizenship rights was debated; the ultimate compromise was brokered off the floor of the convention and offered up for a vote several days later on October 3. The amendment the Californios secured only granted explicit voting rights to *white* American and *white* Mexican citizens; the most de la Guerra and others were able to obtain was a proviso in the amendment that suffrage could be extended to Indians on a case-by-case basis through further legislative decrees. Though the compromise they achieved with the American delegates was not a full recognition of the rights of indigenous and mixed race people as under the Mexican system, it did create a middle ground between the strict racial barriers of the American tradition of citizenship and the more localized, community-based Mexican tradition.

The Californios' discourse over suffrage was characterized by compromise in both form and content, with obviously mixed results. Through rhetorical strategies such as presence and appeal to collective memory, de la Guerra and the Californios subtly carved out space for Mexican traditions of citizenship in the debates over suffrage. Bringing forth the experiences of citizenship under Mexican rule, constituting themselves and others (such as *indios*) as citizens/neighbors, and seeking suffrage for racial minorities demonstrated compromise in service of a legal contract over citizenship.

This discourse of compromise citizenship took shape in a second area of controversy. In addition to the parameters of suffrage in the new state, the delegates of the 1849 Convention debated the role of language for the citizens of California. What would be the place of English

and of Spanish now that California was to become fully American? The issue was debated on Thursday, September 27, in the evening session, after a long and contentious debate about the powers of the legislature over property ownership. After a brief deliberation, perhaps partially attributable to the force of Californios' arguments and partially attributable to the late hour at which it commenced, the delegates voted unanimously to "require publication" of all "laws, decrees, regulations, and provisions emanating" from the state into both English and Spanish.<sup>70</sup> The question the delegates considered was whether or not to make accommodations for Spanish-speaking Californios. The proposition was introduced by Pablo Noriego de la Guerra, who spearheaded many of the Californios' initiatives (along with Jose Carrillo).<sup>71</sup> Because of his long service as a public official, De la Guerra had extensive experience in courtrooms that informed his opinion; he proposed that the new government should ensure proceedings and laws in Spanish to secure the effective governing of Californios. Before de la Guerra could make the case for his amendment, however, opponents of the proposition initiated the debate by arguing that de la Guerra's proposal was an unnecessary provision; Americanization was ensured by the force of history.

Virginian delegate Charles Botts began the debate by recognizing the obvious need for a provision ensuring the short-term translation of government documents. "That all laws [should] be published in Spanish and English," he stated, "is a necessity so clear that the Legislature must at once perceive and provide for it."<sup>72</sup> As a district court judge in California, Botts raised concerns that enshrining bilingualism into the constitution would provide an unnecessary and costly burden on the state. If Americanization of the California population (including the learning of English) was inevitable, there was no need for this provision. He stated,



We cannot but foresee here, that the day will soon arrive when every man [sic] in the State will understand the English language. If you engraft this upon the Constitution, you impose an immense and permanent expense upon the people—an expense for which there will be no necessity in a few years.

“The Legislature will provide” for these short term necessities, he argued, without imposing “an immense and permanent expense upon the people” by having it as a “permanent fundamental law of the land.” Botts asserted a confident presumption of cultural assimilation while remaining diplomatic in his recognition of Californios’ language rights. He opposed the measure to change the Constitution because he remained certain that American language and culture would take hold in the new state. There was no need for an explicit and more permanent constitutional provision in the wake of foreseeable acculturation.<sup>73</sup>

De la Guerra clarified the need for a constitutional solution by using a rhetorical strategy Jasinski and others have called “prudential accommodation.” Like his contemporary Henry Clay, de la Guerra provided a prudential rhetoric valorizing “the ideals of accommodation, conciliation, mutual adjustment, and compromise” in support of his proposition.<sup>74</sup> To achieve rhetoric of prudence, de la Guerra relied on the locus of the existent, a rhetorical topos which Perelman and Olbrechts-Tytecha note “affirm[s] the superiority of that which exists, of the actual, of the real, over the possible, the contingent, or the impossible.”<sup>75</sup> In the face of Botts’ argument, which centered on the inevitable future assimilation of Californios, de la Guerra focused his speech on the status of Californios living within the new state *at that time*. “The reason why I make this proposition,” de la Guerra claimed, “is, [sic] that since this country has been under the American Government, in general all decrees have been published in English.”<sup>76</sup> De la Guerra used his experience as a lawyer and politician in Santa Barbara as example of a

place where “there has been no interpreter,” and “I myself . . . have been compelled to translate several public documents.” His brief examples of the failure of the American government to accommodate Californios meant that “however natural and obvious it may appear that the Legislature should take care of it, the experience of three years has proved that such things may be neglected.” Faced with inconsistencies and ineptitudes in the business of governing California, Californios would be better served with a constitutional guarantee of their language rights.

De la Guerra conceded the overall point made by Botts that inevitably Californios would become integrated into American society, but he valorized the prudential accommodation of Spanish-speaking constituents in the short term. “The proposition may seem of trivial consequence to some; but to me, and those whom I represent, is [sic] one of very great importance,” he said. Californios “will not learn the English language in three or four years; their children may do it; but at present, all laws ought to be published in a language which the people understand.” Not only was this bilingual measure necessary to prevent injury to the Californio population, but in an ultimate gesture of prudential accommodation, de la Guerra also appealed to the assimilationist strand of the Americans’ argument. “You will bear in mind that the laws which will hereafter be published,” he concluded,

will be very different from those which [the Californios] obeyed formerly. They cannot obey laws unless they understand them. I do not believe that in six years the adult Spanish population will be able to speak English; but in twenty years they may; and by that time it is very probable that the present Constitution will be altered.

De la Guerra conceded the Americans' beliefs in inevitable acculturation, yet he argued that it was wiser to focus on the present condition. Since this new life for Californios would be very different, they needed a linguistic tool to help them become good citizens.

Francis Lippitt, an American delegate from San Francisco, delivered arguably the deciding endorsement of the provision after de la Guerra's speech. Taking cue from de la Guerra's rhetoric of prudential accommodation, Lippitt—a lawyer and former Captain in the Mexican-American War—claimed that the provision should be included in the Constitution “in order to satisfy the California population.” Though the law was not needed especially, it would cause no harm to the English-speaking population. Repeating de la Guerra's argument, Lippitt made clear that “in the course of ten or twenty years, everybody will speak English and it will then be a very easy matter to have . . . altered.” But, “there is this especially in favor of it—that it will satisfy the minds of the whole Californio population.” Lippitt's endorsement centered on the initiative as a symbolic gesture to Spanish-speakers that they had a secured place in the new state and nation. It could “satisfy the minds” of Californios by making them believe they would be accommodated.

In the end, the initiatives' sole vocal opponent—the Anglo lawyer Charles Botts—rescinded his opposition and the amendment passed unanimously. Apparently Californios were a conquered group that must be accommodated as a first step in their inevitable assimilation as Americans. In his final statement concerning the provision, Botts rhetorically “satisfied” de la Guerra's mind. He stated, “I hope my motives will not be misunderstood. . . . The gentleman must not judge of the character of our American institutions from [past failures].”<sup>77</sup> Unlike the controversy over suffrage, in the debate over language rights the Californios were able to achieve compromise and accommodation with the Anglo delegates through a rhetoric of prudential

accommodation. By conceding the overall American mythos of Manifest Destiny, the Californios focused instead on securing measures to help and protect them in the new government. De la Guerra and the Californios enacted a prudential rhetoric of compromise.

The Californio delegates did not restrict their participation in the Convention to the issues of suffrage and language rights. In fact, as historian Leonard Pitt notes, “The Californios helped mold [other] key sections of the Constitution of 1849,” such as taxation and the state’s boundaries.<sup>78</sup> Yet these debates over suffrage and language represent moments in which Californios were explicitly asked to negotiate the terms of their newly granted American citizenship. What would it mean to be an American in this new state? How did their old political and cultural identity translate into this new world? The Californios negotiated a compromise citizenship, one that was based on legal compromise between their Mexican/Californian traditions of citizenship and the dominant American traditions the settlers brought with them. In the following section I will show that the Californios’ offered a compromise citizenship in their rhetorical form and in the content of their rhetoric. This citizenship discourse contextualizes the earliest struggles of Latina/os to find agency in dominant traditions of American citizenship.

### **Compromise Citizenship**

Californios faced a difficult task in the Constitutional Convention of 1849; they had to negotiate their newly granted United States citizenship with many of the people who had contributed to their conquest. Before the war, Mexican governor of California Pío Pico warned Californios of the “hordes of Yankee emigrants” whom he saw as a threat to their established way of life, and these Yankees became a central problem for the Californios. Popular stereotypes held in America about the Californios portrayed them as a carefree people who were

mentally inferior and without ambitions; these beliefs fueled a feeling of Manifest Destiny.<sup>79</sup>

The American racial project infused ideas and practices of citizenship and contributed to the interactions between Anglos and Californios at the Convention. In response, Californios adopted a compromise citizenship in their convention discourse, an enactment of U.S. citizenship which sought accommodation of Mexican traditions in the new American state.

The Californio delegates sought compromise and negotiation throughout the convention, and their rhetorical strategies exemplify this compromise view of citizenship. Rather than relying on a rhetoric of confrontation, which I discuss in Chapter 3, the Californio delegates used rhetorical strategies that invited negotiation, including mimicry, rhetorical presence, narratives of history/memory, legal argumentation, and a discourse of prudential accommodation. Through a rhetorical form that mimicked the style and language of the Yankee delegates—an almost the same, but not quite—Californios attempted to find a compromise between the demand for sameness and the desire for difference. In the debates over suffrage, de la Guerra and the Californios relied on arguments of presence to try to concretize the role of indigenous people as members of the California community. In their rhetorical appeals, Californios drew on traditions of Mexican citizenship, such as *vecindad*, which posited that integration into the community was the true measure of citizenship. By showing how *indios* and *mestizos* were integrated into community life—owning property, paying taxes, and serving in public office—Californios constituted them as citizens worthy of suffrage. Narrating collective memory of indigenous peoples' role in California's history, de la Guerra and other delegates further demonstrated that Indians were citizens/neighbors, thereby subtly challenging America's racial project of citizenship. Californios also made legal appeals using the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo as a source of authority; most of the Anglo delegates sought to honor the recently signed treaty, thus

appeals to its provisions provided a common topos of argument. Finally, in debates over language rights in the new state, Californios presented a rhetoric of prudential accommodation which focused on the practical needs of Californios if they were to assimilate into the new state. These rhetorical strategies signaled a compromise view of citizenship.

In addition to the rhetorical strategies in the delegates' discourse, the pragmatic compromises achieved by the delegates illustrated a degree of accommodation between Californios and Americans. In this sense, compromise was also central to the content of the citizenship model Californios enacted. Californios sought compromise between American traditions of citizenship and their own practices and traditions. Though American citizenship in the nineteenth century was drawn along racial lines, Californios struggled to achieve inclusion of *indios* and *mestizos* into this racial project. Whether through legal argument or by appealing to the worth of racial minorities as community members, Californios' discourse sought to marry their citizenship traditions with those of the American delegates. Similarly, in the debates over the recognition of the Spanish language, Californios only demanded language accommodation insofar as it would accelerate their assimilation into the new state. In some cases, Californios succeeded in crafting compromise, while in others they were forced to assimilate into American traditions of citizenship.

Nevertheless, as California historian Leonard Pitt notes, "the Californios gave every indication of feeling reasonably satisfied with the Constitution of 1849."<sup>80</sup> Despite the changes brought by the Mexican-American War and the Gold Rush, Californios' discourse in the Constitutional Convention of 1849 signaled that, at the very least, the Californio elite still enjoyed a place of relative worth and respect in California society, a position that justified accommodation rather than forcible assimilation. But the practical failure of most of the

compromises Californios attempted to craft with American delegates also demonstrated the inherent limitations of their compromise citizenship. As Homi Bhabha notes, “the desire to emerge as ‘authentic’ through mimicry—through a process of writing and repetition—is the final irony of partial representation.”<sup>81</sup> In other words, by striking compromises in their rhetorical form, their traditions, and the parameters of their citizenship, Californios were only able, at the most, to achieve a “partial representation.” By crafting a negotiated citizenship that was almost, but not quite, Californios only sought partial recognition as political subjects and surrendered their right to belong on their own terms.

In sum, this case study outlines the tensions underlying citizenship in the nineteenth century in both Mexico and the United States, and it illustrates how those tensions clashed in the interactions of the two groups on the Western frontier. American citizenship was comprised of a racial project that limited citizenship to white, Christian, men of European descent. Furthermore, analysis of the Convention debates demonstrates how Mexican and Californian traditions of citizenship collided, and how Californios struck a compromise model of American citizenship out of this conflict. This case study provides a window into one of the first moments in which Latina/os (in this case, Latinos) negotiated their citizenship in the United States. As such, one conclusion drawn from this case study is its challenge to many scholarly understandings of Latina/o cultural citizenship. Research on Latina/o citizenship can exhibit a presentist bias, focusing on contemporary enactments and contributing to the presumption that Latina/o citizenship is a recent phenomenon rather than an ongoing struggle endemic to Latina/os’ positions in the U.S.<sup>82</sup> Recent volumes on Latina/o citizenship, such as those by William Flores and Suzanne Oboler, demonstrate this focus on contemporary enactments rather than on tracing the evolution of Latina/o citizenship over time.<sup>83</sup> Studies in the social movement rhetoric of

Latina/os also often situate Latina/o social empowerment beginning in the 1950s or 1960s with Mexican-American or Chicana/o social movements.<sup>84</sup> Yet Californios' nineteenth century compromise citizenship illustrates that Latina/o groups have been struggling to negotiate the terms of citizenship perhaps as long as they have been part of the U.S. Latina/os have been evolving agents in shaping American history. Of course, the number of Californios who were able to exercise a degree of agency in the Convention debates was infinitesimal in comparison to the number of Californios wholly marginalized in the new state. Though the eight Californio delegates were diverse in occupation and county of origin, almost all were members of the landed and wealthy rancho class. Nevertheless, this case study complicates the neat narrative that underlies much scholarship on Latina/o citizenship by showing that the trajectory of Latina/o political mobilization is much more complex.

Partly because of their social and economic position in the new state and partly because of the citizenship traditions which they brought to the Convention, the Californios molded and adapted to American citizenship by striking compromises. Their rhetoric suggests their goal was to achieve legal recognition as citizens and to secure the political rights entailed in membership in a national community (e.g., suffrage, political office). In contrast to later conceptions of citizenship I will discuss, such as border citizenship (Chapter 3) or hybrid citizenship (Chapter 4), the Californios had to be recognized as members of the national community first, before they could challenge the conventions of American citizenship. Furthermore, Californios struggled for legal and political citizenship before they sought full citizenship in social and symbolic terms. Because they were a recently conquered minority group, Californios could not channel their citizenship discourse into a more radical rhetorical form, like later groups; instead the Californios



negotiated citizenship through elite public debate and deliberation, forms of discourse prevalent at the time.<sup>85</sup>

In conclusion, this case study provides a window into one of the first moments in which Latina/os negotiated their citizenship in the United States. Though the term “melting pot” itself was not coined until the early twentieth century, the connection between Americanism and assimilation structured Californio struggles for U.S. citizenship.<sup>86</sup> Californios’ citizenship discourse in the Constitutional Convention of 1849 illustrates that the struggle endemic to citizenship between inclusion (assimilation) and exclusion has always been a tenuous one for Latina/os. A little over a century later, in the 1960s, demographic and societal changes contributed to a very different position for Latina/os in the Southwest. In the radical climate of the time, Latina/o citizens looked critically at their legal, social, and political position in the United States and began to clamor for full recognition as members of the national community. The struggles of one particular group of Latina/o citizens for political and social recognition—*La Alianza Federal de Mercedes Reales* and its leader Reies López Tijerina—are the subject of the next chapter. Through his social movement, Tijerina crafted a very different discourse of citizenship—a *border citizenship* that “migrated” between identification with and radical rejection of American citizenship traditions.

## Notes for Chapter 2

1. Though to our modern sensibilities the term “American” more broadly refers to inhabitants of the Western hemisphere, whether North, Central, or South America, to nineteenth century ears “American” was explicitly used to reference citizens of the United States. Similarly, though in the United States the term “Yankee” referenced residents of northern states, for other countries “Yankee” quickly became a shorthand reference to United States citizens. Therefore, in this chapter I will resort to the nineteenth century usage of these words, not to authorize them, but because they provide easier terms of reference that distinguish citizens of the United States (Americans) from citizens of Mexico living in California pre and post granting of U.S. citizenship (Californios). See Greenberg, *Manifest Manhood and*

*the Antebellum American Empire*, 234-37; Leonard Pitt, *The Decline of the Californios: A Social History of the Spanish-Speaking Californians, 1846-1890* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1966).

2. J Ross Browne, *Report of the Debates in the Convention of California on the Formation of the State Constitution, in September and October, 1849* (Washington, DC: John T. Towers, 1850), 22. The proceedings of the California Constitutional Convention of 1849 were written and compiled by J. Ross Browne, a printer elected by the delegates to serve as the convention reporter. In the tradition of eighteenth and nineteenth century constitutional conventions, Browne recorded the debates and proceedings of the convention instead of creating a complete transcript. At times Browne recorded the delegates' speeches and comments in the first person voice, but at other times he recorded speeches in third person, referencing (and sometimes summarizing) what the delegates stated on the convention floor. For the most part, Browne recorded all the delegates' comments, but at times the debates or speeches were abridged or summarized in the proceedings (particularly when Browne felt they had dragged on too long or they were too repetitive). In fact, these peculiar narrative techniques characterized many convention proceedings in the eighteenth and nineteenth century, as it seems that the convention report was much more common (and perhaps more feasible) than a complete transcript. See, for example, Georgia Constitutional Convention, *Journal of the Public and Secret Proceedings of the Convention of the People of Georgia Held in Milledgeville and Savannah in 1861, Together with the Ordinances Adopted* (Milledgeville, GA: Boughton, Nisbet & Barnes, 1861); United States Constitutional Convention (1787), *Secret Proceedings and Debates of the Convention Assembled at Philadelphia, in the Year 1787, for the Purpose of Forming the Constitution of the United States of America* (Cincinnati: A. Mygatt, 1838); New York State Constitutional Convention (1821), *Journal of the Convention of the State of New York Begun and Held at the Capitol in the City of Albany, on the Twenty-Eighth Day of August, 1821* (Albany: Cantine & Leake, 1821). Though there is no way to tell how historically accurate Browne's notes of the convention speeches are, we can suppose that his document was regarded as trustworthy, since it was approved by the federal Congress. Moreover, modern historians widely rely on this report as a faithful record of the convention proceedings. Joseph R. Grodin, Calvin R. Massey, and Richard B. Cunningham, *The California State Constitution: A Reference Guide* (Westport, CN: Greenwood Press, 1993). In this document, I will keep these peculiar narrative techniques intact to avoid too many changes to the proceedings.

3. As noted in Chapter 1, legal traditions of citizenship operate from a contractual perspective where legal membership in a nation state entails responsibilities and rights for the citizen. As Kuklinski summarizes, under this contractual tradition of citizenship (rooted in political philosophers like John Locke, Thomas Hobbes, and John Rawls) "separate individuals" enter into a "social contract" and become "passive citizens." James H. Kuklinski, *Thinking About Political Psychology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 91. I draw on this contractual tradition of citizenship in my use of the phrase *compromise citizenship*. Ultimately, the Californios sought inclusion into the "social contract" of American citizenship at the most basic level (i.e., legal recognition under a constitution).

4. For scholars of negotiation and group decision-making, a "compromise contract" is a legal agreement that is crafted out of a series of negotiations or bargains on successive issues or subsets of issues. Small negotiations and concessions build, and the "package evolves and gains in complexity" until the final terms of the agreement are reached. Howard Raiffa, *Negotiation Analysis: The Science and Art of Collaborative Decision Making* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap, 2002), 277. This process of compromise characterizes the Californios' discourse of citizenship in the Constitutional Convention of 1849, for they sought accommodation of Mexican and Californio citizenship traditions under a legally binding document (a constitution).

5. Historical scholarship on the California Constitutional Convention of 1849 elaborates both the political/cultural changes of the mid-nineteenth century that influenced the Convention as well as the Convention's role in the history of the Mexican population of California. For several examples of this historical work see: Peter T. Conmy, *The Constitutional Beginnings of California* (San Francisco: Dolores

Press, 1959); Donald E. Hargis, "Native Californians in the Constitutional Convention of 1849," *Southern California Quarterly* 36 (1954).

6. Zarefsky, "Four Senses of Rhetorical History," 29.

7. Ibid. See, for examples, Martin J. Medhurst, "Eisenhower's 'Atoms for Peace' Speech: A Case Study in the Strategic Use of Language," *Communication Monographs* 54 (1987); Lester C. Olson, "Benjamin Franklin's Pictorial Representations of the British Colonies in America: A Study in Rhetorical Iconology," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 73 (1987); David Zarefsky, *Lincoln, Douglas, and Slavery: In the Crucible of Public Debate* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990).

8. Ernest J. Wraga, "Public Address: A Study in Social and Intellectual History," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 33 (1947).

9. James Jasinski, "A Constitutive Framework for Rhetorical Historiography: Toward an Understanding of the Discursive (Re)Constitution Of 'Constitution' In the Federalist Papers," in *Doing Rhetorical History: Concepts and Cases*, ed. Kathleen J. Turner (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1998), 91, 73. In a broad sense, constitutive rhetoric is a perspective that recognizes rhetoric does more than seek to persuade or influence thought. The constitutive perspective argues that the speaker, the audience, and the context are not extra-rhetorical, which is to say rhetoric shapes the identity of the speaker and of the audience and their understanding of the context in which they are situated. In other words, the constitutive perspective posits that rhetoric interpellates audiences and filters understandings of the world. Edwin Black, "The Second Persona," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 56 (1970); Charland, "Constitutive Rhetoric.;" McGee, "In Search of 'the People.'" While the most recognized aspect of the constitutive perspective revolves around the role of rhetoric in creating subjectivity and identity, there are other implications to the constitutive perspective for rhetorical and historical scholars. As Jasinski notes, "discourse functions to organize and structure an individual's or a culture's experience of time and space, the norms of political culture and the experience of communal existence (including collective identity), and the linguistic resources of the culture (including, in particular, the stock of fundamental political concepts that shape the culture's understanding of political existence)." Jasinski, "A Constitutive Framework for Rhetorical Historiography," 77. A constitutive corrective to the instrumental tradition of rhetorical history is important to build our knowledge not just of how public address responded and reacted to its political and intellectual context, but to get at how that discourse shaped the tradition and context of its origin. Thus in this chapter I want to study not just how California delegates' rhetoric was instrumental at the time of the California Constitutional Convention, but also how it was constitutive of a new compromise type of citizenship that entailed negotiations and compromise with the era's dominant racial project.

10. John M. Murphy, "The Language of the Liberal Consensus: John F. Kennedy, Technical Reason, and The 'New Economics' At Yale University," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 90 (2004).

11. James Jasinski, "The Forms and Limits of Prudence in Henry Clay's (1850) Defense of the Compromise Measures," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 81 (1995). To be clear, I do not wish to portray the perspective of "rhetorical history" as a monolithic school or project of rhetorical criticism. What I mean to show is that rhetorical history is a stream of research in rhetorical studies whose scholars share certain commitments to textual criticism, contextual analysis, and building grounded theory. Certainly, differences exist within this approach. For example, while John Murphy is often more committed to the material context in which the discourse took shape (e.g., political, economic, and social context), Jasinski often focuses more on the intellectual context of the rhetoric (e.g., prevalent philosophical or intellectual trends). Nonetheless, both scholars attempt to trace the intersection of public address, history, and intellectual history. This, I think, provides common elements that provide a perspective of rhetorical history.

12. Dilip Parameshwar Gaonkar, "The Oratorical Text: The Enigma of Arrival," in *Texts in Contexts*, ed. Michael C. Leff and Fred J. Kauffeld (Davis, CA: Hermagoras Press, 1989), 268.

13. Murphy, "The Language of the Liberal Consensus," 135-6.

14. The term “performative tradition” is one used by Jasinski to encapsulate the politico-philosophical ideas, beliefs, and practices of a certain time period which serve as both constraints and resources for rhetors to shape and mold in their public address. In this study I use the term deliberately, since many of the practices of citizenship in the mid nineteenth century were eminently performative (in the sense of being enactments or stagings of citizenship). James Jasinski, “Instrumentalism, Contextualism, and Interpretation in Rhetorical Criticism,” in *Rhetorical Hermeneutics: Invention and Interpretation in the Age of Science*, ed. Alan G. Gross and William M. Keith (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1997). For more on performativity from a “postmodern” perspective see Judith Butler, *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*, 2 ed. (New York: Routledge, 1999).

15. Honig, *Democracy and the Foreigner*.

16. Omi and Winant, *Racial Formation in the United States*, 55.

17 Olson, *The Abolition of White Democracy*.

18. Ibid., 79. To be clear, I will not fully trace the legacy of the racial project of nineteenth century America. Tracing the evolution of nineteenth century racial categories and their instantiation in politics and law is beyond the scope of this focused study. However, I will use the work of other historical and rhetorical scholars to describe one element of this racial project—American citizenship—and how Californios crafted a compromise, contractual rhetoric of citizenship in response.

19. Omi and Winant, *Racial Formation in the United States*, 65.

20. Kenneth Burke, *Language as Symbolic Action: Essays on Life, Literature, and Method* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1966).

21. Historian Hubert Howe Bancroft provides an extensive catalog of the delegates, their places of origin, and personal histories. See Hubert Howe Bancroft, *History of California*, vol. 6 (Santa Barbara, CA: W. Heberd, 1963).

22. To be sure, the compromise was not equal and even at all times. While white settlers were forced to compromise to some extent on land grants and language because of the presence of Californio delegates, the Californios were in the minority and, as such, often faced subtle racism and exclusion from the American delegates. Grodin et al., *The California State Constitution*, 4.

23. The election of eight Californio delegates in the 1849 Convention was a significant departure from the overall trend of political and economic usurpation that had been underway since the signing of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo. The Californio delegates to the Convention were, in the words of historian Leonard Pitt, “esteem[ed] not merely ‘of their own kind’ but of Yankees, too.” While they were not unanimously accepted by the majority Anglo delegation, they strongly represented their ethnic and cultural heritage as well as their social status. Their unanimity made them a formidable voting block. Pitt, *The Decline of the Californios*, 43.

24. Pitt, *The Decline of the Californios*, 43, 44.

25. Pitt describes several of these cultural stereotypes that contributed to tensions between Californios and Americans, including stereotypes concerning race, religion, and culture. See Pitt, *The Decline of the Californios*, Chapter 1.

26. Cardinal Leonidas Goodwin, *The Establishment of State Government in California 1846-1850* (New York: Macmillan, 1914), Chapter 1. W. W. Robinson chronicles a number of American and European settlers who had been naturalized into Mexican citizenship and thus given rights of land and political rights. W. W. Robinson, *Land in California, the Story of Mission Lands, Ranchos, Squatters, Mining Claims, Railroad Grants, Land Scrip [and] Homesteads* (Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1948), 59-69. Of course, the relative number of American settlers in California in the early nineteenth century was small enough to cause little alarm among the Californios. But beginning in the 1840s the number of migrants grew to such an extent that they began to threaten Mexican control of the region.

27. Amy Greenberg argues that by the mid nineteenth century, “Manifest Destiny’s discourse had become largely martial in tone, nurtured by scientific race theory and a growing acceptance that the imaginary race of American ‘Anglo-Saxons’ was destined to dominate lesser races.” Greenberg, *Manifest*

*Manhood and the Antebellum American Empire*, 21. It was believed that America's destiny was to tame the wilderness (the West) and subjugate its feminized and racialized natives. This notion of manifest destiny, according to Greenberg, dovetailed with an equally racialized and gendered notion of the American citizen.

28. In nineteenth century parlance, filibusters were American citizens who formed private armies that attempted the 'liberation' and take over of countries throughout Central America. They were part of popular movements at the time which sought to extend America's reach throughout the Western hemisphere as part of Manifest Destiny. Greenberg, *Manifest Manhood and the Antebellum American Empire*, 29. The Bear Flaggers' leader John C. Frémont began the revolt against the Mexican provincial government, and this fighting embroiled California in the ongoing Mexican-American War. Greenberg, *Manifest Manhood and the Antebellum American Empire*, Chapter 1; Goodwin, *The Establishment of State Government in California*, Chapter 1.

29. Conmy, *The Constitutional Beginnings of California*. Technically speaking, Articles VIII and IX of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo concerned the citizenship rights of Mexican citizens within the ceded territories. Article VIII provided Mexican citizens the choice of whether to take on American citizenship or retain their Mexican citizenship, but if the choice was not made within a year, all Mexican citizens would thenceforth be considered American citizens. Article IX called on the federal government to grant citizenship to all those Mexicans who chose to take on their newly granted citizenship, and it extended rights and protections to those newly assimilated Mexicans.

30. Quoted in *Ibid.*, 5. American governors of California during the period increasingly emphasized the Californios' place as citizens in American land. After the raising of the Stars and Stripes in Monterrey on July 7, 1846, Commodore John D. Sloat made clear what the symbol meant: "I declare to the inhabitants of California that although in arms with a powerful force, I do not come among them as an enemy to California, but on the contrary I come as their best friend, as henceforward California will be a portion of the United States . . . and its inhabitants will enjoy the same rights and privileges as the citizens of any other portion of that nation." Quoted in Hubert Howe Bancroft, *History of California*, vol. 5 (Santa Barbara, CA: W. Heberd, 1963), 234-37. Almost a year later on March 1, 1847, Commodore Stephen W. Kearney's proclamation, again appealing to the symbolic power of the flag, marked the supposed integration between Californios and Anglos, who represented the new American future. Kearney noted: "the Star Spangled Banner floats over California, and as long as the sun continues to shine upon her, so long will it float there over the natives of the land, as well as others who have found a home in her bosom. . . . The Americans and Californios, are now but one people; let us cherish one with, [sic] one hope, and let that be for the peace and quiet of our country. Let us as a band of brothers invite and emulate each other in our exertion to benefit and improve this our [sic] beautiful, and which soon must be our happy and prosperous home." Quoted in *Ibid.*, 438-39.

31. Pitt, *The Decline of the Californios*, 42-43.

32. Though the eight Californio delegates formed a sort of block in the convention, they shared as many differences as similarities. Seven of the eight delegates were native Californios, having been born in the province before U.S. occupation. But one delegate—Miguel de Pedrorena—was a Spanish-born immigrant. Seven of the eight delegates were *criollo* class; that is, they were light skinned descendants of Spanish colonizers. But, one of the delegates—Manuel Dominguez of Los Angeles—was a *mestizo* (mixed-race Indian and white) farmer. The delegates also differed in economic and social class; several were prominent lawyers, politicians, or military men, while others were traders and farmers. Recognizing these drastic differences between the Californio delegates, their act of solidarity early in the convention is even more striking.

33. Browne, *Report of the Debates in the Convention of California on the Formation of the State Constitution, in September and October, 1849*, 20. I will use parenthetical citations to reference quotations from the convention proceedings. All subsequent quotations are from this document, unless otherwise noted.

34. Pitt, *The Decline of the Californios*, 43.

35. Since parts of the Convention debates were abridged or excluded from the proceedings, it is difficult to tell to whom Carrillo intended to respond with his comments. See *supra* note 2.

36. The Californios elected to the Constitutional Convention were, for the most part, white, wealthy, land-owning *criollos*. “By 1846,” summarizes Pitt, a select group of families “of substance, influence, or political power ruled California,” possessing sometimes up to several hundred thousand acres of land each. Pitt, *The Decline of the Californios*, 10. This land grant system contributed to the concentrated population of pueblos (mostly clergymen, artisans, laborers, and Indians) in contrast to wealthy rancheros with large tracts of land. As a result of these conditions, the immense wealth disparity often exacerbated hierarchies of citizenship in California, where landed and influential men enjoyed more citizenship rights (such as the right to political office) than poor Indians or mestizos, who lived in the pueblos with little or no land. Thus it is difficult to speculate about how faithfully the Californio elites elected to the Constitutional Convention were representing the will of their “constituents,” most of which did not own land and/or were of mixed race. Nevertheless, Mexican traditions of *vecindad* also formally governed citizenship in California.

37. I could go into more detail about the specific constitutional developments that led to these changes, but they are not entirely central to the purpose of this chapter. Nevertheless, two significant documents contributed to the structure of Mexican citizenship in the nineteenth century: the Spanish Constitution of 1812 and the Mexican Constitution of 1835. In a sense these documents had opposing impacts, as the Cádiz Constitution of 1812 (when applied to Mexico before independence) solidified the regional pueblo structure and corporatist political influence, while the Mexican Constitution of 1835 (really a series of modifications to the 1824 constitution) attempted to centralize power and authority in the national government. Tellingly, the result of these attempts to centralize power in the mid nineteenth century was a string of revolutions, including the rebellion of Texas, which led to the Mexican-American War. In a sense, General Santa Ana’s failed attempts to consolidate his power as Mexican president simply confirmed the power of the pueblos and the regional governments in the Mexican system. Leticia Reina, Elisa Servín, and John Tutino, “Introduction: Crises, Reforms, and Revolutions in Mexico, Past and Present,” in *Cycles of Conflict, Centuries of Change: Crisis, Reform, and Revolution in Mexico*, ed. Elisa Servín, Leticia Reina, and John Tutino (Durham: Duke University Press, 2007).

38. François-Xavier Guerra, “Mexico from Independence to Revolution: The Mutations of Liberalism,” in *Cycles of Conflict, Centuries of Change: Crisis, Reform, and Revolution in Mexico*, ed. Elisa Servín, Leticia Reina, and John Tutino (Durham: Duke University Press, 2007), 134.

39. Federica Morelli, “Entre El Antiguo Y El Nuevo Régimen. La Historia Política Hispanoamericana Del Siglo Xix,” *Historia Crítica* 33 (2007), 135. The translation of these passages is mine. Following is the published Spanish passage from which the quotations are drawn: “La ciudadanía del siglo XIX está estrechamente relacionada con la antigua noción ibérica de *vecindad*, es decir, a una concepción esencialmente territorial y jurídica de la identidad, ligada a los valores de las culturas locales, a la comunidad en la cual el sujeto trabaja y ejerce su acción política, social y cultural<sup>25</sup>. Este vínculo entre libertades antiguas y modernas provoca una difusión masiva y casi irreversible de la ciudadanía, no sólo porque ésta no es controlada por el Estado, pero sobre todo porque, como lo evidenciaron muy bien los trabajos de Antonio Annino, es introducida por las elites coloniales -entre 1821 y 1824, durante la Revolución liberal española- antes incluso de la formación de la República. Esta distancia dramática entre ciudadanía y república es un aspecto que opone a Europa y a la América hispánica.”

40. Herzog eloquently explains this process of enacting one’s citizenship (as opposed to receiving recognition through the law) that characterized Spanish American political culture: “unlike today, early modern categories of belonging were not embodied in legal definitions or in acts of authority. Instead they were generated by the ability to use rights or to be forced to comply with duties. . . . By enacting the role of citizen or native they created a public image that they were citizens or natives, and this image in turn allowed them to become citizens or natives.” I believe Herzog’s description of this localized

citizenship helps to elucidate the Mexican tradition of the *vecindad*. Tamar Herzog, *Defining Nations: Immigrants and Citizens in Early Modern Spain and Spanish America* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003), 4-5.

41. With respect to suffrage, the local nature of nineteenth century Mexican citizenship (and the persistent conflict between local autonomy and centralized authority) becomes even clearer. The power to grant voting rights to particular individuals rested with local councils rather than the national government, though there were a few general requirements stipulated in the constitution (such as literacy and the ownership of property). Elections for the highest federal offices, like president were often conducted by electors subject to more stringent qualifications stipulated by the federal government. In this way the pueblos and the government in Mexico City played out their struggle for authority.

42. California had always been a detached part of the Spanish Empire, and Mexican independence in 1823 did not change its status as a peripheral territory (often called the Siberia of Mexico). Though Californios recognized their sense of independence from southern Mexico, many of the political and cultural changes going on in Mexico during the time impacted California. Throughout the nineteenth century California maintained its detached status. Mexican leaders recognized its strategic and political importance to the new country, but the new government had significant trouble trying to foster national unity in the southern portion of the Republic, and thus California never became fully culturally integrated into lower Mexico. Raymond B. Craib, *Cartographic Mexico: A History of State Fixations and Fugitive Landscapes* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2004). Like in other regions in Mexico, the Mexicans in California had a strong sense of political and cultural autonomy, which they sought to demonstrate to their national government. California's "geographical and political isolation bred provincialism," summarizes historian Leonard Pitt; so much so, that "the local nomenclature changed, until the native-born ceased calling themselves *Españoles* or *Mexicanos* and began to insist on the name *Californios*." Pitt, *The Decline of the Californios*, 2, 7.

43. Liberal traditions of citizenship took a different shape in New Spain, which, throughout its early history (from colonization to independence in 1821), had been characterized by a corporatist and regional structure. Political culture took shape through city councils (*cabildos*) or provincial governments (*ayuntamientos*), and often expansive administrative and judicial powers rested with the local governor or magistrate (*alcalde*). In addition to a primarily regional governmental structure, groups of society congregated into corporations that shared common political and social interests, such as the military, the clergy, artisans, and so forth. The role of the colonial government often became one of regulating and mediating these regional governments and corporate institutions. Even into the nineteenth century "relations between state and society remained negotiations between liberal states in formation and corporate institutions under assault, but unwilling to disappear." Reina, Servín, and Tutino, "Introduction," 7. This regional and corporate legacy influenced the development of liberal citizenship in Mexico throughout the nineteenth century, for citizenship became "closely tied to this other history of communities seeking autonomy" rather than to a national political structure. Antonio Annino, "The Two-Faced Janus: The Pueblos and the Origins of Mexican Liberalism," in *Cycles of Conflict, Centuries of Change: Crisis, Reform, and Revolution in Mexico*, ed. Elisa Servín, Leticia Reina, and John Tutino (Durham: Duke University Press, 2007), 61. While in the United States the nineteenth century saw tensions between exclusion and inclusion in citizenship, in nineteenth century Mexico citizenship became a source for conflict between pueblo autonomy and federal power, between expansion and contraction.

44. Mid-nineteenth century debates centered around whether the states or the federal government "had ultimate authority over who could claim state and national citizenship rights." These tensions, of course, intimated the coming Civil War in the latter half of the century. Smith, *Civic Ideals*, 226. Despite these tensions, America's Jacksonian era (1820s-1850s, roughly) is often regarded as a time of great political, cultural, and economic growth. It saw the westward expansion of the Union to the Pacific Ocean, the strengthening of the executive branch of the federal government, and the growth of public participation in American politics. In fact, the political culture of the time is the subject of Alexis de

Tocqueville's famous *Democracy in America*, a chronicle of his journeys through the country in 1831-1832. See Glenn C. Altschuler and Stuart M. Blumin, "Limits of Political Engagement in Antebellum America: A New Look at the Golden Age of Participatory Democracy," *The Journal of American History* 84 (1997).

45. Smith, *Civic Ideals*, Chapter 8. Alexis De Tocqueville himself commented on the "great political movement" characterizing America: "the political activity prevailing in the United States is something one could never understand unless one had seen it." Alexis de Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*, ed. J. P. Mayer, trans. George Lawrence (New York: Harper & Row, 1969), 242. Several factors contributed to increased debate, discussion, and political involvement during the time period, including the growth of print newspapers, debating clubs, and other avenues of public discourse. For further scholarship on the rise of public deliberation, discussion, and information during this time period see: Angela G. Ray, *The Lyceum and Public Culture in the Nineteenth-Century United States* (East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 2005); Angela G. Ray, "The Permeable Public: Rituals of Citizenship in Antebellum Men's Debating Clubs," *Argumentation & Advocacy* 41 (2004); Michael Schudson, *The Good Citizen: A History of American Civic Life* (New York: Martin Kessler Books, 1998).

46. Altschuler and Blumin, "Limits of Political Engagement in Antebellum America."

47. The writings of early twentieth century philosopher and historian Josiah Royce express this sentiment of Manifest Destiny in the California context. Royce believed that the character and culture of early Californians "represented" the American "national character." Nineteenth century Californians embodied both the "failings and new strength" of the still-forming American national spirit because they "exhibited a novel degree of carelessness and overhastiness [sic]" in their striving for wealth and prestige, but they also exemplified energy and courageousness of the frontier spirit. Thus mid-nineteenth century American Californians saw themselves as the natural heirs to the Western frontier. Josiah Royce, *California: From the Conquest in 1846 to the Second Vigilance Committee in San Francisco: A Study of American Character* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1948), 3; Josiah Royce, *Race Questions, Provincialism, and Other American Problems* (New York: Macmillan, 1908).

48. Smith, *Civic Ideals*, 242.

49. *Ibid.*, 198. See also Schudson, *The Good Citizen*, Chapter 3. To be fair, this same exclusionary tendency in the era's politics is arguably also noted by de Tocqueville in his discussion of the dangers of majority tyranny. de Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*, 259-61.

50 The role of martial patriarchy in these popular conceptions of American Manifest Destiny are noted by Greenberg, who argues that it was through feminization and racialization of indigenous people and Mexicans that the westward expansion of the United States was justified. Greenberg, *Manifest Manhood and the Antebellum American Empire*. This is a point made more concrete by Mónica Russel y Rodríguez, who specifically shows how a lust for domination over the Mexicana body by white American men formed a central justification for the colonization and subjugation of Mexico in the Mexican-American War. Mónica Russel y Rodríguez, "Mexicanas and Mongrels: Policies of Hybridity, Gender and Nation in the Us-Mexican War," *Latino Studies Journal* 11 (2000). Another connection between racial hierarchy and gender oppression in the mid nineteenth century lies in the U.S. and Mexico's patriarchal citizenship policies. Gabriel Gutiérrez analyzes the intersection of racial and gender oppression in Spanish-Mexican land policy in the mid-nineteenth century, showing how non-whites and women were often conflated and marginalized both socially and institutionally. Gabriel Gutiérrez, "Affirmative Action of the First Kind: Social and Legal Constructions of Whiteness and White Male Privilege in Nineteenth-Century California," *Latino Studies Journal* 11 (2000). This gendered dimension of citizenship is one that takes a background in my analysis, though not because it lacks importance, but because, while Californios and Americans debated the relationship of race and citizenship, the exclusive connection between maleness and citizenship went unquestioned. Though the delegates did debate some provisions (such as the rights of women to own property) that demonstrated there was some view of the role of women in public society, women were never considered to be worthy of full citizenship. This is



evidenced by the fact that, though there was a mestizo delegate to the constitutional convention, there was no female delegate. In sum, there was no compromise or negotiation over the patriarchal elements of Mexican and American citizenship.

51. Paradoxically, the racialized, exclusionary traditions of U.S. citizenship in the mid-nineteenth century also, arguably, help explain the growing franchisement of white men and northern European immigrants at the time. In a way, the racialized/sexualized beliefs about American Manifest Destiny and citizenship formed a pillar of Jacksonian democracy. This lent credence to efforts to expand citizenship rights to all white men (even naturalized northern European, Anglo-Saxon immigrants), because citizenship status became intricately tied with white, male identity. See Smith, *Civic Ideals*. This is a point further developed by Mae Ngai, who argues that white identity was, by all intents and purposes, solidified in the nineteenth century through racism against blacks, Hispanics, and Asians. Ngai, *Impossible Subjects*.

52. To be fair, much historical scholarship has documented the ways in which this Mexican system of citizenship contributed to racial hierarchy and the subjugation of indigenous people more than it allowed for their empowerment. As Gutiérrez notes, “during the Mexican period[,] non-assimilating Indians and *mestizos* were marginalized from access to power while those who assimilated were more readily accepted, albeit patronized, for productive roles in society.” Gutiérrez, “Affirmative Action of the First Kind,” 17. Thus one cannot overemphasize the Mexican tradition of citizenship as a progressive one in relation to American traditions of the time; both excluded indigenous people and people of African descent from citizenship, though they did so in different ways. Nevertheless, the flexibility of a designation like *gente de razón* illustrates that the Mexican system of citizenship was based more on social/economic hierarchy than strict racial categorization. It also illustrates that racial and ethnic status was more “ambiguous” in Mexico, resulting in “the need for social and ideological distinctions.” *Ibid.*, 16.

53. Annino, “The Two-Faced Janus,” 63.

54. Pitt, *The Decline of the Californios*, Chapter 1.

55. Homi K. Bhabha, *The Location of Culture* (London: Routledge, 1994), 122. To mimic or imitate the dominant discourses of the colonial power entails, in a sense, “‘normalizing’ the colonial state or subject” creating an “excess or slippage.” Mimicry of white, American citizenship by Californio delegates became “transformed into an uncertainty which fixes the colonial subject as a ‘partial’ presence . . . both ‘incomplete’ and ‘virtual.’” *Ibid.*, 123. In other words, by mimicking white U.S. citizenship, the Californios created “slippage” in the colonial, racial categories of U.S. citizenship.

56. Californios’ rhetoric of compromise and mimicry shares much with the citizenship discourses of women and African Americans in Antebellum America. Susan Zaeske, among other scholars, has shown that, even before attaining full suffrage, women enacted their citizenship through a variety of strategies including anti-slavery petitions which borrowed from the moral language of male society. Zaeske, *Signatures of Citizenship*. Like the discourse of women’s abolitionist petitions, Californios used moral argument to mimic and appropriate the values of dominant culture. Likewise, Kurt Wilson has shown how prominent black orators of the nineteenth century like Frederick Douglass used imitation of white culture as a strategy for attaining civil rights. Kurt H. Wilson, “The Racial Politics of Imitation in the Nineteenth Century,” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 89 (2003). Similarly, Californios constructed a compromise rhetorical strategy that mimicked the language of the American delegates (e.g., their continual reference to their “constituents”) and married it with elements of their cultural traditions. In a sense, the Californios used a similar strategy of accommodation to secure rights and protections in the new government. Further tracing these similarities between nineteenth century discourses may provide for common topoi or a common genre of minority citizenship discourse in the mid nineteenth century. For more on appropriation as a contemporary strategy of counter-hegemony see Helene A. Shugart, “Counterhegemonic Acts: Appropriation as a Feminist Rhetorical Strategy,” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 83 (1997).

57. Chaim Perelman and Lucie Olbrechts-Tyteca, *The New Rhetoric: A Treatise on Argumentation* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1969), 116.

58. This concession to the racism inherent in American citizenship was even more evident in de la Guerra's condemnation of Americans and Mexicans of African descent. He concluded that, "if by the word 'white,' it was intended to exclude the African race, then it was correct and satisfactory." Browne, *Report of the Debates in the Convention of California on the Formation of the State Constitution, in September and October*, 63. His attempts at racial accommodation did not extend to those racial groups which were maligned in Mexican society as well, such as blacks and *mulattoes*. See Annino, "The Two-Faced Janus."

59. Botts' evasion of the question of white identity is what contemporary race scholars would identify as one of the "privileges" of whiteness. Since white identity has long been conceived as the default, natural, and "race-less" ethnicity in contrast to which "colored" people are defined, one of the privileges of being classified as white is the ability to avoid many questions concerning one's racial and ethnic identity. Lisa A. Flores and Dreama G. Moon, "Rethinking Race, Revealing Dilemmas: Imagining a New Racial Subject in Race Traitor," *Western Journal of Communication* 66 (2002); Thomas K. Nakayama and R. L. Krizek, "Whiteness: A Strategic Rhetoric," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 81 (1995).

60. The locus of essence is another argumentative topos described by Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca. The locus of essence accords higher value to those things which embody a true essence, while it disparages those things which are diluted. Thus, Botts implied that only whites had an essence which was worthy of citizenship and suffrage, while racial minorities should be excluded. By appealing to the locus of essence—which Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca describe as a locus, or generally accepted premise—Botts brushed over de la Guerra's subtle challenging of his racial system of categorization. Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca, *The New Rhetoric: A Treatise on Argumentation*, 83-5, 93-4.

61. Pitt, *The Decline of the Californios*.

62. In *The New Rhetoric*, Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca claim that dissociation is a "remodeling [of] our conception of reality" "to remove an incompatibility arising out of the confrontation of one proposition with others." Dissociation breaks apart conceptual unity by redefining and complicating the notion under contestation. Rather than merely separating assumed connections, dissociation reframes the options under consideration. Perelman's and Olbrechts-Tyteca's paradigmatic example of dissociation is the distinction between appearance and reality. Framing a concept as mere appearance devalues it in light of its alternative, reality, since "appearances can be opposed to each other," while "reality is coherent." The effect of this dissociation is to distinguish "those appearances that are deceptive from those that correspond to reality." Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca, *The New Rhetoric*, 411, 416. The Anglo delegates inverted this binary, valuing those Californios who were "apparently" (or only partly) Indian, while excluding from consideration those "real," or full-blooded, Indians. Nevertheless, they enacted dissociation of the category "Indian" by breaking apart its conceptual unity into two pairs.

63. De la Guerra's speech is found in Browne, *Report of the Debates in the Convention of California on the Formation of the State Constitution, in September and October*, 305. All subsequent quotations are drawn from this speech until otherwise noted.

64. Bruce E. Gronbeck, "The Rhetorics of the Past: History, Argument, and Collective Memory," in *Doing Rhetorical History: Concepts and Cases*, ed. Kathleen J. Turner (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1998), 57.

65. Kenneth Burke, *A Grammar of Motives* (New York: G. Braziller, 1955).

66. Browne, *Report of the Debates in the Convention of California on the Formation of the State Constitution, in September and October*, 305. All subsequent quotations are drawn from this speech until otherwise noted.

67. Bhabha, *The Location of Culture*, 123.

68. *Ibid.*, 306. Further examples of this position were expressed by Mr. Steuart, Mr. Sherwood, and others. See *Ibid.*, 305-6. As an aside, this quotation also demonstrates another dimension of the

process of colonial (self) mimicry discussed by Homi Bhabha. By arguing that Indians would capitalize on democratic institutions like free and open elections to destroy those very Enlightenment systems of governance, Hoppe “mocks [their] power to be a model, that power which supposedly makes [them] imitable.” Ibid., 125. In other words, in his obsessive concern to prevent the tyranny of true democracy Hoppe unintentionally uncovered the implicit oligarchy of American democracy.

69. Browne, *Report of the Debates in the Convention of California on the Formation of the State Constitution, in September and October*, 307.

70. Ibid., 273.

71. Pitt, *The Decline of the Californios*, 43.

72. All subsequent quotations until further noted are from Browne, *Report of the Debates in the Convention of California on the Formation of the State Constitution, in September and October*, 273.

73. As I explained previously, Botts’ belief in the preeminence of American culture was connected to the racialized and gendered notions of Manifest Destiny popular at the time. Attendant to this belief in America’s global, providential purpose was the notion that Americans were the best and most perfect of all peoples. Greenberg, *Manifest Manhood and the Antebellum American Empire*.

74. In truth, Jasinski draws this term from Pocock, but he more deliberately explains the rhetorical features of a prudential rhetoric in his essay on Henry Clay’s 1850 compromise address. Jasinski, “The Forms and Limits of Prudence,” 456.

75. Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca, *The New Rhetoric*, 95.

76. All subsequent quotations until further noted are from Ibid., 273.

77. All subsequent quotations until further noted are from Ibid., 274.

78. Pitt, *The Decline of the Californios*, 44.

79. Josiah Royce, a nineteenth century California historian, claimed that “nowhere else were we Americans more affected than [in California], in our lives and conduct, by the feeling that we stood in the position of conquerors in the new land.” Royce, *California*, 2. For a further discussion of these early stereotypes of Californios and how they influenced Anglo attitudes see Ibid., 23-25.

80. Pitt, *The Decline of the Californios*, 46.

81. Bhabha, *The Location of Culture*, 126.

82. Thomas, “How They Ignore Our Rights as American Citizens.”

83. Flores and Benmayor, *Latino Cultural Citizenship*; Oboler, *Latinos and Citizenship*.

84. John C. Hammerback and Richard J. Jensen, “The Rhetorical Worlds of César Chávez and Reijes Tijerina,” *Western Journal of Speech Communication* 44 (1980); John C. Hammerback, Richard J. Jensen, and Jose Angel Gutierrez, *A War of Words: Chicano Protest in the 1960s and 1970s* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1985); John C. Hammerback and Richard J. Jensen, *The Rhetorical Career of César Chávez* (College Station, TX: Texas A&M University Press, 1998).

85. Ray, *The Lyceum and Public Culture*. See supra note 47.

86. The term “melting pot” was coined by Jewish playwright Israel Zangwill whose adaptation of *Romeo & Juliet* entitled *The Melting Pot*, featured a Jewish Russian immigrant who fell in love with a Christian Russian immigrant. The couple was able to move beyond their “old-world” prejudices through their new-world identities as Americans. The popular play debuted in Washington D. C. in 1908. Israel Zangwill, *The Melting Pot: A Drama in Four Acts* (New York: AMS Press, 1969); Philip Gleason, *Speaking of Diversity: Language and Ethnicity in Twentieth-Century America* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992). In his *Letters from an American Farmer*, the French-American writer Hector St. John de Crevecoeur described these powerful forces compelling integration into American culture, forces that impacted Californios’ citizenship discourse in the mid-nineteenth century: “What then is the American, this new man? . . . I could point out to you a family whose grandfather was an Englishman, whose wife was Dutch, whose son married a French woman, and whose present four sons have now four wives of different nations. He is an American, who leaving behind him all his ancient prejudices and manners, receives new ones from the new mode of life he has embraced, the new government he obeys,

and the new rank he holds. He becomes an American by being received in the broad lap of our great Alma Mater. Here individuals of all nations are melted into a new race of men, whose labours and posterity will one day cause great changes in the world.” J. Hector St. John Crevecoeur, *Letters from an American Farmer* (New York: Fox, Duffield, 1782/1904), 54-55.

**CHAPTER 3**  
**BORDER CITIZENSHIP: REIES LÓPEZ TIJERINA AND TESTING THE LIMITS OF**  
**U.S. CITIZENSHIP**

On Saturday night, June 3, 1967, Reies López Tijerina met with about seventy-five members of the organization he had founded—the *Alianza Federál de Mercedes Reales* (Federal Alliance of Land Grants)—“in the back room of an old adobe building” to discuss the groups’ next steps.<sup>1</sup> Over the previous year the organization and its leader Tijerina had increased their influence in New Mexico’s political landscape. Though Tijerina had organized the Alianza in 1963 to lobby for the return of Mexican and Spanish land grants to their original heirs (the same land grants guaranteed by the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo), over the course of four years the Alianza’s mission had expanded along with its influence to include the fight for the civil and cultural rights of Mexican-Americans throughout New Mexico.<sup>2</sup> The Alianza had planned a convention in the small New Mexico town of Coyote for June 3, 1967, but rumors circulated among the general public of the potential for violent resistance, which led New Mexican government officials, particularly District Attorney Alfonso Sanchez, to shut down the meeting and arrest several of the *Aliancistas* (Alianza members).

That night Tijerina and his followers met to discuss what their response to Sanchez’s preemptive crackdown should be. Later, Tijerina would tell one of his biographers that the members who congregated there “were furious like never before.”<sup>3</sup> After all, or so they reasoned, the Alianza had only intended to convene to demand the return of their land and the

protection of their cultural and civil rights. They viewed Sanchez's action as a gross abuse of power. In their anger, the group decided to make a "citizen's arrest" of Sanchez for "tampering [with] and abusing" their "constitutional rights" of assembly.<sup>4</sup> Though Tijerina had given the order to refrain from violence in the citizens' arrest, the Aliancistas raided the courthouse in Tierra Amarilla, New Mexico Monday morning, June 5 in search of Sanchez, and they immediately clashed with law enforcement officials. A shootout ensued, two government officials were wounded, and two others were taken hostage in the Alianza's escape. The ensuing manhunt that led to Tijerina's arrest was the largest in New Mexico's history, and coverage of the raid catapulted Tijerina into the national spotlight. After his acquittal, Tijerina became one of the foremost leaders of the Chicana/o movement, delivering speeches nationwide and conferring with other civil rights leaders.

Because Tijerina was such an influential and controversial figure, even if only for a short time, it is surprising that so little has been written about him and his land grant organization. Apart from a few biographies and scattered sources on Tijerina's contribution to the Chicana/o movement, very little has been said about the polarizing Mexican American leader the media dubbed "King Tiger." Even less has been written about his struggles with U.S. citizenship, a peculiar development since citizenship was such a central problem for Tijerina.<sup>5</sup> Perhaps part of the historical forgetting of Tijerina has to do with his unorthodox tactics, which would lead to multiple imprisonments, the longest span of time being twenty-one months from 1969-1971. However, it is also likely that Tijerina has been a difficult figure to explain in the context of Chicana/o and Latina/o history precisely because his rhetoric and actions present such a contradictory picture.

Though an appeal to U.S. citizenship may seem at odds with some of Tijerina and the Alianza's more unconventional tactics, Tijerina navigated the tensions of U.S. citizenship, between exclusion and inclusion, even in these radical acts. He struggled with the racial project of U. S. citizenship by demanding recognition of the land, political, and cultural rights of "Hispanos."<sup>6</sup> Yet his discourse of citizenship was often in contrast with his radical activism, such as the courthouse raid. To further understand his citizenship discourse in the context of Latina/o struggles with U.S. citizenship, I argue Tijerina constructed a *border citizenship* that continually crossed over the line between integration and separation. Just as Tijerina lived a nomadic life of migration between state and national borders, his rhetoric migrated back and forth across the border between citizen and foreigner. Tijerina constructed, on the one hand, legal and moral appeals for the civil rights of Mexican Americans and, on the other hand, radical and confrontational appeals to ethnic nationalism. This tension in Tijerina's rhetorical project is evidenced in the brief account of the courthouse raid given above—paradoxically, a raid on government agents was purportedly performed in an effort to secure the Alianza's citizenship rights. The migratory and contradictory characteristics of Tijerina's words and work have troubled scholars and biographers, resulting in an, oftentimes, contradictory picture of Tijerina. One of the aims of this chapter, then, is to clarify these tensions by explaining Tijerina's *border citizenship*. A second aim is to show how Tijerina's unique citizenship discourse can both contribute to a historical understanding of Latina/o citizenship and inform contemporary Latina/o struggles.

In the next section, I begin by briefly narrating the events of Tijerina's personal and political life, using them to demonstrate the difficulties found in reconciling the radical and the integrationist Tijerina. Then I discuss scholarship on Tijerina to illustrate the contribution that a

focus on his rhetoric can bring to these studies. The remainder of the chapter analyzes two of Tijerina's writings and one of his speeches to illustrate his discursive enactment of border citizenship, which, I argue, migrated between a radical ethno-nationalist discourse and a reformist civil rights appeal. At times, Tijerina's discourse demanded inclusion *into* conventional political and social dimensions of U.S. citizenship (and shared many similarities with the Californios' compromise citizenship discourse). At other times, Tijerina crafted an oppositional rhetoric that critiqued the exclusivity of U.S. citizenship and constituted Latina/os as a *separate* ethnic and national group. When considered on its own terms, Tijerina's rhetoric can have a significant impact on understandings of Latina/o history and U.S. citizenship.

### **Considering the Life of "King Tiger"**

Reies López Tijerina was born near Falls City, Texas, on September 21, 1926, to Antonio and Erlinda Tijerina. Reies' parents were sharecroppers and migrant laborers; as such, Reies, his six siblings, and his parents moved every year from Texas to Illinois and back again to follow the growing season. In 1934, when he was only seven years old, Tijerina's mother died, which compounded the hardships imposed on his poor family by the Great Depression. Because of this constant traveling, Tijerina only received several months of education at each place before having to join his family in the fields. He abandoned his education after the third grade because an itinerant lifestyle made schooling impossible. Nonetheless, even as a child Tijerina possessed "the art of persuasion," for, as he describes, "they called me *abogado sin libros*, 'lawyer without books.'"<sup>7</sup>

Though raised as a Catholic by his devout mother, Tijerina converted to Protestantism at the age of fifteen when he was evangelized by a Baptist missionary. Religion took an even more important role in his life after his conversion. Tijerina began to make connections between his



new faith and his family's desolate lifestyle, and the Bible strengthened his emerging drive for justice. He notes, "I found all those words [of the Bible] to reach my heart, and learned that mercy and truth could meet."<sup>8</sup> At nineteen he studied at the Latin American Bible Institute, a Pentecostal Bible college in Texas, and, though he did not finish his ministerial training, he began preaching soon afterwards around 1946.

As scholar Rudy Busto summarizes, "Tijerina's itinerant ministry between 1947 and 1955 took him through the Southwest, the Midwest as far north as Saginaw, Michigan, east to Puerto Rican congregations in New York City, and several times to Mexico."<sup>9</sup> Tijerina and his wife Maria traveled, "living from hand to mouth and relying on the generosity of congregations and whomever they met on the road."<sup>10</sup> As he moved, Tijerina's theology grew increasingly more unorthodox; he distrusted the institutional church and what he believed was its latent racism and materialism. Thus, "by 1955," describes Busto, "Tijerina had made a complete break with institutional Christianity." "Gathering around him a band of loyal followers" Tijerina established a utopian religious community in the Arizona desert, which he named the *Valle de Paz* (Valley of Peace).<sup>11</sup> Yet after only two years, Tijerina and his followers were forced to abandon the settlement, and the religious leader moved to New Mexico with his family.<sup>12</sup> Tijerina had attempted to find justice and righteousness by withdrawing from the world and seeking God. But his efforts had failed, and he was forced to return to the world and seek justice through human means.

In the late 1950s and early 1960s, Tijerina gradually channeled his religious zeal and his powerful oratory into political activism. While traveling and preaching throughout northern New Mexico from 1957 through 1963, Tijerina learned of the issue of land grants from disaffected and poor Hispanos in the region. These poor farmers had been dispossessed of their

land—land that had belonged to many of them since before the Mexican American War and which was guaranteed them through the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo. Throughout the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, corporations, factory farms, or wealthy Anglo farmers had taken much of this land through a combination of legal maneuvering and outright violence.<sup>13</sup> Tijerina formed the Alianza in 1963 as an organization to search out and advocate for the holders of these land grants. He also traveled to Mexico and Spain to research and document the land grant issue as much as possible, partly with the intent to file suit against the government over land claims.<sup>14</sup> Over the next three years—fueled by Tijerina’s multimedia rhetorical campaign, which consisted of public speeches, newspaper columns, and a local radio address—the Alianza’s membership grew to over 10,000 members.<sup>15</sup> During this time, Tijerina also wrote letters to local, state, and national government officials, seeking to publicize the Hispanos’ claims to the land.

The Alianza began to move toward “direct action” in the late 1960s.<sup>16</sup> For example, in July 1966 Tijerina led a protest march from Albuquerque to the state capital in Santa Fe, demanding a meeting with the Governor of New Mexico (which Tijerina eventually received). Later that year, in October, the Alianza stormed Echo Amphitheater Park—part of a Spanish land grant that had been absorbed into the Carson National Forest—as a form of protest to the violation of land rights. Tijerina and his group deposed and arrested “trespassing” park rangers, declared the land grant territory an independent nation, and sat as “guardians” until they were removed.<sup>17</sup>

These actions increased Tijerina and the Alianza’s exposure, and their rallies in early 1967 attracted even more attention. Tijerina’s movement also began to draw support from other Chicano activists, such as Rodolfo “Corky” González.<sup>18</sup> With this exposure also came the

increased attention of New Mexican government officials, who worked harder to monitor the organization, its members, and its activities. The government's surveillance antagonized Tijerina, who increasingly spoke of an impending confrontation between the Alianza and the government—between justice and oppression.<sup>19</sup> This led New Mexico District Attorney Alfonso Sanchez to arrest several Alianza members to halt the organization's planned convention in Coyote on June 3. The Alianza's response, of course, was their raid on the Tierra Amarilla courthouse two days later; their stated goal was to place Sanchez under citizens' arrest for violating their constitutional rights of assembly. In the ensuing chaos of the raid, violence erupted between the Alianza and police, and two people were shot. Tijerina became a fugitive and was later arrested. Though he successfully defended himself in the trial over the courthouse raid, Tijerina was later found guilty on charges related to the events at Echo Amphitheater (as well as other charges) and spent twenty-one months in prison.<sup>20</sup>

In between his legal struggles, Tijerina continued to engage in national efforts to publicize Hispanos' land grants and civil rights. In the late 1960s Tijerina engaged in a national speaking tour, conferred with other activists (such as Martin Luther King Jr., Ron Karenga, and Ralph Abernathy), and played a prominent role in the Poor People's March on Washington in the summer of 1968. After his release from prison in 1971, Tijerina continued his activism on behalf of Chicana/o rights. Yet it became clear that "prison had radically transformed" his political vision.<sup>21</sup> After his release, Tijerina focused on a more global political agenda—including protests against Vietnam, nuclearization, and global poverty—that created frictions with major members of the Chicana/o movement who had once supported him.<sup>22</sup> Though his public presence waned, Tijerina's activism continued throughout the 1980s and 1990s. When he was

named “the most influential person in New Mexico History” by the *Albuquerque Journal*, it was primarily his land grand struggle that was deemed worthy of honor.<sup>23</sup>

Because Tijerina is both a fascinating and important figure in the Chicana/o civil rights struggles of the 1960s and 1970s, it is perplexing that he is less well known than other Chicano figures of the time such as César Chávez and Corky González.<sup>24</sup> Scholarly discussion of Tijerina tends to read him into the predominant narrative of Chicana/o history as another of the “Four Horsemen” of the Chicana/o movement.<sup>25</sup> In other words, Tijerina remains a figure (often confined to a paragraph or section) in the larger narrative of the Chicana/o civil rights movement. In the scholarship on Chicana/o and Latina/o rhetoric, Tijerina is even more conspicuously absent in comparison to his more well-known contemporaries.<sup>26</sup>

Apart from developing our understanding of Tijerina’s words and work, this chapter focuses on Tijerina’s rhetoric and its connection to citizenship. Tijerina’s activism was intricately connected to U.S. citizenship, for as he noted in 1968 during his trial for charges relating to the courthouse raid, “I felt New Mexico was the only spot in the southwest where there was a spark of hope for Spanish Americans—where they could make their rights felt in the eyes of the government.”<sup>27</sup> Thus Tijerina argued that a fundamental impetus for his movement had been a struggle with dimensions and tensions of U.S. citizenship. Rather than focusing on narrating Tijerina’s past, explaining his motivations, or interpreting his actions, I analyze Tijerina’s rhetoric of citizenship to tell us more about the specific struggles of the Alianza and about Latina/os’ broader efforts for full U.S. citizenship.<sup>28</sup>

The next section explains the importance of a focus on Tijerina’s rhetoric, and describes the rhetorical texts from Tijerina’s career that I analyze. Then I explain the ways in which Tijerina navigated the borders of U.S. citizenship by migrating between a radical ethno-

nationalist discourse (exclusion) and a reformist civil rights discourse (inclusion). Though Tijerina did not abandon a struggle with U.S. citizenship, he navigated its tensions, not by compromise, but by rhetorically moving back and forth across the borders of inclusion and exclusion. To do justice to Tijerina's role in Latina/o struggles with U.S. citizenship, we must not only come to terms with his contradictory activism, but we must also attend to his complex, border rhetoric.

### **The Importance of Reies and his Rhetoric**

In 1985 rhetorical critics John Hammerback and Richard Jensen noted that “although biographers and scholars chronicled his life and explained his movement . . . Tijerina received no in-depth rhetorical study, nor has the public address which created and built his organization.”<sup>29</sup> Apart from Hammerback and Jensen's work and the work of a few others, their statement is just as true more than twenty years later. This observation is no more conspicuous than when considering the disconnect between Tijerina's reputation as an orator and the lack of attention paid to his public discourse.

Tijerina's status as a “fiery and effective speaker,” a “golden-tongued Spanish-speaking leader of the landless” known for his “oratorical flair,” is widely recognized in both scholarly and biographical treatments.<sup>30</sup> Tijerina “eloquently articulated his points” so much so that they were “delivered with messianic zeal.”<sup>31</sup> Biographer Richard Gardner, in his typical dramatic prose, notes that, while an itinerant preacher, Tijerina possessed “a speaking style that could compel the most skeptical shepherd to come forward with at least a dollar in his hand and his eyes agleam with yearning for instant transmutation from damned to delivered, from lost to found.”<sup>32</sup> Other biographers have compared Tijerina to rhetorical icons as diverse as Stokely Carmichael, Clarence Darrow, Reverend Martin Luther King Jr., Moses, and Malcolm X.<sup>33</sup>

As Busto eloquently summarizes, “every student of Chicano [sic] history knows this image” of Tijerina: “speaking behind a microphone, one or both hands raised emphatically to make a point, wild-eyed and passionate in his dark preacher’s coat, white shirt, and tie.”<sup>34</sup> Being that English was Tijerina’s second language, his widely-recognized rhetorical prowess is even more striking. Because of this widespread recognition that one of Tijerina’s primary contributions was his rhetoric, this chapter pays particular attention to Tijerina’s public discourse. Both before and after the courthouse raid, what made Reies Tijerina an influential and motivational leader was his rhetoric. And now in the twenty-first century, long after his organization has disintegrated and many of his radical acts have faded from public memory, it is through his rhetoric that we can reach a fuller understanding of Tijerina’s enduring significance.

In a book chapter and a few academic essays, Hammerback and Jensen provide the most comprehensive discussion of Tijerina’s rhetoric. They aim to explain the “why, how, and with what effect” of his rhetorical career.<sup>35</sup> Hammerback and Jensen’s treatments of Tijerina provide an understanding of his rhetorical background, his motivations to speak, and the basic themes of his early discourse.<sup>36</sup> Jensen and Hammerback’s work could be supplemented, however, by considering, for example, what Tijerina’s rhetoric meant at the time for evolving traditions of citizenship. More recent work plumbs Tijerina’s most influential speeches and writings for a picture of his “motivations” or “underlying religious vision,” but what demands attention, I argue, is the border citizenship of Tijerina’s rhetoric.<sup>37</sup>

As the trajectory of Tijerina’s career illustrates, he was always migrating across the precarious border between radical revolutionary and civil rights leader. Tijerina appealed for redress from the government, met with state officials, and talked of Mexican American rights, the Constitution, and U.S. citizenship. Yet, he also often condemned the United States, heralding

the birth of a new Latina/o nation. With the help of the Alianza, Tijerina forcibly took over government property and participated in an armed revolt against state officials, oftentimes under the pretense of protecting citizenship rights.<sup>38</sup> At the center of his conflicting and contradictory activism was a fundamental struggle with the tensions of exclusion and inclusion that, in the 1960s, had already characterized Latina/os' lives within the United States for over a century.

Therefore, in the following section I will show how Tijerina's rhetoric negotiated these tensions of citizenship through a border discourse. Tijerina was at times a self-identified U.S. citizen clamoring for his people's rights. And in other moments, Tijerina presented himself as an outsider; he critiqued U.S. democracy and articulated an ethno-nationalist identity for his people. This border citizenship migrated between two extremes: a reformist civil rights appeal and a radical ethno-nationalist discourse. Just as Reies Tijerina navigated the physical border between the U.S. and Mexico throughout his life, Tijerina's border citizenship traversed the boundary between citizen and rebel.

I will show this movement between borders of citizenship through analysis of three primary texts.<sup>39</sup> Tijerina's public letters from jail written in 1969 and his speech at the University of Colorado-Denver in 1967 show how Tijerina navigated the limits of U.S. citizenship through his rhetorical form and content.<sup>40</sup> I begin with an analysis of Tijerina's two letters from jail to demonstrate the bipolar, contradictory dimensions of Tijerina. Scholars have recognized Tijerina's conflicting rhetoric, but have generally emphasized one extreme over another. After I illustrate these two sides of Tijerina's discourse through his public letters from prison, I use his 1967 speech "The Land Grant Question" to argue that Tijerina's rhetoric crossed borders to navigate U.S. citizenship. The power of Tijerina's discursive enactment of U.S.

citizenship lay in his perpetual migration between the extremes of separatism (i.e., exclusion) and inclusion.

### **The Radical and the Reformist Reies: Tijerina's Letters from Prison**

Tijerina had been in jail for a little over two months when he wrote his "Letter from Santa Fe Jail" on August 17, 1969. Since the courthouse raid, Tijerina's name had circulated in the national news media, and his reputation as an unorthodox (perhaps revolutionary) activist had grown. The Alianza had increased in membership, and Tijerina was becoming a leading voice on the land grant issue. Despite, or perhaps because of, this recognition, the demands on Tijerina and the Alianza for activism increased, as did the surveillance by the state and federal government. Tijerina's bond was revoked and he was imprisoned on June 11, 1969 after a confrontation with Forest Rangers during the symbolic burning of a federal government forestry sign.<sup>41</sup>

On August 17, Tijerina wrote a letter to his supporters published in *El Grito del Norte*, an unofficial Alianza paper.<sup>42</sup> Tijerina's letter represents the radical, nationalist rhetoric of his movement; it criticizes the U.S. government, Anglos, and American society for their racism, and it calls on Latina/os and Alianza supporters to rally for the cause. Busto describes it as an "angry" letter which "hammered away at the injustices perpetrated against the Indo-Hispano people by the Anglo United States government."<sup>43</sup> An analysis of Tijerina's text certainly supports this interpretation. Tijerina's "Letter from Santa Fe Jail" also illustrates one of the modes of citizenship discourse Tijerina constructed: an ethno-nationalist discourse of Indo-Hispano citizenship. Like the Chicano movement that was developing in Colorado and California around the same time, Tijerina called for the unity of all Mexican-Americans and Latina/os as a global Indo-Hispano people. Tijerina's radical and oppositional citizenship



articulated in the “Letter from Santa Fe Jail” is even more evident when compared to another important civil rights letter—Rev. Martin Luther King Jr.’s “Letter from Birmingham Jail.”<sup>44</sup>

Like King, Tijerina begins his “Letter from Santa Fe Jail” with an exordium that establishes the audience, the tone of the letter, and Tijerina’s persona.<sup>45</sup> Tijerina’s audience for these “reflections” consists of “my people, the Indo-Hispanos, to my friends among the Anglos, to the agents of the federal government, the state of New Mexico, the Southwest, and the entire Indo-Hispano world—’Latin America.’”<sup>46</sup> Tijerina addresses his letter to both his friends and enemies, and the expanding structure of his opening statement—which moves from the Southwest to the nation to the world—exemplifies that of the entire letter. As he does in this first sentence, Tijerina continually expands his focus throughout the letter, addressing his supporters concerning his personal struggle, then his enemies concerning the struggles of all Hispanos, and finally addressing the entire Latin American world on the need for solidarity.

As part of this exordium, Tijerina presents his persona in the one-sentence second paragraph. “I write to you,” he says, “as one of the clearest victims of the madness and racism in the hearts of our present-day politicians and rulers.” Unlike King, who constructs the persona of social activist and preacher, Tijerina presents himself primarily as an “other,” a victim of systematic oppression.<sup>47</sup> While King focuses on refutation and explanation to provide a “decorous sense of order” to recent protests, Tijerina focuses on decrying the injustices of the government in an indignant and accusatory tone.<sup>48</sup>

Tijerina moves from this brief ethos statement to a statement of his purpose. Describing his personal struggles in jail, he employs parallelism and climax to implicate an ever-larger system of racial oppression. He begins:

At this time I have been in jail for 65 days. . . . I am here today because I resisted an assassination attempt led by an agent of the federal government—an agent of all those who do not want anybody to speak out for the poor, all those who do not want Reies Lopez [sic] Tijerina to stand in their way as they continue to rob the poor people, all those many rich people from outside the state with their summer homes and ranches here whose pursuit of happiness depends on thievery, all those who have robbed the people of their land and culture for 120 years.

Alluding to his altercation with park rangers in June, Tijerina frames his arrest as an attempt by the government to violently terminate his activism for poor and forgotten land owners. Yet Tijerina does not dwell long on his circumstances; instead he uses them as a springboard to expand his charges (his *propositio*) of “madness and racism” against the federal government. The same agent who attempted to assassinate Tijerina represents an entire society of “rich” Anglos who rob and “have robbed the people of their land and culture for 120 years.” Though he begins with the specific and immediate context concerning his imprisonment, Tijerina widens the charges to construct an “oppositional” rhetoric that stands against the dominant culture.<sup>49</sup>

Through this parallel structure and climax, Tijerina implicates the government and Anglo society in a century-long project of racism. Like Malcolm X in some of his later speeches (such as the Rochester Address), Tijerina periodically widens and then narrows his discussion of the crimes of the federal government, connecting the racism and persecution he has faced with the oppression and persecution faced first by land grant holders and then by all Latina/os.<sup>50</sup> Widening and narrowing his focus, Tijerina constructs a wide-ranging critique of U.S. institutions, including U.S. citizenship, as corrupt and oppressive.

After this sweeping accusation, Tijerina returns to his immediate circumstances; he asks “what is my real crime,” and by a subtle move he includes all Hispano land owners in his response (in another widening of his focus):

As I and the poor people see it, especially the Indo-Hispanos, my only crime is UPHOLDING OUR RIGHTS AS PROTECTED BY THE TREATY OF GUADALUPE HIDALGO [sic]. . . . My only crime is demanding the respect and protection of our property, which has been confiscated illegally by the federal government. Ever since the treaty was signed in 1848, our people have been asking every elected president [sic] . . . for a redress of grievances. Like the Black people, we too have been criminally ignored. Our rights to the Spanish land grant pueblos in [sic] the real reason why I am in prison at this moment.

Through a sort of antithesis, Tijerina presents the supposed “crimes” he has committed merely by pursuing his and his people’s “rights.” Tijerina and his people are persecuted outsiders who have been the victims of American imperialism and racism for over a century. Adding to the nuance of Tijerina’s oppositional rhetoric, the rights that he demands on behalf of his people are not their rights as citizens guaranteed under the Constitution of the United States but rather the treaty rights concerning property and culture guaranteed to colonized Mexicans in the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo. Furthermore, by framing his supporters as “Indo-Hispanos” rather than Mexican-Americans or merely Hispanos, Tijerina constructs an ethno-nationalist identity that embodies a common history, ethnic heritage, and cultural unity.<sup>51</sup> In other words, Tijerina aims to situate himself and his audience outside the parameters of conventional U.S. citizenship and its racialized components; he is demanding respect for Hispanos as a separate people.

Again Tijerina widens his scope, first from a focus on his present condition, then, as we see above, to the struggles of all Hispanos against the federal government, and again to a condemnation of Anglo society as a whole. Tijerina denounces the “conspirators against the poor,” including “the press which they control,” who deny the truth of these crimes committed by the government. Constructing an analogy between the supposed complicity of Catholics during World War II, who “contribut[ed] to Hitler’s acts by their SILENCE” while “Hitler and his machine persecuted the Jews,” Tijerina condemns those Anglos and Latina/os who have not support the Alianza’s movement:

By the same token, I denounce those in New Mexico who have never opened their mouths at any time to defend or support the thousands who have been killed, robbed, raped of their culture. . . . We condemn the silence of these groups and individuals and I am sure that, like the Jewish people, the poor of New Mexico are keeping a record of the Silence which contributes to the criminal conspiracy against the Indo-Hispano in New Mexico.

Thus, Tijerina not only widens his condemnation to include all of Anglo society for crimes of racism and oppression, but he also implicitly analogizes the roles of the “Indo-Hispano” poor and Anglo society to that of the Jews and Nazis, respectively. In Tijerina’s equation, silence in the face of these clear injustices equals complicity.

Just as he shifts his focus throughout the letter, Tijerina also alters his persona in the latter half of the letter from that of a victim of government oppression to the persona of an activist for his people’s cause. After again summarizing the difficult circumstances he has had to undergo in prison, he states, “these uncomfortable conditions do not bother me, for I have a driving dream to give me strength: the happiness of my people.” Tijerina turns from outlining

the charges against Anglo society to addressing his audience of supporters, his “people” both within New Mexico and throughout Latin America. In the face of this injustice and persecution, says Tijerina, “I pray to God that all the Indo-Hispano people will awake to the need for unity,” for “times have changed and the spirit of the blood is no longer limited by national or continental boundaries.”<sup>52</sup> Here Tijerina makes multiple references to his “people,” furthering his construction of a collective of supporters united by their common ethnic, linguistic, and cultural ties.<sup>53</sup> Tijerina invites “consubstantiality” between Mexican Americans, other Latina/os, and Latin American people throughout the world, for they are united not only by cultural ties but also by “blood” and by a common experience of U.S. imperialism.<sup>54</sup> Following the rhetorical strategy of widening his scope, Tijerina notes, “Our property, freedom, and culture must be respected in New Mexico, in the Southwest, before the Anglo can expect to be trusted in South America, Mexico, and Canada.” Tijerina connects the New Mexicans struggle for freedom and property to Latin American struggles for self determination; Latina/os everywhere are united through the “spirit of the blood” to fight this cause against the evil Anglo.

Just as Tijerina crosses borders between the personal, national, and international realms in his condemnation of U.S. evils, Tijerina also crosses back and forth across the border between separation and accommodation. Tijerina tempers his radical and nationalist discourse in the “Letter from Santa Fe Jail” in the conclusion, in which he calls for the government’s “good faith” concerning the “land question” and the rights guaranteed in the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo. Tijerina calls for a forum airing the Hispano land holders’ grievances. Continuing to oscillate between his persona of victim and advocate, Tijerina assures supporters and persecutors alike that “WE ARE RIGHT—and therefore ready and willing to discuss our problems and rights under the *Treaty* with the *Anglo* federal government [my emphasis].” While he falls short of

calling for violent revolution, Tijerina also falls short of calling on his supporters to be good citizens. Instead he frames the solution as a meeting of equals in which the “Anglo” U.S. can finally return the land and honor the rights of the “Indo-Hispano world.”

Certainly, then, Tijerina’s rhetoric in the “Letter from Santa Fe Jail” could be classified, in Busto’s words, as “angry” and accusatory. Borrowing from scholarly studies of African American civil rights rhetoric, we could call Tijerina’s implicit notion of equality here “cultural equality,” or an equality “based on power” distribution rather than equality based on inclusion into American society.<sup>55</sup> Chicana/o studies scholar Lee Bebout argues that Tijerina’s rhetoric (and actions) embodied the “revolutionary/bandido trope.” Often represented in classic revolutionary bandits such as Joaquin Murieta and Pancho Villa, the revolutionary bandido “revolted against the United States and other oppressive systems of the Chicano past.”<sup>56</sup> In the “Letter from Santa Fe Jail” we see this revolutionary persona, as Tijerina continually widens and narrows the scope of his critique, connecting his personal struggles against the U.S. federal government to the oppression of Latina/os throughout the world. Moreover, Tijerina’s tone is angry and indignant, and his contradictory persona shifts from that of the victim of oppression to the valiant leader of his “people.” Yet Tijerina complicates this trope, for he couples charges of American racism with demands for a “redress of grievances” and a return of what was rightfully theirs. Tijerina’s ethno-nationalist rhetoric in the “Letter from the Santa Fe Jail” falls short of being considered “Chicano” rhetoric (lacking key concepts still in the making at the time such as *La Raza* and *Aztlán*), yet it does represent a “rhetoric of otherness” which affirms a common and separate identity, critiques dominant society, and issues a call to collective action.<sup>57</sup>

The characterization of Tijerina as a radical revolutionary suggested in his “Letter from the Santa Fe Jail” is supported by much of the literature, both scholarly and biographical. For

example, Patricia Bell Blawis' biography clearly interprets Tijerina and his movement as, in her words, a "*rebellion* against impossible conditions of life [my emphasis]." <sup>58</sup> Richard Gardner, in the more narrative and dramatic style of his biography, claims that "by force of blood and by virtue of conviction, [Tijerina] was a *rebel* . . . at odds with the majority [my emphasis]." <sup>59</sup> Scholarly literature on Tijerina, coming from the fields of Latina/o and Chicana/o studies, has provided a similar picture of Tijerina. In his book on the history of the Chicana/o movement, Francisco Rosales describes Tijerina's movement as "aggressive," "dramatic," and "audacious," characterized by "militancy" and even "separatism." <sup>60</sup> Similarly, Chicana/o studies scholars David Maciel and Juan José Peña classify Tijerina as representing the "radical wing" of the movement. <sup>61</sup> Therefore, Tijerina's biographers are not alone in interpreting him as nothing short of a violent rebel against U.S. imperialism. Certainly they are justified in doing so, as his actions at Echo Amphitheater and Tierra Amarilla and his rhetoric in the "Letter from the Santa Fe Jail" would lead one to believe.

Yet while one can emphasize Tijerina's radical rhetoric and activism, Tijerina's more conventional forms of mobilization—his letter writing, his public address, his appeals to the Constitution of the United States, and his focus on legal redress—complicate this characterization. In rebuttal to other Chicana/o scholars, Rudy Busto decidedly claims: "while Chicano revisionist history would remember him as a revolutionary nationalist . . . Tijerina believed in his rights of due process and equal protection as a citizen of the United States." <sup>62</sup> Likewise, rhetorical critics John C. Hammerback and Richard Jensen conclude, from their analysis of several of Tijerina's speeches and newspaper columns, that his rhetoric "reflected" "conservative values" and was "more traditional than radical." <sup>63</sup> Thus the radical ethno-nationalist Tijerina is often contrasted with a view of Tijerina as a reformist civil rights advocate.

This is a side of Tijerina's citizenship discourse we see in his letter from the State Penitentiary in Albuquerque, New Mexico, written nearly two months later on October 13, 1969.

Tijerina was transferred to the New Mexico State Penitentiary in late August 1969 after his conviction on charges relating to the Echo Amphitheater take-over; there he wrote his second public letter, and there he would face several other trials, including a second trial for the courthouse raid. Tijerina's letter from the Albuquerque prison was published two years later in 1971 in an anthology of Chicana/o activist writings.<sup>64</sup> While scholar Rudy Busto characterizes Tijerina's August letter as "angry," he describes the October letter from the state penitentiary as "celebratory," as a "parade" of "legal texts" in the service of a "moral high ground." Busto writes, "Here there is no mention of . . . [a] vendetta," and "his call for justice" is not drawn along "racial lines."<sup>65</sup> This second letter is significantly shorter than the "Letter from Santa Fe Jail," and while Tijerina's August letter presents a radical, indignant, and oppositional critique of U.S. citizenship, Tijerina's October letter presents a moderate and reasoned appeal for civil rights.

Following the epistolary genre, this second public letter, like the first, begins by outlining Tijerina's audience, his present circumstances, and his purpose in writing. Tijerina states, "I, Reies López Tijerina, consent to write the following for the information of the public."<sup>66</sup> In this short sentence, Tijerina outlines both his audience and purpose: to "inform" the general "public." Tijerina's audience is at once more expansive and less specific than his first letter; whereas in his August letter Tijerina addressed his supporters (the "Indo-Hispanos" throughout the world) and his enemies (the "agents" of the federal government and Anglo society), here Tijerina addresses "the public" without distinction or delineation. Likewise, while in his first letter Tijerina focused



on describing the persecution he and, by extension, the Hispanos were undergoing, in this letter Tijerina writes to *inform* his audience both about his circumstances and the Hispanos' cause.

As in his first letter from jail, Tijerina begins by describing the difficulties he has undergone since his incarceration. Instead of extrapolating a persona of victimhood from these personal struggles, Tijerina presents a Pauline persona, a persecuted crusader for justice who is confident, peaceful, and dignified.<sup>67</sup> Tijerina describes the troubles he has faced in prison but assures his audience that he does not despair. Instead, "for the first time in all my life," states Tijerina,

I feel a deep satisfaction and conviction that I am serving my people with all my energy and strength of my heart. For the rights of my people, I am held captive. Because of the rights of my blood brothers to their property, their culture, and their inheritance, I suffer imprisonment. And I shall suffer it again if necessary.

Tijerina is neither indignant nor desperate. In contrast, he says, "I feel very content . . . because I know and understand well the cause I defend." Channeling the tone and persona of the Pauline epistle, Tijerina makes clear his ultimate commitment to the gospel he defends:

For the land, culture, and inheritance of my people I am ready not only to suffer imprisonment, but I would, with pleasure and pride, sacrifice my life to bring about the justice which is so much deserved by my people—the Spanish American people.

Tijerina begins this second letter, with an entirely different tone and persona than he constructed in his August letter from jail. He is a righteous defender of his people; their cause is just and worthy of the ultimate sacrifice. He is content in this recognition rather than angry at the persecution he faces.

Tijerina not only constructs a unique tone and persona in his October letter from prison, but he also constitutes a different persona for his supporters.<sup>68</sup> Tijerina's "people," those whom he fights for and who support him, are the "Spanish American people" rather than the "Indo-Hispano" people that Tijerina referenced in his August letter from jail. Through his choice of terminology, Tijerina constitutes his supporters not as an independent ethnic and national group separate from the U.S. but as a constituent part of American society. Moreover, unlike in the August letter from prison, where Tijerina's struggle was defined in racial and ethnic terms, here he claims:

In spite of the fact that in New Mexico it is the Latin and the Indian who have suffered injustice and wrong . . . the desire for justice knows no boundaries of race or culture. I think that if another race were the victim of oppression, I would defend it as I now defend my people.<sup>69</sup>

Tijerina's struggle is for justice; it is not an ethnic or racial movement. Like African Americans and other ethnic groups within the United States, he notes, his people clamor for "rights" and "justice" but not power or separation.

Tijerina moves from constructing his audience and his persona to elaborating his purpose. In this letter, Tijerina's Anglo readers are not evil conspirators or complicitous contributors to institutional racism. Likewise, Tijerina does not condemn Anglos for collaborating in his and his people's persecution. Instead, Tijerina is a "little perturbed by what my critics say against me," because "they are ignorant of the documents, accumulated with great expenditure of time and money, to prove my people's claims to their land grants." The tone and attitude Tijerina presents toward his Anglo critics is remarkably different in this second letter. Gone are the references to their "madness" and "racism"; instead Tijerina's detractors are simply "ignorant" of the facts.

Tijerina is sure that these critics will “someday also come to support” his struggle for “justice.” To that end, he states, “I welcome this opportunity to explain to the public our rights and obligations to ask for justice and the restitution of our inheritance, our property, our culture.”<sup>70</sup> Later in the letter, Tijerina isolates the responsibility for the theft of Hispanos’ land to the “fraud and corruption” of a few and the general lack of “knowledge” of the many. Rather than criticizing Anglo society for its complicity, Tijerina takes the opportunity to educate Anglos under the presumption that this information will change their minds.<sup>71</sup>

Not only is Tijerina’s tone and purpose drastically different—i.e., deliberative, conciliatory, didactic—but the dominant theme of “justice” is unique to his October letter from prison. While in his first letter Tijerina emphasized themes of crime, conspiracy, persecution, and the need for unity and resistance, here Tijerina relies on the implicit belief that reason, documents, and evidence will lead to mutual understanding and will secure justice. If we could analogize his first letter to the confrontational and nationalist rhetoric of black leaders such as Malcolm X, this letter echoes the themes of legal equality and justice of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC) and the early rhetoric of Rev. Martin Luther King Jr.<sup>72</sup>

The remainder of Tijerina’s letter makes a detailed and evidence-based case for restitution of Hispanos’ land grants and cultural rights. Consequently, one of Tijerina’s primary rhetorical strategies to build his case for the Hispanos’ cause is the citation of historical documents and research, or as Tijerina puts it, “the rights, the evidence, and the laws which support the claims of the Hispanos over the land grants.”<sup>73</sup> Tijerina’s October letter from the Albuquerque state penitentiary exhibits his “obsession with text-based authority.”<sup>74</sup> Through the frequent citation of “Spanish colonial administrative legal texts,” federal and state constitutions,

international law, and historical sources, Tijerina builds a logos-based argument for the restitution of Spanish/Mexican land grants.<sup>75</sup>

Tijerina constructs his legal argument in logical steps. First, he explains the concept of *ejidos*, or communal land grants given to “villages and towns” for pasturage or communal farming. This concept of communal land grants, argues Tijerina, is supported in international law and is honored in a number of other countries, “even in Russia.”<sup>76</sup> Tijerina makes sure to draw from examples throughout the Western world as well. Through a mixture of historical examples (e.g., the state of Israel which was, according to Tijerina, Jewish communal land guaranteed in the Bible) and documentary evidence (e.g., citation from the *Laws of the Indies*, the governing document of the Spanish colonies), Tijerina argues that land grants are legally and historically recognized worldwide.<sup>77</sup> Discussing the *ejidos* granted to the northern New Mexican Hispanos, Tijerina argues that “without our *ejidos*, there can be no justice.” A “gigantic injustice” has been perpetrated by the “Federal Government of the United States, and the State of New Mexico,” argues Tijerina. However, if the people “unite” against them, the “criminals” can be exposed and brought to justice.<sup>78</sup>

In contrast to his August letter from prison, in which Tijerina constructs a radical critique of Anglo society for its “madness” and “racism,” Tijerina here makes a case for the Alianza’s cause that can win the support of Anglos in their struggles for justice. “We are determined to ask for, to demand, and to struggle for justice until the world gives it to us,” says Tijerina.<sup>79</sup> He supports his arguments with further quotations from the *Laws of the Indies*, the Constitution of the State of New Mexico, and historical research (e.g., the book *The Spanish Empire in America* by historian C. H. Harring) throughout the letter. Consistent with his promise to inform the

audience about the Alianza's cause, Tijerina refutes accusations that the Alianza is anti-Indian and dispels the idea that the Alianza is only after land.<sup>80</sup>

His letter culminates in a final call to action. He has made his case to the Anglo audience, and now he brings them together with his supporters, for “the Hispaño [sic], the Indian, and the Anglo people should insist that the governor and the legislature of New Mexico appoint a committee or commission to investigate . . . the land grants.”<sup>81</sup> In sum, the rhetorical form and content of Tijerina's second letter from prison is significantly different from his first. In the August letter from jail Tijerina aimed to confront the government with evidence of its evil crimes. In this letter Tijerina calls for an investigation of the land grant issue, for he is “positive” these facts will withstand public scrutiny and inquiry.

Tijerina's tone and persona, his purpose, and the audiences he constitutes—both Spanish American and Anglo—in this second letter make it a unique text. While Tijerina's first letter from prison was driven by an indignant tone and the persona of a persecuted victim driven to confrontation, his second letter presents a different relationship to his audience. Like King in his “Letter from Birmingham Jail,” Tijerina's is a Pauline persona, a persecuted but righteous and powerful crusader for justice. Like King, Tijerina is “critical of his white audience but not alienated from it.” He speaks with “restrained energy” that “encourages the white audience to reaffirm its basic values” (i.e., justice) and reevaluate its understanding of the Alianza and its cause.<sup>82</sup> These differences, along with Tijerina's reliance on textual authority and logos, do not conform to those characterizations of Tijerina as a “rebel” or a “violent” and “separatist” revolutionary.<sup>83</sup> As Tijerina puts it in his second letter, “we do not want to destroy the culture of the Anglo; we only ask that our culture also be protected by the law, just as the law reads.”<sup>84</sup> In line with the contractual and rights-based conventions of U.S. citizenship, Tijerina frames his

organization as a movement for full citizenship and civil rights. In Tijerina's words, his goal is "the protection and advancement" of Hispanos' rights.<sup>85</sup> His letter from prison written October 13, 1969, is not a radical ethno-nationalist discourse but a reasoned discourse based on rights and inclusion.

This rhetorical analysis of Tijerina's two public letters from prison demonstrates the distinct dimensions of Tijerina's citizenship discourse. On the one hand, he crafted a radical and confrontational discourse grounded in Mexican/Latin American ethno-nationalism (similar to the nationalism of the Chicana/o movement). Tijerina critiqued U.S. institutions and American society, and he called the "Indo-Hispano" people to unite based on blood and cultural ties to secure their own power and recognition. On the other hand, Tijerina presented a discourse of civil rights and inclusion. Fueled by legal arguments and textual authority, Tijerina demanded full citizenship for "Spanish Americans." Rudy Busto, in his own analysis of Tijerina's two public letters from prison, also acknowledges the drastic change in their rhetorical form and content.<sup>86</sup> These two conflicting discourses of citizenship were evident in Tijerina's activism as well. For the Alianza, petitions, letter-writing campaigns, and civil suits were just as common as protests, vandalism, and physical confrontation.

These contradictory strands of Tijerina's rhetoric and activism have long been difficult to resolve. How can we understand Tijerina's struggle for citizenship rights in concert with his well-known radical actions? The tendency is often to understand Tijerina either through his most radical activism or to temper Tijerina's resistance by emphasizing his more conventional tactics. Fernandez and Jensen argue that these tensions in characterizations of Tijerina "reflected his controversial persona."<sup>87</sup> Biographer Peter Nabokov also acknowledges that "the impulses of saviour [sic] and social bandit had converged in [Tijerina] through the land grant cause."<sup>88</sup>

Nabokov's romantic estimation of Tijerina notwithstanding, both scholarly and biographical sources on Tijerina tend to struggle with the often bipolar elements of Tijerina's activism—as Nabokov puts it, the tension between savior and social bandit or, as I have put it, the tension between Tijerina's radical ethno-nationalist discourse and his reformist civil rights discourse. Both of these contradictory understandings of Tijerina can be justified, as an analysis of Tijerina's 1969 public letters from prison demonstrate, yet neither is sufficient. Both Tijerina's radical pronouncements and his appeals to civil rights were integral to his rhetoric and his movement. Thus to more fully comprehend and appreciate Tijerina's rhetorical career, I advance an interpretation of Tijerina's rhetoric as an enactment of border citizenship.

A border condition is a characteristic of many oppressed peoples' struggles with U.S. citizenship.<sup>89</sup> Gloria Anzaldúa describes the physical and emotional space of the border as the place “wherever two or more cultures edge each other, where people of different races occupy the same territory, where under, lower, middle and upper classes touch, where the space between two individuals shrinks with intimacy.”<sup>90</sup> Border discourse (or border consciousness), then, is nomadic. Like the physical act of migration, it moves between extremes and across demarcations (such as the distinction between citizen and other). It is unsettled because it cannot reconcile a conflicting and contradictory identity.

While scholars of social movements may appropriate the metaphor of the border to explain the rhetoric of other oppressed people, for Mexican Americans and Chicana/os the border is a fundamental and material condition of life. As Lisa Flores explains, “living with the unique experience of being a border culture between Mexico and the Southwest part of the United States, Chicana/os find themselves with a foot in both worlds.”<sup>91</sup> Borders are both material realities and rhetorical constructs that structure the experiences of Mexican Americans,

Chicana/os, and Latina/os who are always crossing over, under, or through borders (culturally, linguistically, and physically).<sup>92</sup>

In the nineteenth century, the first Mexican Americans, the newly colonized Californios, negotiated these border tensions by compromising over elements of their Mexican political traditions and those of their newly acquired American citizenship. Californios attempted to carry over elements of their Mexican/Californio traditions as they crossed the border to become Americans. A similar border condition also characterized the Mexican Americans, or Hispanos, of New Mexico during the 1960s, who were legal citizens, displaced from their land, stripped of their economic livelihood, and refused the full rights and dimensions of their citizenship. While the Californios sought compromise and negotiation to attain citizenship, Tijerina and the New Mexicans who formed his *Alianza Federál de Mercedes Reales* crafted a border discourse, one that was at times “*a part of*” and at other times “*apart from*” the “dominant culture.”<sup>93</sup> Though Chapter 4 discusses a group that was able to integrate these tensions of inclusion and separation in a *hybrid* enactment of citizenship, Tijerina and the Alianza were unable to reconcile these tensions and were left with a continual migration between extremes.

As I will elaborate in the following section, at times Tijerina’s rhetoric and activism borrowed more from dominant traditions of U.S. citizenship: he identified himself as a U.S. citizen, he used legal appeals to America’s laws and founding documents, he emphasized civil rights and justice, and he framed his movement through the language of jeremiad. At other times, Tijerina critiqued traditions of U.S. citizenship and constructed a separate radical ethno-nationalist discourse. In these moments Tijerina appealed to distinct themes, including nationalism based on “blood” and culture, appeals to international laws and treaties, moral condemnation of Anglo society, and the apocalyptic language of evil and sin. This is all to say



that, instead of negotiating with the racial project of U.S. citizenship like the Californios did, at times, Tijerina called for its reform, and at other times, he called for its rejection. In a way, these were schizophrenic appeals, and in the next section I elaborate on Tijerina's border citizenship by analyzing his 1967 speech "The Land Grant Question." In the speech, Tijerina migrated between his civil rights discourse of reform and his ethno-nationalist discourse of rebellion. The picture we get is of a discourse that was "'betwixt and between' all the recognized" traditions of citizenship discourse.<sup>94</sup>

### **Border Citizenship in "The Land Grant Question"**

In Tijerina's letters from prison we saw two distinct discourses concerning citizenship take shape. I characterized Tijerina's rhetoric as border citizenship because he moved (or migrated) back and forth across the border between a reformist civil rights discourse and a radical ethno-nationalist discourse. Tijerina's speech "The Land Grant Question" evidences the true border quality of Tijerina's discourse, for, true to its name, his rhetoric oscillates between these extremes throughout the text.<sup>95</sup> The speech was delivered on November 26, 1967, in an invited talk to a "predominantly Anglo audience" of students at the University of Colorado-Denver.<sup>96</sup> The raid on the Tierra Amarilla courthouse had taken place just five months earlier. Before his imprisonment, and in between his legal struggles, Tijerina engaged in a national speaking tour to promote the cause of the Alianza. Two months earlier, in September, the Alianza had held its largest national conference yet, inviting African American and Native American civil rights leaders who expressed their solidarity with the cause.<sup>97</sup> Despite his string of recent successes, Tijerina faced persistent attacks from media and government officials, many of whom portrayed him, in light of the courthouse raid, as a communist, a violent revolutionary, or a racist. In Denver, Tijerina faced another opportunity to publicize his cause and strengthen

his following. Tijerina's speech was later published under the title "The Land Grant Question," and Fernandez and Jensen claim it "was typical of Tijerina's public discourse during the 1960s."<sup>98</sup>

The speech begins, like his public letters, with a clear outline of Tijerina's purpose. He wishes to take "the opportunity in order to destroy certain lies, fabricated, calculated with evil intentions" about him and his struggle (§ 1).<sup>99</sup> Moreover, Tijerina wishes "to explain the historical, organized crimes of [sic] federal government through its agencies" performed with "evil intentions" on Tijerina and the Alianza (§ 2).<sup>100</sup> In sum, Tijerina expresses his commitment to "explain the truth" based on "constitutional, legal and international laws" (§ 2). Relying on moral language, Tijerina presents a critique of the federal government—of its "evil," its "crimes," and its occlusions of "truth"—that is echoed in his August 1969 letter from a Santa Fe jail. Yet Tijerina also commits to explain the legal backing to his and the Alianza's claims, which more accurately represents the themes of his October 1969 letter from the Albuquerque State Penitentiary. Tijerina, then, combines these themes in "The Land Grant Question," migrating across the border between a confrontational critique of American society and an appeal to citizenship laws and common traditions.

Tijerina moves toward what I call a radical ethno-nationalist position in the first paragraphs of his speech. He points to the imperialism of the United States and its repression of the rights of the Hispanic nation; he calls on the international community to help the Hispanos defend their independence as a unique people. "Even though the United States prides itself" on being the "umpire throughout the world through international commitments [and] treaties," says Tijerina, these are merely cover for America's imperialist reach. As an empire, the U.S. keeps its "foot" in "Guantanamo Base," in "Vietnam," and in various areas "throughout the whole

world.” Likewise, says Tijerina, the U.S. keeps its “finger or foot” on the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo (§ 2). Using the metaphor of the “foot,” Tijerina paints a picture of the United States subjugating other nations, including the Hispanos, with its imperialist boot.

He stretches the metaphor to apply to the subjugation of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo. “A life of a *nation*, a *people*, depends on this treaty,” says Tijerina; “It is our *constitution* [my emphasis],” and it is “the supreme law of the land.”<sup>101</sup> Tijerina strengthens this metaphor with the use of legal evidence that supports his view of the preeminence of the treaty. Even the New Mexico State Constitution states that “all the rights, privileges, and immunities—civil, political, or religious—guaranteed to the people of New Mexico by the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo were, [sic] shall be preserved inviolate” (§ 3). “Yet [these treaty rights] were not only violated,” says Tijerina, “but all those privileges, immunities and rights were frozen[,] completely wrecked” (§ 4). Tijerina uses this legal evidence to support his interpretation that the United States is an imperial power guilty of “crimes” against the Hispanos; Hispanos are “a nation, a people” subjugated by the United States as other foreign countries are crushed under the foot of U.S. imperialism.

Tijerina tells his audience that “we must learn to distinguish between the reality and discrimination, between reality and nationalism, between the reality and isolation” (§ 5). In other words, Tijerina claims that the truth, or “reality,” has been occluded, or “frozen”; it has been couched in “lies, fabricated, calculated with evil intentions,” and must be thawed and uncovered. The metaphor of freezing and unthawing is a prevalent one in this speech, and it implies evil intention rather than a natural disaster. The government and Anglo society have frozen the truths and the laws of the Hispanos, yet they are not dead; if they can be unfrozen the life of the Hispanos can be revived again.

Here, in these brief opening paragraphs, Tijerina begins with a radical voice which exposes the crimes of U.S. imperialism and racism and justifies the existence of a separate Spanish American nation. In a few breaths, though, Tijerina migrates from the position of the foreigner to the position of the American citizen. Subtly refuting the charges that he is an antagonist, Tijerina claims, “I am not against any nation or race or creed or religion or political philosophies, but I only stand as a citizen, as an American citizen, for those rights that truthfully, constitutionally belong to the Spanish American” (§ 5). Tijerina moves from the confrontational rhetoric of ethno-nationalism to a more reformist voice that emphasizes common American citizenship. He further refutes the “narrow and stupid opinions” that he and his supporters are “rebels” (a particularly common charge following the courthouse raid). These lies “will not hold water in the light of law and order, constitutional and international law,” says Tijerina (§ 6).

Instead, Tijerina wishes to

explain the background of our claims in order to help those that truly want to understand because we—like the black man [sic] and like the Indian—are here to stay, and we don’t intend to allow anybody from here on to tamper and fool around with our cultural rights and our property (§ 7).

In this section of the speech, Tijerina wishes to explain the land grant question—not to combat the lies and conspiracies of the federal government, but to combat ignorance among “those who really want to understand because we are part of America,” says Tijerina, and “we belong here” (§ 7). The metaphor Tijerina uses to explain the lack of knowledge about land grants is not that of “freezing” truths (which implies “evil intentions” by someone who has frozen those truths) but the metaphor of disease (which is less reliant on intent): “I think you should be interested in knowing the facts. In order to understand the, [sic] or to find a medicine for the illness we must

discover first what is the kind of disease, what is the ailment, what is the, [sic] how the illness or disease developed” (§ 8).<sup>102</sup> In other words, American society is ill with ignorance (and later, hatred) concerning Hispanos’ land claims; information and justice will be their medicine.

Again the differences in Tijerina’s tone and word choice are subtle but important. In addition to a distinctly different metaphor, in these last few paragraphs of his introduction (paragraphs 5-8) Tijerina speaks of “facts” rather than “truths,” which implies less moral certainty and more evidentiary grounding. While in the earlier part of the introduction (paragraphs 1-5) Tijerina intends to thaw the laws and truths that had been frozen by the government and evil Anglos, here he intends to diagnose the disease of ignorance/oppression so as to find a cure. While I call Tijerina’s first rhetorical strategy a radical ethno-nationalist discourse, this second discourse might be more accurately termed a reformist civil rights rhetoric (one based on inclusion into American polity rather than separatism).

These opening paragraphs (§ 1-8) illustrate the contrasting themes of Tijerina’s speech: on the one hand, an emphasis on truth versus lies, good versus evil, the crimes of Anglo society against the “new breed” of the Spanish American nation; on the other hand, a focus on justice, on law, and on the rights and duties of Spanish Americans as citizens of the United States. Tijerina moves back and forth across this border between reformist civil rights discourse and radical ethno-nationalist discourse, tying his speech together with religious language and metaphors.

Despite Tijerina’s earlier emphasis on his status as an American citizen (in § 5-8), in paragraphs 9-14 of his speech Tijerina moves back across the “border” to the position of foreigner or outsider; he stands in solidarity with his people—“a new breed, a new people”—rather than with American society. Tijerina introduces the metaphor of Indo-Hispanos as the “new breed,” “developed in the last four hundred and fifty-three years last October the

nineteenth.” Drawing on the *Law of the Indies* (the governing document of the Spanish colonies) for his authority, Tijerina claims that Indo-Hispanos (or Spanish Americans) are a new race or breed “born out of law” from “Law Two, Title One, Book Four” (which legally recognized *mestizos* and permitted intermarriage between *criollos* and *indios* in colonial New Spain) of this document. This legal recognition in historical documents amounted to the birth of a new race and a new nation. According to Tijerina, like the Hebrew race and nation had been born from God’s biblical decree, so too had the Spanish American race/nation been born through law.<sup>103</sup> “Four hundred and thirty years,” he argues, “that’s how much it takes for a race, a new breed to develop” (§ 11). “Every nation has a date of birth,” he continues, including the “Anglo,” the “Jew,” and the Spanish American. Like a child, each nation passes “through the same experiences and developing [sic] and then learns and learns [sic] to compete and then he graduates” (§ 11). These legal and historical “truths” mean for Tijerina that the Spanish American “nation,” like the Jewish “nation,” is worthy of respect and protection. Furthermore, he asks his predominantly Anglo audience, “and to what law the Anglo was born [sic]?” “Do I see somebody lifting his fingers or hand?”<sup>104</sup>

Like in the “Letter from Santa Fe Jail,” Tijerina argues that the Spanish American is a separate race and nation, granted legal rights as other nations are, but that those rights were impinged upon by the United States. Later in the speech (§ 22-24), Tijerina expands his argument for the land grants and the “new breed” to the whole of Latin America:

As our land grants were taken away here in New Mexico, in Mexico were [sic] taken away from the Indians and the new breed by blue eyed Spaniards. . . . In Argentina the same, in Brazil, Chile, Peru—all throughout South America, ladies and gentlemen. And, it will be a chain reaction. Let’s not fool ourselves. It will come to surface . . . the whole

thing between the rich and the poor, the powerful and the weak. It's catching up. That is why the government . . . is trying to brand me as a "rebel, criminal" and send me to the penitentiary. That is why, because he's afraid to face these facts (§ 22).

Tijerina frames the new breed as a separate ethnicity/nation—one that is "catching up" and will not suffer the imperialism of the United States much longer, especially concerning its communal land grants (§ 23). In the schools as well, American conspirators have "frozen the Spanish American education" because "they don't want our children to know about the treaty [of Guadalupe Hidalgo], about the land grants, about the historical background, about the dates of our birth . . . because then they will have pride" (§ 24). Not only has Anglo society conspired in stealing the land and culture of this new breed across the continent, but in the United States they also keep the children in the dark to these truths to encourage their assimilation. In a brief statement of desperation Tijerina clamors, "ladies and gentlemen, we cannot swallow it. We cannot live with this kind of destruction, fake, [sic] hypocrisy, murdering, killing, destroying" (§ 24)!

Tijerina's emphasis, then, on themes of the "new breed" as a separate nation, on the crimes of the government, and on the coming "chain reaction" that will challenge this system intimate that his rhetoric is rooted in radicalism rather than reformism. In contrast to the prophetic rhetoric of the jeremiad, which calls for a return to America's founding values, Tijerina's voice here is more apocalyptic. America is hopelessly lost in its evil; it is "incorrigible," or, as Tijerina puts it, "with power you cannot reason" (§ 21).<sup>105</sup> In this apocalyptic world, "justice will require not an enforcement of the terms of the covenant, to which evil is not subject, but a destruction of evil itself."<sup>106</sup> Only a higher power (the force of justice/history) can correct its evils. "This is the era of justice and claims," Tijerina notes, the

“Indian” and “black man” are clamoring for justice, and “small nations are getting independence, such as [in] Africa.” Though they did not “use atom bombs to secure their independence,” he says, “the pressure of justice” is no less apocalyptic. “The pressure of humanity and the pressure of mankind,” says Tijerina, “will deliver the land grants” (§ 30).

Casting Tijerina in the role of the radical, then, is easy to do based on the apocalyptic nationalism of his letters and speeches. Yet to do so presents only part of the picture, as we have seen, for at other moments Tijerina crosses the border from the position of the radical foreigner or outsider into dominant traditions of U.S. citizenship. As likely as he is to identify himself with the “new breed,” Tijerina also identifies himself as U.S. citizen. As I noted, in the second half of Tijerina’s introduction to “The Land Grant Question” (§ 5-8) he tempers his radical voice by refuting the claim that he is a rebel; instead, he portrays his organization as a citizens’ movement for reform and civil rights. His goal, he states, is to make the U.S. more inclusive and more faithful to its noble founding. Of course, Tijerina shifts away from this view in parts of the speech I discussed above, yet he continually migrates back and forth between these two forms of discourse.

For example, while in paragraphs 9-14 Tijerina frames the Hispanos as a “new breed,” he shifts again in paragraphs 15-21 to an appeal to the contract of U.S. citizenship. He says, “We are not asking for something that does not belong to us legally, constitutionally, ladies and gentlemen.” “The land grant question is part . . . of the Constitution” (§ 16). “Am I anti-Anglo?” he asks, and he responds: “No, sir. I like to stay alive and I like to help the Anglo.” “He’s my older brother. . . . He needs me and I need him.” “If we are to survive we must come face to face and face our sins and our crimes and confess them” (§ 17). Tijerina again injects religious language into his appeal for U.S. citizenship; he wants to help Anglo society come



“face to face” with and confess its sins. “History, facts, and the power of justice is [sic] catching up with this nation,” he claims. Its “sins” and “crimes” are “coming out.”

Yet again we see a shift in Tijerina’s persona and purpose, for, like a jeremiadic prophet, he seeks to call to repentance rather than to condemnation. Tijerina presents his struggle as part of the effort to bring to light America’s sins and force its repentance. In his ethno-nationalist discourse, justice would inevitably bring about a revolution to the present system (or at the very least separatism). Apart from his apocalyptic language, Tijerina’s rhetoric also reflects the prophetic language of jeremiad, which, in Robert Terrill’s words, expresses “faith that in American exceptionalism and morality lie the potential to resolve issues of racism and inequality.”<sup>107</sup> In this sense, Tijerina affirms America’s traditions and founding laws as specially ordained. The “United States has a role to play in this continent,” he states, and “God has been keeping up with the conduct of this nation since 1776” (§ 15). But the nation has strayed from God and from its founding principles; repentance for its “crimes” and “sins” is needed. America must “come face to face” with and “confess” its sins (§ 17). “Ladies and gentlemen, that is why we have to stop hate,” continues Tijerina; “That is why we were robbed of our land, of our culture[,] because of hate” (§ 20). The foundations of the nation have been abandoned, he argues. “We have suffered, we the Spanish Americans,” he states, for “our culture was not respected nor [sic] protected, even though the Constitution provides for it” (§ 21).<sup>108</sup>

Though later in his speech Tijerina will once again repudiate the U.S. nation for its “destruction, fake, [sic] hypocrisy, murdering, killing, [and] destroying,” here he appeals to his audience’s moral conscience (§ 25). “So you see,” Tijerina continues, “why the Spanish American is speaking out. The Spanish American—as poor as he is—he [sic] can see through the future and see that we’re running out of time” (§ 26). If the “new breed” is Tijerina’s

metaphor for Spanish American identity in his more radical ethno-nationalist discourse (literally a blend of Spanish and Native American), he provides a different meaning of the phrase “Spanish American” in this more reformist part of his speech. The Spanish American is a citizen who holds equal rights and an equal stake in the future of the nation (i.e., “Spanish” modified “American,” or U.S. citizen). “You can see we are needed [in this country],” he notes; “we have a role to play in its divine plan” (§ 30).

While in his more radical ethno-nationalist discourse Tijerina does not provide a role for the Anglo audience (other than as fellow conspirators in American society), here Tijerina reshapes the place of Anglo citizens in the Alianza’s movement for justice. Though the “bad Anglos” will ignore Tijerina’s prophetic warning and continue their “bitter” and “proudful [sic]” politics, “the good [Anglos] are always with the Constitution and with truth and justice,” says Tijerina (§ 28). Through the tactic of dissociation, Tijerina has given his audience a choice—ignore his call for justice and be constituted as a “bad Anglo,” or stand in solidarity with Tijerina and become a “good Anglo.”<sup>109</sup> In Tijerina’s jeremiad, it is quite clear to the audience what side (God’s side or the side of sin) they should join.

“This is the era of justice and claims,” Tijerina states (§ 30). Just as he opens by stating his case for an ethno-nationalist understanding of the land grant struggle, Tijerina concludes by solidifying his reformist, civil rights discourse of U.S. citizenship. “I thank you for your attention, and I hope you got part of the picture,” states Tijerina (referencing his earlier commitment to educate his audience on the land grant issue). He and the Alianza “invite all good Anglos . . . to help us with our struggle.” “Let’s not turn our backs to history, to facts, to law, to the Constitution,” he states; “You claim your rights under the Constitution; we claim our land grants under the Constitution. . . . We are true Americans” (§ 32).

Tijerina concludes his oration not only by reaffirming his appeal to U.S. citizenship, but also by reiterating the jeremiad that drives his discourse of reform. “Ladies and gentlemen, behold our country coming to nothing just like all the empires,” Tijerina summarizes; “Let’s help” (§ 33). Like in his letters from prison, Tijerina finds in international law the source of justice that will hold the government accountable for its sins.<sup>110</sup> In an echo of Rev. Martin Luther King’s speech against the Vietnam War, Tijerina concludes:

We’ll ask the United Nations to investigate. Only for the survival of the United States . . . not because we hold any hatred. Hatred is not mobilized in our hearts and spirits. It’s just that new potential that has been discovered in New Mexico: Justice—not communism—justice. But not that justice written in the books by historians, ladies, no. Justice—that virgin element, potential created by God—that synchronizes, harmonizes all the elements of the world and brings about peace. Thank you very much (§ 34).<sup>111</sup>

Tijerina alludes to his earlier critique of U.S. sins, such as racism and hatred; he also calls for the force of international justice (through the United Nations) to halt America’s unchecked aggression. As we see in this brief quotation, Tijerina concludes by calling for solidarity among Anglos and Spanish Americans, restating his belief in the Constitution and international treaties, and reaffirming his jeremiadic appeal to justice.

In “The Land Grant Question,” Tijerina navigates between the rhetoric of reform and radicalism in the service of constructing a case for the land grant struggle. In the speech’s structure, tone, and content (including its use of metaphor and evidence), as well as in Tijerina’s persona, we see a migration (or oscillation) between a reformist rhetoric grounded in American civil rights and a radical rhetoric of ethno-nationalism. Similarly, Tijerina moves between a jeremiadic call for America to reaffirm justice and an apocalyptic condemnation of Anglo

society. Tijerina migrates between each extreme, sometimes transitioning between the two with metaphor, but at other times leaving the jarring contrast between these two discourses that is characteristic of the borderlands.<sup>112</sup> Thus, as I have argued in this analysis, “The Land Grant Question” and his public letters most clearly demonstrate Tijerina’s border citizenship. In the conclusion, I discuss the pitfalls and possibilities of this border (or liminal) discourse. I also tie together the three texts I have analyzed, showing how Tijerina navigates the tensions of a border citizenship.

### **Border Citizenship**

Though the texts analyzed in this chapter vary in genre and time period, I have argued they all demonstrate the border quality of Tijerina’s discourse of citizenship. With a few exceptions, scholars who have engaged Tijerina and the Alianza have paid scarce attention to his rhetoric. Moreover, scholarly and biographical depictions of Tijerina portray him in incongruent ways: as either revolutionary or reformer. These characterizations of Tijerina coexist and are equally justifiable, I have argued. Their internal logic comes into focus when we analyze Tijerina’s rhetoric.

Tijerina’s citizenship discourse remains “multiply encoded.” In other words, his border citizenship “looks both ways, north and south, toward the United States and Mexico, toward the past and the present, in order to negotiate the terms of its territorial, cultural, and political sovereignty in the present.”<sup>113</sup> By migrating between contradictory modes of citizenship discourse, Tijerina navigated the tensions endemic to U.S. citizenship, tensions between exclusion and inclusion. At times, Tijerina and the Alianza constructed rhetorics of inclusion by making a legal and moral case for their political and social citizenship. Tijerina appropriated U.S. law and American traditions in his struggle for the rights of poor Hispanos and Chicana/os;

he used the “master’s tools” to expand the borders of U.S. citizenship. At other times, Tijerina’s discourse seemed to bespeak that the tensions of citizenship could never be reconciled. In these moments, he expressed frustration with the master’s tools and instead embraced a position of exclusion. Standing on the outside of U.S. citizenship, Tijerina sought to destroy the “master’s house” and construct a citizenship of his own—an Indo-Hispano identity, united by blood, culture, language, and history into a new nation.<sup>114</sup>

Tijerina’s ambiguous and antagonistic relationship to the “central order” presents a fundamental quality of border, or liminal, discourse.<sup>115</sup> Both the Californios and Tijerina (and the Alianza) struggled with similar racial dimensions of U.S. citizenship. The Californios negotiated the tensions of U.S. citizenship by seeking to negotiate through a *compromise* citizenship discourse. In the contractual tradition of citizenship, they bargained to incorporate Mexican/Californian traditions into U.S. citizenship. Unlike the Californios, Tijerina and the Alianza were legally recognized citizens who faced different challenges. Over a hundred years after the Californios had compromised to attain rights to political participation, the respect of their language and culture, and the preservation of their lands, the *Alianza Federal de Mercedes Reales* organized Latina/o citizens to fight for similar political and social rights.

Like the Californios, Latina/os in the 1960s were struggling with the extension of U.S. empire and the racialized dimensions of U.S. citizenship.<sup>116</sup> More specifically, Latina/os were “grappling with inequities in accessing politics, education, economics, health and welfare, and social justice.”<sup>117</sup> While the Californios used compromise rhetorical forms to achieve a marriage of their Mexican traditions with those of their Anglo counterparts, Tijerina and the Alianza operated from different subject positions. Not members of the institutional spheres of power, Tijerina and the Alianza had to rely on a more migratory discourse, “one that occupie[d] the

periphery in relation to a contextually determined center.”<sup>118</sup> Because they faced not only institutional barriers but also cultural and historical antagonism and outright persecution, the movement developed a border citizenship, one that engaged in a “series of multiple border crossings and multilayered transitions.”<sup>119</sup> Tijerina’s border discourse, which we see manifested in his speeches and writings as well as his actions, oscillated between: 1) a reformist civil rights discourse that argued for political and social citizenship; and 2) a radical ethno-nationalist discourse that rejected U.S. citizenship for a separate Hispanic or Latina/o nation. Tijerina moved between these discourses of citizenship in different moments and for different reasons, making both the content of his discourse and the form with which he articulated it characteristic of border citizenship.

It is difficult to classify Tijerina’s citizenship discourse in relation to the previous chapter, for, to borrow from Victor Turner, it was “neither one thing nor another”; that is, his mode of citizenship chose both inclusion and separation.<sup>120</sup> Tijerina’s distinct and dialectical discourse of citizenship arose within a specific context that I have tried to outline in this chapter. Many of Tijerina’s scholars and biographers have tried to plumb the depths of his psyche, his past, or his religious vision to understand the conflicting tension between Tijerina the radical and Tijerina the reformer, between the “revolutionary/bandido” and the “lawyer without books.” Yet trying to smooth out the jarring contradictions of his life, his work, and his words is a fruitless and, more importantly, an unnecessary endeavor. As Gloria Anzaldúa notes, “the U.S.-Mexican border *es una herida abierta* [is an open wound] where the Third World grates against the first and bleeds.”<sup>121</sup> Tijerina’s discourse represents the contradictions of the borderland and the conflicts of border crossing; the border is “not a comfortable territory to live in, this place of contradictions.”<sup>122</sup> Tijerina’s discourse not only crossed borders between inclusion and

exclusion, it also traversed the boundary between citizen and foreigner and between rhetoric and revolution.<sup>123</sup> In the face of these observations, tracing Tijerina's border citizenship demonstrates the pitfalls, possibilities, and paradoxes of border consciousness.

Tijerina's border citizenship discourse presented him and the Alianza with a unique form of agency that was not available to the Californios of the nineteenth century. Rather than compromise with dominant institutions or traditions, Latina/os like Tijerina, and other social movement leaders of the time, crafted discursive space by experimenting with the very borders of citizenship with which they had struggled. In this specific case study, I have shown the ways in which Tijerina's border citizenship presented a "threat to the central order," which indicates the power Latina/os had found in the 1960s through more confrontational modes of discourse.<sup>124</sup> Yet the meteoric rise of Latina/o social movements, Tijerina's in particular, was accompanied by an equally drastic fall. Border discourse was at times too threatening and at other times too foreign to challenge dominant logics. A discourse that is "betwixt and between" evades easy categorization—both its bane and its boon. In the end, Tijerina's rhetoric demonstrates the innovation of Latina/o efforts to remake and renew the parameters of belonging. It also illustrates the persistent experience that "citizenship is meaningful only in the lives of those who continue to be excluded" from it.<sup>125</sup>

Tijerina and the Alianza present another important moment in Latina/os' struggles with U.S. citizenship. In the next chapter I consider a third moment in which Latina/os struggled to attain U.S. citizenship in its fullest sense. If past struggles teach us how Latina/o citizenship has evolved along with U.S. history, they can also inform how contemporary efforts for Latina/o citizenship are manifested. As I discussed in the opening chapter, the Latina/o immigrant protests of 2006 illustrate Latina/os' contemporary struggles with U.S. citizenship. In the next

chapter, I turn to the largest of these protests—La Gran Marcha of March 25—to show how Latina/o discourses of citizenship have expanded and taken on new forms. Californios struggled for inclusion, while Latina/o movements, like Tijerina’s, struggled between inclusion as citizens and creating a separate public space. Latina/o protestors in La Gran Marcha of March 25, 2006, also confronted the tensions of inclusion and exclusion endemic to U.S. citizenship. But unlike the contradictory and migratory border citizenship I have considered in this chapter, La Gran Marcha demonstrates a successful moment in which Latina/os fused multiple identities, nationalities, and traditions into a *hybrid* citizenship.

### Notes for Chapter 3

1. Richard Gardner, *¡Grito! Reies Tijerina and the New Mexico Land Grant War of 1967* (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1970), 156.

2. New Mexicans had undergone parallel struggles for some of the same economic and cultural rights the Californios initially secured in the Constitutional Convention of 1849. For a more detailed history of Mexicans transitioning to U.S. citizens in nineteenth century New Mexico see David Maciel and Erlinda Gonzales-Berry, eds., *The Contested Homeland: A Chicano History of New Mexico* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2000).

3. Gardner, *Grito*, 156.

4. Ibid. See also Peter Nabokov, *Tijerina and the Courthouse Raid*, 2d ed. (Berkeley, CA: Ramparts Press, 1970), Chapter 6. I will elaborate on this event in Tijerina’s political life later in this chapter.

5. Though few have examined it in detail, several scholars recognize the implicit and explicit themes of citizenship that animated Tijerina’s struggle for land and cultural rights. For example, Rudy Busto writes that the power and novelty of Tijerina’s message stem “from the simple enactment of his reading in the United States Constitution that he is guaranteed certain unalienable rights as an American citizen.” Rudy V. Busto, *King Tiger: The Religious Vision of Reies López Tijerina* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2005), 204. David Maciel and Juan José Peña, too, claim that Tijerina “articulated the issue [of land grants] in terms of social justice and civil rights.” David R. Maciel and Juan José Peña, “La Reconquista: The Chicano Movement in New Mexico,” in *The Contested Homeland: A Chicano History of New Mexico*, ed. David Maciel and Erlinda Gonzales-Berry (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2000), 272. And even in their self-professedly Marxist analysis of Tijerina’s successes and failures, Alaniz and Cornish acknowledge that Tijerina’s and his “movement’s essential direction was toward social justice and economic and political *inclusion* as U.S. citizens.” Yolanda Alaniz and Megan Cornish, *Viva La Raza: A History of Chicano Identity and Resistance* (Seattle, WA: Red Letter Press, 2008), 197. This point will be developed further in the chapter, but this evidence suffices to justify that Tijerina’s rhetoric and political activity are a rich resource for scholars



interested in Latina/o discourses of U.S. citizenship. What I hope to bring to this conversation is a consideration of Tijerina's citizenship as expressed through his rhetoric.

6. Like California during the nineteenth century, New Mexico had also been a relatively independent province of Mexico. In fact, New Mexico was considered even more of a frontier land than California because it was sparsely settled and lacked extensive formal government institutions. Nevertheless, New Mexico's inhabitants also developed a local nomenclature that attested to their political and cultural independence from Mexico: the term "Hispano." Like the contemporary term Hispanic, this term was meant to emphasize the New Mexicans' identification with their Spanish history rather than their Mexican alleciances. As part of the complicated history of the region (which was colonized much later than any other part of the Southwest and remained relatively disconnected from the rest of the area) the Hispanos of New Mexico, particularly the people of the northern mountain villages among which the Alianza sprang up, identified with their Spanish colonial legacy (language, culture, and so forth). Thus, whenever I refer to the Latina/o New Mexicans I use the term "Hispano." When I speak about Mexican Americans more generally, I use that term. When I speak about the Chicana/o movement or those who identified themselves with that ethno-political movement, I use the term Chicana/o. Finally, in some places I use the term "Spanish American," which is a regional term similar to "Hispano," and which Tijerina often used in its place. See Busto, *King Tiger*, ix-x; Lee Bebout, "Hero Making in El Movimiento: Reies López Tijerina and the Chicano Nationalist Imaginary," *Aztlán: A Journal of Chicano Studies* 32 (2007), 114-5.

7. Quoted in Nabokov, *Tijerina and the Courthouse Raid*, 197.

8. Quoted in Gardner, *Grito*, 37.

9. Busto, *King Tiger*, 42.

10. *Ibid.*, 41. Gardner describes how Tijerina was inspired at this period in his life by the stories of Old Testament prophets wandering and preaching to the Hebrews. Tijerina self-professedly sought to emulate their examples in his itinerant ministry through his commitment to a nomadic and poor lifestyle. Gardner, *Grito*, 40.

11. Busto, *King Tiger*, 45. Tijerina's break with the church came to partial fruition in his self-published book of sermons entitled *¿Hallará Fe en la Tierra?* [Shall Faith be Found on this Earth?]. As Busto summarizes, Tijerina's book "warned his readers of the dire consequences of lax faith and predicts God's use of the atom bombs the instrument of divine justice." *Ibid.* Tijerina's book was an apocalyptic narrative drawing from the prophets of the Old Testament that condemned the practices of the institutional church and society and foretold God's coming judgment. Obviously, Tijerina's increasingly radical theology contributed to his rejection of the "material" world and the establishment of the *Valle de Paz*. We can also see many of the strands of Old Testament prophetic discourse in his activist rhetoric, as I will argue later in the chapter.

12. For more about the Valle de Paz experiment see Rudy V. Busto, "Sacred Order, Sacred Space: Reies López Tijerina and the Valle De Paz Community," in *Mexican American Religions: Spirituality, Activism, and Culture*, ed. Gastón Espinosa and Mario T. García (Durham: Duke University Press, 2008).

13. See Gardner, *Grito*, Chapter 5. Patricia Bell Blawis, *Tijerina and the Land Grants: Mexican Americans in Struggle for Their Heritage*, (New York: International Publishers, 1971), Chapter 2. Anselmo Arellano, "The People's Movement: Las Gorras Blancas," in *The Contested Homeland: A Chicano History of New Mexico*, ed. David Maciel and Erlinda Gonzales-Berry (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2000).

14. Gardner, *Grito*, 122.

15. Hammerback, Jensen, and Gutierrez, *A War of Words*, Chapter 2.

16. Busto, *King Tiger*, 56.

17. Gardner, *Grito*, Chapter 9. Blawis, *Tijerina and the Land Grants*, Chapter 6.

18. Busto, *King Tiger*, 57-8.

19. At a protest march of 500 people staged in Albuquerque, the Alianza carried red flags which Tijerina claimed signified “warning” and “danger.” Quoted in Gardner, *Grito*, 140.

20. Blawis, *Tijerina and the Land Grants*, Chapter 13.

21. Busto, *King Tiger*, 68.

22. Nabokov, *Tijerina and the Courthouse Raid*, 280. Of course by the 1970s the Chicana/o movement had lost much of its energy in factional disagreements and cooptation. Busto, *King Tiger*.

23. See Busto for a review of Tijerina’s activism in 1980s and 1990s. Busto, *King Tiger*, 71-76.

24. See for example Tijerina’s treatment relative to other movement activists in the germinal work on Chicana/o history: Rodolfo Acuña, *Occupied America: A History of Chicanos*, 5th ed. (New York: Pearson Longman, 2004). For a critique of this historical amnesia regarding Tijerina in the scholarship on Latina/o and Chicana/o studies see Busto, *King Tiger*, Chapter 1. One of the central arguments of Busto’s book is that this historical amnesia regarding Tijerina is, on the one hand, due to the sedimented narrative of the 1960s that dominates Chicana/o studies, and, on the other hand, a result of Tijerina’s lifelong religious faith, which is an unpopular topic for secular activists and scholars. I believe these two reasons only explain part of the problem scholars have with Tijerina; Tijerina is also a difficult figure to study because of his complex, conflicting, and often contradictory rhetoric and activism.

25. Historical work on Tijerina and the *Alianza* aims to interpret Tijerina’s movement in the current of Chicana/o history. Chicana/o scholars have generally read Tijerina as another member of the larger pantheon of Chicana/o civil rights leaders of the 1960s and 1970s. As Busto summarizes, “from the view of Chicano activists and scholars . . . Tijerina and the *Alianza* were adopted wholesale as representative of the New Mexican Hispano struggle.” Busto, *King Tiger*, 26. Like César Chávez was the voice of Chicana/o laborers, Rodolfo “Corky” González the voice of militant, urban Chicano youth, and José Angel Gutierrez the voice of Chicana/o nationalism, this scholarship has understood Reies Tijerina as the voice of the landless and dispossessed New Mexican Chicana/o. Some examples include Acuña, *Occupied America*; Matt S. Meier and Feliciano Ribera, *The Chicanos: A History of Mexican Americans* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1972); Francisco A. Rosales, *Chicano!: The History of the Mexican American Civil Rights Movement* (Houston, TX: Arte Público Press, 1996). These four Chicano activists have come to be termed the “Four Horsemen” of the Chicana/o movement, according to Meier and Ribera’s formulation. They are popularly considered the four heads of the Chicana/o civil rights struggle, each representing a unique purpose and political strategy. Such an understanding presents a limited picture of Tijerina and his contemporaries, many of whom shared just as many differences as similarities in their beliefs and tactics. Moreover, reading these figures together as elements of a unified Chicana/o movement interprets their historical movements through a contemporary narrative, rather than in the disagreements and conflicts of the time. This conventional narrative of Tijerina and his fellow Chicano activists has tended to limit our understanding of Tijerina’s words and work on their own merit. For a further discussion of this scholarly literature on Tijerina see Busto, *King Tiger*, 22-34.

26. To further this point, there is an important body of work on Chicana/o movement rhetoric, yet most of this work focuses on leaders like Chávez and González. Fernando P. Delgado, “Chicano Movement Rhetoric: An Ideographic Interpretation,” *Communication Quarterly* 43 (1995); John C. Hammerback and Richard J. Jensen, “Ethnic Heritage as Rhetorical Legacy: The Plan of Delano,” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 80 (1994); Hammerback and Jensen, *The Rhetorical Career of César Chávez*. Only several works within the field of communication studies consider Tijerina’s role as Chicano activist/rhetor: Hammerback and Jensen, “The Rhetorical Worlds of César Chávez and Reies Tijerina”; Ruby Ann Fernandez and Richard J. Jensen, “Reies Lopez Tijerina’s ‘The Land Grant Question’: Creating History through Metaphors,” *Howard Journal of Communications* 6 (1995); John C. Hammerback and Richard J. Jensen, “‘The Tongue of a Latin Moses’: The Rhetoric of Reies Tijerina,” in *A War of Words: Chicano Protest in the 1960s and 1970s*, ed. José Angel Gutiérrez (Westport, CN: Greenwood Press, 1985).

27. Quoted in Blawis, *Tijerina and the Land Grants*, 33.

28. Another weakness of Tijerina's biographies, by virtue of being written in the late 1960s and early 1970s, is their tendency to view Tijerina's life through the lens of the courthouse raid at Tierra Amarilla. Each of his biographers, to varying degrees, interprets the incidents at Tierra Amarilla as the culmination of his movement. Their common goal is to describe and interpret the circumstances leading up to the events at Tierra Amarilla. This tends to give Tijerina's biographies a overarching narrative of rebellion or revolution.

29. Hammerback, Jensen, and Gutierrez, *A War of Words*, 14.

30. Gardner, *Grito*, 44. Hammerback, Jensen, and Gutierrez, *A War of Words*, 25. Rosales, *Chicano*, 157.

31. Maciel and Peña, "La Reconquista," 275. Alaniz and Cornish, *Viva La Raza*, 200.

32. Gardner, *Grito*, 44.

33. Fernandez and Jensen, "Reies Lopez Tijerina's 'The Land Grant Question.'"

34. Busto, *King Tiger: The Religious Vision of Reies López Tijerina*, 3.

35. Hammerback, Jensen, and Gutierrez, *A War of Words*, 7.

36. Hammerback and Jensen's work on Tijerina develops what the authors consider the "major substantive themes" of Tijerina's public address, including; "Anglos had illegally taken the Hispanos' land"; "the law would remedy the injustice if Hispanos presented their case effectively"; appeals to "kinship to family, community, and race"; "manhood"; "God"; as well as a variety of others. Hammerback, Jensen, and Gutiérrez, *A War of Words*, 18, 21, 24. Though Hammerback and Jensen's brief (15 pages) review of Tijerina's thirty year rhetorical career stops short of providing an overarching scheme or interpretation, the authors attempt to draw out a "rhetorical model" applicable to other Latina/o and Chicana/o leaders. "Rhetorical discourse," they argue, "created, extended, and intensified the perceived reality of discontented people; this reality built an audience capable of action." Hammerback, Jensen, and Gutiérrez, *A War of Words*, 25. Through their faithful efforts Hammerback and Jensen show that Tijerina indeed possessed a "distinctly rhetorical view of the world." Hammerback and Jensen, "The Rhetorical Worlds of César Chávez and Reies Tijerina," 170. Yet their work neither closely analyzes Tijerina's rhetoric nor considers its significance in the larger trajectory of Latina/o or Chicana/o history; their main goal is to illustrate Tijerina's rhetorical sensibilities. Richard Jensen's essay with Ruby Fernandez begins to address this limitation by analyzing the use of metaphor within Tijerina's most widely circulated speech "The Land Grant Question," but its focus on metaphor divests Tijerina's rhetoric of some of its most powerful, prevalent, and conflicting arguments. Fernandez and Jensen, "Reies Lopez Tijerina's 'The Land Grant Question.'" To be clear, limited work on Tijerina's rhetoric is in stark contrast to Jensen and Hammerback's excellent work on other Chicano figures such as César Chávez, for example. Hammerback and Jensen, *The Rhetorical Career of César Chávez*. In several books and academic articles, Hammerback and Jensen examine the rhetoric of César Chávez in much more detail to show the cultural and rhetorical features that made his discourse unique and powerful, including the rhetoric of plans, *dichos* (aphorisms), and *cuentos* (stories). The problem is merely a lack of development—scholars have not spent significant time with Tijerina's rhetoric *yet*. I hope to further Hammerback, Jensen, and Fernandez's work by attending to Tijerina's rhetoric more closely in the context of U.S. citizenship.

37. For example, in his book *King Tiger*, Rudy Busto attempts to reconcile Tijerina's religious beliefs with his movement for ethnic rights through a consideration of his most influential speeches and writings. Busto, *King Tiger*, 8. In contrast to Hammerback and Jensen, who emphasized the secular themes of Tijerina's rhetoric, Busto concludes that it is "the all-consuming fire of [Tijerina's] religious faith that supports his political life and has always determined his view of himself in relation to the world." Busto, *King Tiger*, 13. Busto's excellent work differs from mine in two important respects. First, perhaps in an unconscious or unwitting nod to Tijerina's biographers, Busto seeks Tijerina's underlying motivations or beliefs that animated his life and activism. Second, Busto focuses on the degree to which religion informed Tijerina's life. As the quotations above demonstrate, for Busto

Tijerina's whole life and work stemmed from his religious faith. In this chapter I seek another dimension of Tijerina's rhetoric, that is, his concern with U.S. citizenship. Tijerina's border rhetoric migrated between a prophetic voice and a secular voice and between a radical voice and an integrationist voice concerning the tensions of U.S. national belonging.

38. Though in his federal trial for the courthouse raid Tijerina was convicted of several charges, the accounts of his involvement in the planning and execution of the raid at Tierra Amarilla vary greatly. For example, the accounts of the raid in two of his biographies differ dramatically from Tijerina's account of the raid in his memoirs. Blawis, *Tijerina and the Land Grants*; Gardner, *Grito*; Reies L. Tijerina, *They Called Me "King Tiger": My Struggle for the Land and Our Rights* (Houston: Arte Público Press, 2000).

39. Pinning down Tijerina's rhetorical and political significance to a handful of his discourse is difficult to do because his rhetoric spanned nearly a decade and took on many forms, including protest, public address, and writings. As such, the picture I paint of Tijerina's discourse of citizenship will only be partial. This caveat must be compounded for, because of space constraints, I will bracket Tijerina's activism through the Alianza, which would be more appropriately considered through a social movement lens. All of this is to say that I do not aim to provide a complete picture of Tijerina's and the Alianza's significance to Chicana/o, Latina/o, and American history, but only to begin to fill in this picture vis-à-vis Tijerina's discourse of U.S. citizenship.

40. Tijerina was in prison convicted of charges stemming from the Echo Amphitheater takeover for twenty-one months, from October 1969 through July 1971, when he was paroled. Tijerina was arrested June 11 for a parole violation and remained in jail during multiple trials until he was sentenced in October. In the summer of 1969 he wrote several public letters that were published in local newspapers or magazines, two of which I have chosen to analyze here. Subsequently the letters have become important historical documents, as is evidenced by their primary placement in several anthologies of Mexican American history. Sadly, I only have access to reprinted excerpts of Tijerina's public letters. Many of these primary documents are only accessible through archives. Reies L. Tijerina, "Letter from the Santa Fe Jail by Reies Lopez Tijerina (1969)," in *Encyclopedia of Minorities in American Politics*, ed. Jeffrey D. Schultz, et al. (Santa Barbara, CA: Greenwood Press Publishing Group, 2000); Reies L. Tijerina, "From Prison: Reies López Tijerina," in *The Chicanos: Mexican American Voices*, ed. Ed Ludwig and James Santibañez (Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1971). The speech I analyze is entitled "The Land Grant Question," and is one of Tijerina's most circulated speeches. It was delivered at the University of Colorado-Denver on November 20, 1967. Unfortunately I was only able to attain a reprinted and excerpted copy of this speech. Reies L. Tijerina, "The Land Grant Question," in *Ripples of Hope: Great American Civil Rights Speeches*, ed. Josh Gottheimer (New York: Basic Civitas Books, 2003). Because I had to rely on excerpts of some of Tijerina's speeches and letters, I chose to analyze three documents to reach a more complete understanding of Tijerina's discourse. Furthermore, I chose to analyze these specific texts for two additional reasons. First, they represent the most visible era of Tijerina's activism—from the courthouse raid until his imprisonment in 1969. Therefore, they provide a snapshot of Tijerina's citizenship discourse in its different expressions. Second, precisely because they come after the courthouse raid, this period in Tijerina's life is characterized by his most contradictory rhetoric and activism. Because of bipolar depictions of Tijerina as either a revolutionary or a reformist, analyzing these texts provides an opportunity to demonstrate his border citizenship.

41. Reports of this incident are conflicting. Reies and some of his biographers clearly place the blame on supposedly overzealous federal agents who were intent on arresting Tijerina again at whatever the cost. Other biographers present a more ambiguous narrative of the events. What we know is that after burning the sign, Patsy and Reies Tijerina and their party of Aliancistas were surrounded by federal and state forestry rangers. While the rangers attempted to apprehend the Tijerinas, a scuffle ensued and several of the rangers drew their firearms. Reies reciprocated by withdrawing his rifle, and he and several other *Aliancistas* were arrested after a stand off. While the other *Aliancistas*, including Patsy were

eventually released, Tijerina's bond on charges stemming from the Echo Amphitheater incident was revoked and he was jailed. Blawis, *Tijerina and the Land Grants*, Chapter 14.

42. In this chapter I am working from an excerpt of the over-30-page letter. Tijerina, "Letter from the Santa Fe Jail by Reies Lopez Tijerina (1969)."

43. Busto, *King Tiger*, 154.

44. S. Jonathan Bass and Martin Luther King, *Blessed Are the Peacemakers: Martin Luther King, Jr., Eight White Religious Leaders, and The "Letter from Birmingham Jail"* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2001).

45. R. P. Fulkerson, "The Public Letter as a Rhetorical Form: Structure, Logic, and Style in King's 'Letter from Birmingham Jail,'" *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 65 (1979).

46. All subsequent references, unless otherwise noted, come from Tijerina, "Letter from the Santa Fe Jail by Reies Lopez Tijerina (1969)," 556.

47. For more on King's persona in the "Letter from Birmingham Jail" see Michael Leff and Ebony A. Utley, "Instrumental and Constitutive Rhetoric in Martin Luther King Jr.'s 'Letter from Birmingham Jail,'" *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 7 (2004), 38, 49.

48. Fulkerson, "The Public Letter as a Rhetorical Form."

49. Robert E. Terrill, "Protest, Prophecy, and Prudence in the Rhetoric of Malcolm X," *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 4 (2001). Paradoxically, Tijerina alludes to the language of the Declaration of Independence through his use of the phrase "pursuit of happiness." This subtle reference indicates Tijerina's continuing oscillation between a radical and an integrationist voice; even in his condemnation of the federal government and Anglo society, Tijerina deploys the language of U.S. citizenship and U.S. founding documents. I will elaborate on this border discourse later in the chapter.

50. Robert E. Terrill, "Colonizing the Borderlands: Shifting Circumference in the Rhetoric of Malcolm X," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 86 (2000).

51. As Bebout notes, Tijerina's term "Indo-Hispano" was a way to identify with the common cultural heritage northern New Mexicans traced back to Spain while also celebrating the mixed ethnic identity of Mexican Americans. "Indo-Hispano" shared many similarities with another term evolving at the time, "Chicano," which nevertheless had important differences. While the notion of "Chicanos," which focused on ethnic and cultural similarities of all Mexican-Americans, was developing in California and Colorado, Tijerina coined the term "Indo-Hispano" because it drew on the Spanish cultural and legal traditions that were so important to northern New Mexicans (i.e., the term "Hispano"). For further discussion of the differences between these two terms see Bebout, "Hero Making in El Movimiento."

52. All subsequent references, unless otherwise noted, come from Tijerina, "Letter from the Santa Fe Jail by Reies Lopez Tijerina (1969)," 557.

53. McGee, "In Search of 'the People.'"

54. Terrill, "Colonizing the Borderlands," 76.

55. Condit and Lucaites, *Crafting Equality*, 192-3.

56. The revolutionary bandit is a common trope in many cultures, notes Bebout, but in the Chicana/o context it is infused with unique cultural conditions. For many Chicana/os in the 1960s, Bebout argues, Tijerina was the embodiment of this revolutionary/bandido trope; Tijerina became an "icon," a "living, breathing revolutionary hero" around which the Chicana/o movement was able to flourish and flesh out its ethno-nationalist philosophy. Bebout, "Hero Making in El Movimiento," 105.

57. Delgado, "Chicano Movement Rhetoric," 448. Though classifying Tijerina's rhetoric as Chicano rhetoric would be inaccurate, it does share several common elements with the evolving Chicano rhetoric of the time period. For example, as Delgado argues, "Chicanismo reconceived Mexican Americans as radicals, populists, and nationalists . . . who were grappling with inequities in accessing politics, education, economics, health and welfare, and social justice." Though it was diverse, Chicano rhetoric shared several themes we also see expressed in Tijerina's more radical ethno-nationalist rhetoric, including the affirmation of an ethnic identity, a critique of the dominant social order, and a call to action.

Fernando P. Delgado, "Chicano Ideology Revisited: Rap Music and the (Re)Articulation of Chicanismo," *Western Journal of Communication* 62 (1998), 98, 109.

58. Blawis, *Tijerina and the Land Grants*, 36. Blawis' treatment is interesting for it was informed by her close association and participation with the Alianza. Yet Blawis' fundamental organizing concern was to describe the evolution of Tijerina's larger struggle for Mexican American land and cultural rights, pre and post Tierra Amarilla. As a self-professed communist, Blawis evaluated Tijerina's successes and failures through this leftist lens.

59. Gardner, *Grito*, 70. Richard Gardner's *¡Grito!* organizes Tijerina's life around the courthouse raid, beginning and ending with the events at Tierra Amarilla. Gardner thickens his account with contextual evidence, interviews, and historical research, but his biography is unique because it takes the most licenses with narrative techniques. As a result it is, arguably, the most engaging of the four.

60. Rosales, *Chicano*, 154.

61. Maciel and Peña, "La Reconquista," 274.

62. Busto, *King Tiger*, 151.

63. Hammerback, Jensen, and Gutierrez, *A War of Words*, 160-2.

64. Tijerina, "From Prison: Reies López Tijerina."

65. Busto, *King Tiger*, 154.

66. All subsequent references, unless otherwise noted, come from Tijerina, "From Prison: Reies López Tijerina," 215.

67. Malinda Snow, "Martin Luther King's 'Letter from the Birmingham Jail' As Pauline Epistle," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 71 (1985).

68. Black, "The Second Persona."

69. Tijerina, "From Prison: Reies López Tijerina," 216.

70. *Ibid.*

71. *Ibid.*, 217.

72. Condit and Lucaites, *Crafting Equality*, 192.

73. Tijerina, "From Prison: Reies López Tijerina," 217.

74. Busto, *King Tiger*, 151.

75. *Ibid.*, 53. As Busto insightfully argues, it is likely that Tijerina developed his reliance on text-based authority and his practice of interpretive reading from his training as a Protestant minister. "His formal membership with the Assemblies of God," argues Busto, "trained [Tijerina] in public speaking and gave him the interpretive reading skills he would use in his political life." Busto, *King Tiger*, 77.

76. Tijerina, "From Prison: Reies López Tijerina," 217.

77. For a further discussion of Tijerina's concept of *ejidos* see Gardner, *Grito*, Chapter 5.

78. Tijerina, "From Prison: Reies López Tijerina," 218.

79. *Ibid.*, 219.

80. On the charge that the Alianza was anti-Indian, Tijerina claimed that Native Americans were part of the constituency for which the Alianza was advocating. "The ejido or pasturage of the land grants is for the Indian and for the Hispano," he argued. Moving on later to the charge that the Alianza was merely after land and had no future plans, Tijerina made clear that the Alianza was a large scale organization meant to secure civil rights for all Hispanos. "In the future the Alliance," he noted (note his use of Alliance here, the English word, not *Alianza*), "will attempt to help the Spanish people clean up politics in the state, to use the vote wisely, and elect good candidates to government positions in New Mexico." *Ibid.*, 219-20. Tijerina's refutative arguments echo more closely King's "Letter from Birmingham Jail," a connection I will discuss further later in this chapter. Fulkerson, "The Public Letter as a Rhetorical Form."

81. Tijerina, "From Prison: Reies López Tijerina," 220.

82. Leff and Utley, "Instrumental and Constitutive Rhetoric," 49.

83. Gardner, *Grito*, 70.; Rosales, *Chicano*, 154.

84. Tijerina, "From Prison: Reies López Tijerina," 219.

85. *Ibid.*, 222.

86. Since Busto is concerned with tracing Tijerina's religious beliefs and motives, he explains the drastic differences in Tijerina's letters by relying on one of the dreams Tijerina had (described in Tijerina's memoir) during his incarceration. Though Tijerina never connects the two things himself, Busto argues that the dream Tijerina had must have impacted him to a great deal, causing him to reaffirm his religious convictions and change his rhetoric and tactics. Busto, *King Tiger*, 155. Though this explanation is certainly possible, it is difficult to ascertain what Tijerina's true motives or thoughts were in 1969 that led to this change even when taking into account Tijerina's memoir, which was written years later and is not specific on this point. Moreover, as I will show later in this chapter, Tijerina's pattern of border rhetoric was more fundamental to his political and rhetorical career; it cannot be explained merely by chalking it up to a dream or vision. In fact, I argue that this rhetorical migration was not a problem at all, but was fundamental to Tijerina's activism.

87. As Fernandez and Jensen further explain, Tijerina often spoke with "pride, determination and outrage before Chicano audiences." But when speaking to "other groups, he assumed the role of teacher." Fernandez and Jensen acknowledge Tijerina's conflicting and contradictory personas. Fernandez and Jensen, "Reies Lopez Tijerina's 'The Land Grant Question,'" 130.

88. Nabokov, *Tijerina and the Courthouse Raid*, 280. According to Nabokov, this tension "still said next to nothing about the source of [Tijerina's] drive." In the end, Nabokov is unable to "plumb" the "source" of Tijerina's conflicting personas; instead he is left simply acknowledging Tijerina's "mystery." Nabokov's biography self-professedly explores what "drove" Tijerina and deftly traces the interweaving interests and agents involved in and leading up to the courthouse raid. As a journalist, Nabokov's biographical account of the raid and the events and personalities surrounding it is grounded in primary documents and interviews, and his collected notes and papers, held at the University of New Mexico, have helped many later writers and scholars explore Tijerina's world. The *Peter Nabokov Papers, 1963-1977*, and the *Peter Nabokov Photography Collection* are held at the University of New Mexico's Center for Southwest Research. They hold notes, manuscripts, recorded interviews, and collected papers concerning Reies Tijerina and other influential New Mexican figures. The few other serious works on Tijerina, including Gardner's biography, have drawn on these papers for primary material. Unfortunately I was not able to include them in this chapter.

89. Robert Terrill, for example, argues that a border consciousness characterized much of Malcolm X's most famous oratory. Argues Terrill, in its rhetorical form Malcolm X's rhetoric inhabited the borders between jeremiad, apocalyptic prophecy and prudential discourse. Robert E. Terrill, *Malcolm X: Inventing Radical Judgment* (East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press, 2004), 29. Terrill also notes that in the content of many of his speeches Malcolm X presented a nomadic form of agency, one that provided his audience with empowerment through multiple forms of critical interpretation. *Ibid.*, Chapter 5. In his Rochester Address, for example, Terrill argues that Malcolm X "invites his audience to join him at the border" between the international realm and the domestic realm, between radical resistance and rights. Terrill, "Colonizing the Borderlands," 68.

90. Gloria Anzaldúa, *Borderlands/La Frontera: The New Mestiza* (San Francisco: Spinsters/Aunt Lute, 1987), vii. To be clear, though I am borrowing from Anzaldúa's discussion of the grating contradictions of border identity, I do not wish to make an analogous claim about Tijerina being an example of Anzaldúa's *new mestiza* consciousness. Tijerina migrated between appeals to U.S. citizenship and calls for Hispano ethno-nationalism. In this sense, then, I use the term "border" to describe this process of continual migration, back and forth, across the borders of citizen and foreigner. Though Tijerina was not able to integrate these tensions in his rhetoric (as I will demonstrate shortly), the group I discuss in Chapter 4—Latina/o protestors in La Gran Marcha of March 25, 2006—found a way to integrate the competing tensions of inclusion and exclusion into a *hybrid* citizenship that would be more worthy of being called a *new mestiza* citizenship.

91. Flores, "Creating Discursive Space through a Rhetoric of Difference," 142.

92. José David Saldívar, *Border Matters: Remapping American Cultural Studies* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997). See also Demo, "Sovereignty Discourse and Contemporary Immigration Politics"; Flores, "Constructing Rhetorical Borders"; Ono and Sloop, *Shifting Borders*; Santa Ana, *Brown Tide Rising*.

93. Terrill, "Colonizing the Borderlands," 76.

94. Victor Witter Turner, *The Forest of Symbols: Aspects of Ndembu Ritual* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1967), 97. Turner develops the concept of "liminality" in the context of cultural rituals and identities. For Turner, the liminal zone or identity is the stage at which an individual is a "transitional being," "neither one thing nor another; or may be both." Ibid. Though Turner develops the concept in the context of cultural initiation rituals, Latina/o and Chicana/o scholars have adapted the term to the context of immigration and border consciousness. Leo Chavez described the life of the Latina/o undocumented immigrant as a process of moving into and through liminality. Leo R. Chavez, *Shadowed Lives: Undocumented Immigrants in American Society* (Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace College Publishers, 1998). Other scholars have developed the concept in the context of Latina/o identity. Gustavo Pérez Firmat, *Literature and Liminality: Festive Readings in the Hispanic Tradition* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1986).

95. As Jane Mansbridge argues, groups articulating difference in democratic society may choose "to oscillate between protected enclaves . . . and more hostile but also broader surroundings" that are more congruous with the "reigning reality." Jane Mansbridge, "Using Power/Fighting Power: The Polity," in *Democracy and Difference: Contesting the Boundaries of the Political*, ed. Seyla Benhabib (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996), 57. Quoted in Daniel C. Brouwer, "Act-Ing up in Congressional Hearings," in *Counterpublics and the State*, ed. Robert Asen and Daniel C. Brouwer (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2001), 89. Dan Brouwer provides an analysis of ACT-UP as an example of how social movements oscillate "between spheres and fora"—between oppositional discourses like protest and institutionalized forms of discourse like congressional hearings, for example. See also Phaedra C. Pezzullo, "Resisting 'National Breast Cancer Awareness Month': The Rhetoric of Counterpublics and Their Cultural Performances," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 89 (2003). In this case, I borrow the theoretical concept Mansbridge and Brouwer develop to describe Tijerina's process of moving back and forth across the border between acceptable citizenship discourse and a radical discourse that eschews American citizenship.

96. Josh Gottheimer, *Ripples of Hope: Great American Civil Rights Speeches* (New York: Basic Civitas Books, 2003), 306.

97. More specifically, the September 1967 conference was the inaugural convention of the *Alianza Federal de Pueblos Libres* (Federal Alliance of Free City-States [*Pueblos*]). This was the second time that the Alianza had changed its name because of pressure and surveillance from state and federal government agents. The Alianza had first changed its name a year earlier, in June 1966, because of pressure it faced from the New Mexico government to hand over its membership rosters. The inaugural meeting of this organization was meant to be held on June 3 at Coyote New Mexico, and the state's preemptive crackdown on the Alianza members before the convention led to the raid on Tierra Amarilla. In 1967 the Alianza changed its name again under similar pressures. At this inaugural meeting were present activists as diverse as Hopi Indian Tomas Benyacya, Ralph Featherstone of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, and Ron Karenga of the Black Power Movement. See Gardner, *Grito*.

98. Fernandez and Jensen's analysis of the speech focuses on Tijerina's use of metaphor to achieve intercultural communication. Fernandez and Jensen outline Tijerina's use of clusters of metaphors surrounding several themes: jeremiad, genealogy, conspiracy, disease, and the apocalyptic. Though Fernandez and Jensen accurately trace Tijerina's use of metaphor, their essay focuses less on explaining Tijerina's narrative or the connection of his speech to American citizenship. Though I find



many of the same themes in my analysis of this speech, I will attempt to explain how they work together through the overarching metaphor of Tijerina's border citizenship.

99. Tijerina, "The Land Grant Question." I will use paragraph numbers to provide more accurate references. The paragraph numbers correspond to the breaks put into the speech in the published edition cited here.

100. Being that English was Tijerina's second language, his public speeches in English often included several errors in grammar or vocabulary. Tijerina's language barrier was a topic that he often brought up in his speeches and interviews, sometimes as evidence of the systematic oppression faced by Hispanos in the United States. Tijerina discusses his language barrier at the beginning of this speech, though not in the abridged version of the speech I used for this chapter. I have tried to preserve the errors of Tijerina's speech here to provide a more "authentic" representation of his border discourse. The changes and additions I have made to aid in clarity are indicated, of course, in brackets. For a discussion of Tijerina's language barrier in this speech see Fernandez and Jensen, "Reies Lopez Tijerina's 'the Land Grant Question.'"

101. Here Tijerina not only borrows language from the so called "treaty power" in Article VI of the U.S. Constitution, but also cites it explicitly in the next paragraph. The relevant portion of the U.S. Constitution states: "all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land." Tijerina states, in "Article Six, Section Two of the Constitution of the United States, you will read that all the treaties made by the authority of the United States become the supreme law of the land" (3). Tijerina uses this legal reference as support for his claim that the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo is the "Constitution" of the Mexican American people.

102. We could call metaphor a "border trope" since its function is to cross cognitive borders—to help us see one thing through the perspective of something completely different. George Lakoff and Mark Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003). For Tijerina, the border quality of his metaphors is amplified, particularly in this speech, by his persistent use of mixed metaphor (e.g., "frozen" truths). These conceptual clashes not only demonstrate the jarring contrasts of the borderland but Tijerina's attempts to stretch even the "borders" of language.

103. Tijerina narrates the history of the Hebrew nation as told in the Pentateuch to serve as an analogy for the development of the Spanish American new breed. Tijerina states: "When Abraham said, 'Where is my people? Where is my nation? . . . [God] said, 'Four hundred and thirty years from now you will have one. But it is necessary for you people to be slaves, servants in Egypt. But after four hundred years I will get them out of Egypt and they will be a great nation.' . . . And after four hundred odd years it was fulfilled" (§ 10). Fernandez and Jensen adeptly explain Tijerina's biblical analogy: "The comparison between Abraham and Chicanos is obvious. Chicanos were promised land by God and now, 400 years after the creation of the new breed, God will live up to His word and restore the land to the chosen Hispanics." Fernandez and Jensen, "Reies Lopez Tijerina's 'The Land Grant Question,'" 139. For further discussion of Tijerina's biblical analogies see Busto, *King Tiger*, 186-7.

104. Tijerina provides further elaboration of his concept of the "new breed" through the trope of metaphor, but these parts of the text were not included in the abridged copy I use for this study. For example, Tijerina states: "You will never find a cow with a little calf allowing another foreign calf to suck from this cow. And you will find that alike in human beings. You will never see a step-mother treating a step-child the same as she treats a legitimate child of her own that was born in her bosom [sic]. That's nature. That is why we know that no nation, [sic] nor race can treat another race the same as they treat their own." Using these metaphors of family and nature, Tijerina argues that the "new breed" is also a "foreign nation" that cannot be assimilated or folded into the United States. Quoted in Fernandez and Jensen, "Reies Lopez Tijerina's 'The Land Grant Question,'" 136.

105. James F. Darsey, *The Prophetic Tradition and Radical Rhetoric in America* (New York: New York University Press, 1997), 117.

106. Ibid. As Robert Terrill puts it in the context of African American apocalyptic discourse, “American culture [is] so hopelessly corrupt that only a catastrophic cleansing guided by a divine hand can effect the necessary changes.” Terrill, *Malcolm X*, 29. Though Tijerina’s apocalyptic discourse does not provide a clearly articulated divine hand, he does discuss the force of “justice” and the coming “chain reaction,” implying a sense of providence and an impending confrontation.

107. Terrill, *Malcolm X*, 29. While the jeremiad and the apocalyptic forms share some similarities, they differ drastically in the source of agency and the mode of change. While in apocalyptic discourse the present system is evil and must be overthrown, the jeremiad, “a speech of woe notwithstanding,” is “is profoundly optimistic.” Darsey claims that the jeremiad was “a vehicle of reform among the Jews of the old Testament, and in American radicalism, it has been consistently associated with perfectionist thinking.” Darsey, *The Prophetic Tradition*, 114. This, of course, illustrates a problem with my terminology of Tijerina’s rhetorical forms (i.e. radical and reformist) because they are both radical by virtue of being prophetic. Yet I believe I am justified in calling Tijerina’s more conventional citizenship discourse “reformist” because it operates from this “reformist” stream of American radical discourse (the jeremiad). Tijerina’s ethno-nationalist discourse is more “radical” because it eschews any faith in American law or culture (apocalyptic). In a sense, if we were to plot Tijerina’s discourses on a scale of radical to conservative, both of these discourses would fall on the more radical side, but Tijerina’s ethno-nationalist discourse lies outside of the dominant traditions of citizenship, which led me to term it “radical.”

108. As he does earlier in this speech, Tijerina goes on to elaborate these Constitutional provisions in more detail in paragraph 24. “This Constitution does not say that only English shall be spoken. This Constitution does not limit the rights, protection for the rights of the Anglos, or the Italians or the Jews. It involves, especially Article Nine of the Amendments to the Constitution of the United States. . . . Ask a lawyer. Why? Because it says the enumeration of certain rights in this Constitution shall not be construed to deprive the people, deprive other rights retained by the people. . . . What are those rights retained by the people? That’s where the Law of the Indies and the original rights of the Spanish Americans had retained for three hundred years. We were promised protection for those rights, ladies and gentlemen. . . . They have no use for [Article Nine]. But we have. The Spanish Americans. We do have.” This legal argument resembles the appeals to legal authority made by the Californios over a hundred years earlier regarding their citizenship rights. The Constitution of the U.S. recognized the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo as the law of the land; thus the land rights should be protected for Spanish American citizens of the U.S. Tijerina relied extensively on legal and historical evidence, as has become quite clear. But when he spoke a discourse of civil rights and inclusion he relied on legal evidence even more regularly. Busto, *King Tiger*, 53; Hammerback, Jensen, and Gutierrez, *A War of Words*.

109. For an explanation of dissociation see Chapter 2 note 64.

110. In the latter part of his speech Tijerina also summarizes the sins he has discussed throughout the speech. He and the Alianza will use “proof, facts, and evidence” to convince the world of “how our leaders were murdered. How our documents were destroyed. How Congress enacted laws to rape our cities, our villages and our language. How the United States has been violating the Constitution made by its own founders” (§ 26). He notes, “We will prove in the courts, and if the United Nations come in and investigate the whole thing, we will show the proof, facts, and evidence” (§ 27).

111. King’s speech on Vietnam to which I refer was delivered on April 4, 1967, at Riverside Church in New York City. In one particularly poignant part of the speech, we see many of the same themes and language in Tijerina’s conclusion of “The Land Grant Question”: “This kind of positive revolution of values is our best defense against communism. War is not the answer. Communism will never be defeated by the use of atomic bombs or nuclear weapons. Let us not join those who shout war and, through their misguided passions, urge the United States to relinquish its participation in the United Nations. These are days which demand wise restraint and calm reasonableness. We must not engage in a negative anticommunism, but rather in a positive thrust for democracy, realizing that our greatest defense

against communism is to take offensive action in behalf of justice. We must with positive action seek to remove those conditions of poverty, insecurity, and injustice, which are the fertile soil in which the seed of communism grows and develops.” Martin Luther King and James Melvin Washington, *A Testament of Hope: The Essential Writings and Speeches of Martin Luther King, Jr* (San Francisco: Harper, 1991), 241. Though there is no evidence that Tijerina directly drew from King’s speech, the similarities in the themes—justice, international law and the United Nations, concern with anti-communism, a jeremiadic quality, and so forth—are striking. The confluence of language and themes is not shocking, since, as I have shown, Tijerina’s discourse also shared elements with the discourse of other civil rights leaders like Malcolm X. Moreover, Tijerina later met with King at the National Conference for New Politics in 1968. For a discussion of King’s Vietnam speech see George N. Dionisopoulos et al., “Martin Luther King, the American Dream and Vietnam: A Collision of Rhetorical Trajectories,” *Western Journal of Communication* 56 (1992).

112. Anzaldúa, *Borderlands*; Fernandez and Jensen, “Reies Lopez Tijerina’s ‘The Land Grant Question.’”

113. John Muthyala, *Reworlding America: Myth, History, and Narrative* (Athens: Ohio University Press, 2006), 131.

114. Tijerina’s notion of a “new breed” was not entirely his creation but instead has been a common idea, in a number of different iterations, expressed by a number of Latina/o philosophers since the nineteenth century. Perhaps the most well known example is Jose Vasconcelos’ notion of *mestizos* as the *raza cósmica*, or the cosmic race. For connections between the “cosmic race” and the “new breed” see Busto, *King Tiger*, 186-7.

115. Pérez Firmat, *Literature and Liminality*, xviii.

116. Juan González, *Harvest of Empire: A History of Latinos in America* (New York: Viking, 2000).

117. Delgado, “Chicano Ideology Revisited,” 98.

118. Pérez Firmat, *Literature and Liminality*.

119. Saldívar, *Border Matters*, 99. See Gardner, *Grito*.

120. Turner, *The Forest of Symbols*, 97. See supra note 101.

121. Anzaldúa, *Borderlands*, 3.

122. *Ibid.*, vii.

123. Celeste Condit and John Louis Lucaites argue that there is a critical “border” that exists between revolution and rhetoric. While rhetoricians (including dissenters) create identification, revolution (i.e., violence) is the abrogation of rhetoric. “A dissenter can ‘talk’ revolution right up to the point of violence,” they argue, “but violence is antithetical to all ideas—indeed, it is the very abrogation of ideas. The ultimate act of dissent thus stands in fundamental opposition to the crafting of a constructive rhetoric.” Celeste Michelle Condit and John Louis Lucaites, “Malcolm X and the Limits of the Rhetoric of Revolutionary Dissent,” *Journal of Black Studies* 23 (1993), 309. As he does with many other boundaries, Tijerina straddled, stretched, and traversed this border throughout his life. As we have seen, his rhetoric stopped short of violent overthrow, even though his radical ethno-nationalist discourse did advocate, at times, separatism. Yet some of his actions like the raid on the courthouse at Tierra Amarilla, which were integral to his overall rhetorical project, cross Condit and Lucaites’ line between rhetoric and revolution. Though they were not instances of “constructive rhetoric” per se, Tijerina’s radical acts (such as the courthouse raid) did not “abrogate” “ideas” but, in contrast, were often enacted with specifically rhetorical messages in mind (e.g., a citizens’ arrest). While these actions fall outside the purview of this chapter (which focuses on Tijerina’s public discourse), they point to the endlessly contradictory and conflicting dimensions of Tijerina’s border citizenship.

124. Pérez Firmat, *Literature and Liminality*, xviii.

125. Oboler, “Redefining Citizenship as a Lived Experience,” 8.

**CHAPTER 4**

**HYBRID CITIZENSHIP: THE INTERSECTIONAL RHETORIC AND  
TRANSNATIONALISM OF LA GRAN MARCHA**

On March 25, 2006, a massive group of immigrants and Latina/os marched through the streets of Los Angeles in what was dubbed La Gran Marcha (The Great March) by protest organizers. Even at conservative estimates, it was one of the largest demonstrations in recent years, yet the exact number of protestors that made up La Gran Marcha is still widely disputed. For example, Los Angeles police claimed that “500,000 plus” marched from Olympic and Broadway to City Hall in a peaceful demonstration. Organizers and activists countered that the “2 million people” present “sent a very clear message.”<sup>1</sup> Regardless of its true size, there is little controversy that the LA crowd sparked a nationwide wave of social protest throughout 2006. In cities from Seattle to Atlanta, Latina/o demonstrators—including citizens, residents, and undocumented immigrants—demanded that migrants be granted political rights and given avenues to attain full citizenship.

La Gran Marcha was organized in response to proposed federal immigration legislation (The Border Protection, Anti-terrorism, and Illegal Immigration Control Act of 2005) that would have made both undocumented immigration and the aiding of undocumented immigrants felony crimes. The Sensenbrenner Bill, as it was popularly nicknamed after its sponsor, would also have mandated the building of a border fence along the U.S.-Mexico border and would have authorized the immediate deportation of undocumented immigrants.<sup>2</sup> Together, the

comprehensive immigration bill aimed to radically restructure immigration policy. Latina/o and immigrant communities in Los Angeles mobilized a massive protest in opposition to the legislation.<sup>3</sup>

Scholars Jenna Loyd and Andrew Burrridge, participants in La Gran Marcha, were astonished by the “remarkable” force of the spectacle, by the “entire families walking together,” by the “jubilant call-and-response chants from one spot in the crowd to another that brought marchers together,” and by the “prominence of U.S. and other Mexican and Central American flags being carried.” Yet for Loyd and Burrridge, the protest left lingering questions: most prominently, “was this movement fundamentally about claiming nationhood, or was it about gaining legal status and protections?”<sup>4</sup> Being so soon after the protest, the limited scholarship on the immigrant demonstrations of 2006 has yet to consider this question directly, that is, whether or not and how the protests were moments in which Latina/os and migrants constructed national belonging.<sup>5</sup> As Loyd and Burrridge ultimately contend, citizenship was a central theme in La Gran Marcha, including its chants, signs, and flags. The demand for citizenship was evident in the words of one of the protest organizers who declared: “we are a peaceful people, a hard-working people, and all we want is to be acknowledged as Americans.”<sup>6</sup> Consequently, citizenship was both an explicit theme and an implicit motivation of La Gran Marcha.<sup>7</sup> Therefore, this chapter turns to La Gran Marcha as a rhetorical text, examining the discourse of citizenship constructed therein. I argue that Latina/o and immigrant protestors crafted a *hybrid citizenship* through their verbal, visual, and material rhetoric. To build this argument, I first briefly explain my use of the term “hybrid” and how it might modify our understandings of citizenship. Then, the bulk of this chapter describes La Gran Marcha in more detail and analyzes

the protestors' citizenship discourse through rhetorical criticism of a fifteen-minute video recording of the march.<sup>8</sup>

In La Gran Marcha, Latina/os enacted hybrid citizenship, which challenged conventions of U.S. citizenship that privilege whiteness, single nation-state identification, cultural homogeneity, and disembodied expressions of citizenship. Protestors, instead, crafted a citizenship model based on hybridity in form, content, and purpose. By fusing multiple modes of discourse, protestors created a hybrid (or intersectional) citizenship in rhetorical form. Blurring the borders of U.S. citizenship contributed to a hybrid content, that is, a transnational performance of national belonging. Finally, blending legal, political, social, and symbolic dimensions of citizenship in their demands for recognition, protestors in La Gran Marcha aimed to construct a hybrid mode of U.S. citizenship.

Hybrid citizenship, in contrast to the compromise and border citizenship of earlier groups, fused multiple, transnational citizenship traditions and varied forms of discourse into a new mode of U.S. citizenship. While the Californios sought accommodation between their traditions and American citizenship, and while Tijerina's discourse was characterized by oscillation between separation and integration, La Gran Marcha was a hybrid performance of citizenship. Flouting their violations of citizenship laws and customs, the protestors, nevertheless, enacted U.S. national belonging by creating a new discursive space.<sup>9</sup> This contemporary model of Latina/o citizenship presents pitfalls and possibilities for the democratic prospects of Latina/os and immigrants in American society, prospects which I consider in the conclusion of this chapter. In the next section, though, I begin by discussing the term "hybrid" and outlining how it informs understandings of U.S. citizenship.

### **Hybridity and Citizenship: Persistent Themes, New Directions**

Though citizenship is a nebulous term, it has several key axes around which national rights and responsibilities cohere. For one, citizenship fundamentally remains tied to the nation-state. As Castles and Davidson note, “the essence of the nation-state is the institution of citizenship: the integration of all the inhabitants of a territory into the political community, and their political equality as citizens.”<sup>10</sup> More precisely, citizenship status entails inclusion into the national community along several lines. Legal and political dimensions of citizenship structure belonging in a nation-state through a contract between political rights and obligations.<sup>11</sup> Social citizenship entails economic integration, including the right to work, to education, to a fair wage, and to other social support.<sup>12</sup> Symbolic citizenship defines more broadly the dimensions of membership within the national community; it refers to the level of cultural acceptance a minority group enjoys in dominant society.<sup>13</sup>

In one sense, as these dimensions of belonging demonstrate, citizenship entails assimilation into a political community. In another sense, though, citizenship has traditionally been an exclusive category. Racial, ethnic, and gender dimensions have historically limited full citizenship to white heterosexual males.<sup>14</sup> Racial minorities have been constructed throughout American history as the non-white, non-citizen “other.”<sup>15</sup> As I have shown in previous chapters, Latina/os’ struggles with the legacy of citizenship have succeeded in varying degrees in expanding these boundaries. However, a growing contemporary demand by minorities such as Latina/os and immigrants for greater rights and autonomy creates a “fundamental contradiction,” according to some, in traditions of citizenship.<sup>16</sup> Castles and Davidson again explain,

The position of minorities within democratic nation-states today is marked by a fundamental contradiction: a failure to make them into full citizens undermines the

inclusive principle of democracy and leads to divided societies, but political inclusion without cultural assimilation may undermine cultural and national identity.<sup>17</sup>

In other words, pressures of exclusion or assimilation are at odds with attempts by minority groups to expand or blur the boundaries of political community. As the previous chapters demonstrate, Latina/os have struggled with a dominant and pervasive tradition of American citizenship that places constraints on Latina/o political and social inclusion. Yet with the integration of the global economy, communication networks, relations of governance, and the greater flow of people across national borders, the strictly national paradigm of citizenship increasingly falls short of these transnational global phenomena.<sup>18</sup>

Such observations about the evolving transnational dimensions of citizenship have certainly been made by scholars of migration.<sup>19</sup> For example, Adelaida Del Castillo claims that immigrants' "exercise of social rights in [their] host country and unauthorized travel across national borders" results in expansions of citizenship<sup>20</sup> Homi Bhabha also comments on the challenges migrants and racial/ethnic minorities present to a purely national view of citizenship; "migrants, minorities," he claims, "are themselves the marks of a shifting boundary that alienates the frontiers of the modern nation."<sup>21</sup> Migrants and formerly colonized people can "deploy the cultural hybridity of their borderline conditions to 'translate', and therefore reinscribe, the social imaginary of both metropolis and modernity."<sup>22</sup> Whereas past groups may have worked to stretch or migrate over the boundaries of citizenship, it seems contemporary Latina/os and immigrants are blurring those boundaries of national belonging.<sup>23</sup>

For example, many Latina/os and immigrants living in the United States enact citizenship (whether through voting or other political mobilization in their communities) but resist pressures of social/cultural assimilation.<sup>24</sup> Moreover, many Latina/o immigrants maintain their citizenship



in their native countries, all the while becoming legal citizens of the United States; often this dual citizenship contributes to patterns of continual migration across national borders. From the dual nationality of Dominican-Americans, to the international political mobilization of Colombian-Americans, to networks of migration along the U.S.-Mexico border, conventions of citizenship do not fit these increasingly transnational expressions. The “fluidity” of contemporary Latina/o groups (in terms of culture, ethnicity, race, and location), Isabel Molina Guzmán and Angharad Valdivia argue, also fundamentally exhibits a hybridity that “challenges popular notions of place and nation.”<sup>25</sup> Not only may Latina/os hold allegiances to or identification with other countries as part of their cultural identity, but Latina/o identity also lies in a “hybrid” zone within the conventional black-white racial binary that structures American racial politics.<sup>26</sup> As usual, the terminological differences between the case studies demonstrate this notion of hybridity, for, in contrast to terms such as “Californio” or “Hispano,” which were tied to particular ethnic and regional groups of Latina/os, the protestors in La Gran Marcha used “Immigrant” and “Latina/o,” which connote transnational connections.<sup>27</sup> These fluid identities and practices create problems of identification for many Latina/os. Drawing from these scholars, I call the challenges and changes in expressions of citizenship among Latina/os and immigrants “hybrid” citizenship.<sup>28</sup>

Scholars of intercultural communication, communication studies, and cultural studies, among others, draw on the term “hybridity” to discuss the melding of cultures and political identities resulting from transnational changes.<sup>29</sup> In general, hybridity refers to the blurring of conventional identity categories. On the one hand, these scholars argue, hybrid identities can challenge sedimented cultural forms by crafting new, diverse, and multipositional forms of political identity.<sup>30</sup> On the other hand, hybridity can also be co-opted by dominant institutions,

such as mass media, to represent “difference” in more palatable ways.<sup>31</sup> Nevertheless, the growing political presence of hybrid groups that blur conventional notions of American citizenship, such as migrants and Latina/os, signals that the social imaginary of citizenship is being further challenged.<sup>32</sup> For example, in the case of undocumented migrants, hybrid citizenship “announces its visibility through the self-conscious, free, and participatory performance of personhood in the formal and informal spheres of the state.”<sup>33</sup> Transcending or eschewing these conventional classifications, migrants and Latina/os enact U.S. citizenship in new and unpredictable ways.<sup>34</sup> Through hybridity Latina/o citizens, residents, and immigrants blur the boundaries of citizenship in their struggles for belonging.

As various scholars hail these purported changes, one is left with the question of what an emerging hybrid citizenship looks like. How is hybrid citizenship enacted by Latina/o and immigrant groups? A rhetorical perspective is important to understand hybrid citizenship, for Latina/os and migrants enact citizenship and Latina/o identity through rhetoric.<sup>35</sup> La Gran Marcha provides a case study through which to examine the changing tensions and dimensions of citizenship. By exploring the hybrid citizenship discourse enacted in this Latina/o immigrant protest, I hope to illuminate some of the enduring challenges facing Latina/os and the contemporary changes facing U.S. citizenship.

In what follows, I situate La Gran Marcha in larger scholarship on hybridity and citizenship, and I argue that Latina/os enacted a hybrid citizenship in La Gran in form, content, and purpose. The protestors in La Gran Marcha enacted hybrid rhetorical *form* characterized by an intersection of embodied rhetoric (bodily presence), material rhetoric (signs, symbols, flags, and clothing), and aural rhetoric (chants and songs), all staged in a spectacle for mass media circulation. The citizenship discourse of La Gran Marcha was hybrid in *content*, since it

performed a transnational and fluid mode of citizenship in contrast to conventional, single-nation-state identification. La Gran Marcha's citizenship discourse was hybrid in *purpose*, since the goal of the protestors was to expand the functions of citizenship beyond mere legal, political, and social identification and to enact citizenship along cultural dimensions.

To elaborate this argument, I analyze a video of La Gran Marcha recorded by Los Angeles' CBS affiliate (CBS 2/KCAL 9) as a "text" in which the Latina/o and immigrant protestors enacted hybrid citizenship. This video documents a segment of La Gran Marcha as it settled near City Hall in downtown Los Angeles. Here protestors congregated following their march through the city to sing, chant, shout, and wave signs, as well as hear speeches from protest organizers. Though the "eye-witness" video does not document the entire march, it records the Latina/o and immigrant protest in front of City Hall without commentary or narration. Equally important, the video of La Gran Marcha documents the protest experience from inside the crowd, as a member of the protest, rather than from an "objective" outside position.<sup>36</sup>

Citizenship was a central theme in La Gran Marcha, I argue, like it was in the twentieth century Latina/o social protest movements which are the subject of Chapter 3. La Gran Marcha and the nationwide wave of subsequent protests it spawned demonstrate that, as Gerald Hauser notes, the body is both a source of discourse and a site on which discourse takes place.<sup>37</sup> Social protest can function as conventional argument within norms of deliberation; as Olson and Goodnight explain, social protest does "the traditional work of the public sphere" through embodied rhetoric.<sup>38</sup> In this sense, protest can influence deliberation and redirect or block public argument. Yet in the "mass media" age, social protest reaches further than its immediate and instrumental circumstances; thus embodied rhetoric of protest can also serve as staged "image

event” that circulates in mass media discourse.<sup>39</sup> These physical protests have unique and far reaching rhetorical significance when they are translated into mass media fragments. Beyond their persuasive role, social protests also have constitutive consequences by constructing collective identity and rhetorical agency for the protestors.<sup>40</sup> In other words, protest does not speak exclusively to an external audience but also has rhetorical significance for the protestors themselves.

Certainly these three strands of social protest scholarship provide a picture of how embodied rhetoric functions in U.S. democracy. In this vein, I analyze the video recording of La Gran Marcha to discuss how the verbal, visual, aural, and material elements of the protest come together as a discourse of U.S. citizenship. I recognize, of course, that analyzing a mediated recording of the protest is not the same as using first-hand experience. Yet as Kevin DeLuca notes, “an argument could be made that images of bodies are perceived transparently, that is as real bodies.”<sup>41</sup> Therefore, I forego a discussion of the differences between video representations of bodies and physically present bodies because it would take me away from the focus of Latina/o citizenship discourse. Instead, I conflate these mediated and present bodies for the purposes of understanding how citizenship was enacted in La Gran Marcha of March 25, 2006. The sections that follow explain how Latina/o protestors in La Gran Marcha enacted hybrid citizenship in their rhetorical form, content, and purpose. Then, this chapter outlines how hybrid citizenship differs from other discourses of Latina/o citizenship and what it communicates about contemporary challenges of U.S. citizenship. First, however, I describe the segment of La Gran Marcha recorded in the video by CBS 2/KCAL 9 used as the “text” for this chapter.

### **La Gran Marcha as Rhetorical Text**

The video of La Gran Marcha recorded by CBS 2/KCAL 9 documents the culmination of the demonstration that congregated outside of City Hall (available at <http://cbs2.com/video/?id=15998@kcbs.dayport.com>).<sup>42</sup> The beginning of the video establishes the scene for the spectacle by circling the camera around to show the surroundings in which the protest takes place. The cameraperson stands at the top of a hill, and we never see his or her face or hear his or her voice. Additionally, the camera is never addressed or acknowledged by another protestor or observer (since many protestors hold cameras).<sup>43</sup> The scene is a street corner in Los Angeles. On the left of the frame, a two-lane street with a sidewalk on each side runs into the center background of the frame. A grass field, edged on all sides by trees, forms a park situated in the center and foreground of the frame (directly in front of the cameraperson). To the right sits City Hall, a large white building that spreads beyond the horizon.

Initially the protest resembles more a fair or picnic than a political rally. Diverse groups of people mill around the sidewalks and park area while Tejano music plays loudly. On a sidewalk to the left, a middle-aged man dressed in a business jacket stands next to an elderly man wearing a cowboy hat and boots. Among many other onlookers, they watch couples walk through the park holding hands or parents strolling along the sidewalk with children in tow. Vendors sell any number of foods and drinks on the sidewalk, which people carry into the park to enjoy as they sit or stand on the grassy knoll. Throughout this movement and music, a din of conversation floats above the crowd; occasional Spanish words or phrases become distinguishable above the dull roar. All the while, police officers walk and bike through the crowd, projecting a sense of authority and order to those congregating. As these Latina/os wait

for the marchers to reach City Hall, the scene resembles more entertainment or cultural spectacle than political argument.

Several minutes later, loud cheering suddenly erupts in the distance, and people begin to congregate. The crowd in the foreground yells and shouts, collecting energy; meanwhile, a large group of people wearing white shirts gathers in the background.<sup>44</sup> Protestors pool at the top of the frame, in the distance, where the street begins to wind down to the park below. Individual protestors blend together as their white shirts contrast with the colorful flags and signs that hover above their heads. The body of protestors pauses momentarily at the top of the street as organizers (wearing orange shirts) give last minute instructions for the march and lock protestors arm in arm. Then the group lurches forward and begins a march toward the center foreground of the frame, where the camera and the park sit next to City Hall. The marching protestors begin to fill the streets as they come closer and closer; the people who once were milling around sidewalks and grassy knolls join the march as it moves through the street. As they chant and wave flags (American, Mexican, Guatemalan, and so on) and signs above their heads (both in Spanish and English), the group grows in size and energy. Many of the individuals standing in the park wait with flags and signs in hand for the protest to engulf them.

Soon the grassy area near City Hall begins to fill with protestors who overwhelm and overshadow the visual landscape. As they congregate, a protest organizer shouts over a loud speaker: “*Si se puede*” [Yes, we can], “Immigrants – *Si*,” and “*Migrantes unidos*” [Immigrants united], as if directing the group forward with his voice. Tejano music continues to blare as the protestors congregate in front of the building. Vendors and observers now dot the growing mass of protestors. As the group grows, they begin to drown out the organizer’s voice with their own chants of “*Si se puede*.” Soon the street and park are so closely packed with people that the grey

pavement and green grass are nearly invisible underneath the protestors' white shirts. Again, one of the protest organizers leads the group in organized chanting, such as “*El pueblo unido jamás será vencido!*” [A united people will never be conquered!], “*Aquí estamos, y no nos vamos, y si nos echan regresamos!*” [We are here, and we are not leaving, and if they kick us out, we'll come back!], and “*México, México!*” Thousands of people fill the corners of the streets and lines of sight. A man carrying a boy on his shoulders stands in front of the camera blocking the view momentarily. Another man to the right suddenly shouts loudly “*Si se puede,*” drowning out the other voices. The group is animated, as people begin to chant, shout, wave signs, and move as a collective; the crowd shifts and sways together, and fists pump into the air and wave signs and flags. Some of these signs read: “*Amnistía* [Amnesty]! Full rights for all immigrants,” “*La Tierra Es De Quien La Trabaja* [The *land* belongs to those who *work it*]. No HR 4437,” “The USA is MADE by IMMIGRANTS . . . and that's it,” “*Ya basta de abusar a los migrantes* [Enough with abusing immigrants],” and “We are not the enemy – we are part of the solution.” Interspersed with the signs are also flags from throughout Latin America and North America. As the energy builds, the sounds and movements of the crowd become too much to experience at once until one of the protest organizers again addresses the crowd.

Speaking in Spanish, he states, “We are about to begin the ceremony and the fabulous program we have planned on this day – this day of festivities, of happiness, but also of courage from our *pueblo* [people].” Several minutes later, the same protest organizer again silences the crowd and raises a dove in his hand. He states:

This dove symbolizes the compromise of all the powers, of all the struggles here on this historic day. . . . Together we march to victory! Today we march for amnesty, tomorrow for citizenship, and after that, to gain the right to govern civilly along with the rest of the

honest workers of this country. [We march] so that there can be justice in this country and in all the world!”<sup>45</sup>

As the organizer releases the dove, the crowd roars. Latina/o migrants and citizens stand together, indistinguishable from one another, demanding rights, recognition, and acceptance as a political, social, and cultural force.

By the video’s end, the crowd fills the streets as far as the eye can see, and the event has taken on a life of its own. Though the video I have described only documents part of La Gran Marcha (fifteen minutes), it clearly demonstrates how the shouting and protesting imbued Latina/os with a sense of collective power, unity, and political energy. The video recording of this segment of La Gran Marcha also demonstrates the theme of U.S. citizenship underlying the protestors’ words and actions. The following section draws on this description of La Gran Marcha to explain how Latina/o protestors enacted hybrid citizenship in form, content, and purpose.

### **Hybrid Rhetorical Form: An Intersectional Rhetoric**

Protestors in La Gran Marcha enacted hybrid citizenship through a rhetorical form that fused multiple media of rhetoric to challenge traditional linkages between discourse and citizenship. Some scholars have termed this hybrid form of discourse “intersectional rhetoric” because it brings together different modes into an intersecting, radical form of discourse. In hybrid, or intersectional, rhetorical form “one form of discourse is not privileged over another; rather, diverse forms intersect organically to create something challenging to rhetorical norms.”<sup>46</sup> Hybrid rhetoric combines multiple modes of discourse to challenge rhetorical conventions and the democratic traditions which these conventions serve. Rather than primarily relying on one channel of discourse, such as public speech or written text, Latina/os and migrants in La Gran



Marcha fused multiple modes of discourse into a hybrid rhetoric of citizenship and national belonging. The citizenship discourse of La Gran Marcha had a hybrid (intersectional) rhetorical form because it was at once public speech, visual rhetoric, public ritual, corporeal rhetoric, and mass media spectacle.

In their chants, shouts, and public speech, protestors affirmed their hybrid identities as Latina/os, immigrants, Latin Americans, and members of the U.S. community. With shouts such as: “Immigrants – *Si* [Yes],” “*Latinos unidos* [united],” “*Palante* [Forward],” and “*Si se puede* [Yes, we can],” the protestors used classic Spanish-language statements of political solidarity to perform their U.S. political identity. With these public statements, Latina/o and immigrant protestors cultivated “voice.” As Eric King Watts argues, social groups can constitute themselves as speakers in the public sphere by cultivating their “voice.” Voice demands ethical and emotional acknowledgment by dominant culture; it demands to be heard.<sup>47</sup> Protestors in La Gran Marcha cultivated their voice not only in the content of their chants, but also by speaking aloud in public and demanding to be acknowledged. “We are here, we are not leaving, and if you kick us out we will be back,” the protestors shouted, affirming both their place and their voice within American society.

The aural messages of their chants fused with the visual rhetoric of signs and flags to extend the performance of national belonging. While the protestor’s songs and chants constituted an appeal for “voice,” the signs and flags they waved linked the movement to demands for national belonging. Through signs such as “*La Tierra Es De Quien La Trabaja*” [The *land* belongs to those who *work it*] and “The USA is MADE by Immigrants,” protestors pronounced their inclusion as members of the national body. We are already part of this nation, they said, though you may not yet acknowledge us. As did their signs, flag waving functioned as

a visual enthymeme of citizenship that fused with the aural and verbal messages.<sup>48</sup> Pineda and Sowards note that waving American flags is an implicit argument about citizenship and national belonging.<sup>49</sup> Civic participation is often communicated through flag waving (e.g., flying flags outside one's home and displaying American flag car magnets), and flags are also used in moments of discursive resistance to dominant society (e.g., flag burning). Therefore, by waving American flags, protestors enacted their civic belonging. Yet by waving Latin American flags along with the Stars and Stripes, Latina/os and immigrants intersected with their verbal and visual messages concerning inclusion on their own transnational terms.

The aural, verbal, and visual rhetoric of the protestors, communicated through signs, chants, and shouts, operated in tandem with the material rhetoric of the protestors' bodies. By taking up public space and coming together as a collective "body politic," protestors fused their aural and symbolic messages of national belonging with a rhetorical "coming out in public," as only citizens can do.<sup>50</sup> "The capacity to make oneself visible, to be seen," argues Anne Norton, "is a prerogative, and hence a sign of power."<sup>51</sup> Thus, through their public presence, the protestors performed public recognition; their material rhetoric strengthened their rhetorical and visual appeals for U.S. citizenship. Furthermore, the material rhetoric of La Gran Marcha demanded recognition of the *racialized* Latina/o and immigrant body. These bodies inserted themselves into the public eye and demanded recognition. They interpellated a degree of "attention" and enacted a degree of effectivity that intersected with the protestors' other rhetorical demands for recognition as citizens in the public sphere.<sup>52</sup> As many argue of the increasing visibility obtained by gays and lesbians, to be seen out in the public eye is a necessary (though not sufficient) component of inclusion. Thus the protestors' "coming out" flouted the racialized components of U.S. citizenship.<sup>53</sup> Immigrants and Latina/os claimed citizenship in

and through their racially and ethnically marked bodies, rather than trying to erase that difference through cultural and social assimilation. These citizens neither compromised with nor separated from U.S. citizenship; they enacted their national belonging through their ethnic and cultural difference.

Through a hybrid rhetorical form, or what some scholars have called an intersectional rhetoric, protestors in La Gran Marcha fused multiple modes of discourse (aural, visual, verbal, and material/embodied) into a unique demand to be seen and heard as citizens. At the level of rhetorical form, this discourse created “a hybrid political space, exhibiting a kind of incredulity toward the political traditions (e.g., US liberal democracy) with which rhetorical traditions are bound.”<sup>54</sup> In contrast to previous case studies, which demonstrated reliance on single modes of textuality, La Gran Marcha exhibited a hybrid rhetorical form. Latina/o and immigrant protestors crafted a hybrid rhetorical form that challenged the conventional model of the disembodied and eloquent “good citizen,” who conventionally expresses “himself” as an informed, rational, and eloquent speaker.<sup>55</sup> This “ideal” model of democratic discourse posits that, though operating from different philosophical and ideological positions, citizens should debate and deliberate through public reason, or terms that are accessible, civil, and understandable by all.<sup>56</sup> Supposedly, the discourse of the citizen is “dispassionate” and “disembodied”; it focuses on the evidence and content of the argument rather than on its style. Discourse that is “too dramatic, emotional, or figurative” is uncivil (i.e., unlike the citizen) because it can alienate participants or lead to misunderstandings.<sup>57</sup>

To be sure, this rational, eloquent model of citizenship has not always reigned. While Californios relied exclusively on the reasoned deliberation of the “good citizen,” Tijerina migrated between reasonable public rhetoric and radical public address. His border citizenship

was unable to transcend this binary, however, oscillating between, at times, a radical rhetoric of separatism and, at other times, a reformist rhetoric governed by more ‘conventional’ appeals. In contrast, La Gran Marcha exhibited a hybrid rhetorical form in which visual, verbal, aural, and material modes of discourse “intersect[ed] organically to create something challenging . . . [to] norms of textual boundedness.”<sup>58</sup> In opposition to conventional understandings of the “eloquent citizen,” protestors in La Gran Marcha enacted citizenship in a confluence of signs, symbols, public speech, performance, and corporeal rhetoric. As evidence of this hybrid form, it is difficult to identify a discreet text in La Gran Marcha, such as a speech, because the various discourses fused into an organic whole. By taking up public space, clamoring to be heard, and enacting rituals of radical democracy, protestors contributed to a hybrid rhetorical form that “was, in and of itself, an act of legitimacy and belonging, and as such, an important step toward demanding recognition as full members in society.”<sup>59</sup>

Protestors in La Gran Marcha enacted belonging rather than clamoring for it. Their hybrid citizenship fused rhetorical forms to “revise the customary components of citizenship,” not only “extending them to include the realm of . . . the symbolic,” but challenging conventions of exclusion and inclusion of migrants and racial minorities through their enactments of citizenship.<sup>60</sup> In turn, this rhetorical form contributed to constructing a hybrid mode of citizenship for the participants. The hybrid citizenship *content* of La Gran Marcha, in a sense, collapsed the boundaries between citizen and “other.” Through use of the Spanish language, Latina/o and Latin American cultural and political traditions, and transnational identities, the protestors created a new discursive space for Latina/o citizens. To further explain the hybrid citizenship enacted in La Gran Marcha, I turn from its hybrid rhetorical form to its rhetorical

content. In other words, the next section asks what constituted U.S. citizenship in the discourse of La Gran Marcha.

### **Hybrid Content: Transnational Citizenship**

The hybrid citizenship model enacted in La Gran Marcha on March 25, 2006, was comprised, first and foremost, of a hybrid rhetorical form which fused multiple modes of address and challenged sedimented traditions of ideal citizenship discourse. Latina/o and immigrant protestors also enacted a hybrid citizenship through their rhetorical content, or the messages about citizenship and political identity communicated through their intersectional rhetoric. Conventional dimensions of citizenship—i.e., legal, political, and social—presume a contractual relationship in which citizens assimilate into a national community in exchange for rights and protections. In their hybrid citizenship, Latina/o and immigrant protestors constructed a model of citizenship that recognized “a right to difference-in-equality.” In other words, this hybrid citizenship was “transnational” for it enacted U.S. citizenship through a host of foreign cultural/political traditions and it demanded national belonging without exclusive national identification or assimilation.<sup>61</sup>

In La Gran Marcha, Latina/o and immigrant protestors asserted national allegiance without adhering to conventions of single-nation-state identification or cultural assimilation. While contractual conventions of citizenship presume exclusive allegiance to a nation-state in exchange for social and political rights, Latina/o and immigrant protestors celebrated cultural difference, multiple national identities, and pragmatic linkages with other political and social movements, all the while explicitly demanding recognition as U.S. citizens. Put differently, the protestors de-linked the rights and recognition included in the conventional contract of citizenship from the other end of the bargain—their promise to assimilate into U.S. society. In

the face of a choice between assimilation and exclusion, these protestors enacted hybrid citizenship, which involved inclusion coupled with acknowledgment of their cultural differences.

Perhaps at the most obvious level, Latina/os and migrants enacted hybrid citizenship by drawing on transnational traditions of citizenship; they fused these traditions through their discourse into a multicultural and multinational performance of American citizenship that challenged the dominant U.S. racial project. Protestors at once waved American flags and Mexican, Guatemalan, or Salvadoran flags, pronouncing their dual national identities and their unique demand for political inclusion. Many observers, such as Loyd and Burrige, wondered how, under conventional understandings of citizenship, a group could demand protection as a member of the U.S. national community but also profess allegiance to another nation. If the USA forges citizens out of a “melting pot,” surely these immigrants and Latina/os could not hold on to their foreign allegiances and traditions. In a sense, though, protestors in La Gran Marcha fused these competing discourses of citizenship together, challenging conventions of exclusion and inclusion endemic to citizenship.

In their chants and signs, for example, protestors combined political slogans from Latina/o and Latin American history, reframing these diverse traditions into a hybrid performance of citizenship. With chants such as “*Si se puede*” [Yes, we can], “*Palante*” [Forward], “*El pueblo unido jamás será vencido*” [A united people cannot be conquered], and “*La Tierra Es De Quien La Trabaja*” [The *land* belongs to those who *work it*], protestors in La Gran Marcha forged links with Latina/o and Latin American protest movements from the twentieth century. Yet they translated and adapted these discourses into demands for American citizenship.

For example, “*Si se puede*,” a chant created by César Chavez, Dolores Huerta, and the United Farm Workers, was deployed by the UFW in the context of boycotts and strikes for wages and other economic rights.<sup>62</sup> “*Palante*” (from *Para adelante*), a rallying cry of the Puerto Rican Young Lords of New York, also presumes radical rhetoric of Latina/o citizenship. The Young Lords, a self-professed radical, socialist organization, used confrontational tactics to oppose racism and segregation against Puerto Ricans in 1960s New York.<sup>63</sup> The Farm Workers and the Young Lords represent the legacy of Latina/os struggling to attain full recognition as citizens throughout America’s history. While each group struggled under different circumstances and for different dimensions of citizenship, both Latina/o groups confronted dominant racial traditions of U.S. citizenship with their own versions of radical rhetoric. By appropriating their slogans into La Gran Marcha, protestors and protest organizers constructed an implicit narrative history which situated their protest in a long line of Latina/os struggling for social inclusion. As Michael McGee notes, constructing a “people” demands producing common myths that present a “vision of the collective life.”<sup>64</sup> This collective life involves both a picture of the past and a plan for the future. Therefore, by drawing on the rhetorical legacies of past Latina/o protest movements like the United Farm Workers and the Young Lords, protestors in La Gran Marcha worked to construct a mythic basis for their status as political “people.” Through these diverse and often disconnected Latina/o movements, La Gran Marcha fused a Latina/o people. Unlike the groups that are the subjects of previous chapters, La Gran Marcha drew from diverse Latina/o legacies—Puerto Rican, Mexican, and Chicana/o—to construct a performance of Latina/o citizenship. Moreover, the political legacies on which protestors drew were not conventional (white) myths of American independence, for the type of citizenship these protestors demanded was not assimilative but steeped in cultural and political difference.

To a large degree, the explicit connections made by protestors in La Gran Marcha between contemporary Latina/o struggles for U.S. citizenship and historical Latina/o struggles with citizenship are natural characteristics of social protest movements, which aim to establish a degree of continuity and connection to the past even as they radically challenge the present.<sup>65</sup> Yet protestors in La Gran Marcha also struck transnational links between their demands for citizenship and the struggles of Latin Americans across the hemisphere. Reaching across national borders, their hybrid discourse of citizenship fused multiple nationalities, political traditions, and identities into, paradoxically, a demand for U.S. national belonging.

For example, protestors in La Gran Marcha used a number of variations on the well-known Spanish chant “*El pueblo unido jamás será vencido*” [A united people cannot be conquered] (some of these adaptations substituted “*Latinos*” and “*Migrantes*” for “*El pueblo*”). This chant, though connected to a variety of South American radical resistance groups, was popularized by Chilean musical groups who used the slogan as a rallying song against Pinochet’s authoritarian government.<sup>66</sup> Drawing on this chant as a rhetorical resource, protestors in La Gran Marcha not only constituted their political agency as a “people” but also implicitly connected their struggles against U.S. immigration policy to Latin American resistance movements against authoritarian regimes. As scholars of social protest have argued, protestors must not only construct an image of the “people” but must also frame the opposition. In this sense, protestors in La Gran Marcha framed U.S. immigration and citizenship policy as an authoritarian system that denied Latina/os and immigrants full inclusion into the national community. The use of this popular Spanish-language chant constructed an analogy for Latina/o protestors to understand their struggles and their adversary.



Another example of the transnational links protestors made by appropriating chants from Latin American resistance movements is evident in the slogan “*La tierra es de quien la trabaja*” [The land belongs to those who work it]. This slogan appeared in visual form on a number of protestors’ signs and banners, though it was never explicitly used as a chant. It was originally popularized by Emiliano Zapata and continues to be a popular slogan of the Zapatistas’ struggle for land rights, indigenous sovereignty, and cultural recognition in Southern Mexico.<sup>67</sup> Being that most of the Latina/o and immigrant protestors were of Mexican nationality or descent, Mexico’s political history seemed an apt rhetorical resource to frame their contemporary protest for U.S. citizenship. For some Mexicans, Zapata and his movement remain legendary political figures who fought against an authoritarian regime for the rights and liberties of ordinary *mestizo* and indigenous Mexicans. Zapata’s notion that Mexicans should be guaranteed their “land and liberty” was used by protestors in La Gran Marcha as a rhetorical analogy to the struggles of Latina/os and immigrants for practical recognition by the United States. By translating this slogan to the U.S. political context, protestors argued that their physical and economic presence in the country should grant them citizenship (literally, ownership of that land). Latina/os and immigrants were “calling for a citizenship and suffrage based on *presence* and *residency*, as opposed to formal and explicit admission [emphasis in original].”<sup>68</sup> Protestors demanded citizenship, arguing through these visual and verbal slogans that they were already members of the community and were being denied their natural rights by an abusive and authoritarian system. Appropriating transnational discourses into the immigrant and Latina/o struggles for U.S. citizenship connected La Gran Marcha to the legacy of Latin American and Latina/o radical resistance.

Protestors drew on diverse rhetorical traditions in the service of constructing hybrid citizenship. At the same time as protestors stated their political power and critiqued structures of U.S. oppression (e.g., “*El pueblo unido jamás será vencido*”), they also constituted themselves as part of the American national community. “The USA is MADE by Immigrants . . . and that’s it,” proclaimed one protestor’s sign. “We are not part of the enemy, we are part of the solution” read another. Protestors chanted “*México, México,*” waved Mexican flags, and chanted Latin American political slogans, but they also chanted “USA, USA” and waved American flags. Drawing on popular myths about America as a nation of immigrants, protestors appropriated symbols of U.S. national identity to enact U.S. citizenship.<sup>69</sup> Though their demands for U.S. citizenship and their transnational appeals seem contradictory, protestors in La Gran Marcha were able to hold competing citizenship traditions in clear tension, all the while performing U.S. national belonging.

Besides their use of multiple discourses and traditions of citizenship, La Gran Marcha constituted a hybrid citizenship because it fused the diverse needs of Latina/os and migrants into a unified and hybrid political future. In contrast to the Californios and the Alianza, who remained relatively focused on their own struggles with U.S. citizenship, La Gran Marcha folded the very different struggles of Latina/o citizens, residents, documented immigrants, and undocumented immigrants into a collective demand for national belonging. While Latina/o citizens presumably marched out of solidarity with immigrants or to demand full inclusion (i.e., political, social, and symbolic, not just legal), documented migrants presumably marched to secure avenues to their legal recognition. Finally, undocumented migrants, those who are legally invisible, marched in defiance, demanding recognition despite lying outside of the nation-state.<sup>70</sup> In La Gran Marcha, Latina/os’ struggles with citizenship became intertwined with the struggles

of immigrants—both documented and undocumented—for rights and recognition.<sup>71</sup> Protestors fused these varying levels of national belonging into a hybrid, collective enactment of U.S. citizenship. Physically speaking, Latina/o citizens and non-citizens stood next to one another, together reclaiming their identity as racialized citizens. By protesting with undocumented immigrants, Latina/o citizens and documented immigrants put themselves at risk both of societal stigma through association with “Mexican illegality” and also at material risk of physical violence or legal prosecution.

Nevertheless, in the collective body of protestors (most wearing white shirts and marching together) Latina/os resignified their bodies as citizens performing their civic identity regardless of ethnicity, race, or legal status.<sup>72</sup> The hybrid Latina/o-immigrant citizenship of La Gran Marcha was further evidenced by the signs and chants of protestors, which conflated the condition of Latina/os and immigrants into a collective political future. “No human is illegal,” read one sign. Protestors collectively stated in Spanish that “Latina/os, united, will never be defeated!” Protestors waved American and Latin American flags in expression of the multiple and intersecting national and ethnic identities represented in La Gran Marcha. Nevertheless, they were united by a collective demand for recognition as citizens expressing themselves as members of the U.S. national community.

Latina/os and immigrants announced they were Americans even though they violated the formal and implicit laws that structure American citizenship. Most obviously, immigrants violated national laws of entry and naturalization through unauthorized border crossings. Nevertheless, they demanded citizenship despite having flaunted some of the basic laws of the nation-state. Similarly, documented Latina/o immigrants demanded inclusion merely based on their presence in the nation. And Latina/o citizens enacted their national belonging without

adhering to the fundamental logics of U.S. citizenship; they flaunted their racial, cultural, and political traditions in the face of American demands for assimilation. In this second way, the protestors in La Gran Marcha performed hybrid citizenship, not only in rhetorical form but also in content. In the words of one protest organizer,

Together we march to victory! Today we march for amnesty, tomorrow for citizenship, and after that to gain the right to govern civilly along with the rest of the honest workers of this country. [We march] so that there can be justice in this country and in all the world!<sup>73</sup>

Justice and citizenship, clamored the protestors, cannot be achieved by integrating seamlessly into the melting pot. Unlike the Mexican Californios, the compromise these protestors struck was not made through integration into American citizenship; the onus of compromise these protestors demanded rested with America, its culture, and its institutions. “We are here, and we are not leaving, and if you kick us out we’ll come back!” protestors shouted. Rather than negotiate the fundamental tension of inclusion or exclusion that structures U.S. citizenship, protestors demanded that they be included in spite of their differences. The citizenship protestors in La Gran Marcha enacted was hybrid in form as well as content, for it affirmed multiple national identities and cultural traditions through intersectional discourse in the service of enacting U.S. national belonging. The protestors’ demands for citizenship extended beyond inclusion and equal rights. Instead, protestors in La Gran Marcha fused a hybrid citizenship where dual national identity and transnational political mobilization were possible.

As Homi Bhabha explains, this hybrid citizenship “moves between cultural formations and social processes” to “disperse the homogenous” traditions of U.S. citizenship.<sup>74</sup> When Latina/os and immigrants enacted American citizenship through Spanish-language chants,

waving diverse national flags, appealing to conflicting political traditions, and flaunting national immigration laws, they presented a hybrid citizenship which blurred the boundaries of national belonging and cultural distinctiveness. Latina/o and immigrant protestors demanded full American citizenship by drawing on Mexican and South American political axioms and national heroes. They demanded an acknowledgment of their il-legal U.S. citizenship. They called on the government to give them rights equal to other Americans while they celebrated Latin American traditions and culture. In sum, protestors in La Gran Marcha celebrated transnational political identity and cultural hybridity, all the while clamoring for legal citizenship, social/economic rights, and cultural recognition. This “in between” or “both-and” citizenship discourse represented a challenge to conventional meanings of citizenship expressed through “nationality and patriotism, love of country, loyalties, and allegiance to a single state.”<sup>75</sup> The hybrid citizenship Latina/o and immigrant protestors enacted affirmed the possibility of integrating the border condition of U.S. citizenship through dual national identity, legal membership without patriotism, multiple national allegiances, and loyalty to country without assimilation.

To summarize, by fusing multiple forms of discourse into an intersectional rhetoric of citizenship La Gran Marcha was hybrid in rhetorical form. And by blending multiple national identities, cultural traditions, and political legacies into an expression of American citizenship, La Gran Marcha was hybrid in its content. Lastly, La Gran Marcha also saw the fusing of political, social, and legal dimensions of citizenship into a cultural performance. In the next section, I explain how the goal of their citizenship discourse was also hybrid: at once political argument, spectacle, cultural performance, entertainment, and expression of belonging.

### **Hybrid Purpose: Blurring the Dimensions of Citizenship**

In its rhetorical form and content, La Gran Marcha represented a hybrid discourse of American citizenship, a discourse in which Latina/os and migrants fused competing traditions of citizenship in challenge to the dominant tensions of U.S. national belonging. In addition to its content and form, La Gran Marcha, like previous Latina/o struggles with citizenship, seemed to remake the relationship between Latina/os and U.S. society. While compromise citizenship in the nineteenth century concerned negotiations between Latina/os and Americans over legal citizenship, Tijerina's border citizenship demanded, at times, recognition of Latina/os' social and political rights, and, at other times, Latina/os' separateness from U.S. citizenship. In La Gran Marcha, protestors challenged dimensions of citizenship by enacting a fusion of legal, social, and political citizenship, a combination of inclusion and separateness.

As I discussed in Chapter 1, legal, political, and social dimensions of citizenship share a common contractual and institutional framework. That is, citizenship functions most often as a legal agreement between individuals and institutions concerning national belonging; the contract of citizenship trades national allegiance (or, at the very least, identity) for political and economic rights.<sup>76</sup> As a result of these legal and institutional characteristics, citizenship has often been an exclusive category. Those non-citizens who must be excluded to justify the uniqueness of citizenship have often been groups who are societally marked as "other," such as racial minorities, women, gays, lesbians, and transgendered people.<sup>77</sup>

Despite these parameters, minority groups have struggled throughout American history for inclusion into the legal, political, and social dimensions of citizenship. These struggles are documented in the previous chapters, which detail how Latina/os fought for national belonging, political recognition, and economic rights at important moments in history. Protestors in La

Gran Marcha too demanded full citizenship for Latina/os and immigrants; yet as I discussed above, the citizenship protestors enacted in La Gran Marcha had different parameters than the exclusively legal, political, or economic discourse of many of their historical antecedents. The hybrid citizenship enacted by protestors in La Gran Marcha blurred the lines between legal, political, and social dimensions of citizenship. Protestors suffused their citizenship rhetoric with elements of political argument, cultural performance, ethnic solidarity, and civic duty. In one sense, this performance of national belonging through “difference” problematized the conventional dimensions of American citizenship. In another sense, protestors in La Gran Marcha challenged the institutional, contractual framework of citizenship through a spectacular and rowdy demonstration. I will discuss both of these elements of La Gran Marcha’s hybrid *purpose* in this section.

As is clear in the video I described above, initially the protestors gathered on streets, sidewalks, and parks were unorganized but calm. The sight resembled a festival or fair, for large and small groups of people milled around the streets, sidewalks, and grassy areas. Couples pushed strollers, children chased each other around the grass, and elderly women walked down the sidewalk. Music played in the distance as a murmur of indistinguishable conversations filled the air. Vendors sold cotton candy on the sidewalk to passersby, and bursts of laughter and cheerful Spanish shouting rose over the din of conversation. Nothing about the initial scene spoke to a larger political purpose for this gathering. Nonetheless, while the gathering seemed haphazard, there were distinct ethnic and cultural markers which conveyed that this was a “special” type of gathering. Spanish conversations and Tejano music were audible. The bodies milling around the park and sidewalk were clearly racially and ethnically marked Latina/o through traditional markers of *mestizaje*.<sup>78</sup>

When the protest began, however, Latina/os and immigrants waved signs and shouted chants that affirmed their membership in the U.S. national community. “We are not part of the enemy, we are part of the solution” and “The USA is MADE by Immigrants” read some of the protestors’ signs. With chants like “We are here, we are not leaving, and if you kick us out we will return,” protestors proclaimed their status as members of the nation. Protestors demanded they be recognized as citizens, despite their legal or cultural differences. “*Ya basta de abusar a los migrantes* [Enough abusing of immigrants],” read one popular sign; another group of protestors proclaimed “*Amnistía!* [Amnesty!] Full rights for all immigrants” with their placards, while another protestor held a sign stating “No human is illegal!” By enacting legal, political, and social belonging, protestors in La Gran Marcha demanded citizenship under conventional contractual terms; they performed their national belonging and demanded the rights that flowed from citizenship. But by warranting such proclamations through their cultural difference, Latina/o and immigrant protestors also challenged these conventional dimensions of citizenship with a hybrid enactment of national belonging. This right to inclusion and difference, or “difference-in-equality” as Homi Bhabha terms it,

can be articulated from the perspective of both national minorities and global migrants; and in each case such a right represents a desire to revise the customary components of citizenship – political, legal and social citizenship (T.H. Marshall) – by extending them to include the realm of ‘symbolic citizenship’ (Avishai Margalit). The symbolic aspect raises affective and ethical issues connected with cultural differences and social discrimination – the problem of inclusion and exclusion, dignity and humiliation, respect and repudiation.<sup>79</sup>



Though using the term “symbolic citizenship” differently than I do in Chapter 1, Bhabha expresses the degree to which ethnic and cultural minorities can enact citizenship that affirms difference rather than sameness. Similarly, the hybrid citizenship of La Gran Marcha blurred the boundaries between legal, political, and social citizenship, suffusing them with a cultural and discursive framework. Protestors enacted their legal belonging as members of the U.S. nation state, not by voting or pledging their allegiance, but by waving flags, holding English signs, and taking up public space. The political rights of citizenship were enacted through the act of public demonstration, which proved Latina/os and immigrants suitable for full recognition. By performing their economic and material significance to the United States (e.g., in signs such as “The USA is MADE by Immigrants”), Latina/os and immigrants clamored for social recognition. In each of these instances, though, Latina/os and immigrants articulated their citizenship as, in Bhabha’s words, “a right to difference-in-equality.” That is, they enacted national belonging without eschewing the markers of difference that made them “other” to begin with.

In another sense, Latina/os and immigrants enacted hybrid purpose because they aimed not only to blur the dimensions of citizenship but also to fuse cultural performance, political argument, and civic duty together. In La Gran Marcha, Latina/os and migrants took to the streets in a collective political demonstration embodying rowdy, open expressions of citizenship, in contrast to the usually civil and rational expressions of “good” citizenship. For example, notions of ideal democratic discourse privilege citizens speaking “dispassionate[ly],” “orderly,” “articulate[ly],” and rationally.<sup>80</sup> “Appeals [by citizens] in the public sphere must be rational,” says Kendall Phillips (in his critique of this ideal model), “and participants must bow to the force of the ‘better’ argument.”<sup>81</sup> We see this presumption of good citizenship in the private and legalistic understandings of citizenship rituals such as voting or public deliberation.<sup>82</sup> Culture

and citizenship are often seen as independent spheres; citizenship is a universal identity without cultural markers, while expressions of unique cultural identity are deemed “differences” outside of citizenship.<sup>83</sup>

Because of the contractual relationship between citizens and democratic institutions, citizenship lends itself to explicitly legal and political manifestations when minority groups clamor for inclusion. In contrast, Latina/os and migrants in La Gran Marcha enacted citizenship as a rowdy and open public act. Harkening to early expressions of citizenship characterized by “bodily mass communication” and “public sensationalism,” the protestors used embodied rhetoric and cultural performances to enact their unique sense of American citizenship.<sup>84</sup> The protestors used the rhetoric of their collected bodies to perform their civic duty as citizens who congregate in public in the service of democracy. And through their public sensationalism, protestors in La Gran Marcha performed citizenship as a rowdy and riotous public act. In sum, Latina/os and migrants in La Gran Marcha fused entertainment, community-building, and political argument into a hybrid citizenship discourse. This is not to say that protestors in La Gran Marcha were the first to construct this fluid mode of citizenship, but it is one of many markers of the way they constituted hybrid citizenship in form, content, and purpose.<sup>85</sup>

For example, in the video we see a carnival-like atmosphere featuring Tejano music, cotton candy vendors, and families laughing and dancing; these things seamlessly transition into political spectacle, including protesting, shouting, sign waving, and speeches. In the first third of the video, the political “argument” of the protest (in conventional terms) is indistinguishable from the cultural performances of the protestors. Thus before any signs, banners, or political messages were delivered, many of the Latina/o protestors gathered to constitute themselves as a collective. As Richard Flores notes, this performance of cultural identity can be part of a hybrid

expression of citizenship. “Because the majority of cultural performances are public affairs,” he notes, “they provide an important location to investigate . . . how communities exert and negotiate their place within the larger civic arena, an arena riddled with multiple relations that impinge on, confront, isolate, anticipate, and crystallize into various forms of power.”<sup>86</sup> In other words, protestors in La Gran Marcha used cultural performance, material rhetoric, and social protest to negotiate their place in U.S. citizenship. La Gran Marcha was an instance of hybrid citizenship in its purpose because it demonstrated how “cultural practices” became avenues toward legal, political, and social citizenship.<sup>87</sup> This cultural element of citizenship was seamlessly integrated with the marching, shouting, and signage as well as with the protests’ elements of conventional political argument.<sup>88</sup> Protestors simultaneously performed the markers of U.S. citizenship, and they challenged those markers through cultural difference and diverse modes of discourse.

Through this hybrid rhetorical enactment of citizenship, protestors in La Gran Marcha challenged conventions of citizenship as contractual allegiance to the nation state. They violated norms of civility central to understandings of “good citizenship,” and they presented a fusion of rowdy cultural performance and political allegiance to the nation. La Gran Marcha exemplified a hybrid model of Latina/o citizenship in its rhetorical form, content, and purpose. The final section discusses what made the hybrid citizenship of La Gran Marcha unique and ventures some conjectures about what it could mean for the politics of U.S. citizenship

### **Hybrid Citizenship**

Latina/os have struggled to find a place within American citizenship throughout history. Yet protestors in La Gran Marcha struck a unique citizenship discourse that shared elements with traditional Latina/o citizenship movements but forged new connections with transnational groups

and cultures. La Gran Marcha also represented a unique discourse which broke from conventions of democratic participation. Through its form, content, and purpose, the hybrid citizenship of La Gran Marcha enacted the blurring of national borders, the fusing of political modes of governance, and the melding of cultural and political identity.

The hybridity of contemporary Latina/o citizenship is evident in Latina/o and migrant identity as well as in the discourse they enacted in La Gran Marcha of Los Angeles on March 25, 2006. Contemporary Latina/os and migrants represent hybrid identities in racial, ethnic, and cultural terms. Migrants cross borders, identify with multiple national communities, and represent transnational economic forces—all the while clamoring for U.S. national belonging. Latina/os too, even those who are citizens or residents, represent the drive toward mixed racial and cultural identity. Though we should not under-emphasize the degree to which national and racial prejudices persist in the Latina/o community, La Gran Marcha represented a concrete example of hybrid connections struck among Latina/os and migrants. The march also exemplified how hybridity has begun to infuse Latina/os' practices of and expectations for citizenship.

In the preceding analysis, I showed how La Gran Marcha of March 26 featured a hybrid discourse of citizenship. In contrast to compromise citizenship—which was characterized by legal compromise over the terms of citizenship—and border citizenship—which was characterized by oscillation between inclusion and separatism—citizenship enacted in La Gran Marcha was characterized by hybridity in its rhetorical form, content, and purpose. With a hybrid or intersectional rhetorical form, La Gran Marcha consisted of a multi-material rhetoric which challenged disembodied, civil, and exclusively textual forms of expressing national belonging. In its content, La Gran Marcha presented a hybrid citizenship, fusing the identities

and demands of Latina/os and immigrants into a collective political future. The protestors proclaimed their American citizenship and demanded the rights it entailed by fusing Latin American, Latina/o, and U.S. political languages and traditions. Finally, by blending legal, political, social, and cultural expressions of citizenship into a rowdy, embodied performance, La Gran Marcha enacted a hybrid citizenship in purpose; that is, its aim was to craft a hybrid expression of national belonging.

To put it differently, if citizenship is conventionally conceived as a contractual relationship, then the Californios sought to negotiate the terms of the contract, while Tijerina and the Alianza alternated between appeals to modify the terms and calls to reject the contract of citizenship altogether. La Gran Marcha, however, moved beyond the explicitly contractual dimensions of citizenship to create a new enactment of citizenship. Its hybrid citizenship performed national belonging while holding on to cultural, racial, and national differences. It enacted citizenship without professing national allegiance. La Gran Marcha fused the rights, obligations, and recognitions of U.S. citizenship with cultural performance and media spectacle. It transcended the conventional choice of either inclusion through assimilation or exclusion based on difference, the fundamental logic of citizenship, to marry both assimilation and difference.

The hybrid discourse of citizenship enacted in La Gran Marcha represented a unique contemporary Latina/o citizenship. It drew upon past Latina/o struggles with exclusion and inclusion, but it reframed and remade those struggles to respond to modern challenges. Whether this protest represents a new mode of citizenship emerging in the Latina/o community is difficult to predict. Likewise, while similar protests spread across the country throughout April, May and June of 2006, Latina/os and immigrants have yet to create a similar groundswell of mobilization

since the protests of 2006. Nevertheless, I venture three important conclusions to draw from La Gran Marcha and its hybrid citizenship, conclusions concerning Latina/os as a social group, the dimensions of U.S. citizenship, and the tensions which structure U.S. national belonging.

One significant conclusion to be drawn from the citizenship discourse of La Gran Marcha is the increased solidarity between Latina/o citizens, documented immigrants, and undocumented immigrants. Groups who have historically felt a degree of tension toward one another (particularly Latina/o citizens toward undocumented immigrants) united in La Gran Marcha to enact their national belonging and to demand their rights as Americans.<sup>89</sup> By standing side by side with undocumented immigrants, Latina/o citizens risked authorizing popular stereotypes that equate Latina/o ethnicity and culture with illegality. Worse, Latina/os risked physical violence and legal persecution if presumed to be “illegal.”<sup>90</sup> Likewise, the willingness of undocumented immigrants, joined by Latina/os, to come out of the shadows perhaps hails an emerging unity among Latina/os in the face of impending struggles for national belonging.

On the one hand, these connections create renewed pressures for exclusion or assimilation, as is evidenced by a number of recent anti-immigrant and anti-Latina/o measures.<sup>91</sup> On the other hand, linkages between Latina/o and immigrant populations create renewed possibilities for citizenship. As William Flores notes, immigrants “are emerging from the shadows as new subjects with their own claim for rights. These claims are given space by Latina/o social movements and by counter-ideology that stresses unity between Latina/o citizens and the undocumented based on community rather than difference.”<sup>92</sup> These developments are of significance to scholars and activists interested in exploring the parameters of Latina/o rhetoric and Latina/o identity. Considering how treacherous tracing the confines of these categories has been, La Gran Marcha could portend connections that help to answer questions

such as “what is a Latina/o?” and “what is Latina/o rhetoric?” These are connections that I explore in more detail in the following chapter.

As I have noted throughout this project, Latina/os have struggled with multiple dimensions of citizenship—the legal, political, social, and symbolic—at different places and times. Another important conclusion to be drawn from La Gran Marcha, then, concerns these conventional dimensions of citizenship. In La Gran Marcha, a hybrid discourse of citizenship emerged, one that expanded the dimensions of citizenship and blurred the boundaries between them. Protestors in La Gran Marcha proclaimed their membership as citizens not in explicitly legal or political terms but by performing citizenship through American political language and culture. They clamored for legal recognition but also demanded social and economic citizenship rights regardless of legal status. Throughout their legal and political demands, protestors affirmed their right to be different, to be other, and still be part of the national community.

Thus, through a combination of cultural performance, community building, entertainment, and political protest, Latina/os and migrants in La Gran Marcha fused the legal, political, social, and symbolic elements of citizenship. This hybrid citizenship, it could be argued, has the potential to expand understandings and practices of citizenship in contemporary society. Scholars of politics, sociology, and communication have long decried the challenges facing citizenship in contemporary society.<sup>93</sup> But as Suzanne Oboler summarizes,

Through their lives, practices, activism and participation, Latina/o/a citizens, residents and immigrants—regardless of political status—are also contributing to the ongoing efforts to redefine and expand the very meaning of citizenship beyond the discussion of rights, of who has them, and who does not.<sup>94</sup>

Latina/os and migrants demonstrate there is promise still in the concept of citizenship, beyond its traditionally contractual relationship between the individual and the nation state. In the face of the weakening of political participation, expanding the terms of the national community can, perhaps, invigorate the category of citizenship. Moreover, even in the world of globalization of culture and capital flow, when citizenship can expand or evolve to take into account new challenges and experiences, it can maintain an important position in contemporary political identity.

Returning, then, to the question of national belonging, a final conclusion that can be drawn from the hybrid citizenship of La Gran Marcha concerns the struggle between inclusion and exclusion endemic to U.S. citizenship. On the one hand, citizenship entails national belonging with all of the duties, obligations, rights, and privileges therewith. On the other hand, citizenship demands an inside and an outside; to justify the category of the citizen, there must be a non-citizen “other.” This is the tension of inclusion-exclusion at the core of U.S. citizenship, and it is a tension with which Latina/os have struggled throughout history with varying degrees of success.

What was unique about La Gran Marcha, though, and the citizenship discourse enacted therein, was that, to some degree, the hybrid citizenship of Latina/o and immigrant protestors rejected this tension of inclusion-exclusion that drives U.S. citizenship. For example, one conventional way to attain inclusion is to shed or minimize the differences that make one “other” and, thus, unworthy of citizenship. Another more confrontational way to attain recognition as citizen entails pushing dominant society to expand or stretch the border between citizen and non-citizen into new territory. However, rather than seeking compromise as a means of achieving inclusion, or trying to expand the borders between inclusion and exclusion, in La Gran Marcha,



protestors demanded *inclusion through difference*. Protestors flaunted their questionable legal status and their violations of national immigration laws. “We are here and we are not leaving and if you kick us out we will return,” they shouted.<sup>95</sup> Protestors also proclaimed their national belonging without assimilating to many legal, social, or cultural norms of U.S. citizenship. Instead, through foreign symbols, languages, cultural expressions, and political traditions protestors clamored “you will recognize us as citizens, but on our own terms.” This demand for belonging in and through difference broke with conventional understandings of inclusion-exclusion structuring citizenship. Protestors in La Gran Marcha enacted a hybrid discourse of citizenship: belonging in multiple national communities, a transnational sense of citizenship, inclusion without assimilation, and separateness without exclusion.

As a result, Latina/os are not simply “entering society”; in the words of William Flores, Latina/os are “reshaping it.” “The world that they are seeking to create is neither a replication of the old countries nor an assimilation into the host society.” The distinct “Latina/o infusion” we see in La Gran Marcha perhaps points to the possibilities and the problematics of citizenship in the twenty first century.<sup>96</sup> Of course, the physical and societal backlash faced just a year later by protestors who tried to recreate La Gran Marcha in the streets of Los Angeles reminds us that we cannot too easily celebrate hybrid citizenship without considering how it too could serve the interests of those who wish to keep citizenship an exclusive category.<sup>97</sup> Moreover, La Gran Marcha, as well as its hybrid style of citizenship rhetoric, has not completely replaced more conventional modes of citizenship, such as legislation, voting, or deliberation. Could citizenship in these different contexts too hold common hybrid elements in connection with La Gran Marcha? I will deal with some of these larger questions concerning Latina/o identity and U.S. citizenship in the chapter that follows. However, La Gran Marcha, and the hybrid discourse of

citizenship it represents, demonstrates that Latina/o struggles with citizenship persist and persist in their evolution. And, just like the protestors' rhetoric, La Gran Marcha portends that the future of citizenship may be hybrid, an amalgam of old and new, a fusion of institution and discourse, but also a continuing motivation for political and social struggles in U.S. democracy.

#### Notes for Chapter 4

1. Watanabe and Bercerra, "How Djs Put 500,000 Marchers in Motion.>"; Teresa Watanabe and Hector Bercerra, "500,000 Pack Streets to Protest Immigration Bills: The Rally, Part of a Massive Mobilization of Immigrants and Their Supporters, May Be the Largest L.A. Has Seen," *Los Angeles Times*, March 26, 2006; J. Sterngold, "500,000 Throng L.A. To Protest Immigrant Legislation," *The San Francisco Chronicle*, March 26 2006.

2. "Border Protection, Antiterrorism, and Illegal Immigration Control Act of 2005," (HR 4437, December 16, 2005), Available from *THOMAS (Library of Congress)*, <http://thomas.loc.gov>, accessed December 14, 2006.

3. Scholars have examined some of the ways that the Latina/o community in Los Angeles was mobilized for La Gran Marcha, including through Spanish-language radio, schools, and community organizations. Irene Bloemraad and Christine Trost, "It's a Family Affair: Intergenerational Mobilization in the Spring 2006 Protests," *American Behavioral Scientist* 52 (2008); Adrián Félix, Carmen González, and Ricardo Ramírez, "Political Protest, Ethnic Media, and Latino Naturalization," *American Behavioral Scientist* 52 (2008); Hector Cordero-Guzmán et al., "Voting with Their Feet: Nonprofit Organizations and Immigrant Mobilization," *American Behavioral Scientist* 52 (2008).

4. Jenna M. Loyd and Andrew Burrige, "La Gran Marcha: Anti-Racism and Immigrants Rights in Southern California," *ACME: An International E-Journal for Critical Geographies* 6 (2007), 4.

5. Several scholars have used interviews and surveys to explore a number of factors about La Gran Marcha, including motivations for Latina/o participation in the protest, methods of mobilization by organizers, and some of the results the protest had on Latina/o political participation. Lisa M. Martinez, "Flowers from the Same Soil': Latino Solidarity in the Wake of the 2006 Immigrant Mobilizations," *American Behavioral Scientist* 52 (2008); Adrian D. Pantoja, Cecilia Menjivar, and Lisa Magaña, "The Spring Marches of 2006: Latinos, Immigrant, and Political Mobilization in the 21st Century," *American Behavioral Scientist* 52 (2008); Félix, González, and Ramírez, "Political Protest, Ethnic Media, and Latino Naturalization." Scholarly interviews and surveys conducted on participants in La Gran Marcha indicate that struggles with nation, community belonging, and citizenship were central motivations for immigrants' and Latina/os' participation. One of the important findings of this social scientific research is to lend support to popular understandings of La Gran Marcha (and the larger 2006 protests) as demonstrations concerning *citizenship*. See Christina M. Getrich, "Negotiating Boundaries of Social Belonging: Second-Generation Mexican Youth and the Immigrant Rights Protests of 2006," *American Behavioral Scientist* 52 (2008); Bloemraad and Trost, "It's a Family Affair: Intergenerational Mobilization in the Spring 2006 Protests."

6. Quoted in the video "Immigration March Draws Thousands of Protestors," March 25, 2006, *CBS 2/KCAL 9 Los Angeles*, available at <http://cbs2.com/video/?id=15998@kcbs.dayport.com>, accessed October 18, 2008.

7. Few studies have explored the citizenship discourse of La Gran Marcha. Summers Sandoval, though, argues that the protestors of La Gran Marcha challenged dominant racial assumptions by channeling negative stereotypes of immigrants (as unruly, "dirty," and dangerous) into political power.

Tomás F. Summers Sandoval Jr., “Disobedient Bodies: Racialization, Resistance, and the Mass (Re)Articulation of the Mexican Immigrant Body,” *American Behavioral Scientist* 52 (2008). This is an argument I have developed in more detail in a previous essay. J. David Cisneros, “(Re)Making the Immigrant Body: Rhetoric, Materiality, and Social Protest in ‘La Gran Marcha’ of March 25, 2006,” in *National Communication Association* (San Diego, CA: 2008). It is also an argument I will expand in this chapter in relation to the protestors’ enactments of a particular type of transnational citizenship. Similarly, Pineda and Sowards argue that the multiple national flags used in the protests functioned as ideographs around which contestation about immigration and citizenship took place. Pineda and Sowards, “Flag Waving as Visual Argument: 2006 Immigration Demonstrations and Cultural Citizenship.”

8. Though analysis of this video, which was recorded for CBS 2/KCAL 9 (a local Los Angeles television news station), cannot substitute for physical presence at the protest, the video can provide an access point for discussions of the protestors’ *hybrid* citizenship discourse. My arguments about the protest drawn from this video are supported by other documentation of La Gran Marcha, including photographic images and eye-witness audio/video recordings. See, for example, the website of Unity Corp, one of the main organizing groups of La Gran Marcha, which collects video, audio and photographic documentation of the protest. Cuerpo de Unidad, Inc., “La Gran Marcha 2006,” (2006), available at: <http://www.granmarcha.org>, accessed December 14, 2006.

9. Oboler, “Redefining Citizenship as a Lived Experience.” It is important to distinguish between what I mean by *border* citizenship and *hybrid* citizenship. Through Tijerina’s discourse oscillated between extremes of reformist civil rights rhetoric and radical ethno-nationalist rhetoric, La Gran Marcha fused radical and reformist extremes, and other traditions, into a new enactment of citizenship. While Tijerina moved back and forth between appeals for inclusion as citizen and calls for separatism based on ethnic/cultural difference, the mode of citizenship crafted in La Gran Marcha combined inclusion and difference into a mode of U.S. citizenship that performed equality through difference. I will elaborate on this argument further in this Chapter.

10. Stephen Castles and Alastair Davidson, *Citizenship and Migration: Globalization and the Politics of Belonging* (New York: Routledge, 2000), 2.

11. Shafir, “Introduction: The Evolving Tradition of Citizenship.”; Falk, “The Decline of Citizenship in an Era of Globalization.”

12. Shafir, “Introduction: The Evolving Tradition of Citizenship.”

13. Flores and Benmayor, “Constructing Cultural Citizenship.”

14. Smith, *Civic Ideals*, Honig, *Democracy and the Foreigner*, Warner, *Publics and Counterpublics*.

15. Omi and Winant, *Racial Formation in the United States*.

16. Castles and Davidson, *Citizenship and Migration*, 153.

17. Ibid. Monica Varsanyi makes this paradox clearer with regard to Latina/o immigrants. “Struggles over political belonging,” she argues, “portend future struggles over the meaning and constitution of membership and citizenship in a world increasingly open to economic flows, but restricted as to the free flow of people.” Varsanyi and other scholars of migration and citizenship claim that the clamoring of migrants and racial minorities for rights will expose the limitations and contradictions endemic to citizenship (exclusion and belonging) until “the boundaries of suffrage and of citizenship” are “redrawn.” Monica W. Varsanyi, “The Paradox of Contemporary Immigrant Political Mobilization: Organized Labor, Undocumented Migrants, and Electoral Participation in Los Angeles,” *Antipode* 37 (2005), 790.

18. Aleinikoff and Klusmeyer, *Citizenship Policies for an Age of Migration*; Thomas Alexander Aleinikoff and Douglas B. Klusmeyer, *Citizenship Today: Global Perspectives and Practices* (Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 2001).

19. Oboler, ed., *Latinos and Citizenship: The Dilemma of Belonging*; Castles and Davidson, *Citizenship and Migration*; Johnston, "The Emergence of Transnational Citizenship."
20. Adelaida R. Del Castillo, "Illegal Status and Social Citizenship: Thought on Mexican Immigrants in a Postnational World," *Aztlán* 27 (2002), 17.
21. Bhabha, *The Location of Culture*, 236.
22. *Ibid.*, 9.
23. Gilbertson, "Regulating Transnational Citizens"; De Genova and Ramos-Zayas, *Latino Crossings*.
24. Flores and Benmayor, eds., *Latino Cultural Citizenship*; Johnston, "The Emergence of Transnational Citizenship"; Jonathan Friedman and Shalini Randeria, *Worlds on the Move: Globalization, Migration, and Cultural Security* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004).
25. Molina Guzmán and Valdivia, "Brain, Brow, and Booty." I have talked previously about the racial and ethnic conditions that define contemporary Latina/o identity, one of racial mixing that has contributed to a sort of confluence between *latinidad* and *mestizaje* in race/ethnicity, culture, language, and so forth. The previous case studies have developed the evolution of this term in Latina/o populations, and in this article I will discuss it in its contemporary connections to Latina/o identity.
26. The black-white binary structures racial understanding in terms of only black or white identity, obfuscating the identity and experiences of Latina/os, Asians, and other racial/ethnic groups. Juan F. Perea, "The Black/White Binary Paradigm of Race: The 'Normal Science' of American Racial Thought," *La Raza Law Journal* 10 (1998). See Chapter 1.
27. Oboler, *Ethnic Labels, Latino Lives*. See Chapter 1 note 66.
28. This notion of transnational citizenship is certainly contentious among political scientists and scholars of citizenship. I do not mean to authoritatively comment on the evolving condition of citizenship worldwide, only to talk about transnational populations seeking access to citizenship. Nevertheless, I feel that turning our focus to discursive enactments of citizenship, as I do in this project, may help us differentiate between transnational citizenship institutions, like international governance, and transnational enactments of national belonging. For a critique of transnational citizenship see Fox, "Unpacking 'Transnational Citizenship.'"
29. Marwan M. Kraidy, "Hybridity in Cultural Globalization," *Communication Theory* 12 (2002), 316.
30. Bhabha, *The Location of Culture*.
31. Shugart, "Counterhegemonic Acts." Shugart argues that hybridity is a more acceptable form of diversity because it neutralizes "otherness" by including aspects of dominant identities. For example, hybrid racial identity is often a more palatable form of diversity to dominant culture than clear racial difference. Valdivia, "Latinas as Radical Hybrid."
32. Néstor García Canclini, *Hybrid Cultures: Strategies for Entering and Leaving Modernity* (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1995).
33. May Joseph, "Introduction: New Hybrid Identities and Performance," in *Performing Hybridity*, ed. May Joseph and Jennifer Fink (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999), 5.
34. This is not to say there are no differences between Latina/o citizens and immigrants, in fact several scholars have documented the historic tensions between these groups. De Genova, "The Legal Production of Mexican/Migrant 'Illegality'"; Rocco, "Transforming Citizenship."
35. See Chapter 1. Asen, "A Discourse Theory of Citizenship."
36. The usual sense of journalistic distance and objectivity that characterized other images of La Gran Marcha is absent from this video. The impression is that of a participant rather than an observer. For further discussion of the usual 'objectivity' of journalistic images see Cori E. Dauber, "The Shots Seen 'Round the World: The Impact of the Images of Mogadishu on American Military Operations," *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 4 (2001); Robert Hariman and John Louis Lucaites, "Performing Civic Identity: The Iconic Photograph of the Flag Raising on Iwo Jima," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 88 (2001).

37. Gerard A. Hauser, "Incongruous Bodies: Arguments for Personal Sufficiency and Public Insufficiency," *Argumentation & Advocacy* 36 (1999). For an excellent survey of the scholarship on social protest, including some of the germinal work in the area, see Charles E. Morris and Stephen H. Browne, *Readings on the Rhetoric of Social Protest* (State College, Pa.: Strata Pub., 2001).

38. Kathryn M. Olson and G. Thomas Goodnight, "Entanglements of Consumption, Cruelty, Privacy, and Fashion: The Social Controversy over Fur," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 80 (1994), 272. The most traditional trajectory in the literature on social protest situates its instrumental role in the workings of argument and deliberation. Social protest works in unconventional ways to persuade, to motivate, and to activate. Kathryn Olson and Tom Goodnight, in their essay "Entanglements of Consumption, Cruelty, Privacy, and Fashion: The Social Controversy over Fur," analyze the rhetoric of anti-fur activists, arguing that the anti-fur activists' oppositional arguments challenge social beliefs and appealing to the common interest. Olson and Goodnight discuss the argumentative workings of these oppositional and confrontational forms of rhetoric by framing them in terms of traditional argument theory; they argue that social protest blocks enthymematic associations and subverts widely accepted arguments as a way to reframe public opinion. Following the work of Olson and Goodnight, others have considered the role of embodied social protest as non-rational public argument or counterpublic discourse. These scholars have examined the ways in which protests function to make arguments in the public sphere. Christina Haas, "Materializing Public and Private: The Spatialization of Conceptual Categories in Discourses of Abortion," in *Rhetorical Bodies*, ed. Jack Selzer and Sharon Crowley (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1999); Brouwer, "Act-Ing up in Congressional Hearings.,"; Pezzullo, "Resisting 'National Breast Cancer Awareness Month.'"

39. Scholars expand the study of social protest rhetoric to its circulation in mass media discourse. See, for example, Kevin Michael DeLuca, *Image Politics: The New Rhetoric of Environmental Activism* (New York: Guilford Press, 1999); S. Craig Watkins, "Framing Protest: News Media Frames of the Million Man March," *Critical Studies in Media Communication* 18 (2001). Delicath and DeLuca, for example, have studied how mediated protests, or "image events," from groups such as Greenpeace and Earth First!, function to redraw boundaries of discourse, subvert "dominant" arguments, and expand "the range of thinkable thoughts." John W. Delicath and Kevin Michael DeLuca, "Image Events, the Public Sphere, and Argumentative Practice: The Case of Radical Environmental Groups," *Argumentation* 17 (2003), 324. This work examines the protesting body as a circulating, mass media image that challenges dominant assumptions and disrupts sedimented practices of deliberation. Kevin Michael DeLuca and Jennifer Peeples, "From Public Sphere to Public Screen: Democracy, Activism, and the 'Violence' of Seattle," *Critical Studies in Media Communication* 19 (2002).

40. Supplementing an instrumental, argumentative, or mass media lens, scholars have looked to social protest as a way to understand the constitution and operation of social movements. Michael McGee notes that social movements do not exist pre-discursively but are constituted by the rhetoric which they utter as a challenge to dominant groups. McGee, "In Search of 'the People.'" More recent work extends this constitutive focus. For example, Darrel Enck-Wanzer argues that "the act of protest itself has a constitutive effect on the people involved and on those who bear witness to it." Darrel Enck-Wanzer, "Trashing the System: Social Movement, Intersectional Rhetoric, and Collective Agency in the Young Lords Organization's Garbage Offensive," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 92 (2006), 187. Beyond or perhaps before influencing belief or motivating action, protests function rhetorically to create group identities, situate political agency, and challenge the make-up of dominant publics. Kristy Best, "Rethinking the Globalization Movement: Toward a Cultural Theory of Contemporary Democracy and Communication," *Communication & Critical/Cultural Studies* 2 (2005).

41. Kevin Michael DeLuca, "Unruly Arguments: The Body Rhetoric of Earth First!, Act up, and Queer Nation," *Argumentation & Advocacy* 36 (1999), 10. In other words, DeLuca notes that our experience of protest is often mediated through other forms of media (such as television). While this is certainly the case, I also argue there is a distinction between looking at how a protest is circulated in mass

media (an approach DeLuca himself takes in *Image Politics*) and how a protest functions on its own terms. Though I analyze a mediated recording of La Gran Marcha, I focus on how the protest enacted U.S. citizenship rather than on how the protest circulated in mass media.

42. "Immigration March Draws Thousands of Protestors," *CBS 2/KCAL 9 Los Angeles*.

43. The anonymity of the cameraperson and the 'transparency' of the camera allow the viewer of the video to substitute him or herself into the position of the onlooker, which heightens the sense of a direct experience of the protest. For a further discussion of the perceived objectivity and 'presence' of the photograph or video image see also Roland Barthes, *Image, Music, Text*, trans. Stephen Heath (New York: Hill and Wang, 1977), 32-51; Cara A. Finnegan, "The Naturalistic Enthymeme and Visual Argument: Photographic Representation in the 'Skull Controversy'," *Argumentation & Advocacy* 37 (2001).

44. Later, in many of the interviews and journalistic accounts of the protest, organizers claimed that the white shirts worn by the protesters were meant to signify peace and unity, while orange shirts designated protest organizers. Watanabe and Bercerra, "How DJs Put 500,000 Marchers in Motion."

45. Transcribed from the Spanish. Unfortunately, the crowd noise makes some of the organizer's speech unintelligible. The following is my Spanish transcription: "Estamos a punto de comenzar la ceremonia y el programa fabuloso que tenemos en este día . . . de fiesta, de felicidad, pero también de coraje del pueblo. . . . Esta paloma simboliza el compromiso de todos los poderes, de todas las fuerzas aquí en este histórico día. . . . ¡Marchamos todos juntos hasta la Victoria! ¡Hoy marchamos por la amnistía, mañana por la ciudadanía, y después para poder gobernar civilmente con el resto de los trabajadores de este país! ¡Para que haya justicia en este país y en todo el mundo!"

46. Enck-Wanzer, "Trashing the System," 191.

47. In the words of Eric King Watts, the voices of protestors are "not detachable" from their bodies but are particularly imbued "ideology and identity." Eric King Watts, "'Voice' and 'Voicelessness' in Rhetorical Studies," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 87 (2001), 192. In other words, the protestors' very act of rowdy speaking, particularly when coming from their marked racial and cultural identity, was in stark contrast to the usual silence and quiescence of the immigrant. This helped cultivate Latina/o and immigrant protestors' "voice."

48. Pineda and Sowards, "Flag Waving as Visual Argument: 2006 Immigration Demonstrations and Cultural Citizenship." Visual enthymemes function like the traditional argument, appealing to implicit premises in the audience, but the initial premise to the argument is provided by a visual image that appeals to cultural vernaculars. Finnegan, "The Naturalistic Enthymeme and Visual Argument: Photographic Representation in the 'Skull Controversy.'"; Cara A. Finnegan, "Recognizing Lincoln: Image Vernaculars in Nineteenth-Century Visual Culture," *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 8 (2005).

49. Pineda and Sowards, "Flag Waving as Visual Argument."

50. DeLuca, "Unruly Arguments," 98.

51. Anne Norton, *Republic of Signs: Liberal Theory and American Popular Culture* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993), 120.

52. Carole Blair, "Contemporary U.S. Memorial Sites as Exemplars of Rhetoric's Materiality," in *Rhetorical Bodies*, ed. Jack Selzer and Sharon Crowley (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1999),

46. Blair describes how material rhetoric (in her study, U.S. memorials) creates rhetorical effectivity through mere physical presence. In this same sense, protestors' public presence (over half a million protestors) physically performed national belonging. To come out into the public sphere constituted the protestors as members of the American public.

53. Charles E. Morris, III and John M. Sloop, "'What Lips These Lips Have Kissed': Refiguring the Politics of Queer Public Kissing," *Communication & Critical/Cultural Studies* 3 (2006), 12.

54. Enck-Wanzer, "Trashing the System," 191.

55. Ronald Walter Greene, "John Dewey's Eloquent Citizen: Communication, Judgment, and Postmodern Capitalism," *Argumentation & Advocacy* 39 (2003). I use the masculine pronoun here

deliberately in the spirit of many feminist critiques of the “good citizen” tradition, e.g., Nancy Fraser, “Rethinking the Public Sphere: A Contribution to the Critique of Actually Existing Democracy,” in *Habermas and the Public Sphere*, ed. Craig J. Calhoun (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1992).

56. John Rawls, “The Idea of Public Reason,” in *Deliberative Democracy: Essays on Reason and Politics*, ed. James Bohman and William Rehg (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1997).

57. Iris Marion Young, *Inclusion and Democracy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 64. See also Iris Marion Young, “Activist Challenges to Deliberative Democracy,” in *Debating Deliberative Democracy*, ed. James S. Fishkin and Peter Laslett (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2003). Benjamin Barber also introduces his notion of democratic talk, which includes all of the “quiet and noisy manifestations of our common humanity.” Benjamin R. Barber, *Strong Democracy: Participatory Politics for a New Age* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984), 177.

58. Enck-Wanzer, “Trashing the System,” 191.

59. Varsanyi, “The Paradox of Contemporary Immigrant Political Mobilization,” 789.

60. Bhabha, *The Location of Culture*, xvii.

61. Ibid.

62. Jacques E. Levy and César Chávez, *César Chávez: Autobiography of La Causa*, 1st ed. (New York: Norton, 1975), 464; Cesar Chavez, Richard J. Jensen, and John C. Hammerback, *The Words of César Chávez*, 1st ed. (College Station: Texas A & M University Press, 2002), xix; Hammerback and Jensen, *The Rhetorical Career of César Chávez*.

63. Sharon Ann Navarro and Armando Xavier Mejia, *Latino Americans and Political Participation: A Reference Handbook* (Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO, 2004), 71; Young Lords Party. and Michael Abramson, *Palante: Young Lords Party* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971); Enck-Wanzer, “Trashing the System.”

64. McGee, “In Search of ‘the People,’” 245.

65. For more on this constitutive function of social movements see Richard B. Gregg, “The Ego-Function of the Rhetoric of Protest,” *Philosophy & Rhetoric* 4 (1971); Charles J. Stewart, Craig Allen Smith, and Robert E. Denton, *Persuasion and Social Movements*, 4th ed. (Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press, 2001).

66. Mark Mattern, *Acting in Concert: Music, Community, and Political Action* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1998), Chapter 3.

67. Lynn Stephen, *Zapata Lives!: Histories and Cultural Politics in Southern Mexico* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002).

68. Varsanyi, “The Paradox of Contemporary Immigrant Political Mobilization,” 787.

69. As Ngai notes, many of these myths are double sided for they contribute to systems of social exclusion that dominate immigrants’ experiences. “The myth of ‘immigrant America’ derives its power in large part from the labor that it performs for American exceptionalism.” Ngai, *Impossible Subjects*, 5.

70. This is a point made by several other commentators on Latina/o immigrant mobilization. Summers Sandoval Jr., “Disobedient Bodies,”; Varsanyi, “The Paradox of Contemporary Immigrant Political Mobilization.”

71. Despite the demographic linkages between Latina/os and immigrants, these two groups have seen historic tensions stemming as far back as the nineteenth century, when Latina/o citizens objected to growing numbers of Latin American immigrants. Pitt, *The Decline of the Californios*. For many contemporary Latina/os, these tensions result from societal racism that equates Latina/o identity with illegality. De Genova, “The Legal Production of Mexican/Migrant ‘Illegality.’”; Rosaldo, “Cultural Citizenship, Inequality, and Multiculturalism.” Even in the 1930s, during reactions to the Brazero Program, deportations of Mexican-American and Chicano citizens, who were suspected of being “illegal” because of their skin tone, were common practice. Flores, “Constructing Rhetorical Borders: Peons, Illegal Aliens, and Competing Narratives of Immigration.” In this cultural and social climate, then, “Latina/os realize that the border crosses them as well,” and that “each stricture against the undocumented

diminishes the rights of all Latina/os.” William V. Flores, “Citizens Vs. Citizenry: Undocumented Immigrants and Latino Cultural Citizenship,” in *Latino Cultural Citizenship: Claiming Identity, Space, and Rights*, ed. William V. Flores and Rina Benmayor (Boston: Beacon Press, 1997), 261. Latina/os increasingly feared that stricter immigration laws would result in more racial profiling and more social pressured felt by Latina/o citizens. As a result, Latina/os joined with migrants to reject attempts at closing the borders of U.S. citizenship.

72. For more about the performativity and (re)signification of the racialized body see Jonathan Xavier Inda, “Performativity, Materiality, and the Racial Body,” *Latino Studies Journal* 11 (2000).

73. Transcribed from the Spanish.

74. Bhabha, *The Location of Culture*, 202.

75. Oboler, “Redefining Citizenship as a Lived Experience,” 17.

76. Dobson, *Citizenship and the Environment*.

77. Honig, *Democracy and the Foreigner*.

78. I do not mean to claim here that *mestizaje* is an authentic marker of *latinidad*. I point out the racial and ethnic markings of the Latinas/os in the protests for two reasons. First because these markings of difference were deployed by dominant discourse to marginalize this protest as an ‘ethnic,’ Latin, or ‘immigrant’ protest. See succeeding note 42. Second, the physical features of the protestors become important not because they signal some essential identity but because they are material aspects of the embodied protest, and because these markers of difference are enacted by the protestors with specific rhetorical and material effects. For a discussion of the use of brownness as a political strategy in the Chicano movement see Hammerback, Jensen, and Gutierrez, *A War of Words*. For a discussion of the racial politics of immigration see Smith. *Civic Ideals*. For further discussion of the racial elements of Latina/o/a identity see Bernadette Marie Calafell, “Disrupting the Dichotomy: “Yo Soy Chicana/o?” In the New Latina/O South,” *Communication Review* 7 (2004).

79. Bhabha, *The Location of Culture*, xvii.

80. Young, *Inclusion and Democracy*, 6.

81. Kendall R. Phillips, “The Spaces of Public Dissension: Reconsidering the Public Sphere,” *Communication Monographs* 63 (1996), 242. For a further discussion on the presumption of reason in democratic discourse see Rawls, “The Idea of Public Reason.”

82. Michael Schudson traces these norms of the “good citizen” and finds that, though the good citizen has not always been the rational, deliberating citizen, in the twentieth century the model of citizenship is based on reason and civility. Schudson, *The Good Citizen*.

83. Rosaldo, “Cultural Citizenship, Inequality, and Multiculturalism.” This universal vision of citizenship contributes to a model of rational, thinking citizens deliberating and casting deciding in private, an understanding of citizenship that persists today. We see the roots of this model of disembodied citizenship in my discussion of the nineteenth century racial project in Chapter 2. See also Carolyn Marvin and Peter Simonson, “Voting Alone: The Decline of Bodily Mass Communication and Public Sensationalism in Presidential Elections,” *Communication & Critical/Cultural Studies* 1 (2004); Jeffrey L. Pasley, “Party Politics, Citizenship, and Collective Action in Nineteenth-Century America: A Response to Stuart Blumin and Michael Schudson,” *Communication Review* 4 (2000).

84. This model of the civil and restrained citizen was not always the norm. As Carolyn Marvin and Peter Simonson document, at one time citizenship gained expression through rowdy public spectacles and a confluence between entertainment, culture, and political activity. Marvin and Simonson discuss two elements to “rowdy” expressions of U.S. citizenship associated with elections: “bodily mass communication” and “public sensationalism.” Bodily mass communication involved the rhetorical force of organized bodies, in this case public rallies. Public sensationalism describes the somatic experience of being “out in public” and involved in a public spectacle. Together these communicative experiences, argue Marvin and Simonson, defined citizenship very differently in the early nineteenth century. Marvin



and Simonson, "Voting Alone," 130. I borrow these terms here to discuss some of the rhetorical force that the protestors in La Gran Marcha were able to construct through their embodied rhetoric.

85. For more scholarship on "rowdy" expressions of citizenship see, for example, DeLuca, "Unruly Arguments.,"; Phillips, "The Spaces of Public Dissension.,"; Robert L. Ivie, "Rhetorical Deliberation and Democratic Politics in the Here and Now," *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 5 (2002). I am not developing any normative argument about the norms of democratic discourse, only using this scholarship to discuss how Latina/o and immigrant protestors challenged these norms through their hybrid discourse.

86. Richard R. Flores, "Aesthetic Process and Cultural Citizenship: The Membering of a Social Body in San Antonio," in *Latino Cultural Citizenship: Claiming Identity, Space, and Rights*, ed. William V. Flores and Rina Benmayor (Boston: Beacon Press, 1997), 125.

87. Flores, "Citizens vs. Citizenry," 277.

88. To clarify, what I call hybrid citizenship in this chapter is different from what some scholars like Flores and Benmayor have called cultural citizenship because, while they see cultural citizenship as an alternative form of national belonging minorities enact when they lack full inclusion I view hybrid citizenship as citizenship enactment rather than a localized, cultural appeal to symbolic recognition. La Gran Marcha illustrates that what Latina/os are doing is fusing "cultural" and "social" dimensions of citizenship with conventional political and legal dimensions. In the absence of full recognition as citizens, Latina/os and immigrants build an alternative, hybrid citizenship. I will develop this argument in the final section of this chapter.

89. Rosaldo, "Cultural Citizenship, Inequality, and Multiculturalism."

90. De Genova, "The Legal Production of Mexican/Migrant 'Illegality.'"

91. For example, California proposition 187, 227, and others that aimed to limit the rights of immigrants and racial minorities. See Crawford, *At War with Diversity*.

92. Flores, "Citizens Vs. Citizenry," 277.

93. A variety of scholars prophesy the death of citizenship if it cannot be invigorated by one means or another. For example, Dewey, *The Public & Its Problems*; Robert D. Putnam, *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2000); Peter Simonson, "Dreams of Democratic Togetherness; Communication Hope from Cooley to Katz," *Critical Studies in Mass Communication* 13 (1996). I do not wish to ascribe any solution, as these scholars do, but only to point to what is, perhaps, not the decline of citizenship but its evolution into new, hybrid forms.

94. Oboler, "Redefining Citizenship as a Lived Experience," 21.

95. "Immigration March Draws Thousands of Protestors," *CBS 2/KCAL 9 Los Angeles*.

96. Flores, "Citizens Vs. Citizenry," 277.

97. Associated Press, "Cop Tactics at Immigration Rally Draw Ire," May 2, 2007, *CBS News*, available at <http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2007/05/02/national/main2751936.shtml>, accessed February 19, 2009.

## CHAPTER 5

### CONCLUSION: WE ARE *AMERICANOS*

It has become quite commonplace for scholars and social commentators to begin their work by remarking on the growth of Latina/os (or Hispanics) in the United States. Over the last two decades we have supposedly witnessed the rise of “Spanglish, the “Decade of Hispanics,” the “Hispanic nation,” and the “Latin explosion.”<sup>1</sup> It seems rather cliché, then, to have commenced and concluded this project with a similar observation. Yet one of the goals of this project has been to investigate these claims about the emergence of the Latina/o in U.S. society. By focusing on their struggles for U.S. citizenship, I have argued that Latina/os resist and/or remake their place in U.S. society and have done so since there have been U.S. citizens of Latin American descent. If Latina/os are increasingly participating in structuring U.S. society and culture, we must ask what these struggles look like, where they came from, and what they portend for Latina/os and their role in the United States.

The first chapter proposed a series of questions that would drive this project: How have Latina/os dealt with the tensions between exclusion and inclusion endemic to U.S. citizenship? How have these struggles changed over time? Has rhetoric been a central component in Latina/os’ making and remaking of their national belonging? Tracing Latina/os’ struggles with U.S. citizenship through three specific moments in history, this dissertation provided a partial picture of how Latina/os contribute to U.S. society and from where those connections stem. This concluding chapter first returns to these driving research questions by reviewing the argument

about Latina/os and U.S. citizenship in this project. Then it summarizes the three case studies to provide several conclusions about contemporary U.S. citizenship and the role of Latina/os in U.S. society. After outlining some of the limitations of this project that can animate future scholarship, I conclude by considering what this project says about Latina/o identity.

### **Race, Rhetoric, and Resistance in Latina/o Struggles for U.S. Citizenship**

Citizenship is a contested term perhaps now more than ever, but it also matters perhaps now more than ever. As evidence of these observations we can look to the growing number of groups who clamor for U.S. citizenship while academics and cultural critics portend its demise.<sup>2</sup> Citizenship is driven by a tension that structures its internal logic—a tension between inclusion and exclusion, between citizen and “other.”<sup>3</sup> Race and ethnicity, as well as sex, gender, sexuality, and social class, are common axes around which these parameters of citizenship are drawn. This dissertation builds upon the work done by other scholars who suggest that U.S. citizenship is one of the United States’ racial projects: structuring systems of representations, institutions, and material conditions that contribute to racial exclusion.<sup>4</sup>

Over the three historical moments in this dissertation, it is evident that U.S. citizenship is an enduring racial project structuring the lives of U.S. Latina/os. Chapter 2 showed how nineteenth century beliefs about race ordered ideologies and practices of U.S. citizenship that drastically changed the economic, political, and cultural role of Californios in the new state. Throughout the twentieth century as well, cultural and institutional practices continued to promote either assimilation into the American mainstream or exclusion. Latina/os in the Southwest, like the “Hispanos” who helped generate Reies Tijerina’s Alianza movement, struggled with institutional racism in land, economics, education, and civil rights, among other areas. Even contemporary society, though it is heralded as the great awakening of the Latina/o

“sleeping giant,” witnesses pressures of national belonging structuring the lives of both Latina/o citizens and immigrants. In a sense, this dissertation has provided a sort of record of these continual pressures of exclusion and inclusion endemic to U.S. citizenship, particularly their impact on Latina/os. Though in principle the United States may welcome those who are tired or hungry or yearning to be free, in practice U.S. national belonging is a more contentious process.

While it is true that the tensions of U.S. citizenship impact the lives of U.S. Latina/os, this dissertation has also illustrated that Latina/os resist these constraints to adapt U.S. citizenship to their political, historical, and cultural contexts. In practical terms, the choice has not always been between assimilation and exclusion. Latina/os renew, remake, and reframe U.S. citizenship in the face of its racialized components. Through an analysis of three moments in which Latina/os crafted unique enactments of U.S. citizenship, I argued that Latina/o groups have been active agents in the making and remaking of U.S. citizenship. In the absence of formal recognition as citizens (in legal, political, social, or symbolic terms), and in the face of pressures of assimilation and exclusion, Latina/o groups enact U.S. citizenship through public discourse to restructure the terms of their national belonging.

In Chapter 2, I showed how some of the first Latin Americans negotiating their U.S. national identity—the Mexican Californios of the mid-nineteenth century—struck a *compromise* citizenship during the California Constitutional Convention of 1849. Californios resisted American conventions of white, male, Christian, citizenship over the issues of suffrage and language. Through rhetorical strategies such as presence, legal appeals, mimicry, and prudence, the Californios sought accommodation of their Mexican citizenship traditions. And though they did not find the middle ground in every instance, the Californios performed a compromise

citizenship that married two distinct ideologies and practices of citizenship through contractual compromise.

After over a century of pressures concerning U.S. national belonging, Latina/os crafted very different enactments of U.S. citizenship in the 1960s. The subject of Chapter 3, Reies López Tijerina, and his organization the *Alianza Federál de Mercedes Reales*, crafted a *border* citizenship which, true to its name, continually migrated between a reformist civil rights rhetoric and a radical ethno-nationalist rhetoric. At times Tijerina appealed to his status as U.S. citizen through arguments based on law, the Constitution, identification, and jeremiad. At other times Tijerina critiqued American citizenship for its inherent exclusion. Using rhetoric grounded in moral language, conspiracy, and apocalypticism, he sought to constitute a separate citizenship for Latina/os based on a common racial and cultural identity.

Contemporary struggles with U.S. citizenship, such as the immigrant protests of 2006, expand the scope of Latina/o citizenship to new realms. Chapter 4 shows how La Gran Marcha of March 25, 2006, the largest of these protests, fused a *hybrid* citizenship in its rhetorical form, content, and purpose. Rather than compromising foreign traditions or oscillating between extremes, the protestors' enactments of citizenship in La Gran Marcha combined intersectional rhetorical forms and transnational citizenship traditions to create a new mode of U.S. citizenship. In a sense, the hybrid citizenship of La Gran Marcha transcended tensions of exclusion and inclusion through a resistive performance of U.S. national belonging.

In sum, in the face of the United States' racial project, Latina/os have struggled to craft new modes of U.S. citizenship. Though Latina/os have not eschewed the traditional dimensions of U.S. citizenship (e.g., legal, political, symbolic), Latina/o groups throughout U.S. history have reworked these traditions to find a middle ground between inclusion through assimilation or

exclusion based on difference. Scholars in Latina/o studies and Chicana/o studies, among other fields, have begun to fill in the picture of where Latina/os' struggles with U.S. citizenship come from and what those struggles have looked like over the years.<sup>5</sup> In this sense, this dissertation has been one element of a project of "recovery and (re)discovery," an attempt to demonstrate that Latina/os have not been passive victims of U.S. colonialism or racism, but rather active agents in shaping U.S. citizenship.<sup>6</sup> As a "recovery project" of sorts, this dissertation has contributed to the (re)writing of our collective memory of U.S. citizenship struggles.

This dissertation counters the claim that Latina/os are a "sleeping giant" only now awakening, or that the U.S. has just recently seen the "decade of the Hispanic." Instead, Latina/os have been central agents in the evolution of U.S. society; they "have been and continue to be an integral part of this country's multicultural patrimony and have at different times played a perceptible role in the shaping of US history." If this project has furthered the process of uncovering important moments in U.S. citizenship crafted by Latina/os, this type of recovery project is important because it can provide a "sense of continuity with the past and a vital source of collective identity and empowerment" for Latina/os.<sup>7</sup> That is, not only can this project further the scholarship on Latina/o citizenship, but it can, perhaps, serve as a rhetorical resource in the struggles Latina/os face regarding their national belonging. Demonstrating that U.S. Latina/os are active agents in the making and remaking of America can strengthen contemporary struggles for inclusion. Beyond their significance for Latina/o citizenship studies, these three case studies provide insights into the role of rhetoric in minority struggles for national belonging. In the next section, I consider a second group of conclusions that this project provides.

### Rhetoric, Inclusion, and U.S. Democracy

The three case studies in this dissertation are certainly very different. For example, apart from the obvious differences between each group, their rhetoric exhibits unique rhetorical forms (such as public deliberation, political oratory, social movement rhetoric, and radical protest). Furthermore, each group emphasized different tropes, types of argument, and linguistic strategies in their appeals for U.S. citizenship. Finally, each group negotiated with different dimensions of U.S. citizenship, from legal to political, social, and symbolic. Despite their differences, these three case studies speak to the role of minority rhetoric in U.S. democracy in two ways. First, they show that, across time, Latina/os, like other minority groups, have used situated, public, and persuasive discourse (i.e., rhetoric) to *enact* citizenship even before it was extended in formal dimensions. Second, though each case study provides a unique rhetorical form and content, they all showcase the discursive perspective of U.S. citizenship more generally.

The three case studies I analyzed provide a window into how subaltern groups enact national belonging in the absence of the full resources available to dominant groups.<sup>8</sup> As “racialized ‘foreigners,’” Latina/os often do not have access to the recognition and political agency that attend U.S. national belonging.<sup>9</sup> Instead, they have sought agency and recognition by enacting U.S. citizenship. That is to say, one unifying element of these Latina/o struggles with U.S. citizenship has been their rhetorical quality. Through rhetoric, these diverse Latina/o groups have *constituted* themselves as citizens in opposition to the exclusionary racial dynamics of U.S. citizenship. For example, the Californio Jose Carrillo noted that he was “as much an American citizen” as the other delegates to the California Constitutional Convention, and the Californios accompanied that pronouncement by performing U.S. citizenship in their search for compromise.<sup>10</sup> During his moments of reformist civil rights discourse, Tijerina enacted his

national belonging through pronouncements such as, “we [the Spanish Americans] are part of America.”<sup>11</sup> Likewise, in their symbolic “coming out” in public, the protestors in La Gran Marcha made clear they were standing as U.S. citizens with statements such as “The USA is MADE by Immigrants . . . and that’s it!”<sup>12</sup> In the absence of material resources or symbolic recognition, the Latina/o groups I analyzed here rhetorically enacted U.S. citizenship to constitute themselves as part of the national community.<sup>13</sup> Rhetorical theorists have long argued that public discourse is constitutive of self and other, and, in this vein, Latina/os constituted themselves as citizens to gain access to national belonging.<sup>14</sup>

Though Latina/os enacted U.S. citizenship as a form of social inclusion, they also critiqued exclusionary dynamics of U.S. citizenship. Latina/os simultaneously constituted themselves as U.S. citizens and challenged the conventions of U.S. citizenship. In other words, their discursive enactments of U.S. citizenship constructed agency for Latina/os and challenged the tensions of inclusion-exclusion. While Carrillo was “as much an American citizen” as the other delegates, he and the other Californios (such as de la Guerra) also subtly criticized the racial project of U.S. citizenship as “most unfair.”<sup>15</sup> Tijerina’s border discourse exposed the exclusionary tendencies of U.S. citizenship as much as it performed U.S. national belonging. And the protestors in La Gran Marcha may have deemed themselves U.S. citizens, but they did so by flaunting the United States’ laws and traditions. By “(en)acting this significant critique of the system,” Latina/os “articulated” a different “social imaginary” of U.S. citizenship.<sup>16</sup> In other words, though they lacked the power to change the imaginary of U.S. citizenship outright, these Latina/o groups exposed the limits in the logics of U.S. citizenship, reshaping the boundaries of national belonging along the way. Though by different means, the Latina/o groups I analyzed here “challenged the constraints” of U.S. citizenship and constituted their collective agency.<sup>17</sup>



Lacking resources or formal recognition, Latina/o groups enacted citizenship through both identification and difference. Since rhetoric has the power to (re)make identities, motivate action, and shape ideological and material conditions, Latina/os have used rhetorical discourse to navigate, to stretch, or to blur the boundaries that structure U.S. national belonging in its many dimensions. In spite of their differences, these case studies showcase that rhetoric has been an avenue for Latina/os to enact and challenge U.S. citizenship even when they are silenced through other means.

Apart from the contributions of this project to the study of Latina/os and minority rhetorics of citizenship, these case studies provide a second conclusion about the role of rhetoric in U.S. democracy. This project demonstrates the importance of a discursive perspective of U.S. citizenship. Certainly, the legal, political, social, and symbolic dimensions of U.S. citizenship prove enduringly important throughout history. But this project illustrates that citizenship is about more than that; “it is about being *visible*, being *heard*, and belonging [emphasis added].”<sup>18</sup> Public discourse drives minority struggles for inclusion, and attention to how groups *enact* or *perform* their citizenship through situated public and persuasive discourse (among other forms of discourse) is central to understanding minority struggles with U.S. citizenship. A discursive view sees citizenship as a mode of action rather than a static identity category; citizenship is conceived as a public enactment of national belonging.<sup>19</sup> As rhetorical scholars have noted, public discourse has been a central element of how Americans express their sense of national identity throughout history.<sup>20</sup> Thus attention to the rhetorical dimensions of U.S. citizenship can inform prevalent debates about public participation and the future of U.S. democracy. Studying how citizens enact their national belonging, whether in the form of debate, discussion,

deliberation, protest, or public performance, is a unique contribution communication scholars can bring to the scholarship on U.S. citizenship.<sup>21</sup>

I have shown in this project how Latina/o studies, citizenship studies, and rhetorical studies are intertwined. Scholarship on Latina/o citizenship can illuminate larger evolutions in U.S. citizenship and rhetoric's role in U.S. national belonging. Likewise, Latina/o struggles with national belonging demonstrate that a rhetorical/discursive perspective is an important addition to the studies of U.S. citizenship. This project provides a diachronic perspective on U.S. Latina/o identity and thickens our understandings of U.S. citizenship more generally. However, like all scholarly work, this project has limitations and oversights. Therefore, before concluding with some final thoughts about Latina/o identity, I outline limitations with the scope and focus of this project, and I explain the potential they provide for future scholarship.

#### ***Problemas y Posibilidades: Directions for the Future***

It is evident that Latina/os have been active agents in the evolution of U.S. society for at least as long as they have been legal U.S. citizens. It is also clear that, in the absence of formal recognition as full citizens, Latina/os have used rhetoric to enact U.S. citizenship. Yet this project is less a neat narrative of the history of Latina/o citizenship rhetoric than it is an incomplete foray into some of this history's important moments. Each of the chapters here presents a part of the complex field of Latina/o citizenship. Moreover, each case study focuses on a narrow body of texts to explain three broad moments of Latina/o citizenship rhetoric. Therefore, one direction the study of Latina/o citizenship can take in the future is to expand on the scope of Latina/o citizenship rhetoric both synchronically and diachronically.

At the individual level, each of these case studies deserves more in-depth treatment. The California Constitutional Convention of 1849 dealt with many other issues over which conditions

of U.S. citizenship were debated besides suffrage and language rights. Also, the California Constitutional Convention was one of the first but certainly not the only moment of negotiation with U.S. citizenship in the mid nineteenth century; Latina/os in Texas and New Mexico faced similar struggles. As I made amply clear in Chapter 3, Tijerina's rhetoric and activism were complex and varied—certainly meritorious of further in-depth consideration. This is not to mention the differences, similarities, and relationships between Tijerina and the various social movements for Chicana/o and Latina/o citizenship in the middle twentieth century. The analysis of La Gran Marcha as a rhetorical text leaves other crucial elements of its citizenship discourse (such as the organization of the protest and its circulation in mass media), as well as the role of other 2006 protests, for future consideration.

Furthermore, by documenting and analyzing a larger survey of Latina/o discourses of U.S. citizenship, scholars could provide a larger picture of Latina/os' roles in U.S. society over time. Expanding scholarly attention to other rhetorical struggles with Latina/o citizenship across history—such as the rise of LULAC (League of United Latin American Citizens) in the 1920s, the Latina/o literary circles of the 1930s, the Zoot Suit Riots of the 1940s, and the civil rights organizations of the 1950s (e.g., the American GI Forum)—could prove fruitful.<sup>22</sup> Political movements organized in response to anti-Latina/o initiatives in the 1980s and 1990s could also yield interesting case studies in Latina/o citizenship rhetoric.<sup>23</sup> In sum, a larger survey of historical moments in which Latina/os struggled with U.S. national belonging can provide a richer picture of the evolution of Latina/o citizenship.

Beyond developing the scope of this project both synchronically and diachronically, a second area for future research relates to the focus of this project on U.S. citizenship, rhetoric, and race in particular. Of course every project demands certain choices in the units of analysis

and the perspectives taken toward those texts, but by focusing on the ways Latina/os struggle with the racial dimensions of national belonging, this dissertation leaves unquestioned the issues of gender, social class, and sexuality in U.S. citizenship. Analyzing the rhetorical struggles of Latinas against the tensions of inclusion and exclusion, for example, is an important project for future research. Other scholars have shown how Latinas (and Chicanas) and gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgendered Latina/os face multiple forms and sources of exclusion based on their race, ethnicity, sex, sexuality, and gender.<sup>24</sup> Latinas and gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgendered Latina/os negotiate the in-group pressures of the Latina/o community and the out-group pressures of U.S. citizenship.<sup>25</sup> When it comes to the politics of U.S. citizenship, these axes of oppression are magnified by the exclusionary nature of national belonging. Thus it would be invaluable, for example, to analyze the case studies in this dissertation from the perspective of gender (not to mention sexuality or social class) to yield insights into how U.S. citizenship is both raced and gendered.

This is all to say that, like all projects, this one has limitations in its scope and focus. But these limitations provide innumerable avenues for future scholarship on Latina/o citizenship. The more we uncover about these historical rhetorical struggles the more we realize there is yet to study. In this dissertation I have only provided a small part of the larger project of tracing Latina/o citizenship rhetoric. Questions for future scholars to consider include: How have Latina/os crafted unique rhetorics of citizenship in specific moments in U.S. history? How have these discourses of citizenship challenged the exclusionary elements of U.S. national belonging? How has Latina/o citizenship changed over time? As other scholars engage Latina/o citizenship from diverse perspectives, such as media studies, historical studies, and performance studies, these questions leave fruitful ground for analysis. As Bernadette Calafell notes, the scholarly

agenda lies in collaborative work that, piece by piece, creates “images or representations [of Latina/os] that are not reductionist [sic], representations that allow for some connection without homogeneity.”<sup>26</sup>

Despite these enduring research questions, then, this project has important insights about what Latina/o citizenship struggles look like, where they come from, and what these struggles portend for Latina/o identity in U.S. society. The case studies analyzed in this dissertation outline new (discursive) approaches to U.S. citizenship and illustrate what Latina/o citizenship has looked like at various moments in history. In the following section I consider the broadest implications of this project. Recognizing that Latina/os have struggled with U.S. citizenship, exclusion, and inclusion throughout history, what do these Latina/o citizenship struggles portend for Latina/os and *latinidad* (or Latina/o identity) and/in U.S. society?

### **We are *Americanos***

As I discussed in Chapter 1, though the three groups studied in this dissertation differ in their nationality and self-identification (for not all would identify as Latina/o), they share common ethnic, historical, and linguistic characteristics that tie their struggles together.<sup>27</sup> More importantly, these three case studies suggest that the struggle with and against dominant traditions of U.S. national identity (and its racial elements) constitutes, to a certain degree, what it means to be Latina/o in the United States. While Californios, Hispanos (specifically Tijerina), and contemporary Latina/os crafted different versions of U.S. citizenship, these Latina/o groups have not wholeheartedly adhered to either side of this neat binary between exclusion and inclusion. This section discusses what these common dimensions to Latina/o citizenship struggles may mean for questions of Latina/o identity.

Of course, it seems these types of broad identity questions are often the most troubling to discuss, for they are the hardest to speak or write about concretely. For those who study the U.S. population of Latin American descent that I have called “Latina/os” (whether Mexican, South American, or Caribbean; whether citizen, resident, or immigrant), the problem of *latinidad* is expressed, among other ways, in an ongoing debate about terminology. Latina/o and Chicana/o studies scholars continue to ask broad terminological questions such as: Are the groups being studied called “Latina/os,” “Hispanics,” or “Mexican/Cuban/Guatemalan/Puerto Rican Americans”? What about more politically charged terms like “Chicanos” or *La Raza*? Is it even worth speaking of some sort of common term, let alone a pan-ethnic unity, among these groups?

The problem of terminology encapsulates the difficulties Latina/o and Chicana/o studies scholars face in trying to pin down any enduring or unifying elements to these groups.<sup>28</sup> Certainly in this limited space I cannot develop anything approaching a comprehensive answer to these problematic identity questions, or at least not more than others have contributed in larger works dedicated to the problem of *latinidad*.<sup>29</sup> However, the struggles with citizenship discussed in this project point to a sense of *displacement* that characterizes Latina/o identity in the United States.<sup>30</sup> This displacement is expressed in the degree to which the various groups discussed in this dissertation have sought *both* U.S. national belonging *and* a degree of distinctness from other U.S. citizens. By trying to negotiate the tension of exclusion-inclusion endemic to U.S. citizenship, Latina/o identity in the United States is a powerful but problematic position.

The case studies I have analyzed in this project demonstrate the “displacement” that characterizes Latina/os—in other words, a desire for distinctiveness *and* for unity. As Acosta-Belén and Santiago note, this “displacement” of Latina/os is

produced by the physical dislocation from their native cultures experienced by (im)migrants, refugees, exiles, or by the colonizing experience. From that constant commuting – *el ir y venir* (the back and forth movement) of those from ‘here’ and ‘there’ (*los de aquí y los de allá*) – emerge the tensions, contradictions, and reconfigurations that influence and mold the construction of our contemporary Latina/o identities.<sup>31</sup>

This sense of dis-placement (literally lacking a home, or having “no place”) is, of course, a material experience for many Latina/os, such as migrants and refugees. It is certainly a material experience of the groups considered in this dissertation, which experienced displacement either through colonialism, the theft of their land/culture, or the lack of full inclusion in the national community. Yet, metaphorically, displacement also seems to characterize the history of Latina/o citizenship; Latina/o groups have struggled for inclusion without abandoning the distinctiveness (racial, cultural, or otherwise) that made them “other” to begin with.

Certainly, the three Latina/o groups discussed in this dissertation—Californios, Hispanos (*Aliancistas*), and modern-day Latina/os—were defined by virtue of their willingness to either assimilate for the sake of inclusion (“Oneness”) or face exclusion by holding on to their cultural difference (distinctiveness).<sup>32</sup> Californios, for example, were constituted as “others” in contrast to nineteenth century standards of white, male, European, Christian citizenship. In that sense, whether they referred to themselves as Californios or Mexicans, their place in U.S. society was defined through those historical relations of race, culture, and colonialism. They faced a simple choice: on the one hand, they could assimilate, which would erase these differences for the sake of inclusion as citizens; on the other hand, by holding on to the ethnic and cultural differences that defined them as a unique people, Californios risked facing continued exclusion. In response, rather than choose either option, the Californios sought *compromise*, a strategy that intended to

integrate difference *and* inclusion. Californios were dis-placed by virtue of being foreigners in their own land. Rather than eschew their difference and assimilate wholeheartedly, the Californios in the Constitutional Convention of 1849 constructed a tenuous compromise between what made them “other” and what could make them “American.”

Tijerina, the Alianza movement, and the Hispanos they attempted to represent, were also defined as “other” by virtue of their race, their identification with Mexico, their appeals to the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, their radical rhetoric, and so forth. Tijerina crafted a *border* citizenship, one that moved back and forth between an emphasis on “Oneness” (i.e., civil rights) and “fragmentation” (i.e., ethno-nationalism).<sup>33</sup> Migrating between reformism and radicalism, Tijerina embodied *el ir y venir* [the coming and going], a dis-placed rhetoric that moved back and forth along the border of U.S. citizenship.<sup>34</sup> Rather than, on the one hand, eschewing cultural and racial difference to achieve inclusion or, on the other hand, rejecting inclusion for the sake of separatism, Tijerina struck a back and forth of tensions and contradictions.

Finally, these same elements of racial and historical displacement (e.g., colonialism, racism, migration) defined the experience of many Latina/os—Mexican-American, Guatemalan, Salvadoran, Puerto Rican, and others—in La Gran Marcha. In response to these negative pressures and stereotypes, Latina/o protestors fused a *hybrid* citizenship, a new mode of national belonging. Rather than accede to pressures of either exclusion based on difference or inclusion based on assimilation, protestors crafted a dis-placed discourse of U.S. citizenship. Unlike the groups that came before them, Latina/os in La Gran Marcha neither sought compromise between difference and sameness nor migrated between these extremes. Instead, combining multiple rhetorical resources and varied citizenship traditions, protestors in La Gran Marcha crafted a new discursive space that was both *aquí y allá*, here and there.



Yet for these three Latina/o groups, the conditions of displacement that facilitated their dis-placed struggles for national belonging *also* contributed to the limited success of their discourses of citizenship. A displaced discourse of citizenship easily fell prey to continued marginalization by dominant U.S. society. For Californios, their insistence on holding on to some of their Mexican traditions both provided the rhetorical resources for compromise and limited the degree of their inclusion in the end. Californios were left without their Mexican traditions but also without full consideration as U.S. citizens. Similarly, Tijerina and the Alianza used border rhetoric to negotiate tensions of U.S. citizenship, but in the end Tijerina's, continual migration between the personas of reformist citizen and radical ethno-nationalist contributed both to his meteoric rise and his precipitous fall. La Gran Marcha evidenced a hybrid citizenship that broke new ground for Latina/os by fusing multiple citizenship traditions and rhetorical forms. Yet the distinctiveness of this hybrid citizenship made a similar protest a year later an easy target for public criticism and state repression.

In a sense, then, these case studies suggest that Latina/o groups have continually sought to defy the very structuring logics of U.S. citizenship. Latina/o groups have struggled for a sense of inclusion that does not abandon the distinctiveness that traditionally results in exclusion. Latina/os define themselves by the very cultural and racial differences that make them "others" to begin with. As each of the case studies here demonstrates, for Latina/os the negotiation of U.S. citizenship has been a perpetual give and take, a struggle between assimilation and exclusion that is irresolvable. Though each group crafted a different mode of U.S. citizenship, for each group the result was a contingent, unstable, and temporary balance between assimilation and distinctiveness, between inclusion and exclusion.

Therefore, these evolving struggles with U.S. citizenship paradoxically demonstrate both what seems to be an enduring element of the U.S. Latina/o condition—its displacement—and the ultimate impossibility of pinning down an essential *latinidad*. The three case studies are different in terms of their time period, the nationality/ethnicity of the group in question, and other factors; yet they share certain fundamental connections, including a common language, common history, common cultural ties, racial/ethnic similarities, and a sense of displacement that could allow us to speak of some sort of enduring *latinidad*. Nevertheless, these case studies also demonstrate the degree to which Latina/o identity is continually “reconstituted or remolded” through “cultural cross-connections with the native culture, with the US mainstream culture,” and with “the cultures of other marginal groups.”<sup>35</sup> For not only have the types of discourse and the modes of citizenship enacted by U.S. citizens of Latin American descent changed across time, but the identity and composition of those groups has changed as well.

While the Californios shared a regional identity, common land, an immediate history, and a common nationality, the members of Tijerina’s *Alianza* only shared the most elemental and distant ties to this Mexican history. Instead they constructed a common identity, in part, by emphasizing the racial and ethnic ties to *mestizaje* that proved a source of such difficulty for the Californios. Perhaps the most obvious blurring of Latina/o identity is evident in the protestors of La Gran Marcha, who constituted a Latina/o identity through common cultural elements (such as the Spanish language and Latin American heritage) rather than nationality or race.

In sum, the ambiguous and *displaced* nature of Latina/os in U.S. society is evident in their material and symbolic place in U.S. society as a dis-placed group. It is also evident in their conflicting struggles for U.S. citizenship, which are structured by a displaced position between inclusion and exclusion. Latina/os are also displaced in the fundamental terms of Latina/o

identity, evidenced in the ever-changing composition of Latina/o groups and in the endless terminological battles over what to call them. No wonder then that there is so much debate about whether or not it is possible to speak of anything resembling a common *latinidad*.

After all of this trouble in answering basic questions about Latina/o identity and Latina/os' place in U.S. society, it is fitting, then, that this project end with a sense of ambivalence and fragmentation. It leaves me displaced regarding past and future struggles for Latina/o citizenship. Certainly the trajectory of this project provides cause for optimism, since the increasingly diverse and unconventional discourses of citizenship examined herein attest to Latina/os' gradual growth in power, prestige, and recognition as members of the U.S. national community. Yet as one door opens others close. With increased recognition have come stereotyped and marginalized representations of Latina/os in media, public debate, and political rhetoric. Along with more power and prestige has come an increase in hate crimes, extremism, and anti-Latina/o initiatives at the state and local level.<sup>36</sup> These tensions are merely manifestations of enduring contradictions in U.S. citizenship and Latina/o identity. The tensions of *latinidad* and U.S. citizenship herald that Latina/o citizenship is a perilous but promising place for scholarship and activism. The undeniable conclusion of this project, though, is that Latina/os are "empowered subjects" integral to the making and remaking of U.S. society.<sup>37</sup> Regardless of the epithet we choose to ascribe to their growing public presence in the U.S., or the tenuous label we give them as a group, Latina/os are rewriting what it means to be *Americano*.

### Notes

1. Leticia Miranda and Julia Teresa Quiroz, "The Decade of the Hispanic: An Economic Retrospective," (Washington D.C.: Office of Research Advocacy and Legislation, National Council of La Raza, 1990); "The Latin Explosion," *New York Magazine*, September 6 1999; Geoffrey E. Fox, *Hispanic Nation: Culture, Politics, and the Constructing of Identity* (New York: Carol, 1996).

2. Though their (ironic) titles may hint otherwise, see the following sources for an elaboration on this point. Falk, "The Decline of Citizenship in an Era of Globalization."; David Jacobson, *Rights across Borders: Immigration and the Decline of Citizenship* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996).

3. Honig, *Democracy and the Foreigner*.

4. Omi and Winant, *Racial Formation in the United States*.

5. As I outlined in Chapter 1, many scholars recognize the pressures of assimilation U.S. citizenship poses on Latina/os. Scholarship on Latina/o citizenship examines contemporary enactments of U.S. national belonging by various Latina/o groups. Fox, *Hispanic Nation*; Flores and Benmayor, eds., *Latino Cultural Citizenship*; Rocco, "Transforming Citizenship"; Oboler, ed., *Latinos and Citizenship*; Acuña, *Occupied America*; De Genova and Ramos-Zayas, *Latino Crossings*. As I explained in Chapter 1, my main contribution to these studies has been through a rhetorical/historical perspective.

6. Acosta-Belén and Santiago, "Merging Borders," 34.

7. *Ibid.*, 33, 32.

8. My use of the term subaltern here draws from the work of "subaltern studies," which usually examines systems of symbolic hierarchy and domination in the colonial legacy of Southeast Asia. See Ranajit Guha and Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, *Selected Subaltern Studies* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988). This scholarly subfield, of course, features many contentious issues and debates, not the least of which is the question of whether or not the subaltern can "speak," or have any agency in the systems of symbolic domination they inhabit. These debates have been extended to the field of Latina/o studies, with similar questions about the role of Latina/o groups in relation to U.S. and international systems of hegemony. I do not wish to enter these contentious theoretical debates here, only to show in these case studies how Latina/o groups, who were "inferior" to dominant society in a number of ways, articulated their position as U.S. citizens. See Paul Allatson, *Latino Dreams: Transcultural Traffic and the U.S. National Imaginary* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2002), 38-44.

9. Rocco, "Transforming Citizenship," 307.

10. Browne, *Report of the Debates in the Convention of California on the Formation of the State Constitution, in September and October*, 22.

11. Tijerina, "The Land Grant Question," 308.

12. "Immigration March Draws Thousands of Protestors," *CBS 2/KCAL 9 Los Angeles*.

13. For a similar argument relating to contemporary Puerto Rican neighborhoods in Chicago see Ana Y. Ramos-Zayas, *National Performances: The Politics of Class, Race, and Space in Puerto Rican Chicago* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003).

14. Black, "The Second Persona."; Charland, "Constitutive Rhetoric: The Case of the People Québécois."; McGee, "In Search of 'the People.'" See also Philip Wander, "The Third Persona: An Ideological Turn in Rhetorical Theory," *Central States Speech Journal* 35 (1984).

15. Browne, *Report of the Debates in the Convention of California on the Formation of the State Constitution, in September and October*, 70.

16. Enck-Wanzer, "Trashing the System," 189.

17. *Ibid.*, 190. Karlyn Kohrs Campbell, "Agency: Promiscuous and Protean," *Communication & Critical/Cultural Studies* 2 (2005).

18. Alejandra Castañeda, "Roads to Citizenship: Mexican Migrants in the United States," in *Latinos and Citizenship: The Dilemma of Belonging*, ed. Suzanne Oboler (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006), 144.

19. Asen, "A Discourse Theory of Citizenship."

20. For example, Marvin and Simonson showed that nineteenth century Americans voted not merely through the act of casting a ballot but through a host of other public rituals and performances that constituted their public identity as U.S. citizens. Marvin and Simonson, "Voting Alone." See also Pasley, "Party Politics, Citizenship, and Collective Action." See Chapter 4 note 85

21. This is not to say that political rhetoric is the only form of communication that should be studied in a discursive framework of citizenship. Latina/o mass media is another form of discourse that shapes and remakes U.S. national belonging. So too do audience's who read, interpret, and/or resist dominant representations through their own discourse. Furthermore, aesthetics, popular culture, and performance could help Latina/os navigate the tensions of U.S. citizenship. In this sense, the discursive perspective could lead to many other avenues to study U.S. citizenship. Furthermore, I am not the first scholar to come at the question of Latina/os role in contemporary through discourse. Excellent work on Latina/o representations and participation in popular culture and mass media can be supplemented, I think, with further consideration of Latina/o rhetoric. Nevertheless, the work of media and performance scholars such as Angie Valdivia, Jillian Báez, Mary Beltrán, Bernadette Calafell, Fernando Delgado, Shane Moreman, Federico Subervi-Vélez, and many others has invaluable shaped our understandings of how Latina/os struggle for their place in the United States. For a good review of Latina/os in media and U.S. popular culture see Angharad N. Valdivia, ed., *Latina/o Communication Studies Today* (New York: Peter Lang, 2008).

22. Latina/o struggles are amply documented in a number of historical works such as Acuña, *Occupied America*. But bringing a rhetorical perspective to these cases, and considering their role in shaping U.S. citizenship, could certainly expand our understanding of Latina/o history. Michelle Hall Kells' work on the civil rights rhetoric of Héctor P. García, which I discussed in Chapter 1, is a good example of what a rhetorical focus on citizenship could bring to studies of Latina/o history. Michelle Hall Kells, *Héctor P. García: Everyday Rhetoric and Mexican American Civil Rights* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2006).

23. For example, bringing a rhetorical perspective on U.S. citizenship to bear on the anti-Proposition 187 or anti-Proposition 227 movements in California could be an interesting study in the evolving politics of Latina/o citizenship. Ono and Sloop, *Shifting Borders*; Crawford, *At War with Diversity*.

24. Within the field of communication and rhetorical studies there is excellent work on how the intersections of race/gender in media and cultural representations impact Latinas and Chicanas. There is also excellent work from a rhetorical perspective on Latina/Chicana feminism. I would like to bring this scholarship to bear on Latina/o citizenship struggles. See Molina Guzmán and Valdivia, "Brain, Brow, and Booty"; Mary C. Beltrán, "The Hollywood Latina Body as Site of Social Struggle: Media Constructions of Stardom and Jennifer Lopez's 'Cross-over Butt'," *Quarterly Review of Film & Video* 19 (2002); Flores, "Creating Discursive Space through a Rhetoric of Difference."; Calafell, "In Our Own Image?"; Valdivia, "Latinas as Radical Hybrid"; Báez, "Towards a Latinidad Feminista"; Molina Guzmán, "Mediating Frida"; Katynka Zazueta Martínez, "Latina Magazine and the Invocation of a Panethnic Family: Latino Identity as It Is Informed by Celebrities and Papis Chulos," *Communication Review* 7 (2004).

25. One fascinating project I hope to take on in the future is to analyze Tijerina's movement from a gender lens. While many of the biographical and scholarly work on Tijerina acknowledges his role as a Chicano figure, little work looks at the role of women in the Alianza movement, especially Tijerina's wife Patsy, who played a tremendously important role in crafting the political strategy and activism of the later Alianza movement. Moreover, Tijerina's border citizenship discourse relied on traditionally masculine conceptions of the revolutionary/bandido and a patriarchal notion of Latina/o culture which deserve attention. Bebout, "Hero Making in El Movimiento." The Latina/o immigrant protest of 2006 also deserve attention from the perspective of gender, since there were intersections between Latina and Chicana feminist groups, as well as other groups, that combined forces in the larger protests like La Gran Marcha.

26. Calafell, *Latina/O Communication Studies*, 127.

27. Several scholars develop some of the unifying elements—such as a common language, common cultural elements, a similar history, and so forth—that tie together diverse groups into some sort

of a Latina/o collective. These scholars also trace these elements of latinidad throughout history much more effectively than I am able to do with these case studies. See for example, Acosta-Belén and Santiago, “Merging Borders”; Oboler, *Ethnic Labels, Latino Lives*.

28. For example, see Delgado, “When the Silenced Speak”; Oboler, *Ethnic Labels, Latino Lives*; Jorge J. E. Gracia, *Hispanic/Latino Identity: A Philosophical Perspective* (Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers, 2000).

29. Many scholars discuss the problems of latinidad, or a Latina/o identity, in more detail than I can do here. In sum, searching for a common Latina/o identity runs the risk of over-essentializing Latina/o people and abstracting Latina/o identity so much that it loses any political or social significance. Despite these dangers, I concur with scholars as diverse as Suzanne Oboler, Jorge Gracia, Bernadette Calafell, and Fernando Delgado that there is value in thinking about what common elements could characterize the experiences of Latina/os in the United States. As Fernando Delgado notes, these types of questions could help us, if nothing else, to “begin to see from the margins and not simply from the center out.” Delgado, “When the Silenced Speak: The Textualization and Complications of Latina/O Identity,” 434. Of course, the important thing to keeping mind, as these scholars note, is that discussions of latinidad are as much an active process of invention as they are an attempt to draw out essential characteristics of Latina/os living in the United States. Therefore, these questions demand a self-reflexive attitude to both the possibilities and the problems that can come with homogenizing or essentializing the diversity of U.S. Latina/os. Oboler, *Ethnic Labels, Latino Lives*. For a review and rebuttal of these criticisms see Gracia, *Hispanic/Latino Identity*.

30. Acosta-Belén and Santiago, “Merging Borders.”

31. *Ibid.*, 36. Lisa Flores also talks about the role of place in Latina/o identity, particularly in the context of Chicana feminists who crafted “discursive space” and a sense of a “homeland” between the displacement of multiple forms of oppression. See Flores, “Creating Discursive Space Through a Rhetoric of Difference.”

32. To extrapolate from Alberto Gonzalez’s characterization of Mexican-Americans, Latina/os living in the United States wrestle with a “self-conscious and resigned ambivalence,” a doubleness that desires both distinctiveness and inclusion, two things that are fundamentally opposed in the dominant traditions of U.S. citizenship. Alberto González, “Mexican ‘Otherness’ in the Rhetoric of Mexican Americans,” *Southern Communication Journal* 55 (1990), 280-2.

33. *Ibid.*

34. Acosta-Belén and Santiago, “Merging Borders,” 36.

35. *Ibid.*, 31.

36. This is certainly an argument that other scholars, particularly those who study gays and lesbians, have made about increased invisibility. With increased public recognition comes greater public criticism, stereotypes, destructive representations, and even violence and backlash. Larry P. Gross, *Up from Invisibility: Lesbians, Gay Men, and the Media in America* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2001). The representations in political rhetoric, pop culture, and mass media are the subject of much work on Latina/os in the fields of rhetoric and media studies. See Chapter 1 for a review. Furthermore, scholars have shown that a number of factors, including the increased visibility of Latina/os in politics and pop culture as well as the growth in Latina/o immigration, have contributed to a rise in racist extremism, anti-immigrant sentiment, and hate crimes against Latina/os. Ngai, *Impossible Subjects*; Crawford, *At War with Diversity*; Santa Ana, *Brown Tide Rising*.

37. Delgado, “When the Silenced Speak,” 424.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Acosta-Belén, Edna, and Carlos E. Santiago. "Merging Borders: The Remapping of America." In *The Latino Studies Reader: Culture, Economy, and Society*, edited by Antonia Darder and Rodolfo D. Torres, 29-42. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers, 1998.
- Acuña, Rodolfo. *Occupied America: A History of Chicanos*. 5th ed. New York: Pearson Longman, 2004.
- Aguirre, Benigno E., and Rogelio Saenz. "A Future Assessment of Latinismo." *Latino Studies Journal* 2 (1991): 19-32.
- Alaniz, Yolanda, and Megan Cornish. *Viva La Raza: A History of Chicano Identity and Resistance*. Seattle: Red Letter Press, 2008.
- Aleinikoff, Thomas Alexander, and Douglas B. Klusmeyer. *Citizenship Policies for an Age of Migration*. Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 2002.
- Aleinikoff, Thomas Alexander, and Douglas B. Klusmeyer. *Citizenship Today: Global Perspectives and Practices*. Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 2001.
- Allatson, Paul. *Latino Dreams: Transcultural Traffic and the U.S. National Imaginary*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2002.
- Allen, Danielle S. *Talking to Strangers: Anxieties of Citizenship after Brown v. Board of Education*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004.

- Altschuler, Glenn C., and Stuart M. Blumin. "Limits of Political Engagement in Antebellum America: A New Look at the Golden Age of Participatory Democracy." *The Journal of American History* 84 (1997): 855-85.
- Amaya, Hector. "Dying American or the Violence of Citizenship: Latinos in Iraq." *Latino Studies* 5 (2007): 3-24.
- Amaya, Hector. "Latino Immigrants in the American Discourses of Citizenship and Nationalism During the Iraqi War." *Critical Discourse Studies* 4 (2007): 237-56.
- Anderson, Benedict R. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. Rev. ed. London: Verso, 2006.
- Annino, Antonio. "The Two-Faced Janus: The Pueblos and the Origins of Mexican Liberalism." In *Cycles of Conflict, Centuries of Change: Crisis, Reform, and Revolution in Mexico*, edited by Elisa Servín, Leticia Reina and John Tutino, 60-90. Durham: Duke University Press, 2007.
- Anzaldúa, Gloria. *Borderlands/La Frontera: The New Mestiza*. San Francisco: Spinsters/Aunt Lute, 1987.
- Arellano, Anselmo. "The People's Movement: Las Gorras Blancas." In *The Contested Homeland: A Chicano History of New Mexico*, edited by David Maciel and Erlinda Gonzales-Berry, 59-82. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2000.
- Asen, Robert. "A Discourse Theory of Citizenship." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 90 (2004): 189-211.
- Associated Press. "Cop Tactics at Immigration Rally Draw Ire." *CBS News*, May 2, 2007. <http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2007/05/02/national/main2751936.shtml> (accessed February 19, 2009).



- Báez, Jillian M. "Towards a Latinidad Feminista: The Multiplicities of Latinidad and Feminism in Contemporary Cinema." *Popular Communication* 5 (2007): 109-28.
- Bancroft, Hubert Howe. *History of California*. Vol. 6. Santa Barbara, CA: W. Heberd, 1963.
- Bancroft, Hubert Howe. *History of California*. Vol. 5. Santa Barbara, CA: W. Heberd, 1963.
- Barber, Benjamin R. *Strong Democracy: Participatory Politics for a New Age*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984.
- Barthes, Roland. *Image, Music, Text*. Translated by Stephen Heath. New York: Hill and Wang, 1977.
- Bass, S. Jonathan, and Martin Luther King. *Blessed Are the Peacemakers: Martin Luther King, Jr., Eight White Religious Leaders, and The "Letter from Birmingham Jail."* Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2001.
- Beasley, Vanessa B., ed. *Who Belongs in America?: Presidents, Rhetoric, and Immigration*. College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2006.
- Beasley, Vanessa B. *You, the People: American National Identity in Presidential Rhetoric*. College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2004.
- Bebout, Lee. "Hero Making in El Movimiento: Reies López Tijerina and the Chicano Nationalist Imaginary." *Aztlán: A Journal of Chicano Studies* 32 (2007): 93-121.
- Beltrán, Mary C. "The Hollywood Latina Body as Site of Social Struggle: Media Constructions of Stardom and Jennifer Lopez's 'Cross-over Butt.'" *Quarterly Review of Film & Video* 19 (2002): 71-86.
- Best, Kristy. "Rethinking the Globalization Movement: Toward a Cultural Theory of Contemporary Democracy and Communication." *Communication & Critical/Cultural Studies* 2 (2005): 214-37.

- Bhabha, Homi K. *The Location of Culture*. London: Routledge, 1994.
- Black, Edwin. "The Second Persona." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 56 (1970): 109-19.
- Blair, Carole. "Contemporary U.S. Memorial Sites as Exemplars of Rhetoric's Materiality." In *Rhetorical Bodies*, edited by Jack Selzer and Sharon Crowley, 16-57. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1999.
- Blawis, Patricia Bell. *Tijerina and the Land Grants: Mexican Americans in Struggle for Their Heritage*. New York: International Publishers, 1971.
- Bloemraad, Irene, and Christine Trost. "It's a Family Affair: Intergenerational Mobilization in the Spring 2006 Protests." *American Behavioral Scientist* 52 (2008): 507-32.
- Brouwer, Daniel C. "ACT-ing up in Congressional Hearings." In *Counterpublics and the State*, edited by Robert Asen and Daniel C. Brouwer, 87-109. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2001.
- Browne, J Ross. *Report of the Debates in the Convention of California on the Formation of the State Constitution, in September and October, 1849*. Washington, D.C.: John T. Towers, 1850.
- Burke, Kenneth. *A Grammar of Motives*. New York: G. Braziller, 1955.
- Burke, Kenneth. *Language as Symbolic Action: Essays on Life, Literature, and Method*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1966.
- Busto, Rudy V. *King Tiger: The Religious Vision of Reies López Tijerina*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2005.
- Busto, Rudy V. "Sacred Order, Sacred Space: Reies López Tijerina and the Valle De Paz Community." In *Mexican American Religions: Spirituality, Activism, and Culture*, edited by Gastón Espinosa and Mario T. García, 85-105. Durham: Duke University Press, 2008.

- Butler, Judith. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. 2 ed. New York: Routledge, 1999.
- Calafell, Bernadette Marie. "Disrupting the Dichotomy: 'Yo Soy Chicana/o?'" In the New Latina/o South." *Communication Review* 7 (2004): 175-204.
- Calafell, Bernadette Marie. "In Our Own Image? A Rhetorical Criticism of *Latina* Magazine." *Voces: A Journal of Chicana and Latina Studies* 3 (2001): 12-46.
- Calafell, Bernadette Marie. *Latina/o Communication Studies: Theorizing Performance*. New York: Peter Lang, 2007.
- Calafell, Bernadette Marie, and Fernando Delgado. "Reading Latina/o Images: Interrogating Americanos." *Critical Studies in Media Communication* 21 (2004): 1-21.
- Campbell, Karlyn Kohrs. "Agency: Promiscuous and Protean." *Communication & Critical/Cultural Studies* 2 (2005): 1-19.
- Castañeda, Alejandra. "Roads to Citizenship: Mexican Migrants in the United States." In *Latinos and Citizenship: The Dilemma of Belonging*, edited by Suzanne Oboler, 143-65. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006.
- Castles, Stephen, and Alastair Davidson. *Citizenship and Migration: Globalization and the Politics of Belonging*. New York: Routledge, 2000.
- Charland, Maurice. "Constitutive Rhetoric: The Case of the People Québécois." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 73 (1987): 133-50.
- Chávez, César, Richard J. Jensen, and John C. Hammerback. *The Words of César Chávez*. College Station: Texas A & M University Press, 2002.
- Chavez, Leo R. *Covering Immigration: Popular Images and the Politics of the Nation*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001.

- Chavez, Leo R. *Shadowed Lives: Undocumented Immigrants in American Society*. Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace College Publishers, 1998.
- Cisneros, J. David. "Contaminated Communities: The Metaphor of 'Immigrant as Pollutant' in Media Representations of Immigration." *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 11 (2008): 569-601.
- Cisneros, J. David. "(Re)Making the Immigrant Body: Rhetoric, Materiality, and Social Protest in 'La Gran Marcha' of March 25, 2006." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the *National Communication Association*. San Diego, CA, 2008.
- Condit, Celeste Michelle, and John Louis Lucaites. *Crafting Equality: America's Anglo-African Word*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993.
- Condit, Celeste Michelle, and John Louis Lucaites. "Malcolm X and the Limits of the Rhetoric of Revolutionary Dissent." *Journal of Black Studies* 23 (1993): 291-313.
- Conmy, Peter T. *The Constitutional Beginnings of California*. San Francisco: Dolores Press, 1959.
- Cordero-Guzmán, Hector, Nina Martin, Victoria Quiroz-Bercerra, and Nik Theodore. "Voting with Their Feet: Nonprofit Organizations and Immigrant Mobilization." *American Behavioral Scientist* 52 (2008): 598-617.
- Coutin, Susana B. *Nations of Emigrants: Shifting Boundaries of Citizenship in El Salvador and the United States*. Cornell: Cornell University Press, 2007.
- Craib, Raymond B. *Cartographic Mexico: A History of State Fixations and Fugitive Landscapes*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2004.
- Crawford, James. *At War with Diversity: US Language Policy in an Age of Anxiet*. Buffalo, NY: Multilingual Matters, 2000.
- Cuerpo de Unidad, Inc. "La Gran Marcha 2006." (2006). available at:

- <http://www.granmarcha.org>, (accessed December 14, 2006).
- Darsey, James F. *The Prophetic Tradition and Radical Rhetoric in America*. New York: New York University Press, 1997.
- Dauber, Cori E. "The Shots Seen 'Round the World: The Impact of the Images of Mogadishu on American Military Operations." *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 4 (2001): 653-87.
- De Cillia, Rudolf, Martin Reisigl, and Ruth Wodak. "The Discursive Construction of National Identities." *Discourse & Society* 10 (1999): 149-73.
- De Genova, Nicholas. "The Legal Production of Mexican/Migrant 'Illegality.'" In *Latinos and Citizenship: The Dilemma of Belonging*, edited by Suzanne Oboler, 61-90. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006.
- De Genova, Nicholas. *Racial Transformations: Latinos and Asians Remaking the United States*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2006.
- De Genova, Nicholas. *Working the Boundaries: Race, Space, and "Illegality" in Mexican Chicago*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2005.
- De Genova, Nicholas, and Ana Y. Ramos-Zayas. *Latino Crossings: Mexicans, Puerto Ricans, and the Politics of Race and Citizenship*. New York: Routledge, 2003.
- de Tocqueville, Alexis. *Democracy in America*. Translated by Geoge Lawrence. Edited by J. P. Mayer. New York: Harper & Row, 1969.
- Del Castillo, Adelaida R. "Illegal Status and Social Citizenship: Thoughts on Mexican Immigrants in a Postnational World." *Aztlan* 27, no. 2 (2002): 11-32.
- Delgado, Fernando P. "Chicano Ideology Revisited: Rap Music and the (Re)Articulation of Chicanismo." *Western Journal of Communication* 62 (1998): 95-113.

- Delgado, Fernando P. "Chicano Movement Rhetoric: An Ideographic Interpretation." *Communication Quarterly* 43 (1995): 446-55.
- Delgado, Fernando P. "Coloring the Screen Bronze." *Text & Performance Quarterly* 15 (1995): 160-73.
- Delgado, Fernando P. "When the Silenced Speak: The Textualization and Complications of Latina/o Identity." *Western Journal of Communication* 62 (1998): 420-38.
- Delicath, John W., and Kevin Michael DeLuca. "Image Events, the Public Sphere, and Argumentative Practice: The Case of Radical Environmental Groups." *Argumentation* 17 (2003): 315-38.
- DeLuca, Kevin Michael. *Image Politics: The New Rhetoric of Environmental Activism*. New York: Guilford Press, 1999.
- DeLuca, Kevin Michael. "Unruly Arguments: The Body Rhetoric of Earth First!, ACT UP, and Queer Nation." *Argumentation & Advocacy* 36 (1999): 9-21.
- DeLuca, Kevin Michael, and Jennifer Peeples. "From Public Sphere to Public Screen: Democracy, Activism, and the 'Violence' of Seattle." *Critical Studies in Media Communication* 19 (2002): 125-51.
- Demo, Anne T. "The Class Politics of Cultural Pluralism: Presidential Campaigns and the Latino Vote." In *Who Belongs in America?: Presidents, Rhetoric, and Immigration*, edited by Vanessa B. Beasley, 247-71. College Station, TX: Texas A&M University Press, 2006.
- Demo, Anne T. "Sovereignty Discourse and Contemporary Immigration Politics." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 91 (2005): 291-311.
- Dewey, John. *The Public & Its Problems*. Athens, OH: Swallow Press, 1927/1954.

- Dickinson, Greg. "Selling Democracy: Consumer Culture and Citizenship in the Wake of September 11." *Southern Communication Journal* 70 (2005): 271-84.
- Dionisopoulos, George N., Victoria J. Gallagher, Steven R. Goldzwig, and David Zarefsky. "Martin Luther King, the American Dream and Vietnam: A Collision of Rhetorical Trajectories." *Western Journal of Communication* 56 (1992): 91-107.
- Dobson, Andrew. *Citizenship and the Environment*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Enck-Wanzer, Darrel. "Trashing the System: Social Movement, Intersectional Rhetoric, and Collective Agency in the Young Lords Organization's Garbage Offensive." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 92, no. 2 (2006): 174-201.
- Falk, R. "The Decline of Citizenship in an Era of Globalization." *Citizenship Studies* 4 (2000): 5-17.
- Félix, Adrián, Carmen González, and Ricardo Ramírez. "Political Protest, Ethnic Media, and Latino Naturalization." *American Behavioral Scientist* 52 (2008): 618-34.
- Fernandez, Ruby Ann, and Richard J. Jensen. "Reies Lopez Tijerina's 'The Land Grant Question': Creating History through Metaphors." *Howard Journal of Communications* 6 (1995): 129-45.
- Finnegan, Cara A. "The Naturalistic Enthymeme and Visual Argument: Photographic Representation in the 'Skull Controversy.'" *Argumentation & Advocacy* 37 (2001): 133-49.
- Finnegan, Cara A. "Recognizing Lincoln: Image Vernaculars in Nineteenth-Century Visual Culture." *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 8 (2005): 31-57.
- Flores, Lisa A. "Constructing Rhetorical Borders: Peons, Illegal Aliens, and Competing Narratives of Immigration." *Critical Studies in Media Communication* 20 (2003): 362-87.

- Flores, Lisa A. "Creating Discursive Space through a Rhetoric of Difference." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 82 (1996): 142-156.
- Flores, Lisa A., and Dreama G. Moon. "Rethinking Race, Revealing Dilemmas: Imagining a New Racial Subject in Race Traitor." *Western Journal of Communication* 66, no. 2 (2002): 181.
- Flores, Richard R. "Aesthetic Process and Cultural Citizenship: The Membering of a Social Body in San Antonio." In *Latino Cultural Citizenship: Claiming Identity, Space, and Rights*, edited by William V. Flores and Rina Benmayor, 124-51. Boston: Beacon Press, 1997.
- Flores, William V. "Citizens vs. Citizenry: Undocumented Immigrants and Latino Cultural Citizenship." In *Latino Cultural Citizenship: Claiming Identity, Space, and Rights*, edited by William V. Flores and Rina Benmayor, 255-78. Boston: Beacon Press, 1997.
- Flores, William V. "New Citizens, New Rights: Undocumented Immigrants and Latino Cultural Citizenship" *Latin American Perspectives* 30 (2003): 87-100.
- Flores, William V., and Rina Benmayor. "Constructing Cultural Citizenship." In *Latino Cultural Citizenship: Claiming Identity, Space, and Rights*, edited by William V. Flores and Rina Benmayor, 1-23. Boston: Beacon Press, 1997.
- Flores, William V., and Rina Benmayor, eds. *Latino Cultural Citizenship: Claiming Identity, Space, and Rights*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1997.
- Fox, Geoffrey E. *Hispanic Nation: Culture, Politics, and the Constructing of Identity*. New York: Carol, 1996.



- Fraser, Nancy. "Rethinking the Public Sphere: A Contribution to the Critique of Actually Existing Democracy." In *Habermas and the Public Sphere*, edited by Craig J. Calhoun, 108-42. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1992.
- Friedman, Jonathan, and Shalini Randeria. *Worlds on the Move: Globalization, Migration, and Cultural Security*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.
- Fry, Richard. *Latino Settlement in the New Century*. Washington, D.C.: Pew Hispanic Center, October 2008.
- Fulkerson, R. P. "The Public Letter as a Rhetorical Form: Structure, Logic, and Style in King's 'Letter from Birmingham Jail.'" *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 65 (1979): 121-36.
- Gaonkar, Dilip Parameshwar. "The Oratorical Text: The Enigma of Arrival." In *Texts in Contexts*, edited by Michael C. Leff and Fred J. Kauffeld, 255-75. Davis, CA: Hermagoras Press, 1989.
- García Canclini, Néstor. *Hybrid Cultures: Strategies for Entering and Leaving Modernity*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1995.
- Gardner, Richard. *Grito! Reies Tijerina and the New Mexico Land Grant War of 1967*. Tierra Amarilla, NM: Bobbs-Merrill, 1970.
- Georgia Constitutional Convention. *Journal of the Public and Secret Proceedings of the Convention of the People of Georgia Held in Milledgeville and Savannah in 1861, Together with the Ordinances Adopted*. Milledgeville, GA: Boughton, Nisbet & Barnes, 1861. microform.
- Getrich, Christina M. "Negotiating Boundaries of Social Belonging: Second-Generation Mexican Youth and the Immigrant Rights Protests of 2006." *American Behavioral Scientist* 52 (2008): 533-56.

- Gilbertson, Greta A. "Regulating Transnational Citizens in the Post-1996 Welfare Reform Era: Dominican Immigrants in New York City." In *Latinos and Citizenship: The Dilemma of Belonging*, edited by Suzanne Oboler, 91-112. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006.
- Gleason, Philip. *Speaking of Diversity: Language and Ethnicity in Twentieth-Century America*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992.
- Goldberg, David Theo. *The Racial State*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers, 2002.
- González, Alberto. "Mexican 'Otherness' in the Rhetoric of Mexican Americans." *Southern Communication Journal* 55 (1990): 276-91.
- González, Juan. *Harvest of Empire: A History of Latinos in America*. New York: Viking, 2000.
- Goodnight, G. Thomas. "The Personal, Technical, and Public Spheres of Argument: A Speculative Inquiry into the Art of Public Deliberation." *Journal of the American Forensic Association* 18 (1982): 214-27.
- Goodwin, Cardinal Leonidas. *The Establishment of State Government in California 1846-1850*. New York: Macmillan, 1914.
- Gottheimer, Josh. *Ripples of Hope: Great American Civil Rights Speeches*. New York: Basic Civitas Books, 2003.
- Gracia, Jorge J. E. *Hispanic/Latino Identity: A Philosophical Perspective*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers, 2000.
- Greenberg, Amy S. *Manifest Manhood and the Antebellum American Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Greene, Ronald Walter. "John Dewey's Eloquent Citizen: Communication, Judgment, and Postmodern Capitalism." *Argumentation & Advocacy* 39 (2003): 189-201.

- Gregg, Richard B. "The Ego-Function of the Rhetoric of Protest." *Philosophy & Rhetoric* 4 (1971): 71-91.
- Grodin, Joseph R., Calvin R. Massey, and Richard B. Cunningham. *The California State Constitution: A Reference Guide*. Westport, CN: Greenwood Press, 1993.
- Gronbeck, Bruce E. "The Rhetorics of the Past: History, Argument, and Collective Memory." In *Doing Rhetorical History: Concepts and Cases*, edited by Kathleen J. Turner, 47-60. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1998.
- Gross, Larry P. *Up from Invisibility: Lesbians, Gay Men, and the Media in America*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2001.
- Guerra, François-Xavier. "Mexico from Independence to Revolution: The Mutations of Liberalism." In *Cycles of Conflict, Centuries of Change: Crisis, Reform, and Revolution in Mexico*, edited by Elisa Servín, Leticia Reina and John Tutino, 129-52. Durham: Duke University Press, 2007.
- Guha, Ranajit, and Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak. *Selected Subaltern Studies*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1988.
- Gutiérrez, Gabriel. "Affirmative Action of the First Kind: Social and Legal Constructions of Whiteness and White Male Privilege in Nineteenth-Century California." *Latino Studies Journal* 11 (2000): 14-48.
- Haas, Christina. "Materializing Public and Private: The Spatialization of Conceptual Categories in Discourses of Abortion." In *Rhetorical Bodies*, edited by Jack Selzer and Sharon Crowley, 218-38. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1999.
- Hammerback, John C., and Richard J. Jensen. "Ethnic Heritage as Rhetorical Legacy: The Plan of Delano." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 80 (1994): 53-70.

- Hammerback, John C., and Richard J. Jensen. *The Rhetorical Career of César Chávez*. College Station, TX: Texas A&M University Press, 1998.
- Hammerback, John C., and Richard J. Jensen. "The Rhetorical Worlds of César Chávez and Reijes Tijerina." *Western Journal of Speech Communication* 44 (1980): 166-76.
- Hammerback, John C., Richard J. Jensen, and Jose Angel Gutierrez. *A War of Words: Chicano Protest in the 1960s and 1970s*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1985.
- Hargis, Donald E. "Native Californians in the Constitutional Convention of 1849." *Southern California Quarterly* 36 (1954): 3-13.
- Hariman, Robert, and John Louis Lucaites. "Performing Civic Identity: The Iconic Photograph of the Flag Raising on Iwo Jima." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 88 (2001): 363-92.
- Hauser, Gerard A. "Incongruous Bodies: Arguments for Personal Sufficiency and Public Insufficiency." *Argumentation & Advocacy* 36 (1999): 1-8.
- Helf, Duke, and Richard Winton. "LAPD Takes Blame for Park Melee." *Los Angeles Times*, October 10 2007, A-1.
- Herzog, Tamar. *Defining Nations: Immigrants and Citizens in Early Modern Spain and Spanish America*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003.
- Hobsbawm, Eric J., and T. O. Ranger. *The Invention of Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- Honig, Bonnie. *Democracy and the Foreigner*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2001.
- "Immigration March Draws Thousands of Protestors" (March 25, 2006), 16 min., 25 sec.; from CBS 2/KCAL 9 Los Angeles, <http://cbs2.com/video/?id=15998@kcbs.dayport.com> (accessed October 18, 2008).

- Inda, Jonathan Xavier. "Performativity, Materiality, and the Racial Body." *Latino Studies Journal* 11 (2000): 74-99.
- Ivie, Robert L. "Rhetorical Deliberation and Democratic Politics in the Here and Now." *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 5 (2002): 277-85.
- Jacobson, David. *Rights across Borders: Immigration and the Decline of Citizenship*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996.
- Jasinski, James. "A Constitutive Framework for Rhetorical Historiography: Toward an Understanding of the Discursive (Re)Constitution Of 'Constitution' In the Federalist Papers." In *Doing Rhetorical History: Concepts and Cases*, edited by Kathleen J. Turner, 72-92. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1998.
- Jasinski, James. "The Forms and Limits of Prudence in Henry Clay's (1850) Defense of the Compromise Measures." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 81 (1995): 454-78.
- Jasinski, James. "Instrumentalism, Contextualism, and Interpretation in Rhetorical Criticism." In *Rhetorical Hermeneutics: Invention and Interpretation in the Age of Science*, edited by Alan G. Gross and William M. Keith, 195-224. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1997.
- Johnston, Paul. "The Emergence of Transnational Citizenship among Mexican Immigrants in California." In *Citizenship Today: Global Perspectives and Practices*, edited by T. Alexander Aleinikoff and Douglas B. Klusmeyer, 253-77. Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 2001.
- Joseph, May. "Introduction: New Hybrid Identities and Performance." In *Performing Hybridity*, edited by May Joseph and Jennifer Fink, 1-24. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999.

Kells, Michelle Hall. *Héctor P. García: Everyday Rhetoric and Mexican American Civil Rights*.

Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2006.

King, Martin Luther, and James Melvin Washington. *A Testament of Hope: The Essential*

*Writings and Speeches of Martin Luther King, Jr.* San Francisco: Harper, 1991.

Klusmeyer, Douglas B. "Introduction." In *Citizenship Today: Global Perspectives and Practices*,

edited by T. Alexander Aleinikoff and Douglas B. Klusmeyer, 1-15. Washington, D.C.:

Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 2001.

Kraidy, Marwan M. "Hybridity in Cultural Globalization." *Communication Theory* 12 (2002):

316-39.

Kuklinski, James H. *Thinking about Political Psychology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University

Press, 2002.

Kymlicka, Will. "Multicultural Citizenship." In *The Citizenship Debates*, edited by Gershon

Shafir, 167-88. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1998.

Lakoff, George, and Mark Johnson. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago

Press, 2003.

"The Latin Explosion." *New York Magazine*, September 6 1999.

Leff, Michael, and Ebony A. Utley. "Instrumental and Constitutive Rhetoric in Martin Luther

King Jr.'s 'Letter from Birmingham Jail.'" *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 7 (2004): 37-52.

Levy, Jacques E., and César Chávez. *César Chávez: Autobiography of La Causa*. New York:

Norton, 1975.

Loyd, Jenna M., and Andrew Burrige. "La Gran Marcha: Anti-Racism and Immigrants Rights

in Southern California." *ACME: An International E-Journal for Critical Geographies* 6

(2007): 1-35.

- Maciel, David, and Erlinda Gonzales-Berry, eds. *The Contested Homeland: A Chicano History of New Mexico*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2000.
- Maciel, David R., and Juan José Peña. "La Reconquista: The Chicano Movement in New Mexico." In *The Contested Homeland: A Chicano History of New Mexico*, edited by David Maciel and Erlinda Gonzales-Berry, 269-301. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2000.
- Mansbridge, Jane. "Using Power/Fighting Power: The Polity." In *Democracy and Difference: Contesting the Boundaries of the Political*, edited by Seyla Benhabib, 46-66. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996.
- Marshall, T. H. *Citizenship and Social Class, and Other Essays*. Cambridge: University Press, 1950.
- Martínez, Katynka Zazueta. "Latina Magazine and the Invocation of a Panethnic Family: Latino Identity as it is Informed by Celebrities and *Papis Chulos*." *Communication Review* 7 (2004): 155-74.
- Martinez, Lisa M. "'Flowers from the Same Soil': Latino Solidarity in the Wake of the 2006 Immigrant Mobilizations." *American Behavioral Scientist* 52 (2008): 557-79.
- Marvin, Carolyn, and Peter Simonson. "Voting Alone: The Decline of Bodily Mass Communication and Public Sensationalism in Presidential Elections." *Communication & Critical/Cultural Studies* 1 (2004): 127-50.
- Mattern, Mark. *Acting in Concert: Music, Community, and Political Action*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1998.
- McGee, Michael C. "In Search of 'the People': A Rhetorical Alternative." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 61 (1975): 235-49.

- Medhurst, Martin J. "Eisenhower's 'Atoms for Peace' Speech: A Case Study in the Strategic Use of Language." *Communication Monographs* 54 (1987): 204-20.
- Mehan, Hugh. "The Discourse of the Illegal Immigration Debate: A Case Study in the Politics of Representation." *Discourse & Society* 8 (1997): 249-70.
- Meier, Matt S., and Feliciano Ribera. *The Chicanos: A History of Mexican Americans*. New York: Hill and Wang, 1972.
- Mieszkowski, Katharine. "'We're Here. We're Not Going Anywhere.'" *Salon.com* (2006, April 11), <http://www.salon.com/news/feature/2006/04/11/sfrally/> (accessed November 18, 2008).
- Miranda, Leticia, and Julia Teresa Quiroz. "The Decade of the Hispanic: An Economic Retrospective." Washington D.C.: Office of Research Advocacy and Legislation, National Council of La Raza, 1990.
- Molesky, J. "Understanding the American Linguistic Mosaic: A Historical Overview of Language Maintenance and Language Shift." In *Language Diversity, Problem or Resource?: A Social and Educational Perspective on Language Minorities in the United States*, edited by Sandra McKay and Sau-Ling Cynthia Wong, 29-68. Cambridge: Newbury House, 1988.
- Molina Guzmán, Isabel. "Mediating Frida: Negotiating Discourses of Latina/o Authenticity in Global Media Representations of Ethnic Identity." *Critical Studies in Media Communication* 23 (2006): 232-51.
- Molina Guzmán, Isabel, and Angharad Valdivia. "Brain, Brow, and Booty: Latina Iconicity in U.S. Popular Culture." *Communication Review* 7 (2004): 205-21.



- Morelli, Federica. "Entre El Antiguo y El Nuevo Régimen. La Historia Política Hispanoamericana Del Siglo XIX." *Historia Crítica* 33 (2007): 122-55.
- Morris, Charles E., III, and Stephen H. Browne. *Readings on the Rhetoric of Social Protest*. State College, PA: Strata, 2001.
- Morris, Charles E., III, and John M. Sloop. "'What Lips These Lips Have Kissed': Refiguring the Politics of Queer Public Kissing." *Communication & Critical/Cultural Studies* 3 (2006): 1-26.
- Murphy, John M. "The Language of the Liberal Consensus: John F. Kennedy, Technical Reason, and the "New Economics" at Yale University." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 90 (2004): 133-62.
- Muthyala, John. *Reworlding America: Myth, History, and Narrative*. Athens: Ohio University Press, 2006.
- Nabokov, Peter. *Tijerina and the Courthouse Raid*. 2d ed. Berkeley, CA: Ramparts Press, 1970.
- Nakayama, Thomas K., and R. L. Krizek. "Whiteness: A Strategic Rhetoric." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 81 (1995): 291-309.
- Navarro, Sharon Ann, and Armando Xavier Mejia. *Latino Americans and Political Participation: A Reference Handbook*. Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO, 2004.
- New York State Constitutional Convention. *Journal of the Convention of the State of New York Begun and Held at the Capitol in the City of Albany, on the Twenty-Eighth Day of August, 1821*. Albany: Cantine & Leake, 1821.
- Ngai, Mae M. *Impossible Subjects: Illegal Aliens and the Making of Modern America*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2004.

- Norton, Anne. *Republic of Signs: Liberal Theory and American Popular Culture*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993.
- Oboler, Suzanne. *Ethnic Labels, Latino Lives: Identity and the Politics of (Re) Presentation in the United States*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1995.
- Oboler, Suzanne, ed. *Latinos and Citizenship: The Dilemma of Belonging*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006.
- Oboler, Suzanne. "Redefining Citizenship as a Lived Experience." In *Latinos and Citizenship: The Dilemma of Belonging*, edited by Suzanne Oboler, 3-30. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006.
- Olson, Joel. *The Abolition of White Democracy*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2004.
- Olson, Kathryn M., and G. Thomas Goodnight. "Entanglements of Consumption, Cruelty, Privacy, and Fashion: The Social Controversy over Fur." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 80 (1994): 249-76.
- Olson, Lester C. "Benjamin Franklin's Pictorial Representations of the British Colonies in America: A Study in Rhetorical Iconology." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 73 (1987): 18-42.
- Omi, Michael, and Howard Winant. *Racial Formation in the United States: From the 1960s to the 1990s*. New York: Routledge, 1994.
- Ono, Kent A., and John M. Sloop. *Shifting Borders: Rhetoric, Immigration, and California's Proposition 187*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2002.

- Pantoja, Adrian D., Cecilia Menjívar, and Lisa Magaña. "The Spring Marches of 2006: Latinos, Immigration, and Political Mobilization in the 21st Century." *American Behavioral Scientist* 52 (2008): 499-506.
- Pasley, Jeffrey L. "Party Politics, Citizenship, and Collective Action in Nineteenth-Century America: A Response to Stuart Blumin and Michael Schudson." *Communication Review* 4 (2000): 39-54.
- Perea, Juan F. "The Black/White Binary Paradigm of Race: The 'Normal Science' of American Racial Thought." *La Raza Law Journal* 10 (1998): 1213-58.
- Perelman, Chaim, and Lucie Olbrechts-Tyteca. *The New Rhetoric: A Treatise on Argumentation*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1969.
- Pérez Firmat, Gustavo. *Literature and Liminality: Festive Readings in the Hispanic Tradition*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1986.
- Pezzullo, Phaedra C. "Resisting 'National Breast Cancer Awareness Month': The Rhetoric of Counterpublics and Their Cultural Performances." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 89 (2003): 345-65.
- Phillips, Kendall R. "The Spaces of Public Dissension: Reconsidering the Public Sphere." *Communication Monographs* 63 (1996): 231-48.
- Pickus, Noah M. *Immigration and Citizenship in the Twenty-First Century*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 1998.
- Pineda, Richard D., and Stacey K. Sowards. "Flag Waving as Visual Argument: 2006 Immigration Demonstrations and Cultural Citizenship." *Argumentation & Advocacy* 43 (2007): 164-74.

- Pitt, Leonard. *The Decline of the Californios: A Social History of the Spanish-Speaking Californians, 1846-1890*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1966.
- Poblete, Juan. "Introduction." In *Critical Latin American and Latino Studies*, ix-xli. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2003.
- Putnam, Robert D. *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 2000.
- Raiffa, Howard. *Negotiation Analysis: The Science and Art of Collaborative Decision Making*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap, 2002.
- Ramos-Zayas, Ana Y. *National Performances: The Politics of Class, Race, and Space in Puerto Rican Chicago*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003.
- Rawls, John. "The Idea of Public Reason." In *Deliberative Democracy: Essays on Reason and Politics*, edited by James Bohman and William Rehg, 93-144. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1997.
- Ray, Angela G. *The Lyceum and Public Culture in the Nineteenth-Century United States*. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 2005.
- Ray, Angela G. "The Permeable Public: Rituals of Citizenship in Antebellum Men's Debating Clubs." *Argumentation & Advocacy* 41 (2004): 1-16.
- Ray, Angela G. "The Rhetorical Ritual of Citizenship: Women's Voting as Public Performance, 1868-1875." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 93 (2007): 1-26.
- Ray, Angela G., and Cindy Koenig Richards. "Inventing Citizens, Imagining Gender Justice: The Suffrage Rhetoric of Virginia and Francis Minor." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 93 (2007): 375-402.

- Reina, Leticia, Elisa Servín, and John Tutino. "Introduction: Crises, Reforms, and Revolutions in Mexico, Past and Present." In *Cycles of Conflict, Centuries of Change: Crisis, Reform, and Revolution in Mexico*, edited by Elisa Servín, Leticia Reina and John Tutino, 1-20. Durham: Duke University Press, 2007.
- Reser, Erin McNeal. "Unequal Freedom: How Race and Gender Shaped American Citizenship and Labor." *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 9 (2006): 337-40.
- Robinson, W. W. *Land in California: The Story of Mission Lands, Ranchos, Squatters, Mining Claims, Railroad Grants, Land Scrip, Homesteads*. Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1948.
- Rocco, Raymond. "Transforming Citizenship: Membership, Strategies of Containment, and the Public Sphere in Latino Communities." In *Latinos and Citizenship: The Dilemma of Belonging*, edited by Suzanne Oboler, 301-28. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006.
- Rosaldo, Renato. "Cultural Citizenship, Inequality, and Multiculturalism." In *Latino Cultural Citizenship: Claiming Identity, Space, and Rights*, edited by William V. Flores and Rina Benmayor, 27-38. Boston: Beacon Press, 1997.
- Rosales, Francisco A. *Chicano!: The History of the Mexican American Civil Rights Movement*. Houston, TX: Arte Público Press, 1996.
- Royce, Josiah. *California: From the Conquest in 1846 to the Second Vigilance Committee in San Francisco: A Study of American Character*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1948.
- Royce, Josiah. *Race Questions, Provincialism, and Other American Problems* New York: Macmillan, 1908.
- Russel y Rodríguez, Mónica. "Mexicanas and Mongrels: Policies of Hybridity, Gender and Nation in the US-Mexican War." *Latino Studies Journal* 11 (2000): 49-73.

- Saldívar, José David. *Border Matters: Remapping American Cultural Studies*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997.
- Santa Ana, Otto. *Brown Tide Rising: Metaphors of Latinos in Contemporary American Public Discourse*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2002.
- Schuck, Peter H. *Citizens, Strangers, and in-Betweens: Essays on Immigration and Citizenship*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1998.
- Schudson, Michael. *The Good Citizen: A History of American Civic Life*. New York: Martin Kessler Books, 1998.
- Seigel, Micol. "Beyond Compare: Comparative Method after the Transnational Turn." *Radical History Review* 91 (2005): 62-90.
- Shafir, Gershon. "Introduction: The Evolving Tradition of Citizenship." In *The Citizenship Debates*, edited by Gershon Shafir, 1-28. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1998.
- Shugart, Helene A. "Counterhegemonic Acts: Appropriation as a Feminist Rhetorical Strategy." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 83 (1997): 210-29.
- Silvestrini, Blanca G. "'The World We Enter When Claiming Rights': Latinos and Their Quest for Culture." In *Latino Cultural Citizenship: Claiming Identity, Space, and Rights*, edited by William V. Flores and Rina Benmayor, 39-53. Boston: Beacon Press, 2006.
- Simonson, Peter. "Dreams of Democratic Togetherness; Communication Hope from Cooley to Katz." *Critical Studies in Mass Communication* 13 (1996): 324-342.
- Smith, Rogers M. *Civic Ideals: Conflicting Visions of Citizenship in U.S. History*. New Haven, CN: Yale University Press, 1997.

Snow, Malinda. "Martin Luther King's 'Letter from the Birmingham Jail' As Pauline Epistle."

*Quarterly Journal of Speech* 71 (1985): 317-34.

St. John Crevecoeur, J. Hector. *Letters from an American Farmer*. New York: Fox, Duffield,

1782/1904.

Stephen, Lynn. *Zapata Lives!: Histories and Cultural Politics in Southern Mexico*. Berkeley:

University of California Press, 2002.

Sterngold, J. "500,000 Throng L.A. To Protest Immigrant Legislation." *The San Francisco*

*Chronicle*, March 26 2006, A1.

Stewart, Charles J., Craig Allen Smith, and Robert E. Denton. *Persuasion and Social*

*Movements*. 4th ed. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press, 2001.

Summers Sandoval Jr., Tomás F. "Disobedient Bodies: Racialization, Resistance, and the Mass

(Re)Articulation of the Mexican Immigrant Body." *American Behavioral Scientist* 52

(2008): 580-97.

Taylor, Charles. *Modern Social Imaginaries*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2004.

Terrill, Robert E. "Colonizing the Borderlands: Shifting Circumference in the Rhetoric of

Malcolm X." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 86 (2000): 67-85.

Terrill, Robert E. *Malcolm X: Inventing Radical Judgment*. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State

University Press, 2004.

Terrill, Robert E. "Protest, Prophecy, and Prudence in the Rhetoric of Malcolm X." *Rhetoric &*

*Public Affairs* 4 (2001): 25-53.

Thomas, Lorrin. "'How They Ignore Our Rights as American Citizens': Puerto Rican Migrants

and the Politics of Citizenship in the New Deal Era." In *Latinos and Citizenship: The*

- Dilemma of Belonging*, edited by Suzanne Oboler, 33-58. New York: Palgrae Macmillan, 2006.
- Tijerina, Reies L. "From Prison: Reies López Tijerina." In *The Chicanos: Mexican American Voices*, edited by Ed Ludwig and James Santibañez, 215-22. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1971.
- Tijerina, Reies L. "The Land Grant Question." In *Ripples of Hope: Great American Civil Rights Speeches*, edited by Josh Gottheimer, 306-14. New York: Basic Civitas Books, 2003.
- Tijerina, Reies L. "Letter from the Santa Fe Jail by Reies Lopez Tijerina (1969)." In *Encyclopedia of Minorities in American Politics*, edited by Jeffrey D. Schultz, Kerry L. Haynie, Andrew L. Aoki and Anne M. McCulloch, 556-7. Santa Barbara, CA: Greenwood Press Publishing Group, 2000.
- Tijerina, Reies L. *They Called Me "King Tiger": My Struggle for the Land and Our Rights*. Houston: Arte Público Press, 2000.
- Turner, Victor Witter. *The Forest of Symbols: Aspects of Ndembu Ritual*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1967.
- United States Congress. House. *Border Protection, Antiterrorism, and Illegal Immigration Control Act of 2005*. HR 4437. 109th Cong., 1st sess. Available from THOMAS (Library of Congress), <http://thomas.loc.gov>, accessed December 14, 2006.
- United States Constitutional Convention. *Secret Proceedings and Debates of the Convention Assembled at Philadelphia, in the Year 1787, for the Purpose of Forming the Constitution of the United States of America*. Cincinnati: A. Mygatt, 1838.



- United States Department of Homeland Security. "Yearbook of Immigration Statistics: 2004." edited by Office of Immigration Statistics. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Homeland Security, 2006.
- Valdivia, Angharad. *A Latina in the Land of Hollywood and other Essays on Media Culture*. Tucson, AZ: U of Arizona Press, 2000.
- Valdivia, Angharad. "Latinas as Radical Hybrid: 'Transnationally Gendered Traces in Mainstream Media.'" *Global Media Journal* 3 (2004): 1-21.
- Valdivia, Angharad N., ed. *Latina/o Communication Studies Today*. New York: Peter Lang, 2008.
- Varsanyi, Monica W. "'Getting out the Vote' in Los Angeles: The Mobilization of Undocumented Migrants in Electoral Politics." In *Latinos and Citizenship: The Dilemma of Belonging*, edited by Suzanne Oboler, 219-46. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006.
- Varsanyi, Monica W. "The Paradox of Contemporary Immigrant Political Mobilization: Organized Labor, Undocumented Migrants, and Electoral Participation in Los Angeles." *Antipode* 37 (2005): 775-95.
- Wander, Philip. "The Third Persona: An Ideological Turn in Rhetorical Theory." *Central States Speech Journal* 35 (1984): 197-216.
- Warner, Michael. *Publics and Counterpublics*. New York: Zone Books, 2002.
- Watanabe, Teresa, and Hector Bercerra. "500,000 Pack Streets to Protest Immigration Bills: The Rally, Part of a Massive Mobilization of Immigrants and Their Supporters, May Be the Largest L.A. Has Seen." *Los Angeles Times*, March 26 2006, A1.
- Watanabe, Teresa, and Hector Bercerra. "How DJs Put 500,000 Marchers in Motion." *Los Angeles Times*, March 28 2006, A1.

- Watkins, S. Craig. "Framing Protest: News Media Frames of the Million Man March." *Critical Studies in Media Communication* 18 (2001): 83-101.
- Watts, Eric King. "'Voice' and 'Voicelessness' in Rhetorical Studies." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 87 (2001): 179-96.
- Wiarda, Howard J. *The Soul of Latin America: The Cultural and Political Tradition*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2001.
- Wilson, Kirt H. "The Racial Politics of Imitation in the Nineteenth Century." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 89 (2003): 90-108.
- Wrage, Ernest J. "Public Address: A Study in Social and Intellectual History." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 33 (1947): 451-57.
- Young, Iris Marion. "Activist Challenges to Deliberative Democracy." In *Debating Deliberative Democracy*, edited by James S. Fishkin and Peter Laslett, 102-20. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2003.
- Young, Iris Marion. *Inclusion and Democracy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Young Lords Party, and Michael Abramson. *Palante: Young Lords Party*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.
- Zaeske, Susan. *Signatures of Citizenship: Petitioning, Antislavery, & Women's Political Identity*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2003.
- Zangwill, Israel. *The Melting Pot: A Drama in Four Acts*. New York: AMS Press, 1969.
- Zarefsky, David. "Four Senses of Rhetorical History." In *Doing Rhetorical History: Concepts and Cases*, edited by Kathleen J. Turner, 19-32. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1998.

Zarefsky, David. *Lincoln, Douglas, and Slavery: In the Crucible of Public Debate*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990.