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The greatest failure of Chicano studies was its complicity with the hidden curriculum in U.S. higher education. The desired radical utopia of establishing an oppositional space within the academy became, at best, an alternative among a number of confined spaces (African American, Asian American, Native American, ethnic, cultural, and women's studies, etc.). Chicano studies fell victim to the only "political correctness" that has ever existed in higher education: management of potential disruptive elements. In this chapter I examine how the university's hidden curriculum contained the activism of Chicano(a) students.

INTRODUCTION

Students of color transformed the university curriculum by institutionalizing ethnic studies in the late 1960s. While most of these programs were about student services, they also sought to establish courses that delved into their particular ethnic, racial, and class experience. (Later, gender was added when women challenged patriarchal practices among students of color.) Students assumed that these courses could subvert the intellectual colonial apparatus. In these classes, students of color would learn who they were; recapture their culture and history; learn about oppressive colonial, class, or national systems of control; and, most importantly, develop a political ideology and organization to fight these systems of oppression.
While many activists recognized the university as part of the process of domination, they did not grasp the operation of institutional power. Therefore they battled over university policies (admissions, requirements); they criticized personalities (faculty, deans); they attacked the apparent bifurcation of university and outside world as well as internal divisions between student services. They never noticed the hidden curricula that structure academic life and were designed to channel oppositional practices into mere alternative choices (Williams 1977, Williams 1989, Said 1983, Ross 1991, Schümann 1994, Soldatenko 1998).

Radicals fell victim to the very mythology of higher education they wanted to challenge. The resolution of student protest was to accept academic practices. While many activists acknowledged the need to negotiate an end to the protests, they also hoped that the new “studies” programs could foster a critical practice. Instead, hidden curricula disciplined the oppositional curriculum into acceptable alternatives. The protests of the late 1960s and early 1970s did not fundamentally challenge, much less overturn, the hidden curriculum. Rather the new programs were schooled by the logic of academic practice.

THE HIDDEN CURRICULUM AND U.S. HIGHER EDUCATION

The works of Michael Apple and others displayed the covert mechanisms through which education reproduces and legitimates unequal class, race, and gender divisions. Now visible, now hidden, these curricula occur at multiple places and times during schooling but overall are what Peter McLaren (1988, 223) called “a pedagogy of submission.” Simultaneously, schools, while sites of domination, can also be seen as locations of contestation and resistance (Margolis, Soldatenko, Acker, Gair this volume).

While acknowledging the possibility of resistance within the hidden curriculum, this chapter emphasizes the limitations of contestation. Both Apple and Giroux left ample ambiguity in their writing to allow us to reexamine the structuralist “reproduction” arguments that drove the original thinking on hidden curricula. While sympathetic to the possibility of resistance, my analysis demonstrates the function and power of the hidden curriculum to manage contestation. The history of curricular development in higher education reveals the permanent structure of the hidden curriculum and its ability to devour, as far as I can see, all expressions of opposition.

Daniel Bell observed that Columbia University, like other colleges and universities, faced three challenges that led to the general education movement in the early twentieth century: discontent with the German tradition in U.S. universities and its professional emphasis; abandonment of a sterile classicism; a change in the character of the student body, particularly the inclusion of children of non-traditional immigrants (Bell 1966, Veysey 1965, Hsi-En 1940). Throughout the first half of the twentieth century, these concerns led to an effort to develop a general education program. Typically the general education movement pushed in two directions: establishing liberal arts programs and linking education to the needs of society and democracy. The marriage was never easy (Bell 1966, 13–15).

The general education movement was reactionary, a return to an earlier tradition in U.S. higher education. Old collegiate values were reasserted against modern approaches based on the German ideal of electives (Rudolph 1965, 449). The early-twentieth-century humanists contested the individualism, materialism, and scienticism fostered by the university with the fundamental goodness of men. Thus the full, free, undisciplined chaos of the elective curriculum was seen as the consequence of the substitution of the science of men for the service of God (Rudolph 1965, 452). The humanists demanded a return to stability—the need for established standards:

The general education movement, as the effort to redefine and enforce a common curriculum has been called, began as a response to the sense of bewilderment with which many young students faced the freedom of the elective course of study. It received clarification during and after World War I, when a consciousness of Western values and national problems found expression in courses designed to orient students to their cultural inheritance and their responsibilities as citizen. And, like all impossible dreams, the general education idea was carried along from decade to decade, receiving new encouragement in one institution or another, the product of a quixotic conviction that the limits of essential knowledge could be defined. (Rudolph 1989, 236–37)

The quixotic quest manifested itself as a repeating pattern, first present in the general education movement at Columbia University in 1919. “General education proposed to restore some balance, to
revitalize the aristocratic ideal of the liberal arts as the passport to learning" (Rudolph 1965, 455). From the beginning the general education movement "was an attempt to capture some of the sense of a continuing intellectual and spiritual heritage that had fallen victim to the elective principle" (Rudolph 1965, 456). The hope of the humanist reform movement was to bring knowledge under control as they hypothesized that it was before the United States became a dominant capitalist and imperialist power.

While the debate over the design of liberal arts—survey courses or great books—dominated the early general education movement, the second theme of societal needs progressively overtook the attempted institutionalization of liberal arts programs. The rise of a national society and a national economy, the growth of the regulatory state, the creation of a national popular culture, the growing demands of international affairs, and changes in student composition pushed this second concern to the fore (Bell 1966, 69–87). By the 1940s, the central question had become: how could higher education serve the needs of U.S. society? In particular, how could the "American" be constructed; that is, a united citizenship with shared values and belief in capitalism. This opened the way for further specialization through the academic "major" (Rudolph 1989, 229). This ran counter to the humanist push for liberal arts programs, often by turning to the great books (Levine 1981, chapter 1; Erskine 1928, chapter 1; Hutchins 1936).

The triumph of societal needs over liberal arts with the turn to specialization resulted in a third feature in higher education—the department. The general education movement assisted the shift of power from the university to the department. The department, defined by "faculty lines" rather than any larger entity, fixed the content of courses. "Whether this is a vice or virtue, the consequence has been that the interests, slants, and prejudices of the departments, rather than any central or unified source, have shaped the curriculum" (Bell 1966, 25). This institutional transformation was reinforced by the growth of research within the university, with the increasing role of extramural funding and therefore prestige (Ross 1991, 161). The department, through the leadership of the discipline's national associations, began to establish academic standards and credentials for those within the department. The accreditation process additionally fortified uniformity. In the process the role of the professor changed from educator to researcher within a discipline. His or her success was measured by discipline-bound publications, recognition within national associations, and mobility.

As disciplinary-fettered faculty came to control departments and associations, the professionalization of the professorate served to secure faculty's pedagogic authority (Ross 1991, 160; Ehrensal, chapter six). To join the ranks of this guild and receive this authority, the adept had to participate in a long apprenticeship during which he or she acquired a particular cognitive base—the discipline's tradition. This valued knowledge was contained within a canon that each acolyte had to master (Wilshire 1990, 48; Robinson 1983, 83). As the adept became initiated and credentialized, she or he reproduced the same power and authority relationship through her or his management of the curriculum (Viswanathan 1989, Margolis and Romero chapter five). The apprenticeship process manufactured consent among the players even before the game had started: "[C]onsent is first created in people's heads and then reinforced by the playing of the game" (Ehrensal, Ehrensal 2000, 97).

Departments and associations mainstreamed all within the discipline. Publications, presentations, invitations, and funding became the measure of success, further reinforcing professionalization. The ability to survive mainstreaming could result in choice positions at research institutions, followed by tenure, and promotions (Cohen 1993, 35). Prestige begat more visibility and prestige. A few achieved superstardom, invited to present to larger groups of fellow initiates (Cohen 1993, 57). With professionalization, academic freedom became simply the right to be an academic and any endeavor to enter public dialogue was frowned upon (Jacoby 1987, 119, 130). "[U]niversity employment often prevents professors (among others) from speaking their mind" (Cohen 1993, xix). To discover an "engaged" or "critical intellectual" among the professorate became increasingly rare. "The idea of the intellectual as adversary of the dominant culture is utterly foreign to current arrangements ..." (Aronowitz and Giroux 1988, 177). Jacoby stated this quite clearly: "[A]cademic careers undermined academic freedom ... the institution neutralizes the freedom it guarantees" (Jacoby 1987, 118–19).

Establishing the liberal arts at the center of undergraduate study became an increasingly distant aspiration as specialization for the major became central. Higher education was subsumed by and came to reflect the larger social, economic, and political concerns of consensus
building and Americanization. This transformation was evident in the different views on general education between Columbia (1919), Reed (1921), Chicago (1924), and Harvard's *General Education in a Free Society*, the famous Redbook of 1945 that was an important blueprint for the postwar university. The Redbook defined "General education, as education from an informed responsible life in our society, has chiefly to do with ... the question of common standards and common purposes" (*General Education* 1945, 4). In the Redbook, education had two goals: to help a person fulfill individual purpose and help students fit into a common culture they share as citizens. This last goal, as I read the report, predominated.

While the Harvard report discussed the need to develop the abilities of effective thinking, communication, and judgement, the final aim was to understand the proper role of education in maintaining a free society (Harvard Committee 1945, 73). Implied was the need to make education play the role of creating and reinforcing the new American citizen who could properly function in the postwar society. It broke from the past and to read the Harvard report as part of a continuum from Columbia to the Redbook would completely reverse its purpose. I suggest that the Harvard reform movement did little to challenge the discipline, department, major, and role of the faculty. (Note the differences between the Redbook and the 1939 Harvard student council report [Kriedel 1989].) Upton Sinclair's (1922, 18) condemnation of education was equally true of policies advocated by the Redbook:

> Our educational system is not a public service, but an instrument of special privilege; its purpose is not to further the welfare of mankind, but merely to keep America capitalist.

The 1950s curriculum, in fact, was more openly defined by the goal of producing a citizenship united by the bounds and logic of the market than ever before (Rudolph 1989, 247; Veblen 1965; Sinclair 1922). According to Lucas, the academic institution differed little from business enterprises seeking to survive in the marketplace (Lucas 1994, 238). The push to create a bond among citizens was to turn to the logic of the market (Henderson 1944). The attempt to corral electives, under a romanticized notion of the liberal arts, corresponded to the emergence of a corporate structure and mentality in higher education. The new general education movement, increasingly centered on the major (and therefore the discipline), was no longer about "liberal learning" but about serving demands that business, government, and the military had placed on the university—or what Clark Kerr, chancellor of the University of California at Berkeley, coined the "multiversity" (Bell 1966, 95).

Corrupted by populism, professionalism, and assembly-like scholarship, universities had allegedly given themselves over to turning students to specialized professional careers as quickly as possible. (Lucas 1994, 269)

The universities became knowledge factories satisfying the demands of business and the state, creating a new unholy alliance (Lucas 1994, 278):

> The American university had committed itself to all that was objective, countable, precise, and verifiable. Its focus, once again, was upon knowledge as a commodity, packaged for consumption in tidy little bundles called credit units, hours, and courses. (Lucas 1994, 269)

The humanist dream of a Socratic education was replaced with the ideologically, driven demands for consensus, reinforcement for specialization, discipline-centered knowledge, and professionalization of the professorate to serve the capitalist order.

> The university in the United States had become largely an agency for social control. ... The custodian of popular values comprised the primary responsibility of the American university. It was to teach its students constructively rather than with an imprudent and disintegrative independence. (Veysey 1965, 440)

The humanists' demand for liberal arts had been incorporated into the very mechanism of specialization and electives they had criticized. Interests that were outside education—business and the state—drove the counterrevolutionary challenge that became part of the program of education. While liberal arts became requirements, they served merely as a preparation for the more important task of the major discipline. The hidden curriculum had subjugated the humanist agenda.
Paralleling the rise of departments and associations, a particular intellectual perspective came to forge “academic knowledge.” Dorothy Ross, a noted U.S. historian, examined the origins of “American social science.” Ross (1991, 28) traced the dynamic interaction between “American exceptionalism” and U.S. institutions of higher learning. She noted that American exceptionalism “was a nationalist ideology” that created a particular vision of the American experience that permeated all forms of discourse. By the turn of the century, this exceptionalist ideal was invigorated by the rise of a new liberalism, rooted in the academy, which contested ideologies that tried to confront American exceptionalism. These liberal scholars formulated paradigms, such as neoclassical economics, liberal economic interpretations of history, a sociology and ideology of social control, and pragmatism, which “laid the groundwork for twentieth-century social science” (Ross 1991, 143). In the process, these Progressive Era social scientists found a new way to comprehend the American experience and its future progress. “America’s ideal future could be attached to the great engines of modern progress: the capitalist market, social diversification, democracy, and scientific knowledge” (Ross 1991, 149). The capitalist market furthermore provided the model of truly free acting individuals.

The aim of this vision together with the reconstitution of American exceptionalism was to respond to challenges of the early twentieth century by constructing a science of social control (Ross 1991, 319). Pragmatism, in particular Dewey’s work, presented “the method of natural science... as the model for all kinds of knowing” (Ross 1991, 328). Science became the only authoritative discourse (Ross 1991, 162). For Dewey, the social sciences could “produce the kind of positivist knowledge that could establish rational control over society and history” and therefore life (Ross 1991, 252). The ambiguities of earlier academic thinking were brushed aside as scientific models became central to the training of future generations of scholars. Furthermore, this view of knowledge defended American exceptionalism—now intimately linked to capitalism (Ross 1991, 386–87). “Social science was to be an autonomous body of knowledge, pursued in a way to develop its scientific character, yet it was to be directed at and constituted in accordance with the technological capacity for control” (Ross 1991, 400).

In the end, instrumentalist rationality and technique became the prize medium for research:

Instrumental positivism and neoclassical economics with its offshoot of social and public choice theory, the paradigms that most closely embody the individualistic and atheoretical premises of liberal exceptionalism.... (Ross 1991, 473)

Academic knowledge, just like the department, association, and faculty, developed its own logic of production and presentation. Riddled with jargon, often obscurantist, research was defined not by the “quality” of result but by whether the process was properly followed. Even in the most legalistic of institutions, candidates were denied tenure because of lack of “collegiality” (Cohen 1993, 36). Scholarship was deemed successful when the producer repeated established patterns, adjusted to reviewers and editors, and fit their piece within the constraints of journal-writing. This process augmented specialization, bound by academic cultural dogma and procedures, creating a particular knowledge and jargon whose purpose was social control (Lucas 1994, 252; Ross 1991; Schürmann 1994). This was made further confusing by a style of writing that reinforced “officiality.” Conservative, liberal, and Marxist academics, Russell Jacoby argued, suffer from a torturous style of writing (1994, chapter 6). C. Wright Mills’s criticism of Talcott Parsons’s writing remains valid today:

In many academic circles today... anyone who tries to write in a widely intelligible way is liable to be condemned as a “mere literary man” or, worse still, “a mere journalist.” (cited in Jacoby 1994, 169)

Sadly, reading scholarship did not even provide the joy of cracking a puzzle; rather, its very pedestrian repetition leaves one, as Jacoby (1987, xiii) suggested, simply bored.5

At the dawn of a new century the battle over curriculum burns anew. Late-twentieth-century humanists demand a return to an imaginary past when higher education, successfully guided by a liberal arts program, taught students “American values.” Allan Bloom and his followers harken back to a mythical past in which liberal arts and general education stood at the heart of higher education. They presented themselves as defenders of the liberal arts against the disruptive and anti-intellectual relativism of activist faculty who imposed political views on students, colleagues, and administrators, vanquishing the
general education curriculum that was essential for a free society (Bloom 1987, Hirsch 1987, Heilman 1987).

To paraphrase Marx, all great humanist traditions in U.S. higher education appear twice, "the first time as tragedy, the second time as farce" (1963, 15). It is difficult to give credence to their rhetoric. A summary history of U.S. higher education makes clear that the failure of the general education movement and the inability to establish liberal arts programs occurred long before the 1960s. Moreover, the radical "takeover" of U.S. higher education was primarily the product of the imaginations of hacks like Dinesh D'Souza, Roger Kimball, and Charles Sykes. To look back, U.S. higher education enjoyed fifty years of stable growth based on a hidden curriculum that reproduces capitalist America. Even the challenges of the 1960s were not that profound. Much of the 1960s curricular agenda was already present in the general education structure (Brubacher and Rudy 1997, 284). Rudolph (1989, 270) argued that the student movement of the 1960s wrought no great transformation in the curriculum. Even the more utopian dream of social justice quickly dissipated (Giroux 1983, 43). As Russell Jacoby (1987, 135) put it, "The New Left that remained on campus proved industrious and well-behaved. Often without missing a beat, they moved from being undergraduates and graduate students to junior faculty positions and tenured appointments." Instead of a threat, tenured radicals remained disengaged and merely served to legitimize U.S. higher education.

What drives this new humanist farce, then? Many humanists were simply unhappy, as Bloom maintained, with the arrival of a new student population with distinct economic and cultural backgrounds whose intellectual curiosity led them to play (temporarily) with a variety of ideas and perspectives. Following the footsteps of Jews, women, and working-class Anglos, the entry of students of color temporarily disequilibrated the academy. Their presence interrogated American exceptionalism and briefly exposed the hidden curriculum. The newcomers, constructed as they were by academic knowledge, denied any positive existence, voided of history, culture, and self-determination, briefly made visible the hidden curriculum and contradictions of U.S. higher education. They brought memory to bear on what had been suppressed; as Cohen (1993, 21) explained, these students tried "to deacademicize the devices and apparatus of memory." For this reason, after all the ink and fury of the humanist Kulturkampf of the 1990s, all that was left was an attack on affirmative action. Their problem was not any particular intellectual tradition, text, or ideology; it was not even the dream of a utopian transformation. Rather, their fear was simply the presence of these people and memory.

Ironically the humanists had little to fear. The students of the 1960s, including those of color, never recognized the nature of their challenge. They spent their energies in battles that either resulted in their expulsion from the academy or their transformation into academics. Militancy mutated into constituency. The hidden curriculum (re)instituted society's particular reading of human nature and the wisdom of the hidden hand—the common good regulated by the laws of the market, free competition, private ownership, and profitability (Apple 1993, 26–31; Boyer 1986). Traditional instrumentalist logic was recycled and repackaged (Giroux 1983, 43). The interests of business and the state (both becoming more difficult to distinguish) were again pervasive.

STUDENT PROTEST AND THE FORMATION OF CHICANO STUDIES IN CALIFORNIA, 1967 TO 1970

The student efforts of the 1960s had a profound impact on the formation of Chicano studies as an academic discipline. While the Los Angeles high school "blowouts" in March 1968 were the first major Chicano(a) student protest, the university strikes at San Francisco State (SFS) and the University of California at Berkeley (UCB) (1968 to 1969) were central to the genesis of Chicano studies in California. The student protesters' political visions formed the background for the establishment of Chicano studies programs in the academy.

Social and political unrest in the Bay Area preceded Chicano(a) activism. Ever since the 1964 Free Speech Movement, student activism was a constant activity at UCB and at times on other campuses in the Bay Area. The developing antiwar and hippie movements together with the transforming Civil Rights Movement/Black Power Movement accentuated campus protests (Caute 1988). Chicano(a) protests rapidly followed in the wake of these other movements. Even though their numbers were small, Chicano(a) students established the first organizations on many campuses in the Bay Area (La Raza 1:7).

At both SFS and UCB Chicano(as) and Latinos(as) participated with African American and Asian American students to organize the
Third World strike with the goal of recruiting students and faculty of color to set up ethnic studies programs on their campuses (Barlow and Shapiro 1969, 292; “The Fifteen TWLF Demands” 1971). For example, at UCB the Third World Liberation Front (TWLF) demanded a college controlled by Third World people:

The TWLF is asking for a college run by minority group administrators, taught by minority group professors and deals with the political and cultural understanding of these long neglected and oppressed people. (Chicanos on the Move 1968)

Behind these demands, as Conchita (1969, 6) stated, was the hope of self-determination, liberation, and a relevant education: “What the students demand can be summed up in two words: liberation and relevancy.” Roger Alvarado of the SFS TWLF stated: “We don’t want equality, we want self-determination” (Barlow and Shapiro 1969, 292). For protesters at UCB and SFS, self-determination and a relevant education aimed at creating an institution within the academy that could serve their home communities. This oppositional space would be under the control of students, faculty, and staff of color with representation of community groups.

In the wake of these student strikes some Chicano(a) students, faculty, staff, administrators, and community came together to formulate a political manifesto based on the demand for self-determination. The Third World strikers sought to use the university to transform their communities and “strive toward the ideal of ‘participatory democracy’ and radical social change” (Barlow and Shapiro 1971, 62). In El Plan de Santa Bárbara, Chicanos(as) furnished the political vision for a strategic use of the university against the oppression of Mexican Americans. The university could become “a vital institutional instrument of change” (Rochin 1973, 888). Chicano power could be achieved through the political application of university resources—channeled through Chicano studies and other campus programs.

In El Plan, Chicano(a) activists proposed that Chicanos(as) build institutions within the academy under Chicano control in order to wage the wider struggle for self-determination. Through institutions Chicano power would be realized on campus and university services could be directed to the Chicano(a) community (Chicano Coordinat-

ing Council on Higher Education 1970, 13). To secure the autonomy of these institutions, El Plan proposed to integrate students, staff, and community with faculty to govern these programs. This balance, it was assumed, could mitigate the rise of Chicano(a) faculty’s self-interest or interference from administration. Simultaneously, collective leadership could assure that courses, while fulfilling an academic role, would prepare students for political and social responsibilities. Following El Plan, Reynaldo Mañés, Juan Gómez-Quinones, and Raymond Castro (1971, 32) argued that Chicano studies must be institutionalized within the university where it should be given sufficient latitude to achieve the goals of self-determination and self-definition.

El Plan, however, did not fully confront the second theme of the Third World strike: a relevant education. At best the authors saw the development of courses that could serve the political battle with dominant society (Gómez-Quinones 1990, 140). To search for the academic roots of Chicano studies one has to turn to El Grito: A Journal of Contemporary Mexican American Thought, the first sustained Chicano challenge to dominant intellectual paradigms. Octavio Romano’s and Nick Vaca’s essays developed a Chicano critical perspective at the periphery of the academy (García 1992, 6). These authors proposed an intellectual framework to question and overturn the social myths of Mexicans and Mexican Americans and began an exploration of the Chicano(a) experience. As their critique developed, they moved from criticism of stereotypes and bad analysis toward a more honest appraisal of the Mexican American experience.

In attempting to uncover the Mexican American experience, some writers in El Grito began to question the entire academic project. Their work problematized academic knowledge. In the essay “Social Science, Objectivity and the Chicanos,” for instance, Romano began by tracing the intellectual origins of “objectivity” in order to contextualize the concept, demonstrate its meaning, and reveal its biases. For Romano (1970, 5), objectivity demanded an artificial (and false) separation of mind and body. In a later piece, Romano (1980, 10) reiterated his point:

If there is a cohesive configuration of cultural themes and overriding values which characterize the historical development of American society and its West European intellectual, philosophical
and political heritage, then that configuration can best be summarized as an analytical orientation toward the empirical, physical, and cultural world accompanied by a pervasive belief in the separability of reality into its constituent parts and elements.

Thus, personal self-consciousness—who we are—was banished from academic knowledge. In rejecting dualism, Romano concluded that the only way to “do” Chicano studies was to commence from the “self-image” of the Chicano(a) himself or herself. Given the impossibility of objectivity, Chicanos needed to reclaim and rewrite themselves:

If this self-image is rejected by non-Chicano social scientists, then, in effect, they will have rejected summarily the rationality of the Chicano. (Romano 1970, 12)

While students eventually achieved the creation of alternative institutions, the larger goal of community liberation was lost. The SFS strike had modest results: several new departments were organized under ethnic studies and stronger support given to recruiting and admitting minority students. The new departments were to be governed by a collective of students, staff, faculty, and some people from the community. Students, however, quickly grew disenchanted with the results. Even as La Raza studies program was instituted, SFS students realized they had been unable to achieve their goal (Smith 1970, chapter 18; Barlow and Shapiro 1971, 320–21). The UCB strike evolved in a similar demoralizing pattern. The strike also resulted in the establishment of an ethnic studies program, but concessions were small compared to the dream of an autonomous Third World College as a center of political action (Kim n.d.). Chicano studies programs, whether at SFS or UCB, were abandoned by students and fell into the hands of faculty who had little choice but to follow academic procedures. William Wei noted a similar situation for Asian American studies at UCB: “By the late 1970s, students and community involvement had all but disappeared, and power was wholly in the hands of faculty” (Wei 1993, 135).

The compromise for an ethnic studies department necessarily deemphasized the activist agenda that had been part of the Third World strikes. Instead “the main route to curricular legitimacy was the liberal model . . .” (Padilla 1974, 157). In order to establish Chicano studies, the protesters accepted the rules of the academy. This led to the changing of the goals for Chicano studies from community transformation to self-preservation in the academy:

What began as a Chicano studies goal of people-community development based on the use of university resources changed to sheltering students from an alien and inhospitable university environment. (Padilla 1974, 48)

Why did this occur? Student protests exemplified the difficulty in challenging the operation of the university and its hidden curricula. Oppositional voices faced two institutional defenses. First the students’ challenge was presented as irrational and lacking validity. In the academy there were proper ways of challenging the institution and the students’ complaint had to fit the criteria of “rationality.” For example, at SFS, administrators used a combination of negotiation (fit your request on the proper form), dismissal (you don’t make sense), and repression to dismiss the protest (Karaguezian 1971; McEvoy and Miller 1970; Smith 1970, chapter 16).

A second response was co-optation. The academy’s self-regulating system provided mechanisms to translate oppositional challenges into more acceptable alternative choices. Self-determination was mutated into the liberal ideology of abstract tolerance (Marcuse 1969)—rendered into the language of institutional rights; in particular, that of academic freedom. Students misunderstood the multiple mechanisms through which higher education reproduced the existing social, political, economic, and ideological order. The students’ criticism of particular institutions, individuals, and programs missed the covert mechanism that is part of the academy and activists were unprepared for the subsumption of their oppositional demands.

Chicano studies, as a concrete manifestation of the protests, itself became an element of hidden curricula. This institutionalization of Chicano power at the university transformed Chicano(a) faculty into agents of colonization, and thrust them between students and the institution. Whatever their rhetorical posture, faculty operated under institutional rules, articulating the institution. Faculty compadres differed little from Fanon’s (1967, 1968) description of the “native bourgeoisie” who “adopted unreservedly and with enthusiasm the ways of thinking characteristic of the mother country.” More importantly,
Chicano(a) faculty began to mold students into future academics. Chicano(a) faculty became just as adept as their non-Chicano(a) counterparts in manufacturing consent. They, too, came to accept publications, presentations, association meetings, professionalization, and the search for prestige as the non plus ultra. It should not be surprising that some critical students quickly acknowledged Chicano(a) faculty as part of the institution and came to despise them—unaware that this was their future as well.

More devastating, from my perspective, was the intellectual failure of Chicano studies. The goal of a relevant education, with its critique of academic knowledge, was channeled into the traditional disciplines, and the oppositional curriculum was brought under control. Like cultural studies in Britain, initially one could discern a zeal to relate Chicano studies to “life-situations . . . outside the established educational system” (Williams 1989, 152). However, like Raymond Williams’s analysis of cultural studies, the academic institution supplanted the bond with life situations with knowledge reproduced in the image of the institution. Like cultural studies, Chicano studies became disassociated from its community and its development was reduced to textual analysis—and academic jargon. “At the very moment when that adventurous syllabus became a syllabus that had to be examined, it ceased to be exciting” (Williams 1989, 156). Williams (1989, 157) noted that at this point of institutionalization:

a body of theory came through which rationalized the situation of this formation on its way to becoming bureaucratized and the home of specialist intellectuals.

For cultural studies this meant the arrival of theories that “tended to regard the practical encounters of people in society as having relatively little effect on its general progress” (Williams 1989, 157). For Chicano studies, it meant acceptance of academic methods and principles later followed by acceptable theoretical alternatives (colonial theory and Marxism) (Soldatenko 1998, 4–5).

El Grito’s critical call to challenge Anglo research and to uncover knowledge of Mexican Americans came to naught. The hidden curriculum established the “how” and “why” of research, and to reject academic knowledge production made it impossible to establish a relationship within the academy. Attempts to “research” outside established paradigms and processes resulted in self-publication or fiction. This reinforced the journal’s move toward the arts. Vaca and Romano had not developed the methodology and theoretical apparatus to produce knowledge outside the bounds of the pre-established procedures of the academy. Unable to get around the hidden curriculum, El Grito lost its voice as the organ of Mexican American contemporary thought.

With the failure of El Grito, the vacuum was filled by Chicano(a) scholars who accepted academic practices albeit with a radical rhetorical tone. The first journal to jump into the gap was Aztlán: Chicano Journal of the Social Sciences and Arts. The editors of Aztlán, though critical of social science literature, retained an ambivalent relationship with academic knowledge (Soldatenko 1999). The editors and some writers, trained within proper research procedures, could not resolve the tension between “scholarship” and “activism.” Activist scholarship became simply a mixture of acceptable academic work and rhetorical—often couched as interdisciplinary, transdisciplinary, multidisciplinary, or comparative work. Instrumentalist logic dominated much of the research in Aztlán; most essays shared an epistemological framework that turned on various interpretations of structures of domination (Rocco 1977). These structuralist approaches, typically based on a variety of mixtures of internal colonialism and Marxism, were acceptable in the academy.

Sliding into the academy, Chicano scholarship demanded its own particular paradigm, journal, and association—all the accruements of any disciplinary endeavor. Though challenged by peripheral journals, such as De Colores: Journal of Emerging Raza Philosophies; El Cuaderno; Con Safo; Calmecac; and Cartel, only Aztlán was able to integrate into “American social science.” In 1973 the National Association of Chicano studies (NACS) developed similar to other disciplines. All in all, Chicano studies replicated all the traditional practices and institutions of academic disciplines.

Like the struggle for self-determination, relevant education floundered on the shoals of the hidden curriculum. Attempts to challenge legitimate knowledge resulted, at best, in the process of “mentioning.” Chicano(a) scholarship became part of the acceptable intellectual mix. Within Chicano studies, canon formation occurred, as in other disciplines. As the canon was being constituted, some Chicano(a) faculty were groomed to enter the professoriate. Eschewing activism, a few
became “divas,” blessed with “superstardom” and allowed to articulate their “uncompromising” positions as public intellectuals. The end result was departments that were no different than other departments. And like other academic pursuits, Chicano studies could not provide any way to engage the world; it, too, was ethically dead.

**DISCUSSION**

Less than five years after the SFS and UCB Third World strikes, Chicano studies programs were under siege by students who felt the promise had been abandoned. Thirty years later students remain critical of Chicano studies for distorting the strikers’ and the Chicano Movement’s goals. At a recent conference organized by the Southern California FOCO [center] of the National Association of Chicana and Chicano studies, while faculty celebrated their programs maturing into departments with increasing numbers of majors, students called attention to how Chicano studies had abandoned its ideals. Students complained: Chicano studies had no organic tie to the community, student services were bureaucratic machines, student and academic services were depoliticized, student input was minimal, and classes reinforced traditional methodologies and epistemologies.

No one at the conference named the hidden curricula or confronted limitations that academic structures and functions imposed on Chicano studies. Chicanos(as) were content to embrace the mystical power of the academic Oz, affirming its mythology and rituals as their own. While faculty and students differed on interpretation, all desired Chicano studies to be part of the academy. Therefore the blueprint was still to establish Chicano studies programs where none existed: if the campus had a program, then struggle to make it a department; and if the campus had a department, then add a research unit. The goal was faculty lines, the only manifestation of institutional power. Chicano studies consented to the bondage of disciplines to become like any other field in the social sciences or the humanities.

In this way Chicano scholars became academics, schooled by the institutions (university, discipline, professional society) into (re)producing themselves as the ivory-tower intellectuals they distrusted or despised. They struggled to publish in mainstream journals, raised grant money, held each other to the tenure requirements, sat in judgment “on each other” in search committees, applied standards of “objective” knowledge, used citation indices, ranked journals on academic criteria like rejection rates and prestige, built good old boy (and good old girl) networks, promoted their friends, built publishing empires, became superstars. . . . They practiced the rituals with the same conviction and ability as any of the adept, disdaining threats from outside and destroying the careers of potential challengers. Chicano studies failed not because it had not properly implemented El Plan or any other vision, but because it was successful in grafting itself onto the academy.

What I find most distressful is how Chicano studies wields academic knowledge. Chicano(a) scholars were rewarded for “doing social science” on their own communities. By the logic of the hidden curriculum they had to objectify/quantify—to study: the smoking rates of . . . ; teenage pregnancy of . . . ; disfunctional families of . . . ; youth violence of . . . ; dropout rates of . . . ; their community. What generations of Anglo social scientists did to Mexican and Chicano communities, Chicano(a) scholarship continues. Nor have fields like history, literature, or the arts escaped this intellectual subordination. Sadly, this is the only way to make careers in academia, build reputations, create departments, gain academic capital . . . survive.

By ignoring and/or denying the socialization power of hidden curricula designed to reproduce academia with its twin goals of serving capitalist markets and non-participatory democracy, Chicano(a) students and faculty became coparticipants in the reproduction of class, gender, sexual, and racial inequality in the United States. Many of us came to the academy because of discontent with the social, political, and economic realities and became active in academic pursuits in order to address questions of social justice. We believed that we had a responsibility to our community, the world at large, and ourselves. Yet in the academy these issues were intellectualized: disciplines compartmentalized knowledge, responsibility was diffused, justice and social responsibility were subordinated to the abstract search for knowledge. In the process, personal and collective responsibility was brushed aside, replaced with abstract notions of justice and tolerance. Dreams of a different world were exchanged for tenured positions. If the modern university has lost its moral compass and the meaning of being human (Wilshire 1990), Chicano studies was no different. This is indeed what Burton Clark (1968) so eloquently called the “cooling-out function,” as it is employed in higher education in capitalist society.
NOTES

1. I would like to thank Eric Margolis for his intellectual vision and leadership. Without his work, this project would never have occurred.
2. I use the term Chicano studies to denote the discipline constructed by activists of the 1960s that replicated the academy's patriarchal and homophobic disposition. This same discipline continues in the present, albeit with variations in nomenclature.
3. Ironically, the imposition of the elective system broke the hold of the classics and created the modern U.S. university. As Rudolph argued, the tradition of liberal learning and the purposes of the German university were incompatible. The European elective system permitted rigorously and liberally educated graduates of the gymnasium and lycée to design appropriate professional programs. In the United States the same program created confusion and disorientation (Rudolph 1989, 206; Lucas 1994, 210).
4. This discussion of the “American university” was really about a limited number of research institutions (Jacoby 1994). These institutions had instituted the research model with specialized fields (creating more faculty positions). Or as Cohen (1993, 62) reminded us: “The ‘research’ model is undoubtedly a colossal piece of narcissism.”
5. Cohen (1993, 4) argued that academic writing, directed to metatheory and metalinguage, fortified the trinity of pedantry, self-satisfaction, and academicism—reinforcing the “narcissism of insiders.” This writing reflected domesticated and tame thought, often reduced to rank and authority.
6. Affirmative action, Bloom (1987, 94) asserted, admitted many who were unqualified and unprepared. Some of these students went on to create programs, like black studies, that were destructive to the curriculum. Hirsch (1987, 21–22) agreed with Bloom when he argued that affirmative action undercut the cultural literacy that was inclusive and democratic.
7. An example was the 1993 UCLA protest by students of color. The protest began as a criticism of the nature of education at UCLA (Nevins 1993, Sack 1993, Mabalon 1993, Shapiro et al. 1993). Unfortunately, a nativist, nationalist, “el chivo” politics came to the fore, transforming the initial protest into a struggle over the formation of a Chicano studies department—a return to El Plan. The protest eventually achieved its goal: domestication.
8. Marcuse (1965, 96–97) argued that intellectuals have a responsibility to preserve historical possibilities, which appear utopian, by understanding the concreteness of oppression. In a capitalist society we entertain an abstract tolerance by which we accept established attitudes, ideas, and critiques. “Consequently, persuasion through discussion and the equal presentation of opposites (even where it is really equal) easily lose their liberating force as factors of understanding and learning; they are far more likely to strengthen the established thesis and to repel the alternative.” Abstract tolerance is merely the neutralization of opposites, not transcendence.