Spatializing Chicano Power: Cartographic Memory and Community Practices of Care

Juan Herrera*

The San Francisco Bay Area is perhaps one of the geographies most powerfully shaped by the activism of the 1960s and 1970s. Oakland, in particular, is a city etched by the political activism of the past, especially the civil rights movement and Black Panther mobilizations (Clay 2012; Miranda 2003; Self 2003). This activism is memorialized through the popular and academic construction of Oakland as a city of Black protest movements and a place of radical mobilizations. The imagery of this activism rests on a characterization of these movements as mass, grand-scale revolutionary attempts to remake US society, and therefore the spotlight remains on the most visible forms of mobilizing: street protests, sit-ins, boycotts, and the celebration of its most vocal leaders. As Andreana Clay (2012) argues, the legacies of this past activism continue to shape how people experience the city and how new generations of youth come to perceive themselves as activists.

The memorialization of Oakland as a site of Black protest has produced a historical amnesia about the city's Chicano/Latino mobilizations. We know little about how Mexican Americans historically mobilized in the city or where they have predominantly lived. Amid Oakland's historical Black and white spatial order lays Oakland's Latino neighborhood of Fruitvale, located in the city's more impoverished sections called its flatlands. It is the area in Oakland with the largest Latino population and a region, as this essay reveals, where the Chicano movement forged a broad base of support. Here Chicano movement activists experimented with the creation of community-based organizations that enlisted community members in projects of neighborhood improvement. The product of this activism included institutions such as legal centers, health clinics, and cultural organizations, many of which still stand today. The legacies of this activism continue to shape the neighborhood: from the murals on the streets to the architectural design of the neighborhood restaurants and shops, it is a region that has come to signal Chicano and Latino identity and an epicenter of present-day immigrant rights organizing.

* **Juan Herrera** (email: juan.herrera@oregonstate.edu) received his PhD in Ethnic Studies at the University of California, Berkeley, and is currently working on a book project, *Care Is Political: The State, Philanthropy, and the Making of Latino Nonprofits*. He is Assistant Professor of Ethnic Studies at Oregon State University and specializes in social movements, Latino/a immigration, comparative race and ethnicity theory, and urban studies.

In this essay I demonstrate how Chicano movement activists drew attention to the historical role they played in changing conditions in Oakland. In their recollections of the past, activists constructed a politics of activism, race, and social movement struggle forged through productions of space. Drawing from 10 oral histories, this essay considers how activists of the 1960s and 1970s remember the formation of community spaces as integral to their participation in the social movements of the past. My analysis extends to how historical and present-day activists experienced the results of this activism. I argue that the work of remembering 1960s social movement activism is a cartographic process that draws attention to the social movement production of space. My concept of cartographic memory is a practice deployed by activists and an analytic to interpret how and why they defined their activities though the invocation and graphing of space. For these activists, memory served as a central device to bring into focus the transformative and experimental aspects of the Chicano movement.

Activists' memories were central to how they constructed cultural politics of place. Through their activism, activists fashioned a collective community identity that differentiated the Fruitvale neighborhood from other Oakland districts. It also re-situated the neighborhood as one that was profoundly linked to the national Chicano movement. By recollecting this work, they created complex mappings of the organizations and new community spaces their work helped to construct. Most of the organizations dotted the main streets in Fruitvale and concentrated at the intersection of Fruitvale Avenue and East 14th. As a 1970s activist and now educator in Oakland, Annette Oropeza told me:

> You know, the focal point was in general in that corner: Fruitvale and East 14th. There was the Street Academy that was in that corner. If you go south from there in Fruitvale there was the original Centro Legal. Right next to Centro Legal was a taller gráfico that Malaquías Montoya ran. If you crossed the street on Fruitvale, crossed East 14th, and started going toward the hills, on that side of the street there was a barrio Youth Center.[1]

Oropeza's memory remapped how residents and activists experienced the neighborhood and shows how organizations were spatially embodied. The organizations, including youth centers, arts organizations, and legal services, were clustered in the center of the neighborhood's major traffic ways. Oropeza asserts that this network of organizations structured residents' interactions with one another and their relationships with the social movements of the time. Her cartographic memory reminds us that actors' day-to-day experience of the movement took on an urban form, which informed how activists remembered the past.

These recollections were far from mere memories. They represented a set of embodied practices and experiential repertoires of organizing that continued to guide activists' participation in neighborhood projects. Collectively, activists' recollections made an important argument that had a temporal dimension. The Chicano move-

ment forged a collective identity for the neighborhood and built spaces, some of which remain today. By spatializing their movement activism through cartographic memory, they constructed powerful rationales for the longevity of the Chicano movement. In the decades following the 1960s and 1970s, activists experimented with the grounded practices of organizing, the institutional frameworks, and repertoires of resource mobilization and engagement with community residents. This ongoing experimentation also included a commitment to social justice and the valorization of cultural difference rooted in the appreciation of different languages, traditions, and ways of being in the world.[2] Through their deployment of cartographic memories, they challenged conceptions of the movement's declining significance by pointing to space and institutions as proof of its continued traction. As I will demonstrate, activists marshaled improvements made in urban neighborhoods—such as parks, urban farms, health clinics, and legal centers—to signal these impacts. According to activists, these changes continue to effect neighborhood politics and its access to opportunities, including how recently arrived transnational migrants experience the neighborhood.

To fully explore these ideas, I first demonstrate how these spatial productions and cartographic memories defined how activists recollected their activism. For many activists, transformations of the urban landscape served as an archive of organized practices of community care. I argue that activists' cartographic recollections were fundamentally political claims to power that operated through space. They deployed these cartographic memories to defend the appropriateness of their struggle and to argue for the longevity of Chicano movement mobilizations. I then define how activists detailed the ways in which Chicano movement mobilizations built community by establishing a robust constellation of neighborhood organizations.

Shifting the Register of Chicano Movement Mobilizations

The Chicano movement is primarily conceptualized as a radical uprising spearheaded by a new generation of youth who revolted against previous moderate or reformist political postures. The activists I interviewed, however, represented a wide spectrum of mobilizing strategies that were not reducible to protest and militancy. This led me to conclude that labels such as "radical" and "conservative" obscure the complexities of movements and the social actors that participate in them. By situating their social movement participation in space, activists made a critical intervention regarding the breadth and scope of the Chicano movement. In their memories, radical spaces stood in proximity to more moderate organizations and therefore signaled moments of convergence between groups traditionally seen as mutually exclusive. Alfredo Cruz, for example, was a member of the militant Brown Berets and served as a security guard for protests and street demonstrations. He simultaneously participated in a church-based nonprofit, Oakland Community Organization (OCO), which helped to establish Fruitvale's first urban farm in the late 1970s. Like Cruz, many activists' spatial recollections of the movement

emphasized the cohabitation, and therefore the mutual constitution, of competing types of political ideologies.

Chicano historiography, however, privileges the rise of 1960s and 1970s youth mobilizations, eclipsing all previous histories of activism (Acuña 2004; Chavez 1994; Gómez-Quiñones 1978, 1990; Muñoz 2007). Chicano historians have acknowledged the existence of reformist policies that fit into what Ethnic Studies scholar Carlos Muñoz, Jr. (2007) calls the Mexican American generation, or what historian Ernesto Chávez (2002: 42) calls "inadequate forms of protest for securing the plight of Chicanos in the late 1960s and 1970s." These studies argue that with the rise of Chicano militancy in the late 1960s, moderate forms of political engagement ceased. As Chavez (2002, 42–43) writes, "this ineffectiveness [of reformist or centrist mobilizations] combined with the general protest environment of the later 1960s to ensure a new style of politics known as the Chicano movement." Instead of relying on the ballot box, Chicano activists took to the streets and demanded change through protest.

This episodic conceptualization of Chicano history overly emphasizes activism as a temporal process—with different stages that replace one another—as opposed to employing a place-based analysis that is attentive to the different modes of political ideologies within a particular space-time. Chicano movement historian Maylei Blackwell (2011, 28) calls this a politics of periodization that has created a male-dominated narrative of the movement. In addition, episodic analyses privilege moments of protest and insurrection that overshadow the grounded practices in which the movement transformed urban landscapes and affected how people experienced space.

Following Chicana feminist interventions, I contend that this movement represented an expansive bandwidth of varying approaches to achieving community change. As Chicana feminists have argued, we must rethink the movement as a contested site of political mobilizations, rather than as a singular site of coherence (Arredondo et al. 2003; Espinoza 2001; Garcia 1997; Perez 1999). I add to this analysis by foregrounding how spatial relations rooted in the care and protection of the community served as an important locus for these contentious politics. My analysis of care also stems from a reading of recent scholarship on the longevity of the civil rights movement and Black Power mobilizations (Clay 2012; Dowd Hall 2005; Nelson 2011). I echo sociologist Alondra Nelson by arguing for an analysis that broadens the scope for the analysis of movements. Also helpful is Andreana Clay's insistence on thinking about how popular and scholarly writing has created representations and understandings of the 1950s and 1960s activism, which are embodied in ossified repertoires of activism. These repertoires are linked to large social movements and privilege the most radical, militant, or outspoken leaders (Clay 2012: 153). This obscures the contributions of various political postures that coexisted within these movements.

I conceptualize the Chicano movement as a contested site of politics for community care. The framework of care opens up a new lens for building a broader register of Chicano movement activism and for its continuation beyond the limited timeframe placed on the Chicano movement. It can also lead to a more extensive assessment of how movement legacies continued even after the mass-scale protests and demonstrations ended. I use this optic of care to analyze how spaces of protest reconstituted themselves from the streets into institutional formations such as the classroom or Chicano nonprofit organizations. Activists I interviewed foregrounded the crucial role nonprofit organizations play in the constant rearticulation of neighborhood politics. Admittedly, my focus on institutionalization challenges literature on 1960s social movements that has argued that nonprofit organizations served exclusively as a site of cooptation (Allan 1969; Gilmore 2007; Rodriguez 2007). I focus on nonprofit mobilizations and comprehensive projects of community care to think beyond ideas of incorporation that equate institutionalization with anti-politics. Furthermore, I reposition nonprofit-mediated mobilizations as a component of the breadth of mobilizing strategies Chicano movement activists utilized to bring about neighborhood change.

Cartographic Memory

The optic of community care brings into focus a central component of social movement activism. Social movements mobilize to make changes in actually existing places. To understand the impacts of social movements, we must therefore think about changes in community spaces, and how those impacts continue even after the alleged decline of the movement. Indeed, activists' recollections of their social movement activities focused on the geographies where they labored or built particular institutions. These memories were far from unitary. In fact, they constituted a set of contested and often contradictory mappings that show the complexities of movement mobilizing.

I employ cartography to call attention to the process by which Chicano movement activists viewed their work through productions of space and how they advanced these projects toward particular claims to power. Historians of cartography have linked cartography and power in their critiques of the way in which maps are typically conceptualized as objective representations of space (Craib 2009; Edney 2005; Harley 1988, 1992). As Raymond Craib (2004: 6–7) observes, "modern cartography, founded upon some geometric and mathematical principles as perspectival space, took form as a supposedly objective science mediating between spatial reality and human perception of that reality. Its products—maps—acquired a disembodied purity, functioning as transparent windows onto preexisting space." Eschewing the presumed objectivity of maps, historians of cartography have demonstrated the centrality of mapmaking in statecraft and the accumulation and reification of state and imperial power. Maps, therefore, are never apolitical and their production, even in the form of memory, is filled with contradictions and contestations.

My concept of cartographic memory is a practice activists deployed and a framework for understanding how leaders defined their activities though the invocation and graphing of space. I borrow Blackwell's (2011) analytic of "retrofitted memory" as a form of "countermemory that uses fragments of older histories that have never been disjunctured by colonial practices of organizing historical knowledge." As Blackwell's term suggests, it is possible to draw from these discarded and suppressed forms of knowledge to understand how, as these leaders defined it, they were mobilizing to construct "new forms of consciousness customized to embody material realities, political visions, and creative desires for societal transformation" (Ibid.). I build on Blackwell's concept by emphasizing the cartographic and geographic nature of activists' memories. Activists fundamentally conceptualized the spatial as a vehicle by which to assess the fruits of their social movement labor.

Cartographic memory is not just an act of remembering. It is a political remaking of urban geography and therefore a *selective* mapping of the neighborhood to emphasize the contributions of certain groups, while rendering others less visible. Activists' cartographic memories also performed the important function of summoning to life some of the places and agencies that no longer existed. In what follows, I analyze how activists' cartographic memories stabilized space toward various political means. I also analyze how competing cartographic memories revealed the multiple conflicts and contingencies that characterized Chicano movement activism. Moments of coherence also demonstrated the negotiations and compromises that defined the movement. Cartographic memories reveal the political nature of placemaking and the centrality of space in negotiations of power. A map, historian Craib (2004, 7) reminds us, reflects "the relationship between modes of representation and the material practices of power."

Spatial Technologies of Remembering

In April 2014, I attended the Fruitvale neighborhood's annual Cesar Chavez Lifetime Achievement Awards. The crowded meeting hall was adorned with United Farm Workers (UFW) flags and posters from the 1960s that commemorated boycotts and marches. Attendees cheered as award recipients gave speeches about their life's work. At the core of their recollections was an argument about how their activism had transformed the neighborhood. Alfredo Cruz arrived in Fruitvale in the early 1970s from Colorado and quickly began to work with groups based in the Catholic Church. He was recruited to work in the UFW and thereafter was involved in a multiplicity of projects, including at one time operating a printing press that produced movement materials in the Bay Area. At the ceremony, Cruz recalled how in the early 1970s he and other neighborhood residents converted an unsightly vacant lot into a vibrant urban farm. During our interview, Cruz explained how they "took three truckloads of garbage out of there, because it was a mess."[3] He also helped to repurpose other vacant lots into neighborhood parks. Cruz remembered:

> At the end of my block there was a creek and there was an elderly woman who couldn't control the weeds. Every year she would set a fire to burn the weeds. We converted that space into Foothill Park and it still exists today, except that now its name is Cesar Chavez Park. There was also an annex to the park that came about, a playground for kids across the street. That was between 38th and 39th avenues and the community garden was on 39th Avenue. The park is located on 37th Avenue.[4]

Cruz's recollections of movement activities were claims to the production of space and were geographic in scope. He did not talk about an abstract park, instead remembering its location and the process by which neighborhood activists had labored to bring these kinds of material changes to the neighborhood. He described how the park had changed over time, acquiring new sections and even a change in name. According to geographer Doreen Massey (2005: 105), current Western-type maps give the impression that "space is a surface—that it is the sphere of a complete horizontality." In contrast, according to Massey, space "presents us with a heterogeneity of practices and processes" and is an "ongoing product of interconnections," meaning that "it will always be unfinished and open" (ibid.). Cruz's mapping was an examination of the present and past, indicating how the park's formation was an ongoing process and that the social movement activism that shaped it was unfinished, and therefore not a historical artifact. He continued to participate in different neighborhood projects and he lived in and owned rental properties in the community. Efforts of the Chicano movement, he asserted, still had traction in the neighborhood; he pointed to the existence of places like the Cesar Chavez Park, which he and other community activists helped to build. The neighborhood's geography and the memories associated with it served as tools to bring into focus the gains made through movement mobilizing.

Another activist, Annette Oropeza, remembered her work in the neighborhood by describing different educational spaces she either worked at or helped to construct. During her interview, she described the energy and activism of the time: "We always had something going on. We are always either at the park, or doing a march, or getting together, taking our contingents from Fruitvale to a bigger march that was maybe happening in downtown Oakland or San Francisco. People were always mobilizing."[5] These mobilizations occurred through the network of organizations that brought people together and built a broad base of support. Like other activists, Oropeza asserted the crucial role of neighborhood public spaces, such as parks, in people's experience of movement organizing. She mapped her activism by illustrating her participation in neighborhood educational projects for youth:

> There was also a school … the Emiliano Zapata Street Academy and it was right on the corner of Fruitvale and East 14th. It was in an old furniture warehouse. Then a second Street Academy opened in East Oakland that

> ended up combining and years later emerged into another library…. The school was really important. It was a focal point. You had people that had worked with the UFW farmworkers that had become teachers there.[6]

Like Cruz, Oropeza's memories spoke about community formation through the projects that social movement activism helped to construct. For Oropeza, educational spaces were at the core of her experience as an activist and of the neighborhood's geography. She detailed how the Street Academy forged translocal linkages between Fruitvale and the UFW solidarity movements occurring throughout the United States. The Street Academy, she said, had relocated to downtown Oakland, yet for her the school would always be tied to her memories of the Fruitvale neighborhood. Thinking about Oropeza's story and the spaces and experiences she mapped through her memory shows us how individual mappings are situated forms of knowledge. Yet when viewed together, they create a latticework of different places that come to constitute the neighborhood's geography of activism.

Activists' cartographic memories were fundamentally perspectival renderings of geography, and admittedly unstable. In fact, my citing of their mappings is not intended to demonstrate accuracy. Many times activists admitted that they did not remember the exact locations of some organizations. In other instances, different activist mappings contradicted one another. Maps, according to Michel de Certeau (1984, 97) are "fixations" that "constitute procedures of forgetting." As Raymond Craib (2004: 91) observes, "in presenting a smooth façade of clearly marked lines, established plots, and definitive borders, the map obscures the social process of its own production." A map comes to represent certainty and fixity, instead of revealing the contested process by which territory is measured and given an artificial form. Activists' cartographic memories defied the fixity inherent in the production of maps. In contrast to the erasures that maps typically present, activists' memories operated fundamentally as a technology for remembering. Viewed in concert, these mappings offered a more expansive and robust understanding of how the Chicano movement affected the neighborhood, and its continued effects.

The Proof Is in Space!

Activists' cartographic memories of the movement also demonstrated the cohabitation of multiple, often contradictory, political postures. Claudia Serrano,[7] for example, began our conversation by handing me a neighborhood map that she had drafted. It was a simple sketch of one central intersection that other activists had previously discussed: Fruitvale Avenue and East 14th (now called International Boulevard). The map was not to scale, showed only a few streets, and only detailed a few organizations. Despite the imprecision of Serrano's map, it made important arguments. It fundamentally spatialized and institutionalized the 1960s and 1970s Chicano political mobilizations by transforming abstract streets into geographies of activism. It also demonstrated the cohabitation, and therefore the mutual constitution,

of various types of organizations. Serrano later classified some of these organizations as "conservative" and others more "radical." She was a self-proclaimed radical who organized many protests and developed a news service agency, COMEXAS, which collected and distributed radical news from all over Latin America. COMEXAS's offices were located at the famed intersection of Fruitvale and East 14th and also served as a meeting place for radical activists.

Serrano's cartography principally referred to defunct organizations to make claims about the powerful work they had performed. Unlike "conservative" organizations that received state and philanthropic funding and continued to operate, she said most "radical" organizations had disappeared. As many of the radical leaders went into obscurity, so did the valorization of the organizations they developed. Serrano's mapping of one of these organizations, COMEXAS, therefore demonstrated the function of memory to conjure what no longer exists and what has largely been forgotten in neighborhood recollections of the past. Through this narrative process, she retold her involvement with COMEXAS, which summoned up other activists, how they had come to the organization, and their unique contributions to the neighborhood. According to Serrano, COMEXAS served as a meeting space for other organizations and was a community learning place, where activists studied Marxism and could avail themselves of radical news from Latin America and beyond.

Serrano lamented that more radical organizations had dissolved primarily due to activist burnout and lack of funding. Moreover, many of these self-proclaimed radical organizations became targets of police and FBI infiltration. Serrano's cartographic memories detailed the projects these radical organizations had engendered, which were at once local, national, and international. In these memories, Fruitvale came to represent an interlinking of different movements that spanned distant geographies. Her recollections were political and selective cartographic memories that give meaning to those fleeting landscapes of past radical organizations. The political nature of her memories rested on bringing to life the organization that she helped to run for years, and that she lamented no one really recalled. By recentering this organization, and literally drawing it on a map (and therefore locating it in the neighborhood), she pulled herself and others who had formed part of the organization out of obscurity.

Leaders of what Serrano referred to as "conservative" organizations similarly deployed space to give power to the work they had done. Self-proclaimed radical groups critiqued organizations that had become too institutionalized due to state and philanthropic funding. They branded the leaders of these organizations as "sellouts" and "conservatives."[8] By the 1980s, organizations such as Clínica de la Raza and Oakland's premier community development corporation (CDC), the Unity Council, had developed into corporatized agencies that radical activists argued had corrupted their initial grassroots political agenda. Radical activists alleged that the conservative organizations had been able to survive because they aligned themselves with

the goals of private philanthropy and state agencies. In my interviews with those leaders, I noticed how they, like the "radicals," deployed cartographic memories to emphasize their work. These individuals did not draw maps for me. However, they retold their activism in cartographic form. Their recollections wielded space to bring into focus the new opportunities and social relations their activism had achieved.

In the summer of 2012, I interviewed a leading Bay Area activist, Herman Gallegos, in his home in a remote town near Sacramento. In his lifetime of work, he helped to establish numerous nonprofit organizations, served as one of the original founders of the National Council of la Raza, and became the first Mexican American to sit on the board of a major philanthropic foundation. Now retired, Gallegos prefers to live outside the spotlight in a town far removed from the geographies of his past activism. When the Chicano movement came up, he offered a loud critique of militant forms of organizing. He said, "I think that some of the students got into this super nationalism and I had a problem with that."[9] He explained his contention with Chicano movement scholarship that did not accurately portray that mobilizations existed in areas like Oakland before and after the temporal framework assigned to the movement. Finally, Gallegos asked, "What was left behind by that kind of militant activism?" In contrast, he eloquently recalled the material legacies left behind by nonprofits and non-militant organizations:

> You can look at the Unity Council, you can go to the barrios where we organized throughout California. East San Jose is a good example of where we had no streetlights, no stop signs, the creek would overflow. Today the streets are paved, there are sidewalks, there are streetlights, there are soccer fields, youth agencies, head start programming in cities. You *can physically see* the changes. I am not saying that there are no problems, but you can go to other barrios and *there are physical changes*…[10]

For Gallegos, these material legacies show the "progress" made in urban barrios and the appropriateness of non-militant forms of activism. As he argued, the fact that you could walk through a neighborhood and point to specific services, buildings, or other infrastructural changes offered proof of the effectiveness of this mode of activism. Like other leaders, Gallego's cartographic memories clarify the role of nonprofits in crafting geographies of opportunities by providing social services and infrastructural improvements. By linking these nonprofit-mediated improvements to a long tradition of Mexican American organizing, he highlighted the social movement production of space.

In contrast to the efficacy of an institutional approach to mobilizing, nonprofit leaders pointed to the inefficiency of militant approaches to community mobilization. David Hayes-Bautista of Clínica de la Raza, for example, argued that many of the "radical" and "revolutionary" approaches to community empowerment were not clear and failed to translate into much more than rhetoric. As he described it:

> There was a lot of posturing going on. [We at the Clínica de la Raza] had things to do so we didn't really have to be super militant. In fact, every so often we got some undergrads from UC Berkeley who said they want to revolutionize the community and we would tell them: "here is a broom ... let's get started with that." That's the way to revolutionize a community.[11]

Fruitvale's community-based organizations were a meeting point of divergent approaches to political mobilization. Yet as Dr. Hayes-Bautista noted, more radical groups had unrealistic plans to "revolutionize" the community. La Clínica's leadership, which was dubbed as "not sufficiently" Chicano, found that mobilizations needed to be more practical and concerned with meeting the most critical community needs, such as easy access to health care.

Despite ideological differences between radical and more moderate institutional sectors of the Chicano movement, they shared neighborhood spaces and converged around projects of community care. Self-proclaimed radicals admitted that educational centers served as major sites of convergence, especially the Centro Infantil elementary school. This alternative educational center was bilingual and bicultural. As Claudia Serrano described it:

> What was so critical about it was that everybody's kids went to that school. So you had people from Centro Legal, people from Educación Para Adelantar (EPA), the Unity Council.... they had a board of directors that was political and progressive.[12]

As Serrano's description of this collaborative project reveals, activists labeled "radical" and "conservative" shared these politicized educational projects and worked with one another. For these activists, community mobilizing entailed securing the well-being of family and children and they subsequently cooperated to create alternative forms of education. Labels such as "conservative" and "radical" therefore obscure the points of collaboration and negotiations that characterized Chicano movement projects of community care. In contrast to the Chicano movement historiography that places "radical" protest organizations in perpetual opposition to reformist or "conservative" modes of activism, Serrano's cartographic memories reveal how neighborhood institutions fostered moments of convergence. The fact that radical and conservative organizations were located in the same neighborhood meant that they engaged with one another. Thinking through activists' cartographic memories allows us to see the grounded complexities of social movement activism.

Activists' recollections of Chicano movement organizing were principally a map-making process. They demonstrated how the Chicano movement changed the urban landscape. The fact that their memories operated in cartographic form brought into focus the day-to-day experience of organizing. Their spatial technologies of remembering were a method by which to render visible their contributions to community formation. These cartographic memories defied contemporary mappings

of the neighborhood that overlooked how social movement activism shaped the community.[13] They also brought into focus the rich history of Mexican American/Chicano activism that is overlooked in the Black/white historiography of the city of Oakland. Furthermore, many activists lamented that present-day neighborhood residents (many of whom are recently arrived migrants) did not acknowledge the history of social movement struggle that built contemporary neighborhood resources. Within this context, activists' cartographic memories valorized the achievements of their activism and justified the appropriateness of their organizational practices.

The Social Relations of Community Care

In addition to mapping their struggles through their memories, activists argued that their work helped to forge a collective community identity. Fruitvale did not always symbolize a Mexican American neighborhood. It had historically been an Italian and Portuguese community and began to change at the height of the World War II-fueled industrialization and the postwar movement of ethnic whites into more suburban areas of the East Bay (Miranda 2003; Self 2003). The creation of Fruitvale as a Mexican American place with a shared politicized identity occurred through social movement organizing. Activists experimented with diverse techniques of building community and created political solidarity among different constituents. Many of these new relationships were intergenerational partnerships between and older generation of grassroots organizers and a new group of politicized youth. Activists further explained that these dense networks of activism constituted long-term friendships, partnerships, and even romantic ties. In this section, I demonstrate how these forms of sociality continued long after what is perceived as the decline of the movement. This meshwork of social relations helped to constitute a uniquely Chicano community in Fruitvale in relationship to other spaces deemed predominantly Black or white.

Building Community

Chicano movement-era institution building was a result of a nexus of social movement activism and the expansion of state social welfare projects into racialized communities (Herrera 2013). In Oakland, these new mobilizing efforts built on preexisting Catholic church-based mobilizations, which had supported the formation of Mexican American leadership. It was also uniquely shaped by city's Black/white construction and the influences of African American social movements like the Black Panther Party's experimentation with projects such as the People's Free Medical Clinics and breakfast programs (Murch 2010; Nelson 2011). Furthermore, federal war on poverty efforts that began in the mid-1960s channeled youth into a diversity of urban anti-poverty projects (Kramer 1969; Pressman 1975; Self 2003). In this context, Chicano youth activists interacted with these existing organizational practices and collaboratively constructed a set of cultural, educational, legal, and

health institutions. These kinds of projects occurred in many Chicano neighborhoods throughout the United States (Bermudez 2014; Espinoza 2001).

The Chicano movement routed first-generation college students to develop neighborhood projects. As one of the founders of Centro Legal, Jose Martinez, described his fellow law students: "They had the rhetoric, the connections, the ideology of community involvement and representation for poor people, increased civil rights and participation by Hispanics and Chicanos, and that kind of thing."[14] Another activist, Regina Echeverría, emphasized how even as a high school student she began to learn of the political work occurring at the time. As Echeverría described the student energy:

> [With] the Third World Strike that was going on in San Francisco [State University] and UC Berkeley, I started paying attention at the time I was still in high school. That really helped open up my ears that there was more going on and it was exciting. The work of Cesar Chavez really hit close to my heart. I couldn't read enough (which was very little at the time); everything I could find, I read.[15]

Echeverría was in one of the first cohorts of Mexican American students to enter UC Berkeley after the Third World Liberation Front, a movement that fought for ethnic studies on campus and greater opportunities for students of color. In 1969, she began her studies and was quickly recruited into different on-campus and community projects. As she remembered, "I was in MEChA [Movimiento Estudiantil Chicano de Aztlán] my first year; I was a secretary or something, because that's what the girls did back then, you know." Once out in the community, Echeverría experimented with other forms of leadership through institution-building projects. Student organizations helped to broker relationships with Mexican American neighborhoods and to grassroots organizing occurring outside the campus. As an undergraduate at UC Berkeley, she recalled "a Community Projects Organization … which gave grants to students to do things in the community. So a lot of funding for projects in Oakland was startup grants from there also." In this fashion, students experimented with the movement's goal to help the "community." This was not an abstract, romanticized version of community. Echeverría said that students were encouraged to build community by engaging in collaborative projects in surrounding neighborhoods, many where they had grown up.

The 1960s mandate of Chicano community improvement jumpstarted preexisting neighborhood organizing endeavors in Fruitvale. Since the late 1950s, a progressive pastor, Father Lynch, had helped to organize neighborhood residents to forge a united voice for Mexican Americans in Oakland. Furthermore, organizations such as the Community Service Organization (CSO) developed local neighborhood politicization projects (see Herrera 2012). Many of these projects linked Spanish-speaking residents to state services that were not available in Spanish and had a

major focus on citizenship campaigns. They also advocated for the creation of state programs designed for Mexican Americans. These neighborhood organizing hubs, comprised mainly of parents and an older generation of leaders, helped to guide neighborhood projects in the 1960s and 1970s. As Dr. David Hayes-Bautista, one of the initial founders of Fruitvale's Clínica de la Raza, recalled:

> I got a phone call one night from one of the moms who I was working with. She said that the parents' group could not depend upon the county, so they needed to develop their own health center. Then of course she started telling me "we don't know anything about it. And you are the only person that knows anything about it. So we would like to ask you to direct us." So I said, "Eleanor, I haven't even started [medical] school yet."[16]

Dr. Hayes-Bautista's recollections demonstrate relationships of collaboration between a new generation of Chicano youth and an older Mexican-American generation. There was a specific gendered component of this work, as mothers who organized to improve community resources spearheaded many of the neighborhood-level forms of organizing. Many of these initial organizing hubs occurred at members' homes and grew into more institutionalized projects. The central goal of these joint efforts was the care and protection of the neighborhood and its residents.

Movement institutional formations were fundamentally part of a community-building endeavor. Echeverría remembered that "when El Centro Legal and La Clínica's first site was identified, it used to be an old restaurant or bakery.... We went there and cleaned it up. I put a crew together which consisted mostly of women, my brothers, sisters, students."[17] This work proved to be a multigenerational project that enlisted the help of all sectors of the neighborhood population. Echeverría's recollections of the formation of La Clinic and Centro Legal demonstrate the collaborative labor required to build these institutions. Once formed, nonprofit projects helped to channel future generations into neighborhood-building efforts. For many first-generation students, nonprofits became their first paid employment opportunities. Echeverría said of her involvement with Centro Legal that she "applied and my roommates and I worked there that summer. It was in my neighborhood on 30th Avenue. I kept volunteering during the year.... It kept me in touch with the neighborhood and it kept me connected."[18] As a Fruitvale resident, Echeverría was able to work in the community where she was raised and to build new relationships with neighbors. Nonprofit projects rerouted students like Echeverría back to their neighborhoods and ensured that there were spaces to put into practice the movement goals of social change and justice for the Chicano community.[19]

Chicano activists marshaled the notion that a collective Chicano community should represent shared interests as neighborhood residents. This occurred because of the Chicano movement's revalorization of Mexican and Mexican American culture and language and because of the need to justify minority status in relation to

African Americans. In this historical moment, federally funded poverty-alleviation programs were principally targeting African American communities (Herrera 2012; Self 2003). A group of law students at UC Berkeley, for example, created a neighborhood Chicano legal center due to frustrations over the absence of county legal services for the Spanish-speaking population. Jose Martinez recalled that:

> Alameda County Legal Aid had neighborhood law offices and obviously there was one in downtown, there was one in the black community, but no office directed toward the Chicano community. And our view of Alameda County Legal Aid at the time was [that it was] favoring the black community and not spending enough resources on the Hispanic community.[20]

Parents and students understood that Oakland antipoverty officials concentrated their efforts on African American institutions and that little information existed on Mexican Americans as a group with shared interests. Dr. Hayes-Bautista elaborated: "We were undergraduates, graduates, we tended to be a little bit extreme and we all thought since [antipoverty programs] are not doing what you are supposed to do and clearly there are needs in this community, why don't we address the needs?"[21] Community efforts to build institutions were guided by the Chicano movement's mission of establishing programs and services that were built for and by Chicanos. Instead of waiting for state services to come to the barrio, they created their own. Neighborhood activists challenged state-sanctioned modes of community development and maintained their integrity as agencies based in and directed by the community.

The formation of Central Legal de la Raza and Clínica de la Raza reveals how the Chicano movement was spatialized in Oakland. It also demonstrates how activists and community residents deployed multiple tactics to create and maintain neighborhood resources. These organizations were crafted to represent and reconstitute the meaning of community. Activists and community residents utilized the concept of "community" as a mechanism in claims-making processes. They created a new politics rooted in the redefinition of the needs and mechanisms through which the Chicano community would create its own resources. This was significant in a period when city and federal agencies overlooked the expanding Mexican American population in Oakland. Chicano movement organizations were initially independent institutions formed without assistance from state agencies. As the organizations grew, they began to work with particular state institutions, such as the university, to bring about change in Mexican American neighborhoods. They also pressured city officials and other state agents to channel resources to the Mexican American community. As such, the formation of these institutions demonstrates the contested process of state and nonprofit incorporation of movement activism. However, activists remembered with a sense of pride that their projects were initially independent from state and philanthropic funding.

Chicano Movement as Boot Camp

Movement activism, according to the activists' memories, occurred through the kinds of neighborhood-level social relationships they developed. Through their commitment to the neighborhood, they participated in a "boot camp" of sorts where they developed enduring social networks that were committed to making positive changes in the community. The ideas of *comadrazgo* and *compadrazgo* describe these kinds of political kinship networks, which revolved around community protection and care.[22] They argued that the social relations they built through their movement activism endured and shaped how they interacted with the neighborhood in the following decades.

I met Roger and Regina Echeverría at their home in a quiet residential section of Fruitvale. It had a museum-like quality. The walls were adorned with countless Chicano movement posters, certificates of recognition, photographs, UFW flags, and other commemorations of the movement. This collection demonstrated their curatorial prowess in the way they historicized their participation in many organizations. As they described the items, they talked about marches and protests. Yet their explanation of the people they had met and worked with was the most important aspect of their movement activism. They profoundly described how they had experienced social movement activism, emphasizing the importance of social relations in the construction of social movements and space.

Both Roger and Regina Echeverría began their activism as students. They met through their work in the neighborhood and shared the experience of working on different community projects. They participated in the Chicano Moratoriums, UFW marches and boycotts, and various nonprofit organizations like Clínica de la Raza and Narcotics Education League. Through these mobilizations, they forged lasting relationships with other activists. These relationships constituted a boot camp where activists experimented with different modes of organizing and relationship building. As Roger Echeverría recalled, "everyone came to boot camp together and the next generation is in line and there's going to be better services because you won't have to deal with the racism and the alienation. You were literally neighbors and you were connected."[23] In Echeverría's view, the Chicano movement built services for the future generation through the collaborative work of different institutions. This occurred through a shared, politicized mission of community improvement.

These social networks consolidated future opportunities and charted connections to numerous county and nonprofit resources. Regina Echeverría, for example, went on to direct a nonprofit called Narcotics Education League (NEL). As NEL's executive director, she relied on the social networks she had built through social movement activism. As she explained:

> Help was a phone call away, a handshake away. It was really easy. That was one of the things that I noticed about the years working at NEL. I always kept my connection with everybody. I could walk into county

> agencies or other nonprofits and get help because I had either worked there or done volunteer work or sat in a committee. It was like going to see your *compadres*, your *comadres*.[24]

Central to Regina Echeverría's explanation of the importance of these social networks was their longevity. Though the moments of street protest were now in the past, the social relations built through these mobilizations endured. And these lasting relationships represented a set of opportunities that enabled contemporary forms of mobilizations. As geographer Doreen Massey (1994, 154) reminds us, "what gives place its specificity is not some long internalized history but the fact that it is constructed out of a particular constellation of social relations, meeting and weaving together at a particular locus." Social bonds and forms of sociality developed in the 1960s and 1970s were kept alive through the relationships activists built with one another. These relationships helped to continually produce Fruitvale as a place shaped by Chicano movement activism and an incubator of social movement struggles. These bonds (including the romantic relationships) and experiential practices of organizing and working together did not end. They continued and helped them build new partnerships in the years that ensued.

Conclusion

Commemorations of the Chicano movement are now part of the ethnic pageantry of US neoliberal multiculturalism. This is most powerfully performed through the celebration of figures such as Cesar Chavez and, more recently, Dolores Huerta. This kind of incorporation of social movement icons performs a crucial political function that fashions the United States as a post-racial nation where race-based mobilizations are a thing of the past (see Melamed 2006, 2011). It also helps to create a romanticized version of the movement that overlooks the complexities and contradictions that typically characterize mass mobilizations. Similarly, we are left without an assessment of the grounded neighborhood-level changes that social movements helped to construct.

In this essay I demonstrated how the Chicano movement forged a broad base of support in Oakland and helped to produce new resources that changed the community's political landscape. Activists' recollections of movement participation were not reduced to charismatic leaders or their participation in protests. Instead, they emphasized how Chicano movement mobilizations produced the Fruitvale neighborhood. The bulk of these changes occurred through the creation of neighborhood institutions, which contoured the way in which residents and activists experienced the movement. The institutions spanned multiple types of political postures and represented the diversity of approaches that activists took to achieve community care. This history of institution building, however, is overlooked in scholarly literature on the Chicano movement primarily because of its narrow focus on militancy and street protests. This scholarly tradition has obscured institutional-

ized modes of organizing and created a chronopolitics that misses the longevity of movement legacies.

By situating their memories in space, and by producing cartographies of their activism, activists asserted the way in which Chicano power was essentially spatialized and experienced in urban neighborhoods. In so doing, they foregrounded the centrality of place-making to constructions of activism and the Chicano movement. And these places, and the multiplicity of social relations they set forth, are still in formation. Such claims are important given changing demographics of the neighborhood, whereby most residents are now recently arrived immigrants who are unaware of the history of activism that gave fruit to the community.

Shifting the framework of analysis from militancy and protest to that of community care can offer a more expansive and complex understanding of the various mobilizations engendered in the 1960s and 1970s. It can also give us a more robust accounting of how the legacies of these mobilizations continue to shape politics in urban neighborhoods like Oakland's Fruitvale. The legacies and longevity of Chicano movement-era mobilizations require a more accurate assessment. Like activists' cartographic memories, analysis of social movement activism must be attentive to the dynamic simultaneity and multiplicity of social relations and organizational practices that give place a social meaning (see Massey 1994; 2005).

It is not inconsequential that Fruitvale today is the origin of annual immigrant rights marches on May Day. This is not simply due to the demographic fact that Fruitvale is home to Oakland's largest concentration of recently arrived migrants. Historically, this neighborhood has been shaped by protest movements and is today the site of many organizations that help to cohere present-day protests and animate neighborhood politics. This diverse cadre of institutions and political action groups are comprised of historical and newly formed organizations that together enact manifold practices and strategies of community care.

NOTES

1. Annette Oropeza, interview by the author, January 8, 2012.
2. Sociologist Edward J. McCaughan comes to a similar conclusion about Chicano artists who "promoted alternative notions of power and social change rooted in community, democratic participation, egalitarian relations, anti-materialistic values, and … different ways of knowing in the world that transcended Western concepts of rationality and objectivity" (2012, 136). I add to that analysis by focusing on the formation of community institutions through which activists crafted these alternative notions of power and ways of being in the world.
3. Alfredo Cruz, interview by the author, September 20, 2012.
4. Ibid.
5. Annette Oropeza, interview by the author, January 8, 2012.
6. Ibid.
7. Claudia Serrano is a pseudonym.
8. In adopting a strict cultural nationalism, some Chicano activists created rigorous boundaries of

what constituted legitimate forms of activism. Chicana feminists, for example, were called sellouts or "*vendidas*" for allegedly aligning themselves too closely with "women's issues" and thus were accused of betraying the Chicano movement (see Blackwell 2012, 160–191; Nieto Gomez 1997, 86–92). In a similar fashion, activists that chose to align themselves with mainstream organizations, including state and philanthropic agencies, were often called "*vendidos*." McCaughan (2012, 143) discusses the 1980 polemic between Chicano movement artists Malaquias and Leslie Montoya and art historian Shifra Goldman regarding concerns of potential cooptation by state and mainstream arts institutions.

9. Herman Gallegos, interview by the author, July 5, 2012.
10. Ibid.
11. David Hayes-Bautista, interview by the author, December 19, 2011.
12. Claudia Serrano, interview by the author, October 20, 2012.
13. Andreana Clay (2012) analyzes the impact of social movements on contemporary youth experiences in Oakland. I add to her analysis by emphasizing the social movement impacts on the built environment and in the creation of social services for Spanish-speaking residents. These services, in the form of nonprofit organizations, continue to deliver services and politicize long-term residents and recently arrived immigrants.
14. Jose Martinez, interview by the author, February 19, 2012.
15. Regina Echeverría, interview by the author, October 21, 2012.
16. David Hayes-Bautista, interview by the author, December 19, 2011.
17. Regina Echeverría, interview by the author, October 21, 2012.
18. Ibid.
19. Although the activists I interviewed did not share a specific gendered analysis of their participation in institution building, most of the labor described was indeed spearheaded by women. Women in the movement were instrumental in projects of community formation, especially those that went on to be mothers at the height of the mobilizations, or others that participated in projects of community mothering. For an extensive analysis of this gendered form of labor, see Bermudez (2014), Bernal (1997), Blackwell (2011), and Espinoza (2001).
20. Jose Martinez, interview by the author, February 19, 2012.
21. David Hayes-Bautista, interview by the author, December 19, 2011.
22. As developed through movement organizing, the terms *comadrazgo* and *compadrazgo*—which traditionally referred to relationships between parents and their children's godparents—do not easily translate into English. Activists retooled the Chicano movement's valorization of the family to create new kinds of political kinship ties based on a shared mission of community solidarity and support.
23. Roger Echeverría, interview by the author, October 21, 2012.
24. Regina Echeverría, interview by the author, October 21, 2012.

REFERENCES

Acuña, Rodolfo
2004 *Occupied America: A History of Chicanos*. New York: Pearson Longman.
Allen, Robert L.
1969 *Black Awakening in Capitalist America: An Analytic History*. New York: Doubleday.
Anzaldúa, Gloria
1999 [1987] *Borderlands/La Frontera: The New Mestiza*. San Francisco, CA: Aunt Lute Books.
Arredondo, Gabriela F., et al. (eds.)
2003 *Chicana Feminisms*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Bermudez, Rosie C.
2014 "Alicia Escalante, the Chicana Welfare Rights Organization, and the Chicano Movement." In *The Chicano Movement: Perspectives from the Twenty-First Century,* edited by Mario T. Garcia, 95–116. New York: Routledge.
Bernal, Dolores Delgado
1997 "Chicana School Resistance and Grassroots Leadership." PhD dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.
Blackwell, Maylei
2011 ¡*Chicana Power! Contested Histories of Feminism in the Chicano Movement*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
Chávez, Ernesto
2002 *"¡Mi Raza Primero!" (My People First!): Nationalism, Identity, and Insurgency in the Chicano Movement in Los Angeles, 1966–1978*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Clay, Andreana
2012 *The Hip-Hop Generation Fights Back: Youth, Activism, and Post-Civil Rights Politics*. New York and London: New York University Press.
Craib, Raymond
2004 *Cartographic Mexico: A History of State Fixations and Fugitive Landscapes*. Durham: Duke University Press.
2009 "Relocating Cartography." *Postcolonial Studies* 12(4): 481–90.
de Certeau, Michel
1984 *The Practice of Everyday Life*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Dowd Hall, Jacquelyn
2005 "The Long Civil Rights Movement and the Political Uses of the Past." *Journal of American History* 91(4): 1233–63.
Edney, Matthew
2005 "Putting 'Cartography' into the History of Cartography: Arthur H. Robinson, David Woodward, and the Creation of a Discipline." *Cartographic Perspectives* 51: 14–29.
Espinoza, Dionne
2001 "'Revolutionary Sisters': Women's Solidarity and Collective Identification among Chicana Brown Berets in East Los Angeles, 1967–1970." *Aztlán* 26(1): 17–58.
Garcia, Alma (eds.)
1997 *Chicana Feminist Thought: The Basic Historical Writings*. New York: Routledge.
Gilmore, Ruth Wilson
2007 "In the Shadow of the Shadow State." In *The Revolution Will Not Be Funded: Beyond the Non-profit Industrial Complex,* edited by Incite! Women of Color Against Violence. Cambridge, MA: South End Press.
Gómez-Quiñones, Juan
1978 *Mexican Students por la Raza: The Chicano Student Movement in Southern California, 1966–1967*. Santa Barbara, CA: Editorial La Causa.
1990 *Chicano Politics: Reality and Promise, 1940–1990*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.
Harley, John Brian
1988 "Maps, Knowledge, and Power." In *The Iconography of Landscape: Essays on the Symbolic Representation, Design, and Use of Past Environments*, edited by D. Cosgrove and S. Daniels, 277–312. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
1992 "Deconstructing the Map." In *Writing Worlds: Discourse, Text and Metaphor in the Representation of Language*, edited by T. Barnes and J. Duncan, 231–47. London: Routledge.

Herrera, Juan
2012 "Unsettling the Geography of Oakland's War on Poverty: Mexican American Political Organizations and the Decoupling of Poverty and Blackness." *Du Bois Review* 9(2): 375–93.
2013 "Nonprofits in Production: Race, Place, and the Politics of Care." PhD dissertation, University of California, Berkeley.
Kramer, Ralph M.
1969 *Participation of the Poor: Comparative Communities Case Studies in the War on Poverty*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
Massey, Doreen
1994 *Space, Place, and Gender*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
2005 *For Space*. London: Sage.
McCaughan, Edward
2012 *Art and Social Movements: Cultural Politics in Mexico and Aztlán*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
Melamed, Jodi
2006 "The Spirit of Neoliberalism: From Racial Liberalism to Neoliberal Multiculturalism." *Social Text* 89, 24(4): 1–24.
2011 *Represent and Destroy: Rationalizing Violence in the New Racial Capitalism*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
Miranda, Marie
2003 *Homegirls in the Public Sphere*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
Muñoz, Carlos, Jr.
2007 *Youth, Identity, Power: The Chicano Movement*. London and New York: Verso.
Murch, Donna Jean
2010 *Living for the City: Migration, Education, and the Rise of the Black Panther Party in Oakland, California*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
Nelson, Alondra
2011 *Body and Soul: The Black Panther Party and the Fight against Medical Discrimination*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
Nieto-Gomez, Anna
1997 "La Feminista." In *Chicana Feminist Thought: The Basic Historical Writings,* edited by Alma M. Garcia. New York: Routledge.
Perez, Emma
1999 *The Decolonial Imaginary: Writing Chicanas into History*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
Pressman, Jeffrey L.
1975 *Federal Programs and City Politics: The Dynamics of the Aid Process in Oakland*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
Rodriguez, Dylan
2007 "The Political Logic of the Non-Profit Industrial Complex." In *The Revolution Will Not Be Funded: Beyond the Non-profit Industrial Complex,* edited by Incite! Women of Color Against Violence. Cambridge, MA: South End Press.
Self, Robert O.
2003 *American Babylon: Race and the Struggle for Postwar Oakland*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.