

Chapter Three: The Mexican Side

3.1 On the other side

If it is difficult to find information on the relationship between Chicanos and Mexicans (who have not migrated) from a Chicano perspective, the paucity of information for the other side of the story is much more evident. It is believed that the study of Chicanos from a Mexican perspective is relatively young because it was not until Mexico acknowledged its migrants and their situation that it was in turn able to recognize their sons and daughters born on the other side. Furthermore, Lorenzo Meyer believes the main issue is that Mexicans do not understand Chicanos just as they do not understand the United States: “Si no se entiende el medio en el cual ellos nacieron, viven y tienen que desarrollarse, pues hay muchas incomprensiones hacia ellos.”

¹⁵⁷ While some argue that Chicano culture and literature has gone “almost unnoticed in Mexico,”¹⁵⁸ here it is argued that although Chicanos have not taken center stage, they have entered Mexico’s peripheral vision.

The relationship between both groups has had its ups and downs, vastly fueled by Mexican migration to the United States. However, although the relationship has changed greatly throughout the years, most scholars will agree that the growing understanding of Mexican immigration to the United States has played a large role in how Chicanos and Mexican Americans are seen in Mexico’s eyes. “Understanding that their views have changed dramatically during the twentieth century may help us to better appreciate that the future is liable not to be a prisoner of the past, and that Mexican American’s growing

¹⁵⁷ Lorenzo Meyer, Colegio de México, interview by author, 13 March, 2005, Mexico City, tape recording. Mexico City.

¹⁵⁸ Eduardo Santa Cruz, “Chicano Literature: Mediator of discordant borders” *Voices of Mexico* 70 (Jan.-March 2005): 117.

demographic power is also accompanied by more influence within Mexico.”¹⁵⁹ Of particular importance, four major events have had great influence in how Mexicans perceive Chicanos: the Mexican migration wave of the early 1900’s, the Chicano Movement of the 1960s & early 70s, and Jorge Bustamante’s efforts to put Mexican immigration to the U.S. on the map.

While this study has tried to circumvent the perceptions that Chicanos and Mexicans have of Mexican migrants because it is an entirely different undertaking, it is that very group which has stirred most of the perceptions that Chicanos and Mexicans have of each other. For example, a middle class Mexican living in Mexico City has little opportunity to interact with Chicanos to the degree where she can reach a better understanding of the Chicano experience in the United States. Similarly, while Chicanos hold Mexico close to their heart, it is mostly the fond elements, “*Mexico lindo*,” which they choose to remember. Thus, both groups, albeit with some exceptions, have little chance to interact and hold a deep understanding of the complex situation in which the other lives. In turn, the vital link for Chicanos and Mexicans has been knowledge about Mexican migration to the United States. “Mexican public opinion about this group gradually changed due to both the political evolution of Mexican intellectuals and to the growing economic and political power of Latinos in the United States.”¹⁶⁰ The evolution of the understanding of Mexican migration in turn creates the basis for the study of Mexican’s changing perception of Chicanos.

In regards to the relationship that Chicanos and Mexican migrants have in the United States, Cossio reminds us:

¹⁵⁹ Richard Griswold del Castillo, “Mexican Intellectuals’ Perceptions of Mexican Americans and Chicanos, 1920-present,” *Aztlán: A Journal of Chicano Studies* 27 no. 2 (Fall 2002), 33.

¹⁶⁰ Griswold del Castillo, 35.

Ambos grupos funcionan en la sociedad norteamericana como si fueran capas independientes de población y con poca comunicación entre si; cada grupo tiene sus propias organizaciones. Los mexicanos forman clubes de oriundos y ligas deportivas. Los mexicano-americanos han formado organizaciones mas estables, se unen por las mas diversas causas para defender sus derechos u promover sus intereses económicos y políticos.¹⁶¹

Nowadays, the Chicano, or Mexican American, community has gained a level of acceptance never seen before. Still, there is much to be learned about one of the fastest growing minority groups in the United States. However, because an acceptance of the Chicano community was not the case at the beginning of the twentieth century, it is necessary to understand the origins of the term in Mexico's perception in order to understand how the Chicano community has become a link, in the eyes of Mexican scholars, to better understand the human side of the U.S.-Mexico relationship as well as the experience of Latinos in the United States.

3.2 The Changing Image of the Chicano

To understand the changing image of the Chicano, we have to go back to the early part of the 20th century- a time where the Mexican Revolution brought about one of the first major Mexican migration waves into the United States. It was a time of stringent nationalism, and those who left the country for other opportunities were generally not seen in a positive light. One of the first examples of these feelings arose from a Mexican writer who joined the migration wave and landed in Los Angeles. This image appears in a 1928 novel by Daniel Venegas, *Las Aventuras de Don Chipote o Cuando los Péricos*

¹⁶¹ Roger Diaz de Cossio, "Prologo," in *Los Mexicanos de Aquí y de Allá: Perspectivas comunes?* (Mexico City: Fundación Solidaridad México Americana, A.C. y Senado de la República, 2004): 12.

Mamen.¹⁶² Nicolas Kanellos, interested in the roots of Chicano literature, found Venegas' work in 1984 and because of the themes and style used, called it the first Chicano novel, now widely accepted as such by Chicano history scholars. In the introduction to the 1984 reprint, Kanellos mentions that the novel was "un esfuerzo heroico por reivindicar al obrero Mexicano inmigrado a los Estados Unidos y su cultura" because at the time,

esta cultura era objeto constante de sátira por parte de los escritores de la elite mexicana de Los Ángeles y San Antonio quienes, con pretexto de elevar el nivel cultural del humilde trabajador, quería en realidad evitar la vergüenza que sentían- como representantes de la intelligentsia y la clase media ante los anglosajones de su misma clase social.¹⁶³

In this context, the main contribution of *Las Aventuras de Don Chipote* is the original use of the term "Chicano." While we currently understand the term "Chicano" as an ethnic identity label for those of Mexican heritage born in the United States, it wasn't always that way. Chicano historians have agreed that the book contains one of the first print versions of the term Chicano, but more importantly, "in the 1920s the phrase was used to identify the working class *pelado* immigrant in the United States, not a Mexican American."¹⁶⁴

The first use of the term Chicano is in Chapter Two when the main character, Don Chipote, is convinced by Pitacio, the laziest man in town and the only one that has been to the United States, that a great future awaits him if he goes North. Don Chipote, desperate for an opportunity to earn more money and for a job that does not entail standing behind an ox all day long plowing land, takes him at his word. Venegas uses his

¹⁶² Daniel Venegas, *Las Aventuras de Don Chipote o Cuando los Péricos Mamen*, Mexico City: Secretaria de Educación Pública: Centro de Estudios Fronterizos del Norte de Mexico, 1984.

¹⁶³ Nicolas Kanellos, "Introducción," in *Aventuras de Don Chipote o Cuando los Péricos Mamen*, Mexico City: Secretaria de Educación Pública: Centro de Estudios Fronterizos del Norte de Mexico, 1984, 8.

¹⁶⁴ Griswold del Castillo, Richard. "Mexican Intellectuals' Perceptions of Mexican Americans and Chicanos, 1920-present." *Aztlán: A Journal of Chicano Studies* 27 no. 2 (Fall 2002), 45.

role as the story's narrator to take a break from the story to insert critical commentary on the condition of Mexican migrants in the United States.

Desgraciadamente la chicanada parece que toda es de "Bolaños" y cree a pie juntillas cuanto se les platica del Norte, y es por eso, más que por las malas condiciones en que la revolución ha puesto al país, por lo que cada día se despuebla más y más.¹⁶⁵

In this and many other instances, Venegas criticizes Mexican migrants for believing everything they hear and not questioning the veracity of the stories of those who have crossed the border. Instead of denoting a politically charged identity, in this early representation, to be considered "Chicano" denoted one's standing on the social ladder. Venegas also uses the story of Don Chipote as an opportunity to strongly criticize the Americanization that Mexican migrants begin to experience and how some deliberately choose to forget their roots.

No quiero pasar adelante sin hacer un pequeño estudio de la debilidad de algunos mexicanos que, como el terpelado por Policarpo, nomás cruzan la línea divisora y ya no saben hablar su idioma. Por desgracia, abundan muchos y estos, que han llegado a Estados Unidos con una mano atrás otra adelante; que han pasado como todos o la mayoría de los emigrantes mexicanos innumerables vicisitudes, por el hecho de haber recibido de nuestros primos las atenciones que atrae el trabajo en los caminos ferrocarrileros y haber aprendido una que otra palabra del idioma yanqui, se olvidan hasta de la parroquia en que les mojaron la chontaca cuando los bautizaron y presumen de gringos, principalmente cuando encuentran paisanos recién desempacados, a quienes les presumen de su sabiduría en el *tok inglis*.¹⁶⁶

In the book, Venegas characterizes those born in the United States of Mexican heritage as ignorant of their culture but admits that as Mexican Americans they also

¹⁶⁵ Venegas, 23.

¹⁶⁶ Venegas, 45.

suffer a great deal because they receive low wages, just as Mexican immigrants do.¹⁶⁷

The characterizations that Venegas uses reflect the influences of his time- the stereotyped image of the Mexican American speaks a great deal of attitudes that dominated the era. On the subject, the historian Lorenzo Meyer comments that in a historical context, the image of the Mexican American in the 1920s was heavily influenced by Mexican nationalism which permeated the era. Specifically, perceptions of Mexican Americans were affected by Mexico's stance towards the United States:

El nacionalismo defensivo tenía como meta ideal crear una distancia relativa de los Estados Unidos, una economía que tuviera un mercado propio, una industrialización para ir disminuyendo la dependencia económica, nacionalización de los recursos naturales, defensa de ciertas áreas de la economía para que no estuviera la presencia norteamericana, etc.¹⁶⁸

However, not everyone held the prevailing image of the Mexican American as a traitor to his country. Another Mexican writer, Julio Arce, also known under his pseudonym Jorge Ulica, instead focused on the Americanization of the Mexican American. Between 1912 and 1925, he was known as a prolific writer for Spanish newspapers in Texas and California, and his interest was on the changing use of Spanish by Mexican Americans. While Mexican scholars such as Venegas chose to reject the Mexican American, Arce took a different perspective and instead focused on how this group fought to assimilate into mainstream American society.

Another influential Mexican scholar during this era was José Vasconcelos, today one of Mexico's best known educators and credited for expanding the rural school program. He was the Mexican Minister of Education in Mexico between 1920 and 1924.

¹⁶⁷ Daniel Venegas, *Las Aventuras de Don Chipote o Cuando los Pericos Mamen* (Heraldo de Mexico, 1928; SEP Cultura: Mexico City, 1984).

¹⁶⁸ Interview with Lorenzo Meyer, March 12, 2004, Mexico City.

He spent part of his life in Eagle Pass Texas, which gave him a clearer understanding of the hardship faced by Mexican Americans. Furthermore, his work, *La Raza Cosmica: Mision de la Raza Iberoamericana*,¹⁶⁹ has been considered one of the rudimentary elements of a Chicano Studies education for putting forward *mestizaje*. While Vasconcelos acknowledged that Mexican Americans faced a difficult situation in the U.S., he criticized those who embraced American culture and forgot about their Mexican heritage.

Yet another important figure is that of Enrique Santibañez. He was the Mexican Consul General in San Antonio in the 1920s and established the city's Hispanic Chamber of Commerce, now one of the oldest minority led business organizations in the country. Aside from his work with the community of Mexican Americans, he was an opponent of Mexican repatriation. Furthermore, he was the author of one of the earliest migration studies.¹⁷⁰ He was also a prolific writer for *Excelsior*, a Mexican newspaper and through his work, demonstrated a marked understanding of the U.S. - Mexico border.

In regards to immigration studies, Manuel Gamio, a well known anthropologist, conducted one of the first studies of Mexican immigration to the United States in 1926.¹⁷¹ In that year, the Social Science Research Council contracted him to conduct a thorough study of migration. Foremost, he was known for exalting the

cualesidades de los emigrantes y se manifestó a favor de que volvieran porque serían elementos de gran importancia para el desarrollo del país. Creía que auxiliarían en la educación del pueblo mexicano y llevarían a cabo una influencia cultural. Se mostró a favor de recibir a los mexicanos

¹⁶⁹ Jose Vasconcelos, *La raza cósmica; misión de la raza iberoamericana; notas de viajes a la América del Sur* (Paris: Agencia Mundial de Librería, 199-).

¹⁷⁰ Enrique Santibañez, *Ensayo acerca de la inmigración mexicana en los Estados Unidos* (San Antonio: The Clegg Company, 1930), 20-21.

¹⁷¹ Manuel Gamio, *Mexican Immigration to the United States; A Study of Human Migration and Adjustment* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1930), 235-41.

provenientes de Estados Unidos, pues creía que durante su estancia en ese país habían adquirido una importante experiencia en la agricultura y las industrias, asimismo habían aprendido a emplear maquinaria, herramientas modernas, disciplina y buenos hábitos de trabajo.¹⁷²

Through his work, Gamio found that some Mexican Americans spoke unfavorably of Mexican immigrants and were not proud to be associated with a class that was regarded so lowly. Thus, not only were Mexican nationals ashamed of the migrants that left the country, but the Mexican Americans that received them in the United States also rejected them.

There was widespread rejection of Mexican migrants during the 1920s, an era characterized by nationalism, but this changed between 1930 and 1950. This era was characterized by a growing interest on the part of Mexican scholars, but there was still a marked uncertainty and questioning of life in the United States by migrants. Two well known novels of the era include *La Patria Perdida* by Teodoro Torres¹⁷³ and *Los Desarraigados* by Humberto Robles. Both books cover the life of migrant families and emphasize the feeling of losing one's nationality when not accepted any longer in the home country nor the receiving country. Robles' work has furthermore been kept alive by a continuous staging of his play and its adaptation into a movie by the same title.

Additionally, Mexican contempt for Chicanos surged in the 1940s through use of the derogatory term, "pocho," used to describe those Mexicans born or raised in the United States. It comes as no surprise that those who read Mexican writer's versions of Chicano life in the United States within this time period have highly negative images of

¹⁷² Alanis, Enciso, "La Otra Cara de la Política Migratoria Mexicana: La repatriación de Nacionales en Estados Unidos," XI Reunión de Historiadores Mexicanos, Estadounidenses y Canadienses, *Las instituciones en la historia de México: formas, continuidades y cambios*, Monterrey, Nuevo León.

¹⁷³ Teodoro Torres, *La Patria Perdida: Novela mexicana* (Mexico D. F.: Ediciones Botas, 1935).

them. By emphasizing the negative effects that life in the United States could bring for Mexicans, these writers almost seem to have wanted to make a distinction which pointed out the superiority of staying in one's homeland, Mexico. If one left for the United States, a troubled future would lie ahead, but staying in Mexico meant that one's culture would be saved. In any case, Mexican writers were not positive about the Mexican American experience in the United States and the overarching nationalism at home probably had a great impact on those visions.

Another important event which created an increased awareness about the plight of Chicanos was the Zoot Suit Riots in 1943 in Los Angeles. On June 3, 1943, after a small conflict, servicemen stationed in San Diego attacked Chicanos in order to "give them a lesson."¹⁷⁴ The riots were a difficult time for Chicanos for they were singled out for their appearance and rejection by Whites. During the next few days, violence escalated, spurred on by the press, which pinned the blame for the so-called riots on Chicanos, and tolerated by police who looked the other way."¹⁷⁵ While the riots gained great attention nationwide in the U.S., they also sparked a debate in Mexico as to whether stand up for a people they were unsure they wanted to be representative of Mexico. After much debate and media hype, at the end of 1943 the Mexican government decided not to protest the assaults made in California against young Mexican Americans by U.S. service men and decided to leave the matter in the hands of the California authorities.

Perhaps one of the best known Mexican writers of the Mexican American, or Chicano experience, is Octavio Paz. His 1957 account of his understanding of Mexican American life in the United States, *El Laberinto de la Soledad*, remains one of the most

¹⁷⁴ Manuel G. Gonzales, *Mexicanos: A History of Mexicans in the United State*, (Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1999), 169.

¹⁷⁵ Gonzales, 170.

important works by Mexican scholars on the topic of Chicanos. His first chapter, “Pachucos and Other Extremes,” reveals his rejection of Chicanos. His experience with Chicanos comes from living in Los Angeles, on which he comments:

Aunque tengan muchos años de vivir allí, usen la misma ropa, hablen el mismo idioma y sientan vergüenza de su origen, nadie los confundiría con los norteamericanos auténticos. Lo que me parece distinguirlos del resto de la población es su aire furtivo e inquieto, de seres que se disfrazan, de seres que temen la mirada ajena, capaz de desnudarlos y dejarlos en cueros.¹⁷⁶

Most critics of Paz, especially Chicano scholars, object to the sweeping notions that Paz used to characterize Chicanos. The above citation reflects the overarching points of the book. In Paz’s eyes, Chicanos are not authentic members of U.S. society and they are constantly, almost to the point of paranoia, on the lookout to make sure no one catches them trying to fit into the mainstream. Paz’s attitude that Chicanos are constantly trying to fit in without success fits in with the pessimism that most Mexican writers used to depict Mexican Americans’ life in the U.S. Gonzales also criticizes Paz for being too harsh on pachucos because “through no fault of their own, they found themselves assailed and rejected on all sides.”¹⁷⁷ Paz’s book remains one of the best known books in Mexico on Chicanos.

Although Mexican writer’s opinions as expressed through their work reveals a great deal about their perceptions of Chicanos, a series of events also had a great impact upon the Mexican perception of Chicanos. While it could have been expected that the Bracero Program, which was in place from 1941-1965, would have generated discussion about Mexican migration to the United States and its effects on the already existing

¹⁷⁶ Octavio Paz, *El Laberinto de la Soledad, Postdata, Vuelta a El Laberinto de la Soledad*, Third Edition (Mexico City: Fondo de la Cultura Económica, 2002), 15.

¹⁷⁷ Gonzales, 167.

Chicano communities, virtually no literature appeared on the Mexican side. Some have attributed the lack of studies and information about the immigrants to a sense of shame and helplessness on the part of the Mexican government for its inability to maintain its workers at home.¹⁷⁸ It was only upon the end of the Bracero program that “the program came under scrutiny by Mexico's intellectuals with a number of Master’s theses being produced in the 1990s.”¹⁷⁹

However, first and foremost, the factor which changed Mexican perceptions of Chicanos was the Chicano Movement of the 1960s and early 1970s. In the early 20th century, the term “Chicano” arose in Mexico to describe the Mexican immigrant who was part of the lower class and the term slowly evolved to encompass a greater understanding of the difficulties Chicanos faced in the United States. However, it was the Chicano Movement that not only forced the U.S. to recognize the collective identity of Chicanos, but it also forced Mexico to take a look at their reality. Chicanos took great steps to differentiate themselves from mainstream culture during this era, and Mexican scholars finally began to try to understand the duality of their connection between the U.S. and Mexico.

Around this time, Mexico was ever more connected to U.S. culture through its movies, music, and technology. Historian Lorenzo Meyer explains:

A mediados del siglo hay una distancia, enojo. El hecho de que los Chicanos tengan una cultura distinta- ya no hablan el español que nosotros, ya no se visten como nosotros. Tienen una visión del mundo diferente. Hay una actitud de rechazo de ambas partes y creo que esto solo cambia hasta fines del siglo 20 que es cuando hay un esfuerzo tanto del gobierno mexicano como de las capas culturalmente dirigentes de México de modificar la imagen que se tiene de los Chicanos, y ya no tener el

¹⁷⁸Barbara Driscoll, Centro de Investigación Sobre América del Norte, interview by author, 15 March, 2005, Puebla, tape recording, Puebla, Mexico.

¹⁷⁹ Griswold del Castillo, 45.

estereotipo que sí domino en los años 50s, 60s de alguien alejado de México que mas bien negaba, o intentaba negar su mexicanidad, y por eso la actitud desde este lado. Es evidente que algunos pudieron intentar negar su mexicanidad, pero otros no es que la negaran sino que tenían una identidad diferente a la de nosotros. No podían ser como nosotros. No se comprendió bien la complejidad de su propio entorno y de lo difícil que era para ellos vivir en EE.UU. y no estar bien asimilados al otro lado, ni estar bien asimilados a este.¹⁸⁰

With both Mexicans and Chicanos accepting parts of U.S. culture, “it became harder to deprecate the ethnic mixture of Anglo American and Mexican language, foods and customs among Mexicans in the United States when millions of Mexicans in Mexico increasingly admired and consumed this same culture.”¹⁸¹ Upon the birth of the Chicano Movement, Mexicans recognized for the first time that Chicanos were a distinct ethnic group and one of the first sources to write about it was *Excelsior*.

During a critical period of the Chicano Movement, Regino Diaz Redondo, *Excelsior's* correspondent in the U.S. wrote about the dimensions of Chicano life in the United States, exactly one week prior to the celebrations of Mexican Independence Day in 1965. In these reports, Diaz Redondo used the terms “mexicoamericanos” and “mexico-estadunidenses” to write about Chicanos. Through his news briefs, Mexicans found out that “many [Chicanos] still attended segregated schools, paid discriminatory poll taxes, lived in substandard housing, and were paid lower wages than Anglo Americans.”¹⁸² An understanding of the difficulties Chicanos faced would lead to a better understanding and dismissal of older stereotypes.

¹⁸⁰ Lorenzo Meyer, Colegio de Mexico, interview by author, 13 March, 2005, Mexico City, tape recording. Mexico City.

¹⁸¹ Griswold del Castillo, 46.

¹⁸² *Excelsior*, September 13, 1965, p. 1, 12A.

Mexicans had received little or no statistics about life on the other side of the border, and the reports from *Excelsior* provided census data which would give them an understanding of the magnitude of the Chicano population and bigger picture of the issues they faced.¹⁸³ Mexicans learned that in 1965, Chicanos constituted the largest portions of the population in New Mexico and South Texas and the numbers were quickly growing in Southern California.¹⁸⁴ While Mexicans before believed that those of Mexican heritage mainly settled in the south, they now learned that this group was branching out to the Midwest and even going as far north as New York.

This important news also cast light on the leaders of the Chicano Movement, whom were for the most part accepted and welcomed in Mexico when they visited. Since Cesar Chavez and his efforts with United Farm Workers were such an important facet of the Chicano Movement, Mexicans' understanding of this leader also helped to understand the social movement. "Not surprisingly Mexican public first learned of the birth of the Chicano Movement through reports about Chavez and the farm workers movement."¹⁸⁵ Chavez was not the only well received Chicano figure. Reies Lopez Tijerina also took a place in Mexican's perceptions of Chicanos. Tijerina was best known for his attempts to regain land grants from losses due to the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo for those of Mexican heritage in New Mexico. Tijerina was one of the two Chicanos leaders who openly developed relations with Mexico. He made two trips, one in 1959 and another in 1964, to present his petition to Mexican authorities, which included the president. The response on the U.S. side was overwhelming as thousands of families filed claims with Tijerina for lost land, but the Mexican side was only a listener and took no action to help

¹⁸³ Griswold del Castillo, 54.

¹⁸⁴ Griswold del Castillo, 55.

¹⁸⁵ Griswold del Castillo, 55.

him get back the lost land.¹⁸⁶ While his attempt to regain lost land failed, Chicano historians agree that his actions to establish a collaborative effort on the issue drew a great deal of attention to him.

It was also during this time that the Mexican government tried to create closer bonds with Chicano communities, although its success is debatable. In the end, “his attempts to organize a caravan of Alianza followers in 1964 introduced Mexicans to the Chicano Movement and a new interpretation of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo.”¹⁸⁷ While these two figures of the Chicano Movement created a great deal of press interest in the Chicano Movement, a march would stress Chicanos’ plight.

During the Vietnam War, an anti-war protest march in East Los Angeles on August 29, 1970, during the height of the Chicano civil rights movement, resulted in a riot that resulted in scores of injuries, deaths, and millions in property damage. The riot produced extensive coverage in the United States, but also in Mexico. Mexicans were thus exposed to some of the harshest realities of the Chicano Movement. Upon this event, the Mexican press began playing a bigger role in the coverage of the Movement and Chicano activism throughout the country.¹⁸⁸ The day after the riots there were front page articles appearing in *Excelsior* and the banner front page headline in *Excelsior* was “They Want to Destroy Us as a Community.”¹⁸⁹ Furthermore, on September 4, *Excelsior* published an editorial entitled “La importancia de ser Chicano” by Jorge Ibarguéngoita which raised a controversial topic on ethnic identity- to be a Chicano was not the same as being a Mexican^{but} that each was equally valid. He was one of the first to acknowledge

186 Meir and Ribera, 227.

187 Griswold del Castillo, 60.

188 Griswold del Castillo, 60.

189 *Excelsior*, August 30, 1970, p. 1.

that although Chicanos maintained attachments to their Mexican roots, through years of living in the United States, some Chicanos did not speak Spanish nor shared many cultural traditions that Mexicans knew: “we have various characteristics in common with them (Chicanos). . . .but we cannot forget that only a small number of them want to be Mexicans.”¹⁹⁰

Actions on the part of the U.S. sparked the need for Mexicans to study immigration. Of these scholars was Jorge Bustamante, who has been credited with being the catalyst for studies of Mexican immigration to the United States. Bustamante became a prolific writer of the topic and with the aid of colleagues from the Colegio de Mexico, Bustamante was among the founders of El Colegio de la Frontera Norte (COLEF). In one of his first publications, “Cuadernos Politicos,” Bustamante, in this article, informed Mexican scholars of the implications that long held stereotypes of Chicanos produced in the country. It was Bustamante who was “promotor de los primeros encuentros oficiales del gobierno Mexicano con los lideres sociales de herencia mexicana.”¹⁹¹

While Bustamante had intentions for the Mexican government to ally itself with Chicanos, he was criticized because “prácticamente desde 1929 las relaciones entre el gobierno Mexicano y las comunidades de herencia mexicana en los Estados Unidos estaban congeladas.”¹⁹² While the Mexican government made an effort to create closer connections with the Mexican community in the United States, they could be characterized as highly superficial and coming at a time when the Chicano Movement was falling apart. “El visible debilitamiento de la izquierda chicana y con ello a perdida

¹⁹⁰ *Excelsior*. September 4, 1970, p. 7A.

¹⁹¹ Arturo Santamaría Gomez, *La Política Entre Mexico y Aztlan: Relaciones Chicano-Mexicanas del 68 a Chiapas 94* (Culiacán Rosales, Sinaloa, Mexico: Universidad Autónoma de Sinaloa, 1994), 74.

¹⁹² Santamaría Gomez, 74.

de influencia de sus dirigentes sociales contribuyo al cambio en las preferencias lopezportillistas.”¹⁹³ Because of the instability of the Chicano Movement, “la extensión y profundización de los vínculos con los líderes sociales chicanos no fueron objetivos del nuevo mandatario mexicano.”¹⁹⁴

While efforts were made in the presidencies of Luis Echeverría Álvarez and Miguel de la Madrid to connect with Chicanos and Mexican migrants, a real possibility for Chicano’s impact rose in 1987 with the campaign of Cuauhtémoc Cárdenas. Cárdenas broke with the traditional indifference of Mexican politicians towards Chicanos because he employed an “effective trans-border campaign that forced the Mexican ruling party to acknowledge the power of the Chicanos in future U.S.-Mexican relations.”¹⁹⁵ Consequently, in the last few years the government of President Carlos Salinas de Gortari carried out a serious effort to improve relations with Chicanos.”¹⁹⁶

It is clear that the viewpoint that Mexican scholars have of Chicanos has changed drastically. In recent years and with the end of the Chicano Movement, Mexican scholars have begun to look at Chicano history in a more realistic light.

La historia del pueblo Chicano presenta, en cierto momento de su desarrollo, una estrecha relación con el proceso histórico mexicano, pues no solo nos une una tradición cultural y sanguínea, sino que dado que la mayoría de los chicanos se encuentra concentrada en el suroeste de los Estados Unidos, más concretamente en los estados fronterizos, la mayoría de sus actividades incumbe tanto al proceso histórico de México como al de Aztlán.¹⁹⁷

¹⁹³ Santamaría Gomez, 79.

¹⁹⁴ Santamaría Gomez, 79.

¹⁹⁵ Yossi Shain, “The Mexican Diaspora,” *Political Science Quarterly* 114 (Winter 99/2000): 669.

¹⁹⁶ Yossi Shain, “Ethnic Diasporas and U.S. Foreign Policy,” *Political Science Quarterly* 109 (Winter 94/95): 832.

¹⁹⁷ Axel Ramírez, Compilador, *Encuentro Chicanos México 1988: Los Chicanos en el Futuro de las Relaciones Bilaterales México-Estados Unidos* (Mexico City: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, 1992), 7.

Additionally, no longer is the trend to see Chicanos as traitors. Instead, Chicanos are described as “participantes de un proceso de dominación en que las diferencias de clase con paralelas a las diferencias étnicas; constituyen un pueblo oprimido cuya marginación los conduce a ser explotados.”¹⁹⁸

Scholarly debates have even gone as far as considering Chicanos as creators of a peculiar nationality:

Esta minoría se ha formado a través del grupo inicial de la población incorporado junto con los territorios conquistados, y debido a las constantes y numerosas migraciones de Mexicanos. Estos últimos han mantenido los lazos con la nación de origen y han sido un factor importantísimo para la conservación de las pautas y tradiciones culturales; puede decirse que los emigrantes han mantenido viva la conciencia del origen nacional.¹⁹⁹

In conclusion, the understanding of the term Chicano has evolved greatly and today “what is more accurate is the view that more educated Mexicans have more information about Chicanos than previously and that the older stereotype, of Chicanos as cultural traitors, has diminished in importance in the Mexican media and in print.”²⁰⁰ Although scholars have presented a more realistic view of Chicanos through their work, it is only those who have access to their material and media as well as have contact with Chicanos that can truly form informed perceptions of Chicanos.

Perhaps the most important change in the image of the Chicano, or Mexican American, is that Mexico is now at a point where it can accept the image of the successful Mexican American. Whereas before, the term “Chicano” had a migrant connotation to it, one of lower class status and rejection, Mexico has begin

¹⁹⁸ Ramirez, 7.

¹⁹⁹ Gilberto Lopez y Rivas, *Los Chicanos: Una Minoría Nacional Explotada* (Mexico City, Editorial Nuestro Tiempo, 1979), 109.

²⁰⁰ Griswold del Castillo, 64.

acknowledging the growing number of Chicanos who are in high positions in the government and business. Ambassador Icaza puts it all into perspective:

You have give or take between 38 and 40 million persons which are Latino. And give or take around 25 million which are Mexican Americans *and* Mexicans. If you take the 25 million that are called into US official estimates that are Mexican Americans and Mexicans in this country, well 10 million from that number were born in Mexico and about 60% of those 10 million are irregular, they are unauthorized migrants. But also the other numbers- you have a 138,000 Mexican Americans serving in the U.S. army. Or you have half a million of business men and professionals and you have a high number of elected officials going into the thousands if you take, specially local level or community level or state level of offices. What we are going to see is that Mexican American communities are going to grow in importance economically, politically, socially in this country and they will increasingly influence how decisions are going to be made in this country regarding relations with Mexico.²⁰¹

We can debate how well or how soon those of Mexican heritage will begin having a significant impact in U.S. politics, but even that such a dialogue is open in the eyes of Mexico's representative to the United States is a positive step forward. Others have also cited "diaspora investment and remittances are particularly strong forces in changing the home country perception of its diaspora"²⁰² as a factor which has helped change Mexico's image of its citizens abroad. Even as late as the 1980s, Mexico had such negative feelings towards Latinos and Mexican Americans, that it did not want someone who identified with these groups filling in the ambassador position. De la Garza reported that in the Carter administration, the Mexican government had hinted that they would not accept Latino ambassadors and he explained that "Mexicans want a true American and they know well the subordinate role that many Chicanos have played in the political and social affairs of the United States... Mexicans must be dealing with people that have the

²⁰¹ Ambassador Icaza, interview by author, 19 July 2004, Washington D.C, tape recording, Mexican Cultural Institute, Washington D.C.

²⁰² Yossi Shain, "The Mexican Diaspora," *Political Science Quarterly* 114 (Winter 99/2000): 665.

right connections... Mexicans unfortunately want an Anglo Ambassador”²⁰³ This attitude has changed greatly.

In a discussion about Ambassador Anthony Garza’s ethnic background, a Senior Foreign Service Officer agreed that it was not Garza’s ethnic background which helped him gain acceptance by Mexican politicians, but instead his own merits, including his previous positions as lawyer and Secretary of State of Texas, had been key.²⁰⁴ He mentioned that the appointment of two of the previous U.S. ambassadors in Mexico of Mexican heritage during the Carter and Reagan administrations had been a failure precisely because they had only been sent for their background.

3.3 Mexican prospective for collaborative efforts

An issue which has been highly debated is whether Chicanos and Mexicans, excluding immigrants, can join their forces together to work towards a common goal. Some have argued that should a collaborative project arise, Mexicans would only be using Chicanos as a Trojan horse for their political agenda, but it should be made clear that this is not a sentiment shared by Mexicans. One of the problems that Mexicans face when dealing with Chicanos is that they realize that Chicanos have limited political power within the United States. This was evidenced as illegal immigrants fought for the right to have licenses in California.

Lo último, señala Moreno, ‘es la atención de los diputados de origen hispano que han prometido una solución, sin resultados. Por ejemplo, el diputado Luis Gutiérrez, del cuarto distrito electoral de Chicago, entregó

²⁰³ Gustavo del Castillo, interview by Rodolfo O. de la Garza, San Diego, California, June 27, 1982. Quoted in Rodolfo O. de la Garza, Harry P. Pachon, Eds., *Latinos and U.S. Foreign Policy: Representing the ‘Homeland’?* (Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2000), 11-12.

²⁰⁴ Senior Foreign Service Officer, interview by author, 11 April 2005, Mexico City, United States Embassy, Mexico City.

una propuesta de ley presentada al Congreso federal para que se investiguen los archivos del banco Wells Fargo, que fue el que descontó 10% a los braceros y se niega a dar información: 'Lo malo es que esa propuesta está congelada y los diputados de la minoría hispana ahora ya es la mayoría, nos ven con filón electoral.'²⁰⁵

Additionally, Mexicans would be very careful in choosing which issue to side with Chicanos, in case an opportunity for a collaborative effort rose. Historically, Mexicans have been cautious about alliances with the United States, and because Chicanos represent the U.S., this ideology would hold. Castañeda puts it best:

Mexicans harp on past tensions and conflicts with the United States, not because of anti-Americanism, but because of the significance of history. It's the history that counts, not the Americans specific part in it. The United States is just one slice of Mexican history, whereas the idea of history cuts across every alley of Mexican political and cultural life: its literature and archeology, its education and art, its identity or lack of it. If the American dream is the archetypal bond in the United States, the Mexican memory unites Mexico. Without it, the country simply might not exist as we know it.²⁰⁶

Historically, the late 1960s "mark the transition to an increasing volume of documented and undocumented Mexican immigrants, the multiplication of permanent settlement communities, a greater participation of women and entire families in Mexican immigration, and the absorption of Mexican immigrant workers into diverse labor markets."²⁰⁷

One of the best summaries of the current Chicano- Mexican relationship is by the head of Fundacion Solidaridad Mexico- Americana, A.C.:

Se ha reconocido también la importancia que tiene nuestra relación con la comunidad mexicano-americana y latina, aunque aun falta una estrategia

²⁰⁵ Martínez, S. "‘‘Esto No Va a Parar...’’" *Proceso* 1424 (15 de febrero 2004), 18.

²⁰⁶ Jorge G. Castañeda, *The Mexican Shock: Its meaning for the U.S.* (New York: The New Press, 1995), 44.

²⁰⁷ Hondagneu-Sotelo, 25.

clara, basada en el pleno entendimiento de los intereses que no son comunes y que reconozca que, muchas veces, las luchas de esa comunidad no son las nuestras y viceversa; una estrategia que diseñe con toda precisión políticas acordes a las características, intereses y problemáticas de los distintos estratos de esa comunidad.²⁰⁸

Furthermore, it is clear that the perception that is held of Chicanos today varies incredibly from the perception that was held of them earlier in the century. Two of the figures that have contributed to the changing image are that of Alberto Gonzalez, US Attorney General, and Ambassador Anthony Garza. “Uno tendría que estar muy cerrado al mundo para no tener una percepción que el grupo Chicano ya es muy heterogéneo, que algunos han logrado posiciones muy importantes, y ya dejar atrás esa visión de tenerlos como algo negativo.”²⁰⁹ Thus, an analysis of scholars’ perspectives reveals the evolution of an increasingly positive view of Chicanos. The next section tries to answer whether academia’s view is reflected in Mexico today.

3.4 Mexican perceptions today

Just as was done in Chapter Two for Chicano participants, this section will be devoted to the analysis and interpretation of the findings for the Mexican side of perception of Chicanos. As a reminder, the Mexican side was composed of 152 students at the Universidad de las Americas, Puebla who were recruited by asking professors within the different schools of the University to allow for class time to fill out the questionnaires.

Mexican participants were composed of slightly more women (58.55%) than men (41.4%). The age range of participants was from 18-28 with the average age of 22.21

²⁰⁸ Diaz de Cossio, 13.

²⁰⁹ Lorenzo Meyer, Colegio de Mexico, interview by author, 13 March, 2005, Mexico City, tape recording, Mexico City.

years old. Furthermore, the participants from three major areas in Central Mexico²¹⁰: Puebla (38.2%), Distrito Federal (25.7%), and Veracruz (10.5%). Most participants were in either the sixth (25.0%) or eighth semester (23.7%) at the Universidad de las Americas, Puebla. Additionally, a large number of participants (42.8%) identified themselves with the Partido Acción Nacional.

Table 12. Demographics for Mexican participants

	Response	<i>N</i>	(%)
Gender	Male	63	41.4%
	Female	89	58.55%
Age	18-19	12	7.9%
	20-21	32	21.05%
	22-23	67	44.08%
	24-25	18	11.84%
	26-28	6	3.9%
	Not specified	17	11.18%
Top three states of birth	Puebla	58	38.16%
	Distrito Federal	39	25.66%
	Veracruz	16	10.53%
Education	First semester	2	1.3%
	Second semester	18	11.8%
	Third semester	4	2.6%
	Fourth semester	13	8.6%
	Fifth semester	8	5.3%
	Sixth semester	38	25.0%
	Seventh semester	15	9.9%
	Eight semester	36	23.7%
	Ninth semester	11	7.2%
	Tenth semester	7	4.6%
Political affiliation	PAN	65	42.8%
	PRI	36	23.7%
	No political affiliation	25	16.4
	PRD	18	11.8%
	PVE	4	2.6%
	Not specified	3	2.0%
	Fuerza Ciudadana	1	1.3%

²¹⁰ Others: Chiapas (2), Coahuila (1), Durango (2), Edo. de Mexico (2), Guanajuato (2), Guerrero (4), Hidalgo (1), Jalisco (3), Michoacan (1), Morelos (3), Oaxaca (5), San Luis Potosi (2), Sinaloa (1), Tabasco (6), Tlaxcala (1), Yucatan (2), Not specified (1).

In order to understand the ethnic self identification of participants, in the next section of the questionnaire, students were asked to choose the labels they used to personally self identify from a list of common ethnic identity terms. The top two labels with which to self identify included Latino(a) (82.2%) and Mexican (79.6%). It must be further noted that participants chose an average of 3.11 of the ethnic identity labels. Lastly, participants were asked to specify which term they preferred to use to identify and the most preferred was “Mexicano” (48.0%). Participants were also asked to specify the birthplace of their parents and the top locations were the following: Mother, Puebla (29.6%) and Father, Puebla (31.6%).

Table 13. Ethnic identity for Mexican participants

	Response	N	(%)
Self identification	Latino(a)	125	82.2%
	Mexican	121	79.6%
	Hispanic	95	62.5%
	Spanish	28	18.4%
	American	28	18.4%
	Chicano(a)	26	17.1%
	Mexican American	19	12.5%
	North American	13	8.6%
	Raza	10	6.6%
	Other	9	5.9%
Preference for self-identification	Mexicano	72	48.0 %
	Hispanic	29	19.1%
	Latino	25	16.48%
	Undecided	18	11.84%
	American	5	3.3%
	Chilango	1	.7%
	Jalisciense	1	.7%
Top 5 locations- Mother’s birthplace	Puebla	45	29.6%
	Veracruz	21	13.81%
	Distrito Federal	19	12.5%
	Tlaxcala	7	4.6%
	Oaxaca	6	3.9%

Top 5 locations- Father's birthplace	Puebla	48	31.6%
	Distrito Federal	27	17.8%
	Veracruz	16	10.52%
	Oaxaca	7	4.6%
	Morelos	6	3.9%

The next section of the questionnaire was aimed at understanding the Mexican participants' connection to the United States by asking them a series of questions about their experience with the country. First, participants were asked whether they had visited the U.S. and a majority (63.2%) had done so. In terms of number of visits, the numbers between Mexicans and Chicano participants were highly disparate. Recalling data presented in Table 3, some Chicanos indicated visiting Mexico more than 300 times, while Mexicans' number of visits numbers much lower (probably due to the visa requirement). Of those who have visited the United States, most (35.5%) have only visited from one to five times. Their main reason for visiting the U.S. was to travel [which did not include family visits] (48.7%) and to visit family (15.1%). Most importantly, the Mexican participants were asked whether they knew anyone who self identified as Chicano or Mexican American, and the majority replied they did not (63.2%), 27.0% said yes, and 9.9% did not specify.

Table 14. Connection to the United States

	Response	<i>N</i>	(%)
Visited United States	Yes	96	63.2%
	No	55	36.2%
Number of visits	0	55	36.2%
	1-5	54	35.5%
	6-10	26	17.1%
	11-15	4	2.6%
	16-20	2	1.3%
	21-25	3	2.0%
	30	4	2.6%
	40	1	.7%
	50	1	.7%
Reason for visit	Travel	74	48.7%
	Visit family	23	15.1%
	Other	11	7.2%
	Work	10	6.6%
	Study abroad	8	5.3%
	School trip	7	4.6%
Know someone who self identifies as Chicano or Mexican American	Yes	41	27.0%
	No	96	63.2%
	Not specified	15	9.9%

In the next section, participants were asked a series of questions about their impersonal contact with Chicanos and Mexican migrants, such as through information seen in the media. First, they were asked the frequency with which they watch television programming in English and 38.2% replied that they did on a daily basis. Next, they were asked the frequency within which they see news about Mexican migrants in any type of Mexican media, and a slight majority (53.9%) replied that they saw this representation 1-2 times a week. In order to get the other side of the story, the participants were also asked how frequently they saw news about Mexican migrants in U.S. media and again, a slight majority (55.9%) replied that they never saw this representation. Finally, they were asked

about the frequency with which they saw the representation of Chicanos and Mexican Americans in the media, and 57.2% reported never seeing this representation either.

Table 15. Other contact

	Response	<i>N</i>	(%)
Frequency with which participant watches television in English	Daily	58	38.2%
	1-2 times a week	35	23.0
	3-4 times a week	35	23.0
	5-6 times a week	14	9.2
	Never	8	5.3
	Not specified	1	.7
Frequency with which participant sees news about migrants in Mexican media	Daily	11	7.2%
	1-2 times a week	82	53.9%
	3-4 times a week	35	23.0%
	5-6 times a week	8	5.3%
	Never	14	9.2%
	Not specified	1	.7%
Frequency with which participant sees news about migrants in U.S. media	Daily	3	2.0%
	1-2 times a week	44	28.9%
	3-4 times a week	13	8.6%
	5-6 times a week	2	1.3%
	Never	85	55.9%
	Not specified	5	3.3 %
Frequency with which participant sees news about Chicanos/Mexican Americans in any media	Daily	1	.7%
	1-2 times a week	46	30.3%
	3-4 times a week	14	9.2%
	5-6 times a week	3	2.0%
	Never	87	57.2%
	Not specified	1	.7%

In order to determine their perceptions of Chicanos, participants were asked to complete two tasks in the last two sections of the questionnaire. The first entailed answering a series of free response questions about the relationship between Chicanos and Mexicans as well as the perception that Chicanos might have of Mexicans. The second task asked participants to rank their degree of agreement on a five point scale, ranging from completely disagree to highly disagree, with statements about Chicanos. A

list of adjectives commonly used to describe and sometimes stereotype Chicanos was used to measure the degree to which Mexicans would reject or accept them, as seen in Appendix B. In order to complete the task, participants were asked to fill in the blank space with an adjective and complete the following statement: “Chicanos can be considered ____.”

Because Mexicans were clearly able to distinguish Mexican Americans and Chicanos as evidenced through their free responses, it was possible to divide the participants into three groups: most negative view of Chicanos, neutral view of Chicanos, and most positive view of Chicanos. These groups were created by taking the range of scores (37-96) based on the Chicano perceptions chart included in their questionnaire and then dividing the group into roughly three equal groups. Thus, 30.9% of participants fell into the Most Negative View of Chicanos group, 36.2% into the Neutral View of Chicanos group, and 32.2% into the Most Positive View of Chicanos group. It was not possible to use the same methodology for the Chicano side because even though it was specified not to consider Mexican migrants when writing about their view of Mexicans, it was evident through their free responses that the image is almost impossible to eliminate. Thus, their scores on the Chicano perceptions of Mexicans chart were unable to be split into groups varying on their perception.

Table 16. Mexican perception of Chicanos

Category	Response	Number of responses	
Chicano perception score	Range: 37-96	Most negative view range: 37-64	
	Mode: 63.00	Neutral range: 65-74	
	Average: 70.11	Most positive view range: 75-96	
View of Chicanos	Most negative	47	30.9%
	Neutral	55	36.2%
	Most positive	49	32.2%

The analysis of the data began by deciding which experiences would most affect Mexican participants' perceptions of Chicanos. Because it has been argued that social interaction is necessary for Mexicans and Chicanos to understand each other better, it was decided that knowing a Chicano, having family in the United States with children who identified as Chicano, and studying abroad would be the best ways to understand perceptions. Thus, the first analysis done was on those Mexican participants who indicated that they knew a person who self identified as a Chicano or Mexican American. For this group, the average score was 71.9 and the range went from 44.0 to 96.0. It was discerned that knowing a Chicano did not correlate with the score of participants, $r = -.123$, $n = 119$, $p > .01$, two tails. In order to further explore this issue, an independent samples t-test was used to analyze whether knowing a Chicano affected participant's scores. However, there was no significant effect of knowing a Chicano on participants' scores, $F(2, 117) = .184$, *ns*. Essentially, simply knowing a Chicano did not affect the participant's scores.

Of this group of 41 participants, 11 (26.8%) reported having visited the United States in order to visit family. The scores for these participants ranged from 49 to 83. Upon closer inspection of their questionnaires, it was clear that while the participants had visited the U.S. in order to visit family, it was in only two of these cases that the participants visited family who now had children who considered themselves Chicanos or Mexican Americans. Both of their free response sections revealed that they had an understanding of the differing agendas between Chicanos and Mexicans and the heterogeneity of Chicanos. One of the free response questions asked participants to evaluate whether it would be a good idea for the Mexican government or an NGO to

work together with Chicanos to help promote policy that would benefit Mexican migrants living in the United States, one of these participants replied: “No se que tan buena idea sea. No sé si la preocupación más grande de un Chicano sea saber del Gobierno mexicano. Ellos prefieren trabajar y ganar dólares.” Because there were only two participants who had family in the United States with children who identified as Chicano or Mexican American, it was neither possible to analyze nor generalize much further.

The next set of analyses were done for those who had studied abroad because their study in the United States might indicate a better understanding of the complexities surrounding its society. This group was also small, consisting of eight participants, and their scores ranged from 58 to 87. There was no correlation between studying abroad and their scores, $r = .011$, $n = 150$, $p > .01$, two tails. An independent samples t-test revealed that studying abroad did not have an effect on scores either, $F(8, 148) = .894$, ns. Thus, studying abroad was not enough to affect a student’s perception of Chicanos.

Since the three main ways of social interaction with Chicanos did not seem to affect the participant’s views of them, the next step was to assess the impact of the media on their views. However, these analyses immediately revealed that the media also had no significant impact upon their perceptions. There was no correlation between watching television programming in English and score, $r = .007$, $n = 150$, $p > .01$, two tails. Participants were asked to name the English television programming they most watched, and the list included everything from the popular comedy series *Friends* to *MTV*, programming in which the lives of minorities, much less Mexican Americans nor Chicanos, has not been featured nor includes a representative number of actors of color. There was also no correlation between seeing the lives of migrants represented in any

type of Mexican media, $r = -.134$, $n = 150$, $p > .01$, two tails. When asked to specify the type of Mexican media in which they saw information about Mexican migrants, the participants replied mainly seeing it in television news and specified the following: *Hechos*, *TV Azteca*, *La Jornada*, *El Financiero*, *Reforma*, and *Noticiero con Lopez Doriga*. Because the current trend is to cover the experience of migrants, should there be any coverage, it was not surprising that Chicanos are not included in those newscasts. There was also no correlation between seeing information on migrants in any type of U.S. media and their score, $r = .137$, $n = 146$, $p > .01$, two tails. It was not surprising that this piece did not make difference since 55.9% of Mexican participants replied that in a typical week, they never saw this sort of information in U.S. media. Furthermore, there was no correlation between seeing Chicanos in either U.S. or Mexican media on their scores, $r = -.133$, $n = 150$, $p > .01$, two tails. Similarly, this was not expected to have an impact because 57.2% of the participants replied that in a typical week, they never see the experience of Chicanos in either U.S. or Mexican media.

In an effort to understand the wide variations of the perceptions that Mexicans have of Chicanos, the scores of the group with the Most Negative view were compared with the scores of the group with the Most Positive view on various levels. None of the following had an effect on the difference in scores between both of these subgroups of participants: age, $F (.08, 80) = .292$, ns., gender, $F (2.6, 93) = .386$, ns., education, $F (.4, 94) = .551$, ns., political affiliation, $F (1.7, 93) = .337$, ns., number of visits to the United States, $F (1.4, 94) = .449$, ns., frequency with which participant watches English television programming, $F (.77, 94) = .533$, ns., frequency with which participant sees Mexican migrants in the Mexican media, $F (6, 94) = .101$, ns., frequency with which participant

sees Mexican migrants in U.S. media, $F(1.6, 92) = .318$, ns., and frequency with which participant sees Chicanos in either U.S. or Mexican media, $F(1.9, 94) = .109$, ns.

The next step to analyze the perception that Mexican participants have of Chicanos was to examine their free response answers. However, one of the major difficulties with this task was the brevity of each comment in comparison to Chicano's comments. Notwithstanding, the free response section reflected many unsuspected findings. The first question asked participants what image they held of Chicanos as a minority in the United States. The participants were divided between those who know a Chicano or have family living in the United States and those who had neither of these contacts to Chicano culture. All of the responses were categorized into 4 levels specified in Table 17. While it was expected that Chicanos would associate images of Mexicans with Mexican migrants, it was not expected that Mexicans would do the same, especially because the group sampled does not have as much contact with migrants as the Chicanos sampled do. The differences between those who know a Chicano and those who don't is evident in the perceptions that Mexicans have of Chicanos. Those who do not know a Chicano had either images related to migrants or negative ones, while those who know a Chicano had a better understanding of their situation in the U.S.

Table 17. Chicano image

¿Qué imagen tienes de los Chicanos como grupo minoritario en los Estados Unidos?				
Category	Migrant	Realistic	Negative	No response
<i>N</i> (Those who know a Chicano)	4 (2.6%)	22 (14.47%)	9 (5.92%)	6 (3.9%)
<i>N</i> (Those who do not know a Chicano)	45 (29.61%)	19 (12.5%)	37 (24.34%)	10 (6.6%)
Example	Los que se fueron del otro lado.	Que están en desventaja a los demás estadounidenses porque a pesar de tener los mismo derechos continúan siendo victimas de la discriminación.	No tienen país y nadie los quiere.	-

The second question asked Mexican participants to write down what they associate when they hear the terms “Chicano” or “Mexican- American.” The participant’s answers were grouped into five categories: migrant, culture, definition, negative, and no response for those who omitted an answer as listed in Table 18. Once again, Mexican participants included views of migrants in their answers. For the most part, those who know a Chicano provided their own working definition of the term, as did those who do not know a Chicano. These findings are clouded by the fact that a definition was provided for the questionnaire’s participants. It cannot be concluded whether the participants’ associations with the term “Chicano” and “Mexican- American” was a definition previously, or whether they listed one because their instructions had one written down for them already. However, because other participants did not associate the terms strictly with a definition, we can assume this factor did not affect everyone.

Table 18. Associations with identity label

Cuando piensas en los términos “chicano” o “méxico- americano”, ¿qué te viene a la mente?					
Category	Migrant	Culture	Definition	Negative	No response
<i>N</i> (Those who know a Chicano)	8 (5.26%)	3 (2.0%)	21 (13.82%)	8 (5.26%)	1 (.7%)
<i>N</i> (Those who do not know a Chicano)	22 (14.47%)	18 (11.84%)	46 (30.26%)	15 (9.9%)	10 (6.58%)
Example	Gente que emigra a los Estados Unidos.	Un joven nacido en EE.UU. de padres mexicanos.	Spanglish	Pandillas y gente pobre.	-

The adoption of certain symbols and customs are shared by both Mexicans and Chicanos, and so, Mexican participants were asked whether they felt a difference between themselves and Chicanos. By far, the replies to this question were of the greatest variance. Six categories were created to fit the replies of all the participants as seen in Table 19. Those who know a Chicano felt the biggest difference lay in their culture (13.81%). Those who do not know a Chicano felt the biggest difference rested on the language difference (19.74%). Since these groups were divided by whether they know a Chicano as well as 6 categories of possible replies, each group became so small that it became difficult to analyze them further.

Table 19. Differences between Chicanos & Mexicans

Algunos chicanos se identifican con sus raíces mexicanas al integrar símbolos tales como la Virgen de Guadalupe, la comida mexicana y el español, al igual que muchos mexicanos. Sin embargo, ¿sientes que hay una diferencia entre un chicano y un mexicano? Si sientes una diferencia, sea cultural, de idioma u otra, ¿cómo la explicarías?

Category	Language & cultural	Language only	Cultural	Nationality	Agreed but not specified	No difference
<i>N</i> (Those who know a Chicano)	11 (7.23%)	4 (2.63%)	21 (13.81%)	2 (1.31%)	1 (.7%)	2 (1.31%)
<i>N</i> (Those who do not know a Chicano)	26 (17.11%)	30 (19.74%)	11 (7.24%)	24 (15.79%)	13 (8.55%)	7 (4.6%)
Example	Si hay diferencias culturales simplemente por que el contexto es diferente para cada uno, de idioma porque mezclan y crean Spanglish.	Ellos hablan ingles diariamente .	Tienen influencia de la cultura estadounidense.	Yo nací en México.	Si es adecuada-son totalmente diferentes.	No, casi no hay diferencias.

A popular phrase that Chicanos have used to describe themselves, and others have adopted as well is “*ni de aquí, ni de allá,*” in other words, neither from the United States, nor from Mexico. Their answers were separated into three categories as demonstrated in Table 20. Whether participants know or don’t know a Chicano, they were apt to agree with the statement. This finding reflects Mexican participants’ belief that Chicanos face a major identity crisis, even though Chicanos might not agree. Mexican participants overemphasized that one of the major issues Chicanos battle is the formation of an

identity. While it is partly true for some, it is clear that with migration backlash and affirmative action issues, Chicanos' major worries in the U.S. include health, economic, education, and other issues, but the formation of an identity is not one of them.

Table 20. Chicanos' border identity

Frecuentemente, los Chicanos identifican su experiencia en los Estados Unidos con la siguiente frase: "Los Chicanos no pertenecen a los Estados Unidos ni a México." En otras palabras, ni de aquí, ni de allá. ¿Crees que sea adecuada? ¿Cuál es tu opinión?			
Category	Agree that description is adequate	Not in agreement	They should pick a side
N (Those who know a Chicano)	26 (17.11%)	10 (6.58%)	5 (3.29%)
N (Those who do not know a Chicano)	61 (40.13%)	47 (30.92%)	3 (1.97%)
Example	Si, el chicano no se identifica porque los EE.UU. los ven como mexicanos y los mexicanos los ven como personas que quieren ser estadounidenses.	No es adecuada porque son ciudadanos de Estados Unidos.	Que con algún lugar se tienen que identificar.

While the focus of the questionnaire was on Mexican participants' thoughts on Chicanos, it was also necessary to consider what they thought Chicanos thought of them. Once again, whether participants knew a Chicano or not, the majority believed that Chicanos hold a negative view of the Mexican middle class and others whom have not migrated. These responses sometimes had traces of guilt because they felt their government and the country's economic situation created the need for migration. These participants also acknowledged that their privileged economic situation was the only separation between themselves and migrants. The results are summarized in Table 21.

Table 21. Chicano perceptions of Mexicans in Mexicans' view

¿Qué percepción crees que los Chicanos tengan de los mexicanos [NO incluyendo migrantes] de la clase social media y alta?				
Category	Postive	Informed	Negative	Don't know
<i>N</i> (Those who know a Chicano)	10 (6.58%)	5 (3.29%)	21 (13.86%)	5 (3.29%)
<i>N</i> (Those who do not know a Chicano)	26 (17.11%)	19 (12.5%)	55 (36.18%)	11 (7.24%)
Example	Nos ven como paisanos.	No creo que distingan entre los diferentes tipos de mexicanos ya que la sociedad mexicana no está dividida en grupos raciales como en EE.UU.	Por nuestra culpa sus padres tuvieron que migrar y que somos corruptos.	No sé.

Once the perceptions were gauged, the next step was to ask participants for the prospective for collaboration between Mexico and Chicanos. While Chicanos were either for the idea, cautious about it, or completely against it, Mexicans were separated by those who agreed, those who opposed, and the few who didn't answer the question. Those who know a Chicano were almost evenly split between agreeing and disagreeing with the idea. Those who do not know a Chicano were more inclined toward disagreeing with joint efforts. Here it is interesting to note that when we add up those who disagreed with the idea, 52.6% of Mexican participants disagreed with the idea of collaborative efforts (Table 22). These participants were doubtful that the idea would work because they felt Chicanos are distrustful of Mexican institutions, their lobbying still hasn't reached levels which would make an immediate impact, and some felt it was better for the groups to work separately according to their separate agendas. Furthermore, it was clear that

participants felt that should any joint efforts arise, it would be a result of Chicanos' initiative, not because the Mexican government or and NGO could produce enough reasons to attract them into collaborative efforts. The acknowledgement that the future of the relationship is in Chicanos' hands was perhaps the most important theme from this set of responses.

Table 22. Prospective for collaboration

¿Qué opinarías si el gobierno mexicano o alguna organización sin lucro mexicana solicitaran ayuda de los chicanos para cabildear en EE.UU. cualquier tipo de reforma (política, social, cultural y/o económica) que tenga como propósito beneficiar a los mexicanos que viven en Estados Unidos? ¿Crees que sería efectivo? ¿Por qué?			
Category	Yes, it's a good idea	No, it's a bad idea	No answer
N (Those who know a Chicano)	17 (11.18%)	19 (12.5%)	5 (3.29%)
N (Those who do not know a Chicano)	42 (27.63%)	61 (40.13%)	8 (5.26%)
Example	Yo creo que si porque ellos saben lo que les hace falta mas que nosotros.	No seria efectivo porque ellos no creen en las instituciones mexicanas.	-

The last question of the free response section was focused on the participants who mentioned that they either knew a Chicano or had family living in the United States in hopes of examining a segment of the sample that has the highest opportunity of holding a better grasp of Chicano issues in the United States. This group was composed of 41 participants, and their responses to what was their first perception of that person and how it changed upon knowing that person fell into three categories listed in Table 23. The majority of participants (70.73%) replied that their perception of Chicanos had changed to a more positive, informed view. A minority (19.51%) felt that their perception had turned negative. Applying Shibutani's symbolic interactionist approach, the fact that

Mexicans felt their views had changed toward a more positive and informed view of Chicanos after meeting a Chicano, it is clear that these twenty-nine participants would be the only group who would be placed on the Primary Relations end of the social continuum. Because this group is so small, it was not possible to discern whether this factor alone played the vital role in their placement on the social continuum.

Table 23. Changing perceptions

¿Haz conocido alguien que se identificara como chicano o méxico-americano? Brevemente, en términos de preconcepciones que hayas tenido sobre los estadounidenses, ¿cual fue tu primera percepción de esa persona y como cambio al conocerlo(a)?			
Category	Changed to a more positive view	Changed to a negative view	No answer
N (Those who know a Chicano)	29 (70.73%)	8 (19.51%)	4 (9.76%)
Example	Mi primera percepción de esa persona fue la misma que uno siente cuando esta frente a un extranjero. Sin embargo, me di cuenta de que no éramos tan distintos.	Me pareció una persona que no quería a los mexicanos, que no mostraba interés por México y que prefería no tener trato con mexicanos.	-

Thus, while it did not even seem necessary to dig as deep as was done here because the little knowledge about Chicanos was evident from the tables presented at the beginning of the chapter, the hypothesis that Mexicans from Central Mexico do not have a thorough understanding of Chicanos from which to base their perceptions was fully supported. The data presented here confirms that Mexicans have an opinion about Chicanos, but their perceptions, as measured by the questionnaire, are not based on any discernable piece of information. Thus, it was confirmed that because the Mexican participants were from Central Mexico they would have a more variable and unrealistic

view of Chicanos. Although the two groups share strong connections based on family ties, history, and culture, the misunderstandings between these groups, unless there is some contact, “becomes more pronounced the further one moves away from the American border toward Mexico City.”²¹¹ Furthermore, this goes in accordance with the belief of Central Mexicans who “have often stereotyped residents of the northern regions as overly Anglicized or denationalized, as evidenced by the widespread inclusion of American vocabulary in their language.”²¹²

It was believed that three factors, knowing a Chicano, having family in the United States with children who identified as Chicano, and studying abroad, would create the most informed view of Chicanos, but in fact, because only few participants knew a Chicano, only a small number studied abroad, and even less had family with children who identify as Chicano, the perceptions of the majority were formed through what Shibutani would consider inferences, landing the majority of the participants in the secondary pole of the social distance continuum with Chicanos. The implications and limitations of these findings will be discussed in the next chapter.

²¹¹ Yossi Shain, “The Mexican Diaspora,” *Political Science Quarterly* 114 (Winter 99/2000): 668.

²¹² Shain, 672.