

Organizational Tenets of Aztlan:

Contrasting MEChA and the League

of Revolutionary Struggle

Different Visions,

Ideologies, and Goals

by

Stephanie A. López

with assistance from:

Chicanos

Committed to

MEChA Autonomy (CCMA)

A Synopsis of the Problem:

A Parasitic Relationship

According to the American College Dictionary, 1964 edition, the definition of parasite is a plant, animal, or a organism that lives on or in another animal (the host) from which it obtains its nutriment. It does this without making any useful and fitting return, instead it lives on the hospitality of others. MEChA, currently has to deal with such an organism that is feeding on it and sucking out its lifeline and energy. An outside organization, the League of Revolutionary Struggle, has set up house inside of MEChA and is living off the nutriment of our Raza without giving anything fitting or useful in return. Instead, the LRS has violated and abused the hospitality of MEChA by usurping its organizational autonomy and attempting to change its basic ideology from Chicano to non-Chicano. Using the tactic of infiltration and dual membership, in both the League and MEChA, and often lying about that dual affiliation, such people promote distrust and dissension in MEChA that often tears apart individual chapters for the sake of LRS "struggle." Such "struggle" divides individual chapters of MEChA and often leads to their destruction or inactivity.

The League, like a Trojan Horse, has entered our Chicano house and intends to take us from within. This separate organization exists inside MEChA and works against the basic organizational goals of Mechistas. Their literature betrays the fact they think that our movement must be led by them, and pursue the League's objectives, and not our own MEChA objectives. Lately, they have taken to making decisions under the name of MEChA State-Wide Educational Task Force and endorsing the recent conference of the Latino Agenda Coalition without the permission of all MEChAs state-wide through a state-wide resolution.

The League of Revolutionary Struggle is a separate organization from MEChA. Its organizational goals and ultimate objectives differ greatly from the goals and ultimate objectives of MEChA. The League is refusing to respect the organizational self-determination of the Chicano student movement, and MEChA's right to function without interference from this outside organization. As Mechistas we want this outside meddling to stop. Such behavior is opportunistic and seeks to take advantage of the Chicano students and their right to make decisions. We want the League to stop its infiltrating, its secret agendas, its rumor-mongering, raiding MEChA for members, and misrepresentation inside of our separate organization. League members should be up front about their

League affiliation and their agenda for MEChA, instead of lying and telling half-truths. For the sake of MEChA's survival it is imperative that the League's parasitic behavior inside of MEChA come to an end. Mechistas unite and reclaim your movement!

ADOPT PRINCIPLES TO PROTECT MEChA'S AUTONOMY!

RE-AFFIRM THE PLAN!

O V E R V I E W

Recent events that have seen an upsurge of activity inside of MEChA by the League of Revolutionary Struggle, make it imperative that the goals and direction of the two organizations be compared and contrasted to determine where each sees the future of the Chicano Student Movement. Over the last several years, the League of Revolutionary Struggle has started a process of infiltrating various chapters of MEChA, while attempting to divert the organization from its fundamental principles of a national emergence of the Chicano people, as El Pueblo Aztlan; these principles of Chicano self-determination were established in the Plans of Aztlan and Santa Barbara. The ideology that a group espouses, i.e. their world view, influences their goals and their interaction with others. It is important to note that MEChA may or may not be exercising in an individual MEChA. For this reason it is important to analyze the differences between the two organizations, their ideologies, and what they advocate for the Chicano Student Movement. With this in mind, let us begin our analysis by viewing the fundamental tenets that led to the founding of Movimiento Estudiantil Chicano de Aztlan.

The Founding of MEChA •

The fundamental principles that led to the founding of Movimiento Estudiantil Chicano de Aztlan are found in El Plan de Santa Barbara (EPDSB). The Manifesto of EPDSB sees the self-determination of the Chicano community as the only acceptable mandate for the social and political action of our community. In essence, this is a commitment to Chicanismo, that draws its faith and strength from our Gente's fight against poverty and injustice, as Raza seeks to meet the needs of our community. The Manifesto of EPDSB states in part:

We recognize that without a strategic use of education that places value on what we value we will not realize our destiny. Chicanos recognize the central importance of institutions of higher learning to model progress, in this case, to the development of our community. But, we go further: we believe that higher education must contribute to the formation of a complete man who truly values life and freedom.

According to EPDSB, a Chicano ideology involves a nationalist identity that integrates a self-awareness for the basic needs of La Raza with a cultural identification that becomes a necessary step to developing political consciousness. This identification with our cultural heritage forms a pride in being an indigenous Gente rooted in the earth of our Pueblo Aztlan. EPDSB includes a segment on campus organizing of MEChA that stresses that every opportunity must be made to educate the Chicano student on the philosophy,

culture, and history of our Raza. EPDSB reminds us that the emergence of Chicanismo involves socio-political and cultural elements that exhort Mechistas to preserve their heritage of our pueblo Aztlan. It exhorts Mechistas to preserve their history, anthropology, sociology, and literature so that the Chicano community may survive as a cultural entity in this melting pot society, while resisting colonial, European culture and identifying with our indigenous Mestizo roots. Such a process is revolutionary, in itself, and thus, establishes a foundation for political direction. Fundamentally, EPDSB asks Mechistas to be of the community and for the community.

Chicano Nationalism:

The Basis for El Movimiento

At the National Chicano Youth Conference in Denver in 1969, the basic principles of the organization and goals of the Chicano Movement were established in El Plan Espiritual de Aztlan (EPEDA). A synopsis of the Plan includes the following tenets: (1) We are Chicanos of Aztlan that are reclaiming the land of our birth; (2) We are free and sovereign to determine our tasks, with Aztlan belonging to our indigenous people and not to a foreign culture; (3) We are a meztizo nation of Bronze people that is a union of free pueblos of Aztlan doing

everything for and nothing against our people; (4) Chicano nationalism is the key to organization and mass mobilization; (5) Nationalism as a catalyst for the emergence of Raza, transcends all political, class and economic factions and becomes the common denominator to bring consensus to the Chicano movement; (6) Cultural values strengthen our identity, and nationally we represent La Familia de La Raza; (7) Calls for organization and nationalization of the Chicano community, that has an independent, autonomous, local, regional, and national political party that represents the sentiments and needs of the Chicano community (i.e. El Partido de La Raza Unida; and (8) EPEDA itself, is a basic plan for Chicano Liberation.

The catalyst for providing impetus for the Movimiento was rooted in nationalism that sought the liberation of Aztlan. El Movimiento de la Gente de Bronze was founded and prized the social, political, and economic principles rooted in the concept of La Familia de La Raza that were sparked by nationalism as the key to mass mobilization and organization of the Chicano movement. Next it is important to contrast how different the ideology of the League of Revolutionary Struggle is as a multinational organization with a goal that seeks to merge various national movements of liberation into an international revolution led by the League.

Tenets of the League of
Revolutionary Struggle
(Marxist-Leninist)
and/or
The August Twenty-Ninth Movement

The August Twenty-Ninth Movement (Marxist-Leninist) and I Wor Kuen merged in 1978 to form the League of Revolutionary Struggle (Marxist-Leninist) and viewed this as an advance for the U.S. communist movement and as a further step towards unifying the entire vanguard communist party of the U.S. proletariat. The LRS upholds the theory of Chairman Mao, upholds the dictatorship of the proletariat, and supports socialist China and the alliance of the proletariat. A key component of the LRS line is that they have a "duty" to win leadership of the national movements and lead these movements toward revolution by using class struggle. Struggle becomes their byword for skirmishing with those in the national movements that disagree with them. Chicano activists who identify the U.S./European colonization of our people and our labor as the prime struggle, are labelled "narrow nationalists" or "petty bourgeoisie" that the League can unite with until they are ready to displace them. The League "line" calls for: (1) the League's version of a Marxist-Leninist "line"; and (2) establishing strong ties with the masses by practicing the

"line." Along with this, the LRS sees its duty as giving direction to the student movement and their respective "struggles" arousing in those same students a revolutionary ferment. The League "line" stipulates that the Chicano people can not proceed to overthrow imperialism except through a League version of revolutionary struggle. For this reason, Chicanos need the communist movement, (they obviously mean the LRS) to lead the movement.

Contrasting the Ideologies of
MEChA and the League

MEChA was founded with a commitment to Chicanismo, based on the national emergence of our Gente culturally, socio-politically, and economically. From the fields of Delano where the farm workers demanded a decent day's wages, to the schools of East Los Angeles and Crystal City where students demanded educational parity, we, as Chicanos, sought complete liberation from the socio-political and economic institutions that have oppressed Chicanos/Mexicanos since the imperialistic actions of the U.S. that began in 1848.

El Movimiento sprang from an indigenous people's battle against the tyranny of that prevailing society that refused to treat the citizens of Aztlan with dignity.

On the other hand, the LRS was founded with a commitment to Marxist-Leninist thought, based on the merger of Chicano/Latino and Chinese communist groups that abhor nationalism. EPDSB stresses the need to educate Chicano students on the philosophy, culture, and history of the movement, and instills a call to serve Aztlan. The League, in contrast, supports Mao Zedong theory of the three worlds and consequently, supports that socialist nation's ideological struggle with the Soviet Union. The LRS fails to recognize colonialism as the major hurdle to freeing Aztlan, instead, the class struggle is their major focus. The League promotes a multinational ideology with that class struggle that comes into direct contradiction with the Chicano effort to end colonialism through a national movement leading to socio-political and economic emergence of Aztlan.

By now, it should be obvious that the LRS is something entirely different from MEChA. If MEChA were to adopt the goals of the LRS, it would lead to the assimilation of the Chicano student movement and its goal for the self-determination of our people into a multinational and non-Chicano movement that seeks a single, vanguard communist party with strong ties to the People's Republic of China.

Just as Raza has fought against the assimilation of our Gente into the culture of the prevailing, colonialist powers,

we also oppose the assimilation of the Chicano movement/into an LRS version of an internationalist movement. Yet, we endorse coalitions of mutual respect with representatives of national movements of liberation. According to EPDSB, when a coalition is no longer in the best interest of our people, "Chicano participation in coalition ends."

A logical extension of this premise is that, as Raza, we are willing to work with other's movements seeking to end tyranny, but that relationship ends if it threatens our Movimiento. This standard is a good yard stick for measuring if coalition with the League is in the best interest of MEChA.

The vision of MEChA is to work in the Chicano community and to build an educational foundation for the emergence of our Pueblo Aztlan, while the League seeks to change that vision into the merging of cultural identities into a single, vanguard communist party. It is easy to see that it is not in our best interest to have a coalition with the LRS. It is the League that ridicules Chicano nationalism as "petty bourgeoisie nationalism." It is the League that admits they are in the Chicano movement to have conflict and eventually lead the national movements: "The struggle to lead the national movements requires class struggle in the national movements." "Struggle" becomes a byword for attempting to move MEChA from a Nationalist revolutionary position to the League's version of a

decisive multinational revolution (Statements on the Founding of the League of Revolutionary Struggle).

This makes it clear what the League's intentions are inside of MEChA; they seek to introduce their agenda into our organization and assimilate Chicano students into the LRS. The League and its agenda for MEChA, including its multinational bent must be resisted and the League must be exposed as opportunistic, as well as chauvinistic.

Marxist-Leninism is not the Problem with the LRS

A commonly used tactic of the League is to parry criticism by saying that those who do not agree with them are "red baiting." Red baiting becomes the cliché of convenience to circumvent criticism and beg the question. For this reason, it becomes important to demonstrate why honest concerns about the LRS and their behavior are not red baiting, but based on inconsistencies in their own "line" that are demonstrated by their actions and their verbal vacillation.

A Marxist-Leninist writer, Omali Yeshitela, writing in the African People's Socialist Party's publication, The Burning Spear, recently criticized the LRS for making "warfare against

legitimate Chicano/Mexicano Movement" and at the same time "openly and obscenely embracing the imperialist anti-Black and anti-Chicano/Mexicano Democratic Party and the openly anti-communist . . . Rev. Jesse Jackson."

As a member of the Latino Agenda Coalition, the LRS must obviously accept the Preamble of the Coalition which states in part: ". . . with support from progressive peoples of all nationalities. We consider ourselves in unity with all who strive for equality, justice, and a better world for our children." Holding membership in that same coalition is Mariq Obledo, former national president of LULAC and outspoken proponent of the Coors Brewing Co., and their funding of LULAC events.

Why are these points important? They are important in that they show an inconsistency in the League's commitment to their "line." For example, Omali Yeshitela's criticism is that the League embraces those that they do not ideologically agree with based on their "line," while at the same time they use their line to try and undermine Chicano/Mexicano principles of self-determination.

Yeshitela's statement that they make warfare on the Chicano Movement, includes such statements as: "We communists are the irreconcilable opponents, in principle, of bourgeois nationalism in all its forms." (Fan the Flames: A

Revolutionary Position on the Chicano National Question,
(LRS). Such verbal vacillation makes it easy to see why Yeshitela calls the League's line "windshield wipers" due to their back and forth action, and thus earns them the moniker of League of Revolutionary Slowness. I guess if Obledo can obtain Coors funding for a future Latino Agenda Coalition conference, such funding should be accepted in the interest of unity, this naturally follows since the "militant" League says that narrow nationalists "offer only the dead end alternatives of 'Chicano capitalism,' or community control without a revolutionary struggle for political power." (Forward: Journal of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought, LRS No. 2 August 1979). How can the League build coalition with such Chicano capitalists as Obledo or others like him without contradicting their "line?" Answer: They can not!

This "windshield wiper" mentality has also characterized the League's skirmishing with other organizations that are Marxist-Leninist. By their own admission, in Statements on the Founding of the League of Revolutionary Struggle, the LRS says that they have had to "struggle" against the opportunism of other Marxist-Leninist organizations. Calling such groups revisionists and opportunists that lacked the proper "line". The League has had conflicts with the CPUSA, the October League, the Revolutionary Union, the SWP, and a divisive

"struggle" that saw the LRS and CASA use the movement as their battle ground. The League, in the same document, (p.11) says that in order to forge a single and unified vanguard communist party they must develop a Marxist-Leninist "line," and that this "line" must be separated from opportunism. How do they demonstrate that they want a unified vanguard communist party? By fighting with anyone else that avows Marxist tenets, i.e. the CPUSA, OL, the RU, the SWP, and CASA. Yet, of even greater inconsistency is the League claim to support the Chicano right to self-determination.

Chicano Self-Determination is a League Exaggeration

According to the League's own writings: The League of Revolutionary Struggle is a multinational communist organization." (Forward: Journal of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought, LRS, No. 2, August 1979). By their own admission, they are not a Chicano organization. As a multinational organization they have taken it upon themselves to enter the Chicano Movement for national self-determination and attempt to move us from our ultimate goal of seeing our Gente emerge as La Familia de La Raza in El Pueblo Aztlan. The League's ultimate goal is exposed by their own "line" that

states emphatically: "Communists must strive to win the leadership of the national movements and lead them towards revolution . . . Only the working class, under communist leadership, can lead the oppressed masses to complete emancipation." In other words, in order for the Chicano national movement to achieve freedom we must be placed under communist (LRS version) leadership. Remember that this is a multinational leadership that is supposed to lead Aztlan to complete freedom. Question: What happens to Aztlan? Answer: It becomes co-opted under the banner of a multinational, single, unified vanguard communist party. Yet, if the League is really serious about their "line", in this regard, why have they failed to mend fences with other Marxist-Leninist organizations? An organization claiming to want a unified vanguard party, of necessity, needs to demonstrate the validity of their own "line" by taking care of business with other organizations that share the same ultimate goal, of a single communist revolution. Instead, the League ~~has~~ taken to parroting phrases like, self-determination for the Chicano Movement, when, in actuality they neither respect that self-determination nor actually seek it. Rather, Chicano self-determination becomes a slogan for promoting their multinational ideology.

In a leaflet of the LRS entitled: A Program for Chicano

Liberation, the League's verbal vacillation and contradictory comments are clearly exposed. Under the slogan of "The Right of Self-Determination for the Chicano Nation" we are given the following definition:

This is our basic demand in the Chicano Nation, which we raise in order to realize the full revolutionary potential of the Chicano national movement. This demand is also made to help forge the unity of the multinational proletariat on the basis of national equality.

The right of self-determination means the right of the Chicano people, in their areas of concentration in the Southwest - their historic homeland, which was annexed by the United States - to determine their own political future, up to and including the right to secede. This demand means that the Chicano people would have the right to exercise full political control over their territory.

A careful analysis of the slogan: "The right of self-determination for the Chicano Nation" and the actual statement that follows the slogan reveals some interesting inconsistencies that include: (1) The LRS claims to support the full revolutionary potential of the Chicano national movement and then flip-flops by saying that this demand also means to help forge the "unity" of the multinational proletariat; (2) The LRS then flip-flops a second time in their line by saying the Chicano people should have the right to exercise full political control over their territory. Ultimately, that second statement is betrayed as dishonest when one contrasts it with the League's "line" concerning national

movements of liberation. What does this "line" actually advocate?

What the League actually means by the Chicano right to self-determination is revealed in their own writings in the Forward: Journal of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought, Forward, 2 August 1979, p.94. The League plainly stipulates:

While communists uphold the right of self-determination, communists must also have their own opinion whether or not a particular expression of the right is advantageous to the proletariat. Upholding the right of self-determination does not presuppose communist support for secession or any other specific exercise of the right. Communists decide on their position taking into account the overall conditions of the proletarian struggle and how secession or whatever form of the right would affect this struggle. In other words, the right of self-determination, as with all democratic demands, is subordinate to the general cause of the proletariat.

This line obviously advocates a multinational accountability for national struggles of liberation and the use of slogans such as "Chicano right to self-determination" are only window dressings" to attract those that are uninitiated. Mario Barrera in his essay: The Historical Evolution of Chicano Ethnic Goals, says that groups like ATM (LRS) have an external line put out for popular consumption and recruitment of the uninitiated, and an internal line that reflects the group's ideology at the time. Further, this external line is used in establishing front groups which are covertly controlled by cadre of the core organization and built around one or more

"legitimate" (quote marks are not mine) issues. Organizations forming issue coalitions with the League should be aware their propensity to abuse coalitions and their past history of disruptive tactics that will be addressed later in the position paper. But, before we examine the tactics of the League it is important to set a foundation for our analysis.

Barrera, in referring to the League (as ATM) tells us that such organizations exhibit certain organizational traits that include: (1) An over-reliance on slogans and formulas related to their quest for the "correct line" to function as the vanguard of the revolution, i.e. "Down with Dogmatism, Build a Genuine Multi-National Communist Party, Venceremos, and Support the Liberation Struggles of all oppressed Nationalities"; (2) Reliance on official terminology that is seen as jargon by outsiders and as scientific by those on the inside, i.e. In our investigation of the question of the right deviation of narrow nationalism (we must be conscious of) the over emphasizing of national characteristic to proletarian internationalism (ATM, 1974, p.5); (3) Over-reliance on argumentation and using the works of Stalin or the collective writings of Marx and Lenin as sacred writings to bolster their point of view; (4) A mechanical application of successful revolutionary movements in other countries such as Cuba, Vietnam, China, or the Soviet Union without examining the

different contexts these movements took place in; (5) Allegiance to one particular socialist country or to a particular ideologist like Trotsky or Mao; (6) claiming "democratic centralism" as a model, which becomes democracy in theory and centralization in practice (where decisions are made by a select few in leadership); and (7) A propensity to engage in infighting with other Left groups that are often seen as a greater threat than the capitalist class of the bourgeois state. For example, of such hostile attacks we cite the LRS' (ATM) attack on the Revolutionary Union: "These new revisionists are hostile to the science of Marxism-Leninism, only pay lip service to it while they systematically attempt to wreck, slander or destroy any attempt by honest Marxist-Leninists to bring socialist consciousness to the working class" (ATM, 1974, p.14).

These organizational characteristics, then, shall serve as a foundation in analyzing the tactics of the League of Revolutionary Struggle that affect their involvement inside the Chicano movement, and attempts to infiltrate MEChA and change its organizational goals from national identification to multi-national assimilation.

Disruptive Tactics of the League

In the fall of 1977, the Orange County MEChA Central put out a position paper because of "the constant and disruptive struggles between ATM (now LRS) and CASA at MEChA conferences and meetings." The position paper takes the following positions: (1) refusal to be affiliated with "other" organizations based on the guidelines of El Plan de Santa Barbara; (2) Coalition and support of Third World movements that respect MEChA as having equal authority and responsibility and which will not endanger or harm its goals and objectives in any manner whatsoever; (3) views MEChA as an autonomous organization whose membership is strictly students; (4) requests that individuals that belong to outside organizations must defer to MEChA's already established ideology that; "must bring to the mind of every young Chicano that the liberation of his people from prejudice and oppression is in his hands;" and (5) indicts groups that act with their mouths instead of using their speech in harmony with their hands.

The National Chicano Student Conference Steering Committee, in 1980, issued a position paper concerning the disruptive delaying tactics that the League employed when it

appeared that the resolutions emerging from the general assembly would not be in the League's interest. According to the National Chicano Student Conference Steering Committee's position paper:

The LRS' interests are other than organizing the student movement. Students took a stand against this opportunism by walking out. The NCSC after analyzing the general assembly has decided that our struggle is not only against the imperialists that oppress us at work, schools, etc., but also against the opportunists that exist within the Chicano movement. Therefore, the NCSC decided that this opportunism must be struggled against at any cost even if it meant stopping the general assembly.

The position paper of the NCSC further relates that the LRS, as the most disruptive element at the conference used "sneaky, underhanded tactics as a front and denying their LRS affiliation, they infiltrate groups and organizations, take over the leadership, and use people for their own selfish interests." They further relate that: "The League of Revolutionary Struggle is a divisive influence in the Chicano movement . . . (they recommend) that the lesson that we (have) learned from our dealings with the LRS (shows) the need to critically analyze each group or individual involved in the Movimiento to understand what they are offering, what has been their historical practices, and what are their intentions."

The October/November 1980 issue of El Popo, MEChA - Northridge publication analyzed, the disunity that was bread in the struggle for organizational control when planning and

directing the 1980 Chicano Moratorium, the League as well as remnants of the disbanded CASA were involved in the dispute. El Popo's editorial staff condemned the behavior of both ATM (now LRS) and CASA-HGT based the on the following factors: (1) Claiming to have the only solution to oppression and attempted to led Raza as robots to accept their world view; (2) disregard for the principles of democratic participation, even though they have little or no base in the community; (3) such groups have a long history of causing continuous division and conflict, "rooted in a shameful display of irresponsible leadership;" (4) such sectarian groups use the Chicano community as an arena for "dogmatic party-building, and airing personal vendettas;" and (5) such groups "create a confusing and destructive political atmosphere." Thus, the editorial staff of El Popo recommends that we stop allowing the Movement to be "used as a political shooting range by rival organizations and define who 'us' is."

A 1983 issue of Nuestra Cosa, points out that the LRS and other left groups have turned to a more pronounced class analysis of Chicano oppression while totally rejecting Chicano Nationalism as limited and counter-revolutionary. "This has had the effect of assisting the Left in their attempts to dominate the ideological direction of the Chicano Movement," according to the same article. The article entitled: "Chicano

Grass Roots and the Left," citing the example of the League, tells us that the LRS is making movidas, using secret members, to gain control of MEChA State-wide and Nation-wide. Nuestra Cosa, the publication of UC Riverside MEChA, points out that such Leftist groups are either elitist or fearful of true Chicano grass-roots revolutionary nationalism." They point out the fundamental problem involves the chauvinistic attitude of groups like the League:

The elitists paternalistically assume that Chicanos are incompetent and incapable of determining their own destiny and, therefore, need to be led down the correct revolutionary path. The others fear the economic independence and separateness of a grass-roots, mass-based Chicano Nationalist Movement.

This analysis of the League's posture in regard to the Chicano Nationalist Movement is exposed by their own line:

Chicano people can not proceed except through a revolutionary struggle to overthrow the rule of imperialism and establish the dictatorship of the proletariat. This is precisely why the movement places before the communist movement the obligation to support it and lead it.

We communists are the irreconcilable opponents, in principle, of bourgeois nationalism in all its forms. Excerpts from Fan the Flames: A Revolutionary Position on the Chicano National Question, by the August Twenty-Ninth Movement (LRS).

At a recent MEChA regional meeting at Cal State Fullerton the LRS succeeded in having a League propaganda film, Adelante: The Chicano Nation placed on the agenda by misrepresenting it as a film on the Chicano Movement.

Obviously, this film represented the League's version of Chicano History and the LRS' "line" on the "Chicano Nation." Antonio Rios Bustamante in his essay: Mexicans in the United States and the National Question: Current Polemics and Organizational Positions, says that ATM (now LRS) in doing historical analysis in Fan the Flames has committed numerous fallacies and errors. Further that their view of history "may be influencing their interpretation and description of the past in conformity with their views -- a decidedly dishonest or ignorant use of history (p.18). Bustamante views the so called self-determination for the Chicano as highly conditional by saying: "Absurdly, the LRS' view of the ultimate self-determination of the 'Chicano people' depends on no less than Sino-Soviet relations" (p.15). He further indicates that they use a "scissors and paste" method of historical analysis.

Other issues of concern involving the League since the CSUF Regional meeting have included threats, innuendos, rumors that those that disagree with their practices would boycott the National and of gravest concern is the mixing of organizational agendas by having MEChA Central meetings at Latin Agenda Coalition meetings or conferences. This demonstrates a gross disregard for the organizational autonomy of MEChA as a separate and independent organization. As those that seek self-determination for our MEChA we ask fellow Mechistas to

deal with the political opportunism of the League that is attempting to infiltrate and move MEChA away from its agenda of freeing La Familia de La Raza. Decisions affecting the future of Aztlan should be made by the Chicano grass-roots not a multinational, opportunistic organization that seeks to assimilate us. We have resisted being assimilated by the Gava and we will resist being assimilated by the multinationalist League of Revolutionary Struggle. For these reasons we offer the following principles to respect the democratic procedures that will strengthen individual Chicano student's rights to

Democratic Procedures to Respect MEChA's Organizational Autonomy

- I. No mixing of organizational agendas, and goals. Thus, MEChA business should originate with MEChA and be decided by MEChA.
- II. Political opportunists that fail to respect the organizational autonomy of MEChA should be asked to leave.
- III. Individual Mechistas should not offer the endorsement of their chapter, nor speak for their chapter without authorization of their chapter.

- IV. Issues that concern the organization should be brought before the general membership for democratic discussion and resolution; Such issues should not be addressed and resolved outside of the organization, individually, nor in small groups without the authorization of the general membership.
- V. Personal issues do not concern the organization and have no place in MEChA. Such issues should be handled personally and privately.
- VI. Gossip, slander, and rumor mongering cause misinformation and dissension and should not be tolerated inside MEChA.
- VII. Decisions of the body should not be undermined by individuals or small groups acting outside the recognized MEChA structure. Individuals that compromise the decisions of their chapter by revealing information that can harm the chapter will be discouraged from betraying their chapter in this manner.
- VIII. Mechistas must not put any other organizational interests ahead of the interests of MEChA and the Chicano community.

IX. If an individual Mechistas outside organizational interests conflict with the interests of MEChA, it is essential and proper for that Mechista to abstain on that issue.

X. Mechistas must be honest in disclosing outside personal and organizational interests that may interfere with the democratic process of MEChA decision making. MEChA should condemn any organized secret activity inside of the organization.

A P P E N D I X

Chicano Nationalism: The Basis for El Movimiento

Excerpts from El Plan Espiritual de Aztlan clearly shows that El Movimiento was organized as a cultural-nationalist movement of an indigenous gente:

1. We, the Chicano inhabitant and civilizers of the northern land of Aztlan from whence came our forefathers, reclaiming the land of their birth and consecrating the determination of our people of the sun, declare that the call of our blood is our power, our responsibility, and our inevitable destiny.
2. We are free and sovereign to determine those tasks which are justly called for by our house, our land, the sweat of our brows, and by our hearts. Aztlan belongs to those that plant the seeds, water the fields, and gather the crops and not to foreign Europeans.
3. We declare the independence of our mestizo nation. We are a bronze people with a bronze culture. Before the world, before all of North America, before all our brothers in the bronze continent, we are a nation, we are a union of free pueblos, we are Aztlan. Por La Raza todo. Fuera de La Raza nada.
4. El Plan Espiritual de Aztlan sets the theme that the Chicanos (La Raza de Bronce) must use their nationalism as the key or common denominator for mass mobilization and organization.

5. Nationalism as the key to organization transcends all religious, political, class, and economic factions or boundaries. Nationalism is the common denominator that all members of La Raza can agree upon.
6. Economic ties of responsibility must be secured by nationalism and the Chicano defense units.
7. Cultural values of our people strengthen our identity and the moral backbone of the movement. Our culture unites and educates the family of La Raza towards liberation with one heart and one mind.
8. Nationally, we will represent one party: La Familia de La Raza!
9. Community nationalization and organization of all Chicanos: (based on) El Plan Espiritual de Aztlan.
10. Creation of an independent, local, regional, and national political party.
11. El Plan Aztlan is the plan of liberation.

Excerpts from Fan the Flames:

A Revolutionary Position on the Chicano National Question

by the August Twenty-ninth Movement (L.R.S.)

1. We can not predict exactly what direction the Chicano struggle will take in the future - whether for independence, for federation, or as a part of a direct struggle for proletarian state power. In any case, we are duty-bound to support and lead that movement.
2. The basic demands of the Chicano movement will not be the starting point of our mass work among Chicanos. The starting point will be the immediate economic and political demands of the specific struggles in line with ATM's program.
3. We must give direction to the struggle of the students against (lost gains), arousing in the course of this work their revolutionary ferment.
- *4. Chicano people can not proceed except through a revolutionary struggle to overthrow the rule of imperialism and establish the dictatorship of the proletariat. This is precisely why the movement places before the communist movement the obligation to support it and lead it.
5. We communists are the irreconcilable opponents, in principle, of bourgeois nationalism in all its forms.
6. Particularly should we be prepared to work within the mass political parties, such as La Raza Unida Party, which many of the Chicano masses see as their own. We must turn these organizations into fighting organizations directed towards militant mass actions, and not allow them to become mere electoral machinery or appendages of bourgeois politicians.

Excerpts from: Forward: Journal of
Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought,
by the League of Revolutionary Struggle
(M-L), No. 2, August 1979

1. (Introduction) The League of Revolutionary Struggle (Marxist-Leninist) is a multinational communist organization with a long history of struggle in the mass movement.
2. In order to defeat the bourgeoisie, communists must be able to unite the proletariat, win the leadership of the Chicano national movement, and direct these two movements against the monopoly capitalist class.
3. Communists must uphold the right of self-determination for the Chicano nation for the same reason they uphold all the other just demands of the Chicano people - to forge the international unity of the multinational working class and to help lead the Chicano people in revolutionary struggle (p.93).
4. How should communists view nationalism? Communists are internationalists; they recognize that the just struggles of all oppressed peoples support one another and the eventual goal is world communism with an end to all national boundaries and divisions (p.95).

Excerpts from: Statements on the Founding of the
League of Revolutionary Struggle (Marxist-Leninist)

1. The August Twenty-ninth Movement (Marxist-Leninist) and I Wor Kuen have merged to form the League of Revolutionary Struggle (Marxist-Leninist). We view this as an advance for the U.S. communist movement and as a further step towards unifying the entire vanguard communist party of the U.S. proletariat. p.3.
2. The League believes that three conditions must be met in order to forge a single, unified, Vanguard party. These are the development of a Marxist-Leninist line and the demarcation of this with opportunism; the unification of the genuine Marxist-Leninist around this line as expressed in a party program; and the establishment of strong ties with the working and oppressed masses by practicing the line. p.3.
3. The major Marxist-Leninist groups have distinguished themselves by their upholding of Chairman Mao's theory of the three worlds, upholding the dictatorship of the proletariat and supporting socialist China under the leadership of Comrade Hua Kuo-feng and the Communist Party of China, recognizing the revolutionary significance of the alliance of the proletariat and the oppressed peoples in the U.S. revolution and other important points. p.12.

4. Communists must strive to win the leadership of the national movements and lead them towards revolution. . . Only the working class, under communist leadership, can lead the oppressed masses to complete emancipation. p.22.
5. The struggle to lead the national movements in consistently revolutionary direction requires class struggle in the national movements. The working class must win the leadership of the national movements. The petty bourgeoisie of the oppressed nationalities often fight against national oppression and can be united with. But at the same time, they promote various forms of narrow nationalism or reformism as the solution to national oppression. If the petty bourgeoisie leads the movement, the struggle against national oppression will not be thorough and decisive. p.22.
6. The Marxist-Leninist movement must deepen its understanding of the objective conditions and further integrate Marxist-Leninism Mao Tsetung Thought with the U.S. revolution. The Marxist-Leninist movement must unify its ranks and struggle to forge a single, vanguard party. Communists must develop their ties with the masses. These are essential and immediate tasks for all Marxist-Leninist and the League of Revolutionary Struggle will do all it can to help fulfill these tasks. Forge

the single, unified Communist Party of the U.S. Proletariat. Long Live Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung thought! p.25.

7. Though its work in a Farmworkers Support Committee, after a short period of time, ATM cadres won the respect of the strikers and helped them to organize a militant resistance to the growers, who tried to break the strike with scabs and goons. Cesar Chavez tried maneuver after maneuver to take control of the strike away from the rank and file, and sabotage it from within. He opposed ATM and tried to isolate ATM from the strikers without success. . . . a decision was made to liquidate ATM's work with the strikers. This did great harm to the strikers, and set back for a long time ATM's work with the farmworkers.